COMINTERN (SH)

Declaration of War on Maoists

in three parts

(1) , (2) , (3)

Long live the unity of the world communist movement !

Down with Maoism !

Long live Stalinism-Hoxhaism !

Decision of the Communist International

(Stalinist-Hoxhaists)

February 6, 2011
Today it is impossible to bring about the victory of the socialist world revolution and to fulfill the tasks of world socialism, it is impossible to strengthen the internationalist unity of the world proletariat, it is impossible to fulfill its world-historical mission without the complete break with Maoism, without explaining to the masses the inevitability of drawing a principled demarcation-line towards the revisionist Mao Zedong Ideas.

We defeated the Soviet revisionism and we shall defeat Chinese revisionism as well.

There cannot be any unification between the ideology of the Maoists and Marxism-Leninism! There cannot be any unification between the proletarian and the bourgeois ideology! Down with all currents of reconciliation between Marxism-Leninism and Maoism!

So called „Marxism-Leninism-Maoism“

is neo-revisionism, is anti-revisionism in words and revisionism in deeds!

Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism

- this is definitely the genuine world-proletarian ideology of today.

Anything else is bourgeois ideology and has to be defeated.

With the beginning of this new decade, the Comintern (SH) makes a long-overdue and historically important step concerning the continuation of the struggle against revisionist Mao Zedong - Ideas.
The Comintern (SH) is sticking to the old correct line of the world communist movement:

Revisionism was, is and still remains as the main danger in the world communist movement.

Essence of revisionism is nothing but bourgeois ideology.

At present the neo-revisionist currents are dominant.

And – after its ugly face was unmasked through our principled Hoxhaist struggle against modern revisionism – the bourgeoisie was forced to exhibit some „beauty treatment“, some „face-lifting“ of its old battered ideology, to give it a new and more attractive „red“ and „revolutionary“ outlook, to label it with the anti-revisionist grade of „Marxism-Leninism“ - solely for the purpose of deceiving the revolutionary working class and to take it in tow.

However, in spite of all its re-newed appearances and masquerading, - revisionism is like it always was:

„Socialism“ in words – capitalism in deeds.

And so we consequently define neo-revisionism of today, as:

„Anti-revisionism“ in words and revisionism in deeds ! Neo-revisionism is restoration of revisionism !

Neo-revisionism serves imperialism to maintain its world hegemony, to maintain global exploitation and oppression and to prevent the world proletariat from smashing the capitalist world system by the world socialist revolution, to hinder the workers to establish their world dictatorship and to build up world socialism for moving on towards world communism.
The revisionists try to prolong the existence of world capitalism. They try to dissuade the world proletariat, the proletariat of each country from the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, from the ideas of the five Classics, from the true science of the world revolution.

They are enemies of the world-dictatorship of the proletariat and the global class struggle, traitors of world-socialism and world-communism.

They also try to fabricate some pseudo-Marxist, pseudo-socialist and pseudo-democratic "theories". Supposedly all these "theories" are "updates" and "further advanced" additions of „Marxism-Leninism“, tailored to the period that runs through humanity at present – just like the Mao Zedong - Ideas. All these anti-Marxists claim that the phenomena of the present period would not fit to the period in which Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha had lived and fought. All these "theories" are fakes. Their only purpose is to adapt the proletarian ideology constantly to the bourgeois ideology. Their aim is to subordinate the proletariat under the rule of the bourgeoisie. And reportedly, the predictions of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism would not comply with the requirements of present conditions. Principles and rules of the revolution would be „disproportionate“ and „outdated“: All these "theories" are based on these false allegations. They have been made to dissuade the proletariat from socialist world revolution, are masquerades of bourgeois ideology, so as if it would be allegedly "proletarian ideology".

In general, the revisionists try to defeat Marxism-Leninism with its own weapons!

In general, the current revisionist tactics of the bourgeoisie consists of infiltrating and penetrating the communist world movement more easily by putting on a new "Marxist-Leninist", „anti-revisionist“ cloak of invisibility. By means of this neo-revisionist mask the bourgeoisie tries to infect the proletarian ideology with the bourgeois ideology , to undermine it, to decompose it and finally to replace it. The neo-revisionists really pursue the old path of the modern revisionists – though they promise solemnly that they struggle „against“ them.

In particular the revisionists try to defeat proletarian anti-revisionism with its own weapons.

This is the neo-revisionist tactics of the Maoists, Trotzkyites etc. !

In particular, the revisionist tactics of the bourgeoisie consists of adapting permanently the anti-revisionist struggle of the revolutionary world proletariat to the revisionist struggle of the world bourgeoisie. Any further development and strengthening
of our anti-revisionist struggle is encountered by the bourgeoisie, on her part, through a further development and strengthening of revisionism. It is a principle of class struggle that the world bourgeoisie and the world proletariat are constantly fighting for respectively fighting against anti-revisionism - developing always new forms and shapes in this struggle. And our declaration on Anti-Maoism – which we have made today – is just an expression of this particular tactics – is the answer to the Maoists who undermine constantly our Marxist-Leninist, anti-revisionist struggle against the neo-revisionist influence of the world bourgeoisie within the workers' and communist world movement.

The dialectics of the anti-revisionist struggle is its permanent further changing in the course of the class-struggle which includes changing of old forms and means – respectively replaced - by new ones. Revisionism is monophormic – is casting its skin. Old revisionist leaders were replaced by new ones who appear on the „Marxist-Leninist“ scene in the course of its degeneration and regeneration, etc.; some revisionist movements appear, others disappear, etc. But revisionist movements, in itself, exist as long as capitalism exists – and even longer. Therefore – any lowering of our efforts in the anti-revisionist struggle, underestimating any revisionist hues, is always the greatest danger for us Marxist-Leninists. With the fall of the last socialist country – the danger of revisionism did NOT fall simultaneously. Once compromised, revisionism always regenerates unavoidably within the ongoing and increasing world-revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Within the Communist world movement there is always a revisionist mainstream accompanied by several other branches of revisionism. But it is not to be excluded and must moreover be expected that a secondary branch develops towards the mainstream, that the old mainstream can be displaced by a new one, etc. The correct determination of the most dangerous branch of revisionism within the Communist World Movement is of great importance for the victory or defeat in the struggle against revisionism. But this is not enough. It is also important the analysis concerning the different developments within all the revisionist streaming, the weakening of the one streaming and the strengthening of the other streaming. The answer to the question of the changing main revisionist danger in the World Communist Movement can only be the result of the scientific analysis in the light of dialectical and historical materialism. Processes and changing within the different revisionist world camps must be determined both in theory and practice. Developments in the revisionist world camps cannot be disconnected from the developments within the capitalist world camp. Otherwise, we cannot earnestly speak about correctly leading our new global anti-revisionist class-struggle.

Today, our struggle against revisionism is not the same in comparison with our
old struggle against modern revisionism which began with the 60ies of the last century. The revisionists made new experiences and we Marxist-Leninist as well and in first line the objective conditions are not quite the same. It would be a great mistake if we would not update and sharpen our old weapons against modern revisionism in times of the last century. This mistake would only serve the world bourgeoisie in her struggle against the world proletariat. Meanwhile most of the revisionists „agree“ (in words) with our former arguments in the struggle against modern revisionism („that's marked-off-historically!“) but most of them disagree with our continuous struggle against new shapes of Maoism, Trotzkyism etc. Neo-revisionists defend Maoism allegedly as an „anti-revisionist“ weapon „against“ the bourgeoisie which is - instead - a well-known revisionist weapon against the proletariat.

The Comintern (SH) states that the present anti-revisionist class-struggle is constantly in danger to be successively assimilated by revisionism. The demarcation line between revisionism and Marxism-Leninism softened with every new day. Stop it!

The Comintern (SH) states, too, that this is not only a phenomenon in this or that country, however a danger which occurs on a global stage. That's why we decided to draw a principled demarcation line against the tendency of revisionism which leads to the assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. The Most dangerous revisionist tools of this tendency of assimilation are Maoism and Trotzkyism.

Maoists raised their „tactics of many lines“ (or at least „tactics of two lines“) on the level of principles. They try to prove this theoretically on the basis of the Mao Zedong-Ideas. This can be compared with Trotzkyism - raising fractionism on the level of principles. Both these forms of bourgeois ideology are used to legalize anti-Marxist positions within the ranks of the communists. We call them tactics to "have a foothold" within the communist ranks - used as a tool to lever us out. Both Maoism and Trotzkyism are ideologies which serve the liquidation of communism in theory and practice. They are counter-revolutionary ideologies. In words both ideologies allege that they are „contra-dictionary“, however, in deeds they are essentially the same. Everybody knows that Mao was a master of Trotskyite tactics in his struggle against the Marxist-Leninists.

The Mao Zedong - Ideas are thus expandable in any direction and interpretable and not clearly determined as compared with Marxism-Leninism. Maoism opens a wide range of „interpretation“ - suitable for opportunism of all hues. This is a special trait of Maoism and gives Maoism some sort of self-preservation in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism by all kinds of evasive maneuvers.
Comrade Enver Hoxha defined the Mao Zedong-Ideas as follows:

The Ideas of Mao Zedong mean: "that all the bourgeois, capitalist, Marxist, pseudo-Marxist, revisionist, Trotzkyite, anarchist views in every field should be allowed to develop freely, and there should be discussion about them."

“They advocate the development of the ‘theory’ of 'letting a hundred flowers blossom an a hundred schools contend'. This means that all the Confucian and bourgeois-capitalist philosophical currents should flourish and this pragmatic, capitalist, idealist ideology, this «Mao Zedong-ideas», is covered with the Marxist-Leninist cloak.”

“Chinese revisionism will be a very complicated, mystical and cunning grafting, because the Chinese will steadily advance in the defence of their eclectic revisionist theories. A characteristic of the Chinese revisionist ideology will be the creation of great confusion on a national scale, not merely to extinguish the revolutionary movements and to discredit Marxism-Leninism, but, at the same time, this eclecticism will also cause confusion in the ideology of other revisionists, especially those who support Soviet revisionism.”

[ ... of course, to the advantage of the Chinese revisionism and of the own hegemony – remark of the author]


The result of this ideological, inextricable knot - this global "cocktail of leftist ideologies" , catered for all leftists' taste - led to nothing but confusing, vast, prevailing and revisionist-eclectic "unity-mush" of ideologies . Mao's revisionist tactics "Let flourish 1000 flowers!" - this was indeed his neo-revisionist weapon against the Leninist slogan: "Bolshevism is a tactics for all !" Look at the current condition of the old Marxist-Leninist World Movement and you can state that the Maoist seed bears fruit.

“Chinese revisionism is that variant of modern revisionism which aims to bring about the linking of the various forms of revisionism everywhere in the world and to establish its own hegemony” (Enver Hoxha, "Reflections on China", Volume II, page 677, October 31, 1977)

This Maoist tactics has contributed greatly to the split of the revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat and its alliance with the forces of revolutionary liberation of oppressed peoples. Maoism is responsible for many hues of the well-known ideological disorientation, for ideological confusion. Maoism spelled trouble, which caused splits and degeneration within the ranks of the revolutionary world movement. Maoism is
increasingly becoming a major revisionist danger within the world revolutionary movement. Most of the movements, which base themselves on the revolutionary armed struggle, are not without Maoist influence. The Maoists try to occupy the leadership over armed revolutionary struggles with the purpose of their liquidation, respectively, with the aim to integrate them into the interests of the Chinese bourgeoisie. This is what happened in Nepal and in some other countries. The „Three-World-Theory“ is the Chinese „theory“ of neo-colonialism, is a „theory“ of Chinese social-imperialist world hegemony.

It was the case in times of Comrade Enver Hoxha, but today the Soviet revisionism can no longer be considered as the main revisionist threat in a world's scale (though its influence is still existing, and unconditional struggle must be continued against the dangerous restoration of Soviet modern revisionism!). At latest in times of the replacement of the revisionist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the open capitalist one — when capitalist restoration was completed —, the Soviet revisionists lost more and more their dominant influence in the communist movement. There was not a dissolution of the revisionist forces but a regrouping within its own ranks. Just as capitalism recovers from economical crisis, also revisionism recovers from ideological crisis. However, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement could not take advantage of this historical opportunity which appeared the phase of revisionist regrouping because — simultaneously — the revisionists in Albania and the degenerated Marxist-Leninist parties in the world destroyed the backbone of the Hoxhaist World movement. And this was NOT accidentally. This was expression of the anti-communist strategy of the world bourgeoisie: The complete and final integration of former revisionist countries into the capitalist world cannot be successful without the liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. The world bourgeoisie was conscious about the necessity of building up a new revisionist bulwark in the case if the Communist World Movement would not fall. Any disarming of revisionist weapons would strengthen the Communist World Movement.

When the correct struggle of Comrade Enver Hoxha against Maoism was discredited by the Albanian revisionists, in general, and with the fall of Socialist Albania, in particular, the Maoist movements all over the world got new impetus. So it is Maoism which became more and more dangerous within the world communist movement after the fall of the last socialist country, after the fall of the Marxist-Leninist world center. We Marxist-Leninists may never forget that Maoism was also responsible for the weakening of Socialist Albania, for the weakening of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement - to the advantage of world capitalism's struggle against Socialist Albania. Splitting our
communist movement was a disservice of the Maoists towards imperialism.

Of course, the Maoists began to use all the collected arsenals of Soviet, Yugoslav and all the other revisionist weapons to build up new global eclectic collecting ponds, all in different “combinations“ with the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism according to the different conditions on different continents and in different countries. The historical moment of the communist world movement which was weakened by the loss of its world-revolutionary center – this was indeed an advantageous moment for the regeneration of the anti-Marxist-Leninist movements in general and for that of the Maoist movements in particular.

Concerning the Maoist „Theory of the Three Worlds“ there are different streaming within the Maoist movement - a result of the principled struggle of comrade Enver Hoxha and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement against it. Some propagate this “theory“ openly, others keep silence on it. Some others lay the blame on Deng Hsiao-ping to come to Mao’s defense. However, the world proletariat will not be duped by this maneuvers of confusion.

Fact is that it was Mao Zedong himself who rehabilitated Deng Hsia-ping - these two friends of the American imperialists. They raised both the “theory of three worlds“ from the baptism. The centrist position of the one was complementary to the rightist position of the other. You cannot fight against Chinese revisionism if you do not fight against ALL its currents in common, the centrist, the rightist and the „leftist“ ones, which are all fighting under the banner of Mao Zedong. This "theory" led directly to the Chinese great-power chauvinism. And it is the Chinese leaders of today who have raised this "theory“ as the state doctrine.

We Stalinist-Hoxhaists have a principled and uncompromising stand towards the Maoist "Three Worlds Theory".

Namely

that the "Three World Theory" has totally revised the basic teaching of Marxism-Leninism:

Marxism-Leninism is the ideology of the proletariat, a class-ideology. Marxism-Leninism is the never-failing compass for the class-analysis of the situation in the world, for the determination of the general-line, for the strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution in the single countries as well as for the socialist world revolution.

that the "Three Worlds Theory" - instead of Marxism-Leninism - denies the class-character of the major contradictions in the contemporary world:

that it considers the antagonistic contradiction of capitalism and socialism to be outdated;
that it denies that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie still exists (estimated in the best case as a "minor issue");
that it ignores the class-character of the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism;
that it supports the forces of reaction, the puppets of imperialism;
that it does not differ the contradiction between the various imperialist countries as contradictions among enemies of the proletariat; (instead of that: speaks about contradictions between "friends and enemies" of the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and the peoples of the world);
that the "Three Worlds Theory" is finally a remake of the Khrushchevite's revisionist "new world strategy" (only in a somewhat different guise) which pursues the goal, to stifle and sabotage the struggle of the proletariat for the socialist world revolution.

Enver Hoxha stressed that the world socialist revolution can not win if the "Three Worlds Theory" will not be liquidated.

Enver Hoxha defined the battle line against the "Three Worlds Theory" as follows:
Hence the peoples who are fighting for liberation must strengthen their unity with the working class and, under the leadership of the working class, fight for their liberation from the internal capitalist bourgeoisie and its main props — American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. (Enver Hoxha: "Reflections on China", Volume II, March 22, 1977).

That was a correct Marxist-Leninist general-line. It is now complemented by the struggle against the strengthening of the Chinese social-imperialism and its Maoist ideology. This correct Stalinist-Hoxhaiist general-line is currently valid for the uprisings in the Arab countries in particular and for all oppressed peoples in general. We live in the epoch of the proletarian, socialist world revolution, in the epoch of the dictatorship of the world proletariat and not in the old era of bourgeois-democratic revolutions. From the very beginning, the Maoism had betrayed the socialist world revolution. Maoists are traitors of world-Bolshevism and this is proved by historical facts. The official Chinese party and state leaders follow openly this Maoist line whereas the different Maoist movements in the world hide behind "revolutionary phrase". Both tactics belong together. They cannot be separated from each other. They complement one another, are expressing the aspirations of Chinese world domination.

With our today's decision we just recognize and confirm these historical facts:

The U.S. imperialism is (still) the dominant old imperialism, the main enemy of the world proletariat and the peoples. And we all know that Maoism had abandoned this
most important definition of the general line of the Communist World Movement. It was Mao who began to betray communism when he declared the main enemy of the world proletariat and the oppressed peoples - as FRIEND !! Co-operation with the main class-enemy means: Marxism-Leninism and Maoism are therefore totally antagonistic ideologies. It is impossible to unite and merge them.

But the communist general-line did never necessarily mean that this enemy will remain eternally as the dominant one. As we can see, the predominant position of US-imperialism is about to crumble – at latest during the self-made world crisis. We clearly see a trend among the world hegemonic capitalist powers: the weakening of the U.S.A. and a strengthening of China. However, in stating this fact, we cannot exclude the possibility of US-imperialism's revival. The restoration of US-imperialism's world-domination is a danger which would be a great challenge for the socialist world revolution and even for the beginning epoch of world socialism. US-imperialism can absolutely recover despite or because of the increasing power of the Chinese social-imperialists - allied with new upcoming imperialist countries (IE. Brazil).

In case of replacement of American imperialism by the social-imperialism of China, the Comintern (SH) would not hesitate to declare the Chinese social-imperialism the main enemy No. 1, no matter with China's „socialist“ mask or without. This would not change our decision.

The Chinese social imperialism is no longer the „junior partner“ of US-imperialism, although younger than the former Russian social-imperialism. For a long time, China replaced the position of the former Soviet social imperialism, who had fought for world hegemony in rivalry with U.S. Imperialism. However, let's not forget that Russian's social-imperialism derived from the destruction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, whereas Chinese social imperialism derived from strengthening the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, because proletarian dictatorship did never exist in China. No Stalinist-Hoxhaist can ignore this historical difference. Why not ? Because Maoism can never be the further advancement of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism which proved the power of the proletarian dictatorship in practice. Maoism never proved this in practice. It proved to be unable to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and to construct socialism. Therefore the world proletariat, who strives for world dictatorship and world socialism, must abandon the „Mao Zedong-Ideas“. And Hoxhaism ? Yes, Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism proved to be capable to realize proletarian dictatorship and proletarian socialism in practice. Therefore Hoxhaism – and not Maoism – is the further advanced teaching of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. Enver Hoxha is the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism – and not Mao Zedong.
“The Chinese revisionists are in no way different from the Soviet revisionists in their stands and actions towards us and towards the world — they are just as much revisionist, just as much social-imperialist, the only difference being that they are new social-imperialists who have to create that colonial strength at which they aim. (Enver Hoxha, “Reflections of China”, Volume II, December 8, 1977).

And today China is already a colonial power, and one of the largest and most rapidly growing in the world, not only in Africa.
Enver Hoxha:

"The peoples of Africa and the peoples of the world are passing through phases that are making them conscious of the need to fight all those who try to fleece and exploit them, internal and external enemies of every hue, whether American, Soviet or Chinese. The aim of all the latter is to plunder these peoples and to destroy their autochthonous cultures, to crush them so that they cannot rise, cannot advance economically or from the cultural standpoint, and cannot raise their well-being in freedom and independence and under genuine sovereignty" (Enver Hoxha, "The Superpowers", Tirana 1986, page 468 – 469).

The current world-position of Chinese imperialism – which is about to outdistance the Western capitalism - proves that the theory of comrade Enver Hoxha on the two superpowers is still valid though to be modified under currently changing conditions. And in the context of this new position of Chinese social-imperialism, we communists must learn to understand and to perform the correct continuation of Enver Hoxha's struggle against Maoism. “

“A merciless struggle must be waged against these two superpowers, without giving way on principles. We must deepen the contradictions between the two of them without taking the side of one or the other. The situations must always be analysed in connection with the circumstances created in the world, and such tactics must be used that do not come into opposition to our strategy, or combat it. Our great slogan, «Proletarians of all countries, unite!» must not remain a dead letter " (August 23, 1973, "Reflections on China ", Volume II, Tirana 1979).

In other words, the world proletariat has its own strategy and tactics. For its own liberation it needs the socialist world revolution and not to become a political football of world imperialism whereas Mao wanted China to become a competing force as an imperialist superpower and for this purpose he united China with the USA. Though Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote this on the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union, it does not harm its further validity. Now, the superpower of the Chinese social-imperialists occupied the place of the superpower of the Soviet social imperialists. The law of the two superpowers has thus in essence not changed, it is still the law of predatory war, the law of the enslavement of peoples, the law of exploitation and oppression of the world proletariat, the law of counter-revolution.

Comrade Enver Hoxha has unmasked Maoism as an ideology of the Chinese social-imperialism – striving for world domination.

Over a period of fifty years, Mao Tsetung and his associates built up a strategy and tactics not for the triumph of the revolution under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, but
for the triumph of China as a great world power. (Enver Hoxha, "Reflections on China", Volume II, December 31, 1976)

We have not forgotten the visits of Kissinger, Nixon, Ford, in Beijing! The Maoists know very well that the collaboration with the main class-enemy No. 1 in the world did not start after the death of Mao Zedong. It was he himself, who hatched this treacherous and abhorrent line of collaboration against the world proletariat. It was he himself, who implemented this counter-revolutionary line in political practice. These are historical facts. And today? Fact is:

While the blood of the Arab insurgents is shed on the streets (by the Arab counter-revolution - backed by the American imperialists with billions of dollars), the Chinese have secret conversations in Washington. They talk about the redistribution of their spheres of influence with the aim of exploiting and oppressing the peoples of the world.

Mao Zedong did never support revolutionary national liberation struggles of peoples against both the superpowers. He supported the bloody imperialism of the USA as well as its bloody dogs in the colonial and neo-colonial countries. And in Beijing, it was not only comrade Enver Hoxha who was welcomed by Mao Zedong. In Beijing, Mao Zedong organized an endless coming and going of the revisionist and capitalist leaders of the whole world. Everybody - who applauded to Mao’s China - was welcomed in Beijing - both the revolutionaries and the counter-revolutionaries (the latter at most). Once upon a time, the American imperialists were welcomed by Mao with great pomp while, today, the Chinese social-imperialists were welcomed in Washington with great pomp. The negotiations are the same – behind the back of the world proletariat and the revolution, behind the back of the liberation struggle of the peoples.

These present facts justify Enver Hoxha’s Marxist-Leninist foresight. Independent from the future constellation of world imperialism, independent from Chinese imperialist influence in the world, Enver Hoxha taught us, that the superpowers and the imperialist and capitalist countries will be weakened steadily - because of the deepening crisis within the capitalist world - whereas world-capitalism has created its own grave-digger, the world proletariat. And this is also true concerning the international influence of Maoism. The world proletariat is the grave-digger of Maoism.

Concerning the Arab peoples Comrade Enver Hoxha had foreseen:
However, we are witnesses to the fact that the flow of events in the Middle East is not going in the way that the imperialists, the social-imperialists and world reaction desire. The Arab peoples of this great oil-bearing zone have awoken, have risen and are boldly demanding to take their fate into their own hands. In many Arab countries a just struggle is being waged against all types of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism and their economic-political and military potentates. This is a positive development which all should support, because it represents revolutionary progress, the future, and responds to the interests and desires of peoples who are aware of their oppression, who live in poverty and ignorance, even though the countries in which they live were the cradle of a brilliant civilization and contain great wealth which, if it were not plundered by foreigners, could bring them well-being, longer life, and the capacity to defend themselves against their savage enemies.

When this resolute and just struggle of the Arab peoples against world imperialism and its local tools and lackeys, this mounting revolution, frees itself from the negative aspects of the religion which is still clinging to dominant positions, which plays an inhibiting role and frequently incites wars between Shia, Sunni and other factions, then it will certainly end with the victory of the Arab peoples more than a hundred million strong, and will mark a new stage and a new page in the history of mankind.

(Enver Hoxha, "Reflections on the Middle East," Page 506 - 507).

"Under the current severe circumstances, only the popular uprisings in the Arab countries works wonders."

"I like and I respect the Arab people, because they are progressive minded, freedom loving and combative." (Enver Hoxha)

In the contrary, Mao invited the reactionary leaders of the Arab world to visit him in Beijing, because they were useful for China's social Imperialist ambitions. China did never support the popular revolutions in the Arab world but supported the Arab (and Israeli!?) Counter-revolution (IE. China supplied both Iran and Israel with weapons). As everywhere in the world it belongs to the Chinese strategy to provoke wars in order to earn blood-money and to take advantage from weakening its rivals on the world market.

Concerning today's revolution in Egypt, the Chinese social-imperialists speak openly about "lawlessness" and chaos "and parrot the words of the imperialist's blood-dog Mubarak: "Me or the chaos ".

The Chinese leaders fear revolution in their own social-fascist country. The Maoists are anxious about the Marxist-Leninist, anti-Maoist socialist revolution in China and all over the world. And this anxiety is absolutely justified. The victory of the Chinese socialist revolution is impossible without destroying the myth of Mao Zedong.

China supplied the North African counter-revolution with weapons - to suppress the peoples revolution (for over 20 years) - (at first only in exchange for oil and gas).
Today, China has already broad impact on the entire North African economies. China possesses own mining rights, oil- and gas drilling rights, production-facilities and own representatives of commerce in North Africa. China is today, for example, monopolistic oil producer - exporter and importer of Sudan. This oil is soaked with blood of the Sudanese civil war. The Chinese social imperialists hold their hands protectively on the corrupt, reactionary Sudanese bourgeoisie. But the Sudan is no exception: China imports the bulk of its oil from the "trouble spots of the world", strengthens there the bourgeoisie, which oppresses the working class and other working people. Hiding behind the label of a „Third-World-Country“ (to inspire the peoples with trust), Mao Zedong paved the way to a neo-colonial super power, on which the fetidness of the old colonialists of the imperialist world does not stick.

China can less and less uphold its tactical restraint out of respect towards the relations with the U.S.A. In late January 2011, at the World Economic Forum in Davos (Switzerland), representatives of the Chinese leaders predicted the "End of the Western World domination". China's social-imperialism rears its ugly head and this means: increasing its aggressive, war-mongering character. „The East-Wind shall dominate the West-Wind!“ - This is the old imperialist slogan of Mao Zedong, and it is, in first line, directed against proletarian internationalism.

In some respect the Chinese prediction may be right, but there they're mistaken if they believe in their own world domination. The times have gone when the one imperialist powers replaced each other. Time has come when the world proletariat shall remove the unavoidability of re-newed world imperialism. It is rather the world proletariat which opens the new epoch of its proletarian world domination - namely on the ruins of any kind of imperialist world power. The revolutionary upheavals in the Arab world will inevitably revolutionize the whole world. The Arab revolution is the prelude to the socialist world revolution. And this will be anything else but a happy start for China's world power. For us Stalinist Hoxhaists it is undeniable that the coming world revolution will have a deep meaning for the future of the world. It will be a proletarian-oriented, will be a socialist revolution. The world proletarian revolution is unstoppable. Its momentum will be speed up by the peoples' revolutions in the Arab world. The peoples' revolutions in the Arab countries announce not only the liberation of the world's imperialist enslavement of peoples. This is only the beginning! The proletarian slogan is: arming of the proletariat with the purpose: to defeat, to expropriate and to disarm the bourgeoisie. This is the slogan which we propagate not only in Arab countries, but on a global scale. The victory of the proletariat, socialism on a global scale is unavoidable.

We know all too well that the contradictions between the U.S. and China shall more and more increase and inevitably break out. This is good and not bad for the acceleration of the world revolutionary process. And we have to use these contradictions in a
revolutionary way. China lost between 2000 and 2009 = 2.18 trillion U.S. dollars through illegal financial transactions and is therefore at first place on the black list.

The greedy clutches of Chinese social-imperialism follow Maoist pragmatism - subordinated under the capitalist law of making maximum of profits. We know that pragmatism is the ideology of imperialism, with which the U.S.A. once had conquered their world domination. This strategy of Chinese pragmatism is even more clever than the American one – last not least - a feature of the Mao Zedong – Ideas – masked behind „Marxist-Leninist“ phraseology.

The “maintenance” of world capitalism is impossible without imperialist wars. Without the forcible redistribution of colonies etc., the new imperialist powers - including China - do not get those privileges which the older imperialist powers - enjoy (IE. U.S.A. and Europe). Whether social-imperialism or imperialism - both mean predatory wars. The danger of a new World War is real. And nobody shall doubt about the fact, that the U.S.A. and China will not play the role of angels of peace. Whether imperialist World War or anti-imperialist World-Civil-War - both means the end of the era of world imperialism and the beginning of world socialism.

"The social revolution can come only in the form of an epoch in which are combined civil war by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries and a whole series of democratic and revolutionary movements, including the national liberation movement, in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed nations“ (Lenin, Volume 23, page 60, English edition).

The Arab peoples will overcome their splits, because they learn from their experiences: who is their friend and who is their enemy? They will unmask not only the"help" of American and European imperialists, but also the "support" of other imperialists - including the "solidarity" of the Chinese social-imperialists.

Any profiteering with the reactionary bloodsuckers of the North African countries and the Near and Middle East - as in any other countries, too - harms the interests of the world proletariat and the oppressed peoples.

We Stalinist-Hoxhaists assess Maoists not according to their words, but according to their deeds, according to their backer who provides them material support for their propaganda. Those who fight for the socialist world revolution cannot go with imperialists and their lackeys. Those who fight against the class-enemies cannot go with the "Fifth Column" of world imperialism, cannot go with Maoist organizations - paid by Chinese money - squeezed out of the working class and the poor masses. And that's why the socialist Albania of comrade Enver Hoxha refused to be forced into the „Fifth Column“ of Chinese social-imperialism.

Take for example the recent statement of the Maoist "ICOR", from 23 January, 2011: "To the popular uprising in Tunisia".
It is indeed much talk of the "democratic rights”, but nothing about the duty of the Communists, to propagate the struggle against revisionist and social-democratic influence within this revolutionary democratic movement. An appeal to the workers' world movement and to the communist world movement - to support the liberation struggle of the Arab world in the spirit of the socialist world revolution - is missing. Concealment of the beginning of the world revolution; concealment of the necessary transition of the democratic revolution to socialist revolution and concealment of further advancement of the struggle of the Arab proletariat towards socialism. In Tunisia, there is prevailing capitalism, there is the fundamental contradiction between labor and capital. This means inevitably: The workers and peasants meet their historic mission by smashing the capitalist state, eliminating the private ownership of the means of production, expelling all sorts of imperialists from their country, expropriating foreign capitalists without compensation, founding a Stalinist-Hoxhaist party, which leads the armed class struggle and fights for the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, the Maoists keep totally silence on these Marxist-Leninist demands. Democratic demands are necessary for the relief and ripening of the process of the ongoing revolution, but Lenin teaches that with democracy, alone, the class-society cannot be removed. The proletariat must establish its class-dictatorship. We will never replace our revolutionary work by reformism and revisionism. We have the power to direct the democratic struggle in the direction of the socialist struggle. We combine the struggle for democratic liberties of the people with the arming of the proletariat for the overthrow of capitalism.

In the Maoist proclamation of the "ICOR" for the Tunisian people, the needed strengthening of the proletarian internationalism is also missing. The unification of the world proletariat and the liberation struggle of the Tunisian people, and with all the oppressed Arab peoples, is needed for the further development of the world-socialist revolution. Otherwise the liberation of the Arab peoples from the yoke of world imperialism is totally impossible. All this is missing, but the ICOR calls itself: "International Conference of Revolutionary parties and organizations." Traitors - all along the line!

Enver Hoxha wrote on December 8, 1977:

As I have said, the policy of China with the Arab countries is non-existent. In its relations with these countries it distinguishes itself for its pro-American and anti-Soviet stand. This orientation dictates the policy of China in the whole Mediterranean basin. Thus, China is in opposition to those Arab countries with which the Soviet Union has relations and is trying to establish its influence, while China is pro the other Arab countries on which the United States of America has its grip and where it makes the law. Hence, on the one hand, some of the states in this basin are opposed to the policy of
China, but these states on the other side are not pro China, either, because they see that it is not doing anything for them. What is China doing in fact? It applauds Somalia, its President Mohammed Siad because he expelled the Soviets from Somalia, and he was quite right to do so, but China applauds him precisely because he went to Washington and placed his country under the yoke of American imperialism. Such is the policy of China. "(Enver Hoxha, "Reflections on China", Volume II,).

With this policy which China is pursuing in the international arena, what stand must it adopt towards the American manoeuvre in the Middle East? China's aim is to preserve the status quo in this zone of the world, to turn Egypt into its own obedient partner; it wants the other Arab countries, too, to recognize and respect it. At the same time, the aim of this manoeuvre is to keep the Arab peoples divided. Naturally, on this course which it has taken, China must adhere to the side of the Americans and that is what it is doing in fact, that is, it supports the pro-American Arab chiefs and supports Israel, hence, is for an American-style peace in which not the freedom and independence of the Arab peoples, but the greed of Israeli fascists and the Egyptian, Saudi-Arabian, and other wealthy

triumphs.

It is clear that this position of the Chinese is anti-Marxist. China is obliged to adopt this position and to pose in the eyes of all the Arab peoples as if it has defended and defends them, but in fact it does not defend any of these peoples, does not defend their aspirations to national liberation, but supports


"The Sino-American neo-colonialist tactic is coordinated especially in Africa. The aim of these two international robbers is to consolidate their positions wherever they have them and to occupy new positions in those countries where they have nothing. Both these partners in crime against the peoples, poke their noses wherever local wars incited by imperialism and social-imperialism ...

... China is trying to penetrate into Africa for two aims: first, to sabotage the interference and establishment of the Soviets and to spread its rug to squat there itself, and second, to strengthen the positions of American imperialism there. Whereas the Soviets and Americans go to Africa under their true colors as neo-colonialists and imperialists, China goes dressed in flowery robes and with Marxist phraseology ...

Is the United States of America afraid of the policy of the Chinese in Africa? For the moment no, because China does not have that economical potential, that cavalry of the dollar and Saint George to really capture the hearts of the Mobutus, Bocassas and others, but it could become dangerous to the United States of America later" (Enver Hoxha, "The Superpowers," Page 467 – 468, English edition). This was written in 1978.
Meanwhile, Enver Hoxha's foresight has proved to be reality. Since the world crisis the U.S. are on a drip of China. The American and Chinese super-powers embrace each other – and in the end they will suffocate each other – to the advantage of the socialist world revolution.

The world imperialism was attacked by the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, and Mao Zedong came, to help the world-imperialism - to rescue his survival.

Mao Zedong, in his time, and the Chinese social-imperialists of today, have one and the same goal: to prolong world capitalism - by replacing the old world imperialist system by a new one, by the Chinese model. Who wants to doubt this?

Our position is clear:
we strive for the abolition of the inevitability of world imperialism at all and never for the replacement of the old imperialist world-forces through some new. And inseparably connected with this aim, we strive for the abolition of the inevitability of revisionism and never for the replacement of old by new revisionists, by the Maoist model.

The class-contradictions in the world are intensifying, in the same degree as the new emerging imperialist forces and the old, rundown imperialist forces exacerbate their struggle for world hegemony, the redistribution of the world.

The intensification of the struggle of the world's counter-revolution against the world revolution inevitably calls forth the intensification of the revisionist forces against the communist forces. This corresponds to the ABC of Marxism-Leninism. We Stalinist-Hoxhaists foresee this dangerous mobilization of the revisionist forces as a consequence of the increasing global class-struggles which herald the socialist world revolution. The existence of world imperialism is in danger and the Maoists are summoned to help liquidating the Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement - similar to the times of Mao Zedong against the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha and similar to the help of the modern revisionists after the death of Comrade Stalin.

Therefore, we are strengthening our global struggle against neo-revisionism. We Stalinist-Hoxhaists declare war on Maoism!

Today's revisionism (Neo-Revisionism) is essentially in accordance with the modern revisionism, namely the ideology of the proletariat to adapt to the changing power relations in global capitalism. Under today's conditions are emerging in the development of two major revisionist trends:
(1) The old revisionist trend is still maintaining the old "balance of power" in the world - with the dominance of U.S. imperialism - the status quo of "peaceful co-existence".

(2) And the other trend, these are the different neo-revisionist streaming, needed to push forward the replacement of the old capitalist world system through a new one (in general). And (in particular) these neo-revisionist streaming are necessary to leverage new power relations under the hegemony of the emerging world-imperialist powers, especially the Chinese imperialism. Both trends are different in their particularity, however, both trends are identical in their common struggle for defending capitalism against socialism.

(3) In between, the centrist elements fluctuate back and forth, trying to reconcile the two trends together and unite them on the basis of "peaceful co-existence". However, antagonistic contradictions cannot be solved in a peaceful way. "Peaceful way" under conditions of antagonistic class-relations does always mean: subordination of the ideology of the proletariat under the ideology of the bourgeoisie. The reconciliation of different opportunist trends serves the bloc-construction against the world proletariat and not against world bourgeoisie.

In particular, the Chinese revisionism is dangerous because it disguises itself with our anti-revisionist struggle. Therefore we draw a principled Stalinist-Hoxhaist demarcation line against the Chinese so-called "Proposal concerning the General-Line of the International Communist Movement" of the CP of China, June 14, 1963. This Maoist general-line is quintessentially an anti-Stalinist line. In the "polemics" Mao kept silence about defense of Stalinism, about the proletarian socialist world revolution, about the dictatorship of the proletariat etc, etc. - all these basic pillars of a genuine Marxist-Leninist General-Line escaped the author. Why? Did Mao not know the basic pillars of Marxism-Leninism? Certainly he knew all about it, but as a revisionist he had to draw the curtain over it. Mao's criticism on the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin is well known. He opposed the General-Line of the Comintern and replaced it by his own one in 1963. Mao neither defended nor based upon the continuation of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin. The "polemics" of Mao Zedong was not written for the defense of the Comintern, in the contrary, it was written against the Comintern. The "polemics" was written with the aim to thwart the needed reconstruction of a new world-revolutionary, communist leading center. A world-communist movement without its leading center is in accordance with the interests of world bourgeoisie and not with the world proletariat. To do world imperialism a disservice Mao attacked the Soviet center of the modern revisionism to replace it by a new world revisionist center of the Chinese revisionism.
We Stalinist-Hoxhaist have never denied the necessity of the world-communist party, neither in theory nor in practice. We were and we are always against anti-Bolshevist „Mother-Daughter-Relations“ among the communist parties. The 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism have always condemned this kind of relationship as a revisionist line. However, does this mean simultaneously that we would ever reject the role of the hegemony of the world proletariat and its vanguard? We are against all models of revisionist leadership - no matter if organized centrally or decentrally, but absolutely for the revolutionary, unrenounceable leadership of our globalized Bolshevist class struggle. The recognition of the Communist Party in his own country is not the same, we the recognition of the Communist world party. The latter implies subordination to the world party, as the individual interests of the proletariat of a country to the general interests of the world proletariat are subordinate. We expose the revisionist "theory of the mother party". We defend both the leadership of the Communist International and the equality and sovereignty of the communist parties of each country - dialectically combined through democratic centralism. A socialist world revolution without global leadership is impossible. And it is also impossible to guarantee the victory of the socialist revolution in a single country without the victory of the socialist world revolution. Those who do not want guaranteed socialism, do not need the socialist world revolution. And again, those who do not need the socialist world revolution do not need the Communist International. And that's what Mao did yesterday and what the Maoists do today – struggle against the Communist International.

Who does not concede the leading role of the CPSU (B) within the III. International, but takes instead a neutral position of the polycentric "independence, equality, etc." - harms the principles of democratic centralism and is not a proletarian internationalist. It was the Maoism which made it impossible for the CP of China, to follow the revolutionary path of the Comintern in its own country. The correct Marxist-Leninist struggle against Khrushchëv's revisionist theory of the "mother-party" and the "daughter- party" was only misused by the Maoists, the Titoists and other revisionists, to strengthen their own revisionist "independence" and "equality" against the Soviet-revisionist tutelage. The Maoists and all the other rivals of the Soviet revisionists enlarged the international spiderweb of revisionism, webs of deception, for all those comrades who refused to follow the Soviet revisionists towards capitalism. Revisionism and imperialism on a world scale can ultimately only be defeated victoriously, if the communist parties - in maintaining their own equality and independence - conjoin themselves in the centralized Communist International. This is the experience of the history of the Communist International. Imperialism had to isolate all the single parties first ideologically and then organizationally with the aim to divide and split them, to liquidate the communist world
movement. Therefore the imperialists tried to increase their ideological divergences and to misuse their national barriers and contradictions, for the purpose of hampering their re-unification within a new Communist International. The Maoists organized international forces with the intention to isolate the individual socialist country from its alliance with the world proletariat, the isolation of the PAA from its brother-parties - the isolation of the leading Communist Party from all the other Communist parties. That was the strategy and tactics of revisionism, that was the strategy of Mao Zedong, and in this way the Maoists have pursued the split of the unity of the Marxist-Leninist world movement - while the Maoists spread the treacherous slogan: "Albania is guilty for the division of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement". The dual strategy and tactics of revisionism on the issue of the leading party of the revolutionary world-center is that: the leading revisionist party in power (SU) co-operates hand in hand with an "oppositional" leading revisionist party (China). By this means the overall revisionist influence in the communist movement maintained and continued uninterruptedly. The baton had to be handed over to the next leading revisionist party as the new successor of the old leading revisionist world-center, thus already before the capitalist restoration was completed. This way the Maoists mastered the tactics of the revisionist placeholder. Denying the necessity of the leading role of the party of the revolutionary world-center under the pretext of the alleged critique at the "mother party" - this is precisely neo-revisionism as it is expressed in Mao's "polemics". Indirectly it is basically a critique at the principles of proletarian internationalism and a smoke screen around the fact that Mao had really assumed the role of the Soviet revisionist "mother-party" [all this can be re-read in the „General-Line of the Comintern (ML)“ – decided in 2001].

We Stalinist-Hoxhaists are the only global force who defend the old general-line of the Comintern against all its enemies - inclusively against the Maoists, inclusively against the „polemics“ (1963) of the CP of China. After the death of Comrade Stalin Mao Zedong wanted to usurp the leadership of the communist movement from the hands of the Soviet revisionists. He put on his "anti-revisionist" mask and he lured the young anti-Krushchevite Marxist-Leninist world movement. For this purpose he created his own „general-line“ in 1963 ("polemics"). Until today, the Maoists defend this revisionist "General-Line". And in one way or another the Maoists still use it as their basis for all their political activities.

The PAA refused, rightly, to be subordinated under this revisionist „general-line“ of Mao Zedong. And so we Stalinist-Hoxhaists declare, today, - again rightly - we shall never subordinate ourselves under any of the different Maoist lines. We destroy them.

Mao was not interested in a world-Bolshevist party, in the Communist
International, which would centrally organize and globally spread the struggle against modern revisionism. And the Maoists of today demonstrate just as Mao little interest in the re-foundation of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin. Mao always refused to practice organizational discipline of proletarian internationalism. In the view of Mao the CP of China ought to stand above democratic centralism of the Comintern. Instead of the Comintern, he only accepted the Communist World Movement under the leadership of the CP of China, under his own leadership. He also tried to impose his Chinese chauvinist line onto the PLA of Comrade Enver Hoxha – however Enver Hoxha completely thwarted Mao Zedong's intentions.

And also Stalin criticized the revisionist line of Mao Zedong:

“When China was liberated, Stalin expressed his doubt that the Chinese leadership might follow the Titoite course. Glancing over all the main principles of Mao Tsetung's revisionist line, in regard to all those things which he raises against Stalin, we can say without reservation that Stalin was truly a great Marxist-Leninist who foresaw correctly where China was going, who long ago realized what the views of Mao Tsetung were, and saw that, in many directions, they were Titoite revisionist views, both on international policy and on internal policy, on the class struggle, on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, etc." (Enver Hoxha, "Reflections on China, Vol II, December 28, 1977).

1963, Mao favored "the revolutions of the peoples"- the main classless slogan of his "polemics". He avoided to emphasize the proletariat ( - in particular, Mao says nothing of the revolutionary role of the proletariat in the revisionist countries). So, in the "polemics" we cannot find anything about the socialist world revolution of the world-proletariat. Mao denied the hegemony of the world-proletariat, denied its historical mission, its leading role in the world as the only consistently revolutionary class, and last not least he denied the defense of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin which struggled for world-communism. Only revisionist lines discard the indispensable internationalist principles of Marxism-Leninism. And the Maoist "polemics" was one of them.

Some years later the "polemics" were withdrawn, allegedly because of the „final victory“ over modern revisionism. To argue in this way is a dangerous, revisionist way, because we know that any dismissal of the anti-revisionist struggle serves the bourgeoisie. To enter and to leave the arena of the struggle against revisionism – this permanently wavering in the tactics of the Chinese revisionists, is excellently described, documented and condemned in the book of Comrade Enver Hoxha, „Reflections on China“. It is one of the most important experiences of the struggle against revisionism that the new revisionists always try to argue that the struggle against „old-fashioned“
revisionism is allegedly outdated and that revisionism dies away „by itself“ ("historically
defeated"). Nothing bourgeois shall fall if it is not forced by the proletariat to fall - not
even revisionism. The history of revisionism is the history of the futile attempts of the
bourgeoisie, to force the Communists' struggle against revisionism into capitulation. In
regard of this general historical experience we can define Maoism in particular as an
ideology which creeps into the Marxist-Leninist movement, with the intention to grind the
sharpness of our anti-revisionist weapons away, to prepare the reconciliation with
revisionism. Maoists recruit re-conciliatory forces, to lead them against the forces of the
Marxist-Leninists. By this means the Maoists try to bring our Marxist-Leninist World
Movement under the rule of the Maoist movements. Maoists criticize revisionism in
words, however, they want the withdrawal from our anti-revisionist struggle in deeds.
The neo-revisionism is the agency of the bourgeoisie within the anti-revisionist
movement – the current main danger within the Communist Movement.

There was a time when the revolutionary elements of the old social democracy had
detached themselves from the opportunists and rightist leaders of the 2nd International
and as well from the centrist leaders of the so called „2 ½ . International (Kautskyites).
They formed revolutionary proletarian communist parties of a new Leninist type and a
new III. International under the leadership of the Bolshevist party – the only party which
had led the proletariat to its dictatorship – by the Great Socialist October Revolution and
which created the first socialist country in the world – the new socialist world camp, the
center of the socialist world revolution.

There was a comparable time when communist parties had detached themselves
from the leading centers of the American, Yugoslav, Soviet, Euro-"communist", Chinese
and other revisionist currents. That was an internal process of struggles of Bolshevist
elements against the revisionist elements within the old parties - beginning after the
dissolution of the Comintern and finally became an open and external struggle after the
open division of the Communist World Movement by the XX. Congress of the revisionist
leadership of the CPSU. The Bolshevist elements formed new parties of a Leninist-
Stalinist type, anti-revisionist parties. Some others did further exist and they expelled
their old revisionist leadership. In this process of detachment from modern revisionism a
new Marxist-Leninist world-center - with the PLA and comrade Enver Hoxha at the top -
emerged in the struggle against centrist currents, mainly against Maoism. The Struggle
against the centrist Mao Zedong-Ideas became one of the most important historical
moments in the history of the Communist World Movement – comparable with the
Leninist-Stalinist struggle against the centrist Trotskyism.

Now we are witnesses of a reverse process. The inevitable demarcation line which
comrade Enver Hoxha had drawn against the Mao Zedong-Ideas became permeable and
was particularly minimized seriously through reconciliation with Maoism (aside from reconciliation with Trotskyism). This creeping development which emerges more and more openly, had to evoke without fail the determined resistance of the true Marxist-Leninists.

Now is the historical time ripe when Stalinist-Hoxhaists elements detach themselves from the leading centers of the neo-revisionist currents. They shall form Stalinist-Hoxhaist parties as sections of the Communist International of a new global Stalinist-Hoxhaist type for preparing and organizing the socialist world revolution.

This is the result of the great history of the Communist World Movement.

And we admit self-critically that we ourselves have contributed to this development, because we did not defend strictly enough the Marxism-Leninism opposite to Maoism. On our web pages we have limited ourselves too much to propagate the teachings of Enver Hoxha against the Mao Zedong-Ideas, without exposing and fighting against the topical activities of the Maoists. It would be disingenuous to justify itself with the statement that there are other web pages which likewise spread the teachings of Enver Hoxha against the Maoism. In comparison to the massive publications of the Maoists and the "re-conciliators of Mao and Enver" - we are in truth only a small minority. On the basis of the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism we have to fight resolutely against the general trend of reconciliation with neo-revisionism and we must defend, maintain and sharpen our clear demarcation-line against Maoism, Trotskyism and other anti-Stalinist-Hoxhaist currents – without neglecting the old danger of modern revisionism with its Menchevist, reformist and social democratic roots.

The Maoists had raised from the beginning, the dirty banner of Trotskyism. They allegedly "attacked" the modern revisionism of Russia - Russia, allegedly the "main enemy No. 1". In truth Mao supported the American imperialists, thus the genuine main enemy No. 1. In truth, the Maoists used this as a hoax within the Marxist-Leninist world movement for hiding their revisionism. All possible reactionary ideologies and "theories" can be hidden behind the banner of Mao Zedong Ideas, to deceive the working class. Circulating many different lines and integrating many opportunistic, pragmatic and liberalistic hues - this is a characteristics of Maoism. Comparable to Trotskyism, Maoism is neither fish nor fowl. The betrayal of Mao Zedong at the world socialist revolution is that he had bought world imperialism time for regeneration and that he had weakened the world communist movement through split and division. Mao gave material support to the Maoists all over the world. Until today, China backs its agencies within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, such as the Maoist MLPD in Germany:

Enver Hoxha wrote on 23 June 1977:

The representatives of the Chinese news agency in Europe and the lackeys of the
Chinese, especially the Trotskyite Jurquet in France and the elements of «Rote Fahne» in Germany [MLPD - remark of the author], are the most active in pursuing the treacherous line of Hua Kuo-feng. They are activizing people not only in their own countries, but wherever they can.

China is financing all these agents, who have created a press and put out some kind of propaganda, but their main propaganda is done with money. China gives these agents money to buy the waverers who take part in the Marxist-Leninist communist parties of Europe.

As I have said before, the aim of the Chinese tactic is to incite a polemic, but this polemic must be developed between the Marxist-Leninist parties and the fascist groupings with Maoist labels, while China remains outside this polemic, is not to be mentioned ... Therefore, in order to expose and defeat it and its agents, it must be faced with the steel strength of the Marxist-Leninist ideology.” (Enver Hoxha," Reflections on China“, Volume II, June 23, 1977).

Unbelievable but true: This „MLPD“ („Red Flag“) founded its Maoist "world-organization", the ICOR, exactly on the date of birthday of Comrade Enver Hoxha (16th of October, 2011) !! And this Maoist "world-organization" accused Comrade Enver Hoxha:

"The attacks of the Party of Labor of Albania against Mao Zedong caused the split in the international labor movement and the Marxist-Leninist world movement” (Stefan Engel, ICC [International Coordinating Committee] - Asia, 2008)

The Maoists accuses us Stalinist-Hoxhaists that we "defend the errors of the international Communist movement under Stalin." They call us Stalinist-Hoxhaists: „Lackeys of Anti-Communism“ !!! In deed, with these baseless accusations, they only accuse themselves as the Anti-Stalinists, as the Anti-Communists. In the view of the Maoists only those are defenders of anti-revisionism who abstain from criticizing Maoism. And, logically, those who attack Maoism are not anti-revisionists. That's the kind of Maoist "anti-revisionism". By the way, the ICMLPO accuses us Stalinist-Hoxhaists that we „defend the errors of the Marxist-Leninist Movement under Enver Hoxha.“ However, in contrast to the open noisiness of the Maoists, the ICMLPO keeps (still) silence on us Stalinist-Hoxhaists and on the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha. We shall force the ICMLPO to break their silence on their treachery.

Once upon a time the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties based their struggle against the betrayal of the Maoists on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. They defended and propagated Albania as the only genuine socialist country in the world, as the homeland of the world proletariat, as the only world-center of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, as the centre of world communism. This was of world historical significance. But what happened to these parties? They turned their back away from Albania and dropped the banner of comrade Enver Hoxha. And simultaneously,
their struggle against the Maoists came to a standstill. We criticized their betrayal, however, this left them unimpressed, they keep silence on us, they continue their treacherous course. By launching their „Quito-Declaration“ they decided that Socialist Albania and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement had never existed before! They let us down in our struggle against Maoism and that's why we call them traitors. Every withdrawal from the struggle against Maoism strengthens the position of the Maoists against the Stalinist-Hoxhaists, serves the counter-revolution.

And the Maoists? Their fight against us Stalinist-Hoxhaists had never stopped. They struggled against us long before China's betrayal in 1978 and after that as well. They never stopped attacking us so called: "Splitters of the international labor movement and the Marxist-Leninist world movement."

Who are the splitters? The Maoists or the Stalinist-Hoxhaists?

"No party in the world (except the CPSU (B) of the comrades of Lenin and Stalin) has ever served more faithful and honorable the defense of the Communist Internationale, the Marxist-Leninist world movement, the world proletariat and the struggles of the peoples for their freedom and independence than this has done the Party of Labor of Albania with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the top." (from: "The General-Line“ of the Comintern [SH], 2001).

The splitters of the Marxist-Leninist world movement were not the Party of Labor of Albania and Comrade Enver Hoxha, however the Communist Party of China and Mao Zedong!


In the eyes of the imperialists and their opportunistic lackeys - who compete their Chinese rival and its own opportunistic lackeys – is Maoism not a proletarian ideology but a competing bourgeois ideology. In the same way the imperialist wage material wars against each other, they also wage metal wars against each other. This is a matter of dialectics. So what is Anti-Maoism? Was comrade Enver Hoxha an „anti-communist“ because he criticized the Mao Zedong-Ideas on the scientific base of Marxism-Leninism? The Maoists declared Anti-Maoism to be „anti-communism“. So they pretend Hoxhaism = anti-communism. Is this a logical deduction? By no means! Maoists suffer this misconception, because they do not know how to stand out against the righteous criticism of Marxism-Leninism on Maoism. The Maoists are not the first ones whom we put an idea out of their head. We have never let a revisionist off unpunished. He can cry as much he likes: „I am a communist! I am unimpeachable!“ To deceive the masses the
Maoists creep in the role of the victim and shout "Stop thief!"
It is not a request for the thief to stop, but a request for the masses to stop the Stalinist-Hoxhaists. Those people who make a feint like this, do not stand up to Marxism-Leninism and this is simply despicably and piteously. However, those who dare beating us communists with an „anti-communist“ club, can „make their will."

Maoism is basically an ideology of Chinese imperialism. Fighting against the Chinese imperialism means above all, to tear the masses solidarily away from the Maoist ideological. We convince them by means of their own experiences. The strength and tenacity of ideological influence on the masses of Chinese imperialism is indeed not caused by the influence of the contemporary Chinese social-fascist leadership, however rather by the ideological influence of the Maoist movements in the world. That is in no way a contradiction. The Chinese social fascists are ruthless, directly and aggressive enemies, and they can and will never "convince" the oppressed and exploited masses. The Maoists, in contrast, try to convince peasants and petty-bourgeois masses and even some retrograde elements within the working class.

If the Maoists speak about „socialist revolution“ then they do not mean socialist revolution in China! While the Marxist-Leninists insist on the socialist revolution against revisionism at power, on destruction of social-imperialism and the social-fascist state, the Maoists refuse to call for the violent socialist revolution in the capitalist China. That's why they fear comrade Enver Hoxha who just called for this. That's why the Maoists are afraid of the socialist world revolution, because it would not forgo China. The Chinese social-imperialists and social-fascists seem to be powerful but they are powerless against the dictatorship of the world proletariat. That' why the slogan of the socialist world revolution is a no-no for all Maoists. Even the world imperialists know for sure, „game is over“, if the Chinese proletariat would have seized power. The dictatorship of the Chinese proletariat is only possible on the ruins of the Mao Zedong-Ideas.

Those Maoists who say: "You must fight against the Chinese imperialism and not against the Maoists" do not understand the ideological tasks of our anti-revisionist struggle. If you really want to destroy imperialism, imperialist wars, reaction and fascism revolutionarily, then you have to liberate the masses comprehensively from any bourgeois ideological influence. The Maoists lie to the masses and give them completely wrong ideas about the revolutionary tasks and about the class-nature of the struggle against imperialism. It is the Maoists, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, who paved the ideological way for the strengthening of Chinese imperialism. They will never stop to do this if we do not hinder them.
Most of the Maoist currents showcase “5 Heads” with Mao Zedong in their “logo”. It is well-known that we also present “5 Heads” in our emblem. What is the difference? Obviously the Maoist „Fifth Head“ is that of Mao Zedong whereas our Fifth Head is that of Enver Hoxha. The essential meaning is not simply the replace-ability of „heads“. The decisive difference is the ideological one: The Maoist call their ideology „Marxism-Leninism-Maoism“, however we Stalinist-Hoxhaists base only on „Marxism-Leninism“.

We speak about the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. We Stalinist-Hoxhaists would have never thought of „Marxism-Leninism-Hoxhaism“. We would never exclude Stalinism or even replace it. Correctly we base on: Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

„Marxism-Leninism-Maoism“ is obviously a replacement of Stalinism by Maoism – and this is the crux of the revisionist betrayal of Maoism – congruent with the revisionist betrayal of all the other modern revisionists who limit themselves on Marx, Engels and Lenin whereas many neo-revisionists of today limit themselves on Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin (IE ICMLPO). All currents of revisionism and neo-revisionism, as a whole, can be characterized as currents against the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism.

The Anti-Stalinism of the Soviet revisionists and that of the Chinese revisionists differs simply only in tactical regard. The Chinese revisionist took up the mask of „Stalin“ to invite all those comrades who abandoned open Anti-Stalinism of the Krushtchevites with the intention to strengthen one’s own Chinese revisionism in opposition to the Soviet one. Maoists hide their Anti-Stalinism behind the Mao Zedong-Ideas. Allegedly, the Mao Zedong-Ideas „corrected“ the so called „errors“ of Stalin. In the eyes of the Maoists, the Mao Zedong-Ideas is the ideology which had „saved“ Marxism-Leninism from Stalinist „falsification“. Mao, himself, spoke about Stalinism to be „60% correct and 40 % wrong.“

The Maoists disclaim the autonomy, independence and perfection of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism in itself. They accept Marxism-Leninism only in the same way as Mao did – namely as a mask to hide behind.

Proletarian science of Marxism-Leninism matures to perfection by itself. It does not need any additions of strange elements of "advanced theories and ideas."

The proletarian ideology is completely independent from all the other class-ideologies. In truth all the so called „enrichment“ turned out to be a disarming of Marxism-Leninism.

Certainly we know very well that the Maoists are „true defenders“ of the Mao Zedong ideas. However, what is the essence of these „ideas“? If you would cross out Marxism-Leninism then nothing is left but bourgeois ideology. Maoists are mistaken if
they believe that Marxism-Leninism would be a „poor“ ideology without the „enrichment“ of the Mao Zedong-Ideas. It is just the contrary. The Mao Zedong-Ideas distort and disintegrate Marxism-Leninism. The Mao Zedong-Ideas adapt Marxism-Leninism to the bourgeois ideology, transform the proletarian ideology into a bourgeois ideology, make it „acceptable“ and usable for the interests of world imperialism – AGAINST the world proletariat.

If Maoism is directed against Marxism-Leninism, then it is a great danger to the unity of the Marxist-Leninist world movement. The re-conciliators with Maoism urge the Marxist-Leninist forces towards revisionism, whose task is to paralyze, divide and liquidate the world communist movement. The attempts of the neo-revisionists to unite us under the guise of "anti-revisionism" with the treacherous revisionist leaders, and their attempts to merge us with them (- of which we have separated permanently -), are becoming clearer by repeated concessions towards the revisionists, by abandoning the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, etc., etc..

The Comintern (SH) detects a dangerous current of reconciliation of Marxism-Leninism and neo-revisionist currents – not only in this or that country but on a worldwide stage.

Therefore, the Comintern (SH) passes this resolution to all true communists, who are loyally defending Marxism-Leninism: Do not stand any longer on the sidelines to watch how the Marxist-Leninist World Movement is urged into the abyss!

Comrades!

Remember the critical teachings of Enver Hoxha's on the Mao Zedong-Ideas are immortal!

We do never allow that these teachings are forgotten and denied!
Let us translate and propagate these teachings all over the world!
Let us draw Enver Hoxha's demarcation line tighter against Maoism!
Let's close our ranks! Support the Comintern (SH) who is the leader of the Stalinist-Hoxhaist struggle against Maoism!

Without defending Enver Hoxha's teachings, we can not defeat Maoism.
The victory over Maoism is not just a victory at the theoretical front. Moreover, Enver Hoxha led the concrete, practical class struggle.

We must defeat the Maoism in practice as well as in theory and on a global scale.

It is not the Maoists, who draw nearer to the ideological positions of us Marxist-Leninists, but conversely, there are a number of former Marxist-Leninist organizations who began to draw nearer to the Maoist ideology and who abandoned and ceded principled position. That the Maoist leaders would "draw nearer" to Marxism-Leninism, is
pure hogwash and a purely tactical feint. The alleged "rapprochement" of the Maoists towards us Marxist-Leninists is planting a rumor to justify the rightist move of the reconciliators away from Marxism-Leninism. The Maoist leaders take never leave of the Mao Zedong-Ideas, however they do not stop their attempts to get us on their side. But with us they shall never succeed!

Comrade Enver Hoxha advised the fraternal parties, not to be the mouthpiece for the revisionists who, themselves, accuse among and against each other. So, as a big capitalist swallows a number of small capitalists, so this is not unlike the revisionists, for they are cut from the same timber. We can not fight together with the revisionists against revisionism.

We do not allow that the Maoists abuse Comrade Enver Hoxha for their machinations. Neither the Maoists nor anybody else can break the ties of friendship between the Chinese and the Albanian people. It is a fact that Comrade Enver Hoxha analyzed the development in China on Marxist-Leninist principles and that he found out serious inconsistencies and errors. Still, he tried for many years, Mao dissuade from his wrong path. This is a correct Marxist-Leninist attitude. But Enver Hoxha finally realized the limit of its efforts. When Chinese revisionism took an openly hostile attitude toward Albania, Comrade Enver Hoxha pulled the brake. It is a great historical merit of Comrade Enver Hoxha, that he defended the Marxist-Leninist world movement against Chinese liquidators. To defend comrade Enver Hoxha means today: to build up the Stalinist-Hoxhaist front against the Maoist front and to purify the communist world movement from opportunism.

Unlike the Maoists, we are keen to distinguish the position of Mao and the position of Enver Hoxha and clearly highlight their antagonism. The Maoists have no interest in it. They need a sort of "Enver Hoxha" - compared with Mao - a revisionist with an "anti-revisionist" mask. The Maoists try to present a sort of "Enver Hoxha" like a servant who bowed before his master. They make forget that Enver Hoxha was a great Stalinist - the best one ever around the world. However, Mao Zedong was never a Stalinist:

"Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist, but a progressive bourgeois revolutionary"

"Mao Tsetung posed as a Marxist-Leninist dialectician, but he was not so. He was an eclectic who combined the Marxist dialectic with Confucian idealism and the old Chinese philosophy.

The fact is that in his leadership of the party and the state, in his policy and ideology, in the development of China and its party, and in international developments, he did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist materialist dialectics to guide China on the road to socialism. (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China", Volume II, December 26, 1977).
"Enver Hoxha and Mao Zedong - together under the same roof"- this slogan developed as a fashion trend because it allegedly expresses "unity and strength" against the "common enemy ". But in truth it is a betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, a betrayal of the anti-revisionist struggle. We cannot defeat the one revisionist current while creeping under the umbrella of another one. This means liquidation of the anti-revisionist struggle - and that is the true meaning of that treacherous slogan.

Unity in the "practical struggle" is supposed to lead to ideological unity (?) That's nothing but pure opportunism. Suffering from this delusion was always criticized by the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism and is also disproved by the experience of class struggle. Every joint action of different political forces who ignore their determined ideological basis are channeled to a direction which leads to an unavoidable ideological bloc-construction, and in this special case ideological subordination to Maoism. We cannot overcome eclecticist ideology by eclecticist practice. This can only be resolved by Bolshevist theory and practice – based upon Marxism-Leninism. Dressing up spontaneism with an "ideological garb" - against this opportunism already Lenin had struggled vehemently (in "What is to be done?").

Lenin teaches: "Before the practical unity comes the ideological clarity." We say to the concerned organizations and comrades insistently: "You know these words of Lenin, but you do not want to adhere to it. You want practical unity on swampy soil and you will sink therein, inevitably. Action-unities are used to strengthen and extend the proletarian class struggle, but they are no good for ideological reconciliation with the Mao-Zedong Ideas!"

Nothing against actions organized by means of unity-fronts and tactical alliances with Maoists on principled Marxist-Leninist ground. However: We never ever renounce our right to perform our own principled struggle. We would never subordinate ourselves under the line of the Maoists. We favor only principled action-unities, and we disdain all the other ones. We cannot strike back at the blows of the Maoists neither by a wavering centrist line, nor by maintaining a false and formal unity with them. The Marxist-Leninist organizations must beware of Maoism, the whole Marxist-Leninist world movement must be purified from any Maoist influence, we must protect our Communist International!

The attacks of the neo-revisionist, directed against the Marxist-Leninist world movement, have the same meaning as the treacherous machinations of the Social Democrats of the 2nd International and the Modern Revisionists after the death of Comrade Stalin. Just as we did Stalin have defended against the revisionists, we must today defend Enver Hoxha against the Maoists. We Marxists-Leninists must draw new lessons from the history. In world socialism there is no place for Maoists.

Under the pressure of world imperialism, under pressure from the world capitalist
crisis, amid the aggravating conditions of the global class struggle, the neo-revisionists tempt us to unite with "everyone", "at any price" and under "every condition". This derives from the panic mongering elements of the petty-bourgeoisie and is strange to us Marxist-Leninists. It is quite clear that this Maoist type of "proletarian internationalism" has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. This "new" Maoist type of "proletarian internationalism" only serves to crush the proletarian internationalism through "practical unity" with the Maoists - strangle through embracement. The Albanian working class, the Albanian people, they got to feel bitterly at their own bodies this kind of Maoist "proletarian internationalism." The Marxist-Leninists never forget this kind of "proletarian internationalism"! The chauvinist character of Maoist revisionism is just the opposite of proletarian internationalism: They accused socialist Albania to be "revisionist", but with this lie they masked and hide their own chauvinism with "Marxist-Leninist" phraseology.

Lenin taught us: the unity of the Marxist-Leninist world movement is a big deal and a great slogan!

But the matter of the world proletariat needs the globalized unity of true Marxist-Leninists, but not the unity of the Marxist-Leninists with their Maoist opponents. Any deviation from Marxist-Leninist positions leads to the alienation of the working class from its revolutionary line, it leads away from the revolutionary path straight into the morass of opportunism. This is the principled stance of the Marxist-Leninists towards the Maoists.

Comrade Enver Hoxha has foreseen:

"But the problem is that all the other genuine Marxist-Leninist communist parties must understand that we have to do with a big enemy, and our struggle is a very severe and complicated one, in the course of which we shall encounter major obstacles and difficulties, but will also have victories.

The Marxist-Leninist communist parties of the world must work intensively and make clear to the masses of workers, and all the working people of their countries the aims of the party, its minimum and maximum programs. It is important that this work should be concretized, and it will be concretized gradually, but the concretization must be done in depth, and not superficially, because superficial concretization does not create that sound solidity which makes it possible to overcome the critical phases and difficult moments which the Marxist-Leninist movement, socialism, communism, and the revolution will encounter in the world. (Enver Hoxha, "Reflections on China", October 14, 1977 - Volume II, Page 669, translation from German edition).

The struggle against Mao Zedong-Ideas is an essential part of the struggle against world imperialism, because he is his offspring and ally is, in theory and practice, the manifestation of bourgeois ideology, a "Trojan horse" of world imperialism in the
Marxist-Leninist world movement.

This is a battle of great historical significance, a battle that will decide on the future of the world revolution, will decide on the question: capitalism or socialism? It is a struggle over life and death.

We are convinced that the Maoists get more and more exposed and discredited, both in their own country and in the international communist movement. They shall suffer one defeat after another, while the ranks of the revolutionary communists are growing with every new crusading against the Maoists.

**Marxism-Leninism will defeat all Maoist currents!**

Long live Comrade Enver Hoxha and his invincible struggle against Mao Zedong-Ideas!

Long live the 5 classics of Marxism-Leninism in the fight against revisionism!

The complete defeat of Maoism and the Triumph of Marxism-Leninism are inevitable!

We are glad and proud to present

**Enver Hoxha's “Reflections on China”**

- English version the first time published in the internet!!! -

We like to thank our Russian comrades for this excellent work and their great contribution in the global struggle against Maoism.

(Thanks to: [www.enverhoxha.ru](http://www.enverhoxha.ru))

click on the cover of the books:
Reflections on China (I)

Volume I

Reflections on China (II)

Volume II
(1973 - 1977)
Tirana 1979
(PDF-file from www.enverhoxha.ru)
Revisionist tendencies have existed since the very beginning of the communist movement. The bourgeoisie always tried to penetrate inside communists’ ranks in order to corrupt the purity of the Marxist ideology and to take its militants away from the idea of the proletarian revolution.

Firstly, we had Bernstein's and Kautsky's revisionisms. Those were obvious revisionisms whose aim was to transform Marxism into an “acceptable” and “reasonable” ideology at the eyes of the bourgeoisie.

As Comrade Enver Hoxha stated:

“(…) after the heroic events of the Commune of Paris, (...) the bourgeoisie, mortally afraid of the spread of the great example it set, encouraged the new opportunist trend of Bernstein, who tried to strip Marxism of its revolutionary content and make it harmless to the political domination of the imperialist bourgeoisie.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anti-communism, Tirana 1980, edition in English).

It's very important to take Bernstein's and Kautsky's revisionisms into consideration, because its ideas influenced nearly all future revisionist, opportunist and anti-Marxist currents, including Maoism:
The theories of Bernstein and Kautsky in various forms, sometimes openly and sometimes modified, are found in the revisionist Browder, are found in Khrushchevite revisionism, in Titoite revisionism, in French revisionism and in the Italian revisionism of Togliatti, in the so-called Mao Zedong thought and all revisionist currents. These innumerable anti-Marxist currents, which are developing in the present-day capitalist and revisionist world, are the fifth column in the ranks of the world revolution to prolong the existence of international capitalism by fighting the revolution from within.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anti-communism, Tirana 1980, edition in English).

Bernstein was, much before Khrushchev, a staunch defender of the “gradual” and “peaceful” way to socialism.

After Bernstein, Kautsky and company, there were other revisionist currents such as Trotskyism, Titoism and Khrushchevism. All these currents were intended to separate peoples from the struggle for socialism by denying the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat and advocating that “there are many ways to achieve socialism”, that “after the socialist revolution, class struggle will disappear”, etc… In their writings, the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism analyzed deeply the causes, the consequences, the ideology and the actions of all those revisionist and anti-socialist currents and there is no need to talk further about them.

When reflecting about the evolution of the successive revisionist movements, we can easily note that the astuteness of the bourgeoisie in discovering new forms of revisionism with the purpose of detaching the broad masses from socialist edification is increasingly sharpening. Facing the strength of the proletarian forces and the growth of their revolutionary conscience, the bourgeoisie is forced to create new reactionary “theories” and “ideas” dressed in a “socialist” cloak in order to perpetuate the capitalist system and its immense class privileges. Of course, in doing this, the main objective of the bourgeoisie is to mislead the proletariat, is to create illusions and to propagate lies in order to thwart the socialist revolution.

When analyzing Maoist revisionism, we see that the bourgeoisie united all the old revisionist ideas and tried to dress them in a “revolutionary” and “leftist” cloak in order to deceive the working classes. However, behind its “revolutionary” outlook, Maoism was an anti-Marxist tendency from the very beginning. As Comrade Enver Hoxha said in his excellent book “Reflections on China”, the 1949 Chinese revolution was nothing more than a bourgeois revolution and Mao Zedong was never a Marxist-Leninist:

“Mao Tsetung is not a Marxist-Leninist but a progressive revolutionary democrat, and in my opinion, this is the angle from which his work should be studied.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, 26 December of 1976, Tirana, 1979, edition in
However, to understand correctly the true character of Maoist revisionism, we have to analyze its origins, we have to analyze the conditions in which the Chinese bourgeois-democratic anti-colonialist movement developed.

In the XIX century, the world was dominated by the European colonial and imperialist powers. British, French, German, Russian, Portuguese, Japanese, etc… imperialisms were dividing the world among them. British imperialism was hegemonic, but this did not hinder the other imperialisms from searching for new colonial areas where they could find new resources and markets to their products and capitals. In fact, the rivalry between the various European imperialist powers was increasing at the same time that there were less and less areas of the world which could be turned into colonial zones without interferences and conflicts with the other imperialisms also interested in colonial expansion. Of course, when these European imperialist powers penetrated in a new territory in order to transform it in a new colony, they only permitted the development of certain industrial and agricultural branches whose growth was considered more favorable for the economy of the colonial power. This is quite normal, because their aim was to turn the colonies into mere suppliers of basic resources without any signs of economic development. The effects and consequences of the European imperialisms were horrendous, from man-made large-scale famines and atrocities perpetrated against the oppressed peoples of the colonies, to the amount of massacres and slaughters which were called the “First World War” and which were a product of violent imperialist contradictions. In many senses, these awful effects are still felt nowadays, especially in what concerns the distribution of the world’s wealth and the division between “rich” and “poor” countries, which was artificially caused by the capitalist and imperialist system.

Nevertheless, it was not until the second half of the XIX century that the western imperialist powers finally fully penetrated into China. In truth, China’s case is very curious because the XIX century was the golden age of traditional colonialism; however, even when the coalition formed by the Great Britain, France, Russia, Japan, etc… managed to defeat the Qing imperial dynasty, those powers didn’t turn China into a traditional colonial country, but instead they applied what can be called an indirect colonialism or semi-colonialism, while maintaining China’s formal independence. In fact, we can almost say that China was one of the first territories in which was applied what we today call neo-colonialism. This caused the development in China of a very powerful and influential bourgeoisie intimately linked with foreign imperialisms (bourgeoisie-compradore). Simultaneously, there were also another sections of the Chinese bourgeoisie which were growing, especially the more nationalistic and radical bourgeoisie whose interests had profound contradictions with those of the bourgeoisie compradore. This happened because the imperialist powers favored greatly the bourgeoisie of
the compradore type, and through this support this bourgeoisie shared the control of China’s main industries and resources with the foreign imperialists.

In order to fight against the favored position of the bourgeoisie compradore, the national bourgeoisie claimed for “genuine independence” and “struggle against foreign control of China”. Therefore, the claims of the national bourgeoisie, whose ideology will constitute the main base of Maoist revisionism, were nothing more than instruments which were used by a section of the bourgeois class to accomplish its interests in front of another more powerful section of the same class. The bourgeoisie-compradore had power because it served the foreign imperialists interests. Consequently, to surpass this situation, the national bourgeoisie wanted China’s “true independence” in order to break the ties between the foreign imperialists and the bourgeoisie-compradore which were granting the latter’s power and influence in China.

This is not to deny that this national bourgeoisie had a certain “progressive” character. After all, we must bear in mind that, in those times, China was still a semi-feudal country and the Chinese peasants were harshly oppressed by the feudal and warlords which ruled the countryside. This fact was determinant in permitting that the national and “progressive” bourgeoisie could win the peasants and the working classes to its side. The “revolutionary” national bourgeoisie “promised” to liberate the peasants from this medieval oppression and with this it started to fight in both fronts: against the bourgeoisie-compradore in the urban areas and against the feudal landowners in the countryside. It was in the context of this struggle between the national “progressive” bourgeoisie supported by the peasants and the working classes, on one side, and the bourgeoisie-compradore and the feudal lords, on the other side, that the 1911 Chinese revolution of Sun-yat Sen (the leader of the Kuomintang) broke out and established the Chinese republic. This revolution was of a bourgeois-democratic character and, despite Sun-yat Sen sympathies for the Leninist Soviet Union, it never managed to menace the power of the bourgeoisie-compradore, nor of the imperialist control in China. Comrade Enver Hoxha brilliantly analyzed the nature of this Chinese republic and the posterior conditions in which the Communist Party of China emerged in an article entitled “Can the Chinese revolution be called a proletarian revolution?":

“*This Chinese Republic was a «bourgeois-democratic» republic, still not fully formed with all the features and characteristics of an advanced bourgeois democracy, although it was moving in that direction. (…) At that time China was languishing under the double domination of the absolute monarchy, of the chaos in the provinces, where the «warlords» reigned with their autonomous administrations and their virtually private «armies», and under the domination of a series of imperialist states. (…) The proclamation of the republic and the coming to power of the Kuomintang did not mean that the big Chinese bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie and the compradore bourgeoisie were eliminated. In no way. This*
bourgeoisie remained in power and continued to maintain, protect and develop its links with the imperialist states, especially with American imperialism (...)

Sun Yat-sen and the Kuomintang chose and developed the course of bourgeois-democratic reforms and, although they had friendly relations with the Leninist Soviet Union, they were far from following the Leninist road for the transformation of China.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, 26th December of 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

The fact that the Chinese republic never managed to get rid of foreign dominance and of the power of the bourgeois-compradore was due to Sun Yat Sen’s ideological weakness. Instead of struggling against the bourgeoisie-compradore, he only blamed the defunct Qing dynasty for the fact that China was still a semi-feudal country completely exploited and controlled by the foreign imperialisms. He never understood that to eliminate semi-feudalism and imperialist interference in China, it was necessary at least to neutralize the bourgeoisie-compradore:

“His views and social inclinations were radical in words, but feeble in content. The ideopolitical inclinations of Sun Yat-sen, Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang as a whole leaned mostly and mainly towards the bourgeois-democratic views of Western Europe, America and other countries such as Japan.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II 26th December of 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

So, we can conclude that the 1911 Revolution which established the Chinese republic didn’t change the country’s general socio-economic and class structures. This meant that the section of the “progressive” national bourgeoisie continued the struggle against rival sections of the bourgeoisie.

Finally, in 1920, the Communist Party of China was born. The CPC was composed by some small groups submerged in a total ideological confusion and vacillation. The members of the Communist Party of China were guided by an ideology which was not Marxism-Leninism, but a reactionary and idealist ideology inspired on Confucianism, Buddhism, Chinese traditional philosophy, not to speak about the Trotskyist and anarchist influences which were also noted within the CPC:

“The Communist Party of China was born and developed in the bosom of the old Chinese society and civilization and its members, at that time, were products of the Confucian moral and intellectual education, democratic liberal education, and finally, Marxist-Leninist education. But even later it cannot be said that the Chinese Marxists broke away completely from the traditional civilization which continued to exert its influence on them through their individual psychology and the national psychology. The first Marxist groups were characterized
by ideological confusion and vacillation in political line.

All these various ideological and political views should have been brought under control, in the sense that the ranks should have been purged and the influence of those elements who were democrats, but were not Marxists and who did not follow the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, should have been reduced. With this I want to say that the terrain should have been purged in order to form a genuine communist party, which would follow the theory of Marxism-Leninism, and apply it in a creative manner in the conditions of China, but apply it with a more profound and clearer understanding according to the ideas which guided the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Marxist ideas of Lenin.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, 26th December of 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

We must also note that the majority of the party members were under the influence of the Chinese national bourgeoisie and, indeed, the future Maoist revisionism would mainly serve the interests of this national bourgeoisie against foreign imperialisms and the bourgeoisie-compradore:

“(…) in the views of the new cadres there remained a pronounced feeling of Chinese nationalism, of the independence of this «great state» and pronounced influences of old philosophical ideas of Confucius, Mencius, etc. This prevented the Chinese comrades, who were being formed during the struggle and battles, from considering Marxism-Leninism a true compass which would guide them in the very dark forest of the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution and from working out a Marxist-Leninist political line with clear objectives, which would guide them unwaveringly in all the stages of the Chinese revolution.

The Communist Party of China adopted only certain Marxist slogans and formulations, but in essence it was not a genuine party of the proletariat, a party of the revolution, which could secure the leadership in the democratic revolution and ensure its transformation into a proletarian revolution. In fact, within its ranks a series of anarchist and other theories and deviations developed. The whole development of China, from the formation of the party, from the foundation of the bourgeois-democratic republic of Sun Yat sen, to this day shows this chaotic course.

The newly formed Communist Party of China should have followed the course of strengthening itself ideologically and organizationally, should have worked to build up its identity and, step by step, create its alliances with the revolutionary classes and forces, should have fought for the strengthening of the positions of the bourgeois democracy which was being built in this first stage, that is, to ensure the democratic freedoms of the people, to increase the influence of the people and, in the first place, of the proletariat (…) it should have worked to
capture dominant positions in the trade unions and to carry on its propaganda with its own class stand, in order to consolidate its positions in the working class, in order to make that class the leading force of the revolution.

At the same time, it should have extended its influence into the Chinese countryside (…) and should have proceeded more consistently in implementing the agrarian reform and the political-educational awakening of the countryside.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, 26th December of 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Moreover, the “C”PC worked in a state of total disorganization, without even looking for the indications and directives that the Comintern of Lenin was giving them. Comrade Lenin analyzed the situation in China and, at its Second Congress, the Comintern defended:

“(…) the thesis that «the revolution in China and other colonial countries must have a program which permits the inclusion of bourgeois reforms and, especially, the agrarian reform», but stressed that the leadership of the revolution must not be handed over to the democratic bourgeoisie; on the contrary, say the decisions of the Congress, the party of the proletariat must direct a strong and systematic propaganda in favor of Soviets and organize the Soviets of workers and peasants as quickly as possible. This was the general line of the Comintern, which should have been followed by the party in China, too.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, 26th December of 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Therefore, Comrade Enver concludes that:

“(…) in general, the Communist Party of China did not properly carry out this role in this situation which had been created in China in a studied and systematic manner, seen from the angle of scientific socialism.

(…) there were different tendencies in that small party which called itself the Communist Party of China, tendencies which have never permitted a correct Marxist-Leninist line to be established, or Marxist-Leninist thought and action to guide it. These initial tendencies which were displayed many times among the main leaders of the party, were frequently leftist, sometimes right-opportunist, sometimes centrist, going as far as anarchist, Trotskyite, bourgeois, and marked chauvinist and racist views. Even later, these tendencies remained as one of the distinctive characteristics of the Communist Party of China which Mao Tsetung and his group eventually led.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II 26th December of 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

As can be seen by these excerpts, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposed the ideological deviations and errors which would greatly influence the future course of the “Communist” Party
of China and its total embrace of revisionism and social-imperialism. He did it in an adequate, correct and Marxist-Leninist manner. Thus, there is no need to talk further about the beginnings of the “C”PC.

Now that we have already taken Maoism’s roots into consideration, we are going to analyze Maoist revisionism in itself.

As was already referred, the “radical” section of the national bourgeoisie continued its struggle against the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie-compradore which the Chinese republic of Sun yat Sen was unable to obliterate.

In 1931, the Japanese imperialism occupied China and in 1939, the Second World War begun. The Communist Party of China struggled against Japanese fascism and against the parts of the Chinese bourgeoisie which took the side of the Japanese and were helping them to dominate China and to win the war. Supported by the peasants and by some working masses, the Communist Party of China played a major role in defeating the Japanese in the National Liberation War. Nevertheless, the “C”PC still could not achieve political power because of the Kuomintang’s opposition. Since the late 20’s, the CPC and the Kuomintang had been engaged in a war for political dominance, but in 1931 they reached a certain unity through the fight against Japanese imperialism. Nevertheless, after the end of the Second World War, the “C”PC could not achieve political power because the war against the Japanese was replaced by the war against the Kuomintang. Both forces wanted to achieve political power and they were representing different sections of the Chinese bourgeoisie: the “C” PC represented the more “progressive” national bourgeoisie, while the Kuomintang of Chiang Kai-shek represented the openly reactionary bourgeoisie linked with American Imperialism. However, as Comrade Enver Hoxha noted, it was not only the Kuomintang which maintained close relations with American Imperialism, in fact, the “C”PC did the same and, as we shall see, the Chinese “communists” revealed themselves to be the best allies of American Imperialism in their quest to stop the world proletariat from doing the revolution and from edificating socialism and communism.

Finally, in 1949, the Communist Party of China emerged victorious of the war against the Kuomintang and the democratic-bourgeois, anti-feudal, anti-colonial and progressive revolution triumphed in China.

Nonetheless, the revisionist ideas of Mao existed many years before the bourgeois-democratic takeover in China. One of the more emblematic texts which characterize the so-called “Mao Zedong Though” is the famous booklet “New Democracy” which was written in 1940. In this work, Mao clearly reveals his bourgeois influences. He says that:

“For many years we Communists have struggled for a cultural revolution as well as for a
political and economic revolution, and our aim is to build a new society and a new state for the Chinese nation.”

But after that, he explains what the Chinese “communists” really mean with “this new society and new state”:

“What we want is to get rid of the old colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal politics and economy and the old culture in their service.”

Here, we can easily note the animosity of the “progressive” bourgeoisie towards the foreign imperialists, the bourgeoisie-compradore and the feudal lords who represented the “old culture” and were preventing the “progressive” national bourgeoisie from achieving political power and from accomplishing its own class interests. In fact, we can consider Mao as some kind of “porte-parole” of the Chinese national bourgeoisie.

In the book “New Democracy”, Mao also presents his famous “theory” of the two revolutions:

“In the course of its history the Chinese revolution must go through two stages, first, the democratic revolution, and second, the socialist revolution, and by their very nature they are two different revolutionary processes. Here democracy does not belong to the old category -- it is not the old democracy, but belongs to the new category -- it is New Democracy.”

First of all, we should note that, as far as we have seen, Mao never explains exactly how will the first stage of the revolution, that of the democratic revolution be turned into the second stage, that of the socialist revolution. He just affirms that the Chinese revolution will have those two stages and that the first stage will no longer be “democracy in general, but democracy of the Chinese type, a new and special type, namely, New Democracy.”

This division of the Chinese revolution in two “different revolutionary processes” is one of the theories to be qualified by the Maoists as an “innovation” (read: deformation) of Marxism-Leninism. Unfortunately to the revisionists of the MLM, this theory constitutes one of the most obvious signs of the reactionary character of the Maoist “New Democracy”.

After the Khrushchevist takeover in the Soviet Union, nearly all the “Communist” Parties which accepted the revisionist betrayal in the S.U started to qualify the Marxist-Leninist militants and parties who refused their rightist course as “ultra-leftists” and “Phrase-Mongers”. However, 16 years before Khrushchev’s coup d’état against socialism, Mao Zedong already named the ones refusing his Trotskyist and Boukharinist ideas as “Left Phrase-Mongers”. Indeed, this is the name of one of the main chapters of his book “New Democracy”. In that chapter he bluntly
“If the capitalist road of bourgeois dictatorship is out of the question, then is it possible to take the socialist road of proletarian dictatorship?

No, that is not possible either.”

In the same chapter, Mao goes even further and makes a statement which is totally astounding:

“(…) there are other people, apparently with no evil intentions (?!!), who are misled by the "theory of a single revolution" and the fanciful notion of "accomplishing both the political revolution and the social revolution at one stroke"; they do not understand that our revolution is divided into stages, that we can only proceed to the next stage of revolution after accomplishing the first, and that there is no such thing as "accomplishing both at one stroke".

This wrong theory is based on the false presumption that it is essential to develop capitalism before advancing towards the socialist revolution. This anti-socialist presumption has its roots in the anti-Bolshevist and anti-Leninist opposition in the context of the 1917 October Revolution and was one of the main “arguments” used by the bourgeois opposition to destroy the October Revolution and to restore capitalism in Russia under the excuse that “economical conditions in Russia are still not ready to the socialist edification”.

In fact, there is a close relationship between Maoism and another major revisionist tendency: Trotskyism. Just like Maoism, Trotskyism tried to glorify and perpetuate bourgeois dictatorship by arguing that socialist revolution is impossible without the development of capitalism. Both revisionisms also tried to convince the oppressed masses that it is possible to rely on non-proletarian classes to successfully achieve socialism.

In truth, the October revolution was the historical precedent which permitted that Lenin affirmed:

“[…] with the help of the proletariat of the developed countries, the backward countries can establish the Soviet regime and, after passing through certain stages, they can achieve communism avoiding the capitalist stage.” (Lenin, “Ille Congrès de l'Internationale communiste”, Oeuvres, Paris-Moscou, 1965, translated from french language).

Furthermore, the examples of the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver Hoxha show clearly the ultra-revisionist character of Mao’s affirmation that:
“One cannot edificate socialism without passing through the democratic phase, this is a Marxist law.” (Mao Zedong, « Du gouvernement de coalition », Oeuvres choisies, Pékin, 1968, translated from French language).

Both countries had backward political and economical systems with feudal and semi-feudal characteristics. However, nor Lenin, nor Stalin, nor Enver Hoxha ever thought of postponing the socialist revolution simply because bourgeois “democracy” and capitalism were still not sufficiently developed in their respective countries. To defend the contrary is nothing more than renouncing to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to the edification of socialism and communism.

As Comrade Enver Hoxha significantly said:

“The Albanian experience proves that even a small country with a backward material and technical base can experiment a great and general economic and cultural development, can grant its independence and can also defeat the attacks of world capitalism and imperialism if that country is conducted by a veritable Marxist-Leninist party, if that country is decided to fight until the end for its ideals having confidence in their achievement.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the VIII Congress of the PTA, Tirana, 1981, translated from the French language).

And as the Party of Labour of Albania correctly understood:

“The level of development of capitalism in a certain country cannot be considered as the decisive factor or the determinant factor in what concerns the victory of the socialist revolution.” (Parti du Travail d’Albanie, Histoire de la construction socialiste en Albanie, Tirana, 1988, translated from French language).

Albanian communists started to apply their Marxist-Leninist ideology even before the complete Liberation of their country, when they expropriated the cereals’ depots privately owned in the areas that they liberated from the Axis’ control. Less than two years after the Liberation, nearly all Albania’s industries and means of production were nationalized, and also the great landowners were expropriated and their properties were given to the landless peasants. The Albanian communists faithfully followed the lessons of Lenin and Stalin and was this ideological firmness that permitted that Socialist Albania could struggle and survive to the imperialist-revisionist encirclement. We should note that Socialist Albania followed a course which was contrary to that of the social-fascist states. Since the middle of the 50’s, those social-fascists states were openly restoring capitalism, the new oligarchic classes were taking power and exploiting the people under “socialist” cloaks. In a word, the general tendency in the states of popular democracy was to weaken and annihilate the dictatorship of the proletariat. However,
in the same period, we note that in socialist Albania the collectivization of the economy in general and of the agriculture in particular was increasingly intensifying, that the proletarian dictatorship was strong and implacable with the enemies of socialism, giving them the treatment they deserved (contrary to what happened in the revisionist countries, where bourgeois “humanism” was undermining the use of revolutionary violence against the reactionaries), that the socialist democracy was more complete than ever, that the living conditions were dramatically improved, etc. In a word, that Albania was not only successfully building socialism, but was also moving towards communism.

An example of the ideological correctness that characterized the actions of the PLA is that even in the first stage of the agrarian reform, the Albanian communists always kept in mind that the small property was nothing more than a temporary stage, that their true objective was the collectivization of all land. And even when the countryside was already organized in socialist cooperatives, the Albanian communists never stopped their militant activity in favor of the transformation of the cooperatives into property of the socialist state, because during socialism the cooperative form of socialist property is also a transitory form, and only its transformation in property of the entire socialist state is compatible with communism. The problem with the cooperative form of property (which the Titoites and the anarchists love so much…) is that it does not totally eliminate the problem of the sense of private property and of bourgeois egoism, because the cooperative is property of the workers of a certain geographical area, it is not property of the entire state of the dictatorship of proletariat. Therefore, this can cause situations in which the workers may feel tempted to favor the interests of their regional cooperative in detriment of the interests of the whole proletarian state. Unfortunately, the revisionist takeover in Albania happened before that the Albanian communists could completely transform all cooperatives into property of the entire state, but the application of Marxism-Leninism in Socialist Albania is in total contrast with Maoist conception that:

“"The republic will take certain necessary steps to confiscate the land of the landlords and distribute it to those peasants having little or no land, carry out Dr. Sun Yat-sen's slogan of "land to the tiller", abolish feudal relations in the rural areas, and turn the land over to the private ownership of the peasants. **A rich peasant economy will be allowed in the rural areas.** Such is the policy of "equalization of landownership". "Land to the tiller" is the correct slogan for this policy. (...) socialist agriculture will not be established at this stage (...).” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

The Albanian Socialist Revolution also had various phases: the first phase was that of the liberation of the country and the conquest of the political power by the proletariat; the second was that of the edification of the economical basis of socialism; and the third phase was that of the cultural and ideological revolution. But these phases are very different from the
stages defended by Mao. While the latter completely separates the democratic stage from the socialist stage (Mao not even explains how the democratic and bourgeois stage will be turned into the socialist stage), the three phases of the Albanian Socialist Revolution, far from being separated, are closely touching each other. The phase of the country’s liberation must have elements of the socialist economical edification, while this second phase cannot be realized without the seizure of power by the proletariat, and finally, the ideological revolution cannot be accomplish without the other two phases and it helps to grant the second stage and to consolidate the Liberation of the country. What this means is that there was only one Socialist Revolution in Albania, and these three phases merely indicate the most important tasks in each revolutionary period (respectively: conquer of political power, socialist economical edification and cultural revolution). The three “phases” of the Albanian Socialist Revolution are deeply merged among them.

This has nothing to do with the Maoist conception which imagines “two different revolutionary processes”, in which capitalism should be developed and in which the cooperation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and its parties are seen as a definitive aim.

In his book New Democracy, Mao does an astonishing statement concerning the 1911 Revolution of Sun Yat Sen. Mao starts by saying that this revolution was of a bourgeois-democratic character, but then he says that after the Russian October Socialist Revolution of 1917, the character of the 1911 Chinese revolution was changed:

“Before these events, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution came within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, of which it was a part.

Since these events, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution has changed, it has come within the new category of bourgeois democratic revolutions and, as far as the alignment of revolutionary forces is concerned, forms part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

This “formula” of considering that, after the 1917 October revolution, all the democratic-bourgeois revolutions are part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution will be generally applied by Mao:

“In this era, any revolution in a colony or semi-colony that is directed against imperialism, i.e., against the international bourgeoisie or international capitalism, no longer comes within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but within the new category.

It is no longer part of the old bourgeois, or capitalist, world revolution, but is part of the new world revolution, the proletarian-socialist world revolution. Such revolutionary
colonies and semi-colonies can no longer be regarded as allies of the counter revolutionary front of world capitalism; they have become allies of the revolutionary front of world socialism.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

This affirmation is a complete falsity. We, Marxist-Leninists, can never confound the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution with the truly socialist and proletarian revolution. To do so is to complete mislead the masses. One thing is to consider that the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution can open the path to the socialist revolution, that it can facilitate the proletarian struggle for socialism. This is true, but to do this it is necessary that the proletariat is able to use and advance the most progressive characteristics of the anti-imperialist revolution in order to transform it into a socialist revolution.

Another completely different thing is to state that the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolutions are integrating parts of the socialist and proletarian world revolution. This is a totally anti-Marxist and anti-communist theory which propagates class collaboration with the bourgeoisie:

“Although such a revolution in a colonial and semi-colonial country is still fundamentally bourgeois-democratic in its social character during its first stage or first step, and although its objective mission is to clear the path for the development of capitalism, it is no longer a revolution of the old type led by the bourgeoisie with the aim of establishing a capitalist society and a state under bourgeois dictatorship.

It belongs to the new type of revolution led by the proletariat with the aim, in the first stage, of establishing a new-democratic society and a state under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes.”

“Although the Chinese revolution in this first stage (with its many sub-stages) is a new type of bourgeois-democratic revolution and is not yet itself a proletarian-socialist revolution in its social character, it has long become a part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution and is now even a very important part and a great ally of this world revolution. The first step or stage in our revolution is definitely not, and cannot be, the establishment of a capitalist society under the dictatorship of the Chinese bourgeoisie, but will result in the establishment of a new-democratic society under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes of China headed by the Chinese proletariat.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

So, according to Mao, all the “revolutionary classes” should collaborate in the “joint
dictatorship”. But what does Mao means with “all the revolutionary classes”? With this affirmation, Mao is permitting that the revolutionary process can be guided by the national bourgeoisie, because in the context of a bourgeois-democratic revolution against feudalism and colonialism, the national patriotic bourgeoisie can perfectly be considered as a “revolutionary class”. What Mao is saying is that the proletariat should closely collaborate with the national bourgeoisie in the development of a “revolution (which) actually serves the purpose of dearing a still wider path for the development of socialism.” To affirm that the proletariat should be dependent of the help of the bourgeoisie to open the path to socialism is a complete negation of the most basic Leninist principles. The truth is that the political power belongs to the class who controls the means of production and the productive relations which form the material base of society, and because of that, in the genuine proletarian dictatorship, the revolutionary proletarian classes will refuse to share the power with the bourgeoisie, no matter if it is with the reactionary bourgeoisie or with the “progressive” bourgeoisie. In an authentic proletarian dictatorship, the proletariat will never let the “progressive” bourgeoisie lead the revolution; indeed, the main task of the proletarian dictatorship is to eliminate the bourgeoisie not only as a class, but also to eliminate all its ideological and cultural influences, because there is no other way to assure the victory of socialism and communism.

Contrary to Lenin, Mao seems to think that it’s positive for the proletariat to collaborate and to share the power with the “progressive” national bourgeoisie, and this means that under the Maoist “New democracy” the bourgeoisie will continue to exist as a class. If the bourgeoisie will continue to exist as a class, then it will certainly control the means of production in a manner detrimental to the proletariat, it will still maintain the economical power in its hands! In the end, Mao frontally denies the necessity of the leading role of the proletariat in this “New Democracy”:

“No matter what classes, parties or individuals in an oppressed nation join the revolution, and no matter whether they themselves are conscious of the point or understand it, so long as they oppose imperialism, their revolution becomes part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution and they become its allies.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

So, for Mao, the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie, the exploited and the exploiters were all at the same level, they had no conflicting and irreconcilable class interests, but on the contrary, they should be united in the “anti-imperialist” revolution, because in doing this, even the bourgeoisie can turn into an ally of the “proletarian-socialist world revolution”!

As if this was not enough, Mao goes even further with his ultra-opportunist and reactionary theories:
“This new-democratic republic will be different from the old European-American form of capitalist republic under bourgeois dictatorship, which is the old democratic form and already out of date. On the other hand, it will also be different from the socialist republic of the Soviet type under the dictatorship of the proletariat which is already flourishing in the U.S.S.R. (…).

Thus the numerous types of state system in the world can be reduced to three basic kinds according to the class character of their political power: (1) republics under bourgeois dictatorship; (2) republics under the dictatorship of the proletariat; and (3) republics under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

As can be observed, Mao is defending some kind of “third way”, nor the “bourgeois dictatorship” nor the “proletarian dictatorship”. This is very similar to the old anti-communist theory which says “nor capitalism, nor socialism” and which is still very used nowadays among the petty-bourgeois and “libertarian” currents. This slogan of the “third alternative” is in fact an ultra-reactionary ideology which serves to perpetuate capitalism because, as it was already said, the economical and political power belongs to the class which owns the means of production, the class who controls the productive relations which constitute the material base of society. While this control of the economical and material means of production is not conquered by the proletariat through revolutionary armed violence, it will always belong to the bourgeois exploitative class. If we say “nor bourgeois dictatorship, nor proletarian dictatorship”, as Mao openly does, then we are automatically favoring the bourgeois dictatorship. This happens because the proletarian dictatorship is the only way to definitively eliminate bourgeois dictatorship; therefore, if we deny the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we are maintaining and serving the bourgeois dictatorship. Mao considers that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can “share” the state power. This is something impossible. It cannot exist a state in which both classes have state power and “share” that power. Or it is the proletariat who detains state power or it is the bourgeoisie. There is no “third way” because what is not revolutionary, it is necessarily reactionary. All those who are not in favor of the proletarian dictatorship and in favor of the communist society are necessarily in favor of the bourgeois dictatorship and of the capitalist system. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are two classes whose interests are irreconcilable. By its own nature and origins, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat have historical missions and roles which are radically opposed. There is no possibility for these two classes to rule under a “joint dictatorship” as Mao argues, because that “share of power” and “joint dictatorship” will invariably be in favor of the bourgeoisie, because no matter how “progressive”, “liberal” and “patriotic”, the bourgeois class has always an exploitative and reactionary character; until the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, the bourgeoisie is the class which controls the economical power and controls the productive forces which determine every
aspect of the human society, obviously including the state power. So, when Mao affirms that the “New Democracy” will refuse “the dictatorship of the proletariat”, it means that it will certainly be a political-economical system in which the wage slavery will continue, in which the national and “progressive” bourgeoisie will continue exploiting the broad working masses.

The Maoist conceptions constitute a profound deviation from the Leninist strategy of the eventual necessity of an alliance between the proletariat and certain branches of the bourgeoisie in the period before the Socialist and Proletarian revolution. This Leninist strategy defends that, in certain conditions, it may be beneficial to the proletariat to make alliances with non-proletarian branches. Of course, these alliances must always be temporary, they can never be configured as an end in itself, and they should only be made in situations in which they can serve to strengthen the positions of the proletariat. Moreover, the proletarian party must never make concessions in what respects to organizational and ideological Marxist-Leninists principles. Therefore, one of the aspects which distinguishes Marxism-Leninism from Maoism is that the genuine Marxist-Leninists must never deviate from the principle that this kind of alliances are nothing more than temporary situations and the Marxist-Leninist party must always persist in its objective of destruction of the bourgeoisie even while temporarily in alliance with that same bourgeoisie. In reality, after the implementation of the proletarian dictatorship, there can be no other party besides the proletarian and communist party, there can be no other class interests besides the ones of the proletarian classes (the working class, the peasantry and the intellectuals born form these two oppressed classes), and there can be no other ideology besides Marxism-Leninism (this is not to say that bourgeois influences will not persist during some time, but the tendency must always be towards their inexorable disappearance, contrary to what happened in Maoist China).

Indeed, more than entering in an alliance and sharing the power with the bourgeoisie, what Mao proposes is that the proletariat should be controlled by the “democratic” (read: bourgeois) parties:

“... The possibility that the democratic parties can exist during a long period is not only determined by the desires of the Communist Party, that depends also on the behavior of the democratic parties and on the confidence that the people has in these parties. [...] Of course, the mutual control is not unilateral, the Communist Party will control the democratic parties and these democratic parties will equally control the Communist Party.” (Mao Zedong, De la juste solution des contradictions au sein du people, Textes choisis, Pékin, 1972, p. 509, translated from French language).

If there were still any doubts about the reactionary and anti-communist nature of the Mao Zedong though, here it is the final answer. What Mao is defending is that the proletariat and the
communist party should rely on the bourgeois parties and on the non-communists in order to achieve communism! This is totally illogical from a Marxist-Leninist point of view. To really edificate communism, it is indispensable to annihilate without mercy ALL the bourgeois and exploitative classes (the imperialist bourgeoisie, the great land owners, the petty-bourgeoisie, the reactionary bourgeoisie, the “progressive" bourgeoisie etc. etc…). Moreover, in the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there can be only one party: the proletarian party, the vanguard party of the working class which is leading the oppressed masses towards socialism and communism. After the establishment and consolidation of the proletarian power, it’s illogical and reactionary to admit and defend the existence of any other parties representing non-proletarian classes. The proletarian party must lead the exploited classes and it constitutes one of the main instruments through which the proletariat exercises the revolutionary armed violence against the bourgeois and oppressive classes. That’s why nearly all kinds of revisionist currents have denied the leading role of the proletarian and communist party. It is very interesting to observe how the Marxist-Leninist conceptions of Comrade Enver Hoxha regarding the leading role of the proletarian party are in total contrast with those of Mao:

“The revolution is a rupture with a whole world and a whole tradition. We should never forget that: the class struggle continues during the entire period of the edification of the socialist society and also while the communist society is still not completely secured. During all this time, the political parties express the interests of determined classes. Only an absurd opportunism can defend the presence of non-proletarian parties within the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, foremost after the edification of the economical base of the socialist system. This evolution, far from constituting a violation of freedom, is in fact consolidating the authentic proletarian democracy. The character of a social order is not determined by the number of parties. It is determined by its economical base, by the class which controls the state power, by the state policy which is or not at the service of the broad masses.

The modern revisionists (...) deny the leading role of the proletarian party in what concerns the seizure of power and the edification of socialism. Their propaganda even argues that it is possible to achieve socialism having the bourgeois and the petty-bourgeois parties as the main leading forces. (...) This conception represents a total betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist principles and of the revolutionary cause of the working class.” (Enver Hoxha cited by Gilbert Mury in Enver Hoxha contre le revisionisme, Paris, 1972, translated from French language).

And referring to the Democratic Front in Albania, Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines that:

“*This Front is not a political party, nor a coalition of parties: in our country, there
are no other parties besides the Party of Labour of Albania.” (Enver Hoxha cited by Gilbert Mury in Enver Hoxha contre le revisionisme, Paris, 1972, translated from French language).

The fake “Marxist” phraseology used by Mao when he says the “New Democracy” will refuse the “bourgeois dictatorship” and that “The Chinese democratic republic must be a democratic republic under the joint dictatorship of all anti-imperialist and anti-feudal people led by the proletariat (...)” is nothing more than an attempt to hide the democratic-bourgeois, anti-imperialist character of the Maoist ideological conceptions. That’s why the Chinese revisionists always supported the “non-aligned movements”; because those petty-bourgeois movements also had the same tendency of refusing both imperialism and socialist revolution while serving the interests of the national bourgeoisie of the semi-colonial countries which wanted to get rid of the limitations imposed by the foreign capitalists and by the bourgeoisie-compradore with the purpose of conducting the capitalist system in favor of its own interests (the social-fascist theory of the “three worlds”, which we will analyze, has its origins in this opportunistic and petty-bourgeois character of the Maoist ideology).

In his book Reflections on China, Comrade Enver Hoxha characterized the Maoist “New Democracy” in a very assertive manner:

“Mao Tse-Tung and the comrades around him were not genuine Marxist-Leninists, they were progressive bourgeois democrats, Marxists in appearance and phraseology, but who fought, and fought to the end, for the consolidation of a progressive bourgeois-democratic great state, for a «new democracy», as Mao Tse-Tung called it.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, 26th December of 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

The opportunistic, revisionist and anti-Marxist conceptions of Mao can also be observed in his descriptions of the economical aspects of the “New Democracy”:

“In the new-democratic republic under the leadership of the proletariat, the state enterprises will be of a socialist character and will constitute the leading force in the whole national economy, but the republic will neither confiscate capitalist private property in general nor forbid the development of such capitalist production as does not "dominate the livelihood of the people", for China's economy is still very backward.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

This paragraph constitutes the admission by Mao himself that the “New Democracy” will be nothing more than the social-fascist dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie. If the “the republic will neither confiscate capitalist private property in general nor forbid the development of such capitalist production”, then how will the proletariat concentrate the means of production in its hands with the purpose of achieving state power? Every Marxist-Leninist knows that while
“capitalist private property” and “capitalist production” continues to exist, it will always perpetuate wage slavery and the exploitation of man by man.

“China's economy must develop along the path of the "regulation of capital" and the "equalization of landownership", and must never be "privately owned by the few"; we must never permit the few capitalists and landlords to "dominate the livelihood of the people"; we must never establish a capitalist society of the European-American type or allow the old semi-feudal society to survive.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English).

As we have already said, the “C” P C was the representative of the interests of the anti-imperialist national bourgeoisie. It is quite normal that its objectives were limited to the struggle against the Japanese imperialist aggression and the bourgeoisie-compradore. Indeed, all the objectives of the “C”P C were kept within the limits of the bourgeois-democratic anti-colonial revolution, because the class which was leading the revolution and which seized state power in China in 1949 was precisely the “radical” national bourgeoisie and not the proletariat. The great problem with the so-called Mao Zedong Though is that Mao tried to hide its bourgeois and reactionary conceptions under a “socialist” and “revolutionary” cloak which continues to mislead the oppressed working masses which see Maoism as a “development” of Marxism-Leninism, when in fact Maoism is a deformation of Marxism-Leninism, when in fact Maoism serves not to eliminate the capitalist system, but to perpetuate it in favor of the “progressive” section of the national bourgeoisie. The “anti-monopolist” claims made by Mao are proof of this. The truth is that Maoist conceptions are frighteningly similar to bourgeois Keynesianism and to the anti-monopolism of many revisionist parties. And before that the fascists of the MLM start saying that all this is nothing more than a product of the “imagination” of the “Hoxhaïtes”, here it is the confirmation of what is being said coming from Mao himself:

“The revolution of the New Democracy only wants to eliminate feudalism and the monopolist capitalism, only wants to eliminate the great land owners and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, and not capitalism in general, nor the superior branch of neither the petty-bourgeoisie nor the middle bourgeoisie.” (Mao Zedong, « La situation actuelle et nos tâches », Oeuvres choisies, Pékin, 1967, t. IV, translated from French language).

One of the main purposes of chinese revisionism is to “regulate” capitalism in order to maintain the system of exploitation, its objective is to try to avoid the periodical crisis of capitalism and to deny the proletarian character of the revolution.

When studying the “Mao Zedong Though”, we easily note that its ideas are intimately related with those of one of the most known European revisionist leaders: Maurice Thorez, the leader of the French Revisionist Party. One of the most known historical examples of revisionist
relations between the bourgeoisie and the “communist” party is precisely the 1936 Popular Front, whose objectives were clearly appointed by the French revisionist leadership as being reduced to “Peace, Bread and Independence for all”. Can anybody imagine a more reactionary, reformist, capitulationist and anti-socialist slogan? Just like Mao, Thorez will also configure the communist party as a party of various classes. If Mao has painted the anti-imperialist revolution as the final objective which justified the permanent alliance with the “progressive” bourgeoisie, Thorez has made the same with the opportunistic “United Front of the French nation against the oligarchic classes”. Just like Mao, Thorez also proposed an anti-monopolist unity:

“According to the existing social conditions, our society is divided in multiple classes. The capitalist oligarchy exploits the working class, it also exploits the middle classes constituted by peasants, by artisans, industrials (?!!!), people of commerce and liberal professions, etc. The Communist Party is conceived in function of the necessities of the struggles of the people against the oligarchs.” (Etudes et Documents Marxistes-Léninistes - Pour la lutte théorique, N° 1, décembre 1979. 58 L'Ecole élémentaire du Parti communiste français - Troisième leçon : Le Parti, Paris, 1936, Ed. la Section nationale d'éducation du Parti communiste français, p. 6., translated from French language).

Mao and Thorez completely corrupted and denied the proletarian character of the Communist Party by posing as the only legitimate leaders of their respective parties, by thwarting criticism and self-criticism inside their respective parties, by trying to “legitimate” their union with the national bourgeoisies of their countries and by keeping the oppressed and exploited classes away from the idea of the socialist revolution through making the bourgeois-democratic and anti-monopolist revolution as an end in itself.

However, the ultra-reformist strategy of the “anti-monopolist front” was not the only “idea” that the Chinese revisionists “borrowed” from revisionism of the classical type. In fact, just like Bernstein, Togliatti, Thorez, the Krushchevists, the Eurocommunists, etc. the Chinese revisionists also openly defend the “peaceful way to socialism”. In truth, their defense of this “peaceful transition” is synonym of a direct negation of the proletarian dictatorship.

Flagrantly denying the most basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese revisionist leaders affirm the following:

“If we have adopted the policy of the struggle in favor of the union towards the national bourgeoisie, that’s mainly with the purpose of educating the national bourgeoisie.

We think that we should follow the principle of the “long term coexistence and mutual control between the Communist Party and the democratic parties and groups. The social base of these parties and groups is the national bourgeoisie, some branches of the petty-bourgeoisie
and the intellectuals. [...] The bourgeois ideology will exist for a relatively long time (...) the democratic groups and parties should represent this ideology and help it to reeducate itself.

[...] the democratic and popular dictatorship has become, by its own nature, a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and this permits that our bourgeois-democratic revolution can be directly transformed into a socialist and proletarian revolution through peaceful means.” (Liou Chao Chi, Rapport politique du Comité central du Parti communiste chinois au VIIIe Congrès national du PCC, Pékin, 1956, translated from French language).

Reeducation of the bourgeoisie?!!! The bourgeoisie doesn’t exist to be educated! It exists to be exterminated by the proletariat through revolutionary violence! Lenin once said that the great problems of humanity were always solved through violence and this is foremost applicable to the elimination of the bourgeoisie, to the annihilation of the capitalist system and to the edification of socialism and communism.

This capitulationism idea is closely related with the “theory” of the “peaceful transition” to socialism through bourgeois means; it is linked with the Eurocommunist and reformist idea of “humanizing” and “educating” capitalism. The image of the “civilized” capitalism is common to all revisionist currents and Maoism is no exception.

And there’s more:

“The bourgeois elements have become members of the administrative staff in the mixed enterprises and they are being transformed from exploiters into workers which live through their own workforce; on the other hand, they still receive a fixed amount from those enterprises (...)” (Mao Zedong, De la juste solution des contradictions au sein du peuple, Textes choisis, Pékin, 1972, translated from the French language).

This statement is an example of the many things that Maoism has in common with Boukharinism. This bourgeois current is centered on the idea of the “peaceful” integration and inclusion of capitalism and capitalist elements within socialism, it is based on the idea of the “joint government” of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in order to undermine the edification of socialism through capitulation to bourgeois and non-proletarian influences and elements.

The utopian character of the Maoist ideology can also be noted in its presumption that the exploitative tendencies of the bourgeoisie can be gradually removed and that the bourgeois elements can be turned into inoffensive proletarian elements living “through their own workforce”. Moreover, it is astonishing to see that in “communist” china, the bourgeoisie continued to exploit the working people through the “mixed enterprises” which were nothing more than a disguise to the bourgeois and fascist dictatorship that Mao and the other Chinese
The documents and excerpts presented above prove that, contrary to what the fascists of the MLM might argue, the anti-Marxist conceptions of the Maoist ideology were not limited to the first phases of the “Mao Zedong thought”. In fact, one just has to look to the documents of the period after 1949, when the power of the national bourgeoisie guided by the “C” PC was already assured, to conclude that these conceptions were not temporary errors, but represent the general and definitive ideological constructions which constitute the main pillars of the Maoist bourgeois and reactionary ideology.

It’s not by chance that Comrade Stalin was always distrustful about the true character of the Chinese “socialist” revolution. He understood the bourgeois nature of that “revolution” and said that:

“In China, we cannot speak about a socialist revolution neither in the urban areas, nor in the rural areas. It’s true that certain enterprises have been nationalized, but their number is irrelevant.”

Stalin’s suspicions regarding the Chinese “revolution” are acknowledged by Mao himself who declared that:

“Since the beginning of the war, Stalin was very skeptical towards us. When we won the war, Stalin perceived our victory as being of the same kind of that of Tito, and in 1949 he exercised a very strong pression upon us.” (Mao Zedong, Oeuvres choisies, Tome V, translated from French language).

We must bear in mind that Mao’s works were published in the Soviet Union only after Stalin’s death. And this is not surprising. If they were published while Stalin was still alive, then Mao would have received the same treatment as Tito, that’s for sure.

In fact, many years before Mao’s 1949 bourgeois revolution, Stalin analyzed the conditions of the Chinese “revolutionary” movement and harshly criticized the “rightist deviationism” that existed within that movement:

“… the rightist deviationism that jeopardizes that independent class objectives of the chinese proletariat and is leading it towards an amorphous fusion with the national democratic movement.” (Stalin, La question nationale et coloniale, translated from French language).

We cannot separate this distrust of Stalin from his struggle against the already mentioned Boukharinist ideas which preached the “integration” of capitalist elements within socialist society:
“Boukharin’s greatest mistake is that he concedes that the koulaks and other bourgeois elements (...) can be integrated within socialism. This theory is a total absurd! The capitalists, the kulaks, the representatives of the foreign imperialists can be integrated in socialist society, according to Boukharin. We certainly don’t want this kind of “socialism”. We will not adhere to Boukharin’s conceptions. We, Marxist-Leninists, we think that there are irreconcilable differences between the capitalists and the proletariat. This is the base of the Marxist theory of the class struggle. But the Boukharinist theory about the peaceful integration of the capitalist elements within socialism contradicts the most basic Marxist principles, it contradicts the inevitable opposition between the exploiters and the exploited because the exploiters are included within socialist system. (Stalin, The questions of Leninism II, 1931, translated from French language).

It is astonishing the way in which these criticisms made by Stalin in 1927 perfectly fit Maoist revisionism:

“But if the capitalist of the urban areas and of the rural areas; if the kulaks and the other bourgeois elements are integrated in the socialist system, for what would serve the dictatorship of the proletariat? And even if it could serve for something, we have to wonder what would be the class it would repress.” (Stalin, The questions of Leninism, 1931, translated from French language).

Comrade Stalin’s correct analysis of the fake Maoist “revolution” was praised by Comrade Enver Hoxha in the Volume II of “Reflections on China”:

“When China was liberated, Stalin expressed his doubt that the Chinese leadership might follow the Titoite course. Glancing over all the main principles of Mao Tsetung’s revisionist line, in regard to all those things which he raises against Stalin, we can say without reservation that Stalin was truly a great Marxist-Leninist who foresaw correctly where China was going, who long ago realized what the views of Mao Tsetung were, and saw that, in many directions, they were Titoite revisionist views, both on international policy and on internal policy, on the class struggle, on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, etc.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, December 28, 1976, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Stalin was right about all these aspects and he saw clearly that the chinese “new democracy” was nothing more than the dictatorship of the national and “patriotic” bourgeoisie. In truth, if we analyze Mao’s works, we will always find the idea of the “development” of capitalism. For example, some months before the 1949 revolution, Mao affirmed that: “(...) we must permit the existence and the development of all the capitalist elements which are
profitable and which don’t jeopardize the national economy”.

However, Mao goes even further and affirms that:

“(…) capitalism will be limited in China through various means: through restrictions in its activities, through taxes, through market prices and through working conditions. We will adopt an appropriate policy regarding the limitation of capitalism, according to the specific conditions of each place, of each section and of each period. It is very useful to remember the teachings of Sun Yat-sen about “controlled capitalism”. Therefore, it is in the interests of the national economy, of the working class and of all workers not to impose excessive limitations upon capitalist economy, but on the contrary, we should let that economy to exist and to develop in the context of the economical policy and of the economic planification of our popular republic”. (Mao Zedong, Sur la dictature populaire démocratique — cited by Yu Hai in Le rôle de la bourgeoisie nationale dans la révolution chinoise, in Cahiers du communisme, août 1950, translated from french language)

This development of capitalism means in fact the perpetuation of capitalism. And Mao even dares to say that this maintenance of the capitalist system is in the interests of the working class! Mao’s ideology is very similar to that of the openly pro-capitalist politicians which declare that “although capitalism is not perfect, the truth is that it creates wealth and permits that the proletariat can benefit of a consumer society”.

Even today, there are many Maoists which still claim that this perpetuation of capitalism is not anti-Marxist, but on the contrary it can be compared to the New Economic Policy (NEP) practiced by Lenin in the Soviet Union. What those Maoists “forget” to say is that the NEP was absolutely necessary in the context of the Soviet Union in the early 20’s because the country’s economy was totally ruined after 6/7 years of uninterrupted war (first, the four years of the First World War, second, the horrendous Russian civil war caused by the invasion of the capitalist powers with the objective of overthrow Bolshevik power), because the alliance between the proletariat and the immense peasantry was still not consolidated, because of the backward characteristics of the Russian economy, because the analphabetism of the Russian workers and their lack of experience in what concerned economic management caused great difficulties in the feeding of the population and because the presence of the petty-bourgeois elements in the economy was overwhelming. For all these reasons, it was permitted that, during some time, the petty-bourgeois elements could operate within straight limits with the purpose of revitalizing the economy. Nevertheless, we must always bear in mind that Lenin saw the NEP merely as a temporary process which would be surpassed through the development of the economic base of the socialist system and the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This conception is in total contrast with that of the Maoists which see the “development of capitalism”
as a definitive process and not as a temporary stage imposed by harsh historical and economical conditions.

As Comrade Enver Hoxha states:

“Mao Tsetung has presented his opportunist stand towards the bourgeoisie as a creative implementation of the teachings of Lenin on the New Economic Policy (NEP). But there is a radical difference between the teachings of Lenin and the concept of Mao Tsetung on allowing unrestricted capitalist production and maintaining bourgeois relations in socialism. Lenin admits that the NEP was a step back which allowed the development of elements of capitalism for a certain time, but he stressed:

«. . there is nothing dangerous to the proletarian state in this so long as the proletariat keeps political power firm/y in its hands, so long as it keeps transport and big industry firm/y in its hands»'.

In fact, neither in 1949 nor in 1956, when Mao Tsetung advocated these things, did the proletariat in China have political power or big industry in its own hands.

Moreover, Lenin considered the NEP as a temporary measure which was imposed by the concrete conditions of Russia of that time, devastated by the long civil war, and not as a universal law of socialist construction. And the fact is that one year after the proclamation of the NEP Lenin stressed that the retreat was over, and launched the slogan to prepare for the offensive against private capital in the economy. Whereas in China, the period of the preservation of capitalist production was envisaged to last almost eternally.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Nowadays, there are even Maoists who claim that the predatory social-Darwinist capitalism which dominates today’s China is “a new NEP”!! To qualify the bourgeois-capitalist economy that existed in China until the middle 70’s as “socialist” is completely erroneous and reveals total ignorance of the most basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, but to paint today’s chinese neo-liberal economy as a “new NEP” means to openly defend the fascist dictatorship which is governing China.

Chinese economy was never socialist, nor in the 50’s, nor today. The truth is that the chinese national bourgeoisie could not have dreamt about an ideology who could better serve its class interests than Maoism. And this because Maoism permitted that national bourgeoisie could exploit the proletariat in a “peaceful” and “controlled” manner while hiding behind a “Marxist” and “revolutionary” mask. One of the main reasons why Chinese national bourgeoisie supported Maoism was because of its “leftist” outlook which misled Chinese working masses.
We can affirm that Maoism granted the Chinese bourgeoisie with a certain “safety”. Maoism was the best way that the Chinese national bourgeoisie could have found in order to neutralize the revolutionary feelings which existed among the Chinese proletariat. Instead of sitting idle seeing the Chinese oppressed classes adhering to Marxist-Leninist ideology and developing revolutionary conscience in order to accomplish proletarian revolution, the Chinese “patriotic” bourgeoisie elaborated its own “revolutionary” ideology and accomplished its own “revolution”. Of course, this bourgeoisie could never reveal that this “ideology” was simply covering the implementation of its dictatorship, because otherwise it would never seduce the Chinese exploited classes. The Chinese national bourgeoisie solved this problem in a very cunning way. It dressed its own bourgeois ideology with “Marxist-Leninist” clothes and with “revolutionary” phraseology with the purpose of winning the oppressed classes to its side. The Chinese national bourgeoisie used the mask of Marxism-Leninism in order to hide its exploitative and reactionary class interests and to conquer economical and political power.

Nowadays, large sectors of the world proletariat are still deceived by Maoists which try to force the oppressed masses to “recognize” Maoism as the “third stage” of communism, after Marxism and Leninism (thus openly negating Stalinism and Hoxhaism). They even qualify their reactionary and anti-Marxist ideology as “the highest development” of Marxism-Leninism. This arrogant attitude has been a constant in the history of Maoist revisionism. Maoists always tried to paint themselves as “the greatest developers of the proletarian ideology” in order to hide their anti-socialist intentions and their support of Chinese social-imperialism. Maoists have also tried to paint themselves as “ardent anti-revisionists”. One of the main arguments utilized by them in order to “prove” their “anti-revisionism” is the fake “defense of Stalin” allegedly made by Mao in the context of the revisionist takeover in the Soviet Union.

What the Chinese revisionists did was to use Stalin’s name and legacy with the aim of covering their reactionary, anti-communist and social-fascist ideology with a “revolutionary” disguise. When analyzing Comrade Enver Hoxha’s “Reflections on China” and “The Krushchevists”, we conclude that he suspected of Maoism’s nature from the very beginning, but he tried to correct the Chinese “comrades” by advising them and informing them about the ideological divergences that existed between the CPC and the PLA:

“We were said that Mao was applying an interesting line of socialist edification in China, he collaborated with the local bourgeoisie and with other parties qualified as “democratics”; the communist party permitted and stimulated the existence of mixed enterprises with both private and state capital, it encouraged and remunerated the members of the wealthy classes, which were many times leading those enterprises, etc. All these things were inconceivable for us and despite our efforts, we could not find a single argument in favor of their conformity with Marxism-Leninism.”
However, we thought that China was a great country, populated by millions of people, which has just emerged from a bourgeois-feudal past, it has a lot of problems and difficulties to surpass and, in time, we thought that it would rectify its errors, thus getting back to the correct Marxist-Leninist road.” (Enver Hoxha, Les khrouchtchéviens, Tirana, 1980, translated from French language).

This was the general line followed by the PLA towards the CPC during the period 1949-1956.

Comrade Enver noted that in 1956, in the context of the XXth Congress of the CPSU, the CPC assumed openly revisionist positions. The meeting between Comrade Enver and Mao Zedong which occurred in 1956, on the occasion of Enver’s visit to China, is described as deceitful by Comrade Enver himself:

“In truth, our impressions regarding this meeting were not what we expected (...) We had not acquired any kind of useful learning and experiences, and we perceived that this meeting was a mere courtesy act. We were surprise by Mao’s words and opinions about the Kominform, about Stalin and about the Yugoslav question.” (Enver Hoxha, Les khrouchtchéviens, Tirana, 1980, translated from French language).

In fact, during the meeting, Mao expressed views and opinions which were in total accordance with the ultra-revisionist, opportunist and anti-Marxist line which was dominating the communist movement in 1956. For example, regarding the Yugoslav question, Mao said:

“In that question, you Albanians did not commit any errors towards the Yugoslavs, and the Yugoslavs did not commit any errors towards you. It’s the Kominform which is responsible for grave errors.” (Enver Hoxha, Les khrouchtchéviens, Tirana, 1980, translated from French language).

So, according to Mao, the Marxist-Leninists of the PTA and the social-fascists of the Tito’s clique were totally equal. “Nor the Albanians nor the Yugoslavs committed mistakes”, is what Mao says, and then he affirms that all that happened is Kominform’s fault! To affirm this is to openly defend Titoite imperialism which tried to transform Albania in the seventh Yugoslav republic. From the very beginning, even during the Second World War, the Titoites always tried to hinder Albania’s independence. They tried through all means to control the Albanian partisans and to subjugate them to the orders and discipline of the Yugoslav Communist Party. The Titoites were always interfering in the internal affairs of the PLA and trying to impose their anti-Marxist line. They hired agents and spies and infiltrated them within the PLA in order to sabotage its Leninist line and to turn Albania into a Yugoslav satellite.
But let’s return to Mao’s affirmations during the meeting with Comrade Enver. When Mao asked Comrade Enver what he thought about Stalin, Enver proudly defended Stalin’s legacy. However, Mao disagreed with him and said:

“Stalin made mistakes. He made mistakes towards us, for example, in 1927. He made mistakes towards the Yugoslav comrades, too.” (Mao cited by Enver Hoxha in The Khrushchevites, Tirana, 1980, edition in English).

This affirmation is totally false; Stalin was never mistaken towards Yugoslav “comrades”. On the contrary, he unmasked their true character and objectives, thus making proof of a great Marxist-Leninist wisdom, and he also acted correctly towards Titoite Yugoslavia. The Titoites deserve to be hated and repudiated by all genuine communists because they totally betrayed the aspirations of the Yugoslav peoples, who fought and sacrificed their lives in the struggle against Nazism with the objective of edification of a socialist Yugoslavia. Unfortunately for those peoples, Tito sold the country to the Anglo-Americans and followed a revisionist-capitalist line. It’s curious to see that Maoism and Titoism are very similar. Both ideologies are trying to mislead the oppressed masses and to lead them away from the socialist and proletarian revolution, both propagate class reconciliation and incentive the supposed “positive aspects of capitalism” and the “mixed economy” (indeed, both open the path to social-imperialism, but Tito’s imperialism was limited to a local scale, while Maoist imperialism, due to China’s immense demographic and economic potential, reached a global scale).

As can be seen, the truth is that, in 1956, Mao adopted ultra-revisionist positions regarding Stalin, Tito and the Kominform.

We must keep in mind that, after Comrade Stalin’s death, Mao always desired to become leader of the communist movement. In order to achieve that, Mao tried to embrace revisionism and to agree with Khrushchev that “Stalin committed mistakes” (we should also remember Mao’s famous sentence: “Khrushchev is the Lenin of our times”). However, Mao’s great error was his underestimation of the great esteem that the SU enjoyed among world proletariat and the exploited classes. In 1956, nobody could assertively predict the dimensions that the revisionist disease would reach, and the world communists continued to see the SU as a socialist country. Indeed, the SU was seen with great esteem because it was the country in which the first successful socialist revolution had happened, it was the homeland of Lenin and Stalin, two of the greatest masters of the proletarian ideology. It’s true that Comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA were very suspicious about the line which was being followed in the SU and about Khrushchev’s intentions after the death of Stalin, but we must note that the PLA was born in circumstances which armed the Albanian Marxist-Leninists against all kinds of opportunisms. The PLA had to face revisionism since its very foundations and this made the Albanian
communists more able to unmask all kinds of bourgeois ideologies, even the ones which are hidden. That’s why the PLA was always in the front line of the struggle against revisionist currents, from Titoism to Maoism. Nonetheless, the great majority of the other Communist Parties embraced Khrushchevist revisionism without almost questioning it. And this ready acceptance was precisely due to the already referred prestige that the SU still enjoyed among the world proletariat.

On the contrary, the chinese 1949 bourgeois-democratic revolution, although seen with sympathy by the communists, did not grant Mao sufficient admiration to obliterate the Soviet Union’s role as the center of the communist movement, even because the SU had increased its strength with the essential role it played in the victory against nazi-fascism in the Second World War. For all these reasons, Mao could not accomplish his intentions of becoming the new leader of the communist movement through alliance with the soviet revisionists. In face of this, Mao changed his strategy. Instead of playing the role of the Khrushchev’s supporter in the supposed struggle against “Stalin’s mistakes and deviations”, Mao appeared as the “unwaverling Stalinist”, as the “orthodox Leninist”, as the “great defender of Marxist-Leninist purity”. This tactical change occurred at a time in which many communists around the world began to challenge Khrushchev’s “anti-Stalin reports” as being anti-Marxist.

Nowadays, Maoists want us to believe that the line of the CPC was always a “Marxist-Leninist”, “anti-revisionist and anti-Khrushchevist” line from the very beginning. Unfortunately for the Maoists, the reality was something else. The “anti-revisionist” strategy that Mao adopted in 1960 had nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism. Mao never wanted to truly defend Stalin’s legacy. He just used Stalin’s name and prestige to achieve his own purposes of becoming the leader of the world communist movement in order to damage this movement with his bourgeois-capitalist “ideas” and to manipulate it in favor of China’s ascension as a new superpower. The Chinese revisionists wanted the position occupied by Khrushchev and by the CPSU at the head of the communist movement, but when they saw that they could not achieve that through open revisionism, they invoked a false “anti-revisionist and pro-Stalinist struggle” with the purpose of manipulating the honest communists which were worried about Khrushchev’s treacherous line. Maoism was presented to those communists as “the enrichment of Marxism-Leninism”, and Mao was the “leader of the struggle against Khrushchev”.

Even Maoist criticisms about “soviet social-imperialism” are nothing but a big fraud. Those criticisms are only intended to cover Mao’s own social-imperialist intentions and objectives.

Comrade Enver Hoxha exposed all this with Marxist-Leninist precision:
“Many times, I have turned back to this period of the history of the Communist Party of China, trying to figure out how and why the profoundly revisionist line of 1956 subsequently seemed to change direction, and for a time, became “pure”, “anti-revisionist” and “Marxist-Leninist”. It is a fact, for example, that in 1960 the Communist Party of China seemed to be strongly opposing the revisionist theses of Nikita Khrushchev and confirmed that “it was defending Marxism-Leninism” from the distortions which were being made to it, etc. It was precisely because China came out against modern revisionism in 1960 and seemed to be adhering to Marxist-Leninist positions that brought about that our Party stood shoulder to shoulder with it in the struggle which we had begun against the Khrushchevites.

However, time confirmed, and this is reflected extensively in the documents of our Party, that in no instance, either in 1956 or in the ’60s did the Communist Party of China proceed or act from the positions of Marxism-Leninism.” (Enver Hoxha, The Krushchevites, Tirana, 1980, edition in English).

And in 1978, by the occasion of the Sino-Albanian split, the Central Committee of the PLA sent a letter to the Central Committee of the CPC which underlined that:

“In the beginning, the CPC was in accord with the PLA in what respected to the polemics between the PLA and the Khrushchevist revisionists. However, this agreement was only superficial because what China really wanted was to reconcile with Soviet revisionists and to avoid the ideological polemic with them. (...) The chinese leaders affirmed that this attitude was on Albania’s interests, but the truth is that to avoid polemics was (...) only advantageous to Khrushchev and to his struggle against socialism and Marxism-Leninism.” (Letter from the Central Committee of the PLA to the Central Committee of the CPC and to the Chinese government, Tirana, 28th July of 1978, translated from French language).

One of the most meaningful episodes involving the CPC’s willingness to reconcile with soviet social-imperialism happened in 1964, when Khrushchev was expelled from power. The Chinese revisionists celebrated this happening as if soviet social-fascism had been totally defeated. They were so anxious and happy about reconciliating with soviet revisionism that they sent a delegation to Moscow and wanted the PLA to do the same. Of course, this treacherous and capitulationist proposal was firmly refused by the Albanian Marxist-Leninists:

“The Central Committee of the PLA could not accept this proposal which was synonym of the extinction of the struggle against revisionism and of ideological reconciliation with it. If the PLA had surrender to that line of reconciliation with the soviet revisionists, that would have been catastrophic to the Marxist-Leninist movement
That’s why our party firmly rejected the Chinese proposal (...). The Central Committee of the PLA sent a letter to the CPC explaining that the reasoning made by the Chinese leaders about the changes occurred in the Soviet Union was wrong and that its proposal of sending a delegation to Moscow was unacceptable. In that letter it was said, among other things, that:

“This happening (Khrushchev’s expulsion from power), although important and with serious consequences, does not lead revisionism towards its total defeat, it does not represent the final victory of Marxism-Leninism over revisionism, this happening only accelerated the putrefaction of revisionist ideology (...) while Khrushchev’s successors are striving to save revisionism through applying the policy of Khrushchevism without Khrushchev.” (Letter from the Central Committee of the PLA to the Central Committee of the CPC and to the Chinese government, Tirana, 28th July of 1978, translated from French language).

During the 60’s, two major events would demonstrate the anti-Marxist road in which China was engaged and the utopian and petty-bourgeois character of Maoist ideology: the “great leap forward”, and especially the “great cultural proletarian revolution”.

The “great leap forward” consisted in a totally utopian program to supposedly make China “advance directly to communism”. The aims and objectives that Mao imposed over the Chinese people in the context of the “great leap” were completely unrealistic, even because Mao affirmed that those objectives were to be fulfilled in a period of 2-3 years!

Despite China’s demographical and territorial potentialities, the fact is that 13 years after Mao’s bourgeois anti-imperialist revolution, China’s economy was very far from being at its maximum. It’s true that extreme poverty was almost eliminated and that some positive improvements were made regarding the living conditions of the popular masses, but it is also true that these improvements were not proportional to the country’s potentialities. The main reason for this slow development can be found in the reactionary nature of the 1949 Chinese revolution and its maintenance of capitalist and bourgeois elements not only at the key branches of the economy, but also their maintenance in the key branches of the country’s government, which was turned from a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie into a dictatorship of the national “patriotic” bourgeoisie.

However, we must bear in mind that this state of things was not unanimously accepted by the Chinese proletariat; there were many workers who refused to follow Maoist illusions and clearly saw that China was not engaged in a veritable socialist path. These Chinese proletarians were becoming a very inopportune voice, they were very dangerous to the Chinese national bourgeoisie because they were breaking the climate of “social peace” that Maoism had implemented in order to allow that Chinese bourgeoisie could freely exploit workers without
being disturbed by that horrible thing called class struggle.

It was in this context that Mao tried to mislead the masses through “Marxist” phraseology by falsely declaring that “China will pass directly to the communist phase of the revolution” through the “great leap forward”. This treacherous attempt to mislead the Chinese proletariat was unmasked by Comrade Enver Hoxha:

“In a demagogic way, Mao Tse-Tung and the Communist Party of China have subordinated all their declarations about the construction of the socialist and communist society to their pragmatic policy. Thus, in the years of the so-called great leap forward, with the aim of throwing dust in the eyes of the masses, who, emerging from the revolution, aspired to socialism, they declared that within 2-3 five-year periods, they would pass directly over to communism. Later, however, in order to cover up their failures, they began to theorize that the construction and triumph of socialism would require ten thousand years.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

During three years (1962-1965), the Chinese workers toiled like slaves trying to accomplish an utopian and megalomaniac economical program without any perspectives of success. Indeed, this was so obvious that even top leaders of the CPC were hesitant about following Mao’s directives about the “great leap”. Of course, this “great leap forward” resulted in a great leap backward, because it constituted a horrific failure which put Chinese industry and agriculture in complete chaos and originated a severe famine around the country. For example, the production of carbon and the production of cotton in 1964 were much below the level of 1958. As we said, the impossible character of the “great leap” was visible since the very beginning: the “C” PC planned that with the “great leap forward”, China would be able to produce certain quantities of cereals and steel that were totally exaggerated; for example, the Chinese revisionists affirmed that before the end of the “great leap” (1962-1965), China would produce around 750 tons of cereals, but the fact is that China’s production of cereals was still inferior to 500 tons in the late 90’s! The final results of Mao’s “great leap forward” were so disastrous than Mao himself had to make his auto-critic in front of the central committee of the “C”PC.

This is not to agree with the affirmations of the rightist ideologues which affirm that the “great leap forward” was a “communist holocaust” which “claimed up to 30 million of lives”. These affirmations are false, firstly because the death toll they attribute to the “great leap” is ridiculously inflated, and second, even if the death toll of 30 million was true (and it’s not) that would never be a “red genocide” simply because there was never socialism in China. The rightist ideologues sold to the capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie cannot stand the fact that there are people who dare to struggle against capitalism, people who don’t resignate to the
“consumer society” and to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. For them it is incomprehensible that some people can dedicate their lives to the struggle for the implementation of the proletarian dictatorship and to the edification of the stateless and classless society. That’s why they try to discredit communism through all means. Because they know that it’s to communism that the future belongs, they know that Marxism-Leninism is the only ideology which can completely destroy their beloved capitalism. Their class interests and anti-communism turn them so blind that they are totally unable to distinguish between what is really communist and what is not. For them, everything that qualifies itself as communist is a potential target, no matter if it is really communist, or if, on the contrary, it’s nothing more than bourgeois ideology disguised in Marxist phraseology. That is what happened with the Maoist China and especially with the “great leap forward”.

Some Maoists claim that “one of the signs which indicate that Maoist China was a veritable socialist country is the fact that the openly reactionary bourgeoisie of the capitalist and revisionist countries accused Maoist China with the same arguments it had previously used against Stalin’s SU”. To put things like this is totally fallacious. It’s true that the hypocritical, reactionary and false accusations of the capitalist-revisionist bourgeois “humanitarians” which affirm that the Stalinist Soviet Union supposedly caused “a genocide of enormous proportions” is, in some aspects, very similar to those accusations that the same bourgeoisie adopts towards Maoist China. However, if the formal accusations have important similarities, the truth is that the reasons behind them are radically different. The capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie tried to discredit the Stalinist proletarian democracy because it constituted a living proof that the proletariat was not eternally condemned to the horrors of capitalism and to the bourgeois tyranny, because it showed that a more humane and advanced social-economical system was not only possible, but also necessary. On the contrary, that same capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie accused Maoist China of perpetrating “horrific human rights violations” and of being a “communist hell” not because Maoist China constituted a genuine example of Marxist-Leninist edification, but because, due to China’s demographic and territorial weight, its ascension as a new superpower would put the world domination of the imperialist-capitalist-revisionist powers in a great danger.

The capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie manipulates the pathologic anti-communism of its own ideologues in order to mislead the proletariat. The capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie understood clearly that the Chinese national bourgeoisie which conquered power and which exploited the Chinese proletariat in favor of its own interests and not in the interests of the foreign powers would sooner or later follow an imperialist line which would be a lethal challenge to the capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie. In discrediting Maoist China as an “unspeakable communist dictatorship”, the capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie is accomplishing two great aims:
to slander communist ideology while simultaneously discrediting an imperialist rival in unstoppable ascension.

But let’s return to the historical course followed by Mao and by the “C”PC. After the “great leap forward”, we will now try to analyze the so-called “Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution” which, as Comrade Enver Hoxha correctly affirms:

“(...) was neither a revolution, nor great, nor cultural, and in particular, not in the least proletarian.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

The Cultural Revolution was linked with the already referred Maoist idea that workers’ exploitation can be erased without the use of revolutionary violence by the proletariat and that the bourgeois elements can be peacefully converted to socialism through “reeducation”:

“In what respects to the national bourgeoisie, a great education effort can be made in the present period towards that class. When the time comes to accomplish socialism, to nationalize private enterprises, we will advance even more in our efforts to reform and to educate the bourgeois elements.” (Mao Zedong, Sur la dictature populaire démocratique — cited by Yu Hai in Le rôle de la bourgeoisie nationale dans la révolution chinoise, in Cahiers du communisme, August of 1950, translated from french language).

The ideological roots of the Cultural Revolution were a mixture of multiple anti-Marxist-Leninist currents, including spontaneism, anarchism and, of course, Mao Zedong anti-communist “theories”.

To understand the true causes of the Cultural Revolution we must note that after the 1949 chinese revolution, the chinese state appeared as a kind of arbitral organ which kept “social peace” by “regulating” the productive contradictions which existed between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Of course, this arbitral cover was very important to hide the true character of the Maoist state as a dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie; indeed, the improvement of the living conditions of the chinese people after the revolution was linked precisely with this need of creating a false impression among the oppressed classes, making them believe that China was following a socialist path and that the Maoist state was on the side of the proletariat. We have already explained that the 1949 revolution was led by the national bourgeoisie which conquered political and economical power against the interests of the former imperialist bourgeoisie. Therefore, despite the claim that Mao “nationalized” many of the key branches of the economy, the truth is that the chinese national bourgeoisie was never really expropriated. There are two kinds of nationalizations: the nationalizations of the bourgeois type and the nationalizations of the proletarian type. The first type is done in the interests of a certain
branch of the bourgeoisie, while the second type is done against all bourgeois class and with
the purpose of destroying the capitalist system. What mainly distinguishes them is that the first
is done without veritable expropriation of the bourgeoisie, while the second is done with total
expropriation of the entire bourgeois-capitalist class. The nationalizations which took place in
Maoist China were clearly included in the first type, they were bourgeois nationalizations which
were done with the objective of favoring the interests of the national “patriotic” bourgeoisie by
permitting that this class occupied and controlled the direction of the nationalized enterprises. In
addition to this situation, we must remember that, outside the nationalized enterprises, there
were many essential branches of the economy which were not even formally nationalized and
continued openly in the hands of the private bourgeois capital. As we had already explained,
the material base of the chinese society continued to be dominated by the capitalist relations of
production, and this was reflected in the political, social and cultural superstructure. It is
impossible to prevent a class which controls economical power from controlling political power,
since the political superstructure is a direct reflex of the material and economic productive base
of society. This is what Marxism teaches us. Consequently, it was obvious that Maoist
pretensions of “conciliation” of the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were entitled
to fail from the very beginning. If the proletariat does not establish its dictatorship, then the
bourgeoisie will automatically continue to be the dominant class and will continue exploiting the
oppressed masses. It’s impossible to find a third way between the bourgeois dictatorship and
the proletarian dictatorship.

The causes of the Cultural Revolution are linked with the fact that, since the end of 50’s,
the chinese national bourgeoisie was increasingly revealing its reactionary character, it was
demanding the end of the Maoist “arbitration state” and the implementation of an openly
capitalist dictatorship. This national bourgeoisie was now turned into a veritable state
monopolist bourgeoisie which dominated all aspects of the chinese society. Therefore, it’s not
surprising that this bourgeoisie which controlled the CPC tried to change the composition of its
Central Committee according to its own exploitative interests; the chinese monopolist
bourgeoisie tried to replace the centrist faction of Mao by more rightist sections which would
erase the last remnants of Marxist phraseology and of apparent “socialist features”.

The Cultural Revolution was promoted by Mao in order to try to reverse the dominance of
the more rightist factions of the CPC which were defending the implementation of a capitalist
regime with fascist characteristics in the interests of the new monopolist bourgeoisie.
Nonetheless, we must bear in mind that Mao did not incentive the Cultural Revolution because
he was worried about the reactionary and pro-fascist character of the party factions which were
representing the new monopolist bourgeoisie. No. Mao used his own authority to propagate the
Cultural Revolution because, in first place, he did not want to be expelled from power by other
party factions (as every bourgeois politician, Mao Zedong had lust for power and, throughout his political career, he did his utmost to keep his political supremacy). We must remember that Mao’s prestige was still seriously affected by the failure of the “great leap forward”, and the Cultural Revolution was seen by him as an opportunity to reconquer his lost status and to consolidate his positions within the apparatus of the Chinese bourgeois state.

The second reason is that Mao understood very well that, with the establishment of an openly capitalist regime, the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie would also lose important means which permitted to deceive the Chinese proletariat and to keep a climate of “social peace” in which exploitation and wage slavery could be peacefully exercised. We must not forget that Mao’s anti-imperialist rhetoric and “socialistic” outlook contributed greatly to the acceptance of the new bourgeois dictatorship by many sectors of the Chinese oppressed masses. The Chinese proletariat was on the side of the national bourgeoisie in the struggle against foreign imperialists, but, contrary to what Mao tried to promote, those two classes continued to have irreconcilable interests and this situation did not change just because they temporarily united in the context of a determined historical period of struggle against external oppressors. Of course, the revisionist Mao tried to perpetuate this “union” between the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie in the interests of the last one, he propagated the false and impossible idea of the “share of power” between those two classes in order to eliminate class struggle and to disguise capitalist exploitation under a “Marxist” and “revolutionary” facade. However, if the monopolist bourgeoisie could install a openly capitalist and pro-fascist regime in China, that “socialist” mask invented by Mao to disguise the exploitative character of the Chinese bourgeois state and to keep the Chinese proletariat in bondage would totally fall apart. Moreover, Mao was also on the side of that petty-bourgeoisie of the rural and urban areas which still defended the coexistence and conciliation between the multiple classes which constituted the Chinese society. The Cultural Revolution was precisely an attempt to thwart the efforts of important sections of the national monopolist bourgeoisie which wanted complete control of their class over the Chinese bourgeois state, without even the apparent “share of power” which Mao proposed.

And it was for those reasons that Mao promoted the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution”.

However, the anti-Marxism of the Cultural Revolution was not limited to its origins and to its reasons of existence. In fact, its anti-Marxist roots were clearly visible in the way it was conducted and directed.

In first place, the Chinese Cultural Revolution was the result of a call made by Mao Zedong as an individual revolutionary enjoying considerable prestige. We must note that Mao enjoyed an immense personal power within the party and controlled his own private militias
which were used by him to secure his positions in face of the threats coming from other rival sections inside the party:

“Recently, «Renmin Ribao» published an article by a so-called theoretical group of the «General Directory» of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. This article says that under the name of the «General Directory», Mao had set up around himself a special apparatus which kept the Political Bureau, the Central Committee of the Party, the cadres of the state, the army, the security service, etc., under surveillance and control. Entry to this Directory and knowledge of its work was forbidden to all, including the members of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau. Here plans for the bringing down or elevation of this or that factionalist group were worked out. The men of this Directory were present everywhere, they eavesdropped, watched, and reported independently, outside the control of the party.

Apart from them, this Directory had at its disposal entire armed detachments, hidden under the name of the «Guard of Chairman Mao». This praetorian guard more than 50,000 strong went into action whenever the chairman wanted «to act with one blow», as has frequently occurred in the history of the Communist Party of China (...).” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

And Mao’s individualist tyranny was not limited to the highest echelons of the party. On the contrary, he exercised his total control even among the population:

Under the pretext of maintaining contacts with the masses, Mao Tse-Tung had also created a special network of informers among the population who were charged with the task of keeping the cadres of the base under surveillance and investigating the conditions and state of mind of the masses, without anybody’s knowledge. They reported directly to Mao Tse-Tung alone, who had severed all means of communication with the masses and saw the world only through the reports of his agents of the «General Directory ».” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

As can be seen, Mao Zedong repeatedly violated the most basic norms of democratic centralism and of Leninist-Stalinist democracy. This situation happened during the entire period of the Maoist governance, although it was more intense during the Cultural Revolution. Mao Zedong implemented an authentic personal dictatorship, totally outside the control of the party or of the proletariat:

“The article of «Renmin Ribao» provides new information which enables one to understand even more clearly the anti-Marxist direction and personal power of Mao Tse-Tung in the Chinese party and state. Mao Tse-Tung did not have the slightest respect for either the Central Committee or the congress of the party, let alone the party as a whole and its
committees at the base. The party committees, the leading cadres and the Central Committee itself received orders from the «General Directory», this «special staff», which was responsible to Mao Tse-tung alone. The party forums, its elected organs, had no authority whatsoever.

The article of «Renmin Ribao» says, “no telegram, no letter, no document, no order could be issued by anybody without first going through Mao Tse-Tung's hands and being approved by him». It turns out that as early as 1953. Mao Tse-tung had issued a clear-cut order: «From now on, all documents and telegrams sent out in the name of the Central Committee can be dispatched only after I have gone over them, otherwise they are invalid. Under these conditions there can be no talk of collective leadership, democracy within the party, or Leninist norms.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

With this, we note that the leading role played by the revolutionary communist party is totally abandoned by Mao. Instead of that, we have an individual who uses its authority to “ideologically” mobilize certain “popular” branches to serve the interests of the revisionist group led by him (we must never forget that the Cultural Revolution was essentially a dispute for power between different bourgeois-revisionist party factions):

“The figure of Mao Zedong has been blown up until it has reached the dimensions of a Chinese emperor. And indeed, this modern emperor operates omnipotently over his courtiers, who have created an extensive and terrible bureaucracy in which the "brilliant ideas" of the "Great Steersman" are carried out.

He used the Communist Party as a stepping stone and has been doing so whenever he feels like it and as often as he thinks it is "reasonable"; depending on the "dialectical" development of the "contradictions", seen from the perspective of Taoism, he makes people drop from power, attacks the party and liquidates it, starts some "revolution" and balances the power of the courtiers.

He explains all this with allegedly revolutionary phrases which are in fact nothing but more "cultured" actions than those of Emperor Bokassa, the Shah of Iran or the King of Nepal, whom Mao liked very much, whom he welcomed and accompanied, not only because material interests, such as the hope of gaining political advantages and to make them into Chinese satellites, made him do so but also because Mao's philosophy coincided completely with their own.” (Enver Hoxha, Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo, 30th July of 1978).

Comrade Enver Hoxha affirmed that the main event which made the PLA start to analyze Mao Zedong though in a more profound manner was precisely the Cultural Revolution. For the
Albanian Marxist-Leninists, that was the decisive point which eventually led them to unmask Maoist revisionism and to demarcate themselves from Chinese social-imperialism (although Comrade Enver and the PLA had already previously criticized the CPC’s opportunistic features):

“(...) what attracted our Party’s attention most was the Cultural Revolution, which raised a number of major questions in our minds. During the Cultural Revolution, initiated by Mao Tsetung, astonishing political, ideological and organizational ideas and actions came to light in the activity of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state, which were not based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

In judging their previous dubious actions, as well as those observed during the Cultural Revolution, and especially the events following this revolution up till now, the rises and falls of this or that group in the leadership, today the group of Lin Piao, tomorrow that of Teng Hsiao-ping, a Hua Kuo-feng, etc., each of which had its own platform opposed to the other’s, all these things impelled our Party to delve more deeply into the views and actions of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China, to get a more thorough knowledge of «Mao Tsetung thought».

When we saw that this Cultural Revolution was not being led by the party but was a chaotic outburst following a call issued by Mao Tsetung, this did not seem to us to be a revolutionary stand. It was Mao’s authority in China that made millions of unorganized youth, students and pupils, rise to their feet and march on Peking, on party and state committees, which they dispersed.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

According to Comrade Enver, what really upset the Albanian communists was the fact that the Cultural Revolution was a “mass movement” with spontaneist and anarchist features which completely excluded the leading role not only of the party, but also of the proletariat:

“(...) the main thing was the fact that neither the party nor the proletariat was in the leadership of this «great proletarian revolution». This grave situation stemmed from Mao Tsetung’s old anti-Marxist concepts of underestimation of the leading role of the proletariat and overestimation of the youth in the revolution. Mao wrote: «What role did the Chinese young people begin to play since the 'May 4th Movement'? In a way they began to play a vanguard role — a fact recognized by everybody in our country except the ultra-reactionaries. What is a vanguard role? It means taking the lead... »”. Thus the working class was left on the sidelines (...)." (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

It is a well known fact that one of the most famous characteristics of Maoist ideology is
constituted by its eagerness to put every social class leading the revolution. Every social class...except the proletariat, of course. For example, during the Cultural Revolution, Mao considered the youth as the social branch which must play the leading role in the revolution. This idea is totally anti-Marxist. It’s true that the youth is a very progressive force, that it has a tendency to follow what is new and to reject what is old and backward. Nonetheless, this does not mean that it should lead the proletarian revolution. The same can be said about the peasantry. Although the small peasantry (and in the beginning stages of the revolution, also certain branches of the medium peasantry) can play an important and even decisive role in the victory of the proletarian revolution, the peasantry can never replace the proletariat as the leading force of the communist revolution:

"Mao has said that all other political parties and forces must submit to the peasantry and its views. «... millions of peasants will rise like a mighty storm, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back... he writes. «They will put to the test every revolutionary party and group, every revolutionary, so that they either accept their views or reject them»”. According to Mao, it turns out that the peasantry and not the working class should play the hegemonic role in the revolution.

Mao Tse-Tung also preached the thesis on the hegemonic role of the peasantry in the revolution as the road of the world revolution. Herein lies the source of the anti-Marxist concept that considers the so-called third world, which in Chinese political literature is also called «the countryside of the world», as the «main motive force for the transformation of present-day society».

According to the Chinese views, the proletariat is a second rate social force, which cannot play that role which Marx and Lenin envisaged in the struggle against capitalism and the triumph of the revolution, in alliance with all the forces oppressed by capital. The Chinese revolution has been dominated by the petty- and middle bourgeoisie. This broad stratum of the petty-bourgeoisie has influenced the whole development of China. Mao Tse-Tung did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory which teaches us that the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie in general, is vacillating. Of course, the poor and middle peasantry plays an important role in the revolution and must become the close ally of the proletariat. But the peasant class, the petty-bourgeoisie, cannot lead the proletariat in the revolution. To think and preach the opposite means to be against Marxism-Leninism. Herein lies one of the main sources of the anti-Marxist views of Mao Tse-Tung, which have had a negative influence on the whole Chinese revolution. The Communist Party of China has not been clear in theory about the basic revolutionary guiding principle of the hegemonic role of the proletariat in the revolution, and consequently it did not apply it in practice properly and consistently. Experience shows that the peasantry can play its revolutionary role
only if it acts in alliance with the proletariat and under its leadership. (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the peasantry is a vacillating class, that the proletariat must convince it and inculcate in it its scientific revolutionary theory. The Maoist theory which absolutizes the role of the peasantry and directly refuses the principles of Marxism-Leninism about the role of the proletariat brought horrific consequences to the entire communist movement. One of the most dramatic cases in which Mao’s abject and anti-communist theory of the “encirclement of the city by the countryside” assumed extremist features was that of Cambodia under Pol Pot (a subject which we will develop later in this article).

Therefore, the leading role in the proletarian revolution should always belong to the working class (the proletariat). If the revolution is not led by the proletariat, that means that the revolution has not a Marxist-Leninist and communist character. Anyone who denies the leading role of the proletariat in the communist revolution is an Anti-Marxist-Leninist and must be implacably fought, and the truth is that Maoism rejected the leading role of the proletariat both in theory and in practice. Indeed, it is impossible to speak about the leading role of the proletariat in a context like that of Maoist China, in which the national bourgeoisie dominated the material base of the economical power, and consequently dominated the social and political superstructure which permitted the perpetuation of capitalist exploitation.

The anarchist characteristics of the Cultural Revolution are intimately related to the leftist anti-Marxist conceptions of Mao Zedong which were highlighted during the Cultural Revolution:

“To encourage the freedom of expression, it’s to encourage the public voice, so that every person can freely speak and criticize. (Citation by Mao Tse-Tung, 16th May of 1966).

In the context of the Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution, the masses can only liberate themselves and we can never pretend to act in their place.” (Decision of the Central Committee of the CPC about the Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution, 8th August of 1966, Beijing).

This theory about the auto-liberation of the masses clearly reveals the idealist and voluntarist nature of the Maoist conceptions. Indeed, this false idea of “letting the masses liberate themselves” is common to nearly all Maoist parties around the world, supposedly with the objective of “avoiding bureaucratic deviations”. In fact, this theory is very similar to the leftist and anarchist thesis which don’t accept what they call “socialism imposed from above”; or in other words, which don’t accept the leading role of the communist party as the vanguard of the proletariat in alliance with the other exploited classes. This negation of the leading role of the proletarian class leads directly to the negation of the necessity of the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.
This kind of thesis of anarchist inspiration invariably emerges in situations of social tensions, but in which there is not a veritable Marxist-Leninist party to lead the oppressed classes and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Regarding the anarchist features of the Mao Zedong Though in general, and of the “Cultural Revolution” in particular, Comrade Enver Hoxha remarked that:

“One must not label Mao Zedong as a “prophet” of the revolution but as a "prophet of the counter-revolution”. He represented the type of the Anarchist in whose blood runs confusion, chaos, the undermining of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism, but under the condition that this permanent anarchy was led by him or by his typical Chinese anarchist ideology. Mao Zedong is a Chinese Bakunin. The Cultural Revolution was an expression of the ideas and action of this Chinese Bakunin.

The chaos which resulted in China, originated from this anti-Marxist, traitorous line of Mao Zedong and his courtiers, a chaos full of defeats in politics, ideology and economy was fought by the "Great Steersman" through the anarchy of the Cultural Revolution.

This anarchist revolution saved the Maoist absolute rule but contained the risk of undermining it, too. The "prestige" of the "Steersman" had to be saved, the anarchy was not allowed to topple the myths, therefore military measures were taken.

The character of bureaucracy with the courtier Zhou Enlai-Confucius was saved and supposedly "younger" "revolutionary" elements were integrated into the scene of agitation and propaganda, for whom the "Steersman" had intended the role of painting out the anarchy as a "revolution within the revolution" by which the alleged bourgeoisie, which had infiltrated the party, was supposed to be eliminated.

But in fact there was no party, but only the bourgeoisie, there were clans and factions which were fighting for power. This was the Trotskyist "permanent revolution", led by Mao Zedong-Trotsky.” (Enver Hoxha, Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo, 30th July of 1978).

At this point, another question is posed: Maoists are always abstractly referring to the “masses”, but what do they mean with that? It's not by chance that their definition of “masses” is so vague and empty. This is because, behind the so-called masses, the Maoists can justify the existence of various classes under fake “revolutionary” and “socialist” slogans.

It's not astonishing that the CPC practically ceased to exist during the Cultural Revolution. It ceased to exist because, during the Cultural Revolution, there were several revisionist clans within the CPC which fiercely struggled against each other and tried to conquer
power to defend the interests of the branches of the bourgeoisie that were represented by each of them. In this context, the CPC was “neutralized” simply because it had no independent role to play. After this Cultural Revolution, when the victorious branches of the bourgeoisie consolidated their power, then the CPC re-occupied its place as the general committee of the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie.

The idea of the spontaneous leadership of the masses is also included in the Maoist thesis which propagates the control of the Communist Party by the bourgeois parties and classes. It proposes general criticism among the elements of the various classes existing within the social and economic bourgeois system which constitutes the Maoist definition of “New Democracy”. We may not forget that Mao always defended the “100 schools”, which should debate among them. Of course, those “100 schools” mean a great variety of bourgeois ideologies which, according to Mao, should be allowed not only to exist, but also to develop and to spread their poisonous influence over the proletariat and the exploited masses:

“The revisionist concepts of Mao Tse-Tung have their basis in the policy of collaboration and alliance with the bourgeoisie, which the Communist Party of China has always applied. This is also the source of the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist course of «letting 100 flowers blossom and 100 schools contend», which is a direct expression of the coexistence of opposing ideologies.

According to Mao Tse-Tung, in socialist society, side by side with the proletarian ideology, materialism and atheism, the existence of bourgeois ideology, idealism and religion, the growth of poisonous weeds» along with «fragrant flowers», etc., must be permitted. Such a course is alleged to be necessary for the development of Marxism, in order to open the way to debate and freedom of thought, while in reality, through this course, he is trying to lay the theoretical basis for the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and coexistence with its ideology.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

This is in total contrast with what happened in the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and in Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver Hoxha, where Marxism-Leninism had absolute predominance and was obliterating all kinds of bourgeois ideas and mentalities. In the context of a genuine proletarian dictatorship, there can be no space left for non-Marxist-Leninist ideologies. Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism must be the only ideology allowed and encouraged in all spheres of life. To inculcate Marxism-Leninism in the minds and hearts of all workers is the best way to assure the strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship and the successful edification of the socialist and communist society.
Of course, Maoism rejects all this and proposes a “revolution” made by “various classes” (read: the bourgeoisie). This is on the antipodes of the basic Marxist-Leninist teachings on the major role that the proletariat must play in any authentic proletarian revolution in order to completely remove even the smallest remnants of the bourgeois-capitalist system and ideology.

Comrade Enver Hoxha also notes that Mao’s defense of class reconciliation with the bourgeoisie goes so far that he (Mao) even criticizes the struggle against bourgeois elements and influences:

“Mao Tse-Tung says, «...it is a dangerous policy to prohibit people from coming into contact with the false, the ugly and the hostile to us, with idealism and metaphysics and with the thoughts of Confucius, Lao Tze and Chiang Kai-shek. It would lead to mental deterioration, one-track minds, and unpreparedness to face the world...».

From this Mao Tse-Tung draws the conclusion that idealism, metaphysics and the bourgeois ideology will exist eternally, therefore not only must they not be prohibited, but they must be given the possibility to blossom, to come out in the open and contend. This conciliatory stand towards everything reactionary goes so far as to call disturbances in socialist society inevitable and the prohibition of enemy activity mistaken. «In my opinion, » says he, «whoever wants to provoke trouble may do so for so long as he pleases; and if one month is not enough, he may go on for two, in short, the matter should not be wound up until he feels he has had enough. If you hastily wind it up, sooner or later trouble will resume again».

A11 these have not been academic contributions to a «scientific» discussion but a counterrevolutionary opportunist political line which has been set up in opposition to Marxism-Leninism, which has disorganized the Communist Party of China, in the ranks of which a hundred and one views and ideas have been circulating and today there really are 100 schools contending. This has enabled the bourgeois wasps to circulate freely in the garden of 100 flowers and release their venom.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

And there’s more:

“(…) openly taking counterrevolutionaries under his protection, Mao Tsetung stated: «. we should kill none and arrest very few... They are not to be arrested by the public security bureaus, prosecuted by the procuratorial organs or tried by the law courts.

Well over ninety out of every hundred of these counterrevolutionaries should be dealt with in this way». Reasoning as a sophist, Mao Tsetung says that the execution of
counterrevolutionaries does no good, that such an action allegedly hinders production, the scientific level of the country, and will give us a bad name in the world, etc., that if one counterrevolutionary is liquidated, «we would have to compare his case with that of a second, of a third, and so on, and then many heads would begin to roll. .. once a head is chopped off it can't be restored, nor can it grow again as chives do, after being cut». As a result of these anti-Marxist concepts about contradictions, about classes, and their role in revolution that «Mao Tsetung thought» advocates, China never proceeded on the correct road of socialist construction.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

These quotations of Mao Zedong show clearly that he refused the use of revolutionary violence against the bourgeois and capitalist elements.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, consider revolutionary violence as a fundamental weapon to establish the proletarian dictatorship. Without revolutionary violence, there can be no correct and solid edification of the socialist and communist society.

As a final note on the Cultural Revolution, we must conclude that Mao’s ultimate objective was not achieved. Mao failed to keep the apparent “equilibrium” of the Chinese bourgeois state through the supposed “share of power” between the national bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois peasantry. He could not stop the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie from putting the Chinese state under its total control and dominance, and Mao could not stop it because the economical power of the bourgeoisie was never eliminated and even the productive relations continued to have a capitalist and bourgeois character during Mao’s rule. For these reasons, it was only a question of time until the Chinese national monopolist bourgeoisie would take complete control of the state apparatus, as indeed happened.

The truth is that since the end of the 60’s and the begging of the 70’s, the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie was consolidated as the incontestable dominant class in China, thus obliterating any pretensions of the petty-bourgeoisie and even from the peasantry about the “joint dictatorship” of all classes. What the petty-bourgeois classes and also, to a certain extent, the Chinese peasantry did not understood was that, since the end of the 60’s, China had entered in a new stage, the stage of the imperialist expansion of the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie. Immediately after 1949, the greatest concern of the national bourgeoisie was to assure its independence in face of the foreign imperialist powers and of the bourgeoisie linked with them. And this because, in its first stage of development, the Chinese national bourgeoisie had to struggle to avoid that the dependence on foreign imperialisms could maintain the Chinese economy in a backward state. After this, the national bourgeoisie accumulated many resources and developed the internal economy. And that was the point in which Mao’s ideas were decisive to serve the interests of the national bourgeoisie. Maoist Thought ideologically
paralyzed the Chinese workers and “united” their interests with those of the national bourgeoisie. We know that this “union” was only superficial and was deeply anti-Marxist, but the fact is that it misled large sectors of the Chinese working masses (Mao’s “socialist” phraseology greatly contributed to this), thus permitting that the Chinese national bourgeoisie could exploit them without worries, thus developing the industrial base of the Chinese economy in order to pave the way for the future ascension of China as a new imperialist superpower.

After the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese national bourgeoisie definitively achieved a monopolist character and took absolute control of the political power. With this, it began to enter into imperialist competition and development, even because its colossal economical power was supported by an advanced and diversified sector of heavy industry and by the endless labor force provided by China’s colossal demographical and territorial dimensions.

It was in this context that the relations between Socialist Albania and Maoist China began to deteriorate seriously. Since the end of the 60’s, the Albanian Marxist-Leninists noticed that the Chinese “comrades” tried to dissuade them from developing the industry of means of production and from accomplishing many projects in various branches of the economy (agriculture, metallurgy, etc…). It is quite clear that the Chinese revisionists wanted to thwart Socialist Albania’s independent course, but they failed due to the heroic efforts of the Albanian proletariat:

“The building of factories of heavy industry in Albania with China’s help had to face many difficulties which were surpassed due to the hard work of the Albanian workers and specialists.” (PLA, Histoire de la construction socialiste en Albanie, translated from french language).

Since 1971, the Chinese revisionists imposed a harsh commercial blockade against socialist Albania and tried by all means to subjugate this country in favor of their imperialist interests. The chinese revisionists even refused to receive delegations from Tirana to discuss the political contradictions which were increasing between the two countries. In fact, the VI Congress of the PLA (1976), in which Comrade Enver Hoxha criticized the Maoist “theory of the three worlds”, was not attended by any chinese delegation.

Social-imperialist China officially broke with Socialist Albania in 1978. This rupture was not something surprising, nor had its origins in the period 1976-1978. On the contrary, the Sino-Albanian split was only the culmination of a long process which had intensified since the late 60’s, but that had its origins in the very beginnings of that decade.

The Albanian Marxist-Leninists trusted the chinese people and thought that the CPC would be able to correct its mistakes and to take a genuine Marxist-Leninist course. Comrade Enver and the other Albanian communists regularly criticized the CPC and told the Chinese
“comrades” about the ideological questions in which they were in disagreement.

Nowadays, there are communist groups which correctly consider Albania as an authentic Socialist country and affirm (also correctly) that the Albanian socialist society was free from revisionist deviations. However, there is one aspect about Socialist Albania’s foreign policy that continues to confuse some of these communist groups and parties: the fact that Albania continued to have apparently friendly diplomatic relations with China until after Mao’s death. Many of the communists which see Mao Zedong Though as a bourgeois-revisionist current wonder why Socialist Albania was not capable of criticizing maoist China earlier.

First of all, we must not forget that the chinese revisionists always tried to hide the truth about the CPC’s internal situation. During many years, the Albanian communists could not have known what was going on within CPC’s ranks:

“(…) we did not have full knowledge about the internal political, economic, cultural, social life, etc. in China. The organization of the Chinese party and state have always been a closed book to us. The Communist Party of China gave us no possibility at all to study the forms of organization of the Chinese party and state. We Albanian communists knew only the general outlines of the state organization of China and nothing more; we were given no possibilities to acquaint ourselves with the experience of the party in China, to see how it operated, how it was organized, in what directions things were developing in different sectors and what these directions were concretely.

The Chinese leaders have acted with guile. They have not made public many documents necessary for one to know the activity of their party and state. They were and are very wary of publishing their documents. Even those few published documents at our disposal are fragmentary.

The four volumes of Mao’s works, which can be considered official, are comprised of materials written no later than 1949, but besides this, they are carefully arranged in such a way that they do not present an exact picture of the real situations that developed in China.

(…) The Chinese leaders did not invite any delegation from our Party to study their experience. And when some delegation has gone there on our Party's request, the Chinese have engaged in propaganda and taken it here and there for visits to communes and factories rather than give it some explanation or experience about the work of the party. And towards whom did they maintain this strange stand? Towards us Albanians, their friends, who have defended them in the most difficult situations. All these actions were incomprehensible to us, but also a signal that the Communist Party of China did not want to give us a clear picture of its

Therefore, it’s erroneous to judge the PLA’s attitudes towards China as if the Albanian Marxist-Leninists had total knowledge about the reactionary deviations which were happening in China.

Nowadays, thanks to the publication of many books of Comrade Enver and of the PLA, we can have a broader view on this matter and we can say that, in truth, Comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA effectively criticized Maoist revisionism since the early 60’s.

If we search Comrade Enver’s Reflections on China, Volume I, we will easily observe that Comrade Enver already noted that China was following a centrist course and was reconciliating with soviet revisionism in 1962 (see: Reflections on China Volume I: The Chinese are giving Khrushchev a hand - April 6, 1962; China is proceeding on a centrist course - June 13, 1962; The Chinese are moving towards conciliation with the Khrushchevites - July 2, 1962; China is not acting well in failing to reply to Khrushchev’s attacks - December 20, 1962; The stands of the Chinese comrades are improper in several directions - December 24, 1962; etc…).

Moreover, in other books such as “The Krushchevists” and “Imperialism and the Revolution”, Comrade Enver also reveals that he and the other Albanian Marxist-Leninists had many suspicions about the true character of the chinese “revolution” and of the chinese “socialist edification” from the first moment.

In the early and middle 70’s, there were already some people which criticized socialist Albania for not being able to denounce chinese revisionism. But today we know that this criticism was in discordance with reality. By that time, Socialist Albania and Comrade Enver Hoxha not only had already done their criticism of maoist revisionism, but also noted that China was paving the way in order to become a new imperialist superpower.

In those times, many of these communists feared that if Socialist Albania refused to criticize Maoist revisionism, that would cause the degeneration of the socialist character of Albania. However, this fear was totally illogical and only reveals lack of confidence in the PLA’s ideological strength. In truth, there was never the risk of revisionist degeneration of socialist Albania, because Comrade Enver always maintained a correct and principled Marxist-Leninist stand and never made any concessions to Maoist revisionism, not even when Albania and China had “friendly” relations. While Comrade Enver was leading the Albanian people, socialist edification in Albania always followed a coherent Marxist-Leninist line and the PLA never let Maoist degenerative and anti-Marxist influences to penetrate the Albanian proletariat. We must remember that in the period 1974-1975, the PLA launched a ferocious battle against the party
members which were trying to sold Albania to chinese imperialism, and thanks to the party’s vigilance, many pro-Maoist traitors were unmasked and received the treatment they deserved (and it’s important to stress that this happened in 1974-1975, 4 years before the official split between Beijing and Tirana, thus proving that Comrade Enver Hoxha had already predicted the inevitability of that rupture and cleaned the PLA from pro-chinese elements, thus preparing the Albanian proletariat to face the future inexorable rupture with China). Those pro-chinese traitors were united around Beqir Balluku and their objective was to subjugate Socialist Albania to the interests of the revisionist powers, including those of the chinese social-fascists:

“Chou En-laï explained to Beqir Balluku the point of view that Albania did not need heavy industry and that it could never defend itself against an external aggression (…). That’s why, according to Chou En-laï, (…) Albania should make a deal with Yugoslavia and with Romania. The Bureau of the Central Committee of the PLA unanimously rejected this anti-albanian and counter-revolutionary proposal of Chou En-laï. And although he said he agreed with the Bureau’s decision, Beqir Balluku later revealed to be in total accordance with the chinese proposal and he acted in secret to accomplish that hostile plan against Socialist Albania.”

(Letter from the Central Committee of the PLA to the Central Committee of the CPC and to the Chinese government, Tirana, 28th July of 1978, translated from French language).

To think that Socialist Albania should have broken its relations with China and should have made public its anti-Maoist criticisms earlier than 1978 reveals a very superficial analysis of the facts.

After the Liberation, Albania was almost completely destroyed. The war had imposed a very heavy burden on the country. The heroic efforts of the Albanian people to build socialism under the direction of the proletariat through the PLA led to the edification of a new Albania. This new Albania engaged in the edification of a socialist and latter communist society achieved great victories and became a symbol to all truly revolutionary militants around the world. However, this glorious path was not without obstacles. Indeed, after surpassing many difficulties caused by the country’s destruction, the Albanian communists had to face Comrade Stalin’s death and the ascension to power of soviet revisionism. As we know, before Khrushchevite betrayal, the Soviet Union was the main supporter of socialist Albania; it supported Albania not only on economical aspects, but also regarding political questions (for example, Comrade Stalin’s defense of Albania’s independence and sovereignty helped the Albanian communists to defeat Tito’s imperialist ambitions and to avoid Albania’s transformation into a Yugoslav colony). But after the revisionist takeover, Albania had to advance towards socialism without the Soviet help. The rupture between Albania and the Soviet Union in the period 1956-1961 had some negative effects in Albanian economy, but thanks to the emphasis that Comrade Enver Hoxha had always put on the country’s internal forces and on the development of the heavy industry of
means of production, Socialist Albania was able to surpass the rupture with Moscow without grave consequences to the socialist edification. After this episode, socialist Albania decided to accept China’s help bearing in mind that, despite CPC’s many and profound ideological mistakes, the CPC had also defended Comrade Stalin (at least apparently…) and consequently, it could still correct its political line in accordance with Marxist-Leninist principles. During some years, the Albanian Marxist-Leninists hoped that the CPC would return to the socialist path and actively tried to call the attention of the Chinese revisionists to the profound ideological errors they were committing and to the abject anti-Marxist deviations they were making:

“Each time that our party noticed that the CPC was practicing acts and adopting attitudes which were in opposition with Marxist-Leninism and with proletarian internationalism, in opposition with the interests of socialism and the revolution, it tried to expose the CPC’s errors and criticized the CPC in a comradely spirit. But the leadership of the CPC never wanted to apply Marxist-Leninist principles to the relations between parties.” (Letter from the Central Committee of the PLA to the Central Committee of the CPC and to the Chinese government, Tirana, 28th July of 1978, translated from French language).

“On many of Mao Tse-Tung’s theses, such as that about the handling of the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as non-antagonistic contradictions, the thesis about the existence of antagonistic classes during the entire period of socialism, the thesis that «the countryside should encircle the city», which absolutizes the role of the peasantry in the revolution, etc., we had our reservations and our own Marxist-Leninist views, which, whenever we could, we expressed to the Chinese leaders.

Meanwhile, certain other political views and stands of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China which were not compatible with the Marxist-Leninist views and stands of our Party, we considered as temporary tactics of a big state, dictated by specific situations. But, with the passage of time, it became ever more clear that the stands maintained by the Communist Party of China were not just tactics.

By analyzing the facts, our Party arrived at some general and specific conclusions, which made it vigilant, but it avoided polemics with the Communist Party of China and Chinese leaders, not because it was afraid to engage in polemics with them, but because the facts, which it had about the erroneous, anti-Marxist course of this party and Mao Tse-Tung himself, were incomplete, and still did not permit the drawing of a final conclusion.

On the other hand, for a time, the Communist Party of China did oppose US imperialism.
and reaction. It also took a stand against Soviet Khrushchevite revisionism, though it is now clear that its struggle against Soviet revisionism was not dictated from correct, principled Marxist-Leninist positions.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

But patience has limits and since the early 70’s, Comrade Enver Hoxha clearly understood that the CPC’s erroneous and anti-communist line was definitive and irreversible:

«Socialist China» receives the communist comrades in the same way as Nixon, Tanaka, and the revisionists, just as it might receive Chiang Kai-shek. This means blatant treachery. (…) Therefore the Chinese cannot be in accord with the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line of our Party. They are not in agreement with the whole of our internal and external policy, either. And this they are displaying. Chou En-lai, Li Hsien-nien and Mao have cut off their contacts with us, and the contacts which they maintain are merely formal diplomatic ones.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, April 20, 1973, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Moreover, the Albanian communists noted the attempts made by the chinese to sabotate Albania’s economy and to hinder socialist edification (see: Reflections on China Volume II: Why are the Chinese against our building the Fierza hydro-power plant?! - April 2, 1974; The Chinese are not supplying us with all the industrial projects - June 18, 1975, etc…). It was in these circumstances that the Sino-Albanian split took place:

“The unilateral manner in which Chinese leaders broke the economical and militar agreements which they had sign with Albania (…), the suspension of the most important works for our socialist economy, etc…reflect a well defined political and ideological line which is being followed by the chinese leadership. This is a consequence of the deviation of the CPC from Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism, of its collusion with American imperialism, with world capital and reaction, (…) of its willingness to turn China into a new imperialist superpower. This line of the CPC (…) always faced the opposition of the PLA (…). That's why several ideological contradictions and disagreements emerged in the relations between the CPC and the PLA, and those contradictions and disagreements became even more accentuated.(…) The PLA tried to solve this divergences through Marxist-Leninist ways, through explanations and consultations in a comradely manner, without rendering those divergences public.” (Letter from the Central Committee of the PLA to the Central Committee of the CPC and to the Chinese government, Tirana, 28th July of 1978, translated from French language).

“In these circumstances, when the CPC refused every contact, every discussion or
consultation, when it acted with arrogance and brutality (...) what should the PLA do? Should it accept the anti-Marxist line of the CPC thus negating itself? Should it renounce to the struggle against imperialism and against modern revisionism and unite with the enemies of the revolution, of socialism (...)? Should it separate from the true Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, and associate with the bourgeois opportunists? Should it cease supporting people’s struggle against superpowers? The PLA decided to remain loyal to Marxism-Leninism (...).

It’s precisely because chinese leaders could not subjugate socialist Albania that they want to (...) thwart socialist development in Albania. But with this attitude, the chinese leadership only reveals even more its anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary face.” (Letter from the Central Committee of the PLA to the Central Committee of the CPC and to the Chinese government, Tirana, 28th July of 1978, translated from French language).

Comrade Enver's attitude towards the CPC was a Marxist-Leninist one. As we already referred, Comrade Enver always kept in mind that the Maoist ideological line was erroneous (as we have already mentioned, Comrade Enver never tried to hide the thoughtful ideological divergences that existed between the CPC and the PLA – for example, in what concerned Mobutu’s, Nixon’s and Rockefeller’s visits to Beijing, or in what respected to China’s friendship with Franco and Pinochet, which were considered by the PLA as obvious signs of wretched capitalist degeneration), but he honestly tried to correct it, he tried to show the chinese “comrades” how to follow a genuine Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist line; however, when he understood that it would be impossible, then he fiercely and publicly denounced Maoist social-fascism:

“The analyses we conduct regarding the Chinese revisionism are generally correct, objective in the light of Marxism-Leninism. Maoism as anti-Marxist theory is dying. It will face the same destiny as the other theories invented by world capitalism and by the decaying imperialism. (...)

The correct Marxist-Leninist line of our party will not only today but also in the future be supported by the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists worldwide, it will be supported by the world proletariat and the peoples.” (Enver Hoxha, Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo, 30th July of 1978).

The Sino-Albanian split also represented a profound defeat to the capitalist-revisionist powers which thought that Mao Zedong would undermine the international communist movement:

“(…) when Mao Zedong thought was exerting its influence in many parties, the imperialists and social imperialists were more at ease, because they knew that this
revisionist current was doing its work of undermining the Marxist-Leninist movement. Now that this current has been exposed, the enemies are trying to sow confusion by spreading all kinds of pseudo-Marxist theories, to split and weaken the parties through factional struggle, to manipulate weak and ill-formed elements in various ways and impel them to revisionist positions.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the VIII Congress of the PLA, Tirana, 1981).

It was also in the middle 70’s that the chinese revisionists presented one of their most famous ideas: the “three world theory”. The main objective of this “theory” is:

“(…) to detach the peoples from the veritable struggle against American imperialism and soviet social-imperialism and to paint the reactionary leaders who serve imperialism and neocolonialism as “progressives” and “democratic”. (VIIIe Congrès de l’Union des Femmes d’Albanie, Tirana, 1978, translated from French language).

The three world theory is a reactionary and anti-Marxist theory which tries to extinguish people’s struggle and to obliterate Leninism. The three world theory, as its own name clearly indicates, divides the world in three parts: the first world, which is composed by the superpowers: the USA and the Soviet Union (this superpower does not exist anymore); the second world, which is composed by the capitalist countries that are not superpowers: Great Britain, France, Germany, Canada, Australia, etc…; and finally the third world, which is composed by what the bourgeois analysts call “undeveloped countries”, that is, by the great majority of the African countries (Mozambique, Burundi, Kenya, Guinea, Mali, Sudan, Nigeria, etc…) by many Asiatic countries (Pakistan, Bangladesh, Thailand, etc…) and also by some countries of Central and Latin America (Paraguay, Bolivia, Uruguay, Haiti, etc…).

Accordingly with the Maoists, this third world is “the main revolutionary force of the present epoch”, it is this “third world” which is “advancing the revolution”. Of course, this is nothing more than a direct denial of the proletariat as the key revolutionary force. Indeed, this division of the world in three has the purpose of stopping the class struggle, of keeping the oppressed peoples in bondage.

When analyzing the “three world theory”, Comrade Enver stated that:

“After the triumph of the October Revolution, Lenin and Stalin said that in our time there are two worlds: the socialist world and the capitalist world, although at that time socialism had triumphed in only one country. Lenin wrote in 1921:

« ...there are now two worlds: the old world of capitalism, that is in a state of confusion but which will never surrender voluntarily, and the rising new world, which is still very weak, but which will grow, for it is invincible.».
This class criterion of the division of the world is still valid today, regardless of the fact that socialism has not triumphed in many countries and the new society has not supplanted the old bourgeois-capitalist society. Such a thing is certainly bound to happen tomorrow.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

The three world theory wants to deviate the exploited classes’ attention from the fact that there are exploited and exploiters everywhere, there are oppressors and oppressed in the “first world”, in the “second world” and, of course, also in what is called “third world”.

An authentic Marxist-Leninist should recognize that there are disagreements and contradictions between the imperialist countries and the nations which, although capitalist, do not have an imperialist character. But to be aware of the existence of these contradictions does not mean that we should have doubts about their common capitalist nature. United States and Zaire, for instance. The first country is an imperialist superpower, while the second can be included in what the maoist revisionists call “third world”. It’s crystal clear that the existence of contradictions between these two nations is inevitable, because, on one side, the United States, in accord with its predatory imperialist nature, wants to dominate countries like Zaire not only in economical matters, but also even in political matters. However, on the other side, the national bourgeoisie of Zaire is also struggling to defend its own class interests and it can happen that these interests are in opposition to those of the American imperialist plutocracy. What we must always bear in mind is that, despite some conflicts which may occur, the bourgeois character of both countries (USA and Zaire, in this case) remains unchanged and unaltered. They continue to be capitalist countries in which the ruling classes (headed by the bourgeoisie) oppress and exploit the working classes (headed by the proletariat). Therefore, it is unconceivable for a genuine Marxist-Leninist to defend that the proletariat of Zaire should “unite” with the bourgeoisie of that same country in order to supposedly “fight” against American imperialism (or any other imperialism), as the Maoists argue. That treacherous “union” would only benefit the interests of the national bourgeoisie which does not want to share the profits of the workers’ exploitation with some foreign imperialist bourgeoisie.

It was not by chance that we cited Zaire in our example. This country’s recent history is very interesting, especially if we want to observe and understand the real intentions behind the untrustworthy “third world theory” invented by the Maoists.

After achieving a formal independence from Belgian colonialism, Zaire fell under the yoke of American imperialism which murdered a bourgeois-progressive president (Lumumba) and imposed a brutal and bloodthirsty cleptocracy headed by General Mobutu which would exploit the working classes to the bone. In the beginning, Mobutu faithfully served the interests of the American imperialist bourgeoisie, but that situation would be challenged precisely when
Maoist China started to have visibility in the international scene. Mobutu was a self-proclaimed anti-communist, but that did not stop the Chinese revisionists from inviting him to Beijing and from receiving him with great honors. During this visit, Mobutu met with Mao and received promises of $100 million (!!) in technical aid. Of course, this attitude was harshly criticized by Comrade Enver Hoxha:

"Chou’s statement at the banquet with Mobutu is flagrantly anti-Marxist. He included China in the «third world». This means to deny socialism, to conceal the true individuality of China and the character of its socio-economic order from the eyes of the world. This is an opportunist, anti-Marxist view. (...) General Mobutu and his clique are reactionaries, the murderers of Lumumba and other progressive individuals in their country. China receives the representative of this anti-democratic African clique with great honours (...)." (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, January 15, 1973, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

The truth is that Mobutu’s visit to China was not an incoherence in the Maoist foreign policy. On the contrary, to receive reactionary leaders was something usual for the Chinese revisionists (apart from Mobutu, they received Nixon (!!!), Ferdinand Marcos (!!!), Rockefeller (!!!!!), among many others...). And we must underline that the receptions made to those leaders were everything but discreet. Those leaders were received by the highest ranks of the CPC, including by Chou En Lai and by Mao Zedong himself. They were accompanied by sumptuous banquets and luxury parties, all this at the expense of the Chinese working classes. But we should not be surprised. After all, they were just anti-communist leaders which were being splendidly received in an anti-communist country, as was the case of Maoist China.

But let’s return to Zaire’s example. After his visits to China, Mobutu started to oppose American Imperialism and to primarily defend the interests of the national bourgeoisie of Zaire (which was the main component of his own governing clique). This situation intensified even more in the middle 70’s, when Mobutu openly criticized USA. It is curious to note that, after his first visit to China, Mobutu adopted the title “the Helmsman”, which was used by Mao.

In the meantime, the Chinese social-imperialists were using their friendship with Mobutu in order to penetrate in Africa and to undermine Soviet positions in that continent. But the most important aspect we must retain from the Zaire example is how the Chinese revisionists tried to seduce the reactionary leaders of the “third world” with the purpose of attracting them to the Chinese sphere of influence and to cover them with “anti-imperialist” disguises in order to deceive the peoples of those “third world” countries and to keep them in a state of slavery through the perpetuation of the capitalist system and of the reactionary cliques which were ruling those countries. We can never forget that if exploitation is not eliminated within a certain
country, then that country will sooner or latter start to have commercial relations with more
powerful capitalist countries, and, with time, these commercial relations will change their nature
and will be transformed into relations of economical subjugation towards those other capitalist
countries. This was predicted by Karl Marx, who explained that this phenomenon will inevitably
happen because of the contradictions between production and consume within the internal
market, and also because of the different productive degrees inside social work. This means
that the more powerful capitalist countries, which are able to take profits of the selling of great
quantities of merchandises which were produced at a very low cost, will inexorably dominate
the weaker capitalist countries as long as capitalist exploitation continues to exist. Consequently, all the theories of “non-alignment”, of “fair trade”, are nothing but a big fraud
fabricated by the revisionists to hinder the world socialist revolution.

Even today, the Maoists are still using this “theory” and continue to claim that only the
countries which are included in what they understand by “third world” are truly progressive. With
this, they openly deny the revolutionary character of the proletariat and of the oppressed
classes in the countries of the “second” and of the “first world”. With this, they openly assume
that they are against the world proletarian revolution and in favor of pro-fascist “class
cooperation”. With this, they clearly show the anti-Marxist and pro-capitalist character of their
deprecated ideology.

Indeed, we observe that in the countries of the “third world” it is frequent that worker’s
exploitation is exercised in a very high degree, because great part of these countries are ruled
by reactionary and pro-imperialist cliques which do their utmost to serve their foreign bosses
while brutally repressing their respective peoples’ aspirations for freedom and socialism. What
the Maoists mean with this fake “three world theory” is that a bunch of countries which are
mainly governed by backward forces and which are closely linked with imperialist interests can
be considered as “the main motive force of the revolution”:

“How is it possible in the present epoch of social development, which has at its
hub the most revolutionary class, the proletariat, to call a grouping of states, the
overwhelming bulk of which are ruled by the bourgeoisie and the feudal lords, indeed,
even open reactionaries and fascists, the motive force? This is a gross distortion of
Marx’s theory.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in
English).

As we said above, the Maoists deny that there is class struggle in every “world” invented
by them. And they do this because they are anti-Marxist, and therefore they are not able to
understand that the proletariat is invariably the main motive force of the revolution, whether in
the “first”, “second” or in the “third world”. They try to paint the countries of the “three world” as
“progressive” and “revolutionary” in order to thwart peoples’ struggle against their internal and external oppressors. In fact, if we follow the three world theory, we will easily reach the conclusion that this theory leads us towards the more abject cooperation and conciliation with the more reactionary branches of the bourgeoisie. Through this three world theory, the Maoists try to justify the peaceful coexistence between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, because they defend that from the moment a certain state is included in the so-called “third world”, that state is automatically qualified as “revolutionary” and “anti-imperialist” and therefore, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of that state should allegedly unite with the objective of struggling against imperialism. So, what the Maoists propagate is that the union between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat within a determined “three world country” is something “progressive” because it will supposedly contribute to the defeat of the superpowers. It’s hard to imagine a more counter-revolutionary and pro-capitalist theory than this one. In truth, the Maoists are condemning the revolutionary actions that the proletariat must undertake against its internal and external oppressors because, in the Maoists’ view, that would undermine the “necessary” union between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat:

“The theory of «three worlds» advocates social peace, class conciliation, and tries to create alliances between implacable enemies, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the oppressed and the oppressors, the peoples and imperialism.

It is an attempt to prolong the life of the old world, the capitalist world, to keep it on its feet precisely by seeking to extinguish the class struggle. But the class struggle, the struggle of the proletariat and its allies to take power and the struggle of the bourgeoisie to maintain its power can never be extinguished.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Indeed, this three world theory fabricated by the chinese revisionists headed by Mao is very curious because the idea of the “union” and the “cooperation” between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the countries of the “third world” looks like a copy of Mao’s theory of New Democracy. In truth, the “three world theory” is an attempt made by the Chinese revisionists in order to impose their own anti-Marxist and bourgeois line to other countries. Throughout this article, we underlined that the Chinese 1949 “revolution” was nothing more than a bourgeois anti-imperialist revolution and that Maoism was nothing more than the ideology of the chinese national bourgeoisie which strove to reach economical and political power in order to pave the way for China’s ascension as a new superpower. We also noted that one of the main instruments used by Mao in order to mislead the Chinese proletariat over the true nature of the Chinese “revolution” was precisely his theory of a “joint dictatorship” of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, of a “share of power” between these two opposite classes with irreconcilable interests. Now, when analyzing the “three world theory”, we conclude that the Chinese
revisionists were trying to spread those reactionary ideas with the purpose of hindering the class struggle and of taking the world proletariat away from the idea of the proletarian revolution. They are still trying to deceive the oppressed classes by encouraging them to reconcile with the bourgeoisie, and we had already seen what happens when the bourgeoisie pretends to “share the power” with the proletariat. In these situations, this false “share of power” will never last (not even in appearance) because from the moment that the bourgeoisie is not expropriated and destroyed by the proletariat, then it will always conquer and dominate the economical and political power; that is, it will always establish a bourgeois dictatorship. Therefore, to say that in the “third world countries” the proletariat and the bourgeoisie should “unite” with anti-imperialist purposes is to completely erase the class character of the social and economical relations that exist in these nations. The truth is that the main objective of the “third world theory” is to facilitate China’s ascension as a new imperialist superpower, by pretending to “lead” the “third world countries”.

This paragraph written by Comrade Enver correctly exposes China’s pro-imperialist intentions disguised under the cloak of the “three world theory”:

“The theory of «three worlds» is against the proletarian revolution, and replaces it with the bourgeois-democratic revolution. This anti-Marxist theory eliminates the decisive leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, lumps all the forces together under one umbrella or in one bag, calling them the «third world» and giving them that role and those attributes which these forces do not possess, and with this «world» denies the socialist world.

This means that China denies that it is a socialist country, calls itself an «undeveloped country» and not a socialist country. According to this theory, to be an undeveloped country means to be a socialist country. This theory is simply anti-Marxist and reactionary, it means to consider all the undeveloped countries with bourgeois capitalist systems as socialist countries.

Why is China doing this? It seems to me that it is doing this not only to defend an incorrect ideological thesis, but in order to realize its secret objective — to lead all those states of Asia, Africa or Latin America, which it includes in this «world», to become their leadership by presenting itself as their main defender.

But in fact China is not defending anything, because it does not give any sort of aid, even economic aid, to these states which are bourgeois-capitalist states; the majority of them are linked with the United States of America and the capital of other imperialists, or with the Soviet Union.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, March 22, 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).
This “theory of the three worlds” emerged in a trouble context regarding China’s internal situation. In the spring of 1976, Mao was dying. Due to his serious disease, the country was now ruled by what would be later called “the gang of the four”. This “gang”, which was formed by Wang Hongwen, Zhang Chunqiao, Jao Wenjuan and Jiang Qing (Mao’s wife), was the representative of Mao’s “orthodox” and pro-nationalist line, and was struggling against the “reformist” section led by Deng Xiaoping.

This group of the four succeeded in expelling Deng from the leadership of the Central Committee of the CPC, but the fights between the group’s militias and the pro-Deng factions almost led to a civil war. With Mao’s death in September of 1976, the “gang of four” lost its main supporters and was obliterated by Deng’s pragmatic faction. After the arrest of the “gang”, Deng Xiaoping reconquered his former party positions and conducted China towards an openly pro-capitalist and imperialist road.

Nowadays, the majority of the Maoists which still insist in painting themselves as “pure communists” argue that the “gang of the four” was a kind of guardian of Mao’s “genuine communist line”, and that the “gang” was expelled by the “pro-capitalist forces” inside the CPC which would “betray” the socialist edification in China. Of course, this kind of argumentation is nothing but a masquerade. In fact, the “gang of four” was so revisionist and pro-capitalist as Deng’s faction:

“The "Gang of Four" was a group of megalomaniac, ambitious, intrigant babblers without any principles, just like the other fractions of the bourgeoisie which were swimming in the swamp. (…) 

The bourgeois world called the "Gang of Four" radical. If you wish, you can also add the term "socialist" and call them "radical socialist". But those four were neither radical nor socialist.” (Enver Hoxha, Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo, 30th July of 1978).

Both factions wanted to rule China and to totally dominate the CPC’s apparatus. Both sections were representing a determined branch of the Chinese bourgeoisie. However, the “gang of four” was defeated and Deng’s faction triumphed. Why? In truth, the answer to that question can be found in the interests of the chinese monopolist bourgeoisie which was dominating China since the late 60’s. As we have already referred, the economical objectives of the chinese national bourgeoisie after the 1949 “revolution” can be divided in two main stages: the first one, which lasted until the Cultural Revolution, was characterized by the efforts of the national bourgeoisie to create and strengthen China’s internal market in order to consolidate its economical and political positions; while the second, which begun after the Cultural Revolution and was fortified in the middle 70’s, was characterized by the definitive victory of the chinese
national bourgeoisie over the petty-bourgeois and peasant elements which still believed in the “joint dictatorship of all revolutionary classes” proposed by Mao. With this victory, the Chinese national bourgeoisie turned into a veritable monopolist bourgeoisie and started to enter into competition with foreign imperialisms. In order to achieve success in becoming a new imperialist power, the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie needed to increase exportations and also to incentive foreign investments in China. And this is the main reason why the “gang of four” was defeated. It was defeated because it did not serve the interests of the monopolist bourgeoisie anymore (what distinguishes Deng’s supporters from Mao’s supporters was that the firsts relied on the international market in order to turn China into a superpower, while the seconds relied on the internal market). The “potentialities” of the Mao Zedong though which were utilized by the Chinese bourgeoisie to deceive the Chinese proletariat were no more needed because the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie had now total control over the Chinese state and it had no more necessity to mislead the working classes through fake slogans covered by “Marxist-Leninist” phraseology. Therefore, the “gang of four” was eliminated and Mao’s epoch was gone forever.

However, we must not forget that it was Mao’s anti-Marxist ideology which permitted the development and economic consolidation of the Chinese national bourgeoisie and its later transformation into a monopolist bourgeoisie. Thus, the Mao Zedong though was an objective and direct cause of the emergence of Chinese social-imperialism; in the same way that the emergence of the Chinese social-imperialism was an objective and direct consequence of the Mao Zedong Thought. One thing is intrinsically linked with the other and both are inseparable. This point must be crystal clear:

“The Communist Party of China and especially Mao Zedong, who was an idealist dreamer and utopian without general education (apart from the one about ancient China), followed the development of human history as xenophobic dilettantes. Their ideological, political and organisational principles, especially since the foundation of the Communist Party, are demonstratively pragmatical and solely focused on China’s interests with the obvious aim of transforming "eternal" China into a superpower which controls the world, dictates the law, imposes its own culture and its own will upon others.” (Enver Hoxha, Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo, 30th July of 1978).

The anti-Marxist conceptions of Mao continued to thwart the world proletarian revolution and to perpetuate the capitalist system. As we had already referred, the ascension to power of Deng Xiaoping and the definitive inclusion of China inside the orbit of world capitalism were accompanied by imperialist expansion which included the imposition of pro-Chinese reactionary cliques in a number of countries. One of the most flagrant and impressive examples of the immense damages caused by Mao’s reactionary ideas and by Chinese social-imperialism was
that of Cambodia under Pol Pot.

We choose to develop the Cambodia example not only because it represents one of the most brutal attempts made by the chinese revisionists to create a sphere of influence of their own, but also because the “Pol Pot question” is one of the most important arguments used by the world bourgeoisie to discredit communist ideology.

The Pol Pot regime was a direct product of the Maoist pro-capitalist revisionism and of the social-imperialist interests it fostered.

After the American defeat, Vietnam started to be governed by a revisionist clique which served soviet interests. It was already in this epoch that the Cambodian nationalist-bourgeois “resistance” against the pro-American regime of Lon Lol was intensifying and Pol Pot and his “Red” Khmers were part of that “resistance”. Seeing all this, the Maoist imperialists, which were very irritated about Soviet influence in Southeast Asia, supported Pol Pot’s struggle for power with the purpose of transforming Cambodia into a Chinese satellite which would counter-balance Vietnam’s pro-Sovietism.

Pol Pot, whose real name was Saloth Sar, was born in a bourgeois family. Thanks to his family’s wealth, he was able to study in France, where he supposedly took contact with communist ideology. This is nothing astonishing, since the great majority of the sons of the native bourgeoisies which studied in colonialist metropolis during the second half of the XXth Century took contact with communist ideology at a determined moment. Therefore, just because the young Pol Pot read some communist books does not mean that, because of that, he had become a communist. Indeed, there are many bourgeois which know a lot about communist ideology, which even read the works of the Classics. But does that mean that they ceased to be bourgeois and can be considered genuine communists? Of course not. They are not communists because they don’t accept Marxism-Leninism, because they are unable to understand the grandiosity of that ideology. Even if they pretend to be communists, their true bourgeois nature will always appear in the way they distort and corrupt Marxism-Leninism. This was what happened with Pol Pot. In reality, in Pol Pot’s case, we cannot merely say that he was not a communist. In fact, we must affirm without fear that Pol Pot was a veritable anti-communist, because more than a simple rejection of Marxism-Leninism, he would launch a brutal war in order to avoid the Cambodian people from taking the socialist revolutionary path. The best proof of Pol Pot’s reactionary character was his embracement of Maoism. In fact, what most attracted Pol Pot towards Maoism was precisely Mao’s negation of the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution and its replacement by the peasantry. One of the main thesis which would be used by Pol Pot to justify the reign of terror that the “Red” Khmers imposed on the Cambodian people was precisely the famous Maoist conception about “the encirclement of the
city by the countryside”.

In his works against Maoism, Comrade Enver Hoxha openly exposed the anti-Marxist character of this idea:

“In his writings, Mao has expressed and continues to express that «the peasantry is the most revolutionary force on which the revolution must be based».

Another expression of this anti-Marxist line of Mao’s is the concept that «the countryside must encircle the city». This means that the poor peasantry must lead the revolution, that «the proletariat of the city has lost its revolutionary spirit, has become conservative and has adapted itself to capitalist oppression and exploitation».

Of course, this theory is anti-Marxist and cannot lead to revolution, cannot establish and give the role that belongs to it to the dictatorship of the proletariat, or to its leadership — the Marxist-Leninist proletarian party. Anything can be covered up with words and propaganda, but not the essence of the question, and consequently, if not today, tomorrow, the time will come when the roof and the walls will fall in, because, without the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist communist party and without resolutely implementing the immortal theses of the Marxist-Leninist theory in the correct way, socialism cannot be built.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, January 1, 1976, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

Mao’s anti-Marxist thesis about the “encirclement of the city by the countryside” means that, accordingly with Mao, it is the peasantry which should lead the revolution, it is the peasantry which should be the main revolutionary force. Nonetheless, Pol Pot understood this idea in a totally literal manner. He interpreted this “encirclement” as a de facto encirclement, and as if the countryside should not only encircle the city, but also destroy the city and everything related with urban culture. This constitutes the main aspect of Pol Pot’s “ideology”.

Maoism deformed Marxism-Leninism by adapting it to bourgeois anti-colonialist nationalism, while Pol Pot deformed Maoism by adapting it to his individualist greed for absolute power over an entire people. Pol Pot’s ideology can be considered an extremist form of revisionism.

But let’s return to historical events. In 1975, after overthrowing Lon Lol pro-western despotic government, Pol Pot reached power and became an instrument of chinese social-imperialism.

Pol Pot occupied power from 1975 to 1979, and during those 4 years he took Cambodian people back to the stone age. Cambodia never had heavy industry and was very far from
having an independent economy. After all, we must not forget that after being subjected to French imperialism, Cambodia was governed by pro-American puppets which sold the country to foreign capital. However, during Pol Pot’s rule, the few industries that existed in Cambodia were reduced to nothing. And it was not only the industries. The Cambodian proletariat also almost disappeared under Pol Pot. These effects were due to the policy followed by the “Red” Khmers which consisted in forcibly dislocating the urban people to the countryside with the alleged purpose of “making them learn from the peasants, which are the only revolutionary force”. Therefore, all that was linked with the urban proletariat (factories, schools, roads, electricity systems, etc…) was simply smashed. During Pol Pot’s rule, the Cambodian cities were deserts where nobody lived.

It is interesting to note that, as every genuine Marxist-Leninist knows, it is the existence of the urban proletariat and the development of the heavy industry that permits that even a backward country can edificate socialism in a correct and independent manner. The examples of Soviet Union of Comrades Lenin and Stalin and of Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver Hoxha are living proofs of the scientific character of this theory. In both countries, after the socialist revolution, the urban proletariat increased exponentially and the main economic efforts were directed towards heavy industry; and this because, without wanting to diminish the great importance that socialist agriculture and the peasantry had in Socialist Albania and in Soviet Union, the truth is that the socialist edification is unconceivable without a strong and well organized urban proletariat in order to lead the revolution, and without a firm and diversified industry of means of production in order to assure the material base of the proletarian dictatorship and to grant its independence from world capitalism. But we observe that the strategy followed by Pol Pot was in total and irreconcilable opposition with that defended and applied by the Classics of Marxism-Leninism. The actions of the Pol Pot clique turned socialist edification in Cambodia completely impossible and, by leaving the country in ruins, Pol Pot gave a precious help to world capitalism which wanted to steal and to exploit the Cambodian people (a totally desolated and miserable country whose people is dying of hunger and malaria is a much easier prey to the capitalist multinationals looking for huge profits).

The terrorist actions which the “Red” Khmers perpetrated against the Cambodian people were also incompatible with the essence of the communist ideology. In Pol Pot’s Cambodia, the workers and even the peasants (the two main productive forces which should construct socialism) lived in total terror. They did not think about how to build a classless and stateless society based on the teachings of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism. Instead of that, they spent their time thinking if they would live to see another day or not (even the anti-religious struggle of the “Red” Khmers was conducted in a wrong and counter-revolutionary manner, because it was launched rightly after Pol Pot reached power, at a time when Cambodian people was still not
ready to embrace atheism, and thus instead of removing religion in an efficient manner, the Pol Pot regime strengthened religious feelings because Cambodian people saw religion as a factor of unity against the rulers which were repressing them in such a harsh way. The anti-religious struggle which Mao launched in China was also inconsistent and ineffective, although that was due to reasons linked with the incoherence of that struggle, because on one side Mao affirmed he wanted to combat Buddhism, but on the other side, his own ideology was strongly influenced by that religion. The wrong anti-religious strategies followed by Mao in China and by Pol Pot in Cambodia are an antithesis of the revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist struggle against religion as it was conducted in Soviet Union of Comrades Lenin and Stalin and in Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver Hoxha).

In such conditions, it is impossible to speak about dictatorship of the proletariat. Under a genuine proletarian dictatorship, the workers and the peasants must enjoy the greatest liberty, they should be free to expand and develop their Marxist-Leninist ideology in order to achieve socialist and later communist society. This happened in Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and in Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver. These two states were by far the most democratic that ever existed, rightly because they were authentic proletarian dictatorships.

And as if that was not enough, the Pol Pot regime even provided the world reaction with another “anti-communist weapon”. If we observe the disgusting books about the so-called “communist crimes” which are largely published in the repugnant bourgeois media, we will conclude that nearly all of them refer to “the Cambodian genocide”, to the “Cambodian killing fields” or to the “the mass killings perpetrated by the communists in Cambodia”, etc…Those false qualifications of the Cambodian genocide which try to paint it as a “communist atrocity” are nothing more than evidence of how desperate the international reaction is in trying to justify the tyrannical imperialist-capitalist system which oppresses humanity today more than ever. Of course, this is not to deny that mass killings happened in Cambodia under Pol Pot. Undoubtedly, there were horrible killings. But, contrary to the desires of the bourgeois ideologues, it was not a “communist crime”, even because the so-called “communist crimes” never existed, they are nothing more than a fabrication by the bourgeoisie. Communism is the highest of all ideals, it is the most noble of all ideologies, and the bourgeois concept of “crime” is totally incompatible not only with communist ideology in itself, but also with the process of edification of a socialist and communist society. In socialist edification, the proletariat and its revolutionary party commit no crimes, but only acts of justice against the awful oppressors.

On the contrary, the course and the outcome of the Pol Pot regime clearly indicate that the killings which occurred in Cambodian were actions of an anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary nature, because they precluded the Cambodian people from establishing the proletarian dictatorship and from edifying socialism. The fact that Pol Pot qualified himself as
the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Cambodia does not change anything:

“History does not know any case of a country which has engaged or has achieved socialism under the direction of a non-Marxist-Leninist party or political organization. (...) It is true that nowadays there are a lot of people who talk about socialism, there are also a lot of parties which are pretending to be authentic socialist parties and which are pretending to lead the struggle for socialism. However, we can never judge things simply according with the words and the names that those people and those parties attribute to themselves. On the contrary, it is necessary to judge their actions, their concrete attitudes and the policies followed by them, all this with the objective of observing to whom are those people and parties serving and who profits from their views and actions.” (PLA, A propos des thèses concernant le Xe Congrès du Parti communiste Italien, article published in the newspaper Zëri I Popullit, on 17-18 November of 1962, in Les idées du marxisme-léninisme triompheront du révisionnisme, Tirana, 1964, translated from french language).

Concluding, the regime imposed in Cambodia by Pol Pot can be qualified as a reactionary anti-communist bloodthirsty dictatorship whose objective was to paralyze the socialist revolutionary aspirations of the oppressed Cambodian people in order to facilitate Cambodia’s exploitation by foreign imperialisms, especially by Chinese social-imperialism.

Comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA severely criticized the Pol Pot regime and understood that it was a result of chinese social-imperialism and of Maoist anti-Marxist ideological deviationism:

“In regard to Cambodia, our Party and state have condemned the bloodthirsty activities of the Pol Pot clique, a tool of the Chinese social-imperialists. We hope that the Cambodian people will surmount the difficulties they are encountering as soon as possible and decide their own fate and future in complete freedom without any «guardian».” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the VIII Congress of the PLA, Tirana, 1981).

In 1979, Vietnam invaded Cambodia and Pol Pot was finally overthrew, in what represented a dispute between two exploitative and anti-Marxist cliques which symbolized pro-Soviet revisionism (Vietnam’s ruling clique) and pro-Chinese revisionism (Pol Pot’s ruling clique). It’s important to note that, throughout his rule, Pol Pot was also supported by American Imperialism, which provided his “government” with diplomatic recognition (even after knowing about the atrocities committed by it). The Americans also supported the “Red” Khmers in their disputes against pro-Soviet Vietnam. If Pol Pot was a true communist, would the Americans give him this kind of help? Obviously not. They supported Pol Pot because his ideology entirely
coincided with their own.

After analyzing some of the effects of Maoist social-imperialism, we will now turn to another happening which occurred in Deng Xiaoping’s China, and which still attracts a lot of attention all over the world: the Tiananmen events of 1989.

In the beginning of this article, we observed how the former Chinese bourgeoisie linked with foreign imperialism suffered a tremendous defeat with the 1949 revolution, which promoted the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie. Nonetheless, that former bourgeoisie of the compradore type never stopped trying to reconquer its lost power, and the last attempt made by that class to achieve that purpose was precisely the Tiananmen “pro-democracy movement”, as it was called by the western media. This “movement” was led by the surviving elements of the Chinese bourgeoisie of the compradore type linked with the Kuomintang and was promoted by the western powers which were afraid of the competition that an imperialist China would represent to them. Fang Lizhi, the main “leader” of the “movement”, even made a tournée in nearly all western capitals in order to win the support of the western leaders towards the “pro-democratic” movement which was about to be launched. Of course, this ridiculous “pro-democracy” movement represented nothing more than the interests of China’s imperialist rivals who wanted to freely exploit and penetrate into China’s markets with the purpose of transforming the country into the semi-colonial state it was before 1949. Of course, the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie was not stupid and knew very well that from the moment it let the other imperialisms penetrate China, those foreign imperialisms would try to overthrow its power with the purpose of transforming China into a semi-colonial country again. In order to avoid that, the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie fabricated a scheme which would permit to utilize foreign investments without submitting to the western imperialisms. That scheme consisted in letting foreign capitals and investments penetrate China, but only in certain industrial branches, especially in light industry. And this because while the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie has imperialist ambitions and wants to turn China into the new superpower, it also has a clear notion that it is fundamental not to permit the investments of foreign imperialisms in strategic economic branches (heavy industry), because otherwise the anti-Chinese capitalist rivals would undermine China’s imperialist ascension. Therefore, under the guise of criticizing “socialism” and of demanding “free market reforms”, the Tiananmen “movement” was in fact criticizing the domination of the Chinese economic and political apparatus by the monopolist bourgeoisie, and at the same time it was struggling in favor of a totally submissive pro-western regime which would get the former Chinese bourgeoisie compradore back in power to serve the interests of the foreign imperialists. Those “students” which were “demonstrating” in Tiananmen had absolutely nothing to do with democracy, they were only the instruments used by China’s imperialist rivals with the objective of urging the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie to remove the
obstacles which it put to foreign imperialists’ penetration in the most important branches of the state monopolist industry.

China’s imperialist rivals suffered a great defeat when the Tiananmen “movement” was obliterated by the security forces at the service of the monopolist bourgeoisie. In face of this, the western powers hypocritically started to scream about the “lack of human rights in China”, or about the “lack of democracy in China”, but there was nothing that they could do. The crushed Tiananmen “movement” was their last chance to reverse China’s ascension as a new superpower.

Today’s China is an entirely capitalist and imperialist country with huge class inequalities and in which the workers are savagely exploited in favor of the multinational’s superprofits. The political and economic tyranny that the chinese monopolist bourgeoisie exercises over the chinese exploited classes is so intense that we can qualify today’s China as a veritable fascist dictatorship. This is nothing surprising. Long time ago, comrade Enver Hoxha had already predicted this course:

“The black reaction of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping, which seized power, will lead a power struggle in order to build a fascist dictatorship. There will be a fight about world hegemony. The strategy they pursue is only logical. The alliances with American imperialism and the world reaction are logical and normal. Just as normal are the antagonisms and the outbreak of the predatory wars which will result from this fellowship of bandits. (…)"

The currently ruling crew in China and the others who will definitely follow as result of the internal faction fights for power will use Maoism, using it as an anti-historical corpse in order to ruthlessly, shamelessly build a powerful imperialist Chinese state, in unity and in divergence with the other imperialists and through the oppression of peoples who long fought for liberation, independence and socialism and who will fight for it.

The fascist-revisionist Chinese cliques will stop at nothing to antagonise the Chinese people through propaganda and other means and to deceive the world public.” (Enver Hoxha, Letter to Comrade Hysni Kapo, 30th July of 1978).

Of course, the chinese social-fascists try to deny this and even qualify their ferocious economic politics of ultra-liberalism as a “socialist market economy”. In 1992, it was clarified at the 14th CPC National Congress that the goal of the reforms of China’s economic system was to establish a “socialist market economy”. In 1993, the China’s constitution was modified and it was explicitly stipulated that China adopts a “socialist market economy”. The expression “socialist market economy” is not an invention of the chinese revisionists. In fact, this
expression has been used by revisionists and anti-Marxists of all types and represents the total abandonment of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideology and its replacement by bourgeois and capitalist Keynesianist or even neoliberal ideology.

Another major aspect of Chinese revisionism is its tolerance regarding religion. In his book Reflections on China, Comrade Enver Hoxha already noticed the opportunistic stand taken by the CPC towards religion:

“The Chinese propaganda openly implies that religion is not combated in China and that is why it speaks about religious celebrations, about Easter, Bairam, about masses and prayers in the churches and mosques in Peking.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, January 18, 1973, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

“The Chinese will cause ideological confusion not only because they are impelled by the desire to unmask Soviet revisionism, but also because of the whole psychology and the Confucian Asiatic mentality of China and Asiatic idealist philosophy in general. When we speak about philosophy, we cannot exclude the influence of religion on it, the influence of Buddhism, Brahmanism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, these latter to the degree that they make themselves felt on the Asiatic continent and the Chinese subcontinent.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, October 14, 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

And nowadays, when searching on the official site of the CPC, we find an article with this astonishing title: “China Highlights Role of Buddhism in Promoting Social Harmony.” (!!!!!!!) In this article from 2008, it is gladly affirmed that China is home to “100 million Buddhism adherents, as well as some 200,000 monks and nuns in 130,000 monasteries and convents.” Furthermore, it is said that:

“(…) the doctrines of Buddhism are officially recognized by the atheist government as a conducive vehicle to help with the creation of a harmonious society.”

According to Ye Xiaowen, director of China’s State Administration for Religious Affairs, whose words are quoted in this article:

"This policy coincides with the Communist Party of China's ambitious campaign to "build a harmonious society" initiated by President Hu Jintao in 2005, when he urged state and Party leaders to prioritize social harmony on their agenda. Wealth disparity and materialism have not just created strains and tensions in modern China, but an ideological vacuum. Many feel lost, spiritually and morally. Buddhist clergies believe Buddhism offers peace of mind to fill the vacuum.”
Can anybody imagine a more reactionary and anti-communist attitude than that of a party which calls itself “communist”, but which not only tolerates religion but also propagates it with the purpose of accomplishing “social harmony” and “peace of mind”? Throughout history, religion has always been an instrument used by the dominant classes to keep the oppressed workers in bondage, thus facilitating their exploitation by the elites. Under socialism, all religions, without exception, must be harshly fought and replaced by an atheist and materialist scientific culture. As it was already referred in this article, Soviet Union of Comrades Lenin and Stalin and Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver Hoxha are the best examples about how to correctly struggle against religion and all kinds of superstitions and obscurantism.

On the contrary, the chinese social-fascists which are ruling China clearly see Buddhist religion as a valuable instrument to neutralize the revolutionary aspirations of the chinese oppressed masses and to alienate those masses from the daily sufferings that are imposed on them by the ultra-capitalist and social-imperialist system which is governing China.

Throughout their political course, the Chinese social-fascists completely obliterated the fundamental class question. They affirm that China is a socialist country because “the means of production are nationalized and the economy is still controlled by the state”. This affirmation is false because the fact that there is economical planning does not change anything; everything depends of what class is effectively in power. In capitalism, the bourgeoisie dominates economical and political power and through that, it tries to dominate every sphere of the worker’s life. This state of things can only be changed through a socialist revolution which establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, while bourgeoisie is in power, it does not matter if that bourgeoisie adopts a more planned or a more “free” version of the capitalist economical system. And this because, while the proletariat does not achieve power through violent revolutionary means, the economical system will always have a capitalist nature, even because the option made by a determined bourgeoisie between a capitalist system with more “planned” characteristics and a capitalist system with “free market” characteristics is intimately linked with the circumstantial interests of that bourgeois class. There are historical occasions in which it is more beneficial to the bourgeoisie to practice a capitalist “planned” economy, and there are others in which is more beneficial to that same bourgeoisie to practice a capitalist “free market” economy. One of the best examples of this is precisely the tactic followed by the chinese national bourgeoisie. During the first phase of it development, the chinese national bourgeoisie chose to practice a capitalist economy with “planned” features (this phase corresponded to Mao’s rule and its “planned” characteristics mislead many people around the world about the true capitalist character of this economical system) , while in the later phases of its development, it chose to practice a capitalist economy with “free market” features (these phases correspond to Deng’s and his successors governments and lasts until the present
Deng Xiaoping once said that:

"(...) Practice of a market economy is not equivalent to capitalism because there are also markets under socialism."

This statement clearly shows the revisionist character of its author. It is true that in the first phases of socialist edification, it can happen that some minor markets still persist. But that should not be something definitive. On the contrary, the markets which continue to exist after the proletarian revolution will disappear gradually but firmly with the development of the edification of socialist and communist society. And even in the first stages of socialism the minor markets should never be allowed to constitute a form of exploitation and of bourgeois-capitalist restoration; they should be subjected to total control by the proletarian state which must always keep in mind that the final objective is the elimination of those minor markets. In the late 40’s and early 50’s, Comrade Enver noted that Albania was the country in which the proletarian nationalizations were accomplished more quickly and in which the internal free market was more reduced. Comrade Enver Hoxha frequently remarked that one of the causes of the success of socialist implementation in Albania was the fact that in that country the internal markets were reduced to a minimum and the PLA was struggling for their total eradication simultaneously with the deepening of socialist edification. But in Maoist and revisionist China, the opposite happened. The CPC never wanted to eliminate markets. On the contrary, it strengthened internal markets in order to allow the national bourgeoisie to exploit the Chinese proletariat and to consolidate its class power.

This is also closely related with what the Chinese revisionists call “socialism with chinese characteristics”. As every revisionist current, Maoist revisionism also propagates its own “chinese socialism”, alongside with the Titoites’ “Yugoslav Socialism”, with Thorez social-chauvinist “French road to socialism”, and with many others. Of course, there can be certain national particularities which will dictate some specificities of socialist construction. However, Comrade Stalin and Comrade Enver Hoxha always underlined that those specificities are always limited to minor and secondary aspects of the socialist edification and can never be extended to its essential characteristics, because socialist and communist edification must follow a certain and invariable line in accordance with the teachings of the Classics, regardless of the place in which socialism is being built.

Nowadays, the bourgeois-reactionary parties which call themselves “Marxist-Leninist-Maoist” are continuing the anti-Marxist and pro-capitalist mission started by Mao. Their final aim is to definitively thwart world socialist revolution, consequently perpetuating imperialism and
capitalism. They defend Maoist bourgeois ideology and even dare to affirm that Mao is the “fifth Classic of Marxism-Leninism”, alongside Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. However, it is remarkable that, on one side, they consider Stalin as one of the Classics, but on the other side, they say that their ideology is “Marxism-Leninism-Maoism”, thus totally obliterating any mention to Stalin or to Stalinism. This apparent contradiction is not surprising. In 1960, Mao used Stalin’s name and legacy trying to become the leader of the world communist movement with the objective of assuring China’s imperialist dominance over the oppressed peoples. Mao hid his anti-communist ideology and views under the mask of the “defense of Stalin”. Just like Mao did in the 60’s, today’s Maoists also utilize Stalin’s glorious name in order to mislead the world proletarians and to convince them to follow an ideology which represents the interests of the bourgeois and capitalist classes. One of the main instruments used by the Maoists to achieve this is precisely the Marxist phraseology and the “revolutionary” appearance which characterizes Mao Zedong Though. Therefore, we can affirm that the tricks and the deceptions which had been used by Mao and his revisionists successors with the purpose of protecting bourgeois class interests and of transforming China into an imperialist superpower are still widely used by Maoist “groups” and “parties”.

There are two main currents within world maoist movement. The first is the one which is assumedly revisionist and social-fascist and which considers today’s China as a socialist country. This current has a tendency to disappear and it’s becoming more and more discredited because only openly reactionaries can affirm that today’s social-Darwinist China is a socialist (?!?) country. This current “proves” the alleged “socialist” character of China by saying that only a socialist country could experiment such a meteoric economic development and expansion as China is doing. Of course, this absurd affirmation simply doesn’t hold water. There are many historical examples of capitalist countries which also experienced tremendous economical growth and that certainly didn’t make those countries turn socialist. The case of the United States between 1850 and 1928 is a vivid example. During that historical period, the United States knew an incredible and almost uninterrupted economical growth. Therefore, according to those Maoists, we can conclude that between 1850 and 1928 the United States of America were edificating socialism!!!! This conclusion is so ridiculous that we will not waste our time commenting it further.

The Constitution of the Communist Party of China states that:

“Under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of China led the people of all ethnic groups in the country in their prolonged revolutionary struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, winning victory in the new-democratic revolution and founding the People’s Republic of China, a people’s democratic dictatorship.” (Constitution of the Communist Party of China, amended and adopted at the
This paragraph is quite interesting. First of all, it is curious to note that they consider that the “revolutionary struggle” guided by Mao Zedong was waged against what they call imperialism, feudalism and...bureaucrat-capitalism! Apparently, the Chinese revisionists think that not all capitalism is bureaucratic but only a part of it, and they even explicitly affirm that the struggle of the CPC was directed against bureaucrat-capitalism. Therefore, we conclude that, according to the Chinese revisionists themselves, Mao Zedong and the CPC only fought against a bureaucratic kind of capitalism, and not against all kinds of capitalism. Of course, bearing the CPC’s historical course in mind, we must conclude that when the Chinese revisionists are referring to the struggle against bureaucrat-capitalism, they are referring to the struggle against the former bourgeoisie of the compradore type whose interests were in opposition with those of the Chinese national bourgeoisie which Mao and the CPC defended and fortified.

In fact, every Marxist-Leninist knows that capitalism has always a bureaucratic nature, it is never dynamic nor progressive nor “human”, contrary to what its propagandists claim. Therefore, if we fight against capitalism, we must also fight against the bureaucratic nature which is inherent to it. Consequently, it does not make any sense to say that we will fight against bureaucratic-capitalism, because all capitalism is bureaucratic. To say the contrary is to be a complete opportunist and a counter-revolutionary which tries to distinguish between the “bad” capitalism (bureaucratic-capitalism) and the “good” capitalism (non bureaucratic-capitalism), when every communist knows that there is never a “good” capitalism, that all kinds and types of capitalism, without exception, are always and invariably bad and dreadful.

But there is more. In the same paragraph, we are told that, under the leadership of Mao Zedong, the CPC transformed China into a “people’s democratic dictatorship”. In truth, when analyzing the Constitution of the CPC, we cannot find a single mention to the proletarian dictatorship. Instead, we find this thing called “people’s democratic dictatorship”. One is left to wonder about what the Chinese revisionists mean with this expression. People’s democratic dictatorship? What do they mean with “people”? Looking back again to the CPC’s historical and ideological course, we cannot avoid concluding that, in Maoists’ view, the national bourgeoisie is also included in what they call “people”. Therefore, we observe that the Constitution of the CPC which was adopted in 2007 follows exactly the same ideological line that we had already found in Mao’s book New Democracy which was written in 1940! This a clear proof that the imaginary division which some Maoists draw between the CPC before Mao’s death (labeled as “socialist”, “ideologically pure”, “revolutionary”, etc...) and the CPC’s of Deng Xiaoping and his successors is nothing more than an imaginary and non-existent division. The ideological line followed by the CPC’s was always totally coherent with the class interests served by the party. The CPC’s invariably adopted a strategy and a line in total accordance with the interests of the
chinese national bourgeoisie, later turned into a veritable monopolist bourgeoisie.

The Maoists who argue that Deng Xiaoping and his successors are “traitors” to Mao’s “socialist line” constitute the second current within the Maoist movement. This current is as revisionist and social-fascist as the first one, but tries to cover its character through claiming the “purity of Maoism as the third development of Marxism-Leninism” and through the fake “denouncement” of what they call “the capitalist betrayal in China”. Accordingly with this last current, Mao was “betrayed” by what these Maoists call “the rightist section of the CPC”. Therefore, they pretend to defend “Mao’s socialist legacy” against capitalist development in China after Mao’s death (one of the main criticisms that this trend directs towards Comrade Enver is that he “had not the clairvoyance to distinguish between Mao and the Chinese pro-capitalist leaders which betrayed him” – as if there was some kind of substantial or ideological difference between them!!!) While the other current is openly pro-capitalist, this second current is much more hypocritical and treacherous, because it has a much more “revolutionary” and “Marxist” outlook. This trend is the dominant inside Maoist movement precisely because it is the one which better misleads the world proletariat and which better convinces the oppressed classes to support a counter-revolutionary ideology like Maoism.

One of the organizations included in this last trend of the Maoist movement is the so-called Union Obrera Comunista (UOC), a neo-revisionist organization which has the purpose of perpetuating capitalism. In order to achieve this task, the UOC tries by all means to discredit Stalinism-Hoxhaism, because Maoists perfectly know that Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the only ideology which can lead the world proletariat towards world socialist revolution. Maoists fear Comrade Enver Hoxha very much, because they are aware that Comrade Enver Hoxha is the Fifth Classic of Marxism-Leninism and not Mao Zedong; and they fear Hoxhaist ideology also because this is the only ideology which gave concrete historical proofs of being capable of unmask the reactionary and pro-capitalist character of the Mao Zedong Thought. In April of 2011, the official newspaper of the UOC arrogantly remarks that:

“(…)[W]here is an objective tendency within the international communist movement towards the reorganization of the Marxist-Leninists-Maoists (…) Therefore, we understand the desperation of the Hoxhaist International (Comintern SH) which on 6th of February published a “Declaration of war against the Maoists”, an attack which, as happened with the trotskyists, shows the wicked face of the bourgeois detachments inside the communist movement (…) which in all history have never been able to accomplish a single victorious revolution (…).” (UOC, Semanário Revolución Obrera, 18th April of 2011, translated from Spanish language).

It's outrageous the way in which those social-fascists and defenders of chinese
imperialism dare to compare us Stalinist-Hoxhaists with the trotskyists and to qualify us as “bourgeois detachments inside the communist movement”!!!

Maoism is nothing more than chinese fascism. And it's really shameful to see Maoists’ logo...to see how they consider the fascist Mao, the lover of Franco and Pinochet, the great friend of American imperialism, the main architect of chinese imperialism which exploits and oppresses the peoples of the entire world as the 5th head of “Marxism-Leninism-Maoism”!!!! It's deplorable to see how they put Mao side by side with such great communists as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. They accuse us of being desperate, but they are the ones which say that “in all history of the proletarian revolution, they (Stalinists-Hoxhaists) could not make a single successful revolution”. No comments. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are the followers and continuers of the Communist Party of the SU (B) and of the Labour Party of Albania, which were the two only Communist parties which accomplished socialist revolution by leading their respective peoples under the dictatorship of the proletariat towards socialist and communist society, no matter if their revolutionary course was ultimately thwarted by revisionist traitors after the deaths of comrade Stalin and of Comrade Enver Hoxha.

To what "successful revolution" are those social-fascists referring to? To the bourgeois chinese "revolution" inspired by confucianism and buddhist religion, which was conducted by a party which was communist only in name and whose objective was to pave the way to china's ascension as a new superpower?

When analyzing Maoist “arguments” against Hoxhaism, we notice that they insult us, but they don't specify their insults, they call us opportunists but they don't explain why. This is quite normal. Maoists can never point a single ideological error in what concerns Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology simply because Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology contains no errors nor in theory, nor in practice. The ideological purity of the Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology is in total contrast with Maoism reactionary eclecticism.

In the excerpt, we can also note that the Maoists of the UOC try to compare us Hoxhaists with the Trotskysites. This abject “argument” has been widely used by the Maoist revisionists. For example, in its First May Declaration entitled “Joint message to the workers of the world”, the UOC states that:

“The unity of the communists must be conquered on the base of the defense of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism against all attacks (...) and, especially, against rightist opportunism which is nothing more than genuine revisionism and which is allied with Trotskyism and Hoxhaism, occupying the place of the bourgeois detachments inside workers’ movement which deny Maoism as the third and the highest stage of the development of proletarian ideology.” (UOC,
And in other occasions, the Maoists stated that:

“Hoxhaism joins Trotskyism in its denial of the necessity of organizing the peasantry.”

This comparison is totally false. If we properly and honestly analyze the ideological nature and the historical role played by each of them, we will easily conclude that Trotskyism and Hoxhaism are intrinsically opposite ideologies. Trotskyism tried to deny the thesis of the socialism in a single country at a time when acceptance of this thesis was essential to the survival of the October Revolution and of the socialist edification in Soviet Union. On the contrary, Hoxhaism proved that even a backward and semi-colonial country can apply this thesis in a successful manner if it is guided by an authentic proletarian and Marxist-Leninist party.

Trotskyites always negated the glorious legacy of Stalin, calumniating him in order to prevent the world proletariat from overthrowing capitalism. On the contrary, the PLA of Comrade Enver Hoxha was the only party which consistently and coherently defended Stalin’s splendid inheritance against all kinds of revisionists and deviators, including Maoists.

Trotskyism completely denied the role of the peasantry in the revolution. On the contrary, Hoxhaism recognizes that role. Indeed, the first partisan detachments of the Communist Party of Albania which fought against the Axis during the Second World War were mainly composed by peasants. However, Hoxhaism refuses to see peasants as “the main force of the revolution” as does Maoism, because Comrade Enver Hoxha knew that only the proletariat guided by its vanguard party can lead the workers towards socialist revolution and establish a communist society. Therefore, the claims that Trotskyism = Hoxhaism are nothing more than a proof of the anti-communist nature of Maoism.

It is Maoism which has everything in common with Trotskyism. Just like Mao, Trotsky also defended the existence of various parties under socialism. In his “Program of Transition”, Trotsky affirmed that:


And the fascists of the MLM also state that:
“The President Mao was criticized by both the rightists and the leftists, but he always insisted in the struggle between multiple currents within the proletarian party, and it was like that since the beginnings of the Communist Party of China until the Cultural Revolution.” (Unión Obrera Comunista, Letter received from the committee of popular struggle “Manolo Bello”, 12th May 2011, translated from Spanish language).

In this paragraph, we see that the “Marxist-Leninist-Maoists” recognize and praise the anti-Marxist and ultra-revisionist conception of Mao Zedong according to which the maintenance of numerous non-communist tendencies inside the “communist” party is something positive which should be stimulated. To defend this reactionary and opportunistic conception is to openly defend the evil bourgeois dictatorship and the totalitarian capitalist system. To defend this idea is to defend wretched bourgeois pluralism which also preaches the “diversity of opinions within society”.

And we should remember that the MLM is one of the more “leftist” factions of the entire Maoist Movement. Therefore, even the “orthodox” section of the Maoist movement loves bourgeois pluralism very much and has no problems about assuming that depraved love.

Recently, the Maoists again exposed their ultra-revisionist face in the context of the events in Nepal. After centuries of absolute and despotic monarchy, the king of Nepal was overthrown and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) took power. However, this was not a revolutionary nor Marxist-Leninist takeover, because a party based on Maoist ideology can never be revolutionary nor Marxist-Leninist. In fact, instead of establishing a proletarian dictatorship towards the edification of socialist and communist society, the “C”PN (Maoist) abjectly capitulated to the repulsive bourgeois legalism and parliamentarism.

There was another party which was also “opposed” to the Nepalese absolute monarchy. It was the Nepali Congress, an openly bourgeois party of social-democratic ideology which is linked with the interests of Indian imperialism in Nepal. Of course, if the CPN (Maoist) was a truly communist party, it should have smashed the Nepali Congress whose pro-capitalist ideology was poisoning the minds of the Nepalese people and preventing the country from taking the socialist road. The revolutionary violence which is inherent to the proletarian dictatorship serves precisely to eliminate bourgeois parties and influences. But the CPN (Maoist), faithfully following the reactionary and anti-communist nature of Maoist ideology, not only did not implement the proletarian dictatorship, but also organized elections of bourgeois style (!!!!). In these elections, the Nepali Congress won and the leader of that party is currently governing Nepal. Consequently, the CPN (Maoist) accepted defeat and left power, thus acting as the well behaved bourgeois party that it is.
Long time ago, Comrade Stalin taught us that a genuine revolutionary party cannot wait until the majority of the people has acquired Marxist-Leninist conscience to seize power. On the contrary, the communist party must conquer power as soon as possible, and it is after the seizure of power that the Marxist-Leninist party must start to educate and temper the exploited classes which still not have a developed revolutionary conscience and ideology. As can be seen, the CPN (Maoist) acted in the opposite manner and helped to perpetuate capitalist and bourgeois-imperialist dominance in Nepal.

The “orthodox” current of the Maoist Movement hypocritically qualifies the attitudes of the CPN (Maoist) as “revisionist”. However, this false criticism is completely unmasked by the fascists of the MLM themselves which, immediately after qualifying the CPN (Maoist) as revisionist, affirm that:

“The red faction within the CPN (M) is supported by the international maoist organizations. It is our duty to support it in order to facilitate the advancement of the New Democracy Revolution in Nepal.” (Unión Obrera Comunista, Letter received from the committee of popular struggle “Manolo Bello”, 12th May 2011, translated from Spanish language).

Therefore, they criticize the CPN (M) not from truly Marxist-Leninist and anti-revisionist standpoints, but only because they want the replacement of the open revisionism of the CPN (M) by another kind of revisionism, one with a more “revolutionary”, “popular” and “Marxist” outlook; one which is more able to deceive the Nepalese people and to turn proletarian and socialist revolution impossible. This is evident in the defense that these “orthodox Maoists” still do of the social-fascist New Democracy fabricated by Mao. The reactionary and pro-capitalist nature of this “New Democracy” was already exposed in this article and there is no need to repeat it.

MLM also claims the defense of the so-called “Naxalite Movement” in India. This “Movement” is mainly inspired by Mao Zedong Thought and is operating in many districts of India. The Naxalites are labeled by the world bourgeoisie and by the Indian reaction as “communists”, but this qualification is not correct. Since 1978, from the moment that a party or a certain “movement” assumes that it is based on Maoism, that is equivalent to openly affirm that the party or “movement” in question is anti-communist.

The Naxalite movement begun in 1967 and claims to be leading a “people’s war” against the repressive Indian government. Accordingly with the leaders of the “movement”, the Naxalite combatants are mostly recruited among the poorest strata of the population and it is quite possible that those leaders are saying the true. But the fact that its members come from the
lower classes does not mean that a certain movement is progressive, let alone Marxist-Leninist. The fact that the Naxalite movement is mainly composed by people from the poor classes only proves how much can Maoism deceive the exploited masses and neutralize their revolutionary aspirations.

The activities developed by the Naxalite Movement are not revolutionary nor Marxist-Leninist. Indeed, they have striking similarities with the actions of the anarchists or of the nihilists. The “revolutionary activities” undertaken by the Naxalites consist in organizing terrorist attacks mostly in the countryside (although sometimes also in cities), killing large amounts of people. The Naxalites claim that these attacks are intended to kill the members of the bourgeois security forces, but the truth is that, together with the members of the armed forces, the attacks of the Naxalites also kill oppressed working people. For example, in the year 2009, the Naxalites killed around 600 civilians and only 300 members of the security forces. This means that the number of civilians killed by the attacks doubled that of the members of the armed forces who died in the same circumstances. And we must bear in mind that the Naxalites mainly operate in poor areas, therefore the immense majority of the civilians killed by them belong to the exploited classes.

It is obvious that these kind of activities have as result the detachment of the Indian masses from communist ideology. If the actions of the Naxalites only detached Indian workers from Maoism, that would not be a problem; on the contrary, it would be a very good thing. But unfortunately, the bourgeoisie misleads the proletariat and defends its class interests by painting Maoism as an inseparable part of the communist ideology. Thus, when condemning and fearing the terrorist actions of the Naxalites, the Indian workers feel compelled to condemn and fear not only the Maoist ideology which inspires the Naxalites, but also the entire Marxist-Leninist ideology and movement which, under the manipulation of the bourgeoisie, they see as inescapably linked with Naxalite terrorism.

The fascists of the MLM qualify the activities of the Naxalites as a “people’s war”. In truth, it is not only relatively to the Naxalite movement that the anti-communists of the MLM speak about “people’s war”. This expression is permanently on their lips. But what does this notion really means?

The political-military concept of “people’s war” was invented by Mao Zedong to be applied to China’s conditions (although it was also used by the Nicaraguan Sandinists, by the Cuban Revisionists, by the Nepalese opportunists, and even by the Irish republican nationalists of the IRA). The “people’s war” is intended to be mostly applied in semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries, in which the peasantry represents the majority of the population. The “people’s war” is also closely related with the “encirclement of the city by the countryside”, because Mao
defends that it is in the countryside that the so-called “revolutionary forces” should start the “guerrilla warfare” against the bourgeois government. The “people’s war” is divided in three stages:

1º - Strategic defense: formation of peasant militias with the purpose of starting the guerrilla warfare. The “warriors” should try to gain the support of the peasants through propaganda and to establish a revolutionary base area.

2º - The “revolutionary” army grows and launches more attacks against the state and its forces. It forms more revolutionary base areas and initiates programs such as the agrarian reform.

3º - This is the final part of the “people’s war”. It is the stage in which the war intensity reaches its highest degree and in which the city must be conquered and the government must be overthrown.

It is evident that this concept of “people’s war” is totally anti-Marxist because the entire idea is centered on the already referred Maoist thesis according to which it is the peasantry and not the proletariat which should lead the revolution. The same happens with every stage of the “people’s war”. Mao defends that the “revolutionary” war should begin on the countryside and be mainly supported and waged by the peasants. If we follow Mao’s thought concerning the course of this “people’s war”, we will easily conclude that in this war there is no place left to the proletariat. During the entire process of the “people’s war”, the determinant role is invariably attributed by Mao to the peasantry and to the countryside. It is in the countryside that the decisive struggles are waged, and it is the peasantry that provides the great majority of the members and leaders of the “revolutionary army”. In truth, only at the final part of the third stage Mao allows that the “revolutionary fighters” should capture cities. And we must note that, even in this final stage, the cities will be conquered by “revolutionary guerrillas” mainly composed by peasants.

In other words, the dominant and leading role that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha attribute to the proletariat is completely obliterated by Mao in this anti-communist concept of “people’s war”. However, this is not something astonishing because it is not only in what respects to the “people’s war” that Mao denies the dominant role of the proletariat. In fact, Mao denies the leading role of the proletariat throughout his ideological writings and also throughout his entire political career; from 1940 book “New Democracy” to his “reflections” about the “Cultural Revolution” in the late 60’s.

The use of the expression “people’s war” is also frequently used by the Maoists to hide their support for the participation and inclusion of the “radical” and “progressive” bourgeoisie in
This “revolutionary” and “popular” war.

This is not to say that the exploited classes will not need to wage war against the bourgeoisie in order to implement the proletarian dictatorship. It is not the idea of the “peoples’ war” that is entirely wrong, but the Maoist definition of it. To achieve power, the oppressed masses must declare war on the ruling classes, but this war can only be communist and revolutionary if it is led by the proletariat. There is no other class or popular branch who can replace the principal and indispensable role that the proletariat has to play in the revolution. On the other side, the proletariat must be organized around a veritable and centralized Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist party which must be free from all kinds of revisionist tendencies (including Maoism, of course).

If the proletarian control starts to observe that some revisionist currents are appearing within the communist party and that those currents are able to undermine and sabotage the socialist edification, then the proletarian dictatorship has not only the right but also the duty to purge the party from all the elements that are linked with the revisionist deviations. This was what happened in the Soviet Union of Comrades Lenin and Stalin and in Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver Hoxha. In both countries, there were periods of war in the traditional sense of the word against the internal and external oppressors: the Russian Civil War in the case of Soviet Union, and the National Liberation War in Socialist Albania’s case. And after the respective victories of the Russian and Albanian Marxist-Leninists, the proletarian class struggle against the exploiters didn’t stop; on the contrary, it intensified even more with the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat in both countries (we must always keep in mind that this class war against the exploiters goes on during the entire period of socialist edification right until communism is utterly achieved).

Of course that in Maoist China, the so-called “people’s war” only served the interests of the chinese national bourgeoisie in defeating the bourgeoisie-compradore and the foreign imperialisms which were thwarting its economical and political ascension.

In fact, the Maoist expression “people’s war” must be replaced by the expression “proletarian revolutionary war”. This last expression permits to retain the notion of the necessity of the armed struggle against the capitalist oppressors while simultaneously underlining the decisive and major role that the proletariat has to play in that struggle for the triumph of the authentic revolution. Additionally, we can never forget that the proletarian revolutionary war must be always conducted by the vanguard party of the proletariat, which must be free from opportunisms and dogmatisms of all kinds and which must always keep in mind the complete establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. And we must also remember that, in the present globalized conditions, the proletarian revolutionary war should be waged at a world scale.
It is obvious that this genuinely proletarian and communist war is in total contrast with the petty-bourgeois and anarchistic fights of the Naxalite Maoist movement. First of all, the “founding father” of the Naxalites was an Indian Maoist called Charu Majumdar, which in 1967 led a peasant uprising in Naxalbari (that is the reason for the name of the movement).

His main work was the “Historic Eight Documents”, which has been seen as providing the ideological foundation of the Naxalites. In the “Historic Eight Documents”, Majumdar argues that Indian revolution must take the path of armed struggle on the pattern of the Chinese revolution. With this, we easily understand that the Naxalite movement is Maoist to the bone (and thus revisionist, reactionary and anti-Marxist) since its very foundations. Indeed, it operates mainly in the countryside and its members are mostly peasants, as Mao’s “people’s war” proposed.

And there is still another important aspect in which the Naxalites faithfully fulfill the “teachings” of the “Chairman Mao”: the multiplicity of parties in the leadership of the Naxalite Movement. This is in total agreement with Mao’s defense of various non-proletarian parties under socialism. In fact, the social-imperialists of the MLM want us to believe that “the Communist Party of India (Maoist) is leading the Naxalite movement”. But this is a lie. The CPI (M) is only one among many other “communist” parties which also claim to lead the “Movement”. The truth is that the Naxalite Movement is not composed by a single party; it is composed by various parties which are commonly based on Maoism. Some of the parties which are included in the “movement” apply an ideology which is openly anti-Marxist. For example, the Communist Party of the United States of India defends that caste issues should be precedent over class issues. This is a great error because the caste system is nothing more than a fabrication by the Indian ruling classes in order to deviate the attention of the proletariat from the only question that really matters: the class question. So, on one side these “communist parties” pretend to struggle against the Indian ruling classes, but on the other side, they gladly accept and embrace the ideological inventions and influences of those same ruling classes.

This does not mean that there are not people within the Naxalite movement who sincerely think that they are part of a genuinely revolutionary movement and that, by following Maoism, they are defending Marxism-Leninism. After all, India is a country in which the poor workers (which constitute the main social base of the Naxalites) have to endure a miserable life, with ridiculous salaries and horrendous working conditions. And we must never forget that Maoism is a very treacherous bourgeois ideology, whose “anti-revisionist” and “Marxist” appearance can attract and deceive many honest workers that are genuinely against capitalist system, but that are not correctly informed and that don’t have truly Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideological skills.

A similar situation to that of the Indian Naxalites occurred in Peru with a Maoist group
called the Shinning Path. This group was led by a bourgeois professor known as President Gonzalo (although his real name was Abimael Guzmán). The group’s ideology is a mixture of Maoist revisionism and Guevarist influences and it wants to conquer power in order to implement a system of New Democracy (which means the perpetuation of capitalism and the continuation of workers’ exploitation by the “radical” and “progressive” bourgeoisie). Following the strategy of Maoist “people’s war”, the Shinning Path established base areas and its actions were equivalent to those of the Naxalites. Both “movements” are characterized by their terrorist attacks against the working people, by their obliteration of the role of the proletariat, by their consequent absolutization of the role played by the peasants as the initiators of the “people’s war” and by trying to detach the oppressed masses of the city and of the countryside from Marxism-Leninism.

The Shinning Path reached the peak of activity in the early 80’s and claimed to represent the interests and the aspirations of the Peruvian peasantry, but the truth is that it faced the opposition of large numbers of peasants from the very beginning (there were many occasions in which the peasants attacked the members of the Shinning Path and those conflicts often developed into harsh armed struggles).

The Shinning Path is still active, although it is inexorably declining since the capture of President Gonzalo in the early 90’s. The ideological revisionism and opportunism of the Shinning Path is a direct consequence of its Maoist roots and can be observed in the words of Gonzalo himself, who in 1988 gave an interview to the newspaper “El Diario”:

“El Diario: What will be the attitude of the Communist Party of Peru regarding religion from the moment that the party reaches political power in the country?

President Gonzalo: Marxism taught us how to separate the Church from the State and that will be the first thing that we will do. Secondly, let me repeat that we always respect the freedom of conscience of the people, and we apply the principle according to which people have the right to believe in God, while having also the right to be atheist. This is our attitude.”

This paragraph is just astonishing. And it is astonishing because the Shinning Path is presented everywhere as an orthodox and radical communist group which supposedly would not hesitate to use violence against the bourgeois institutions. However, the answer of Gonzalo concerning the attitude of the Shinning Path towards religion totally destroys that image of Shinning Path as the “hard-line communist organization”.

The purpose of all religions is to prevent the oppressed workers from adhering to communist materialist ideology and from doing the world socialist revolution. Religion always plays an inhibiting role, and we will never be able to achieve world communism if religion is not
totally removed from the workers’ conscience. This is what Marxism really teaches us.

Gonzalo’s proposal about the separation between Church and State is not something new. On the contrary, the principle of the separation between the church and the state has been largely proclaimed by every bourgeois and “liberal” state (even if not applied in practice…). Every Marxist-Leninist knows that the effort to eradicate religion cannot be limited to the separation between the Church and the State. That struggle has to be constituted by an open and ferocious struggle against all kinds of religions, including the use of revolutionary violence against the reactionary as well as against the “progressive” clergy which will attempt to overthrown the proletarian dictatorship and to undermine socialist and communist edification. There can be no mercy towards religious influences and forces. Stalinist-Hoxhaist proletarian ideology will smash all religions like an hurricane.

The words of Gonzalo are proper of a liberal bourgeois, not of someone which qualifies himself as “Marxist”. For the leader of the Shinning Path, people should be free to decide if they believe in God or not; if they want to practice religion or not. This is a totally opportunistic and capitulationist attitude. To act like Gonzalo means an abject capitulation to religions influences, thus permitting that the religious forces can freely thwart socialist revolution in order to restore capitalism and wage slavery.

However, we cannot accuse Gonzalo of being incoherent. On the contrary, he is totally coherent with Mao’s embracement of non-proletarian and anti-communist influences, as is the case of religion.

Another major characteristic of Maoist revisionism is its attempt to annihilate Marxism-Leninism by replacing it with pro-capitalist “Mao Zedong Thought”. This was clearly visible in the case of the Shinning Path. In the interview mentioned above, President Gonzalo (the leader of the Shinning Path) also said that:

“The ideology of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, is the only ideology which is truly powerful (...) it is the product of the extraordinary historical work of such extraordinary men as Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and President Mao Zedong (...) but we will specially underline three of them: Marx, Lenin and President Mao because their work will be continued and fulfilled by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, mainly by Maoism.”

As can be seen, Gonzalo shamelessly tries to erase and deny the tremendous importance of the work of Comrades Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin while ridiculously overestimating a reactionary bourgeois nationalist like Mao!!! In truth, we observe that Gonzalo not only considers Mao as one of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism, but he even tries to paint Mao as being above Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin! Gonzalo’s positions are so intensely
revisionist that we must conclude that when he says that “we will specially underline three of
them: Marx, Lenin and President Mao”, he only mentions Marx and Lenin to avoid being
immediately unmasked as the social-fascist and anti-communist that he is. And Gonzalo’s
reactionarism reaches outrageous levels when we notice the disrespect and disdain which he
shows relatively to Comrades Engels and Stalin, as if their work and legacy are of no value.
Unfortunately, it is not only Gonzalo and the Peruvian Maoists which treat Engels and Stalin in a
scornful way. All Maoists without exception treat the communist legacy of these two Comrades
in the same manner. Of course, what the Maoists really want is to totally expunge also the
names of Comrades Marx and Lenin, but, as happened with Gonzalo, they don’t dare to do that
because if they denied the work of Marx and Lenin they would loose even the smallest
remnants of the “communist” and “revolutionary” masquerade which they use as a disguise to
their social-fascist ideology.

In what concerns Comrade Stalin, the Maoists use the same arguments of the bourgeois
“criticisms” against him as an excuse to deny his magnificent legacy; while the valorous work of
Comrade Engels is simply ignored by the MLM.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that there are five Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx,
Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. All the five Classics have the same value and they
cannot be considered from a purely individual perspective. The legacy of each of them is
intimately related with the legacy of all the others. Although our ideology is called Marxism-
Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, we refuse to underestimate the glorious and irreplaceable work
of Comrade Engels, which is the second Classic of our ideology and has exactly the same
worth as any of the other four Classics.

It is obvious why the Maoists in general and the Shinning Path in particular try to wipe out
and deny the inheritance of the true Classics of Marxism-Leninism. They try to diminish and to
erase the importance of the first four Classics of Marxism-Leninism while simultaneously
misleading the world proletariat about the true identity of the fifth Classic of Marxism-Leninism
(which is Comrade Enver and not Mao) because this is essential to defend the bourgeois and
social-imperialist interests they are serving. Through the replacement of Marx, Engels, Lenin
and Stalin by the fascist Mao they are directing the world workers towards a reactionary
ideology which is detaching the proletariat from the revolution. The main purpose of Maoism is
to eternally maintain the capitalist system by avoiding the outcome of the world socialist
revolution through all means. In order to cover their intentions, the Maoists spend their time
screaming about “world socialist revolution”, “proletarian internationalism”, etc…But the analysis
of the origins, history, actions and consequences of the Mao Zedong Thought totally unmarks
their evil intentions, and clearly shows that expressions like “world socialist revolution” and
“proletarian internationalism” are nothing more than empty lies when said by the Maoists.
Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the only ideology which can fully erase the poisonous influence of Maoism from the conscience of the workers. And this because Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the only ideology which is completely faithful and coherent with the interests of the world socialist revolution: it is the only ideology which is able to successfully lead the world proletariat towards the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and the edification of socialism and communism.

Nowadays, there are Maoist parties in almost every country of the world. The reactionarism which characterizes the Mao Zedong Thought is largely spread among world workers. In face of this, the Maoists certainly think that their wicked ideology will be “the dominant force within the international communist movement”. But they are wrong. It is to us, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, that the future belongs.

We, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, are the only true defenders of the communist ideology, and we are entitled to triumph over the social-imperialist and social-fascist “Maoist movement”.

Maoism is nothing more than a disgusting pro-capitalist and reactionary ideological aberration. The “Mao Zedong Thought” is not a development but a deformation of Marxism-Leninism and thus it will inevitably disappear as will happen with everything which is of bourgeois nature:

“Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist, but a progressive bourgeois revolutionary, more progressive than Liu Shao-chi, but still a centrist revolutionary, who posed as a communist and stood at the head of the Communist Party. Within China, in the party, among the people, and abroad, he had the reputation of a great Marxist-Leninist who fought for the construction of socialism. But his views were not Marxist-Leninist, he did not follow the theory of Marx and Lenin, was a continuer of the work of Sun Yat-sen, but in more advanced positions, and dressed up his views, so to say, with some leftist revolutionary formulas, some Marxist-Leninist theses and slogans. Mao Tsetung posed as a Marxist-Leninist dialectician, but he was not so.”

Mao Tsetung thought» is not Marxism-Leninism and that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist. He did not betray himself, as you might say. We say that Mao is a renegade, is an anti-Marxist, and this is a fact. We say this because he tried to disguise himself with Marxism-Leninism, but in fact he was never a Marxist.

In general, we can say that in some directions the revolution in China had certain features of a tendency to develop on the socialist road, but the measures taken stopped halfway, or were annulled, as they are being annulled at present, and the masks will be dropped one after the other. All these things must be understood by the Chinese people, and they must
be understood outside China, too, because, unfortunately, the whole development of that country, the national liberation war of the Chinese people, the establishment of the progressive bourgeois people's democratic state, has gone down in history as a proletarian revolution (…)” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, December 26, 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English).

When the world proletariat finally takes weapons and overthrows world bourgeoisie, the counter-revolutionary influence of Maoism will definitively be removed from proletarian conscience. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are the only ones who remain faithful to the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. We are the ones which tirelessly fight against all kinds of revisionism, without any exception. Maoism has caused tremendous damages to the Communist Movement, but Maoists’ plans and tricks to deceive the exploited classes will not last forever and will ultimately fail. As Comrade Enver Hoxha once said:

“No force, no torture, no intrigue, no deception can eradicate Marxism-Leninism from the minds and hearts of men.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is anti-communism, Tirana, 1980, edition in English).
World proletariat – unite against Maoist bourgeois ideology!

Fight against the treacherous and pro-capitalist Chinese revisionism!

Don’t be deceived by Maoist apparent “revolutionary” and “Marxist” outlook!

Maoism is nothing more than social-fascism!

Denounce the crimes of Chinese social-imperialism!

Establish the proletarian dictatorship through the armed proletarian world revolution!

Let’s edificate world socialism and world communism!

Long live the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism:

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha!
Long live the Comintern (SH), the only authentic
defender of the proletarian ideology!

Long Live Stalinism-Hoxhaism!

Long Live the World Socialist Revolution!

Declaration of War against Maoists III

1 – Introduction

Among all anti-socialist ideologies that the world bourgeoisie ever managed to fabricate, Maoist ideology can rightly be considered as one of the most treacherous and reactionary:

“One of the most successful instruments of the bourgeoisie to disarm the proletariat and the people are undoubtedly the anti-Leninist “Mao Tsetung Ideas”. By the „Mao Tsetung Ideas“ Chinese revisionism came to power and hindered - in fact - the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, hindered Leninism to come true in China.” (Documents of the Comintern (Stalinists-Hoxhaists), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

In fact, Maoism hides its pro-bourgeois nature behind “Marxist” and “leftist” slogans in order to mislead the proletarians. It is true that Maoism is far from being the only pro-capitalist ideology which hides behind “communist” masks. However, we can affirm that Maoism is one of the best examples of the bourgeois capacity to corrupt Marxism-Leninism and to spread illusions among workers. Just like happened with Trotskyism, Maoism was one of the first reactionary ideologies to cover itself with “anti-revisionist” slogans. Indeed, just like the Maoists also the Trotskyites masked themselves behind “struggle against revisionism” (of course, this was aimed against Stalinism. There are even certain Trotskyites who mask themselves behind the “struggle against Maoism”).

After all, Maoism can be considered as an ideological fabrication invented by the bourgeoisie to prevent workers from acquiring a truly Marxist-Leninist consciousness; that is, when all the other pro-capitalist ideologies have failed to alienate workers, then bourgeoisie utilizes Maoism to do so. Maoism is undoubtedly one of the most perfect creations of the exploiting classes to divert workers from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. And there is no better proof of this than the immense numbers of world proletarians which continue to believe that Maoism is a genuinely socialist ideology. Mao’s “Marxist” disguise is so well done that it even managed to
mislead many experienced and honest communists, especially during the period of Mao’s fake “struggle against Khrushchevism”. That’s why we, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, must reveal Maoism’s veritable character to the broad masses and that’s why our relentless struggle against Maoist ideology cannot stand still.

With this purpose, in the previous first and second parts of the Declaration of War on Maoism (DWM), we tried to expose the main principles of Maoist ideology explaining why Maoism cannot be considered as a revolutionary and communist ideology but on the contrary, it is a deeply revisionist, anti-Marxist and backward ideology whose objective is to pave the way for the imperialist ascension of the Chinese national bourgeoisie. We disclosed the truth behind the concept of “state of New Democracy” invented by Mao to justify the bourgeois domination in the so-called Chinese “socialist revolution” at the detriment of the working classes which continued to be exploited and oppressed by the Chinese national bourgeoisie under “socialistic” cloaks. Indeed, Maoism was intended to mislead the Chinese proletarians, making them believe that socialism was being built in China, and thus hindering the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in the country. These illusions had the purpose of making the Chinese workers support the national “patriotic” bourgeoisie in its quest for consolidating its power against its main rivals: foreign imperialism and the Chinese bourgeoisie of the compradore type. Therefore, the truth is that Maoism started by being nothing more than an ideological instrument fabricated and used by one section of the Chinese exploiting classes against the other sections of those same classes at the expenses of the Chinese proletariat.

Besides this, we tried to analyze the most significant episodes of the history of Chinese revisionism, that is, not only the ones related with the naissance and consolidation of Maoism in itself, but also the ones connected with Mao’s social-imperialist successors who – far from having “betrayed” Mao, as the fascists of the MLM claim – limited themselves to the continuation of Mao’s ideological trajectory towards the transformation of China into a world imperialist superpower.

We reflected about Mao’s supposed “anti-revisionist” struggle against Khrushchev in the early 60’s, revealing it as nothing more than an inter-bourgeois contradiction between two social-fascist leaders who wanted to have total control over the international communist movement in order to better liquidate it. Furthermore, we exposed the class nature and class intentions behind the famous “Great Leap Forward” and the “Great Cultural Revolution” and we also explained how Chinese imperialism tried to prevent the development of socialism in Albania and how comrade Enver Hoxha’s denunciation of Maoist social-fascism elucidated the authentic revolutionaries and directed them towards the correct Marxist-Leninist path of the struggle against all currents of revisionism without exception. The 1978 Sino-Albanian Split was inevitable due to the irreconcilable class contradictions between Socialist Albania and social-fascist China. Comrade Enver’s brilliant books like “Reflections on China”, “Imperialism and the Revolution” and “The Krushchevists” allowed the world revolutionaries to understand what Maoism truly is and taught them how to efficiently struggle against it.

Besides our analysis of the historical course of the “C” PC and our denouncement of its bourgeois and pro-capitalist foundations and aims, we focused on the actions of other Maoist organizations like the Peruvian Shining Path or the Cambodian Khmer Rouge. In both cases, we concluded that the reactionary and pro-imperialist character of Maoism can never inspire authentic Marxist-Leninist organizations, but on the contrary, it can only give birth to social-fascism. The Shining Path and the Khmer Rouge were ultra-revisionist organizations whose purpose was to favor the bourgeoisie and to terrorize working masses, keeping them away from socialism. The Shinning Path and the Khmer Rouge depicted themselves as “communist”, thus inculcating in the oppressed masses the false idea of correlation between the terrorist activities of those Maoist organizations and the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.
Both in the first and second parts of the DWM, we also centered our attention on more recent issues related with the counter-revolutionary activities of the so-called MLM “movement”, such as the anti-socialist Nepalese “Revolution” and the anarchistic-terrorist Naxalite “Revolution” in India. Now - with the third part of the DWM - our objective is to continue our analysis of those anti-socialist ideological actions. In order to do this, we selected a group of Maoist parties and organizations from all continents with the purpose of disclosing their pro-capitalist and reactionary character through the scrutiny of their own documents and ideological principles. All these Maoist parties and organizations are staunch enemies of the world socialist revolution, they do their utmost to prevent the establishment of the world proletarian dictatorship, of world socialism and world communism. For all these reasons, it is our duty as Stalinist-Hoxhaists to continue our coherent and consistent struggle against Maoist revisionism always basing our combat on the immortal teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha.

2 – American continent

The American continent has been under Maoist influence since many decades. This situation is particularly acute in what respects to Latin America, in which, as we shall see, Maoist social-fascism is closely linked with Guevarism – a veritable ideological disease deliberately spread by the bourgeoisie to poison the minds of the exploited workers preventing them from acquiring a genuine socialist consciousness. This Maoist influence in Latin America can be explained through the “ideological seduction” that Maoism’s “leftist” phraseology and pseudo-“Stalinist” positions exercise over the miserable Latin American proletarians. After all, Latin America is still among the most oppressed regions of the world. During many centuries, Latin America was – and continues to be – subjected to the harshest imperialist oppression (coming from both the “traditional” imperialist powers like the USA and from the new imperialist powers like China and Brazil). In face of this, it is not difficult to understand that the socio-economic conditions of Latin America provide a fertile ground to the expansion of Mao’s anti-Marxist “theories” within the ranks of the impoverished Latin American workers. Indeed, Maoism is so thoroughly spread in Latin America that we can only conclude that the exploiting classes favor the adoption of Maoist ideology by the oppressed masses. And – let’s face it – what better manner of misleading the proletarians could they find? They could have never conceived a more favorable ideology than Maoism, because Maoism is an ideology which has a pro-capitalist and social-imperialist content, but at the same time it has a “socialistic” appearance – what transforms Maoism in the perfect weapon to mislead the toiling masses of Latin America who are not aware of Maoism’s inherent reactionary nature.

Indeed, we have to take into account Maoism in relation to the class of the peasants. Latin America was characterized by agriculture, while North America is characterized by industry; peasants in Latin America are the biggest class; and in contrast the industrial proletariat is predominant in North America. Through the overwhelming majority of the peasants in China and Latin-America, we can conclude similarities and parallels of the living conditions of the class of the peasants, and that made it relatively easy to export petty-bourgeois ideology - like Maoism - to Latin America.

Relatively to North America, Maoist influence is not as intense as in Latin America, but this does not mean this it is absent. Quite on the contrary, it has been a serious handicap for the development of socialist revolution in North America. One of the best examples of the noxious influence of Maoism in North America is the former Black Panther Party, an organization of assumed Maoist tendencies which acted like a sect with the alleged purpose of “liberating afro-Americans from oppression and exploitation”. True, Afro-Americans are among the most exploited and oppressed workers in North America, but the Black Panther Party could never achieve their socio-economic liberation. And this because it never managed to renounce to its
nationalist/ anarchist views and actions which – together with its Maoist leanings – prevented
the BPP from ever reaching the deepest aspirations of the North American proletariat. In fact,
as its own name clearly reveals, the Black Panther Party committed a very serious mistake:
since the beginning it openly aimed to “solve the problems of Afro-American workers”, thus
remitting all the other workers to a secondary place and creating a racial division between black
and non-black workers. This is, of course, in total opposition to the teachings of the Classics,
who struggled all their lives to unite the world workers, encouraging them to surpass the
differences related with race or gender.
The Maoist leaders of the BPP often affirmed that “black workers should receive an
indemnization in compensation for the centuries of exploitation and repression against them”.
Besides the fact that the “radical” and “ultra-leftist” Maoist leaders of the BPP sounded like
bourgeois lawyers calling for an “indemnization” to their clients, we must ask: And who would
pay those indemnization? The white workers, who – in most cases – are as miserable and
exploited as black workers and who also endured centuries of oppression and exploitation? And
even if those indemnization were paid by the ruling classes, that wouldn’t solve any of the
problems related with the entire capitalist system; on the contrary, the ruling classes would
“indemnify” the black workers only to better continue their exploitation.
It is obvious that all these mistakes and deviations had much to do with the Maoist nature of the
BPP which prevented it from becoming a veritable revolutionary party and from ever being a
true menace to the North-American monstrous capitalist-imperialist plutocracy.
Concluding, both Latin American and North American workers are submerged in anti-
communism, with Maoist revisionism playing a major role in their misleading. Therefore, we
hope that this article will help them to adopt a consistent Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist
ideology free from all anti-socialist deviations.

2.1 – Communist Workers’ Union (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) – Colombia

The “Communist” Workers’ Union (MLM) (in Spanish: Unión Obrera Comunista Marxista-
Leninista-Maoísta) is a Colombian organization which openly follows “Marxism-Leninism-
Maoism”:

“Art. 1- The CWU (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) is a pro-party organization of the working
class and its interests are the same of those of the proletariat. Its theorical base, its
guide to action and its work methods are those of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (…).”
(Documents of the CWU, Estatutos de la Unión Obrera Comunista, September of 2001,
translated from Spanish language)

This statement taken from the CWU’s own statutes clearly reveals that Colombian Maoists are
totally anti-Leninist and reactionary, because they try to mislead the masses relatively to
Maoism’s ideological nature. They falsely affirm themselves to be “an organization of the
working class” and that their “interests are the same of those of the proletariat”, but at the same
time they expressly assume their adherence to Maoism. This is an unsolvable contradiction. It is
impossible to defend the interests of the proletariat and of the working class while adopting
Maoist social-fascism as an official ideology (as it is the case with the Colombian Maoists). As
comrade Enver straightforwardly said:

“The anti-Marxist concepts of «Mao Tse-Tung thought» about the revolution are even
more obvious in the way Mao has treated the motive forces of the revolution. Mao
Tsetung did not recognize the hegemonic role of the proletariat. (…) According to Mao, it
turns out that the peasantry and not the working class should play the hegemonic role in
the revolution.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in
Therefore, when the Colombian Maoists or any other Maoists around the world claim to “serve the interests of the working class”, this is nothing more than a shameful amount of lies. Maoism never wanted to defend the interests of the proletariat. Quite on the contrary, Mao’s purpose was to create an ideology that could serve the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie. However, during the first stages of its ascension, this bourgeoisie needed the support of the oppressed masses in its struggle against the Chinese pro-imperialist bourgeoisie. Therefore, Maoism had to include some “revolutionary” and “popular” slogans which would attract those oppressed masses to the side of the national bourgeoisie. That is the reason behind the “leftist” phrases that sometimes appear in Mao’s books and works. And we must note that even those “revolutionary” slogans are in complete opposition to Marxism-Leninism because Mao always denied the leading role of the proletariat, affirming that the peasantry should take the lead in revolution. It is easy to see what kind of interests this anti-socialist thesis serves. The Chinese national bourgeoisie could never allow the Chinese working class to take the lead in the anti-imperialist revolution, because that could mean its transformation into a socialist revolution and – consequently – all the plans of the Chinese national bourgeoisie to become the absolute ruling class in the country and to turn China into an imperialist power would have failed. But at the same time, it could never assume that it was leading that anti-imperialist “revolution”, because this implied the risk of allowing the Chinese exploited classes to understand that, far from advancing towards socialism, Maoist China was indeed a dictatorship of the “progressive” section of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Therefore, as the bourgeois lackey he was, Mao had to find a manner of at least neutralizing the role of the Chinese proletariat without having to openly assume the class dominance of the Chinese national bourgeoisie. In order to accomplish this, he preached the role of peasantry as the major motive force behind the “revolution”. In this way, he denied the leading role of the proletariat (thus preventing the outcome of the socialist revolution) and simultaneously he managed to give a “popular” outlook to his ultra-reactionary thesis. Furthermore, through this, he also granted the support of the Chinese numerous peasants to the cause of the Chinese “patriotic” bourgeoisie. This support carried no risks because the peasantry is not able to transform a bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution without the proletariat.

Of course, we must never be mislead about the fact that – despite Mao’s treacherous talk about “the peasants’ role” – the Chinese peasantry never had the leading role in the Maoist capitalist state. That role always belonged to the Chinese “patriotic” bourgeoisie:

“\textit{The Chinese revolution has been dominated by the petty- and middle bourgeoisie. This broad stratum of the petty-bourgeoisie has influenced the whole development of China.}”

(Enver Hoxha, \textit{Imperialism and the Revolution}, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In fact, Maoism is even not the ideology which liberates the poor peasants from their oppression and exploitation. The liberation of the poor peasants is only possible by means of the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat – as the closest ally of the world proletariat in its socialist world revolution.

In spite of this, the Colombian Maoists prefer to embrace their social-fascist ideology while affirming ridiculous things:

“\textit{The communist revolutionary party of Colombia must be independent in its ideology, objectives and organization. Its guide to action it is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. (…) Its point of view is that of the proletariat (…). It is not a multi-class party, but a party of the working class.}” (Documents of the CWU, \textit{Proyecto de Programa de la Unión Obrera Comunista (marxista leninista maoísta)}, September, 2010, translated from Spanish language)

Again, the same contradiction comes to light. It is impossible to simultaneously defend Maoist revisionism and the interests of the proletariat:
“(... ) there are some Maoists who proclaimed Mao Tsetung as a „classic of Marxism-Leninism“ and who declared the „Mao Tsetung Ideas“ as Marxism at the third and highest level“. There is a world movement which refers to the so-called „Marxism-Leninism-Maoism“ . They claim to be anti-revisionists and defenders of Marxism-Leninism. The problem is the combination of Marxism-Leninism with Maoism. If the „MLM“-ists defend Maoism, then they violate Marxism-Leninism. If they would defend Marxism-Leninism, they would violate Maoism.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

But in that affirmation from the Colombian Maoists, another awful lie must be noticed: their attempt to convince Colombian and world workers that they are not a bourgeois party. However, this kind of masquerade is condemned to fail because the most conscious proletarians know very well that an organization which follows Maoism is inevitably a bourgeois organization:

“Mao Tse-Tung (... ) conceives the party as a union of classes with contradictory interests, as an organization in which two forces, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the «proletarian staff» and the «bourgeois staff», which must have their representatives from the grassroots to the highest leading organs of the party, confront and struggle against each other.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“The „Mao Tsetung Ideas“ contradict totally with the ideas of Leninism concerning the leadership of the Bolshevist party of Lenin’s type as it was defended and practiced by Stalin and Enver Hoxha. Mao Tse-Tung was not a defender of a proletarian class party and did not cling to the relationship between Bolshevist party and the class of the proletariat. (...) The Bolshevist party is formed as one mould and not the arena of different blocs of different class-elements. Mao Tsetung was neither willing nor able to take to heart the principles and standards of a Bolshevist party.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

Therefore, from the moment an organization like the CWU declares itself as Maoist, there can be no doubts that it is indeed a bourgeois organization, no matter the lies and the shibboleths the Colombian Maoists might use in order to hide this truth. And this applies also to any other Maoist party and organization around the world which pretends to be “an organization serving the workers” or “an exclusively proletarian party”. A Maoist organization is always and invariably a pro-capitalist organization due to the inherent origins of Maoist revisionism whose main purpose was to paralyze class struggle in China in benefit of the national bourgeoisie.

However, the fact that Maoism defends the interests of the national bourgeoisie does not in any case allow us to forget to mention its inestimable utility to the overall interests of the world bourgeoisie. Maoism is a revisionist ideology on a world scale and in first line an instrument of the world bourgeoisie to hinder the victory of the socialist world revolution and of the world proletariat!

And as if this was not enough, the Colombian Maoists even praise Mao’s social-fascist “New Democracy”:

“In 1948, there was the victory of the New Democracy Revolution, that is, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type under the leadership of the proletariat and in alliance with the peasantry and the bourgeois democrats. In this manner, the People’s Republic of China was founded, and it aimed to revolutionarize China’s economic structure (…), thus moving towards socialism without having to go through a capitalist society of bourgeois dictatorship.” (Jaime Rangel, El Marxismo-Leninismo-Maoismo, Ciência de la Revolución Proletaria, 1993, translated from Spanish language)

This statement would be laughable if it didn’t reveal the seriousness of Maoist reactionarism. The “New Democracy” is nothing more than a disguise used by the Chinese revisionists to hide the fact that the Chinese “Revolution” was completely pro-capitalist and controlled by the
bourgeoisie. In his book “Eurocommunism is anticomunism”, comrade Enver genially revealed the truth behind Mao’s “New Democracy” – and he did this using Mao's own words:

“Mao Zedong was for the unrestricted free development of capitalism in China in the period of the state of the type of «new democracy», as he called that regime which was to be established after the departure of the Japanese. At the 7th Congress of the CPC he said, «Some think that the communists are against the development of private initiative, against the development of private capital, against the protection of private property. In reality, this is not so. The task of the order of new democracy, which we are striving to establish, is precisely to ensure the possibility for broad circles of Chinese to freely develop their private initiative in society, to freely develop the private capitalist economy.» (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anti-communism, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

In face of the indisputable array of proofs and arguments put forward by comrade Enver, the Maoists in general and the Colombian Maoists in particular get desperate; they know that it will be just a matter of time until the world workers finally understand that Maoism means perpetuation of capitalism.

In Maoist “New Democracy”, the national bourgeoisie continued to freely exploit the workers and peasants; indeed, it was deeply infiltrated within the ranks of the Chinese “Communist” Party since the very beginning. Well after 1949, when China was already supposedly “communist”, the factory owners continued to extract huge profits from workers’ and peasants’ exploitation. The affirmations of the Colombian Maoists that the “New Democracy” was “a revolution under the leadership of the proletariat” are ridiculous. Accordingly with the information provided by the famous bourgeois journalist Edgar Snow - who is considered to be an “expert” in Mao’s China - in his book “Red China Today: The Other Side of the River”, the difference between the salary of a worker and the salary of an “administrator of public enterprises” in Maoist China was around 1 to 15 (from 20 to 300 yuan). And this difference could be even higher due to the supplementary revenues that were earned by many “party cadres” and “directors” (read: members of the Chinese national bourgeoisie). Furthermore, in Maoist “socialism”, there was a thing called “state stock shares” whose purpose was to benefit the new bourgeoisie. In fact, nearly all the members of the national bourgeoisie who controlled the major means of production and occupied the highest positions within the “C” PC possessed vast amounts of those “state stock shares” and they took considerable profits from them. And this is what the Colombian Maoists call “revolutionarization of China’s economic structure”!

In face of this, no wonder why the so-called “Western Marxists” like Edgar Snow loved and praised “Socialist” China so much. They did this because Mao's social-fascism corresponded exactly to their pro-capitalist dreams of a “socialist society” which would be free from what they called “Stalinist influences”.

The wage differentials in Maoist China are significant enough to reflect the existence of capitalist relations of production based on workers’ exploitation. What a contrast with what happened in socialist Albania, where the difference between the highest and lowest salaries was around 1:2 and if a worker was entitled to do a difficult or dangerous job, the salary of this worker could be as high as that of a minister. And this is not a mere hypothesis; indeed, this situation often occurred in Comrade Enver’s Albania. Therefore, contrary to what happened in Maoist China, in Socialist Albania the differences between manual work and intellectual work were the lowest all over the world. It is important to note this, because the wage differentials in Maoist China are an irrefutable proof of how the treacherous “New Democracy” was under the complete domination of the bourgeoisie which successfully kept intact capitalist exploitative productive relations. Therefore, the claims of the Colombian Maoists that the “Revolution of New Democracy” was led by the proletariat are a total fake.

And the same can be said about their argument that Mao had allegedly “avoided” bourgeois
dictatorship, when the truth is that the rule of the Chinese revisionists since 1949 until today has always served the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie. Mao declared that the “New Democracy” was an alternative between bourgeois dictatorship and proletarian dictatorship, but this is a complete falsity. There are no “third alternatives”: from the moment Mao rejected proletarian dictatorship, he was automatically defending bourgeois dictatorship; because from the moment the Chinese national bourgeoisie continued to control the major means of production and to exercise its control over the oppressed masses, there can be no talk about “avoiding the bourgeois dictatorship”. The establishment of the proletarian dictatorship is the only manner to avoid the establishment of bourgeois dictatorship. Therefore, if we deny the first, we are inevitably supporting the second. This is like things are, whether you like it or not, “dear” Maoists!

Even more serious and grave are the direct attacks, insults and calumnies that the Colombian social-fascists launch against Comrade Enver Hoxha, the beloved 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism:

“The Marxist-Leninist movement still faces a deep crisis, which reached a critical point with the reactionary coup d’état in China after Mao’s death and with Enver Hoxha’s perfidious betrayal.” (Documents of the CWU, Declaración del Movimiento Revolucionario Internacionalista, March, 1984, translated from Spanish language)

When reading this, one gets impressed by the arrogance, presumption and demagogy of the Maoists. Maoism is among the most disgusting and perverse ideologies ever invented by the world bourgeoisie. Maoism plays with the masses’ aspirations to socialism and communism in order to benefit the exploiting classes through “dressing” capitalism with “progressive” and even “socialistic” colors. Besides this, Maoist fascism opened the path to China’s ascension as a new imperialist superpower. And after all this, the Maoists even dare to qualify comrade Enver as “perfidious”!!!

Maoists tried in vain to reconcile Maoism with Marxism-Leninism, to absorb Marxism-Leninism by Maoism, to replace, to liquidate Marxism-Leninism through Maoism. We defend the merit of comrade Enver Hoxha, namely the necessary purification of the Marxism-Leninism from Maoist influence. Enver Hoxha prevented the deep crisis of the Marxist-Leninist Movement through his principled demarcation line against Maoism. Until today, the Maoists have never and nowhere proved their defamatory assertion (neither with practical nor with theoretical substance). This is expression of the deep crisis of the MLM. Their defeat is unavoidable as long as they try to merge Marxism-Leninism with neo-revisionism and in particular with Maoism. Those, who attack socialist Albania of comrade Enver Hoxha, attack also the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin. Without defending both the only socialist countries, the victory of the socialist world revolution and world socialism is impossible.

But let’s return to the anti-Hoxhaist deliriums of the Colombian Maoists:

“Revisionism in its dogmatic form continues to be a fierce enemy of revolutionary Maoism. This current, whose maximum expression can be found in the line of the PLA, attacks Maoism, the Chinese revolution and – above everything – the experience of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Under the guise of “defending Stalin” (when in truth many of their theses are Trotskyist), these revisionists destroy Stalin’s revolutionary legacy. (…)” (Documents of the CWU, Declaración del Movimiento Revolucionario Internacionalista, March, 1984, translated from Spanish language)

In first place, the MLM has never proved the “truth” that many of our theses would be allegedly “Trotskyist”.

However, we point at least to two counter-arguments:
1. Comrade Enver Hoxha has proved in “Reflections on China”, Volume II, that Mao had criticized the Stalinist line of the Comintern in the Chinese question which was – in the main - correct. Can the MLM explain the accordance of Mao’s and Trotsky’s criticism on the Stalinist line of the Comintern? (see: Trotzky: “The Chinese Question after the Sixth Congress ”).

2. A characteristic of Trotskyism is the “principle” of fractionism. While comrade Enver Hoxha defeated successfully the Trotskyist fractionism within the PLA, Mao – in a centristic manner - collected several “left” and right-wing fractions within the “C”PC with the purpose to maintain his leadership.

Furthermore, the Colombian Maoists don’t hesitate before using the old trick of trying to depict the genuine revolutionaries as “dogmatics”. This tactic has been used by revisionists of all colors and tendencies in order to discredit the authentic Marxists-Leninists. One of the main “arguments” used by Khrushchev against comrade Stalin was precisely that Stalin was a “dogmatic”. And the Maoists follow the same pattern of their ideological mentor, also qualifying the veritable communists as “dogmatics”. Indeed, they do this while affirming to defend “Stalin’s revolutionary legacy”! Such hypocrisy! The Maoists know very well that the glorious PLA led by comrade Enver Hoxha was the greatest disciple of comrade Stalin. On the contrary, comrade Stalin soon understood who Mao truly was:

"Since the beginning of the war, Stalin was very skeptical towards us. When we won the war, Stalin perceived our victory as being of the same kind of that of Tito, and in 1949 he exercised a very strong pression upon us.” (Mao Zedong, Oeuvres choisies, Tome V, translated from French language)

As can be concluded from this quotation, the Colombian Maoists are wasting their time pretending that they are defending Stalin against PLA’s “dogmatism”. After all, it was Mao himself who admitted that comrade Stalin perceived the bourgeois character of the Chinese “revolution” and that its victory was contrary to the interests of socialism.

In what respects to the PLA’s correct and consistent ideological line, the Colombian Maoists call it “Trotskyism”. This is nothing new. Since many years, the Maoists try to discredit the principled positions of the Albanian Marxists-Leninists as being “Trotskyist”. Such was the case, for example, of comrade Enver’s fair criticisms against Nixon’s visit to Maoist China in the early 70’s. As an authentic Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist, comrade Enver clearly saw that to support Nixon’s visit to China was synonym of betraying the world revolution and the principles of revolutionary communism. Nixon was the representative of the American imperialist plutocrats, he was one of the worst enemies of the world proletariat. Therefore, the PLA promptly criticized this visit and rightly qualified it as “treason”. Being a Marxist-Leninist party, the PLA could not have acted otherwise. Indeed, Nixon’s visit to China was one of the episodes that made the Albanian Marxists-Leninists start wondering about Maoism’s veritable ideological nature:

“When Nixon was invited to China, and the Chinese leadership, with Mao Tsetung at the head, proclaimed the policy of rapprochement and unity with American imperialism, it became clear that the Chinese line and policy were in total opposition to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Following this, China's chauvinist and hegemonic ambitions began to become clearer. The Chinese leadership started to oppose the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples, the world proletariat, and the genuine Marxist-Leninist movement more openly.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In those times, the Maoists already qualified PLA’s principled stand towards Nixon’s visit to China as being “Trotskyist”. Indeed, if we notice the “arguments” used by the Maoists against the PLA and against comrade Enver, we will see that they are not in the least solid. The strategy used by Maoists is to repeatedly affirm that comrade Enver’s PLA was “revisionist”, thus trying to inculcate this idea in the minds of the workers. However, the synthesis of the
Maoists’ “attacks” and “criticisms” against the PLA is circumscribed to the fact that the Albanian Marxist-Leninists unmasked Mao. The Maoists call comrade Enver a “revisionist” because he denounced Mao’s revisionism. Even today, the Maoists feel a deep anger towards the PLA because the Albanian Marxists-Leninists were the pioneers of the struggle against Maoism, because they were able to finally expose Maoist social-fascism. Until then, the Maoists had posed as “genuine Marxists”, but after Comrade Enver’s brilliant unmasking of Maoism, they were revealed as they truly are: pro-capitalists who – using some “anti-revisionist” slogans – do their utmost to strengthen imperialism and to prevent socialism:

“Previously, when Mao Zedong thought had not yet been openly exposed by our parties, the social-imperialists and imperialists were rather tranquil, because they thought that this revisionist current was working within us like a worm in an apple. Now, after our exposure of it, we see that they have increased their attacks upon us.” (Enver Hoxha, *Only in struggle can Marxist-Leninist parties be strengthened and tempered and gain capability*, July, 1980, edition in English)

And relatively to the Maoists’ affirmations that the PLA attacked the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution”, we can only confirm them. Yes, of course the PLA attacked Mao’s anarchistic “Cultural Revolution”. Indeed, given the anti-communist and reactionary nature of that “Cultural Revolution”, the Albanian Marxists-Leninists could not have acted differently:

“When we saw that this Cultural Revolution was not being led by the party but was a chaotic outburst following a call issued by Mao Tsetung, this did not seem to us to be a revolutionary stand. (…) The course of events showed that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was neither a revolution, nor great, nor cultural, and in particular, not in the least proletarian. It was a palace putsch on an all-China scale for the liquidation of a handful of reactionaries who had seized power.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

After all this, we conclude that the Colombian Maoist organization CWU is a social-fascist organization whose aim is to spread and promote Maoist revisionism among the masses in order to prevent the outcome of the world socialist revolution. To do this, they use “Marxist” phraseology and they try to paint Maoism with somewhat “revolutionary” colors, but their attempts will undoubtedly fail. They say that “to defend Maoism is to defend Marxism-Leninism”, but their false claims can be easily unmasked even through the most superficial analysis of Mao’s Works and of Maoist China’s realities. In truth, the MLM – Colombia makes much noise of propaganda about the foundation of the “Communist International”, about the socialist world revolution, etc.... This is a heavy attack against the Comintern (SH) and should not be missed in our counter-attack against MLM Colombia!! Maoists are in words advocates of the Communist International, but in deeds, they are enemies of it, as can be proved by the hostile and treacherous actions of Mao against the decisions of the Comintern (see: Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, Volume II).

Very important are the attempts of the MLM – Colombia of playing a leading role within the Maoist world movement. They attack the revisionism of other Maoist organizations in the world with the only purpose to mask their own revisionism behind “principled ideology of MLM”. Masking one’s own revisionism by “criticizing” the revisionism of the others – this is typically for Maoism as can be seen by Mao’s “criticism” on the Soviet-revisionism.

2.2 – Communist Party of Bolivia (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist)

Another Latin-American organization which also follows Maoist revisionism is the “Communist” Party of Bolivia - MLM (in Spanish: *Partido Comunista de Bolivia - Marxist Leninista Maoista*). The official site of this loathful party is full of praises to Mao’s pro-capitalist ideology and in one occasion, the Bolivian Maoists make an astounding affirmation:
“The rightists inside the CPC deceived Mao and started a policy of approachment to American imperialism. (…). Mao, who was very sick, trusted them (…).”

Therefore, accordingly with the Bolivian Maoists, Mao had nothing to do with China’s pro-American reactionary stance. It was all the rightists’ fault, who perversely misled the poor and sick Mao, forcing him to receive Nixon and Kissinger. One might wonder how these “rightists” could oblige Mao to organize huge welcome ceremonies to receive the American imperialists, to appear to personally salute them and to make public statements supporting them against their main rival – Soviet social-imperialism. In face of this, we conclude that the ridiculous attempts of the Maoists to justify Mao’s social-fascism and to present him as a “great revolutionary” know no limits.

And there is much more.

In the beginning of this article, we affirmed that Latin American Maoists are staunch defenders of Guevarism. And indeed, in a text entitled “Che, a friend of Mao”, the Bolivian Maoists declare that:

“This will certainly surprise many of you, but the truth is that Che Guevara saw China as an example to be followed and admired Mao Zedong very much.”

In first place, we must say that this does not surprise us, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, at all. It is quite normal and expectable that Che Guevara admired Maoist China. After all, both Che and Mao were bourgeois ideologues who tried to stop the revolutionary struggle of the world workers’ through spreading pro-capitalist “theories” under the guise of “socialism”.


In his book “Imperialism and the Revolution”, comrade Enver states that:

“According to «Mao Tsetung thought», a new democratic regime can exist and socialism can be built only on the basis of the collaboration of all classes (…).” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Just like Mao, Che Guevara also held idealist views which were centered around the same idea of “collaboration” between oppressors and oppressed. In 1965, while visiting Argelia, Che Guevara said that “the development of the liberated countries should be paid by the socialist camp”. Besides the fact that this statement is infinitely closer to Christian charity than to revolutionary Marxism and that the development of a certain country must be primarily accomplished by its own workers in the process of socialist construction, and not due to some “charitable help” from outside, we should also ask to what “socialist camp” Che Guevara was referring. In 1965, Khrushchëv’s treason was totally consummated. Soviet Union had been transformed into an imperialist superpower dominated by the new revisionist bourgeoisie which fiercely exploited the oppressed peoples. Therefore, Che Guevara wanted the social-fascist and capitalist Soviet Union to pay for “the development of the liberated countries”! This was completely impossible because social-imperialist Soviet Union had not the slightest interest in developing the semi-colonial oppressed countries. On the contrary, Soviet bourgeoisies did its utmost to keep those countries in state of bondage in order to exploit them more easily. But
Che’s statement clearly reveals that he preached the “cooperation” between the exploited proletarians of the semi-colonial countries and the Soviet imperialist exploiters.

Thus, we see the striking similarities between Maoism and Guevarism in what respects to paralyze and deny the irreconcilable contradictions between exploited and exploiters in benefit of an alleged “cooperation” between them. Besides this, and also like happens with Mao, Guevara’s image has long been a very profitable product in the hands of the capitalists who use it to promote the ideological corruption of the workers.

Furthermore, the Bolivian Maoists openly qualify Che Guevara as an “anti-revisionist” and as a “Marxist-Leninist”. They state that both Mao and Che defend that the revolution must start in the countryside:

“Traditional Marxism predicted that revolution would start thanks to the urban proletariat (…). However, Mao noticed that this was not suitable to China’s conditions, where the urban proletariat was extremely reduced (…). Mao based his victory on the peasantry and Che agreed with this view because he though that this tactic was also the most adequate to Latin American circumstances.”


So, the Maoists happily affirm and confirm Che’s and Mao’s anti-socialist stands towards the urban proletariat and their revisionist belief in the “revolutionary hegemony of the countryside and of the peasants”. The interesting thing is that they do this in a very proud tone, as if to hold this kind of degenerated pro-bourgeois stands is something heroic! Just note the manner in which they try to present Mao and Guevara as being ideologically superior to what they depreciatively qualify as “traditional Marxism”!

Accordingly with the Maoists, the “traditional Marxism” - which defends that the motive force of the revolution must always be the urban proletariat – is “surpassed” and “inferior”, it is something only supported by the “dogmatists” who stubbornly refuse to accept the “innovations” produced by such “great Marxist-Leninists” as Mao and Che Guevara.

In the other parts of the DWM, we have already stressed countless times that the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism consider the leadership of the proletariat as an indispensable condition for the triumph of an authentic socialist revolution. We had also seen how Mao plainly denied this basic principle of communist ideology. Recalling comrade Enver’s genial conclusions:

“(…) Mao was not a Marxist. According to him the leading force of the revolution is the peasantry, not the proletariat. (…) From a long time back we have not been in agreement with the views of Mao Tsetung, especially with his saying that «the countryside must encircle the city». We, as Marxist-Leninist, have never accepted this view of Mao Tsetung's because in this way Mao Tsetung considers the peasantry the most revolutionary class. This is an anti-Marxist view. The most revolutionary class of society is the proletariat, therefore it must lead the revolution in alliance with the peasantry, which is the most faithful ally of the proletariat.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Maoism and Guevarism are among the most treacherous, deceitful and counter-revolutionary revisionist tendencies. A genuine Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist must combat and denounce them without mercy. A model of struggle against both Maoism and Guevarism was precisely comrade Enver, whose views on Che Guevara and on Guevarism we will equally recall:

“Who was Che Guevara? (…) He was a rebel, a revolutionary, but not a Marxist-Leninist as they try to present him. (…) His is a bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leftism, combined
with some ideas that were progressive, but also anarchist which, in the final analysis, lead to adventurism. (...) The views of Che Guevara and anyone else who poses as a Marxist and claims "paternity" of these ideas have never been or had anything to do with Marxism-Leninism. (...) What sort of Marxism-Leninism is this which advocates attacking the enemy, fighting it with these "wild" detachments, etc. without having a Marxist-Leninist party to lead the fight? There is nothing Marxist-Leninist about it. Such anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist theories can bring nothing but defeat for Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, as Che Guevara's undertaking in Bolivia did. (…) This trend brings the theses of the armed uprising into disrepute. What great damage it causes the revolution!

With the killing of Guevara, the masses of common people, contaminated by the influences of these anarchist views, will think: "Now there is no one else to lead us, to liberate us!" Or perhaps a group of people with another Guevara will be set up again to take to the mountains to make the "revolution," and the masses, who expect a great deal from these individuals and are burning to fight the bourgeoisie, may be deceived into following them. And what will happen? Something that is clear to us. Since these people are not the vanguard of the working class, since they are not guided by the enlightening principles of Marxism-Leninism, they will encounter misunderstanding among the broad masses and sooner or later they will fail, but at the same time the genuine struggle will be discredited, because the masses will regard armed struggle with distrust.” (Enver Hoxha, The Fist of the Marxist-Leninist Communists Must Also Smash Left Adventurism, the Offspring of Modern Revisionism (From a conversation with two leaders of the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Ecuador), 21st October, 1968, edition in English)

These quotations from Enver were already used by us in other articles, but given the hysterical proportions that the “Guevaramania” reaches throughout the capitalist world and the explicit encouragement of it by the Maoists revisionists, it seems that they are never repeated frequently enough. The combat against Guevarist influences is very important and it undoubtedly constitutes one of the main demarcation lines between the Marxists-Leninist and the revisionists. When a party or even an individual claims to be Marxist-Leninist, one of the indicators that can be verified to conclude whether that qualification is accurate or not is precisely the stands that the party or the individual holds relatively to Che Guevara. If they denounce Che Guevara’s revisionism and anti-Marxism basing themselves on Stalinist positions, then this is an important indicative sign that the party or the individual in question may be Marxist-Leninist (of course, to conclude this safely it is necessary to verify many other things besides the position towards Guevarism). On the contrary, if a party or an individual accepts and even praises Guevarism, then there is no need to search for nothing more; this suffices to prove their revisionist and counter-revolutionary character. Such is the case of the Maoists in general and of the Bolivian Maoists in particular (indeed, also the Communist Revolutionary Party of Argentina - another Latin-American Maoist organization - explicitly eulogizes Che Guevara’s supposed “contributions to Marxism-Leninism” in its official site: http://www.pcr.org.ar/nota/%C2%A1hasta-la-victoria-siempre-0. Therefore, it is crystal clear that Guevarism is an ideological disease which is gladly supported and promoted by the Latin American Maoists with the objective of keeping the proletarians in bondage).

But the anti-communist perversity of the Maoists goes even further with their abhorrent praises of KimIlSungism and of the North Korean feudal-monarchic-fascist regime. In an unpalatable article entitled “Comrade Kim Jong II has died”, the Bolivian Maoists affirm:

“On behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolivia (MLM) (...) we want to express our condolences to the Workers’ Party of Korea on occasion of the death of the great communist leader Kim Jong II. (...) We are sure that the WPK and the revolutionary people of North Korea will continue the path of such heroic leaders as Kim II Sung and Kim Jong II.”

As can be seen, the Maoists don’t have the slightest scruples about supporting such an horrendous bourgeois dictatorship as that of North Korea. But this is unsurprising. In fact, Maoism has everything in common with KimIlSungism, namely the pro-capitalist character of both these revisionist currents. The remarkable similarities between Maoism and KimIlSungism can be noted not only in the manner both defend the maintenance of the bourgeoisie as a class under “socialism”, but also how KimIlSungism follows Maoism in its denial of the proletarian dictatorship and in its support for the infiltration and influence of bourgeois elements within the ranks of the “communist” party:

“Some think that only the Marxist-Leninists can adhere to the Workers’ Party of Korea and that only the Marxists-Leninists can participate at the main present tasks. This is a very dangerous example of “left” opportunism. (...) It is a grave error to consider that only the Marxists-Leninists should be allowed to do those things. We consider that all those who display a vibrant energy and patriotic love towards the edification of a democratic nation and assume the role of vanguard can adhere to the WPK even if they are not Marxists-Leninists. Therefore, all those who – not only among the workers, but also among the peasants and the intellectuals – bravely struggle at the head of the masses can adhere to the WPK.” (Kim Il Sung, Oeuvres choisies, Pyongyang, 1971, translated from French language)

This statement coming directly from Kim Il Sung is astoundingly revisionist and anti-socialist. Kim Il Sung and his successors are frequently hailed as “hard-line Marxists” and even “Stalinists”. But this declaration completely negates this false image. What the social-fascist Kim Il Sung is affirming is that the “communist” party must be seen as a gigantic basket case where all (Marxist-Leninists and anti-Marxists-Leninists, proletarians and bourgeois) should be included. Of course, taking into account the fact that there was never socialism in North Korea and that the North Korean bourgeoisie continued to exploit Korean workers, it is easy to see that this “inclusion” of bourgeois elements means in fact their ideological predominance within the party, thus making the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship impossible.

Kim Il Sung and his descendants are a fascist family of the worst kind. They served and continue to serve the interests of the North Korean bourgeoisie, doing their utmost to prevent the construction of socialism in Korea. They couldn’t care less about the fact that their reactionary and exploitative regime is based on the painful division of an entire people, since thanks to this division they can continue to live a lavish life in their magnificent palaces, where they have their eating tables full of delicious foods and their beds full of attractive mistresses. In order to perpetuate this state of things, they use their ultra-revisionist ideology to deceive the world workers in general and the Korean workers in particular. And these bandits are qualified by the Maoists as “great communist leaders”. A party who qualifies the North Korean capitalist tyranny as “socialist” is totally submerged in the darkest reactionary waters, it is a rabid enemy of the world proletariat and of all oppressed and exploited masses. Such is the case of the Bolivian Maoists and of their “Communist” Party of Bolivia (“ML”M).

2.3 - Communist Party of Peru (Marxist-Leninist) and Communist Party of Panama (Marxist-Leninist)

The “Communist” Party of Peru – “ML” (in Spanish: Partido Comunista del Peru – Marxista-Leninista) is another example of how Maoist Revisionism constitutes a serious obstacle to the development of socialist revolution in Latin America and to the acquisition of a genuine proletarian conscience by the exploited Latin American workers. After all, we cannot forget that the Peruvian Maoists have a long revisionist tradition of misleading the exploited workers and of harshly repressing them in the name of “communism” [in the second part of the DWM, we had already analyzed the ideology, activities and purposes of the Peruvian Shinning Path, a bourgeois-terrorist group led by the pro-capitalist “President Gonzalo”. The “Shinning Path” is the ideological antecessor of the current “C’PP (“ML’]).
In the newsletter of the infamous neo-revisionist and pro-Maoist “International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations (ICMLPO)”, the leaders of the “C”PP openly admit their depraved social-democratic and reformist stands. In their “country report”, the Peruvian Maoists try to mislead the workers by launching some demagogical “attacks” against the “right-wing reactionaries”, claiming that Peru is becoming a “American colony” (like nearly all Latin-American revisionists, the Peruvian Maoists continue to present American imperialism as being the only enemy while ignoring the emergent imperialisms like the Brazilian one, for instance). It is curious to note that they mention the “compradore bourgeoisie at the service of US imperialism”, but they do not say a word about the struggle against the “progressive” and “nationalistic” Peruvian bourgeoisie. This is easy to explain because Maoism was conceived precisely to benefit the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, and – in the same manner - Maoist parties around the world are also instruments serving the interests of the national bourgeoisies of their respective countries in particular, and those of the world bourgeoisie in general. Indeed, the Peruvian Maoists angrily declare that the maintenance in power of Alan Garcia (the representative of the pro-American compradore bourgeoisie) prevented “the victory of the progressive and nationalist forces”. Therefore, what the Peruvian Maoists truly want is the victory of the “patriotic” section of the Peruvian bourgeoisie which would continue the exploitation of the Peruvian proletariat in a “civilized” and even “progressive” manner. In fact, their ridiculous attempts to hide behind “Marxist-Leninists” slogans are completely denied by their ultra-reformist “popular demands”:

“The coordination and the treaty of unity in action, which we have achieved with some organizations with nationalistic and indigenous tendency, is a first step. It is only a small one, but it has to be strengthened with utmost initiative. This is our concrete political orientation. For this we propose the following platform of struggle and unity to the workers and the people:

- End neoliberal economic policy
- Announce a break in foreign debt payments and demand their annulment
- Annul those treaties for handing over and "selling" public enterprises, the sources of income and the raw materials, which have been negotiated with the monopolies and the transnational firms
- Fundamental tax-reform with the direct taxes as a basis. Those who earn the most, pay the most. Abolition of the tax privileges granted to the big monopoly enterprises.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

Primarily, Peruvian Maoists do not utter a word about the necessity of eliminate private property. On the contrary, Marxist-Leninists demand for the revolutionary abolition of the private property. Those who do not propagate and fight for the socialization of private property by the socialist revolution cannot be true communists.

Moreover, after having praised and encouraged an opportunistic union with the “nationalist and indigenous tendency”, the Peruvian Maoists demand:

- The end of neoliberalism – a totally revisionist demand. Neoliberalism is just one of the forms that capitalism can assume. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are against capitalism as a whole, and not just against one of its multiple forms. Neoliberalism is usually preferred by the pro-imperialist bourgeoisies of the compradore type, while state capitalism is usually preferred by the “progressive” and “anti-imperialist” sections of the national bourgeoisies. As the Peruvian Maoists are defending these last ones, it is easy to understand the meaning of their anger against neoliberalism. They do not want the abolishment of capitalism, they only want the adoption of another form of it which is more suitable and adequate to the interests of the Peruvian national bourgeoisie. In present times of globalized development of productive forces it is in the interest of the world proletariat to struggle for a world-socialist economic system - everything else is retrograde and reactionary.
- Announce a break in foreign debt payments and demand their annulment – this demand might sound appellative at first sight, but if we pay more attention to it, we will conclude that it is also opportunist. Foreign debts will always exist as long as capitalist exploitative system exists. Consequently, the only manner to definitively eliminate these debts is to annihilate capitalism. However, since the moment they adopt Maoism as their official ideology, the social-fascists of the “C”PP are automatically embracing the perpetuation of that same capitalism and are making the extinction of foreign debts impossible.

- Annul those treaties for handing over and "selling" public enterprises, the sources of income and the raw materials, which have been negotiated with the monopolies and the transnational firms – right, the Peruvian Maoists want to prevent the control of the country’s main resources and means of production by the bourgeoisie compradore in order to facilitate their handing to the national bourgeoisie under state capitalist forms which will permit the continuation of the exploitation of the Peruvian workers under “socialistic” cloaks.

- Fundamental tax-reform with the direct taxes as a basis. Those who earn the most, pay the most. Abolition of the tax privileges granted to the big monopoly enterprises - this demand from the Peruvian Maoists is truly amazing. They sound exactly like the bourgeois politicians who defend the ignominious “welfare-state”. If they were authentic Marxists-Leninists, they would demand the abolition of the entire tax system, they would demand the annihilation of all forms of exploitation. But as they are nothing more than bourgeois social-democrats, they preach the “abolition of the tax privileges granted to the big monopolies” and that “those who earn the most, pay the most” in order to alienate the proletarians, because the adoption of this kind of “welfare-state measures” contributes to hide the class character of the capitalist state, thus turning the acquisition of a communist conscience by the workers much more difficult – all this without touching the capitalists’ superprofits.

And there is more. The Peruvian Maoists go further with their pro-capitalist “demands”:

“- Directives on raising wages or income for the active workers, as well as for those without work and retired people. Rehiring of the dismissed workers.

- Introduction of a universal, obligatory, mutually supportive system of social insurance.

- Reinstallation of an educational system which is free of charge for all stages and qualifications, development of educational personnel and educational policy (…).

- Promotion of the reorganization and democratization of the armed forces, with the aim of transforming them into a useful instrument for the economic and social development in the country and for defending national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

- Convening a constitutional assembly aimed at setting up a new, democratic, patriotic, decentralized and socially just assembly.

The political orientation which we propose are concrete tactics to achieve the broadest accumulation of political and social forces, (…) to further develop the political awareness of the masses and to create the best possible objective and subjective conditions and to lead the people to a peoples’ rebellion within a short or medium term period of time. This will prepare the way for a democratic peoples’ government and to abolish the neoliberal program with its consequences and so to put an end to the period marked by neoliberal colonialism (…).” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

The first three demands are typically social-democratic. Things like “directives on raising wages”, the “free educational system” and the “mutually supportive social insurance” could have been proposed by some social-bourgeois party seating in the European Parliament. But no! They were proposed by the Maoists, who dare to qualify themselves as the “highest representatives of Marxism-Leninism”.
As for the “democratization of the armed forces”, the Peruvian Maoists follow the same line of the infamous Carrillo - one of the founders of Eurocommunism - who also said that the Spanish army (one of the main supporters of Franco’s pro-nazi regime) would become a “progressive force in society”. All Marxists-Leninists know that the capitalist army is one of the most reactionary and staunch defenders of the exploitative order, they know that it is not possible to “democratize” it or to transform it into “an instrument for the social development of the country”, as the Peruvian Maoists pretend. Within the framework of a capitalist system like that which dominates Peru, the army is inevitably and invariably a counter-revolutionary weapon in the hands of the capitalists and imperialists who use it to bloody repress Peruvian workers. With the exception of the proletarian armies which emerge within the scope of an authentically socialist society, all armies are noxious to the cause of the proletariat and therefore they must be implacably smashed and destroyed. There is no other way to remove the immense danger that bourgeois-capitalist armies - like that of Peru - represent to workers’ liberation. As comrade Enver correctly affirmed:

“The principles, laws and organizational structures in the bourgeois armies are such that they allow the bourgeoisie to exert control over the army, to maintain and train it as a means to suppress the revolution and the peoples. This shows the markedly reactionary class character of the bourgeois army and exposes the efforts to present it as «above classes», «national», «outside politics», «respecting democracy», etc. Regardless of the «democratic traditions », the bourgeois army in any country is anti-popular and destined to defend the rule of the bourgeoisie and to carry out its expansionist aims.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anti-communism, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

And the claims of the Peruvian Maoists of aiming at a “socially just assembly” and of wanting to “further develop the political awareness of the masses to lead the people to a peoples’ rebellion within a short or medium term period of time” can only be qualified as a total masquerade. A socially just assembly? Can anything related with capitalism be just? Of course not. The Peruvian Maoists do their utmost to preserve capitalism. They may prefer state capitalism to neoliberal capitalism, but in the end everything remains the same: it is still capitalism, it is still exploitation and oppression. Thus, their ridiculous talk about a “socially just assembly” will never deceive the revolutionary workers. And as if this was not enough, they even affirm that their “political orientation” is developing “the political awareness of the masses”. What?! They call a bunch of reformist, social-democratic demands as “development of the political awareness of the masses”? Quite on the contrary, the purpose of the Peruvian Maoists is precisely to conceal the class character of the capitalist state through the adoption of some pro-welfare state measures which will spread illusions among the workers and which will detach them from the communist struggle for the violent overthrow of the capitalist state. Indeed, the so-called “people’s rebellion” that the Peruvian Maoists arrogantly pretend to be leading “within a short or medium period of time” is nothing more than the replacement of the pro-imperialist and compradore section of the Peruvian bourgeoisie by the “progressive” Peruvian national bourgeoisie. The same can be said about the Peruvian Maoists’ “intentions” of putting “an end to the period marked by neoliberal colonialism”. They want to end “neoliberal colonialism” only to allow the ascension of the “patriotic” section of the Peruvian bourgeoisie which will continue sucking the blood and sweat of the Peruvian proletariat. Indeed, this is what the Maoists really want: a “perfect” capitalism using a “socialist” mask in which there will be no class struggle, thus permitting the eternal exploitation of the workers.

And the situation is the same with the “Communist” Party of Panama – “ML” (in Spanish: Partido Comunista de Panama – Marxista-Leninista):

“We urgently call for joining the different struggle fronts of the masses to a united revolutionary people’s movement on a massive scale to achieve democracy, (…) a Democratic Republic which is carried and surrounded by organizations of the people.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

Just like all the other Latin American Maoists, also the Panamanian Maoists deny the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship, replacing it by a “Democratic Republic” composed by multiple “struggle fronts of the masses”. It is obvious that these various “fronts of the masses” mean that the hateful “Democratic
Republic” proposed by the Panamanian Maoists is nothing more than a disguised form of Mao’s “New Democracy”, that is, a bourgeois-capitalist oppressive dictatorship which tries to mislead the workers, giving them the false impression that the exploiters are “sharing power” with them while moving towards “socialism”. But these attempts by the Panamanian Maoists to detach the workers from the path of the violent proletarian dominion, from the path of genuine socialism will never be successful. When the world socialist revolution finally comes, the end of the Maoists will be as horrible and loathful as their own social-fascist nauseating ideology. The infuriated world proletariat will literally tear them into pieces, thus giving to these pro-capitalist charlatans the treatment they fully deserve.

2.4 - Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA

Finally, before finishing our analysis of the Maoist organizations in the American continent, we will examine a very relevant document which was published by two Maoist parties: the Revolutionary “Communist” Party of Chile (in Spanish: Partido Comunista Revolucionario de Chile) and the Revolutionary “Communist” Party of the USA. This joint document is treacherously entitled “Fundamental principles to achieve the unity of the Marxists-Leninists and of the International Communist Movement’s ideological line” and we decided to study it because it contains some of worst attacks ever made by the Maoists against the glorious Marxist-Leninist line of comrade Enver Hoxha and of the PLA. In fact, this is nothing astonishing because both parties are social-fascist to the bone. The “Revolutionary Communist” Party of the USA is even the party of the infamous ultra-revisionist Bob Avakian, who exercised and continues to exercise growing influence in the Maoist World Movement (http://www.rwor.org/a/ideology/mlm.htm).

In 1990, Bob Avakian wrote a text entitled “Our Ideology is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism”, of which we will emphasize ten items of criticisms:

1. Bob Avakian denies the class-character of the Bolshevist principle of criticism and self-criticism. He says: “It serves the people”. However, he does not say that it can only serve the people as an instrument in the hands of the proletariat and its communist party.

2. Bob Avakian speaks much about the revolution as a kind of anarchist “rebellion against oppression”: “Marxism is the doctrine of rebellion.” However, he keeps silence on the necessity of the armed destruction of the dictatorship of the world bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the world proletariat, on the construction of world socialism.

3. Bob Avakian says: “To give a basic answer to the first question--what is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism?--we can turn to the statement by Mao: 'It is right to rebel against reactionaries'.” However, this is not at all the basic answer of what Marxism-Leninism really is: Marxism-Leninism is the victorious ideology of the world proletariat, is the guidance for the socialist world revolution, is the revolutionary weapon in the hands of the invincible army of genuine communists who guide the proletariat and all oppressed towards destruction of the capitalist world and creation of the new world of socialism. Marxism-Leninism is the teaching of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha.

4. Bob Avakian says: “The guiding principle we Maoists live by is to serve the people.” We Stalinist-Hoxhaists say: The guiding principle of Marxism-Leninism is serving the class of the world proletariat. The politics of the masses must be guided by the world proletariat and the Communist International (Stalinist-Hoxhaists), everything else is anarchism, revisionism – whatever you like, but not Marxism-Leninism.

5. Bob Avakian defends the social fascist Chinese system which was created by Mao.

7. Bob Avakian praises that Mao's China would have allegedly prevented capitalist restoration. However, the truth is that China was never socialist, and thus capitalist restoration – as happened in the Soviet Union and Albania – could not at all have been “prevented” in China. Bob Avakian defends Mao against Deng Hsiao Peng, but it was Mao himself who rehabilitated him! Bob Avakian speaks about the “overthrow” of Mao’s “socialism”, but the truth is that the “Mao Testung- Thoughts” had been the basis of the revisionist-capitalist development of China.

8. Bob Avakian calls Marxism-Leninism-Maoism allegedly the ideology of the international proletariat. He stresses the word “today” which means that Mao would have developed Marxism-Leninism from a “European ideology” to an international one. Marxism-Leninism was always the ideology of the world proletariat, whereas Maoism is the ideology of the world bourgeoisie.

9. Bob Avakian says: “It is necessary to unite with the Black petty bourgeoisie and as far as possible with the Black bourgeoisie” - this sentence must not be commented, it unmasks itself.

10. Bob Avakian says: “Mao upheld and applied the communist viewpoint farther in theory and in practice than had previously been done in the experience of socialist countries.” This is not true. In the contrary: Mao has never upheld and applied the communist viewpoint. He neglected the experience of the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, he replaced these experiences of Marxism-Leninism by revisionism.

The social-fascist and ultra-revisionist character of Bob Avakian’s “theories” is so obvious that it is even discredited among Maoists themselves:

“(…) we need to criticize incorrect understandings entrenched in Avakian’s new synthesis. But that is only the start. This is a process that will deepen only as we will learn more by doing more. In sum: The RCP’s current path and methods have not worked and will not work. Its recent strategic turn is indifferent to the lessons of its own practice (…)

It was a promising thing in the late 1980s, when the RCP raised to itself the importance of “coming from within.” And yet the party’s overall method repeatedly thwarted that process. The party’s work has remained a series of “forays” — constantly reapproaching people “from without,” as if they are some unexplored territory. Over and over, the party would pull back without real roots or networks, only to sally out again in some new direction with new hopes and schemes.” (Mike Ely - mikeely.wordpress.com., Nine Letters To Our Comrades, December, 2007, edition in English)

Of course, the Maoists who “criticize” Avakian are only afraid that his openly reformist ideas finally reveal Maoism’s true anti-socialist purposes to the working classes.

Anyway, the pro-capitalist character of the “RC”PUSA has been denounced by the genuine Marxists-Leninists since many years:

“The truth is that Chinese revisionism, which was corroding the Communist Party of China from within, has also long propped up, financed, bribed and danced quadrilles around almost all the opportunist trends in the American “left” movement. It has sought to subvert the powerful movement against modern revisionism, to divert what it could into the path of support for Chinese revisionist ambitions and to smash the rest of the movement. To this end, it has used the mainstream of neo-revisionism as its special agency, in particular, the Klonskyite October League, now calling itself the “Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)”; the Revolutionary Union, now calling itself the “Revolutionary Communist Party, USA”; and a host of smaller imitators and competitors.” (Documents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of
But let’s return to the analysis of the joint document “Fundamental principles to achieve the unity of the Marxists-Leninists and of the International Communist Movement’s ideological line”. In this document, we find a compilation of the deceitful slanders invented by the Maoists to discredit Hoxhaist ideology and experience.

One of the first things we note when we observe the document is the shameless defense of Maoist revisionism. Indeed, the iniquitous slogan “Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism” is written in nearly every page of the document, turning obvious that both the “RC”PC and the “RC”PUSA are anti-socialist parties completely submerged in Maoist reactionarism.

But – as we had already affirmed – the most relevant aspect of the document in question is the false attacks launched against comrade Enver and the PLA. The Chilean and American Maoists affirm that:

“The PLA and its leaders surrendered to revisionism. After the counter-revolutionary coup d’état in China, they attracted some revolutionaries because they were opposed to the clique of Teng Siao-ping (...). However, (...) the leaders of the PLA adopted Trotskyist positions about many questions, (...) excluding people's war as a form of revolutionary struggle, etc…” (Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, Principios Fundamentales para la Unidad de los Marxistas-Leninistas y para la Línea del Movimiento Comunista Internacional, 1980, translated from Spanish language)

First of all, we must realize that when the Maoists say that the PLA “surrendered to revisionism” this means just one thing: that the PLA denounced the bourgeois-capitalist nature of Maoism. Accordingly with the Maoists, the fact that the PLA unmasked Maoism and exposed its social-fascist character is synonym of “becoming revisionist”. This is nothing surprising. Until the Sino-Albanian split and the subsequent denouncement of Chinese revisionism in general and of Maoism in particular, the Maoists posed as “faithful Marxists”, as the “defenders of the truly communist line”. But after those events, they had been completely unmasked. The Albanian Marxists-Leninists, the most loyal supporters and continuers of the Stalinist line, had finally understood the true purpose of Maoism. Therefore, the Maoists needed desperately to fabricate a tactic to discredit PLA’s accurate stands in front of the toiling masses. In order to accomplish this, the Maoists started to qualify the PLA and comrade Enver as “revisionist” for the simple reason that they had correctly exposed Maoism. They even dare to call comrade Enver a “trotskyist” because he would be against the so-called “people’s wars”. But this is not true. Comrade Enver always defended that the oppressed peoples should liberate themselves from both the internal and external exploiters through armed force. However, Comrade Enver had no illusions relatively to the true nature of the Maoists' "people's wars" (like those of Peru or Nepal, for instance). Enver knew very well that the Maoist “peoples’ wars” deny the most basic Marxist-Leninist principles (like that of the hegemony of the proletariat). He also knew that if the Maoist organizations which lead those "people's wars" manage to achieve power, that would not mean a victory for socialism due to the bourgeois character of the Maoist ideology. As we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, clearly understand:

"Mao Tsetung gave special prominence to the military politics and army. However the guns themselves are not a circumstantial evidence for a revolutionary „people's war” - as proclaimed by numerous armed Maoist organizations all over the world. That looks and sounds very „revolutionary”, but is that really true? Lenin always proclaimed the hegemony of the proletariat as the only revolutionary class who leads the armed struggle – and this concerns particularly the strategy and tactics if the revolutionary people’s war. The theory of the people’s war is a theory from Lenin. The „Mao Tsetung Ideas” („encircle and conquer the towns from the side of the villages” - proletarian revolution in words and peasant-revolution in deeds!) are contrary to the Leninist dialectical theory of the proletarian revolution (peasantry as the most important ally under the proletarian leadership)." (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

Consequently, we see that – once again – the veritable reason behind the qualification of Enver
as “trotskyist” by the Maoists resides in his brave exposure of Maoist social-fascism. The Maoists try to depict the true revolutionaries as “revisionists” and “trotskyists” in order to hide their own pro-capitalist purposes.

The revisionist parties, the lackeys of the Soviet revisionists, were once blaming comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA as “Trotskyites” with the “argument” that the Albanians would have allegedly damaged the unity of the Communist World Movement.

The Maoists of today use the same accusations of “Trotskyism” which the Soviet revisionists and their lackeys have used against comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA - namely that the Albanians would have allegedly damaged the unity of the Communist World Movement. In truth, Comrade Enver Hoxha defended Marxism-Leninism and the Communist World Movement bravely against the Soviet revisionists and against the Chinese revisionists who are the real enemies of Marxism-Leninism and the Communist World Movement!

Defending Marxism-Leninism and the Communist World Movement against Maoism is not “Trotskyist” but Hoxhaist. Hoxhaism is the invincible weapon in the war against Maoism.

And the Chilean and American Maoists continue with their anti-communist fever:

“Enver Hoxha erases the differences that exist between the various types of countries – the colonial and dependent, on one side and the imperialists, on the other side – and the differences that exist between two different types of revolution: the democratic anti-imperialist revolution and the socialist revolution. (...) this can only lead to grave errors because in the colonial and semi-colonial countries the revolution has a (...) democratic character, while in the imperialist countries the revolution (...) has to be proletarian and socialist.” (Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, Principios Fundamentales para la Unidad de los Marxistas-Leninistas y para la Línea del Movimiento Comunista Internacional, 1980, translated from Spanish language)

This statement is very interesting because the “leftist” section of the Maoist movement tries to present the “three world theory” as an invention of what they call “Chinese revisionists” (the ideological continuers of Mao). Besides the fact that this is a total lie – the “three world theory” was used by the Chinese bourgeois government since 1971 and was explicitly approved by Mao himself – it is amazing to observe that also the mentioned “leftist” and “orthodox” section of the Maoist movement assumes its adherence to the ultra-reactionary “three world theory”. In fact, when they accuse comrade Enver of erasing “the differences that exist between the various types of countries – the colonial and dependent, on one side and the imperialists, on the other side”, they are denying the Leninist principle which teaches that the world is divided only in two: the socialist world and the capitalist world. Comrade Enver was always a firm defender of this Leninist teaching and that’s why the Maoists criticize him (of course, there are contradictions between the capitalist countries, but this does not justify their division in two separate categories. Countries like Zaire or Nigeria are semi-colonial and dependent nations, while countries like the USA are imperialist nations. However, this does not exclude the fact that they are all capitalist countries).

In what respects to the Maoists’ claim that Enver would supposedly “erase the differences that exist between two different types of revolution: the democratic anti-imperialist revolution and the socialist revolution”, this false accusation doesn’t hold water. Comrade Enver understood very well that a democratic anti-imperialist revolution is something different from a socialist revolution, as can be proved through a quotation taken from his book “Imperialism and Revolution”:

“The Marxist-Leninist parties have as their aim the overthrow of the capitalist order and the triumph of socialism, whereas, when the revolution in their country is confronted with tasks of a democratic and anti-imperialist character, they aim to develop it unceasingly, to raise it to a socialist revolution, to go over as quickly as possible to the
fulfillment of socialist tasks.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

The Maoists insinuate that Comrade Enver confounded both types of revolutions but this is not true. What really upsets the Maoists is that - contrary to Mao - comrade Enver always defended that the democratic/anti-imperialist revolutions cannot stand still, and that they have to be transformed into socialist revolutions:

“Mao Tsetung was never able to understand and explain correctly the close links between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the proletarian revolution. Contrary to the Marxist-Leninist theory, which has proved scientifically that there is no Chinese wall between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, that these two revolutions do not have to be divided from each other by a long period of time, Mao Tsetung asserted: «The transformation of our revolution into socialist revolution is a matter of the future... As to when the transition will take place, it may take quite a long time. We should not hold forth about this transition until all the necessary political and economic conditions are present and until it is advantageous and not detrimental to the overwhelming majority of our people». Mao Tsetung adhered to this anti-Marxist concept, which is not for the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution (…).” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Enver’s position is correct and Marxist-Leninist. On the contrary, Mao’s positions are revisionist and pro-capitalist:

“Mao Tsetung was not able to differ and combine the bourgeois-democratic revolution with the proletarian revolution because he did not understand the coherency which Lenin demonstrated masterly in theory and practice. This was the reason why Mao Tsetung was not able to lead over to the proletarian revolution.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

Using the excuse of “not skipping stages” and of “the necessity of distinguishing between the democratic/anti-imperialist revolution and the socialist revolution”, the Maoists paralyze the revolutionary movement, they prevent the transformation of the democratic/anti-imperialist revolution into a socialist revolution by eternally postponing it, thus permitting the free development of bourgeois and capitalist relations and elements. In order to disguise this ultra-reactionary position, the Maoists make some empty affirmations about the “proletarian and socialist character” of the revolution in imperialist countries, but this is just empty talk. The truth is that Maoist ideology as a whole is conceived to prevent the coming of socialism. It is not by chance that we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, say that Maoism is a bourgeois and pro-capitalist ideology. The aim of the Maoists is really to preserve capitalism and imperialism under fake “socialistic” cloaks.

And there is more:

“The Albanian leaders (...) affirm that the proletariat of Western Europe has to “defend the independence and sovereignty of its countries” and (...) they think that this struggle should be directed against American imperialism and not against the USSR (...). Here, the PLA is adopting a very wrong position proposed by Stalin after the Second World War: that the bourgeois in the imperialist countries had rejected the banner of independence and sovereignty and that – in face of this – it was the duty of the communist parties to erect this banner (...).” (Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, Principios Fundamentales para la Unidad de los Marxistas-Leninistas y para la Línea del Movimiento Comunista Internacional, 1980, translated from Spanish language)
First of all, it is a lie to affirm that the Albanian Marxists-Leninists only defended the struggle against American imperialism while neglecting the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism. Comrade Enver always understood quite clearly that it was necessary to combat both superpowers and never neglected the danger represented by Soviet revisionist imperialism:

“Brezhnev went to and returned from the United States of America. His talks with Nixon were very cordial and spectacular. (…) As his dowry, Brezhnev took to Nixon the wealth of the Soviet Union, the land, political freedom, sovereignty and prestige of the Soviet Union, in return for a handful of dollars. (…) And what was the reason for this scandalous abasement? To seek dollars, and with these dollars, which are dripping with blood, to buy advanced American technology, and at the same time, to find a market to sell the wealth of the Soviet people to the American multimillionaires. (…) «the clever but silent politicians» pose as if they understand everything, and do not fail to say openly and publicly: «The Soviet revisionists are more dangerous than the American imperialists». Why is it necessary to discuss who is the more dangerous, when the two are equally savage enemies of the peoples, of their freedom, independence, and sovereignty?!” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“Soviet revisionism has been and still is the most dangerous current of modern revisionism. (…) it retains its socialist disguise and Leninist phraseology in order to cover up the present-day capitalist reality of the Soviet Union and its aggressive imperialist foreign policy. It is a revisionism which has seized power in a state which is a great power and has ample means and possibilities to exert its influence in the world, to operate in many directions and on a large scale.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the VIII Congress of the PLA, November, 1981, edition in English)

On the contrary, Mao openly supported a policy of capitulations and alliances towards American imperialism precisely under the excuse of “struggling against Soviet social-imperialism”. He was never able to hold the correct revolutionary positions of Comrade Enver, who struggled against both American imperialism and against Soviet social-imperialism.

And the Maoists also accuse the PLA of “dogmatism” because it followed what they call the “erroneous positions of Stalin” (as revisionists, the Maoists don’t lose a single opportunity to slander comrade Stalin) relatively to the question of national independence and sovereignty. In truth, Comrade Stalin’s positions are correct. After the Second World War, American imperialism was invading the Western European nations through “aids” and “credits” whose objective was to prevent the implementation of proletarian dictatorships in those countries. Therefore, when saying that the communist parties and the proletarians of Western Europe must erect the banner of national independence and sovereignty, comrade Stalin meant that those communist parties and proletarians must struggle for socialism, because the establishment of a socialist society is the only manner to grant genuine national independence and sovereignty against all kinds of imperialism (we have to remember that comrade Stalin affirmed this during the first stage of socialism, during the epoch of socialism “in one country”).

Following this line, also the Albanian Marxists-Leninists knew that socialism is the only way to effectively struggle for genuine independence and sovereignty:

“Lenin teaches us that the revolution must be carried through to the end, by liquidating the bourgeoisie and its state power. Only on this basis can there be talk of true freedom, independence and sovereignty.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Therefore, the accusations of the Maoists that the Albanian Marxists-Leninists had “fervently defended Stalin’s serious mistakes” are totally phony. Neither comrade Stalin nor comrade Enver committed any mistakes. Indeed, the Maoist social-fascists are the ones who must be
sternly condemned because they deny that socialism can avoid the inevitability of imperialism.

Continuing:

“The Albanian leaders have a tendency to neglect the rivalries that exist between USA and the Soviet Union, thus neglecting also the danger of a world war. (...) In his book “Imperialism and Revolution”, Enver Hoxha even affirms that the danger of an armed conflict with Soviet Union is now less intense.” (Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA, Principios Fundamentales para la Unidad de los Marxistas-Leninistas y para la Línea del Movimiento Comunista Internacional, 1980, translated from Spanish language)

Relatively to this statement, we should note that the Chilean and American Maoists who wrote the document use Enver’s book “Imperialism and Revolution” to allegedly “prove” their calumnious affirmations. However, we searched the mentioned book in its entirety and we could not find a single place where comrade Enver denies or minimizes the danger of a new world war. On the contrary, Enver states that:

“American imperialism is striving to get its hooks ever more deeply implanted into the economies of other peoples, while Soviet social-imperialism, which has just begun to spread its claws, is trying to drive them into various countries of the world in order to create and to consolidate its own neo-colonialist and imperialist positions. But there is also the «United Europe», linked with the United States of America through NATO, which has individual, not concentrated imperialist tendencies. On the other hand, China, too, has joined in the dance in its endeavors to become a superpower, as well as Japanese militarism which has risen to its feet. These two imperialisms are linking themselves in an alliance in order to form an imperialist power opposed to the others. In these conditions, the great danger of world war is increased.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In face of this, we see that Maoists don’t hesitate in lying directly, affirming that comrade Enver defended a certain position when in reality he defended the opposite one. They also dare to accuse the Albanian Marxists-Leninists of “making an erroneous analysis about the origins and character of revisionism”, affirming this with the aim of discrediting Hoxhaism, because this is the only ideology capable of destroying their falsehoods and slanders and of leading the world proletariat towards world socialism and world communism.

And today we must talk about the Chinese superpower as a dangerous warmonger who strives violently for imperialist world hegemony. This means that those Maoist forces who neglect or who ignore this fact, or who keep silence on it, are objectively on the side of the imperialist warmongers, no matter if they deny this or not. Therefore, the accusations on comrade Enver Hoxha have damaged the Maoists themselves. In words the Maoists are against imperialist wars, but in deeds they support them. The Chinese warmonger misused the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the unavoidability of imperialist wars. The question of the unavoidability was absolutized and deformed for the purpose of their military intentions. In history, the peoples did not face the warmongers as a “passive mass”. They have bravely shown and proved for many times that they had successfully prevented unleashing of wars. However, the Chinese social imperialists ignore the active peace movement of the peoples and paralyze its revolutionary potency for the purpose of having free hand of unleashing their imperialist war. Neglecting the rivalry between US-imperialism and Chinese social imperialism means neglecting the danger of the world war.

By publishing such a dreadfully anti-Hoxhaist document, the Chilean and American Maoists openly assume their anti-Marxist ideology. But all these falsities invented by the Maoists have no future. Far from having done “an erroneous analysis about revisionism”, the Albanian Marxists-Leninists headed by comrade
Enver brilliantly unmasked all revisionist currents without exception. One of the greatest merits of comrade Enver as 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism was precisely to denounce Maoism as a deceitful pro-imperialist and pro-capitalist, ultra-reactionary and anti-socialist revisionist tendency:

"Under the leadership of comrade Enver Hoxha the capitalist-revisionist world was not able to smash Albanian socialism and to sweep socialism off the globe. His struggle and teachings resisted the attacks of all revisionist branches all over the world including the revisionist branch of Maoism. The teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha are therefore the guarantee of the protection and development of the Marxism-Leninism of today. The teachings of Enver Hoxha are the teachings of Marxism-Leninism of today." (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

This is the true reason why Maoists qualify Enver’s analysis as “erroneous”.

3 – European continent

Relatively to the European continent, we must say that this is a continent whose proletariat in significantly influenced by Maoism. Europe was, during many years, the main epicenter of communist ideology and of proletarian consciousness. In fact, Marxism was born in Europe and also the Great October Revolution of 1917 started in the European part of Russia. And how could we forget Comrade Enver’s Albania, an European country which proved that socialism is not only a mere possibility, but a veritable historic necessity which cannot be avoided?

Formerly, Europe was considered to be – together with North America - the center of the socialist revolution. Nowadays, this is not true anymore, but despite this, the European workers continue to have a very important role to play in the world socialist revolution. Because of this, the world bourgeoisie in general and the European bourgeoisie in particular use Maoist revisionism as an instrument to deceive European proletarians. This situation was especially evident during the second half of the XXth century, when immense numbers of European revolutionaries were seduced by Maoism, especially after Khrushchevist betrayal, when Mao tried to depict himself as “the most faithful defender of Marxism-Leninism”. This Maoist noxious influence was particularly felt among the young European workers who believed in Mao’s lies. One of the most notorious examples of this was the very famous “Revolution” of May, 1968 which reached significant dimensions in many European countries.

This “Revolution” was bourgeois and anti-socialist to the bone and was encouraged by the “liberal” bourgeoisie with the purpose of directing the grievances of the young students towards convenient scapegoats in order to prevent them from gaining a truly Marxist-Leninism-Stalinist consciousness. Of course, Maoism was essential in the accomplishment of the bourgeois’ plans. Its “leftist” phraseology greatly contributed to the misleading of those students, because besides its fake “radical” slogans, the truth is that Maoism’s objective is to establish a “civilized” and “tamed” capitalism free from all forms of class struggle. Indeed, it was not by chance that the “Revolution” of May, 1968 was mostly led by students; after all, the anti-Marxist “Great Cultural Revolution” fabricated by Mao was also led by students. The “Revolution” of May, 1968 was nothing more than an European copy of the Maoist “Great Cultural Revolution” and the purposes of both were exactly the same: to perpetuate capitalism through the alienation of the masses’ attention in benefit of the exploiting classes. And the irrefutable proof which suffices to clarify the social-bourgeois character of these “revolutions” was the fact that in none of them the proletariat and its party played a relevant role - a situation which is in total opposition to the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism. And even the manner in which the “Revolution” of May, 1968 was organized shows its totally pro-capitalist tendencies: after much noise, the “revolution” ended with the bourgeoisie making some phony “concessions” to the “revolutionary students”. These “concessions” did not touch capitalist exploitation in the least – quite on the contrary, it permitted the bourgeoisie to increase class oppression due to the occultation of the class nature
of the capitalist state through the granting of those “concessions.”
The “Revolution” of May, 1968 was only one among many examples of how Maoist influence constitutes a serious handicap for the advancement of socialism in Europe.
Nowadays, there are Maoist parties and organizations in nearly all European countries, and this reveals how much Maoist social-fascism is disseminated within the ranks of the European proletariat. This situation is particularly grave in Southern Europe, where poverty, unemployment and austerity measures imposed by the imperialist European Union have attracted many workers to Maoism due to its “revolutionary” appearance. But Maoist social-bourgeois theories are also a serious obstacle to the advancement of socialist revolution in the countries of Central and Northern Europe. Even in Norway there is the Workers’ Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Norway – AKP (“ML”) - which is just as revisionist as any other Maoist organization around the world. In the late 70’s, the neo-revisionist leaders of the AKP (“ML”) sent a letter to the PLA ridiculously affirming how shocked they were about the unmasking of Maoism by the authentic Marxist-Leninists. In that letter, they re-affirmed once more their support for the fascist “three world theory”:

“We disagree with the criticism of the theory of the three worlds. The AKP (m-l) program from 1976 and our Resolution on social-imperialism from 1974 make it quite clear that we support Mao Tsetung's theory that the world today is to be divided in three: the superpowers, the small and medium-sized imperialist countries, and the third world. This is the characteristic of the objective conditions of the world today, and no correct strategy for revolution can be drawn up if it is not founded on such analysis of the world situation.” (“Class Struggle” - International Bulletin of the Workers’ Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Norway, No. 12, Letter from the AKP (ML) to the Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Albania, October 1978, edition in English)

In reply, the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha remarked that:

“Today the “three world” theory has become an object of scorn and hatred all around the globe. This so-called “theory” is nothing but the social-chauvinist stand of sellout and betrayal and a mishmash of tired-out revisionist theses. It is despised and condemned by the Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations the world over. (...) The recent establishment of U.S.-China diplomatic relations and Deng Xiaoping's tour of the U.S. have provided yet another proof of the utter bankruptcy of the “three worlds” theory. These events were both part of and a new stage in the warmongering U.S.-China alliance. Today those who do not see the revisionist and counter-revolutionary nature of the theory of “three worlds” are blind. (...)”

Thus all over the world the Marxist-Leninists have put fighting the “three worlds” theory and Chinese revisionism as one of their crucial tasks. It is an essential part of the fight against modern revisionism and social-imperialism. (…)

The “three worlds” theory is not just an erroneous “international line,” nor is Chinese revisionism just a question of policies relating to China's internal degeneration. No, first and foremost, “three worlds-ism” is a whole system of opportunist and revisionist views and practices on every question. It is all-round collaboration with the bourgeoisie on all questions.” (Documents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism, Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists, 1979, edition in English)

“A new kind of revisionism has emerged – it is the treacherous “three world theory”, which is an attack against Marxism-Leninism and against the Communist International (...). The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties must perceive the counter-revolutionary “three world theory” as being an expression of modern revisionism. (...) The concept of “three world” is presented as being “an important contribution to Marxism-Leninism” and a “new global strategy”, but in truth it is nothing more than a general assault against
Marxism-Leninism whose purpose is to jeopardize the cause of revolution and socialism. Therefore, this variant of modern revisionism must be firmly combated. (...) Despite the sabotage of the revisionists, the proletariat and the oppressed peoples will undoubtedly manage to achieve socialist victory and the world revolution will triumph over world imperialism.” ("Der Weg der Partei" – theoretical Organ of the KPD/ML, Die "neue Weltstrategie" der Führung der KP Chinas - eine Strategie des Revisionismus, 1978, translated from German language)

Furthermore, the neo-revisionists of the AKP (“ML”) also declared that:

“In conversations with representatives from the AKP (m-l) Comrade Ramiz Alia has explicitly stated that the PLA does not consider Mao Tsetung a Marxist-Leninist classic on a par with Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. We think this is a mistake, an underestimation of Mao Tsetung. In the point of view of the AKP (m-l), Mao is not only a Marxist-Leninist classic, but he is one of the greatest.” (Class Struggle - International Bulletin of the Workers’ Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Norway, No. 12, Letter from the AKP (ML) to the Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Albania, October 1978, edition in English)

Here we can see that against all evidences, Norwegian Maoists continued to qualify social-bourgeois Mao as a “Classic of Marxism-Leninism”.

And there are may more Maoist parties in Europe which are as reactionary as the AKP (“ML”). Therefore, we will try to unmask some of those European Maoist parties which are doing so much harm to the noble cause of communism not only in Europe, but also in the whole world.

3.1 – Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

The “Communist” Party of Great Britain (“ML”) is one of those few Maoist parties which still consider present China as a socialist country. This kind of Maoist parties is becoming rarer and it is easy to understand why: nowadays, the predatory character and actions of the Chinese imperialist state are completely explicit and obvious. The “leftist” and “progressive” appearance that Chinese social-fascism had during Mao’s epoch (when the power of the Chinese national bourgeoisie was still not fully consolidated, and consequently it needed “communistic” slogans in order to deceive Chinese toiling masses) begun to disappear when Deng Xiaoping came to power. Today’s China is an openly fascist dictatorship which bloodily represses Chinese ultra-exploited workers in favor of the profits of the Chinese monopolist bourgeoisie. In face of this, the majority of the Maoist parties try to draw a demarcation line between Mao’s China (which was allegedly “Marxist-Leninist”) and post-Mao China (which is reactionary and capitalist). We, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, know very well that there is no difference between Mao and his successors. Deng Xiaoping’s pro-capitalist clique was the logical and necessary continuation of Mao’s pro-capitalist clique:

"Mao Tsetung was neither willing nor able to take to heart the principles and standards of a Bolshevist party. This concerns again the handling of his successors. It was Mao Tsetung himself who decided first Liu Schao – tschi, then Deng Hsiao – ping, Lin Piao and then Hua Kuo – feng as chairmen of the party after his death – and this after all their revisionist crimes and betrayals! (...)"

In our opinion there is no essential demarcation line between the Chinese revisionism before and after the death of Mao Tsetung. The development of the Chinese socialimperialism and socialfascism of today is the logical consequence of the revisionist “Mao Tsetung Ideas”.” (Documents of the Comintern (Stalinists-Hoxhaists), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

Nonetheless, nearly all Maoist parties try to make this differentiation in order to deceive the proletarians, making them believe that Mao was a true communist which was supposedly “betrayed” after his death. In
this sense, the British Maoists are among the most sincere of all Maoists, because at least they assume their support for Chinese social-imperialism and social-fascism in straightforward terms:

“Oh on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist) (CPGBML), and all the members and supporters of our party, we would like to extend our warmest fraternal greetings to you on the forthcoming seventeenth national congress of the Communist Party of China. (…)

Comrade Hu Jintao also laid great stress on the fact that none of China’s recent achievements could have been possible without the strong foundations laid by Mao Zedong and his comrades.

He said that the party “must never forget” that their work over the last period was “conducted on a foundation laid by the party’s first generation of central collective leadership with Comrade Mao Zedong at its core, which founded Mao Zedong Thought, (…) and scoring great achievements in our socialist revolution and construction (…).

(...) the ancient land of China, once despised and bullied as a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, has today stood up as a dignified power to whom no imperialist bully can dictate. (...)"

We shall follow the proceedings of your congress with interest and take this opportunity to affirm our militant solidarity with the Communist Party and people of China in your struggle to further develop China so that it may become a strong, prosperous socialist country that will make its due contribution to the communist goal of the emancipation of all humanity.”

(http://www.cpgb-ml.org/index.php?secName=proletarian&subName=display&art=349, Proletarian issue nº 21, December 2007, edition in English)

These words written by the British Maoists on the occasion of the 17th Congress of the “C” PC may sound unbelievably reactionary, but the readers who have doubts about our sincerity can easily enter the official site of the “C”PGB (“ML”) to read them with their own eyes. Indeed, the efforts of the British Maoists to defend Chinese social-fascism are so intense that they are even recognized by the leaders of the “C”PC, who regularly send their representatives to attend the congresses and meetings of the “C”PGB (“ML”):

“(…) delegations from the Chinese embassy have attended meetings of the CPGB-ML (...).”(Wikipedia, Communist Party of Great-Britain (Marxist-Leninist), version in English)

Therefore, the British Maoists are entirely integrated in the perverse schemes of the Chinese pro-capitalist leaders. And social-imperialist China is far from being the only revisionist state praised by the British Maoists. In their official site, we can find eulogizing references to all existing social-fascist regimes, including to Castroist Cuba, which has been misleading, exploiting and repressing Cuban proletariat for more than 5 decades:

“Unswayed, Cuba continues to build socialism and to provide for its people. Furthermore, Cuba stands in comradeship with the revolutions in the Peoples’ Republic of China and the Democratic Peoples’ Republic of Korea, as it does with the struggle of Zimbabwe led by ZANU-PF and comrade Robert Mugabe. Socialist Cuba will always stand on the side of anti-imperialists in their struggles to free themselves, and those who claim to support Cuba must, if their professed support for Cuba is to mean anything, do the same.”

(http://www.cpgb-ml.org/index.php?secName=proletarian&subName=display&art=389&from=results Proletarian issue nº 23, April 2008, edition in English)

In this article, we already explained the embracement of KimIlSungism by the Maoists and the close links that exist between both revisionisms. Consequently, we will now focus our attention
on the “CPGB’s praises of nepotist Cuba and of social-fascist Zimbabwe.

Just like Mao represented the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie struggling for power against the dominion of the Chinese bourgeoisie of the compradore type, also Castro represents the interests of Cuban national bourgeoisie fighting against the total and exclusive sway that American imperialism held over the island. In many senses, the aims of this “radical” section of the Cuban bourgeoisie led by Castro were far less ambitious than those of the Chinese national bourgeoisie led by Mao. While the latter aimed at complete domination over Chinese state and its transformation into an imperialist superpower, Cuban “progressive” bourgeoisie only aimed at a better position within the capitalist world market. Despite this, the ideological content of Maoism and Castroism is fundamentally the same: both try to mislead the workers of their respective countries through using “socialistic” and “leftist” masks to hide the perpetuation of capitalism and both prevented the proletariat from establishing its dictatorship and from building socialism in their countries. And just like happens with Maoism, also Castroist ideology is presented by the world bourgeoisie as being “communist” and even “Stalinist”. Of course, the world bourgeoisie has a lot of interest in convincing world workers of this, because in this manner they are kept away from the authentically revolutionary Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology. Furthermore, there is also another important characteristic which is common to both Maoism and Castroism: both propose an apparently “civilized” and “progressive” capitalism. A bourgeois analyst once described Castroist Cuba as being “a somewhat radicalized version of the Scandinavian welfare state”. And the same could be said about the phony “socialism” theoretically designed by Mao. Indeed, the final purpose of these revisionist currents is to construct a “perfect” capitalism under which there would be no class struggle because its socialistic mask would be so well done that workers would firmly believe that they were “advancing towards communism”. Wage slavery and exploitative capitalist relations of production would hide behind an allegedly “state-controlled economy” and a political system supposedly dominated by the “communist party”. Workers would no longer struggle against capitalism for the simple reason that apparently capitalism has already been abolished! The “communistic” outlook of this kind of system would reach the point of inculcating in the proletarians the false conviction that they are already living in a “socialist society”. This is undoubtedly the ultimate revisionist dream. Indeed, the creation of such capitalism is the final objective not only of Castroism/Guevarism and Maoism, but also of most of the other revisionist currents. Of course, one of the main essential characteristics that this “capitalism with a socialist face” must have in order to deceive the workers is a wide range of so-called “social and human services” like “free” health care and “free” education system (we say “free” because the oppressive tax system continues to exist in this kind of capitalist-revisionist system, and therefore those “free” services are actually paid mainly by the workers). These “social and human services” are to be presented by the revisionist bourgeoisie as “undeniable proofs of socialism”. However, if to us Stalinist-Hoxhaists this kind of “perfect” capitalism which utilizes a “socialist” disguise in order to be eternally preserved is something horribly deceitful and dangerously counter-revolutionary, to the social-fascists of the “CPGB (“ML”) it seems to be a sort of heaven on earth:

“The Cuban people enjoy a standard of living incomparable in the western world. Incomparable not because of the material goods they have, as these are undoubtedly limited, but because of the freedoms that they benefit from: the freedom that ensures every Cuban lives under shelter, has the right to universal free education and access to a healthcare system that is not dependant on income. In short, the freedom to live a full life no matter who you are or which family you are born into. (…)

As for education, the initial ambition of the revolution to rid Cuba of illiteracy has long since been achieved, something not all so-called developed countries can lay claim to. Education is taken very seriously, with 10 percent of Cuba’s GDP being spent on
providing free, universal education for all. (…)

Before the revolution, only 8 percent of the rural population had access to health care, but today Cuba can boast of a system that provides free health care to its entire population (…). The doctor to patient ratio in Cuba is higher than any other country, with a doctor for every 169 inhabitants. In Britain, on the other hand, the average doctor has to attend to 600 inhabitants.”

(http://www.cpgb-ml.org/index.php?secName=proletarian&subName=display&art=456, Proletarian issue nº 27, December 2008, edition in English)

“In Cuba there is one teacher for every 36.8 inhabitants. In the UK, there is one teacher for every 802 inhabitants. (…)

A poor country like Cuba is only able to achieve all this because of its socialist system.”

(http://www.cpgb-ml.org/index.php?secName=proletarian&subName=display&art=251, Proletarian issue nº 16, February 2007, edition in English)

These statements could not be clearer: “a country like Cuba is only able to achieve all this because of its socialist system.” As if socialism is nothing more than education and health care, as if socialism is reduced to some ridiculous alms given by the social-fascist-revisionist bourgeoisie to the workers it oppresses and exploits!

Socialism is infinitely more than that: socialism means the definitive abolition of capitalist exploitation, it means the destruction of the tyrannical class society under which workers are subjected to wage slavery and its replacement by a society which is in accord with the principle: “From each one according with his/her capacities, to each one according to his/her work”. But socialism also means the implementation of a new mentality; because socialism cannot be completed and cannot give place to communism without the total revolutionarization of social and family relations, without the annihilation of backward habits, etc… Therefore, socialism is synonym of destruction of everything related with the old exploiting capitalist socio-economic-ideological order through the use of harsh revolutionary proletarian violence. As comrade Enver remarked:

“True, PLA’s general-line struggles for the country’s industrialization, the development of cooperative agriculture, the extension of education services (…). However, no matter how important these objectives are, they will never be an end in themselves, because they are just means to achieve a higher purpose: the material and spiritual emancipation of the working masses (…).”(Enver Hoxha quoted by Gilbert Mury in Enver Hoxha contre le révisionnisme moderne, Paris, 1972, translated from French language)

What a contrast with the awfully reformist theories supported by the British Maoists, for whom socialism = bourgeois welfare state!

In fact, being staunch supporters of “capitalism with a socialist face”, the British Maoists present the existence of health and education services as proof that socialism is being built in Cuba. This “theory” is so absurd that it would be laughable if it was not so excruciatingly reactionary. Nowadays, nearly all countries of the so-called “developed world” provide health and education services to the workers (true, the quality and level of gratuity of those services may vary from
one “developed” capitalist country to another, but those services still exist in most of them). Indeed, comrade Karl Marx had predicted this long ago by noting that the capitalists need qualified and healthy workers whose “fruitful” exploitation is able to originate plenty of profits. Therefore, if we follow this “theory” defended by the “CPGB (“ML”), we will certainly conclude that practically all the “developed” capitalist countries are socialist!!

But what could we expect from a party which shamelessly supports black racist Mugabe and his oligarchic tribal tyranny which serves Chinese imperialism against the interests of Zimbabwean workers?

During centuries, Zimbabwe (former Rhodesia) was part of the British colonialist empire and served only as a supplier of raw materials in benefit of the profits of British imperialist bourgeoisie. Rhodesian white leaders were ardent defends of social-Darwinist racist theories and considered Rhodesia’s black population as “subhuman” (these theories were used by them to justify the intense exploitation and repression which was exercised over Rhodesia’s black workers, who constituted the majority of the population). Consequently, after independence from Great Britain, a white supremacist plutocracy was installed in Rhodesia under the leadership of Ian Smith. As a consequence of the racist and genocidal exploitative policies of Smith’s regime, Zimbabweans quickly organized an armed liberation struggle. Unhappily, this struggle was never led by an authentic communist party, but by a bourgeois-nationalist organization – the Zimbabwe’s African National Union (ZANU). The ZANU claimed to follow “the principles of Marxism-Leninism” allegedly in order to “establish socialism in Zimbabwe”, but unfortunately, reality was something else. Indeed, in spite of its cheap “leftist” slogans, the ZANU was never truly Marxist-Leninist. In his speech to the 6th Pan-African Congress, H. Chitepo – the president of the ZANU – affirmed his organization’s adherence to Pan-Africanism and openly declared that:

“Pan-Africanism rejects the narrow viewpoints related to (...) class.” (H. Chitepo, Speech of the national chairman of ZANU to the 6th Panafircan Congress, Zimbabwe News, Volume 8, Noº 6 - June 1974, translated from version in German language)

A genuine Marxist-Leninist would never defend something like this. In first place, Pan-Africanism is a non-communist notion which, although useful in the bourgeois-democratic stage of African peoples’ struggle (for purposes of anti-imperialist union, etc.), it ultimately turns out to be a counter-revolutionary concept in posterior socialist and communist stages. This because Pan-Africanism is mostly based on cultural and racial concepts and not on class materialist ones. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that class concepts determine everything. This constitutes one of the basic pillars of the whole communist ideology. Therefore, it is extremely reactionary to say that to see things from a class viewpoint is to be narrow-minded. Another serious mistake committed by ZANU is its refusal to make differentiations between white settlers. Throughout their historical documents, ZANU’s leaders homogenously refer to “the oppressive regime of the white racist settlers” and declare:

“Our party unites everybody against their common enemy – the white settlers.” (Historical documents of ZANU, Political Program of ZANU, November 27, 1973, translated from version in German language)

As can be concluded, ZANU does not even make a firm distinction between the white landowners and capitalists (who go to Zimbabwe only to increase profits through workers’ exploitation), on one side, and the poor toilers of European descent who emigrated to
Zimbabwe to improve their lives but who also ended up being exploited and who are in a
situation equivalent to that of black workers, on the other side. ZANU should have encouraged
union with these last ones, because both oppressed black and white Zimbabweans workers
have the same class interests, purposes and enemies. Indeed, their union only increases their
strength in the combat against racism, capitalism and imperialism. However, ZANU’s leaders
preferred to declare:

“There cannot be share of power between Africans and whites in Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe is
an African country and therefore, Africans are its legitimate owners.” [Zimbabwe News
central organ of ZANU), ZANU ‘s Criticism on the ANC, Vol. 1, Nº 1; November 1973,
translated from version in German language]

In first place, it is obvious that Zimbabwe’s legitimate owners are the native Africans. Nobody
here is questioning it. However, this should not prevent the union between native proletarians
and white proletarians against their common oppressors. Also in this, ZANU’s leaders rejected
the principled positions of the former Comintern of comrades Lenin and Stalin about African
countries: recognizance that Africa belonged primarily to native workers without neglecting the
urgent necessity of union between black and white exploited masses. In its “Resolution about
the South African Question”, the former Comintern correctly stated:

“ (...) South Africa belongs to the native population. (...) In its propaganda among the
native masses the Communist Party of South Africa must emphasize the class
differences between the white capitalists and the white workers, the latter also being
exploited by the bourgeoisie as wage slaves (...) black and white workers are not only
allies, but are the leaders of the revolutionary struggle (...) intensive propagation of the
chief slogan of a native republic will result not in the alienation of the white workers from
the Communist Party, not in segregation of the natives, but, on the contrary, in the
building up of a solid united front of all toilers against capitalism and imperialism.”
(Documents of the former Comintern, Resolution about the South African Question, adopted by
the Executive Committee of the Communist International following the Sixth Comintern
congress in 1928, version in English language)

These words were about South Africa, but they are also totally applicable to Zimbabwe’s
situation.

Therefore, if white Zimbabweans toilers are also exploited and subjected to wage slavery just
like black Zimbabwean workers, there is no reason why they should not unite and seize power
all together. Contrary to what ZANU’s leaders declare, this is not a question of sharing of power
between different races. In the context of the struggle for socialism and communism there are
no races, but only classes. So, instead of being so worried about preventing the share of power
with whites, ZANU’s leaders should have strived for preventing the share of power with the
exploitative elements – independently of their skin color. They should have fought for the union
between both white and black repressed workers. But they could have done this only if they
were true communists, if they were true Marxist-Leninists – and this was not the case.
Consequently, they played racists’ game and ultimately defended the further division between
native and white Zimbabwean toilers.

ZANU tends to see everything from a race perspective instead of from a class perspective:
“In Zimbabwe, (...) the exploiters (...) are exclusively white, while the exploited are all black Africans. The struggle in Zimbabwe is a racial war.” (H. Chitepo, *Speech of the national chairman of ZANU to the 6th PanafriCAN Congress, Zimbabwe News*, Volume 8, Noº 6 - June 1974, translated from version in German language)

If there were still doubts about ZANU’s anti-Marxist leanings, this statement dissipates all of them. In first place, even during Smith’s rule it was false that all exploiters were white. There were at least some black tribal chiefs who sided with the forces of white colonial rule and were also exploiting Zimbabwean workers.

In second place, it is also false that all exploited are black Africans. As we had referred many times, there were and still are many white Zimbabweans toilers who are as exploited and abused as their black colleagues. Relatively to this, ZANU’s leaders argue that white workers were better paid than black workers, but this does not mean that white workers were necessarily less exploited than blacks. In synthesis, what determines the degree and intensity of exploitation is the quantity of surplus-value that the capitalist can extract from the worker’s labor. It may happen that a better paid worker is in fact more exploited than a worse paid worker if the surplus-value that the capitalist master extracts from the first one is superior to that he extracts from the second one. Finally, the affirmation that the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe was a “racial war” is incredibly anti-socialist. The liberation struggle in Zimbabwe and in the rest of the world is always and without exception a class war between exploiters and exploited, between the owners of the means of production and the wage slaves.

Unsurprisingly, shortly after the phrases mentioned above, we can find in the cited Chitepo’s speech a quotation from Mao stated in a praiseful tone. So, wherever there are anti-Marxist affirmations, Maoist quotations are never too far… Indeed, Zimbabwe’s “liberation struggle” centered mainly in the countryside and ZANU’s “freedom fighters” were mainly peasants, intellectuals and bourgeois, in what represented a neglecting of the proletariat – the only truly revolutionary class. The truth is that ZANU’s leaders were very enthusiastic about Maoist anti-communist ideas:

“Undeveloped areas provide the basis for the struggle of the oppressed peoples.” (H. Chitepo, *Speech of the national chairman of ZANU to the 6th PanafriCAN Congress, Zimbabwe News*, Volume 8, Noº 6 - June 1974, translated from version in German language)

This paragraph is frighteningly similar to Maoist ridiculous premises that “only the peoples of undeveloped nations are revolutionary”. This idea relates with Mao’s “three world theory” defending precisely that the so-called “third world” (which is still nowadays under the rule of some of the worst fascist, reactionary and pro-imperialist regimes) is destined to be “the main force of revolution”. The anti-Marxist and pro-capitalist meaning of this concept was already explained by comrade Enver Hoxha in his brilliant works “Imperialism and the Revolution”, “The Superpowers”, etc… and also in this and in many other documents of the Comintern (SH). Therefore, we will not give further explanations about it right now. We will only add that even the terms used by ZANU’s leaders denote a deeply accentuated social-bourgeois and pro-Maoist tendency. In truth, they refer to the “oppressed peoples of the undeveloped countries”, but it would be much more accurate to refer to the “oppressed classes of the undeveloped countries”, because the word “people” can be very treacherous, as its meaning can include also exploiting elements. And given the fact that ZANU was heavily influenced by Maoism, we can certainly conclude that ZANU’s leaders perceived the members of the aspiring black Zimbabwean bourgeoisie as being part of the “oppressed people” – while simultaneously considering white exploited workers as being part of the “oppressive enemy”. Therefore, for
ZANU’s Maoist-influenced leaders, it was infinitively more desirable to promote the interests of the wannabe black exploiters than to unite with white oppressed proletarians in the revolutionary combat for socialism and communism.

In face of all this, no wonder that the revisionist and anti-Marxist tendencies of ZANU gave birth to such a disgraceful thing as it is the totalitarian social-fascist oligarchy presently ruling Zimbabwe – and which is nothing more than a puppet regime of Chinese social-imperialism.

In fact, bourgeois-nationalist ZANU was deeply influenced by Maoism since the beginning – social-bourgeois China was inclusively one of the main providers of weaponry to ZANU’s fighters. This is entirely comprehensible in the context of Maoism’s purposes of turning China into the world dominant superpower. Chinese imperialists clearly understood that to conquer Zimbabwe to their sphere of influence, they had to support ZANU against the white regime backed by western imperialism. In this manner, they first promoted an ideological invasion of Zimbabwe through Maoism with the goal of depicting this wicked and counter-revolutionary ideology with “progressive” colors, with the aim of presenting it as the ideology which would supposedly “free black Zimbabweans from racist tyranny towards socialism.” And we have to admit that many Zimbabwean workers and peasants were totally misled by Maoist lies, they were blatantly manipulated and convinced that Mao’s social-fascism would show them the path to complete liberation. This explains why the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe never evolved from a bourgeois-nationalist stage into a veritable socialist stage. Moreover, the ZANU was also supported by monarcho-fascist North Korea. This reveals us the lack of coherence affecting ZANU’s leaders and members. On one side, they fought against Smith’s pro-western racist plutocracy, but on the other side, they had no problems about receiving support from one of the most reactionary regimes that exist in this planet. We have already stated our position relatively to the North Korean oligarchy which savagely represses North Korean workers. We will only add that if ZANU’s leaders were true Marxist-Leninists, they would have never accepted any kind of support from a social-fascist regime which bases its existence over the forced division of an entire country.

However, it is understandable that socialist Albania had to support ZANU due to strategical motives. Indeed, the armed struggle of ZANU was the only correct line to the liberation of Zimbabwean people. This is a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism.

As time passed, the ZANU transformed itself from a bourgeois-democratic movement into an openly fascist party. During Smith’s rule, the ZANU’s leaders screamed a lot against western imperialism, but they were not authentically anti-imperialists. They were just waiting for their opportunity to contribute to the replacement of western imperialism by Chinese imperialism and to benefit from capitalist class privileges. Even ZANU’s anti-racist character suffered total degeneration. Nowadays, Zimbabwe’s white minority is affected by discriminations and oppressions which are very similar to those suffered by black Zimbabweans during white colonial dominion. We can say that after the fall of white colonial rule, the white supremacist bourgeoisie was replaced by a black bourgeoisie which started to encourage racist attacks against the white minority. This situation worsened since Mugabe’s clique is governing Zimbabwe. True, there are still some white landowners which are linked to western imperialism and who would like to restore white rule in the country. However, there are also many propertyless workers of European descent who were never involved in white rule and who are systematically intimidated, displaced or even killed by Mugabe’s fascist forces. Black Zimbabwean journalist Kholwani Nyathi affirms in his articles:

“Mugabe (…) has been on a crusade against whites (…). (Mugabe) thinks fellow citizens
who are different from him are less human. (...) Although some may argue that there is nothing like black racism, what Mugabe and Zanu PF are doing is known as reverse racism. The term refers to racial prejudice or discrimination directed against the traditionally dominant racial group.” (www.newsdays.co.zw, Kholwani Nyathi, Racism, tribalism: Elephant in the room, November 21, 2012, version in English language)

However, the problem of black racism in Zimbabwe reached the peak of attention when Zimbabwe’s only white minister, David Coltart, complained that racist insults against white people are commonplace during Mugabe’s cabinet meetings. Coltart is a bourgeois activist and a former opponent to Smith’s regime. He affirms that his ministerial colleagues seem to forget he is in the same room when they make “shocking remarks” about whites and he says that “if I directed similar insults towards black people, I would rightly be branded as a Nazi or an admirer of the Ku Klux Klan.” This gives us an idea about the seriousness of the racist offenses heard by Coltart. And we must bear in mind that he is talking about the highest-ranking officials of Zimbabwe’s government! Therefore, we can conclude that the most intimate servers of the Zimbabwean dominant classes are doing their utmost to spread racist venom in order to prevent Zimbabwean workers from acquiring a communist consciousness and from uniting against their common foe – Mugabe’s fascist tyranny and its Chinese social-imperialist bosses.

Furthermore, Mugabe publicly encourages the practice of black racism and has once said to his supporters: “Strike fear in the heart of the white man.” In sequence of this, many white Zimbabwean workers were assassinated with impunity.

The referred statements are so explicit that we won’t waste our time commenting them further. Zimbabwean toilers must annihilate their enemies through revolutionary force and violence under the guidance of a genuine Stalinist-Hoxhaist party leadership. But they must do this because of the exploitative and oppressive character of those enemies, and never because of their skin color. Furthermore, we had already mentioned that to perceive every white African as someone who is inevitably reactionary is a terrible mistake which has been committed by many African liberation movements – including by ZANU.

The purpose of this kind of attacks against white minority is to make Zimbabwe’s black proletarians forget that they are being as much exploited under Mugabe’s pro-Chinese tribal oligarchy as they were under Smith’s white supremacist order – while the last one was a lackey of Western imperialism, the first one is a lackey of Chinese social-imperialism. The only distinction between them are the different imperialist masters to whom they serve – in all the rest, Mugabe and Smith are ideological twins.

Here are some revealing facts about the absolute control Chinese social-imperialists exercise over Zimbabwe (all information was taken from the mentioned bourgeois and pro-capitalist sites):

Accordingly with recent news coming from China Development Bank, China has plans to invest around 10 $ billion in Zimbabwe in various key economic sectors like gold and platinum refining, oil and gas exploration, fuel procurement and distribution, housing development, etc. Mashakada, the minister of economic planning and investment promotion of Zimbabwe openly declared that:

“China is looking into mining development, exploration and exploitation of agriculture,
However, the construction of Chinese hotels in Mutare, Harare and the defence college in Mazowe is of no benefit to the majority of Zimbabweans, but only to the country’s dominant classes and its Chinese social-imperialist masters.

And of course, the Chinese would never invest 10 $ billion if they were not sure that they would get zillions more in return. And this was not the only billionaire agreement signed between Chinese social-fascists and Zimbabwe’s cleptocrats. After all, we must not forget that Zimbabwe has the world’s second biggest platinum reserves and huge deposits of alluvial diamonds:

“Mining will be a major beneficiary of an US$8 billion accord the government of Zimbabwe and a Chinese joint venture have signed. Reporting from the Zimbabwe capital, The Herald newspaper said that the agreement would result in investment in the southern African country’s mining, energy and housing industries.”

Recently, a bourgeois book entitled “Win-Win Partnership? China, Southern Africa and Extractive Industries” authored by pro-capitalist organization Southern Africa Resource Watch (SARW) concluded that most Chinese companies in Zimbabwe violate local regulations and abuse workers with impunity because they are being protected by the country’s leaders.

Moreover, several bourgeois articles significantly refer:

“Chinese investors have snapped up commercial and residential properties in Zimbabwe's capital, Harare, over the past few years. The influx of cheap Chinese goods, known locally as “zhing-zhong”, has caused widespread annoyance.”

“The Asian giant, in return for its investments -- both in Zimbabwean infrastructure and in Mugabe's personal accounts -- has won near-exclusive dominance of everything from mineral rights to labor standards, as well as the apparent acquiescence of local politicians and police. (...) So far, the Zimbabweans who are most feeling China's influence in their country are the workers. As Chinese firms take over business and Chinese managers come to run everything from billion-dollar mining companies to the downtown restaurants in capital Harare, Zimbabwean workers and labor unions are complaining of mistreatment and exploitation. Earlier this month, construction workers went on strike over low pay -- $4 per day -- and they complained about regular beatings by their Chinese managers within the Anhui Foreign Economic Construction Company.

Reports of beatings by Chinese managers are so common that even a cook at Harare's popular China Garden restaurant complained of them, telling the Zimbabwe Mail &
Guardian, "Working for these men from the East is hell on earth." "Workers continue to endure various forms of physical torture at the hands of these Chinese employers right under the noses of the authorities," a spokesperson for the Zimbabwe Construction and Allied Trade Workers' Union told the same newspaper. "One of the most disturbing developments is that most of the Chinese employers openly boast that they have government protection and so nothing can be done to them. (...) China has adeptly co-opted much of the country's political leadership, buying impunity for Chinese managers as well as control over much of Zimbabwe's economy. China recently paid $3 billion for exclusive access to Zimbabwe's extensive platinum rights, a contract estimated to be worth $40 billion." (http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/06/in-zimbabwe-chinese-investment-with-hints-of-colonialism/240978/, In Zimbabwe, Chinese Investment With Hints of Colonialism, The Atlantic, 24th June, 2011, version in English language)

So, the Chinese social-imperialists pay $3 billion for a contract worth $40 billion. Our previous assertions that Chinese greedy social-fascists only invest if they are able to regain maximum profits in return are confirmed. And it is obvious that corrupt Mugabe is willing to sell his own country to the Chinese imperialists if this assures him bourgeois luxury class privileges:

"Zimbabwe-watchers suspect that the autocratic president benefits personally from these kinds of deals from China. It's not hard to find the payoff -- he keeps a large (and heavily guarded) mansion in Hong Kong, where he is often seen on shopping sprees under the guard of Chinese special police." (http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/06/in-zimbabwe-chinese-investment-with-hints-of-colonialism/240978/, In Zimbabwe, Chinese Investment With Hints of Colonialism, The Atlantic, 24th June, 2011, version in English language)

It is also known that the Chinese embassy in Harare (Zimbabwe's main city) prepared an opulent birthday party for fascist Mugabe on occasion of his 86th anniversary (!). This testifies of how content the Chinese social-imperialists are towards their Zimbabweans servants. Indeed, this is the reason why Mugabe is still in power. From the moment Chinese social-fascist are not happy with him anymore, then he and his clique will be quickly ousted from power. In what respects to protecting and advancing their profitable class interests, Chinese social-fascists are anything but sentimentalists.

Today, the control exercised by the Chinese social-imperialists over Zimbabwe is so intense that the country can undoubtedly be considered as a veritable Chinese neo-colony ruled by a puppet regime which totally depends on China in political, economic and militar terms:

“China's grasp on Zimbabwe extends beyond even the African country's economy and political system. A massive military compound is under construction in Harare, built by Chinese firms and with a Chinese loan of $98 million. The open-ended loan, which the already indebted Zimbabwean government has no obvious way of paying back, means that this component of the country's military will be effectively Chinese-owned. (...)This isn't the first time that Zimbabwe has relied on China for its security needs. During the 2008 political crisis, when Mugabe deployed violence to retain control of the country after declaring victory in a heavily disputed election, South African dock workers discovered that China was shipping in weapons for Mugabe's army. (...) the effect has been to deepen China's influence over what happens, and who rules, in Zimbabwe.” (http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/06/in-zimbabwe-chinese-investment-with-hints-of-colonialism/240978/, In Zimbabwe, Chinese Investment With Hints of Colonialism, The Atlantic, 24th June, 2011, version in English language)
So, it is crystal clear that after the Maoist ideological invasion, Chinese social-imperialists are now occupying Zimbabwe with their bloody weapons, obnoxious “investments” and predatory capital penetration.

Mugabe and Hu Jintao (social-imperialist China’s “president”): two fascist dictators, two ruthless adversaries of the world proletarian dictatorship, two implacable enemies of world socialism and world communism.

But the British Maoists of the “C”PGB couldn’t care less about all this. They are so deeply submerged in their nauseatingly anti-communist ideology that they don't have any scruples about openly supporting Zimbabwe’s pro-Chinese kleptocracy. They try to justify this by qualifying Zimbabwe as a “black progressive regime” but they will never be able to deceive the world proletarians, who know very well that capitalist exploitation is always and invariably noxious, independently of the skin color of who exercises it. The same can be said about racism, because black racism is as counter-revolutionary and anti-socialist as white racism. Those who advocate the opposite (like happens with the British Maoists) are perilous enemies of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinist-Hoxhaism and of the world socialist revolution.

In face of all this, we think that there is nothing more to add relatively to the anti-communist character of the Maoist “C”PGB (“ML”). The facts are obvious and speak for themselves.

3.2 - Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany (MLPD)

The second European Maoist party about which we will reflect is the “ML”PD (in German: Marxistisch-Leninistische Partei Deutschlands - MLPD), which can be considered as the largest Maoist party in Germany.

Who is the MLPD?

The MLPD was founded in 1982 and recruited from various neo-revisionist elements. These circles appeared since 1970 - thus in a time when the KPD / ML [founded by Comrade Ernst Aust in 1968/69 - and which is now identical with the oldest section of our Comintern [SH]] - was in its construction process. The former leader of the MLPD, Willi Dickhut, was once a member of the first Central Committee of the KPD / ML. The MLPD is therefore originally a union of circles, which partly emerged from our former party members, and who tried to split the KPD/ML. Their goal was to hinder the development and strengthening of a true Bolshevik party of Lenin's and Stalin's type - on German soil and with the help of the ideology of Maoism.

The MLPD defends Mao Zedong as a "classics" of Marxism-Leninism and - from the very beginning - was guided by the revisionist general-line of Mao Zedong (published in 1963, June 14). The MLPD argues that China was "socialist" in lifetime of Mao Zedong and that capitalism was "restored" in China, after his death, after the so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution".

The contradictions and the struggle between the MLPD and the KPD / ML increased in Germany in the same way and at the same time, such as between China and Albania, as between the Maoist and the Hoxhaist world movement. The MLPD and the KPD / ML embodied the organized struggle between Maoism and Hoxhaism on German soil for decades.

Meanwhile, the MLPD has nearly completely dropped its "Marxist-Leninist" mask and, in essence, the MLPD became an ordinary revisionist party both in theory and practice.

A considerable number of different political groups in Germany attempted to bridge these deep ideological contradictions between Maoism and Hoxhaism. In Germany there are different groups who estimate the MLPD as a "Marxist-Leninist" party though they criticize the mistakes of the MLPD. In Germany, there are diverse centrist-conciliatory positions towards the MLPD and this concerns also to the Turkish MLCP who is member of the ICOR. Thus this conciliatory position towards Maoism has to be
combated as an international phenomenon. Hoxhaism cannot be reconciled with Maoism, neither on a national nor on a global scale. They are two antagonistic ideologies, namely the ideology of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Therefore, it can and will be no unity with the MLPD.

Maoism is an ideological instrument used by the world bourgeoisie, under the guise of "Marxism-Leninism," for the purpose to denounce the true Marxist-Leninists in the world as "sectarian" and "ultra-leftists", for the purpose to isolate them from the world proletariat, from the socialist world revolution. The MLPD says: "Whoever attacks Mao Zedong, attacks also the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. This is the core question". That's why the MLPD vilifies Comrade Enver Hoxha as a "liquidator", and why they treat him like a "revisionist", just to be in a better position to hide behind the MLPD's own revisionism. The MLPD has taken over the anti-Stalinist line of Mao Zedong and makes Stalin responsible for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union (bureaucracy-accusations). And so we say to the Maoists, "Those who attack Stalin, also attack Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism!"

The MLPD considers the Mao Zedong-ideas as "the main feature of a Marxist-Leninist organization." In contrast, we Stalinists-Hoxhaists say that anti-Maoism is an essential feature of a true Marxist-Leninist organization: a party which gives to itself the name "Marxist-Leninist party", however which refuses to struggle against Maoism, can never be a genuine Marxist-Leninist party.

The MLPD is a product of the organizational circle-principle, which is based on Maoism and expanding internationally. Together with other organizations of the ICOR the MLPD tries to spread the Menshevik spirit of Mao Zedong-ideas onto an international level. This is an attack on the Bolshevik organizational principles of the Communist International of Lenin and Stalin, is against the world's Bolshevik principles of organization of the Comintern (SH) directed. The MLPD plays a not insignificant role in the globalization of the organizational Menshevik circle-principle against the organizational principles of the Bolshevik world party, against the Comintern (SH).

The Chinese "Cultural Revolution" was directed against the principle of the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. The MLPD defended this "cultural revolution" and is therefore against the communist leadership of the masses. From the very beginning the MLPD in Germany has practiced worship of the spontaneity of the masses and the MLPD tries to expand this Maoist "mass-line" all over the world. Maoist mass struggle means nothing else than guidance by spontaneity instead of guidance by Marxism-Leninism, means guidance by the bourgeois ideology. The Maoist so-called "mass politics" is bourgeois tailism who is dressed in revolutionary slogans. Even if the MLPD is trying to globalize this "mass politics", this will change nothing to its counter-revolutionary character. This concerns especially the trade-union-politics of the Maoist MLPD. Lenin combated the economists who have tried to sacrifice the Communist Party as a free supplement to the trade unions. The MLPD condemned our revolutionary trade-union policy as "sectarian" and our RGO (Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition) as "ultra-left". So the MLPD takes side with the imperialist and fascist German Trade Union Federation (DGB), the main instrument of the monopoly bourgeoisie within the workers' movement. By the way, the chairman of the DGB is also chairman of the largest world organization of the yellow unions. On May 1, 2012, the MLPD writes: "Fortunately, the DGB has finally realized that the MLPD is a friendly organization."

Continuing with our analysis of the “ML”PD, we will now scrutinize the party’s participation at the 7th Conference of the ICMLPO which is divided in two parts: the first part consists of a “country report” while the second part consists of an historical account of the former Communist International seen from a Maoist point of view.

Starting with the first part of “ML”PD’s participation, we observe that it is mainly composed of Maoist boasting:

"At the suggestion of the MLPD (...) in February at Bosch, then at Siemens, and in July at DaimlerChrysler, powerful company-wide strike days took place. (...) On July 5, 2004, 60,000 DaimlerChrysler workers went out on strike in a company-wide day of strike; 2,000 workers blocked a main traffic artery. (...) This characterizes the growing influence of the “ML”PG on the core of the class-militant industrial workers (...).”(ICMLPO, International Newsletter, n° 33, July,
As to whether these “successes” of the “ML”PD were real or not, we don’t know. We wouldn’t be surprised if these words were nothing more than an enormous lie, because Maoists were always the masters of deceiving. But even if we admit that the German Maoists are saying the true, this only shows how much Maoism’s reactionary poison is spread within Europe’s most powerful imperialist country – Germany. This is a very worrying situation because the acquisition of an authentic revolutionary consciousness by the German workers and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in Germany are absolutely decisive for the triumph of socialist revolution in Europe and all over the world. Nonetheless, it is in the second part of their participation that the German Maoists mainly display their counter-revolutionary and anti-Marxist character by harshly criticizing the former glorious Comintern of Lenin and Stalin:

“Item 17 of Lenin’s proposal stated: “All decisions of the Communist International’s congresses and of its Executive Committee are binding on all affiliated parties” (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 211). (…) Accordingly, all parties were obligated to “everywhere build up a parallel illegal organization, which, at the decisive moment, will be in a position to help the Party fulfill its duty to the revolution” (ibid., p. 208).

But the building of parallel structures went far beyond that. (…) This department’s representatives had de facto authority over the representatives of the local CPs and increasingly were bound up with the organs of the Soviet secret services. They also coordinated training and propaganda in the Comintern and headed publications that had nothing to do with parties in the capitalist countries (…).

These structures were linked with the secret services and special agencies of the USSR and were ultimately controlled by them. (…) In practice, the ideological-political and organizational independence of the communist parties was undermined or even abolished by way of these parallel structures. Democratic centralism in the Comintern acquired bureaucratic-centralist features.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

As can be seen, the “arguments” used by the German Maoists against the former Comintern of Lenin and Stalin are completely anarchistic. Accordingly with them, Comintern’s “mistake” was that it supposedly “undermined the ideological-political and organizational independence of the communist parties and turned them into appendixes of the Soviet secret services”. First of all, we must keep in mind that when the Maoists talk about “independence”, what they really mean is independence relatively to Marxism-Leninism and nothing more. What truly upsets the Maoists is the great example set by the former Comintern, which basing itself on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism was able to unite the proletarian parties in benefit of the victory of socialism throughout the world. The Comintern founded by Lenin and Stalin represented what Maoists most hate: unconditional loyalty to genuine communist ideology. The Comintern of Lenin and Stalin always fought against the germination of bourgeois-revisionist tendencies within the ranks of the communist parties, and that’s why the Maoists say that the Comintern “undermined their independence”. Of course that the heroic and outstanding Comintern of Lenin and Stalin could never allow this Maoist “independence” which means nothing more than letting the communist parties capitulate in face of the pro-capitalist influences, thus jeopardizing the preservation and development of socialism.

It is crystal clear that this “criticism” entirely corresponds to the anarchistic origins of Maoism. Indeed, behind Maoists’ fake “concerns” about “independence”, we can easily perceive a furious anger towards the fierce proletarian discipline which characterized the Comintern’s work and activities and which was in total opposition to the anti-Marxist policy of bourgeois factions and to the anarchistic defense of the masses’ “spontaneous initiative” that are advocated by Maoism.

Finally, it is very interesting to note the depreciative manner in which the German Maoists refer to the Stalinist secret services. These secret services were one of the most valuable
instruments for the defense of the Soviet proletarian dictatorship and they were totally right about exercising surveillance over the communist parties in order to avoid the infiltration of the class enemy within their ranks. It is obvious that the Maoists are so furious about the activities of Stalinist secret services because they are still deadly afraid of the socialist power which was behind those secret services.

In making such kind of criticisms, the German Maoists are not saying anything new; they are just repeating the infamous slanders and calumnies that the pro-capitalist reactionaries invent with the objective of denigrating the glorious Soviet proletarian dictatorship headed by comrade Stalin.

And the German Maoists go further with their anti-communist zeal, stating that:

"Political mistakes and dirigism by the Executive Committee of the Comintern mainly were responsible for grave errors in the policies of the Communist Party of Germany, KPD. The Executive Committee was the initiator, for example, of the so-called RGO (Revolutionäre Gewerkschaftsopposition [Revolutionary Trade-Union Opposition]) policy." (ICMLPO, *International Newsletter*, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

So, now it is against the valiant Communist Party of Germany (KPD) led by proletarian hero Thalmann that the social-fascists of the “ML”PD are launching their attacks. They qualify KPD’s attitude towards the expulsion of communists from the German bourgeois trade-unions during the late 20’s and 30’s as “sectarian”. The German Maoists say that KPD’s decision of reacting to those expulsions by building up new red trade-unions under the leadership of the German communists was “a serious mistake”:

"To counter the reformist leadership's policy of expulsion, the communists must work with great skill in the unions and prove to be active members. It is fundamentally wrong to withdraw from the trade unions or encourage the organization of red unions affiliated to the party." (ICMLPO, *International Newsletter*, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

Therefore, accordingly with the “ML”PD, the German communists who were expelled from bourgeois trade unions during the advent of Nazism should have betrayed their ideology by imploring to the leaders of those trade unions to let them stay. Indeed, the German Maoists go even further by affirming that German communists should have make efforts to “be active members” of the pro-nazi trade unions, that is, that they should have contributed to the strengthening of those trade-unions. This opinion is so awful and reactionary that it does not need further comments. It entirely speaks for itself and plainly reveals Maoists’ ugliest face.

As if this dreadful ultra-reactionary position was not enough, the social-fascists of the “ML”PD also criticize comrade Stalin’s correct Marxist-Leninist teaching that considers social-democracy as synonym of social-fascism. They claim that this position was “wrong” and affirm that its adoption by Thalmann’s KPD promoted the ascension of Nazism:

"Closely related with the sectarian RGO policy was the social-fascism theory, which likewise originated with the Comintern. (…) The adoption of aggressive anticommunism in theory and practice by the Rightist leaders of the Social-Democratic Party (SPD) (…) did not make the SPD anything like a social-fascist party (?!!). Willi Dickhut pointed out the historic consequences of this wrong theory:

Defaming all social-democrats as social-fascists destroyed existing contacts between communists and social-democrats and prevented the creation of a proletarian united front which, as a strong backbone of a broad antifascist unity of action, could have prevented Hitler from seizing power.” (ICMLPO, *International Newsletter*, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

In first place, comrade Stalin’s position is correct and consistent. Social-democracy is really a synonym of social-fascism: both try to maintain wage slavery and to preserve capitalist exploitative tyranny. In what respects to the accusation made by the German Maoists that the adoption of this firm and principled stand towards social-democracy by the KPD contributed to the ascension of Nazism, we can only say that this
charge is nowadays rejected even by bourgeois ideologues. In his book, “Blackshirts and Reds”, American bourgeois-democratic scholar Michael Parenti reflects about the ascension of Nazism and affirms that:

“In the December 1932 election, three candidates run for presidency: the conservative incumbent Field Marshall von Hindenburg, the Nazi candidate Adolf Hitler and the Communist Party’s candidate Ernst Thalmann. In his campaign, Thalmann argued that a vote for Hindenburg amounted to a vote for Hitler and that Hitler would lead Germany into war. The bourgeois press, including the Social-Democrats, denounced this view as “Moscow inspired”.

True to form, the Social-Democrat leaders refused the Communist Party’s proposal to form an eleventh hour coalition against Nazism. As in many other countries, past and present, so in Germany, the Social-Democrats would sooner ally themselves with the reactionary Right than to make common cause with the Reds. Meanwhile, a number of right-wing parties coalesced behind the Nazis and in January 1933, just weeks after the elections, Hindenburg invited Hitler to become chancellor.” (Michael Parenti, Blackshirts and Reds, San Francisco, 1997)

As can be concluded, even non-communists admit that the social-democrats of the SPD were to blame for Nazi ascension. So, contrary to what the social-fascists of the “ML”PG say, the adoption of aggressive anticommunism in theory and practice by the Rightist leaders of the Social-Democratic Party (SPD) (...) indeed made the SPD a social-fascist party!

Of course, German Maoists do their utmost to defend their ideological partners (the social-democrats) while falsely accusing the German communists of being responsible for the emergence of Nazism. This is quite expectable because both Maoism and social-democracy play the same role: they keep the oppressed masses in bondage by detaching them from the authentic communist ideology through the support of an allegedly “tamed capitalism”.

After this, the German Maoists affirm that:

“It was only the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935 which corrected the sectarian course and gave out a new tactical orientation to establish a united front against fascism.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

Of course, the social-fascists of the “ML”PD would never loose an opportunity to praise the infamous 7th Congress of the Comintern in which the ultra-revisionist Dimitrov presented his loathful anti-Leninist “theory” of the “united front against fascism”. In truth, Dimitrov’s “ideas” were nothing more than an explicit appeal to the capitulation of communist parties in benefit of bourgeois-revisionist ideologies and movements; but the German Maoists seem to think that Dimitrov’s abhorrent social-capitalist “theories” were a veritable “cure” for the “mistakes” supposedly committed by “Stalinist sectarianism”. This position can be understood if we take into account the striking similarities between Dimitrov’s revisionism and Maoist revisionism, particularly in what respects to the defense that both make of the unity with the bourgeoisie under the excuse of “struggling against the common enemy” (in the case of Dimitrov’s revisionism, the role of this common enemy was played by fascism, while in Mao’s revisionism, the common enemy was imperialism – at least during Maoism’s initial stages). By perpetuating capitalism, both these kinds of revisionism ultimately favor the enemies they pretend to combat: Dimitrov’s “united front” theories aim to struggle against fascism, but by supporting the union between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie (which will always be an inherently exploitative class, no matter if we are referring to its openly pro-fascist sections or to its “progressive” and “anti-fascist” sections), Dimitrov’s revisionism is ensuring that the fight against fascism will never have a truly socialist and Marxist-Leninist character, it is ensuring that this anti-fascist struggle will never put capitalist system in risk, thus preventing the abolition of the inevitability of fascism, because fascism will always exist as long as capitalism exists. In the same manner, Mao’s phony “anti-imperialism” was never based on an authentic socialist ideology, but only wanted to pave the way for Chinese national bourgeoisie’s own imperialist aims. By advocating and promoting the “unity of all revolutionary classes” (including the alleged “anti-imperialist” bourgeoisie), Maoist revisionism prevented the anti-imperialist struggle of the
Chinese workers from acquiring a genuine communist nature, it prevented that anti-imperialist struggle from surpassing the limits of capitalism. This actually meant that Mao avoided the abolishment of the inevitability of imperialism, because imperialism will always exist as long as capitalism exists – what permitted the accomplishment of the imperialist predatory purposes of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, to whom Mao faithfully served.

Consequently, by denying proletarian supremacy and by automatically supporting the dominance of the bourgeois oppressive socio-economic-ideological order, both Dimitrov’s revisionism and Maoist revisionism fulfill their tasks of defending the class interests of the capitalists. In face of this, no wonder that Maoists love Dimitrov so much! They know very well that the aims and objectives of Dimitrov’s “theories” are exactly the same of those of “Mao Zedong Thought”.

Besides this, the German Maoists also state that they support a “socialism” which would allegedly be in accordance with each country’s “specific laws and conditions”. They add that Mao’s “C” PC applied this “principle” in an “exemplary manner”:

“This called (…) for independent parties willing and able to concretize the theory of Marxism-Leninism by applying the dialectical method to revolutionary practice in their countries and to realize strategy and tactics according with the specific laws and conditions. In an exemplary manner the Communist Party of China under Mao Zedong’s leadership managed to achieve this (…).” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

Of course, being reactionaries and social-fascists, the German Maoists could not fail to praise the “theory of national socialism” which has been defended by all kinds of revisionists: since the sadly famous Tito’s “Yugoslav road to socialism” to the not less famous socialisme à la française fabricated by the social-chauvinists of the French “Communist” Party and, of course, to the “socialism with Chinese characteristics” invented by Mao. All these “theories” of “specific socialisms” are nothing more than perverse attempts to hide the pro-capitalist and bourgeois character of their authors. As we had already highlighted in the DWM II:

“This is (…) closely related with what the Chinese revisionists call “socialism with Chinese characteristics”. As every revisionist current, Maoist revisionism also propagates its own “chinese socialism” (…). However, Comrade Stalin and Comrade Enver Hoxha always underlined that those specificities are always limited to minor and secondary aspects of the socialist edification and can never be extended to its essential characteristics, because socialist and communist edification must follow a certain and invariable line in accordance with the teachings of the Classics, regardless of the place in which socialism is being built.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Declaration of War against the Maoists II, June 2011, version in English)

Finally, the German Maoists don’t hesitate before insisting in the old lies about the supposed “anti-revisionist” struggle of the “C” PC and about the allegedly “socialist” nature of Mao’s “Cultural Revolution”:

“Beginning in 1963 the CP China conducted a public polemic against the revisionist betrayal. (…) The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in 1966 was the creative advancement of the strategy and tactics of class struggle in socialism, a successful mass movement to counter the danger of revisionist degeneration of the CP China and the restoration of capitalism in China.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

In the previous DWM I and DWM II, we had already analyzed this subject and tried to expose Mao’s “anti-revisionist combat” as the total masquerade it actually was. Therefore, we will not lose more time with this issue and we politely direct our readers to the referred DWM I and II. Relatively to the claims of the German Maoists that the Maoist “Cultural Revolution” was an example of “class struggle in socialism” and a “successful mass movement to counter the danger of revisionist degeneration”, we will only recall comrade Enver’s words:
“The «Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution» was not a cultural revolution (it was aimed against that culture which Marx and Lenin advocated). It was a political revolution, not on the Marxist-Leninist course, but an anarchist revolution, without a program, against the working class and its party, because in fact, the leading role of the working class and the party itself were liquidated. (…)

During this chaotic and anarchist revolution, allegedly repairs were carried out on the party, allegedly it was reformed. And how many were expelled after all this great turmoil and period of distrust and insecurity? Only three to four per cent. However, this figure does not indicate that the party had «decayed», but implies that Mao and some of his followers had no confidence in the party. What other «benefit» did the Cultural Revolution bring? None at all!” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

After all this, we think that no more comments are needed. The pro-capitalist, ultra-reactionary and social-fascist nature of the Maoist “ML”PD is already entirely proved and confirmed.

3.3 – Portuguese Workers’ Communist Party

The PW “C”P (in Portuguese: Partido Comunista dos Trabalhadores Portugueses) is the main Maoist organization in Portugal. Its aim is to mislead Portuguese workers by presenting Maoist revisionism as being the solution to all their problems. In many senses, the PW “C”P has a more “orthodox” appearance than the other European Maoist parties that are analyzed in this article. For example, in their statutes, the Portuguese Maoists treacherously affirm that:

“The Portuguese Workers’ Communist Party is the political party of the Portuguese proletariat (…). Its general-line consists in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, in the replacement of the bourgeois dictatorship by the proletarian dictatorship. The final purpose of the PWCP is to implement a society without classes and without exploitation, is to implement communism.” (Documents of the PWCP, Estatutos do PCTP, translated from Portuguese language)

As can be observed, in comparison with the “C”PGB (“ML”), the phraseology used by the Portuguese Maoists sounds much more “socialist” than that used by the British Maoists, for example. However, this “communist” mask is only able to deceive those who want to be deceived. The truth is that the PW “C”P is a social-fascist organization which serves the interests of the Portuguese exploiting classes. For example, presently the Portuguese Maoists are launching a campaign entitled: “We won’t pay!” In this campaign, they defend that Portuguese people should unite with the other Southern European peoples and refuse to pay the country’s debt towards imperialist institutions such as the IMF and the European banks. At first sight, this may sound appellative, but the truth is that the Portuguese Maoists seem to “forget” that foreign debts are the inevitable result of the domination of some countries over the others. And the domination of some countries over the others is something intrinsic to the capitalist-imperialist system which presently rules the world. Therefore, the only manner to abolish the inevitability of countries’ debts is through the total and complete destruction of this capitalist-imperialist order. But by embracing Maoist revisionism, the social-fascists of the PW “C”P are automatically rejecting any possibility of efficiently removing capitalist-imperialist exploitative system and all the evils inherent to it (like the oppression of some countries by others which originates the huge foreign debts, for instance).

Actually, if we search the documents of the Portuguese Maoists, we will see how their “proletarian” disguise completely falls apart and reveals all the counter-revolutionary and pro-capitalist ideological premises which are inherent to Maoism.

In 1997, Arnaldo Matos, the former leader of the Portuguese Maoists, gave an interview in which he did not make the slightest effort to hide the bourgeois nature of the PW “C”P:
“Stalin (...) was mistaken when he said he was building socialism in a single country. (...) He was mistaken when he thought (...) to have accomplished socialism in the countryside. (...) Therefore, when we criticize Stalin, we are criticizing an individual who committed mistakes.” (Arnaldo Matos, *Questões da Revolução*, January, 1997, translated from Portuguese language)

These statements are appallingly revisionist. It is obvious that the Portuguese Maoists fully embrace bourgeois lies and slanders about the glorious period during which comrade Stalin led the Soviet proletariat in the process of building socialism against the pressure of both the internal and external reactionaries. It is important to note that, just like happens with all other revisionists, also the Portuguese Maoists pretend to “take into account both Stalin’s errors and Stalin’s successes”, but this is a ridiculous lie. They are not interested in comrade Stalin’s inestimable victories and accomplishments. Under the excuse of “highlighting Stalin’s successes as well as his errors”, the Maoists repeat capitalist calumnies against comrade Stalin. Indeed, if we are going to believe in the Portuguese Maoists, we would conclude that nearly all actions of comrade Stalin were mistakes, when the truth is that comrade Stalin’s errors were practically inexistent. Indeed, comrade Stalin’s brilliant works and deeds constitute the essential core of his irreplaceable legacy. We know that there are no “perfect communists”, but Stalin was undoubtedly one of the comrades who were closest to revolutionary infallibility.

In what respects to the specific “accusations” made by the social-fascists of the PW “C”P, we can observe that they are irremediably fallacious. Relatively to their false affirmation that “socialist construction in a single country was a mistake”, it is crystal clear that that the Portuguese Maoists adopt Trotsky’s “arguments” against comrade Lenin and comrade Stalin’s tenacity in keeping Soviet socialism alive. This “argumentation” corresponds to the main objective of the Maoists: to prevent the building of socialism. This was also the main purpose of the Trotskyists who defended the capitulation of the Soviet proletarian dictatorship allegedly in favor of “the world revolution” at a time when there were still no conditions to accomplish it. Therefore, we see the frightening similarities between the Maoists and the Trotskyists: both try to defeat socialism by advocating its capitulation towards capitalist-imperialist world. Comrade Lenin and comrade Stalin knew very well that to follow these counter-revolutionary “arguments” would mean to put weapons down in benefit of the internal and external enemies, it would mean the abandonment of the struggle for socialism in the Soviet Union. This was the reason why Trotskyism had to be harshly fought, because its victory would be synonym of defeat of the Soviet proletarian dictatorship. Just like Trotskyism was successfully combated by the Soviet workers led by comrades Lenin and Stalin, also nowadays the direct ideological successors of the Trotskyists – the Maoists – must be resolutely annihilated.

Furthermore, the Portuguese Maoists also criticize comrade Stalin by depreciatively affirming that he did not put Soviet countryside in the socialist path. We will answer to this infamous accusation by saying that everything depends on what we understand by “socialism”. If we embrace the concept of “socialism” as it is fabricated by the Maoist social-fascists, then the Portuguese Maoists are totally right when they say that Soviet countryside under the leadership of comrade Stalin was never “socialist”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soviet countryside under comrade Stalin’s authentic socialism</th>
<th>Chinese countryside under Mao’s fake and reactionary “socialism”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- total abolition of private property and of the bourgeoisie as a class</td>
<td>- preservation of private property, including that of the great landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- elimination of the exploitation and misery which formerly heavily affected the peasants</td>
<td>- perpetuation of peasant’s exploitation and repression by the landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the organs of the Soviet power in the countryside were at the service of the</td>
<td>- Maoist “popular communes” were at the service of the dictatorship of Chinese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
proletarian dictatorship and were firmly controlled by the heroic Soviet Marxist-Leninists who led the CPSU (B) national bourgeoisie which controlled state power

| - Soviet collective farms enjoyed a high technical level and peasants lived in abundance | - Maoist “popular communes” remained technically backward and they often suffered from severe famines and lack of basic materials and means (like occurred during the terrible Great Leap Forward) |
| - Soviet collective farms were living proofs of socialist democracy and of the alliance between the peasantry and the proletariat under the leadership of the latter. Together, these two classes fought against bourgeois elements and influences in benefit of genuine socialism always faithfully following the immortal teachings of Marxism-Leninism | - Chinese national bourgeoisie exercised its class dominion over these “popular communes” by sending “party delegates” who were mere pro-capitalist lackeys helping the Chinese national bourgeoisie to keep the peasants in bondage. Most times, these “party delegates” lived a lavish life at the expenses of the fierce wage slavery to which Chinese peasantry continued to be subjected during Mao’s reign |

So, if we embrace Mao’s notion of “socialism” as the social-fascists of the PW “C”P do, then we are correct when we say that Soviet Stalinist countryside never aimed at “socialism”. On the contrary, if we remain loyal to the immortal teachings of Marxism-Leninism, if we thoroughly defend the principles of genuine communist ideology, then we know very well that Stalinist countryside was one of the most wonderful examples of socialist construction, then we know very well that Stalinist countryside was a place of heroic class struggle against the last remnants of bourgeois-capitalist material and spiritual oppression and exploitation.

But these kinds of anti-Stalinist and anti-communist positions are not astonishing if we take into account the ideological leanings of PW “C”P’s leaders. For example, the present general-secretary of the PW “C”P – a bourgeois lawyer – is closely connected with some of the most dreadful figures of the Portuguese right. Recently, he authored a book about “today’s political issues” whose preface was written by his friend Freitas do Amaral, who is the historical leader of the Portuguese “Christian-Democrats”. The crimes committed by the so-called “Christian-Democrats” (who are nothing more than mere fascists) against the communist movement not only in Portugal but also in many other countries are numerous in quantity and sinister in quality, but they do not belong to the scope of this text. We will only note that this kind of counter-revolutionary “friendships” reveal the true class nature of the Portuguese Maoists. Indeed, even the ultra-reactionary Durão Barroso (the president of the “European commission” and one of the main lackeys of the European imperialist bourgeoisie) was once a member of the PW “C”P!

But let’s be sincere, if Mao himself was a friend of fascist bandits like Pinochet, Franco, Kissinger, Rockefeller and many others, then why should the Portuguese Maoists refrain from also being friends of the fascists?

These examples provide sufficient proof that Maoist social-fascism is intimately related with classical fascism.

Besides this, the PW “C”P also explicitly defends bourgeois pluralism:

“Within the party, nobody should be persecuted for having opinions which are in opposition to the dominant ones. (…) Everybody has the right of defending opposite views. This is a right which must be absolutely safeguarded. And this must happen not only in the party, but also in the entire State. (…). The expression of opinions must be
Of course, this kind of ultra-revisionist stands are in total agreement with Mao’s appeal of “letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools contend”. The purpose of this appeal is to encourage acceptance of pro-capitalist ideologies and influences, thus strengthening bourgeois exploitative rule and keeping the workers away from revolutionary socialism. As comrade Enver Hoxha accurately affirmed:

“Mao, who is advertized as a «great Marxist-Leninist» is nothing but an eclectic, a pragmatist, and as such, an opportunist. To move towards the theory of «letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools contend», is precisely the essence of the most opportunist pragmatism which leads to pluralism of parties, to undermining the leading role of the Communist Party of China in the revolution and the construction of socialism, hence to the restoration of capitalism.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And the Portuguese Maoists are far from being the only ones who embrace this nauseating “theory”. As we will see, also the Greek Maoists openly support bourgeois “pluralism” in defense of capitalist wage tyranny.

3.4 - Committees to Support Resistance for Communism (CARC) and (new) Italian Communist Party

The CARC (in Italian: Comitati di Appoggio alla Resistenza per il Comunismo) is a Maoist organization affiliated with the neo-revisionist (new) Italian Communist Party (in Italian: nuovo Partito Comunista Italiano) which allegedly aims to “reconstruct Italian communist movement”. In truth, it is a mere social-bourgeois organization which tries to prevent the formation of a truly Marxist-Leninist party in Italy. Fearing that the Italian proletarians could acquire a truly revolutionary consciousness, the Italian exploiting classes fabricated the CARC and the (n) I “C”P in order to detach them from the path of the world socialist revolution. But these purposes of the Italian bourgeoisie will undoubtedly fail because nothing on earth can keep the Italian workers away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. Indeed, a simple look at the “country inform” given by the Italian Maoists at the 7th Conference of the ICMLPO completely reveals their social-fascist character:

“On October 2004, it was founded the (new) Italian Communist Party ((n) PCI) (…) The (n) PCI declared that its task was to resume the way begun by the first Italian Communist Party (PCI, the party of Antonio Gramsci), constituted in 1921. That party carried out a heroic resistance against Fascism (…).

The birth of (n) PCI started a debate within the CARC, that ended in the Spring of 2005. The CARC recognized the (n) PCI as the embryo of future headquarters of the working class, and gave it their full trust.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

As can be observed, the Italian Maoists explicitly admit their anti-Marxism when they affirm to be in favor of the continuation of “the party of Antonio Gramsci”. This statement could not be clearer. The Italian Maoists are praising Gramsci who – much before Togliatti – was the main founder of Italian revisionism. The I “C” P born in 1921 was never a truly communist party, it was revisionist since its beginning precisely due to Gramsci’s anti-socialist and pro-capitalist views. In fact, Gramsci replaced class struggle by the ultra-revisionist concept of “culture struggle”. Accordingly with Marxism-Leninism, what defines a certain class is its position relatively to the major means of production, but Gramsci denies this irrefutable truth by reducing everything to a mere “cultural issue”. Gramsci also openly denies proletarian dictatorship, replacing it by “proletarian cultural hegemony” – a very enigmatic concept.
whose only objective is to confound workers, making them renounce to the establishment of a genuine proletarian power. Therefore, if we follow Gramsci’s “theories”, we will conclude that the entire transition from capitalism to socialism has nothing to do with proletarian dominion, nor with the use of revolutionary violence against the capitalist exploiters, but with a “cultural struggle” in which the proletariat will finally achieve “cultural supremacy” over the oppressors. Needless to say that Gramsci’s “ideas” are totally opposed to Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. The proletariat can only achieve cultural supremacy if it deprives the bourgeoisie of the private property of all means of production, if it has absolute control and power over the productive and material basis of society. And this can only be accomplished through the implementation of the proletarian dictatorship with the purpose of violently repressing the exploiters and of annihilating capitalist oppressive system. But Gramsci rejects all this. Indeed, it was not by chance that Gramsci’s works were never published in Stalinist Soviet Union. They were never published because comrade Stalin understood the true nature of Gramsci’s social-bourgeois “theories” like he also understood the true nature of Mao’s social-bourgeois “ideas”. And it is not difficult to see why. Maoist revisionism and Gramsci’s revisionism have everything in common: both deny proletarian dictatorship (one of the main ideological teachings and aims of MLSH), replacing it with abstract concepts whose objective is to disguise the perpetuation of wage slavery and of bourgeois tyranny that these revisionisms defend (Maoism utilizes the concept of “new democracy” while Gramsci’s revisionism uses the concept of “proletarian cultural hegemony”). Also both revisionisms try to cover their pro-capitalist ideological contents with some “socialistic” slogans in order to mislead the oppressed working masses. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that Italian Maoists depict Gramsci’s I “C” P as an example to be followed, arguing that it “carried an heroic resistance against Fascism” and trying to present themselves as the continuers of that “heroic anti-fascism”. However, their ridiculous masquerades will never deceive the proletariat, nor in Italy nor anywhere around the world. The truth is that Maoist revisionism and Gramsci’s revisionism have exactly the same origins and purposes of fascism: they are ideological instruments fabricated by the bourgeoisie in order to eternally preserve capitalist exploitative totalitarianism.

Besides this, the Italian Maoists also present some kind of synthesis of their party’s objectives:

“(The) (...) party (...) has brought Communists to enter again in a field let to bourgeois and revisionist parties for years, the field of bourgeois political struggle. This was a particular task within the general struggle carried out by the (n) PCI (...). The CARC believe necessary to carry out the work in this front of the struggle, where the Communists are almost completely absent (...). It is the field of the electoral campaigns, the activity of Parliament and other elective Assemblies, the campaigns of public opinion’s orientation, the demonstration and the strikes organized by the bourgeois organizations.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

As can be concluded, the Italian Maoists are advocating participation in bourgeois political life, including in bourgeois elections and in the bourgeois trade-unions. They argue that CARC’s and the (n) I “C” P participation in bourgeois political life is important because, accordingly with them, this is a field “where the Communists are almost completely absent”. At first sight, we would feel tempted to think that this position was correct if it was not for the fact that the Maoists of the CARC and of the (n) I “C” P are not communists. Indeed, their anti-communist character can be observed in the manner they completely despise the necessity of illegal work: we searched throughout their hateful “country report” but we could not find a single word about the indispensability of illegal work and activities. And this while they display so many concerns about “the necessity of entering in bourgeois political struggle”, that is, about the needing of legal work. Of course, this is unsurprising because only the authentic Marxist-Leninist parties are able to adopt and apply the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism relatively to illegal work. Being Maoist, the CARC and the (n) I “C” P are automatically revisionist and pro-capitalist organizations, and therefore we could never expect that they would embrace correct positions relatively to this matter. In his book “Imperialism and Revolution”, comrade Enver Hoxha reflected not only about the necessity of illegal work, but also about the relation that must exist between illegal and legal work within a veritable communist party:

“The Marxist-Leninist parties are parties of revolution. Contrary to the theories and practices of the revisionist parties, which are totally immersed in bourgeois legality and
"parliamentary cretinism", they do not reduce their struggle to legal work, nor do they see this as their main activity. (...) they attach special importance to the combination of legal with illegal work, giving priority to the latter, as decisive for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the real guarantee of victory.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

So, comrade Enver not only perceives illegal work as being an essential part of the activities of all genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, but he even expressly affirms that illegal work must have primacy over legal work. This makes a lot of sense because the authentic Marxist-Leninist parties are parties of the violent socialist revolution, they are parties of proletarian dictatorship, and not of bourgeois “democracy”. However, the Italian Maoists are on the antipodes of this consistent revolutionary position and they do not even accept the necessity of illegal work (let alone recognizing its priority over legal work).

Concluding, the CARC and the (n) I “C” P are nothing more than counter-revolutionary organizations whose pathological reformism comes directly from their Maoist ideology. They undoubtedly provide a very instructive proof of how the deplorable state of the “communist” movement in Southern Europe is closely related with Maoist revisionism.

3.5 – Communist Organization of Greece (KOE)

Now it comes the turn of the “Communist” Organization of Greece (in Greek: *Kommunistiki Organosi Elladas*). We decided to include this organization in the DWM III because it provides an illustrative example of the Maoist Movement in a country – Greece – which has been making the headlines of the main newspapers in nearly all European countries. In fact, if Greece is nowadays facing bankruptcy, it was not put in this state of things by magical arts. Greece is among the most exploited countries in Europe, it is perhaps the European country which endures the severest pressure from foreign capitalist creditors (banks, etc...). Moreover, the Greek proletariat has suffered unimaginable horrors at the hands of the imperialists. During the Second World War, Greece was occupied by the Axis which killed large numbers of the Greek workers. When finally the WWII ended, the Axis occupation was replaced by that of Anglo-American imperialism, which caused the Greek Civil War (1946-1949), which was a fight between the monarcho-fascists who were on the side of the Anglo-American imperialism, and the progressive and communist forces that were on the side of the Greek people. The purpose of the Anglo-American exploiters was to prevent the Greek communists (who had been the main organizers of the struggle against the Axis) from attaining power. Finally, the Anglo-American imperialists emerged victorious from this war and installed a fascist puppet regime which would impose a savage exploitation over Greek proletarians during many decades.

The truth is that this defeat of the Greek communists in the Civil War had much to do with the serious ideological and tactical errors committed by them. In fact, during the Greek Civil War, the Communist Party of Greece was completely infiltrated by revisionist tendencies and by pro-bourgeois elements which were greatly responsible for its defeat. But if the Greek Civil War was even fought during comrade Stalin’s lifetime, what kind of revisionism could have affected the CPG? As we will see, Maoism constituted a severe handicap to the victory of the CPG and it undoubtedly played an essential role in its defeat.

The years after the reactionary triumph in the Greek Civil War were characterized by an anti-communist reign of terror. Thousands of Greek communists were persecuted while many of the Greek islands were transformed into concentration camps where they were tortured to death. But despite all this, the Greek “communists” never managed to learn from the experiences provided by both the defeat in the Civil War and by the fascist repression – indeed, the Greek
“communist” movement continued to have a social bourgeois character.

In the 50’s, with the ascension of Soviet revisionism, while the “C”PG fully embraced Khrushchev’s anti-Stalinist betrayal, some groups started to supposedly “denounce” Soviet social-imperialism, to qualify themselves as “anti-revisionists” and to openly follow “Mao Zedong Thought”. Needless to say that these groups were the antecessors of the “C”OG, which was formed in the early 80’s when the fascist form of bourgeois dominance in Greece had already been replaced by its “democratic” form.

As we already said, Greece has been news throughout Europe and many people who call themselves “revolutionaries” and even “communists” display an enormous enthusiasm over the “Greek situation”, claiming that it can allegedly give birth to an “European revolution”. But this is a false idea. It is an irrefutable fact that Greece can be considered as one of the weakest links of the European imperialist chain, and that the objective factors are totally ready for socialist revolution in that country. Unfortunately, the socialist revolution does not need only objective factors. It also equally needs the subjective factor, which still lacks among the Greek proletariat. This can be explained due to the pro-capitalist and revisionist-anarchistic nature of the Greek “revolutionary” movement. One of the best examples of this is precisely the “C”OG. As in many other countries, so in Greece, Maoism has been a serious obstacle to the fulfillment of the subjective factor of the socialist revolution.

In their official site, the Greek Maoists state that:

“The Communist Organization of Greece (KOE) is a popular, democratic and militant organization.”
(http://www.international.koel.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=31:who-we-are&catid=5:about-the-koe&Itemid=14, About the KOE, version in English)

As can be observed, the Greek Maoists clearly assume the reformist character of their organization. With this, we mean that the other Maoist parties are usually more ingenius in hiding their reactionarism by defining themselves as “Marxist-Leninist”, “anti-revisionist”, etc… (for example, the Colombian UOC even claimed to be and “exclusively proletarian organization”). But the Greek Maoists don’t even waste their time trying to cover their social-fascism. They affirm to be “democratic” and “popular”, but to what kind of “democracy” are they referring to? Taking into consideration the inherent features of Maoism, we can only conclude that they are referring to a bourgeois-revisionist “democracy” under which the workers would be exploited through “popular” ways. This entirely corresponds to Mao’s “new democracy” which excluded genuine socialism.

After this, the Greek Maoists affirm that:

“Our roots are in the Communist Movement of Greece (…).”
(http://www.international.koel.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=31:who-we-are&catid=5:about-the-koe&Itemid=14, About the KOE, version in English)

It is interesting to note that that Greek Maoists affirm this as if to have the Greek “Communist” Movement as an inspiration is an irrefutable guarantee of ideological reliability. As we had already explained, the Greek “Communist” Movement was thoroughly infiltrated by social-capitalist currents and elements; indeed, in what respects to the strategy and tactic it followed during the Greek Civil War, the Greek “Communist” Movement is an example of what must not be done. Comrade Enver Hoxha understood this and he even highlighted the abysmal differences between the Marxist-Leninist struggle of the PLA and the revisionist capitulation of
the Greek “communists”:

“Despite the innumerable difficulties we encountered on our road we scored success one after another. We achieved these successes, in the first place, because the Party thoroughly mastered the essence of the theory of Marx and Lenin, understood what the revolution was, who was making it and who had to lead it, understood that at the head of the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, there had to be a party of the Leninist type. (…)

This stand gave our Party the victory, gave the country the great political, economic and military strength it has today. Had we acted differently, had we not consistently applied these principles of our great theory, socialism could not have been built in a small country surrounded by enemies, as ours is.

Even if we had succeeded in taking power for a moment, the bourgeoisie would have seized it back again, as happened in Greece, where before the struggle had been won, the Greek Communist Party surrendered its weapons to the local reactionary bourgeoisie and British imperialism.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

As we had noted, Maoist influences played a crucial role in this capitulationist attitude of the Greek “Communist” Party. Indeed, in an article entitled “The Influence of the Chinese Revolution in the Communist Movement of Greece”, the Greek Maoists state that:

“A conviction was born among the Greek communists and sympathizers, that the Chinese Red Army was invincible. During the occupation [of Greece, 1941-1944] and after, the CPC, its Army, as well as Mao became even more popular.


In face of the tremendous anti-socialist mistakes that ultimately led the Greek “communists” to their defeat in the Greek Civil War, we can say that the acknowledgement of the fact that they were being influenced by Mao’s social-fascism certainly explains a lot about the reasons behind that defeat. After all, as comrade Enver pointed out, only an authentically Marxist-Leninist party can be victorious against the forces of capital and reaction. From the moment it was contaminated by Maoism, the “Communist” Party of Greece had not the slightest chance of leading Greek people towards socialism and communism. And this because Mao fosters the famous “theory of the two lines” (the proletarian line and the bourgeois line) that, accordingly with him, must coexist within the “communist” parties and organizations:

“The existence of “two lines” is a product of the Mao Tsetung Ideas and totally incompatible with a Marxist-Leninist party which is based on the only proletarian line. The “Mao Tse-Tung Ideas” teaches the unity with the enemy, giving him the one hand and struggling against him with the other. These ideas are diametral contradiction with the Leninist Communist party as the organized troop and avant-garde which has only one monolithic line and only one iron unity of thought and act.” (Documents of the
Moreover, Mao’s wicked movement of the “hundred flowers” also advocates unprincipled tolerance relatively to anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary theories. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand the intimate correlation between Maoist influence in the Greek “communist” movement and its defeat during the Civil War. Maoist social-fascist poison promoted the ideological and tactical capitulation of the Greek “communists” in benefit of the monarcho-fascists. As comrade Enver said, the Greek “communists” surrendered their weapons, that is, they voluntarily abandoned armed struggle against the imperialist-fascist oppressors. This act of surrendering their weapons to the capitalists is highly symbolic. In doing this, the Greek “communists” renounced to the possibility of implementing the proletarian dictatorship in Greece, what also corresponds to Mao’s ultimate dream of banishing armed proletarian violence forever. Unfortunately for the Maoists, there is no force on earth which can prevent the outcome of socialism and communism. If the Maoists think that they will be able to convince the world proletarians to surrender their weapons to the capitalists as the Greek “communists” did, they are totally mistaken.

After analyzing how Maoist revisionism played a major role in the defeat of the anti-fascist forces during the Greek Civil War, we will now focus on another outstanding affirmation made by the Greek Maoists:

“Our theoretical base is Revolutionary Marxism, founded by Marx and Engels and enriched by Leninism and the works of Mao Zedong.”

(www.international.koel.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=31:who-we-are&catid=5:about-the-koe&Itemid=14, About the KOE, version in English)

So, accordingly with the Greek Maoists, “revolutionary Marxism” is composed by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao. Comrade Stalin is completely ignored and despised by them, who even replace him by the fascist Mao. This is an appalling insult to comrade Stalin’s glorious name, to his brilliant work as leader of the heroic Soviet proletarian dictatorship and of the world communist movement. Comrade Stalin – the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism – is irreplaceable. His genial teachings are an inestimable treasure without which communist ideology is irremediably incomplete and unable to lead the world proletariat towards the definitive victory over capitalist-imperialist totalitarianism. All those who deny comrade Stalin’s legacy are pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist and anti-socialist. Indeed, they reject Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism in its entirety, because to deny one Classic means to deny all Classics.

Of course that the Greek Maoists could not act otherwise because Maoism is the negation of Stalinism, the final objective of Maoist ideology is to destroy and annihilate Stalinist ideology. Maoism is related with Stalinism in the same manner that capitalism is related with socialism: they are irreconcilable opposites – wherever there’s Maoism there cannot be Stalinism, just as wherever there is capitalism, there cannot be socialism.

It is also interesting to note that in the context of the present situation in Greece, the social-fascists of the “C”OG talk much about the “struggle against Germany’s dikat”. However, by denying comrade Stalin, the Greek Maoists are renouncing to an effective combat against German imperialism. And this because Comrade Stalin was the most successful and outstanding fighter against German imperialism of all times, he was the architect of Nazi defeat. It is not possible to efficiently combat German imperialism while refusing comrade Stalin’s glorious teachings, but the Greek Maoists are totally oblivious to this unquestionable truth. Indeed, they pretend to combat one imperialism while relying on another, because Maoism was the ideology of foundation and development of Chinese imperialism which is nowadays on the verge of world domination. Therefore, all those who defend Maoism are also inescapably
supporting Chinese social-imperialism, because this is the logical and inevitable consequence of Maoism social-fascism.

And the Greek Maoists go on with their fervent anti-communism:

“What we are struggling for:

- For Greece to be independent from imperialism and liberated from the yoke of all international organisms that impose misery and war. For the exit of Greece from NATO and EU, for the dissolution of all imperialist organizations, including the IMF, WTO, etc. (…)

- Against the policies of poverty, unemployment and dependence applied by both right-wing parties (…). For the social and democratic rights of our people, against the neoliberal raid and the "anti"-terrorist legislation.

- For the anti-imperialist/anti-capitalist orientation of the mass movement against the imperialist globalization and the war (…).

- Against nationalism-chauvinism and racism (…)."

As can be concluded, Greek Maoists pretend to be much worried about things such as “the struggle against neoliberalism and war”, “the struggle against racism and chauvinism”, “the fight against poverty and unemployment”, “the dissolution of all imperialist organizations”, etc…But this is all an enormous masquerade, because all these things will always exist as long as capitalism exists. Therefore, the only manner to definitely abolish these evils is through the destruction of capitalism. Only in this way their inevitability can be prevented. But to destroy capitalism and all the harms which are inherent to it, it is necessary to faithfully follow and apply Marxism-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology, which the Greek Maoists entirely deny.

Moreover, we must also note the stand of the Greek Maoists towards globalization. In fact, they affirm to be “against imperialist globalization”; indeed, they perceive globalization as being nothing more than a damaging occurrence which solely benefits imperialism. But this is not true. Although it may be highly noxious in its present capitalist form, globalization is the key which will allow the world proletariat to open the doors of the world socialist revolution towards world socialism and world communism. As the Platform of the Comintern (SH) states:

“Are we for or against globalization?

We are against capitalist globalization, however, absolutely for socialist globalization (strengthening the second trend of the universal law of socialism).

Our anti-capitalist struggle is not limited in the struggle against most extremely abuses of globalized capitalism. We are world-revolutionaries and not world-reformists! We fight in first line for the destruction of capitalism, not for capitalist reformism, neither on a global scale, nor on a national scale. (…)

As Stalinists-Hoxhaists we differ fundamentally from all the other opponents of
globalization, namely that we fight against the inevitability of capitalism. That’s a huge and basic difference.” (Documents of the Comintern (S-H), Platform – world programmatic declaration, November, 2009, edition in English)

To say that globalization is something purely negative is to embrace petty-bourgeois reactionary nationalistic views which are in total opposition to the genuinely revolutionary Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology.

Moreover, the Greek Maoists also support Mao’s “100 flowers and 100 schools” theory:

“We say no to glasshouse “Marxism”. Marxists are not afraid of confronting wrong ideas. Only through this confrontation can Marxism be forged, invigorated and prevent revolution from “freezing”.”


With this statement, it is obvious that the social-fascists of the “C”OG are trying to justify the existence and preservation of bourgeois-revisionist ideologies and views. They deprecatively present the coherent and consistent Marxist-Leninist struggle against those ideologies and views as “glasshouse Marxism”. Instead, they defend that it is a positive thing that anti-Marxist ideas continue to exist and to spread among the workers, and that Marxism must enter in confrontation with those ideas. This is a totally opportunistic stand. Under genuine proletarian dictatorship, under genuine socialism, there cannot be “confrontation of ideas” as the bourgeois pluralist ideologues advocate. On the contrary, there can only be one ideology: Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism; and this revolutionary ideology must have absolute control and dominance over each aspect of workers’ life and conscience. The more absolute control Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism holds over workers’ minds and acts, the more difficult will be capitalist-revisionist restoration. That’s precisely why Maoists propose this kind of bourgeois-pluralist garbage: because they ardently support capitalist-revisionist degeneration, because they want to condemn socialism to fail through preventing the proletarians from getting rid of reactionary and anti-communist influences. In his book “Imperialism and the Revolution”, comrade Enver makes a criticism which perfectly suits the positions of the Greek Maoists:

“The revisionist concepts of Mao Tsetung have their basis in the policy of collaboration and alliance with the bourgeoisie, which the Communist Party of China has always applied. This is also the source of the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist course of «letting 100 flowers blossom and 100 schools contend», which is a direct expression of the coexistence of opposing ideologies.

Such a course is alleged to be necessary for the development of Marxism, in order to open the way to debate and freedom of thought, while in reality, through this course, he is trying to lay the theoretical basis for the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and coexistence with its ideology. (…)

Mao Tsetung says, «...it is a dangerous policy to prohibit people from coming into contact with the false, the ugly and the hostile to us, with idealism and metaphysics and with the thoughts of Confucius, Lao Tze and Chiang Kai-shek. It would lead to mental deterioration, one-track minds, and unpreparedness to face the world...». From this Mao Tsetung draws the conclusion that idealism, metaphysics and the bourgeois ideology will exist eternally, therefore not only must they not be prohibited, but they must be given the possibility to blossom, to come out in the open and contend. This conciliatory stand towards everything reactionary goes so far as to call disturbances in socialist society
inevitable and the prohibition of enemy activity mistaken. (...)” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

And as if all this was not enough, the Greek Maoists still have another “gift” for us: an open admission of the anarchistic tendencies which can be found throughout Maoist revisionism:

“Modern revisionism is permeated by statism. It reproduces the superstition of worshipping state, something which has nothing in common with the Marxist-Leninist view of proletarian power. It is afraid of the mobilization and spontaneity of the masses; it does not trust the masses and the working class. It depends on bureaucratic and administrative methods and increases the distance between the mechanisms and the masses.”

(Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

This alleged “struggle against worshipping state”, this “defense of the spontaneity of the masses” are typically anarchist. Everybody knows that the anarchists love to scream against “Stalinist statism” and against “Leninism bureaucratic despotism” which would supposedly “deny freedom to the masses”. These loathful pro-capitalist slogans are always used by them in their struggle against revolutionary Bolshevism. Therefore, just like happens with the anarchists, we can also easily perceive the hateful attacks which the Greek Maoists are launching against the necessity of a fierce proletarian power led by an authentically Marxist-Leninist party in accord with the iron rules of proletarian discipline and of democratic centralism. But this is quite expectable. Both Maoism and anarchism share characteristics which reveal the truth about their social-fascist nature - like anarchism, also Maoism denies:

- the proletarian dictatorship:

“Just as everyone should share what food there is, so there should be no monopoly of power by a single party, group or class.” (Mao Tsetung, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, p. 235, Albanian edition)

- and the absolute and exclusive leadership of the communist party:

“We think that we should follow the principle of the long term coexistence and mutual control between the Communist Party and the democratic parties and groups.” (Liou Chao Chi, *Rapport politique du Comité central du Parti communiste chinois au VIIIe Congrès national du PCC*, Pékin, 1956, translated from French language)

“(…) the mutual control is not unilateral, the Communist Party will control the democratic parties and these democratic parties will equally control the Communist Party.” (Mao Zedong, *De la juste solution des contradictions au sein du people*, Textes choisis, Pékin, 1972, p. 509, translated from French language)

Relatively to these aspects of Maoist social-fascism, comrade Enver correctly remarked:

“Contrary to Lenin’s theory, in regard to relations between the centre and the masses, Mao Tsetung opened fields for the spontaneous action of the masses in general and the working class in particular. As is known, Lenin did not permit spontaneity of action contrary to Marxist principles. According to Lenin, the actions of the masses and the class must be guided and directed by the Marxist party. Mao had the view that the
masses themselves, without the leadership of the working class and its party, and disregarding the principles of democratic centralism, must build their own life.” (…) 

“The non-Marxist, eclectic, bourgeois political and ideological views of Mao Tsetung gave liberated China an unstable superstructure, a chaotic organization of the state and the economy which never achieved stability. China was in continuous disorder, even anarchic disorder, which was encouraged by Mao Tsetung himself with the slogan «things must first be stirred up in order to clarify them».” (Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China, Volume II*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

Mao’s “Cultural Revolution” was one of the epochs during which the anarchist influences inherent to Maoism appeared more clearly. In 1966, when this ultra-reactionary palace putsch was in its heyday, the Central Committee of the “Communist” Party of China affirmed:

“(…) the masses can only liberate themselves and we can never pretend to act in their place.” (*Decision of the Central Committee of the CPC about the Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution, 8th August of 1966, Beijing, translated from French language*)

As can be concluded, the similarities between this statement and the words of the Greek Maoists about the “mobilization and spontaneity of the masses” are striking. And the social-fascists of the “C”OG also openly defend the ultra-revisionist “Cultural Revolution”:


To this affirmation of the Greek Maoists, there can be no better answer than the one which is found within our own invincible Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology:

“What about Mao and his “Culture-Revolution”? This revolution was neither socialist nor proletarian and is contrary to the October-Revolution and the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It was neither led by a Bolshevist party, nor by the proletariat itself. It was an anarchist movement of parts of the army and the students against the Chinese proletariat.” (*Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English*)

The truth is that hard times are waiting not only for the Greek Maoists, but also for all Maoists around the world. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, will make their lives a veritable hell. Maoist social-fascism represents a serious danger to the world socialist revolution and to the world proletarian dictatorship, and therefore we will not rest until both Maoism and the Maoists are definitively dead and buried.

3.6 - Workers’ Party of Belgium and the Russian All-Union Communist Party Bolsheviks

First of all, we must stress that the “W”PB (in French: *Parti du Travail de Belgique*) is not an explicitly Maoist party. However, it is a *de facto* pro-Maoist organization which has an international leading role and has united over 25 parties (!!) all over the world (including on the African continent).
In spite of the fact that the “W”PB is not admittedly Maoist, we could never let it go unmentioned in this article, because the Maoist parties “take advantage” of all those parties in the world who count Maoist parties by Marxist-Leninist parties. This is obviously a strengthening of the position of the Maoists and a weakening position of us Hoxhaists in our struggle against Maoism. Thus, “W”PB supports Maoism at least indirectly.

This is in our opinion part of the tactics of all the revisionists to unite against us Stalinist-Hoxhaists in our struggle against Maoism in particular and revisionism in general. If we declare war against the Maoists then it is our duty to declare war also to those parties who help the Maoists in their struggle against us.

The truth is that any reconciliation of comrade Enver Hoxha with the revisionist Mao Tsetung is consequently a defense of Maoism and an attack against Hoxhaism, and a party like the “W”PB which unites fifty (!!) parties all over the world under the roof of this revisionist reconciliatory line is a great international support for all Maoist organizations in their struggle against Hoxhaism. The parties affiliated with the social-fascist “W”PB signed the resolution of 1999 in which they decided not to attack the "different anti-revisionist tendencies", thus inclusively not to attack Maoism. This is the same line that the Maoist ICOR has followed, namely not to attack Maoism. This cannot be tolerated by true Marxist-Leninists.

Concluding, the “W”PB is a revisionist party which tries to reconcile revisionism with Marxism-Leninism under the disguise of "anti-revisionism". This is originally the basis of Chinese revisionism, a key-ideology of eclecticism of the Mao Tsetung Ideas. This is in essence the unity on the basis of the Chinese revisionist general-line of the communist world movement (Polemics, July 1963).

And Ludo Martens, the famous late leader of the “W”PB, once affirmed that:

“Today, as a result of the restoration of capitalism under Gorbachov, the "pro-Soviet" tendency crumbled into innumerable tendencies. In the sixties, a "pro-Chinese" tendency emerged but split into various tendencies after Mao's death. There has been a "pro-Albanian" tendency, which also split after the collapse of socialism in Albania, and a so-called "pro-Cuban" tendency, mainly in Latin America. Some parties, finally, maintained an "independent" position vis-a-vis the tendencies mentioned. Whatever one's opinion about the correctness or the necessity of these splits at a certain point in history may be, it is nowadays possible to overcome these divisions and to unite the Marxist-Leninist parties, which are divided in different currents.” (Documents of the WPB, Proposal for the unification of the international communist movement, edition in English)

As if opportunistic and anti-socialist stand of “unity with everyone at any cost” was not enough to prove the ultra-reactionary nature of the “W”PB, in the 1999 Declaration of the International Communist Seminar, the leaders of this neo-revisionist party declared that “Mao Zedong, Enver Hoxha and other eminent communist leaders, such as Kim Il Sung, Che Guevara and Ho Chi Minh, brought their contribution to the struggle against revisionism, and that their anti-revisionist struggle prepared the ground for a renewal of the communist movement on genuinely revolutionary foundations.”

They referred also to the “victories of the international working-class and socialism in the era of Lenin, Stalin and Mao (!!!!)” - what about the era of comrade Enver Hoxha, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism?

The social-fascists of the “W”PB pretend to “acknowledge” comrade Enver’s heroic anti-revisionist struggle in words, but they deny and despise it in deeds!

In fact, the revisionist Ludo Martens was always a staunch critic of comrade Enver. One of Enver’s books against which Martens directed his pro-capitalist hate was – unsurprisingly –
“Reflections about China”. Martens didn't lose a single opportunity to discredit comrade Enver's correct Marxist-Leninist stand against Maoism and once declared that “while criticizing the opportunistic deviations of the “C”P of China”, comrade Enver would allegedly adopt an “equally dangerous ultra-leftist phraseology”. But comrade Enver, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, was and is well ahead of all the Ludo Martens of this world, and he had already predicted long time ago that these kind of “arguments” would be used by the revisionists. Therefore, in the same book “Reflections on China”, comrade Enver answered to this kind of pseudo-arguments with Leninist bravery:

“I have tried to be objective and correct in my analyses, regardless of the very strong terms I have sometimes used. But I think that things must be called by their proper names. (...)"

In my notes I have written from time to time about many questions, some of them in harsh terms. Judging from the Marxist-Leninist angle, from the theoretical and practical experience and the Leninist organization of our Party, many political, ideological or organizational matters of the Communist Party of China, Mao Tsetung, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese revolution, and the various blows against deviationists, have seemed to me far from clear, and I have stressed this, indeed many times I have used harsh terms about them. This I have done because my communist consciousness, the experience of the Party, and study of the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism did not allow me to use gentler terms in the face of many confused and dubious situations. Then, frequently, filled with anger when I saw and read all these things which were being done to the detriment of Marxism-Leninism and the cause of the proletariat, I have poured out my feelings in this diary of mine (...).”(Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In what respects to the Russian All-Union Communist Party Bolsheviks (the Vsesoyuznaya Kommunisticheskaya Partiya bol'shevikov led by Nina Andrejewna), this is an organization which has close ties with the “W”TB. The AU“C”PB has much influence on other Maoist parties in Europe and all over the world, and it is known by its unwaveringly anti-communist support for the social-fascist leadership of North Korea. The AUCPB is inclusively the main organization which tries to restore social-imperialism and social-fascism in Russia and which has most influence within the former countries of the Soviet Union.

It is an irrefutable fact that declarations of war against Maoism are useless if we do not simultaneously combat all the parties who try to reconcile with Maoism. Consequently, the Comintern (SH) declares war against all forces over the worlds which reconcile Maoism and Hoxhaism. This principle is indispensable and immanent part of our Declaration of War against Maoism.

4 – Asian continent

Asia is perhaps the continent which is most affected by Maoist revisionism. This is nothing surprising, since Asia is the continent where Maoism first appeared. In fact, the influence of Maoist social-fascism over Asian proletariat is so intense that we can affirm that Maoism is one of the main – if not the main – obstacle to socialist revolution in Asia. This is a very grave situation because Asia is the most populated region in the world; it is an almost infinite source of proletarian militants for the future world socialist revolution.

If we analyze Asia’s recent history, there are so many examples of Maoist counter-revolutionary activities that it is difficult to know where to start. First of all, we have the “Communist” Party of China and the Maoist 1949 Chinese “revolution”, whose origins, causes and consequences we have already analyzed in
DWM I and DWM II. Therefore, we will only say that the 1949 Chinese “revolution” continues to mislead many workers due to its false “socialist” mask. Of course that the Asian workers are among those who are most deceived by this phony “revolution”, even because Maoism opportunistically claims to be “Marxism-Leninism adapted to Asia’s conditions”. Therefore, it is quite understandable that many Asian workers and movements fell under Maoism’s anti-socialist sway. This is what happens for example with the Indian Naxalites and with the Maoist guerrillas operating in the Philippines, not to mention the bloodthirsty crimes committed by the counter-revolutionary Maoist organization “Khmer Rouge” in Cambodia and which are still nowadays used by the world bourgeoisie to discredit our glorious communist ideology. Unfortunately, the workers who support these terrorist movements still think that they are following genuinely revolutionary organizations.

Obviously, there is no lack of Maoist parties and organizations in Asia. Only in India there are dozens of them. Asian Maoists are totally dedicated to detach Asian workers from a truly revolutionary path, and they have publicly declared to be against the formation of a new Communist International:

“Remember the Chinese Communist Party never advocated the formation of an International (…). History remembers that despite the achievement of C.P.C under Mao, the party did not go towards establishing the Communist International or establishing an International Organization. Instead it stressed for the Communist Parties of the camp to apply he universal truths of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete situation of their country. It emphasized that other countries should not copy the Chinese Experience but apply the Chinese experience in accordance to their own condition.

The main reason for the C.P.C's caution was devising through local regimes new forms of neo-colonial rule and only a native communist party could analyze and review such situations. An outside force could not grasp the concrete reality. Thus the necessity of political independence of each country’s communist party.”


As can be observed, the Asian Maoists use the pretext of “the independence of each Communist Party” and of the “concrete situation in each country” to deny the necessity of the formation of a new Communist International. Of course that these arguments used by the Maoists are not in the least valid. It is true that each country has its own specific conditions that must be taken into consideration by the Communist Party. However, the general principles and main foundations of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, the lessons and scientific rules taken from the Soviet Union of comrades Lenin and Stalin and from socialist Albania of comrade Enver Hoxha are applicable and must be accomplished everywhere, in all countries and regions without exception. It is crystal clear that, with this attack, the Asian Maoists are trying to discredit the formation of our Communist International (SH). But there are no obstacles which can prevent us, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, from proving to the Asian working masses that Maoism is nothing more than a pro-capitalist ideology and we will do our utmost to conquer Asian exploited workers to the side of our invincible anti-revisionist proletarian ideology. We will not spare efforts to liberate Asia proletariat from noxious Maoist ideology. With this in mind, we sincerely hope that our reflections about Asian Maoism are able to serve this noble purpose.

4.1 – Bolshevik Party of North-Kurdistan - Turkey

The “B” PT is one of the main Maoist organizations in Turkey. Its name – which includes the word “Bolshevik” – is a clear intent to mislead the Turkish workers by trying to convince them that the “B” PT is a genuine communist party. Moreover, as Turkey is a fascist state whose bourgeoisie has illegalized the “B”PT, this contributes to give the Turkish Maoists a somewhat “anti-fascist” and “radical” appearance. This is a very grave situation because the immense majority of Turkish workers lack socialist conscience and formation. In this manner, they easily believe in the Maoist charlatans that claim to be “Marxist-Leninists”. In truth, if we take a look to the “participation” of the Turkish Maoists at the ICMLPO’s 7th Conference, we will conclude that, far from being a truly Bolshevist party, the “B” PT is nothing more than an anti-Marxist social-fascist organization. The Turkish Maoists start by describing some of the
In its first stage the revolution in Turkey/North Kurdistan will be an anti-imperialist, anti-fascist, new-democratic one.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

As can be seen, the Turkish Maoists don’t hesitate before defending Mao’s theory of the “two revolutions”. According to Mao, the “revolution” is divided in two stages: the bourgeois anti-imperialist stage and the “socialist” stage. Of course, the purpose of the first stage is to ensure that the second stage will never happen, because Mao explicitly supports the development and encouragement of capitalist exploitative elements during the first “democratic” stage, thus granting the formation, consolidation and preservation of the new bourgeois dictatorship. And Mao even tries to present this ultra-revisionist theory as being a “Marxist law”:

« It is not possible to achieve socialism without passing through the democratic (read: bourgeois) stage, this is a Marxist law. » (Mao Zedong, Du gouvernement de coalition, Oeuvres choisies, Pékin, 1968, t. III, p. 246, translated from French language)

Relatively to this “theory of the two revolutions”, comrade Enver remarked that:

"Mao Tsetung was never able to understand and explain correctly the close links between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the proletarian revolution. Contrary to the Marxist-Leninist theory, which has proved scientifically that there is no Chinese wall between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, that these two revolutions do not have to be divided from each other by a long period of time, Mao Tsetung asserted: «The transformation of our revolution into socialist revolution is a matter of the future... As to when the transition will take place. It may take quite a long time. We should not hold forth about this transition until all the necessary political and economic conditions are present and until it is advantageous and not detrimental to the overwhelming majority of our people». Mao Tsetung adhered to this anti-Marxist concept, which is not for the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution (...)” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

To affirm that it is impossible to make a socialist revolution and to construct socialism without passing through a capitalist stage means to defend the preservation of capitalist exploitation. Comrade Lenin taught us that:

“(…) with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, the backward countries can construct a Soviet regime and also (...) a communist society while avoiding the capitalist stage.” (Lenin, Ille Congrès de l'Internationale communiste, Oeuvres, volume 31, p. 252, translated from French language)

In fact, the Maoists falsely claim that “the first stage will not lead to capitalist perpetuation because only small/medium capitalists will be allowed”. This argument is completely fallacious. The Classics of Marxism-Leninism teach us that small property inevitably originates monopolist property and that so-called “petty capitalism” inevitably originates monopolist capitalism. This was indeed the case with Maoist China, where after having defeated the bourgeoisie of the comprador type, the Chinese national bourgeoisie managed to transform itself into a monopolist bourgeoisie of the social-fascist type through controlling Chinese revisionist state.

Concluding, when the Turkish Maoists say that the “revolution” must undergo an “anti-imperialist, newly-democratic” stage, they indeed mean that they are against socialist revolution, that they will do their utmost to grant the maintenance of capitalism through keeping state power firmly in the hands of the “patriotic” bourgeoisie. This is what the Turkish Maoists mean when they ridiculously refer to the “anti-imperialist revolution”.

After this, the social-fascists of the “B”TP state that:
“It is still a fact:

* that US imperialism is aggressive and expansionist;
* that it acts like a world policeman;
* that it invades countries – as in Afghanistan and Iraq – and occupies them;
* that it builds up further military bases everywhere – in the Middle East, in the Philippines, in Afghanistan, etc. – to translate its plans for world hegemony into action;

US imperialism undoubtedly is the biggest imperialist power today, as regards economic power and also military and political power, and it fights to gain sole world hegemony.” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

This affirmation was true some years ago, but nowadays U.S Imperialism shares the role of main imperialist power with Chinese social-imperialism, whose origins can be found precisely within Maoism. The Turkish Maoists admit that “Chinese imperialism is growing”, but they affirm this insinuating that Chinese social-imperialism has nothing to do with “Mao Zedong Thought”, but this is not true. The ascension of Chinese imperialism is the logical consequence of Mao’s ideology and principles which support that the bourgeoisie must have freedom of action and must continue dominating the entire political-social-economic order. As the final purpose of every bourgeoisie is to maximize profits, it is not difficult to understand why the Chinese bourgeoisie struggled to control state power and to transform China into an imperialist superpower. To deny this means to be totally submerged in an anti-communist delirium.

So, the Turkish Maoists not only deny that Chinese social-imperialism is today one of the main enemies of world workers and that it has the same military-economic level of U.S Imperialism, but they also try to treacherously present Maoism as having nothing to do with it.

And as if this was not enough, the Turkish Maoists try to create an artificial contradiction between the struggle against foreign imperialism and the struggle against Turkish fascist state:

“Turkey is a client country of imperialism. It is not occupied by the imperialist powers (...) – this is mainly US and German imperialism. (...) it is our view that it is wrong to portray US imperialism alone, still the Number 1 among the dominating imperialist powers in Turkey, as the main enemy. In Turkey/North Kurdistan the main enemy of the peoples is the fascist Turkish state. (...) In their struggles the workers, peasants and other working people are confronted by the Turkish state machinery as main enemy, not by the US state machine, not by US military, police, judiciary, etc. Fascism in Turkey is not practiced by US imperialism but by the Turkish state!” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

Therefore, the Turkish Maoists affirm that Turkey is a capitalist state of fascist type which is dependant on foreign imperialism, but they also declare that the main enemy of the Turkish people is Turkish fascist state. They try to fabricate a contradiction between the struggles against both enemies as if they had absolutely no links between them, as if foreign imperialism has nothing to do with the dominion of the Turkish fascist bourgeoisie. In truth, the Turkish Maoists are presenting the situation as if Turkish workers have to make an option: or they struggle against foreign imperialism or they struggle against Turkish fascist bourgeoisie. This view is completely false and counter-revolutionary. Presently, the bourgeoisie which rules Turkey through fascist means belongs to the comprador type. It sells Turkey’s resources to foreign imperialisms in exchange for some profits and privileges. Therefore, the combat against Turkish fascist bourgeoisie and the struggle against U.S and German imperialism are indivisible between them. Both struggles form a sole unit. One cannot exist without the other, because foreign imperialisms supports Turkish fascist dominant classes and these last ones rely on those imperialisms to be kept in power. As comrade Enver Hoxha firmly stated:

“The Chinese revisionist leadership forgets that the unity of these national states can be
ensured only through the struggle of the proletariat and the working masses of each particular country, in the first place, against the external imperialism which has penetrated into that country, but also against the internal capitalism and reaction.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

These words from Enver relatively to the Chinese revisionists perfectly suit Turkish Maoists. Indeed, Turkish workers must combat simultaneously both American imperialism and the Turkish fascist bourgeoisie. And this is what the Maoists of the “B”PT should defend if they were true revolutionaries and not mere social-fascists.

As for the phony claims of the Turkish Maoists that their party is illegal because of its alleged “socialist anti-fascism”, it is not difficult to see the true reason behind the illegalization of the “B”PT by the Turkish fascist state: the bourgeoisie comprador which controls this state recognizes the “B”PT as the representative of another section of the Turkish bourgeoisie which rivals it for the dominance of political-economic power in the country. The Turkish Maoists are the representatives of the Turkish national bourgeoisie which wants to overthrow the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie which currently rules the country. Consequently, the claims of the Turkish Maoists that their party is illegal because “it is a veritable Marxist-Leninist party” which allegedly defies “Turkish fascism” are totally false.

And lastly, the social-fascists of the “B”PT even refer the world socialist revolution from their Maoist point of view. They affirm that:

“(…) the world revolutionary process is the sum of non-simultaneous SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONS in the imperialist countries and anti-imperialist NEW-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTIONS in the oppressed countries.” (ICMLPO, *International Newsletter*, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

This statement is very similar to an affirmation made by the Chilean and American Maoists in the joint document we analyzed previously in this article. Therefore, we will only repeat that to maintain capitalist relations and elements in one part of the present globalized world (the so-called oppressed countries) automatically denies the socialist character of Maoist fake “world revolution”. The talks of the Turkish Maoists about “socialist revolution in developed countries” are all lies. The capitalist-bourgeoisie nature of the “New Democratic revolutions” occurring in the oppressed nations invalidates the safety and definitiveness of socialist construction in the rest of the world (the so-called developed countries). At least, this is the case in the context of the current globalization.

Moreover, we note that the Turkish Maoists are rejecting the Hoxhaiist teaching that even an oppressed, semi-feudal and backward country can effectively advance towards socialist revolution and towards the construction of a socialist society without having to pass through a capitalist-bourgeois “New Democratic” stage:

“The Albanian experience proves that even a small country with a backward material and technical base can experiment a great and general economic and cultural development, can grant its independence and can also defeat the attacks of world capitalism and imperialism if that country is conducted by a veritable Marxist-Leninist party, if that country is decided to fight until the end for its ideals having confidence in their achievement.” (Enver Hoxha, *Report to the VIII Congress of the PTA*, Tirana, 1981, translated from the French language)

This unquestionable truth is one of the main principles of Hoxhaiism. By refusing it, the Turkish Maoists are rejecting Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaiism in its entirety, because to deny the teachings of one of the Classics means to deny the teachings of all the other Classics of Marxism-Leninism, and this means to deny communist ideology in itself. But this is just what the Turkish Maoist do, thus fully revealing their veritable class character.

For all this reasons, it is time for the Turkish workers in general and to the Turkish proletariat in particular to awake and to reject Maoism social-fascism, thus understanding that the founding of a truly Stalinist-Hoxhaiist party in Turkey is the only manner to definitively abolish all the evils which are
inherent to capitalist-imperialist world rule.

4.2 – Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist)

The “Communist” Party of India (“Marxist-Leninist”) is one of the most famous Maoist parties in the world due to its dimensions and also due to its close relations with the anarchist-terrorist Naxalite movement, whose activities are used by the world bourgeoisie in general and by the Indian bourgeoisie in particular to discredit communist ideology in front of the toiling masses. Indeed, the “C”PI (“ML”) has an enormous influence within the world movement of Maoism - which can be proved by their activities within the ICOR.

Just like happens with many other Maoist parties, the “C” PI (“ML”) has a very “revolutionary” and “Marxist” appearance that completely falls apart when we reflect about the party’s ideological principles.

In fact, the revisionist and social-bourgeois nature of the “C”PI (“ML”) can be easily perceived in the party’s documents:

“Under the neo-liberal regime hundreds of thousands of industrial units were closed down, the public sector enterprises were fully or almost privatized, (...) education, health-care, etc. are privatized and being made beyond the reach of common people, prices of essential commodities are soaring up (...).” (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

In this situation only the communist revolutionary forces who uncompromisingly oppose all ruling class policies including imperialist globalization can provide leadership to the struggle against imperialism, comprador bureaucratic bourgeois classes and the landlord classes and the political parties representing them.”

This statement is typically reformist and social-democratic. Accordingly with the Indian Maoists, neoliberalism, privatizations, etc… are the sole enemies. Here we see the tendency inherent to Maoism of keeping popular demands within the limits of a bourgeois welfare state, of keeping the workers’ struggle confined to some alms given by the bourgeoisie. The Indian Maoists are not in the least worried about the definitive and complete destruction of capitalism. All that they want is to pretend to “combat” a form of capitalism: neoliberalism. And their claims about “health care”, “prices soaring”, etc… reveal the true objectives of the Maoists: they want to establish a “civilized” capitalism with a “socialist” mask only to deceive the workers, convincing them that there is no need to adhere to an authentically revolutionary socialist ideology: after all, in this “tamed” capitalism planned by the Maoists, the workers would have “everything”: health care, low prices, etc… Of course that wage slavery and exploitation would continue under “leftist” disguises. Indeed, it is interesting to note the position of the Indian Maoists relatively to private property, because they scream against “privatizations” as if there could ever be genuine social property under a capitalist state such as that which presently rules India. Under capitalism, property is always private, no matter if it is assumedly private or if it belongs to the state capitalist bourgeoisie and uses a “public” disguise. This kind of apparently “public” property which in fact is under the private control of the state capitalist bourgeoisie is what the Maoists really defend. This “public” property is much more deceitful and treacherous than the openly private property, because it creates in the proletariat the false impression that capitalist private property has been abolished, when the truth is that it continues alive and of good health. Anyway, it is not at all astonishing that the Indian Maoists criticize privatizations. They do it because they relate privatizations with the interests of foreign imperialisms in India and with the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie comprador, that is, they relate it with the interests of the section of Indian bourgeoisie which they aim to combat. In truth, Maoists try to give a “progressive” and even “leftist” color to these intents, thus inculcating in the Indian workers the false idea that the interests of the Indian national bourgeoisie are also their own, that they must exclusively focus on combating “neoliberal foreign imperialism”. This situation is very serious, even because this same Indian national bourgeoisie is nowadays successfully consolidating India’s positions as a new imperialist power.

And the Indian Maoists continue with their anti-communist zeal:
"The CPI (ML) which upholds Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought (…) is committed to complete the New Democratic Revolution. The task before the party in the stage of the New Democratic Revolution is to overthrow the rule of comprador bureaucratic bourgeois-landlord classes serving imperialism and to replace the present reactionary Indian state with the New Democratic or People Democratic state led by the proletariat (…)" (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

It is crystal clear that the empty talks of the Indian Maoists about the supposed “leadership of the Indian proletariat” in the “new democratic revolution” are nothing more than revisionist shibboleths. The preservation of bourgeois domination and dictatorship and of capitalist exploitation are inherent to Mao’s concept of “New Democracy”, because according to Mao himself, the national bourgeoisie will continue to have total freedom for controlling the major means of production and to utilize the “state of new democracy” as an instrument of its class despotism:

"Mao Zedong was for the unrestricted free development of capitalism in China in the period of the state of the type of «new democracy», (…). At the 7th Congress of the CPC he said, «Some think that the communists are against the development of private initiative, against the development of private capital, against the protection of private property. In reality, this is not so. The task of the order of new democracy, which we are striving to establish, is precisely to ensure the possibility for broad circles of Chinese to freely develop their private initiative in society, to freely develop the private capitalist economy.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anti-communism, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

From the moment bourgeois-capitalist domination is not abolished, the proletariat and the workers can never implement genuine socialism nor in India or in China, nor anywhere around the world. And the Indian Maoists even dare to explicitly support the union of the Indian proletarians with the imperialist policies of the Indian national bourgeoisie:

"Strategic united front of all revolutionary classes and forces (…) as well as necessary tactical united fronts should be developed for furthering the people's revolutionary movement." (ICMLPO, International Newsletter, nº 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

This affirmation from the social-fascists of the “C”PI (“ML”) corresponds almost word by word with a very famous statement from Mao:

"No matter what classes, parties or individuals in an oppressed nation join the revolution, and no matter whether they themselves are conscious of the point or understand it, so long as they oppose imperialism, their revolution becomes part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution and they become its allies.” (Mao Zedong, New Democracy, January of 1940, edition in English)

These declarations clearly reveal the commitment of the Maoists to prevent socialist revolution by promoting the subjugation of the workers to the bourgeoisie with the purpose of safeguarding capitalist private property and productive social relations, thus perpetuating exploitative political-economic order. This is what the hateful “peoples’ revolutionary movement” of the Maoists is all about.

Besides this, there is still the Naxalite question. In the DWM II, we had already reflected about the anti-communist character of the Indian Naxalites. We will only add that the entire Naxalite movement is intimately related with the “C”PI (“ML”), because the Naxalite movement was founded by the leaders of the “C”PI (“ML”) and, therefore, the social-capitalist ideological stands of the “C”PI (“ML”) are the same of those hold by the Naxalites. The truth is that the Naxalites are nothing more than the armed section of the Indian national bourgeoisie trying to defeat the influences of the Indian bourgeois comprador. The Indian Maoists claim that “the Naxalites are composed by working people from the lowest classes”, but even if this is truth, it does not change anything. On the contrary, it only shows that Indian Maoism is exercising a noxious influence over the most exploited sections of Indian working masses, that is, over the ones which should constitute the vanguard of the Indian oppressed classes. Instead of following Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism and of preparing the Indian proletariat to be a valiant detachment
of the future world proletarian red army, the ultra-exploited branches of the Indian workers are being mislead and attracted by Maoist social-fascism to serve the imperialist interests of the Indian national bourgeoisie.

This situation is unbearable and constitutes a grave obstacle to the world socialist revolution because India is one of the greatest world sources of proletarian workforce, it is a highly unequal country where the Indian toiling masses live in the most abject misery. Therefore, India is undoubtedly among the regions over which we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, must primarily focus our revolutionary work with the purpose of conquering the ultra-exploited Indian proletariat to our anti-revisionist side.

But to accomplish this, we have to make the Indian workers understand that the “C”PI (“ML”) and the Naxalites are social-fascists and social-bourgeois organizations whose only aim is to benefit and advance the imperialist interests of the Indian national bourgeoisie while maintaining Indian proletarians subjected to the harshest exploitation through using “anti-imperialist” and “progressive” excuses to detach them from the path of genuine communist ideology, from the path of authentic socialist revolution. We hope that this short analysis of the reactionary character of the “C”PI (“ML”) will help those Indian proletarians to get rid of the venomous anti-communist influences of the Indian Maoists.

4.3 – Communist Party of the Philippines

The “Communist” Party of the Philippines is one of the most deceitful Maoist parties in the world. In truth, Philippine Maoists managed to fabricate a “revolutionary” aura around them due to the fact that the “C”PP is engaged in an armed struggle against the country’s pro-American puppet government. This situation gravely misleads world workers in general, and Philippine workers in particular, who wrongly see the “C”PP as a genuine socialist party. The world bourgeoisie also plays a great role in presenting the “C”PP as an “hard-line communist group”, thus inculcating in the proletariat the false idea that Philippine Maoists are authentic anti-capitalist revolutionaries. This is completely false. Just like the other Maoist parties, the “C”PP is a mere counter-revolutionary and anti-socialist organization which aims to keep Philippine workers subjected to wage slavery and bourgeois despotism. The archipelago of the Philippines is among the poorest and most exploited countries of the planet. After having been a Spanish colony, the Philippines became a neo-colony of the American imperialists, who dominated and continue to dominate the entire political-economic system of the Philippines in benefit of the American monstrous corporations which take immense superprofits from the exploitation of Philippines’ resources and workforce. One of the best examples of this domination was the imposition of the fascist dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos, who exercised an excruciating repression over Philippine proletariat while accumulating an incalculable personal fortune through serving the interests of the American plutocrats. In the late 80’s, Marcos’ clique was ousted from power but his continuers still rule Philippines in favor of the interests of the pro-American bourgeoisie comprador. Of course, like happens in many other countries, so in the Philippines, the Maoists represent the interests of the Philippine national bourgeoisie which is deprived from the control of the main means of production because of the dominion of the pro-American bourgeoisie comprador. In face of this, the Philippine Maoists do their utmost to hide the fact that far from struggling for the overthrow of the entire oppressive order, they only pretend to replace a certain branch of the exploiters by another. With this purpose, the social-fascists of the “C”PP try to depict their defense of the Philippine national bourgeoisie as “anti-imperialism”:

“This political programme must serve to weld together the broadest unity of progressive forces and groups to isolate US imperialism and the die-hard reactionaries, composed of the comprador bourgeoisie (…)“

(http://www.philippinerevolution.net/documents/rectify-errors-rebuild-the-party, Rectify Errors, Rebuild the Party!, December, 1968, edition in English)

“Let us broaden our revolutionary united front and fight US imperialism and the Aquino regime.”

(http://www.philippinerevolution.net/statements/broaden-our-ranks-and-advance-the-revolutionary-armed-struggle-against-us-imperialism-and-the-aquino-regime, Persevere in advancing the NDFP 12-
“4. (...) the revolutionary armed struggle and mass movement in Mindanao focus against the brutal (...) suppression campaign of the US-Aquino regime and against those multi-national companies that prevent the people from realizing their aspiration for agrarian reform and national industrialization.” (http://www.philippinesrevolution.net/statements/broaden-our-ranks-and-advance-the-revolutionary-armed-struggle-against-us-imperialism-and-the-aquino-regime, Persevere in advancing the NDFP 12-Point Program, the only viable alternative to the anti-people program of the US-Aquino regime, April, 2012, edition in English)

These statements are clearly aimed at presenting American imperialism and the multinational foreign corporations as being the only enemies of Philippine people. Through this, the social-fascists of the “C”PP try to conquer Philippine toiling masses to the side of the national bourgeoisie, because American imperialism holds an almost exclusive control over the Philippines. Consequently, by promoting and encouraging the struggle against foreign imperialism in general and against American imperialism in particular, the Philippine Maoists are once again doing their utmost to cover the greedy intentions of the Philippine national bourgeoisie with “anti-imperialist” and even “progressive” masks. They do this in order to make Philippine workers forget that all sections of the bourgeoisie are equally exploitative and repressive, and that all of them without exception must be totally eliminated, including the national “patriotic” bourgeoisie, of course.

Moreover, the “C”PP explicitly upholds the most anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary theories ever put forward by Mao:

“The Communist Party of the Philippines must rely on peasant revolutionary bases to defeat the reactionary state power in the countryside before capturing the cities. Comrade Mao Tsetung has extensively shown with genius in theory and in practice how the countryside can encircle the cities (...). The universal truth of the theory of using the countryside to encircle the city has been proven invincible.

The theory of people’s war is universal and applies to Philippine conditions. (...) The cities are actually the bastions of bourgeois state power before the people’s democratic forces develop the capability of capturing them. The counter-revolutionary army must first be defeated in the countryside.” (http://www.philippinesrevolution.net/documents/rectify-errors-rebuild-the-party, Rectify Errors, Rebuild the Party!, December, 1968, edition in English)

The Maoist concepts of “peasant revolutionary war” and of “encirclement of the cities by the countryside” were already thoroughly explained and unmasked in the DWM I and DWM II. They are expressions of Mao’s denial of the hegemonic role of the proletariat in the revolution and its alleged replacement by the peasantry. Therefore, we will only recall the words of the authentic Marxist-Leninists about:

- Mao’s peasant “revolution”:

“The Mao Zedong though was always opposed in theory and in practice to the correct Leninist idea that during the epoch of imperialism, in each revolution - be it democratic, anti-imperialist, of national liberation or socialist – the leadership must belong to the proletariat. Mao based the struggle against Japanese occupiers on the peasantry. In the same manner, he did not see the regime of new democracy as the power of the working class, but of the peasantry. After the liberation in 1949 and during the stage in which socialism was allegedly being built on China, the proletariat was invariably deprived of its hegemonic role (...).” (Naun Guxho, La Pensée MaoTseToung, theorie et pratique antiproletariennes, 1979, translated from the French language)

“In his theoretical writings Mao Tsetung says that China could not have been liberated without the leadership of the peasantry, that the revolution in China was a peasant revolution. According to
him, the peasantry was the most revolutionary class, that it had to lead the revolution «and did lead the revolution». This is a major theoretical error on the part of Mao Tsetung and shows that he was not a Marxist-Leninist but an eclectic and a bourgeois-democrat. Mao Tsetung, as a progressive democrat, was for a bourgeois-democratic revolution, and when China was liberated, he clung to the same views. According to his views, the peasantry was the leading force and the working class had to be its ally (…). Mao Tsetung wanted to transform this bourgeois democratic theory of his into a universal theory and, in fact, this «theory» was called «Mao Tsetung thought».” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

- Mao’s theory of the “encirclement of the city by the countryside”:

“Mao formulated and defended non-Marxist theses such as that which is stressed in his obituary: «The countryside must encircle the city». His obituary stresses that, «without acting in this way the revolution cannot be carried out»! This means that the peasantry has to lead the proletarian revolution. This thesis is anti-Leninist. (…)

From a long time back we have not been in agreement with the views of Mao Tsetung, especially with his saying that «the countryside must encircle the city». We, as Marxist-Leninist, have never accepted this view of Mao Tsetung's because in this way Mao Tsetung considers the peasantry the most revolutionary class. This is an anti-Marxist view. The most revolutionary class of society is the proletariat, therefore it must lead the revolution in alliance with the peasantry, which is the most faithful ally of the proletariat.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

“Mao Zedong’s thesis of surrounding the cities by the countryside is not simply the description of the course of the military operations in China’s liberation war. To the contrary, it is a cover for definite anti-Marxist-Leninist theories which negate the hegemony of the proletariat and the role of the cities in the revolution. No, “Mao’s road” of encircling the cities from the countryside is a diabolical theory of distrust of the proletariat which replaces proletarian hegemony in the revolution with that of the peasantry. This theory that in China the revolution could do without the urban proletariat and that the revolution didn’t have to be organized in the cities simultaneously with the work in the countryside, is another ugly manifestation of the pragmatism of Mao Zedong Thought. This road was not illuminated by Marxism-Leninism. Quite the opposite, (…)

Thus, for Mao, it was only the rural areas and the peasantry which were “indispensable, vital positions of the Chinese revolution” whereas the cities and the proletariat were of less consequence or of no consequence at all and were to take a back seat and wait for liberation to be brought to them from the peasantry! Of course, nowhere do the Chinese give a serious argument for this line which is diametrically opposed to Marxism-Leninism, to the experience of the October Revolution, to the correct advice of Stalin, etc. No, this anti-Marxist line is justified with idiotic dithyrambs such as “revolutionary villages can encircle the cities, but revolutionary cities cannot detach themselves from the villages”!” (Documents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism, Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists, 1979, edition in English)

The embracement of this kind of social-bourgeois “theories” is totally in agreement with the aims of the “C”PP:

“Let us build the broadest possible alliance and mobilize the biggest number of people in democratic and anti-imperialist mass struggles (…). Let us gather the broadest possible support for (...) the people's mass struggles.” (http://www.philippinerevolution.net/statements/set-sights-on-intensifying-the-people-s-anti-imperialist-and-democratic-struggles-as-we-mark-the-39th-anniversary-of-the-ndfp, Set sights on intensifying the people's anti-imperialist and democratic struggles as we mark the 39th anniversary of the NDFP, April, 2012, edition in English)
These references to the “biggest number of people” and to the “broadest alliance” are clear signs of the opportunistic and pragmatic nature of the Philippine Maoists, for whom the anti-imperialist struggle must be a Russian salad which will include all kinds of reactionaries and which will promote the interests of the Philippine national bourgeoisie while preventing that same anti-imperialist struggle from advancing towards an authentically revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist combat against all kinds of oppression and exploitation, against the bourgeoisie in its entirety and not only against a certain part of it.

Indeed, these declarations represent an attempt by the “C”PP to put the anti-imperialist struggle under the control of the Philippine national bourgeoisie. This is in total accord with Mao’s theory of the “new democratic revolution” in which the national bourgeoisie would be the ruling “anti-imperialist” class. After all, it is not by chance that the Philippine Maoists openly praise Mao’s “new democracy” and they don’t hesitate in declaring:

“The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) was re-established on December 26, 1968 on the theoretical foundations of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It is the advanced detachment of the Filipino proletariat leading the new-democratic revolution. The CPP organizes and leads the New People's Army that wages revolutionary armed struggle in the countryside.”

(http://www.philippinerevolution.net, The CPP, edition in English)

Yes, there is no doubt that the “C”PP is engaged in an armed struggle. But not every armed struggle is a truly revolutionary and red armed struggle. In truth, the counter-revolutionary and pro-capitalist character of the “C”PP is clearly expressed even within the armed struggle which the Philippine Maoists try to present as proof of their supposed “anti-revisionist ideology”:

“Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law

Between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES,
including the executive department and its agencies,
hereinafter referred to as the GRP

AND

THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC FRONT OF THE PHILIPPINES, including the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and the New People’s Army (NPA),
hereinafter referred to as the NDFP

Hereinafter referred to as “the Parties”,

Article 1. This Agreement is meant to meet the needs arising from the concrete conditions of the Filipino people concerning violations of human rights and the principles of international humanitarian law, and to find principled ways and means of rendering justice to all the victims of such violations.

Article 2. This Agreement seeks to confront, remedy and prevent the most serious human rights violations in terms of civil and political rights, as well as to uphold, protect and promote the full
scope of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including:

4 - (…) the right not to be subjected to campaigns of incitement to violence against one’s person. (…)

11 - The right to freedom of thought and expression, freedom of conscience, (…) and the right not to be punished or held accountable in the exercise of these rights.

12 - The right to free speech, press, association and assembly, and to seek redress of grievances. (…)

18 - The right to own property and the means of production and consumption that are obtained through (…) entrepreneurship, skill, inventiveness and intellectual merit (…).

Article 3. The Parties decry all violations and abuses of human rights.”


This incredibly reactionary statement is taken from an “agreement” signed between Philippine’s bourgeois pro-imperialist government and the NDPF (of which the “C”PP is the main force). Here, we can see the true face of the alleged “revolutionary armed struggle of the Philippine Maoists”. As can be observed, the “C”PP happily accepts and embraces all disgusting bourgeois-capitalist concepts about “human rights”, “political and social rights”, “freedom of speech”, etc…This kind of bourgeois garbage is completely hypocritical. If we follow and apply Maoism, this means to perpetuate capitalism, and if we perpetuate capitalism, things like “freedom of expression”, “freedom of press”, etc… will solely benefit the ruling classes who control the mass media and are able to inculcate their ideology deeply in the workers’ minds. On the other side, only those people who defend bourgeois exploitative order are allowed to have “free speech” in these media. And the same happens with so-called “human rights”. For an authentic Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist party, there can be no agreements on “human rights” or on “political freedoms” with the oppressive classes which are the only ones being favored by this kind of hypocritical abstract concepts. Under a genuine proletarian dictatorship, there can be no “human rights” to the capitalists and to those who support them. The reactionaries will never have “freedom of speech”, “freedom of expression” or “political rights” under proletarian power, because otherwise this would gravely jeopardize the construction of the socialist society. To give “rights” to the reactionaries would be synonym of opening the path to the restoration of capitalist-bourgeois tyranny.

And the Philippine Maoists go even further with their anti-communist delirium when they gladly agree on “freedom of political convictions” and on “the right to own property and the means of production and consumption that are obtained through (…) entrepreneurship, skill, inventiveness and intellectual merit (…)”. If there were still doubts about the social-fascist nature of the Philippine Maoists, we think that these affirmations prove it beyond any doubts. The pro-capitalists of the “C”PP are not only recognizing and supporting capitalist private property, but they also display their infinite hypocrisy by saying that “private property must be won through skill and entrepreneurship”(!!!). This is amazing, because if we are going to ask the billionaires who rule the world, they will all claim that they obtained their wealth through their own “work, skill and entrepreneurship”. The capitalists call “skill”, “entrepreneurship and “inventive merit” to their ability of fiercely oppressing and exploiting the workers in order to accumulate outrageous profits. Therefore, this statement is an open admission by the Philippine Maoists that they defend and support the perpetuation of capitalist order (of which private property is one of the main pillars).

Another very interesting clause assured in the agreement between the bourgeoisie comprador and the Philippine Maoists is “the right not to be subjected to campaigns of incitement to violence against one’s
person”. In this clause, we can find total negation of the possibility of achieving socialism and communism, because their accomplishment necessarily involves the implementation of proletarian dictatorship, and the proletarian dictatorship cannot be implemented without the intensive promotion, encouragement and use of harsh violence against the capitalist-imperialist exploiters. Indeed, this violence will surely be widespread and the proletariat led by the Stalinist-Hoxhaist will stop at nothing to eliminate world capitalist system and to advance towards world socialism and world communism. And if to achieve a stateless and classless society it is necessary to physically annihilate all the anti-communists in this earth, we will certainly do it! Everything for the world socialist revolution! We, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, are not bound by the ridiculous concepts of “human rights” or of “political freedoms” and much less by the ultra-reactionary concepts of “freedom of conscience” and of “the right to own private property”. The only purpose of these “freedoms” is to keep bourgeois exploitation alive, is to postpone the red proletarian revolution.

Contrary to what happens with the Philippine Maoists, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, are warriors for socialism. We are not like the bourgeois sentimentalists, who hide their support for a dreadful system which ruthlessly kills billions of workers behind hypocritical concerns for “human rights”. And also contrary to what the revisionists think, far from shocking the workers, our positions will attract them because these are consistent and coherent Marxist-Leninist stands which are unchallengeable and invincible. It is the revisionist, opportunistic and pro-capitalist positions of the Maoists in general, and of the Philippine Maoists in particular which cause outrage among the world proletarians and which allow them to see Maoism’s true ideological and class colors.

4.4 - Maoist Bolshevik Reorganisation Movement of the Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party - Bangladesh

The MBRMPBSP of Bangladesh is another of those Maoist organizations which takes advantage of the fact that their respective countries are under the fascist form of bourgeois dominion in order to better deceive the workers. In truth, these parties always make much advertisement around their being obliged to act underground with the purpose of giving themselves a more “socialistic” and “radical” outlook. On the other side, the fascist bourgeoisie which rules these countries also has a lot of interest in keeping the workers thinking that the Maoists are genuine revolutionaries, because in this manner they prevent workers from searching for an authentic communist ideology. Moreover, we must never forget that Maoists are also persecuted because they represent the interests of a section of the bourgeoisie which is distinct from that which is in power. This is precisely what occurs in Bangladesh, one of the poorest nations in Asia which is under the dominance of the U.S and Indian imperialists who use local fascist lackeys to keep the country’s proletariat in a situation of de facto slavery.

The MBRMPBSP is also one of the Maoist parties which explicitly deny Marxism-Leninism, giving absolute priority and prevalence to Maoism. It is true that all Maoist parties and organizations without exception deny Marxism-Leninism. However, most of them try to hide their revisionist nature by qualifying themselves as “Marxist-Leninist-Maoist” and by putting Marx, Engels, and Lenin side by side with Mao on their logos. But the Bangladesh Maoists are not even worried about maintaining a “Marxist-Leninist” appearance. In their official documents, they bluntly say:

“In view of the correctness of the essence we are in favor of formulating our ideological line as Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Maoism. (…) That is, as per our today’s understanding on the ideological line question, that to adopt Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is especially to adopt Maoism (…)”

As can be concluded, the Bangladesh Maoists don’t even hesitate about affirming their total and open
refusal of Marxism-Leninism, assuming the total predominance of Maoism. And what is interesting is that Bangladesh Maoists do it in a very straightforward manner, without subterfuges, as if they were assuming an undisputable truth. Indeed, they even do it in a very pompous tone:

“This we achieved through the quite lengthy process of experience of our party, especially through the process of the recent intense two line struggle. (...) we also believe that no body can become a communist without adopting Maoism today. (...) It means to us, whatever is in line with Maoism we have to adopt it, and whatever is not in line with Maoism we have to reject it.”


So, the social-fascists of the MBRMPBSP claim that their denial of Marxism-Leninism comes from the “two line” struggle. Here it is a proof of how anti-Marxism engenders more anti-Marxism. The “two line” theory was fabricated by Mao with the objective of justifying the dominant position of bourgeois elements within the “Communist” Party of China. Accordingly with Mao, the maintenance of pro-capitalist elements within the party is a positive feature because it would allegedly encourage “the struggle of the opposites” and the “confrontation between the ideas of the bourgeois line and the ideas of the proletarian line”. Of course that this was nothing more than a facade invented by Mao to disguise the fact that the “C”PC was under the complete control of the Chinese national bourgeoisie and had nothing to do with the fulfillment of the aspirations of Chinese workers. This “two line” theory was very useful to the advancement of the imperialist interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, because it gave a “Marxist” outlook to its presence in the leading organs of the “C”PC. When the authentic Marxist-Leninists noticed that the leadership of the “C”PC was not composed by proletarians, but by preeminent members of the national bourgeoisie, Mao ridiculously argued that things had to be like that because only through tolerating the “two lines” a party could be “authentically socialist”. Mao’s shameless defense of bourgeois order had no limits! He reached the point of claiming that without the presence of the national bourgeoisie in the dominant positions, the “C”PC would not be “revolutionary” because it would lack the “argumentation between the two dialectic lines”. In truth, Mao corrupted Marxism’s genial scientific principles by trying to use them to justify and preserve the social-capitalist character of the “C”PC. These are the veritable facts behind the “struggle of the two lines” supported by the Maoists. In his brilliant books, comrade Enver Hoxha couldn’t have been clearer:

"Mao Tsetung himself has advocated the need for the existence of «two lines» in the party. According to him, the existence and struggle between two lines is something natural, is a manifestation of the unity of the opposites, is a flexible policy which unites in itself both loyalty to principles and compromise. «Thus,» he writes, «we have two hands to deal with a comrade who has made mistakes: one hand to struggle with him and the other to unite with him. The aim of this struggle is to uphold the principles of Marxism, which means being principled; that is one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is to unite with him. The aim of unity is to offer him a way out, to reach a compromise with him». These views are diametrically opposed to the Leninist teachings on the communist party as an organized vanguard detachment which must have a single line and steel unity of thought and action. The class struggle in the ranks of the party, as a reflection of the class struggle going on outside the party, has nothing in common with Mao Tsetung's concepts on the «two lines in the party». The party is not an arena of classes and the struggle between antagonistic classes, it is not a gathering of people with contradictory aims. The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is the party of the working class only and bases itself on the interests of this class. This is the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Defending the Leninist principles on the party, which do not permit the existence of many lines, of opposing trends in the communist party, J. V. Stalin emphasized: the communist party is the monolithic party of the proletariat, and not a party of a bloc of elements of different classes».” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

As for the “argument” put forward by the Bangladesh Maoists that only those who adopt Maoism are
communists, this statement is a laughable attempt to press the workers to embrace Maoism. By now, it must be clear to everybody that in reality it is the opposite which occurs: nobody can be communist while being Maoist.

Furthermore, the Bangladesh Maoists are engaged in promoting, assuming and supporting Mao’s most disgusting anti-socialist theories like the infamous “New Democracy” and the not less infamous “people’s war”:

“In the context of imperialist world system the politics of eradicating imperialism to (...) is the politics of Maoism. In the imperialist suppressed semi-feudal and semi-colonial countries like us the concrete form of this politics is the revolutionary politics of New Democracy. (...) In our country the New Democratic Revolutionary politics means to eradicate the imperialism under the leadership of US, Indian expansionism, bureaucrat capitalism (...) and to establish the New Democratic economics, the New Democratic politics and the New Democratic culture.”


Relatively to Maoist “New Democracy”, we know that we have already talked about it a thousand times, but the truth is that this concept is one of the main foundations of Maoist revisionism, and therefore we must note once more the intimate links that exist between the defense of the “New Democracy” made by the Bangladesh Maoists and the interests of the national bourgeoisie. Indeed, it is not by chance that the Bangladesh Maoists put so much stress in the “struggle against U.S and Indian imperialism”. They do it because the combat against those phenomenons correspond exactly to the interests and aims of the Bangladesh national bourgeoisie, which aspires to surpass and destroy the influence that those foreign imperialisms hold over Bangladesh and which are preventing the country’s national bourgeoisie from obtaining the lion share of the profits made through the exploitation of the workers. And what about the “struggle against bureaucratic capitalism” proposed by the Bangladesh Maoists? It is very interesting because they openly admit that they don’t want to struggle against capitalism as a whole, but only against its “bureaucratic” features. Therefore, we conclude that for the Bangladesh Maoists, there are two types of capitalism: there is the “bureaucratic capitalism” – which is bad - and the “non-bureaucratic capitalism” – which is “good”. It is crystal clear that this stand is revisionist to the bone because all kinds of capitalism without exception are bad, dreadful, oppressive, exploitative, and must be fought without mercy until their total and complete destruction. Of course that the Bangladesh Maoists identify this “bureaucratic capitalism” with the interests of foreign imperialism and of their country’s bourgeoisie comprador. That is why they put so much emphasis in the struggle against it. But what could we expect from a party which dares to acknowledge its support for the implementation in Bangladesh of the dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie?

“In our country the New Democratic Revolutionary politics means (...) to establish the state power of workers-peasants-middle class-national bourgeoisie (...)”


This declaration plainly confirms all that we had previously affirmed. A party which defends the repressive dominion of the national bourgeoisie is a totally anti-communist and pro-capitalist party. It is true that during the historical epoch of the first period of socialism, the national bourgeoisie could play a somewhat progressive role under very limited circumstances in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, but nowadays - in the context of the globalized world and of the outcome of the second period of socialism (that of world socialism) - this is not the case anymore. Indeed, the Bangladesh Maoists still mention the “workers, peasants and middle class” for the only reason of trying to attract them to the side of the interests of the country’s national bourgeoisie, inculcating in them the false notion that under the rule of the national bourgeoisie, their hardships will miraculously disappear, that the supposedly
“progressive” dominion of the national bourgeoisie is synonym of socialism. And as if this was not enough, the Bangladesh Maoists also make a scandalous defense of the counter-revolutionary “people’s war”:

“(…) there is no existence of any Maoism without the politics of people’s war. We believe, the essence of the Maoist New Democratic Revolutionary politics is the Democratic Revolution; the principal aspect of which is agrarian revolution and its central point is land revolution, and that could be implemented through the strategy of protracted people’s war depending mainly on the farmers in the rural areas (…)”

As can be observed, the social-fascists of the MBRMPBSP assume the undeniable links between “people’s war” and the Maoist reactionary theory which depicts the peasantry as the hegemonic class in revolution. In truth, accordingly with the social-bourgeois, anti-Marxist and anti-proletarian concept of “people’s war” fabricated by the Mao and by the Maoists, the peasantry will supposedly control and dominate everything: the people’s army will be composed almost exclusively by peasants, the “people’s war” will occur almost solely in rural areas, etc. Of course, we Stalinists-Hoxhaists know that this apparent “peasant power” is nothing but an enormous masquerade. The only class which will truly control and dominate the Maoist “people’s war” is the national bourgeoisie. The empty talks about the “hegemonic role of the peasantry” and about “peasant leadership” are a strategy used by the Maoists in general and by the Bangladesh Maoists in particular to seduce and attract the oppressed peasants, who are encouraged to see Maoism an “authentically revolutionary ideology which represents the most profound aspirations of the peasants”. The Bangladesh Maoists do this with the aim of transforming the peasantry into an immense force serving the interests of the country’s national bourgeoisie. Their tactic is: to engage peasants into an armed struggle against foreign imperialism and the bourgeoisie comprador under the false pretext of “establishing peasant power”. When the poor peasants finally overthrow the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie comprador, they might be able to understand that they only managed to replace a branch of the bourgeoisie by another one equally exploitative. But by that time, it will be too late: the national bourgeoisie will have its class power sufficiently consolidated to cope with peasants’ complaints. This was what happened in China and this is also what the social-fascists of the MBRMPBSP are also planning to do in Bangladesh. Indeed, this situation is excellent to the national bourgeoisie, because thanks to Maoist misleading, it can take advantage of having a powerful force at its service which is composed by a relatively “safe” class – after all, the peasantry lacks the inherently revolutionary character of the proletariat, it lacks the proletariat’s intrinsic tendency to Marxism-Leninism and to anti-revisionism.

Lastly, the Bangladesh Maoists arrogantly affirm that:

“Certainly Maoism is invincible (…)”

Unfortunately for them, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know very well that Maoism can and will surely be defeated, but only through faithful and absolute embracement of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, which is the authentic ideology of socialism and communism. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, will never stop our struggle to ensure that not only the Bangladesh workers, but also all the world workers are definitively and totally liberated from all remnants of Maoist social-fascism.
The “C”PB (MLM) is the main Maoist organization in Bhutan, one of the poorest and most backward countries in the world. In fact, Bhutan is under the dominion of a feudal-fascist monarchy since many centuries. This monarchy serves and represents the interests of the bourgeoisie comprador and of foreign imperialism, condemning Bhutanese workers to live in the most loathful misery and primitivism, suffering hunger and torture by the monarchic ultra-reactionary forces.

Needless to say that Bhutanese Maoists know very well how to manipulate this situation in favor of the interests of the class they serve: the “anti-imperialist” national section of the Bhutanese bourgeoisie. This can be easily concluded if we take into account the words of the Bhutanese Maoists relatively to whom they consider to be the enemies:

“\[The true enemy (…) is the Wangchuk dynasty and its despotic regime, which serves as the compradors of Bhutanese feudalism, Indian expansionism and imperialism as a whole.\]\n

Therefore, it is easy to see that Bhutanese Maoists don’t really want to organize and lead a genuine socialist revolution to liberate Bhutanese workers from monarchic-feudal-imperialist oppression. All they want to do is to fabricate an “anti-imperialist and “anti-feudal” revolution which will unite Bhutanese workers around the interests of the Bhutanese national bourgeoisie. With this purpose, they use apparently “progressive” and even “leftist” slogans with the aim of making the Bhutanese workers believe that the social-fascists of the “C”PB (MLM) are truly on their side. Of course, the Bhutanese Maoists don’t lose the opportunity of embracing and praising Mao’s wicked anti-socialist theories of the “peasant revolution” and of the “new democracy”:

“(…) it is crystal clear that the New Democratic Revolution is the historical necessity of the hour to solve all the kinds of crisis of semi-feudal and semi-colonial Bhutan. Hence, (…) we proudly proclaim the declaration of the Bhutan Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) to wage the new democratic revolution on the soil of Bhutan and take oath to reach a classless society via socialism by waging an anti-feudal, anti-imperialist peasant revolution through the new democratic revolution in Bhutan.”


Throughout this article, we noted that all Maoist parties staunchly defend the counter-revolutionary “New Democracy” invented by Mao and which constitutes on the main ideological pillars of Maoist revisionism. Consequently, it is not a surprise that Bhutanese Maoists also support it, even because this “New Democratic revolution” means in truth nothing more than the implementation of the dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie. Just like happens with many other Maoist organizations which we already analyzed (like the MBRMPBSP, for instance), also the “C”PB (MLM) does it utmost to attract peasants by claiming that the objective of the Bhutanese Maoists is to lead a “peasant revolution”. In this manner, they manage to mislead the brutally oppressed and exploited Bhutanese peasantry, which lacks ideological formation and it is therefore an easy prey to the supposedly “revolutionary” slogans of the Maoists. Amidst their appalling and unspeakable living conditions, the Bhutanese peasants are certainly pleased by Maoists’ fake promises of “peasant power”, and they cannot imagine what Maoism truly is; they don’t even dream that far from being concerned with their emancipation and well-being, the Bhutanese Maoists only want to open the path to the replacement of the monarchic-fascist dictatorship of the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie by the equally exploitative dictatorship of the national “patriotic” bourgeoisie. As the Bhutanese Maoists perfectly know that the peasantry is a naturally vacillating and ideologically non-consistent class, they transform Bhutanese peasantry into an huge force involuntarily defending the interests of the Bhutanese national bourgeoisie; who is in search for the profits and properties of which it has been deprived by the pro-imperialist comprador classes which rule and control Bhutan’s political-socio-economic power. Of course that the Bhutanese peasants are not informed about this, and they sincerely think that Bhutanese Maoists are “struggling for peasants’ liberation”.

Needless to say that there is not the smallest place for the proletariat within the documents and programs of the Bhutanese Maoists. Indeed, the working class is Maoist’s greatest fear because it is the only class
which is able to open the peasants’ eyes to the combat against all kinds of revisionisms, including Maoism, and against all exploiters, including the national bourgeoisie.

But despite all their efforts to hide this truth from the Bhutanese toiling masses, the Bhutanese Maoists cannot cover their perverse support for the capitalists:

“The Bhutan Communist Party (MLM) requests all the Bhutanese (…) peasants, businessmen, employee, students, youths, teachers, writers, intellectuals and civilians to accept its appeal and call and to help physically, morally and economically in the struggle.”


As can be observed, the Bhutanese Maoists appeal to the old opportunistic trick of the “union of all classes” against a “common enemy”. In this case, the “common enemy” is foreign imperialism and the monarchic-feudal-fascist bourgeoisie of the comprador type. Also in this statement, we can note the vicious attempts by the Bhutanese Maoists to keep the working class away from the leadership of the revolution. They even reach the point of appealing to the “businessmen”, that is, to the “patriotic” capitalists. And the social-fascists of the “C”PB (MLM) don’t support the capitalists by chance. They do it to ensure that the future pro-bourgeois “revolution” will not run the risk of being transformed into an authentic socialist revolution by the Bhutanese workers (it is true that Bhutan’s working class is weak in numbers, but if it acquires a genuine Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist consciousness, it would surely became a lethal menace to the interests of the national bourgeoisie).

Through granting the preservation of the bourgeoisie as a class, the Bhutanese Maoists turn impossible the abolition of exploitation and wage slavery in the “New Democratic revolution”, and thus they are allowing the implementation of the oppressive tyranny of the referred “businessmen”, that is, of those whom the Bhutanese Maoists consider to be the “progressive” bourgeoisie.

And the anti-communist fever of the Bhutanese Maoists goes even further:

“The Bhutan Communist Party (MLM) also requests the international communities, (…) not to help the autocratic regime of the Wangchuk dynasty, but extend their support towards the Bhutan Communist Party (MLM) which is fighting in the forefront of the struggle for democracy, civil and human rights in the democratic struggle of Bhutan.”


This declaration is pathetic. The Bhutanese Maoists are appealing to the same imperialist-capitalist institutions (the “international communities”) that support Bhutan’s fascist-feudal monarchy in order to make them “stop helping the monarchy”! What a “great” strategy! The Bhutanese Maoists are anti-socialist to the point of believing that world capitalists-imperialists are really worried about the well-being of Bhutanese masses. Indeed, if these words were not written on an official document of the “C”PB (MLM), we would feel tempted to believe that we were reading some of the garbage published by those hateful hypocrite pro-capitalists organizations such as “Amnesty International” and the like…

Contrary to what the Bhutanese Maoists insinuate, world capitalists-imperialists couldn’t care less about the so-called “human rights”. The bourgeoisie only cares about the maximization of profits and nothing more. In fact, the very concept of “human rights” is anti-Marxist because it rejects class viewpoints (the bourgeoisie affirms that “human rights are for all”, but this is not true. Under capitalist dictatorship only the exploiters have their “human rights” recognized while the workers are treated worse than animals. This situation can only be reversed through the implementation of proletarian dictatorship).

All this suffices to prove the counter-revolutionary and social-fascist character of the “C”PB (MLM). Nonetheless, we will continue our analysis by recalling the astonishingly reactionary affirmations of one of the main leaders of the “C”PB (MLM): “comrade” Sushil. In an interview given in 2009 to the Lal Salm blog (a Maoist site), this leader of the Bhutanese Maoists declared:

“LAL SALAM BLOG: Last year your party started a Peoples War in Bhutan…”
COMRADE SUSHIL: No. We have not initiated a protracted peoples war in Bhutan. (...) Much of the media proclaimed this as the beginning of the Peoples War, but we are not at that phase. We are trying to reach the level of Peoples War, but we have not yet reached it, and are preparing for it. We do not know how long this will take, it will depend on many factors.

LAL SALAM BLOG: The Maoists in Nepal have given up their Peoples War and taken a new tactic in pursuing the Constituent Assembly elections. Is this a correct tactic in your parties opinion?

COMRADE SUSHIL: In regards to the UCPN (M) we do not think that they have given up their goals. We think they are pursuing another way, another tactic to establish a peoples state. (...) We too will go for a Constituent Assembly (...).

LAL SALAM BLOG: So a Constituent Assembly is a tactic that you are interested in for change in Bhutan?

COMRADE SUSHIL: Actually it is the tactics and strategy of communist parties in the third world. Third world countries are semi-colonial and semi-feudal. So without a New Democratic stage we cannot reach socialism.”

As can be concluded, contrary to what happens with many other Maoist parties which try to give themselves a “radical” and “leftist” appearance through engaging in social-bourgeois “peoples’ war”, the Bhutanese Maoists do not even waste their time doing this. They freely assume not only that they are not concerned about armed struggle, but also that they are ready to enter and participate in bourgeois elections through the formation of a “Constituent Assembly”. In truth, this can be explained due to the fact that bourgeois fake “democracy” is strikingly similar to Maoism: both try to deceive the workers by inculcating in them a false impression of “freedom” and “emancipation” only to hide the perpetuation of capitalist repressive rule.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the Bhutanese Maoists happily defend and support the so-called “Constituent Assembly” which is nothing more than a synonym of the bourgeois treacherous “democracy”. Indeed, we should not forget that the social-fascists of the “C”PC (MLM) have the Nepalese Maoists as their models and inspiration. And what did the Nepalese Maoists did? They overthrew the Nepalese king only to surrender in favor of Indian imperialism and to organize bourgeois elections after which they abandoned power in peaceful manner, thus giving a blatant example of how far Maoists’ pro-capitalism can go. That’s why some Maoist parties and organizations criticize the Nepalese Maoists. They criticize them not from genuine Marxist-Leninist positions, but merely because the “Communist” Party of Nepal (Maoist) clearly revealed Maoism’s true nature in front of the eyes of the working masses without any kind of subterfuges (in the DWM I and DWM II we had already analyzed the revisionist course of the “C”PN – M with more detail). As for the Bhutanese Maoists’ claim that to participate in bourgeois elections in order to install a capitalist tyranny does not mean to give up goals, we have to say that they are completely right, but only in what respects to their ideology. Indeed, by collaborating with the implementation of a bourgeois “democracy”, far from giving up their goals, the Maoists are precisely accomplishing them: they preserve and support a form of bourgeois dictatorship which tries to hide the exploitative class character of its socio-political-economic order with the purpose of perpetuating capitalist oppression.

Moreover, the leader of the Bhutanese Maoists also fully embraces Mao’s anti-Marxist “theory” that demands that to achieve socialism it is necessary to first develop capitalism during the “New Democratic” stage: he explicitly said that “without a New Democratic stage we cannot reach socialism”. This ultra-reactionary idea was scientifically unmasked by comrade Enver Hoxha:

"Mao Zedong took over the anti-Marxist concept of Kautsky, according to which in the backward
countries the transition to socialism cannot be achieved without going through a lengthy period of free development of capitalism which prepares the conditions to go over to socialism later. In fact, the so-called socialist regime which Mao Zedong and his group established in China was and remained a bourgeois-democratic regime.” (Enver Hoxha, *Eurocommunism is Anti-communism*, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

Finally, the Bhutanese Maoists reach the peak of their own social-fascist reactionarism by declaring that:


So, the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PB (MLM) explicitly admit that the main objective of their organization and ideology is the participation in bourgeois political game through the installation of the dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie which will keep Bhutanese toiling masses in eternal servitude and whose oppressive nature will be covered by “progressive” and even “socialistic” masks.

**5 – Australasian continent**

Despite being the smallest continent of the world, Australasia is full of Maoist revisionist poison. The continent’s biggest countries – Australia and New Zealand – have both well established Maoist parties which keep Australasian proletariat carefully away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, thus safeguarding the class interests of the capitalists.

This continent’s history is an uninterrupted succession of colonialist brutalities, with the Australasian indigenous peoples being victims of the profit-driven exploitative system since many decades. In fact, Australian Aboriginals and New Zealand Maoris have lived in Australasia since much before European colonization. However, from the moment British imperialists set foot on the continent for the first time, they did not spare efforts to subjugate, oppress and exterminate Australasia’s native populations, who suffered unspeakable exploitation. Of course, the vast majority of white settlers who went to Australasia was as miserable, poor and repressed as the indigenous peoples. In order to prevent the European workers from understanding that there was identity of interests between them and the natives - because all them were equally exploited by the same oppressing classes - the British colonialists did their utmost to promote racism against indigenous Australasians, depicting them as “being more animals than humans”. This strategy was successful in dividing Australasian workers and British imperialism managed to remain dominant in the continent until the second half of the XXth century, when it was replaced by American imperialism. Recently, Australian bourgeoisie started to engage itself in the promotion of Australia as a regional imperialist power, but these pretensions are not much entitled to have success, because now there is another major world imperialist power which is also deeply interested in controlling the continent: social-imperialist China. This situation is encouraged due to the relative geographical proximity between China and Australasia.

As we shall see, Maoist parties in this continent support and defend Chinese social-imperialism, thus trying to keep Australasian proletariat in bondage and at the mercy of capitalist-imperialist gluttony.

**5.1 – Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist)**

The “Communist” Party of Australia (“Marxist-Leninist”) is the main Maoist organization in that country. Historically, it was born from a split which occurred within the former CPA in the 60’s between the pro-Soviet revisionists and the pro-Chinese revisionists. These last ones managed to form their own party and this was how the “C”PA (“ML”) first appeared. This party tries to deceive workers by affirming that “it aims to continue the CPA’s revolutionary traditions that begun in 1920”, but this kind of treacherous
slogans are completely unmasked by the ultra-revisionist and reactionary theories put forward by the “C”PA (“ML”).

The Australian Maoist party has played a role of betrayal within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha:

**What was the role of the “C”PA (“ML”) within the Marxist-Leninist world movement in time of comrade Enver Hoxha?**

To answer this question we refer to our main source: Enver Hoxha *Reflections of China* - Volume II, pages 340 - 366 [December, 1976] – Enver Hoxha's Criticism at the Chairman of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), Edward Hill.

The “C”PA (“ML”) was and is indeed one of the "5th Columns" of the world bourgeoisie in general and in particular that of the Chinese social-imperialists. The “C”PA (“ML”) assumed a hostile attitude towards comrade Enver Hoxha, the PLA, the Socialist Albania and towards the whole Marxist-Leninist World Movement since the end of the year 1976.

For the “C”PA (“ML”), the unconditional subordination under the Chinese line was and is more important than the principles of Marxism-Leninism. With the charge of "abandonment of the Mao Zedong-Ideas", the “C”PA (“ML”) attempted to put the Marxist-Leninist parties under pressure for the purpose to secede them from the PLA. The “C”PA (“ML”) advocated the Chinese point of view of limiting the cooperation of the Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties exclusively on bilateral relations. This Chinese line was contrary to the line of Lenin and Stalin who always struggled also for the necessity of multilateral relations among the Communist parties. The foundation of the Comintern is a bright example for this. And in their struggle against Maoism the genuine brother parties of the PLA started successfully to organize their multilateral relations and international meetings inclusively the invitation of delegations of the brother parties for their participation at party congresses.

After the PLA had dared to criticize the counter-revolutionary "three worlds" theory, the Chinese revisionists and their lackeys, such as the “C”PA (“ML”), increased their efforts, to force the Marxist-Leninist world movement to bow down to the general-line of the “C”P China. In the countries of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Chinese leaders installed parallel, so called "Marxist-Leninist" organizations with the intention to combat our fraternal parties in their own countries. All this shows that the “C”PA (“ML”) is a sworn enemy of the Marxist-Leninist world movement; this Maoist party is an enemy of proletarian internationalism.

In the 50s and 60s of the last century, the Khrushchev-revisionists continued the betrayal of the Second International and with the beginning of our struggle against modern revisionism, the Chinese revisionists created their counter-revolutionary "theory of three worlds" as another instrument for the purpose of splitting and liquidate the Communist World Movement.

The “C”PA (“ML”) supported the Chinese revisionist leaders in their struggle against the Marxist-Leninist world movement. Therefore, they are an agency of the Chinese revisionism. The “C”PA (“ML”) attacked the Albanian Party of Labour and the Socialist Albania and also the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin on behalf of the revisionist leaders of the “Communist” Party of China (see: Enver Hoxha, *Reflections of China*).

However, as a result, their paralyzing mission failed. The Marxist-Leninist World Movement with comrade Enver Hoxha at the head thwarted the insidious intentions of the Chinese lackey Edward Hill:

“The tactic of the Chinese is plain. They (...) use Hill and perhaps others, by means of whom we are to engage in polemics on the question of China. The objective of this is to split the revolutionary movement and the unity of the Marxist-Leninist communist parties. They have done such a thing long ago with a number of Marxist-Leninist communist parties with which they have broken off relations and now maintain relations with a hotchpotch of groups of provocateurs that call themselves «Maoists». On the other hand, while playing this game they are trying to isolate the Party of Labour of Albania and reduce its great authority. We must be vigilant in this direction, must guard against provocateurs and defend the correct line of our Party and the purity of
Marxism-Leninism with all our strength. The revisionist Chinese and their lackeys will be discredited and will fail.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In the struggle against Khrushchev revisionism the Marxist-Leninist parties had been in minority, however, in the proceeding struggle against Maoism the Marxist-Leninist parties maintained their majority. Most of the Marxist-Leninist parties stood much more firmly on the side of the PLA in order to combat the divisive activities of the “C”PA (“ML”). The alleged "anti-revisionist" Mao Zedong-Ideas were unmasked by comrade Enver Hoxha and rejected as revisionist ideas. Thus, this ideological new weapon of the world imperialists against the communist world and against world revolution failed to have the desired effect. Maoism had to accept defeat. In contrast, the struggle against Maoism was the historic peak of the strengthening of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement, guided by comrade Enver Hoxha.

Moreover, Australian Maoists don’t hesitate before eulogizing Mao’s “revolution by stages”, even affirming that this constitutes the party’s main ideological base:

“The Programme of the Party is based on revolution by stages; the current stage being the struggle to win real national independence by resisting and expelling US and other imperialisms from Australia. With the establishment of a democratic peoples' republic, the working class and its allies can build and consolidate the social and material conditions for the later stage of socialism.” (http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/about.php, About CPA (ML), edition in English)

“We're fighting to:

- Build people's power in society as the foundation stone for a democratic people's republic uniting all anti-imperialist classes and sectors.” (http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/fightingprogramme.php, Fighting Programme of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), edition in English)

And the historical leader of the Australian Maoists even openly admitted and praised the preservation of capitalist elements under the so-called “anti-imperialist stage of the revolution”:

“There are two stages to Australia’s revolution. The first is the completion of the tasks of the anti-imperialist revolution. (...)” (Edward Hill, The Great Cause of Australian Independence, November 1977, edition in English)

These words from the social-fascist Edward Hill are a confession by the Maoists themselves that the objective of Mao’s “revolution by stages” is to maintain tyrannical wage slavery by promoting the development and consolidation of bourgeois-capitalist elements which will take socio-economic power in their hands, thus denying to the working masses any kind of genuinely socialist perspective. This is how the pro-bourgeois “democratic and anti-imperialist” stage of the Maoist “revolution” ultimately invalidates and paralyses the advance towards the “socialist” stage. Therefore, the affirmations of the Australian Maoists about the construction of “the later stage of socialism” are nothing more than empty lies which should not mislead conscious proletarians.

Indeed, if we pay attention to the declarations of the Australian Maoists, we will observe that they basically limit their “revolution” to the alleged foundation of an “anti-imperialist democratic people’s republic”. In what respects to their fake anti-imperialism, we will try to reveal its true character later in this article; but relatively to the concept of “democratic peoples’ republic” fabricated by them, it seems crystal clear that the Australian Maoists are in fact referring to Mao’s social-fascist “new democracy”. It is quite natural and understandable that Maoists try to disguise their defense of this reactionary theory by giving it different names like “peoples’ democracy”, “people’s republic”, etc…But in the end, the truth remains and the Maoist “New Democracy” continues to be the anti-socialist idea it has always been,
independently of what the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PA (“ML”) decide to call it. Throughout this text, we have already reflected about and analyzed the veritable nature of this perverse “New Democracy”. We have concluded that this “New Democracy” is nothing more than a masquerade invented by Mao and only serves to foster bourgeois class strengthening during the supposedly “anti-imperialist democratic stage of the revolution”. According to Mao, the objective of this stage is to “open the path to socialism”, but this is a lie. As the comrades of the glorious Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha accurately affirmed:

“Mao Zedong dressed up his theory of “New Democracy” to appear as if it were in accord with the Marxist-Leninist theory of the “new democracy,” that is, the national democratic revolution of the new type; that in the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples is no longer the reserve of the bourgeoisie but has become inseparably linked with the world proletarian revolution and socialism. But this was a hoax. The actual theory of Mao Zedong was that of the great barrier between the democratic and socialist revolutions. While Lenin stressed that under the conditions of imperialism the oppressed nations can ensure their genuine freedom and independence only with the establishment of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that the proletariat and people can bring the revolution to the socialist stage through the bourgeois democratic revolution of the new type; Mao, on the other hand, advocated the opposite. Mao wanted to stop the Chinese people’s revolution of a new type halfway, to drag it back towards the bourgeois democratic revolution of the old type, dreaming pipe dreams of a non-socialist independent Chinese state on a middle road, independent of both imperialism and socialism. (…) This “Thought” of Mao’s, however, is not in the least original or new but is a basic tenet of the revisionism of the heroes of the Second International, an idea held by the Russian Mensheviks which was theoretically demolished by Lenin as early as 1905.” (Documents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism, Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists, 1979, edition in English)

Therefore, the purpose of this “New Democracy” is not to accomplish socialism (let alone communism…), but to preserve capitalism as an everlasting socio-economic oppressive order through avoiding the implementation of proletarian dictatorship (about which, by the way, the Australian Maoists do not utter a single word…).

In what respects to their fake “anti-imperialism”, the Australian Maoists proclaim it throughout their documents and texts while pretending to call our attention to “inter-imperialist contradictions”:

“Imperialism gives rise to constant international instability and wars of aggression. The root cause of instability and war is imperialist expansionism and rivalry of and between the United States of America and the European Union and to a lesser extent, Japan.” (http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/programme.php, Independence from US imperialism - Programme of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist, 2009, edition in English)

“As deputy sheriff to US imperialism in the region, Australia hosts a large number of significant US military bases. This makes us dependent and subservient to US economic, political and military interests at home and internationally.”(http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/latestnews.php?subaction=showfull&id=1303421852&archive=&start_from=&ucat=1&. Unite on May Day, April, 2011, edition in English)

So, according to the Australian Maoists, nowadays the main imperialist contradiction occurring in the world is that between American imperialism and European imperialism. The social-fascists of the “C”PA (“ML”) must think we are still living in the 1920’s or in the 1930’s, because only someone who thinks like that can affirm that today’s’ main imperialist rivalry is between American and European imperialism. At first sight, this affirmation seems merely ridiculous, but if we analyze it carefully, we will easily conclude that it has indeed a very precise objective: to keep the workers’ attention away from the necessity of struggle against the emergent Chinese social-imperialism, whose origins we can find within
Maoist revisionism. In fact, while screaming about the “anti-imperialist combat”, Australian Maoists try to deny the existence of Chinese social-imperialism. In truth, more than merely denying Chinese social-imperialism – which is nowadays on the verge of world domination, being about to surpass the USA as the world’s main imperialist superpower – the Australian Maoists go even further and reach the point of praising its expansion:

“*Australians are genuinely grateful that Chinese demand for resources such as coal and steel has helped cushion us from the extremes of the world economic crisis.*”

This statement is just astonishing! Australian Maoists are affirming that Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie did well to the Australian workers through exploiting them to obtain coal and steel (two raw materials which are much needed by Chinese social-imperialists because they are essential to the construction of machines, industry, etc…). Therefore, if we are going to believe in the neo-revisionists of the “C”PA (“ML”), Australian workers should be infinitely happy for the fact of being chosen to serve as producers and suppliers of the raw materials necessary to the further expansion of Chinese social-imperialism! Needless to say that by being obliged to contribute to the strengthening of the Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie, Australian proletarians are also being forced to open the path to their own further exploitation, because Chinese social-imperialism aims to exploit all workers of the world, including Australian ones, of course. And the Australian Maoists shamelessly affirm that for this Australian workers must be “grateful”! This is undoubtedly an outrageous declaration. Instead of defending the annihilation of capitalist-imperialist world system as the only mean to definitively prevent the inevitability of economic crisis, the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PA (“ML”) thank Chinese social-imperialists for having allegedly helped cushion its effects over Australians.

But what could we expect from a party which considers China a country with “socialist characteristics”?

“In China today there are examples (…) of positive social behaviour characteristic of socialism.”

Here, we can see how the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PA (“ML”) mislead Australian workers. They disguise their support for Chinese social-imperialism through a very simple trick: they deny that China is an imperialist country, even affirming that it has “socialist features and elements”, when the truth is that not only China is presently totally engaged in imperialist ascension, but also that it had never anything to do with socialism. In this manner, by depicting social-imperialist China as including “socialist elements”, Australian Maoists try to give a “progressive” color to their support for Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie. It is really scandalous how the Australian Maoists are so worried about “US imperialism influence within Australia” while outrageously defending and even praising Chinese social-imperialism.

Moreover, the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PA (“ML”) spent their time criticizing Australia’s political leaders saying they are “lackeys of the pro-American bourgeoisie”. It is indeed true that Australian political-economic system is conceived to foster the interests of the pro-American bourgeoisie, but it is also true that Australian Maoists are not substantially different from those they pretend to criticize. The only distinction we can make between them is that while Australia’s current bourgeois politicians favor the interests of American imperialism, Australian Maoists aim to achieve power to favor the interests of Chinese social-imperialism.

And as if this was not enough, the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PA (“ML”) go on with their appalling anti-socialism:

“(…) US imperialism (has not) given up its dreams of destroying the People’s Republic of China or once again attacking the Republic of Cuba or the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and other progressive countries.”
So, according with the Australian Maoists, nepotist Castroist Cuba and monarcho-fascist North Korea are “progressive” countries. The neo-revisionists of the “C”PA (“ML”) really know no limits to their reactionarism. Nonetheless, we must admit that this praise of social-fascist countries by the Australian Maoists is not a surprise if we take into account the anti-communist nature of their political line. In fact, the social-fascists of the “C”PA (“ML”) do not spare efforts to confine workers’ demands within reformist limits:

“(…) the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) supports demands to (…) vigorously tax the large multinationals and the super-rich.” (http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/programme.php, Independence from US imperialism - Programme of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), 2009, edition in English)

“We're fighting to:

• Raise living standards with a progressive tax system.” (http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/fightingprogramme.php, Fighting Programme of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), edition in English)

“(…) people demand guarantees of jobs, savings, decent living wages and conditions, housing and access to education and healthcare services.” (http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/statements.php?subaction=showfull&id=1225099825&archive=&start_from=&ucat=6&, Make the Rich Corporations Pay! Guarantee jobs, living wage, savings and housing, October, 2008, edition in English)

These slogans were taken from the official documents of the Australian Maoists and they clearly display their social-democratic character. If we are going to believe them, there is no need to violently overthrowing capitalist-imperialist system neither to implement proletarian dictatorship towards the construction of a socialist and communist society. All that we need is to “impose higher taxes on the millionaires”, because this will rise “living standards”. These proposals from the Australian Maoists perfectly configure a defense of the famous bourgeois “state of well-being”. But contrary to what the Australian Maoists insinuate, this reformist “welfare state” is highly benefic to the capitalists because it contributes to prevent the working classes from adhering to communist ideology. The “higher taxes” are always irrelevant relatively to the colossal accumulation of wealth and profits by the capitalists, but they allow these capitalists to tell the workers: “See, the state is forcing us to pay more taxes, there fore it is false that the state is controlled by us. Consequently, you can see that the communist principle that state is an instrument of our dictatorship is false.” In this manner, many workers believe in the lies of the capitalists and think that there is no need to accomplish violent socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship for the simple reason that allegedly there is not bourgeois tyranny. After all, it is not necessary to replace bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship because the state would already be supposedly under “popular and democratic control”. Of course, such things as higher wages, housing, jobs, etc…are presented as “proofs” that the state is really exempt from bourgeois dominance. Through this scheme, capitalists can sleep quietly while this “welfare state” inculcates in the toiling masses the false idea that the crucial principle of Stalinism-Hoxhaism according to which under capitalism the state power is always an instrument of oppressive profit-driven totalitarianism and must be overthrow is not correct neither applicable anymore. This constitutes a veritable life insurance to capitalism, an everlasting guarantee to wage exploitation.

This is the kind of pro-bourgeois masquerades that the social-fascists of the “C”PA (“ML”) want to promote and encourage. But if they think they can deceive workers forever, they are the ones who are completely misled. Proletarians in Australian and in the world will awake and they will wage a fierce struggle against the influence of all kinds of revisionism in general, and of Maoist revisionism in particular. And if they wage this combat under the iron proletarian leadership of the Comintern (SH), they will surely achieve glorious socialist victories!
5.2 – Communist Party of Aoteraoa (New Zealand)

The “Communist” Party of Aoteraoa is the main Maoist organization in New Zealand, a nation which was a British colony during many centuries and which is nowadays under the influence of American imperialism.

In their official documents, New Zealand Maoists pretend to struggle against foreign imperialism and they don’t hesitate in qualifying the still existing revisionist states as their ideological allies:

“Tested and deepened in revolutionary battles around the world, Marxism-Leninism has shown its worth. For it was under the leadership of parties armed with this powerful weapon that people in Russia, China, Korea, and Vietnam, more than a quarter of the world’s population won their freedom from capitalism.” (http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/, Workers, Join Your Party!, edition in English)

As can be observed, New Zealand Maoists affirm that social-fascist regimes ruling North Korea, China and Vietnam are Marxist-Leninist! This is a tremendous insult to the heroic ideology of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. Someone who qualifies bourgeois-nationalist Vietnam as a “Marxist-Leninist country” is totally submerged in the most abhorrent anti-communism. Vietnamese people fought hard against imperialist aggressors, but unfortunately this anti-imperialist struggle never managed to reach a truly socialist and revolutionary level, remaining at a merely nationalistic-bourgeois ground. Thus, after the defeat of American imperialism, Vietnamese bourgeoisie implemented a revisionist state which would inclusively fall under the sway of Soviet social-imperialism. Nowadays, Vietnamese social-bourgeoisie ruling classes continue to live lavishly thanks to the exploitation of Vietnamese people and they are also approaching Chinese social-imperialism which is already predominant in Southern Asia. As can be concluded, the historical course, ideology and stands of the “Communist” Party of Vietnam are very far from being Marxist-Leninist.

Relatively to the affirmations of the New Zealand Maoists that North Korea is “Marxist-Leninist”, they dispense our commentaries. We have already unmasked Maoists’ support for monarcho-fascist North Korea and explained the intimate links and striking similarities between Maoism and KimIlSungism. Like Maoism, also KimIlSungism aims to perpetuate capitalist oppressive despotism and to avoid the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, it is not surprising that New Zealand Maoists praise it so much. Indeed, in what respects to the refusal of communist ideology, they use a very interesting trick in order to deceive working masses. They declare that:

“Comrade Mao Zedong (…) bequeathed to us the immortal and powerful legacy of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism. He stands alongside the great communists Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.” (http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/, General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought, December, 1993, edition in English)

As can be seen, New Zealand Maoists try to give themselves a somewhat “anti-revisionist” outlook by mentioning comrade Stalin and by wanting to equalize him with the fascist Mao. But in the end, they can’t help assuming their revisionist character by qualifying themselves as followers of “Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought”, thus rejecting Stalinism. As we had already referred, those who pretend to defend the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin without defending Stalin and Enver Hoxha are nothing more than vulgar revisionists. And those who go even further and support Maoist revisionism while refusing Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology are undoubtedly among the most dangerous enemies of the world socialist revolution. To refuse and despise comrade Stalin’s glorious teachings means to deny socialist ideology in its entirety, for there cannot be socialist construction without the inestimable and genial lessons from comrade Stalin, the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Needless to say that New Zealand Maoists do not even utter a word about comrade Enver or about socialist Albania. They are terribly afraid of what the teachings and principles of Hoxhaism can do against Mao’s wicked revisionism. The counter-revolutionaries of the “C”CPA know very well that comrade Enver Hoxha scientifically refuted and
denounced Maoism’s veritable pro-capitalist nature, but instead of resorting to lies and calumnies against the brilliant Albanian Marxist-Leninists, they prefer to cover comrade Enver’s anti-revisionist combat with silence. This alone constitutes a clear sign that Maoists recognize Stalinism-Hoxhaism as the only ideology able to defeat them.

And there is more.

The New Zealand Maoists do another astonishing affirmation when they affirm:

"In leading the new democratic revolution to victory in a country as vast as China, containing one-fourth of humanity, Mao is undeniably a great communist thinker and leader whom the world proletariat and people can be proud of." ([http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/, General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought, December, 1993, edition in English](http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/))

So, if we are going to believe in the social-fascists of the “C”PA, the fact that Mao operated in a vast country as China is sufficient to automatically conclude that we was “a great communist”. Consequently, according to the New Zealand Maoists, the question of whether someone is a great communist or not is entirely dependent on the geographical size of that person’s country. This line of thought is so absurd that we are not even going to waste our time with it. Comrade Enver Hoxha was one of the greatest and more brilliant communist leaders that ever lived and he was lived on one of the smallest nations of the world – Albania. On the contrary, Mao was nothing more than a revisionist whose only purpose was to foster the coming to power of the Chinese national bourgeoisie and China’s transformation into an imperialist superpower.

And the New Zealand Maoists continue with their anti-communist fever:

"He (Mao) excelled as the master of political and military science in accordance with materialist dialectics. He successfully pursued the theory and strategic line of protracted people's war.” ([http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/, General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought, December, 1993, edition in English](http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/))

By defending Mao’s reactionary “peoples’ war”, New Zealand Maoists are despising the proletariat, keeping it away from the leadership of the masses. Mao’s “people’s revolutionary war” - which supposedly puts the peasantry in the leadership of the revolution - is nothing more than a pretext to keep the revolution within the limits of the oppressive system, to keep it under bourgeois control. It is a theoretic concept invented by Mao to annihilate and neutralize the influence of the only class which is capable of definitively destroying all kinds of capitalist exploitation: the working class, the proletariat.

Moreover, as if this was not enough, the New Zealand Maoists even dare to affirm:

"Mao's line of socialist revolution and construction through the Great Leap Forward, (...) was tested and proven correct when it (...) resulted in strengthening the industrial foundation of China and produced the bumper crops and ample manufactures for agricultural production and the people's consumption.” ([http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/, General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought, December, 1993, edition in English](http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/))

When reading this statement, we feel tempted to think that it can only be a joke. The Great Leap Forward promoted industry and people’s consumption?! Are they kidding?! The GLF was a disaster, it was catastrophic to the Chinese oppressed masses, it spread hunger and disease among Chinese poor people. As we had already explained in the DWM II, the GLF is the prototype of Maoist utopian bourgeois idealism which can only conduct workers to the most desperate misery. Indeed, the main victims of the GLF were the peasants, who were obliged to work 16 hours a day during 4 years to accomplish a totally unrealistic economic program which had not the slightest possibility of being successful. This reveals the truth behind Maoist phraseology about the supposed “defense of the peasants”.

And the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PA are so in love with Mao’s distortion of Marxism that just
after having eulogizing the calamitous GLF, they don’t think twice before declaring Mao’s “Cultural Revolution” as being nothing less than “the higher development of Marxism-Leninism”:

“The practical application of the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian class dictatorship through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution succeeded for ten years from 1966 to 1976 and created the most extensive democracy ever experienced by mankind. (...) This theory is of great historic significance for having inaugurated a new and higher stage in the development of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. This is the stage of Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism.” (http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/, General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought, December, 1993, edition in English)

The anti-Marxist character of Mao’s “Cultural Revolution” is evident if we take into account that it was nothing more than a palace putsch led by one branch of the Chinese national bourgeoisie against another which was trying to seize absolute political-socio-economic power. Mao represented that section of the national bourgeoisie which still aimed at maintaining a “socialist” mask as a disguise to the continuation of wage slavery after the 1949 Maoist “revolution”. Mao’s section was very clever in making the Chinese workers believe they were really constructing communism, thus keeping them away from the genuinely revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideology.

On the contrary, the section of the Chinese national bourgeoisie against which the “Cultural Revolution” was directed defended the assumption of an explicitly monopolist, fascist and imperialist-capitalist power free from any of the subterfuges and “leftist” disguises advocated by Mao. In the end, despite Mao’s efforts, this last branch of the bourgeoisie managed to triumph and it is currently ruling China. Furthermore, the pro-anarchist “Cultural Revolution” meant in fact the negation of the supremacy role of the Communist Party. Recalling once more the wise words of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha:

“(…) in fact the course of the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution shows that Mao Zedong and the other leaders of Chinese revisionism believed it possible to do without the party. In this massive struggle, Mao Zedong did not use the party as a mobilizer of the masses. On the contrary, the youth and student masses were to rise up without the party. The party and various mass organizations were actually dispersed in the early stages of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, and later on the army was called in to calm down the resulting chaos. We supported the Cultural Revolution because we wished to see the downfall of the diehard revisionist and capitalist elements who had usurped key positions in the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese state power. We and other Marxist-Leninists were correct to support the Chinese people at this critical and dangerous moment when China was under a brutal and savage attack from the imperialist-revisionist encirclement. But the question arises: how could the Chinese Cultural Revolution succeed without the leadership of the party or of the proletariat?” (Documents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism, Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists, 1979, edition in English)

New Zealand Maoists try to depict the inter-bourgeois contradictions and interests which dominated social-fascist China as being the “continuation of revolution under proletarian dictatorship”! As if there was ever a proletarian dictatorship in China! The truth is that Chinese workers were always under the tyrannical repression of the national bourgeoisie, which did not spared efforts to promote anti-communism both within the country and abroad. But the social-fascist of the “C”PA deny all this:

“Oh under the leadership of Mao Zedong, China was a bulwark of the world proletarian revolution. In accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Chinese communist party, proletariat and people of all nationalities did everything they could to unite and strengthen the international communist movement along the general revolutionary line against imperialism, social-imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.” (http://home.clear.net.nz/pages/cpa/, General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought, December, 1993, edition in English)

What?!!! To support Pinochet and Franco is to combat reaction? To friendly receive Nixon and
Rockefeller is proletarian internationalism? To despise people’s aspirations to socialism in benefit of the imperialist goals of Chinese national bourgeoisie is to struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism? Is all this synonym of “strengthening the international communist movement”? In October of 1975, when Mao was still alive and in power, comrade Enver rightly remarked that:

“In its international policy the Communist Party of China is maintaining wrong, non-Marxist stands. Its policy is not a revolutionary, proletarian class policy, is not pro the revolution. (...) The Communist Party of China poses as though it is assisting the world revolution and the Marxist-Leninist communist and workers’ parties, but in reality it is not doing this. (...) China propagates friendship and alliance with the whole of the «third world» without any political distinction, and especially without making any class distinction, without struggling or doing anything to deepen the contradictions between the working class of these countries and their oppressors, the reactionary bourgeoisie. The Communist Party of China and the policy of the Chinese state are ignoring these contradictions and acting to soften them by openly defending cliques such as those of Pinochet, Franco, Mobutu, and many others. This is not a Marxist-Leninist policy, but an anti-Marxist one, because it is an attempt to quell the class struggle at the international level. Hence, the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state forget their class ally, the world proletariat, underestimate it and highlight their alliance with the heads of the bourgeoisie who are ruling over the proletariat and the peoples. And this kind of alliance, not seen from the class angle, is switched according to circumstances.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

If there were still doubts about the ultra-reactionary and pro-capitalist nature of the “C”PA, we think that this gives us the final answer. New Zealand Maoists are nothing more than apologists of Maoist fascism, which has transformed China into an imperialist monster whose only objective is to accumulate uncountable profits by asphyxiating the world proletariat in bloody oppression and exploitation. But the perverse aims of the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PA will ultimately fail. In the future, New Zealand workers will reject any kind of revisionism, including Maoism. They will finally understand that the world socialist revolution based on the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism is the only way to the authentic abolition of world capitalist-imperialist tyranny, and that the implementation of the Stalinist-Hoxhaist world proletarian dictatorship is the only manner to accomplish workers’ liberation towards a classless and stateless world society.

6 – African continent

African continent can be considered as the most exploited continent of the entire world. African workers live in the most abject misery; everyday thousands of them perish of famine and preventable diseases. But the unspeakable oppression exercised by the African peoples is nothing new. Indeed, it has begun many centuries ago when European colonizers occupied the continent in search for the immense material resources that Africa possesses. In fact, the white colonialists were not only hunting for raw materials, they were also looking for human workforce who could be easily and endlessly exploited (that was how and why black slavery was born). The period of European colonization lasted until the XX century and was characterized by the most brutal and bloodthirsty oppression of the African workers, who were deliberately kept in the most profound ignorance so they would never acknowledge the barbarity of their living and working conditions. In the second half of the XX century, the so-called “national liberation movements” that supposedly aimed at granting African peoples’ freedom and independence initially gave much hope to the ultra-exploited African proletarians. However, they soon realized that those fake “national liberation movements” were struggling against European colonialism only to replace it by American or Soviet imperialism. Indeed, most of them did not even have a progressive (let alone Marxist-Leninist ...) character. So, African toiling masses were not able to do nothing more than observing how European “traditional” imperialism gave place to the equally exploitative neo-imperialism of the Superpowers. As comrade Enver Hoxha highlighted:
Africa is a mosaic of peoples with an ancient culture. Each African people has its own culture, customs, way of life, which, with some variations, are at a very backward stage, for well-known reasons. The awakening of the bulk of these peoples has only recently begun. De jure, the African peoples, in general, have won their freedom and independence. But there can be no talk of genuine freedom and independence, since most of them are still in a colonial or neo-colonial state. Many of these countries are governed by the chieftains of the old tribes who have seized power and rely on the old colonialists, or the US imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists. The methods of government in these states at this stage are not and cannot be other than a marked survival of colonialism. The imperialists are ruling most of the African countries again through their concerns, their capital invested in industry, banks, etc. The overwhelming bulk of the wealth of these countries continues to flow to the metropolises. (...) The African population remained culturally and economically undeveloped and continuously diminished in numbers, declining because of colonial wars, the savage racial persecution, and the traffic in African negroes, who were sent to the metropolises, the United States of America, and other countries to work like animals in the plantations of cotton and other crops, as well as in the heaviest jobs in industry and construction. For these reasons, the African peoples still have a great struggle ahead of them. (...) The policy pursued by the big landowners, the reactionary bourgeoisie, the imperialists and the neo-colonialists is intended to keep the African peoples in permanent bondage, in ignorance, to hinder their social, political and ideological development, and to obstruct their struggle to gain these rights. At present we see that those same imperialists who used to lord it over these peoples in the past, as well as other new imperialists, are trying to penetrate into the African continent, by meddling in every way in the internal affairs of the peoples. As a result of this, the contradictions among imperialists, between the peoples and the bourgeois-capitalist leaderships of most of these countries, and between the peoples and the new colonizers, are becoming more and more severe every day.” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

During many years, due to its “communistic” mask, Soviet social-imperialism was the Superpower better capable of deceiving and paralyzing the aspirations of African workers to genuine socialism. It used to dominate African in detriment of American imperialism. But with the fall of Soviet empire, the American plutocrats did not waste time before increasing oppression over African peoples with the purpose of making the profits of their imperialist corporations soar.

Recently, also Chinese social-imperialism has extended its claws over Africa and it has been engaged in a fierce struggle against American imperialism for control over the incalculable wealth and resources of the continent. But despite the expansion of Chinese social-imperialism in Africa – where it has already managed to put many countries under its neo-colonialist sway – there is not abundance of Maoist parties and/or organizations in this continent. In truth, they are quite rare. In Chad, there is the Chadian Action for Unity and Socialism (in French: Action Tchadienne pour l'Unité et le Socialisme – ACTUS / PRPE) - a neo-revisionist organization closely related with the ultra-opportunistic Workers’ Party of Belgium – whose leaders treacherously affirm that:

“The first stage of the struggle of our party, the ACTUS / PRPE (...) consists in working in favor of the accomplishment of the abolition of the pro-imperialist dictatorship.” (Djimadoum, l’Action Tchadienne pour l’Unité et le Socialisme / Parti Révolutionnaire Populaire et Écologique, Letter sent to the Comintern (SH), July, 2010, translated from French language)

But these words are complete lies. Far from waging a revolutionary and uncompromising combat against the pro-imperialist despotism which is currently governing Chad, the social-fascists of the ACTUS happily participate in the electoral masquerades fabricated by general Déby (Chad’s capitalist dictator):

“In the parliamentary election held on 21 April 2002, the party (ACTUS) won 1 out of 155 seats.” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chadian_Action_for_Unity_andSocialism, Chadian Action for Unity and Socialism (Action Tchadienne pour l'unité et le socialisme), edition in English)

It is obvious that a party which gladly involves itself in such ridiculous maneuvers whose only purpose is to deceive Chadian workers about the ultra-exploitative system oppressing them can never be nothing
more than an ultra-reactionary and anti-socialist party.

Another of the very few Maoist African parties is the “Communist” Party of South Africa (“Marxist-Leninist”) which we are going to analyze right now.

6.1 – Communist Party of South Africa (Marxist-Leninist)

South Africa is by far one of the most – if not the most – industrialized country of the whole African continent. Contrary to what happens in many parts of this region, South Africa is a nation in which capitalist productive relations are highly developed and in which there is a very significant number of urban proletarians. As we know that the development of capitalist productive relations necessarily cause the deepening of workers’ revolutionary conscience, it is not at all surprising that South African ruling classes try to find manners of opposing this awaking consciousness by using Maoist revisionism to deceive South African workers. This is why one of the rare African Maoist organizations is located precisely in South Africa, a country whose working class is among the most repressed and abused of all.

After centuries under British colonial dominion, South African toiling masses obtained formal independence only to find themselves under the ultra-reactionary rule of the white racist plutocrats who imposed a system of terrible oppression not only over black workers, but also over poor white workers. The purpose of this system was to divide proletarians according to race, thus preventing them from uniting against their common exploiters. Simultaneously, under the pretext that black people were “racially inferior”, South African dominant classes kept black proletarians in the most loathful poverty and degradation with the aim of preserving them as a vast amount of hungry and desperate human workforce to be easily subjugated by the white plutocrats, who made (and continue to make…) outrageous superprofits from the exploitation of these black workers. However, this openly reactionary system involved many risks because it could foster the acquisition of a communist conscience by both black and white proletarians, so obvious and explicit was the class character of the South African racist socio-economic system and state. It was a dangerous situation not only to the local dominant classes, but also to the American imperialists which supported the highly profitable Apartheid system. In order to avoid that South African workers advanced towards an authentically socialist ideology, it was fabricated a plan whose objective was to keep South African workers in dreadful life conditions while giving them a false impression of “freedom”. And so the masquerade of the alleged “end of the Apartheid system” was put in place in the early 90’s. This masquerade managed to mislead many workers who sincerely thought they would live in a “multiracial democracy”.

An essential instrument used to deceive South African proletarians was the formation of a tiny black bourgeoisie whose existence is willingly supported by the same white plutocrats that kept the Apartheid system alive for decades. This black bourgeoisie - of which Nelson Mandela’s pro-capitalist African National Congress is the best example – proved to be the best mangers and protectors of the white monopolists’ rule. Needless to say that the vast majority of black workers knew no improvements in their living and working conditions with the replacement of the former system of open Apartheid by the present system of hidden Apartheid.

Initially, just like occurred during the open Apartheid, South African exploiting classes continued to be basically of comprador type. Recently, South African bourgeoisie started to engage in imperialist expansion and nowadays this country can already be considered as a regional imperialist power, but despite this it continues to be under the influence of world imperialism in general and of American imperialism in particular. This is unsurprising if we take into account that the end of the explicit Apartheid did not mean the slightest change of the socio-economic exploitative relations; the dominant classes remained fundamentally the same. However, there was a section of the already referred black bourgeoisie which started to want something more than mere alms from the foreign imperialists and from the white capitalists. The main tasks that the local monopolists and the foreign imperialists assign to the black bourgeoisie consist in contributing to hide that the oppressive dominion of the white racist plutocrats and of foreign imperialism were continuing just like during the epoch of open Apartheid. But
as time passed, this black bourgeoisie divided in two factions: one of purely comprador type which serves the interests of the old South African pro-imperialist elites, and the other of national type which aims to seize politico-economic power in order to achieve a better place within the world capitalist market, in order to establish its rule without having to give most of the profits to the local and foreign imperialists.

And it’s precisely the interests of this national bourgeoisie - whose main goal is the strengthening of South African imperialism - which the “Communist” Party of South Africa (“Marxist-Leninist”) represents. South African Maoists try to disguise this truth behind “revolutionary” phraseology. They state that:

“In line with the reorganisation of international production major efforts on the part of the South African government are afoot to establish Export Processing Zones (EPZ’s) or so-called Special Economic Zones (SEZ’s) as an attraction to foreign direct investors whereby they can reap maximum profits including repatriation of all profits and labour flexibilization that includes the right of the bosses to hire and fire workers at will and no trade union protection for workers whatsoever.” (http://www.icmlpo.de/, ICMLPO 8th International Conference - Contribution of CPSA (ML) – Country report South Africa, May, 2004, edition in English)

As can be seen, South African Maoists criticize the “Special Economic Zones” that exist in their country. In fact, these “SEZ” were invented by South African bourgeoisie comprador in benefit of foreign imperialist monopolist corporations which are able to maximize their profits through limitless exploitation of South African workers. But the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PSA (“ML”) could not care less about the well being of those workers. They are just using them as a pretext to criticize the “SEZ” because they perceive them as being closely related with the dominion of the comprador bourgeoisie, whom they want to combat and overthrow with the aim of replacing it by that of the national bourgeoisie. Indeed, the anger of the South African Maoists against the “repatriation of profits” made by foreign imperialist investors illustrates very well the fact that the social-fascists of the “C”PSA (“ML”) are not in the least concerned about the huge oppression that those foreign imperialist investors exercise over South African proletariat. The South African Maoists are just upset because instead of going to the pockets of the foreign imperialists and of the bourgeois comprador, they would prefer to see those profits going to the pockets of their own national bourgeois bosses.

And the neo-revisionists of the “C”PSA (“ML”) don’t hesitate before affirming:

“In conclusion the CPSA (ML) is today active in a situation of the following developments:

All parties that come from the old national liberation movement against the racist minority regimes e.g. the African National Congress (ANC) (…) have jettisoned the course of national liberation as anti-imperialist, have embraced neocolonialist parliamentarism and are now parties of compradorisation who are prepared and actually serve the interests of monopoly capitalists and their representative institutions at home and abroad.” (http://www.icmlpo.de/, ICMLPO 8th International Conference - Contribution of CPSA (ML) – Country report South Africa, May, 2004, edition in English)

First of all, we must not forget that the ANC was never a genuinely revolutionary movement. It was just a bourgeois-capitalist organization totally dedicated to save and defend the interests of the white plutocrats and of the foreign imperialists through contributing to the enforcement of a fake “multiracial democracy” only to mislead South African workers. However, right in the beginning of its course, the ANC had indeed a somewhat “anti-imperialist” and even “leftist” appearance because it was much repressed during the epoch of explicit Apartheid. This used to happen when the white monopolists were still not yet able to recognize the utility of the ANC as a valuable instrument to keep South African proletarians away from communist ideology. But as the ANC was nothing more than a mere bourgeois movement, its leaders didn’t even think twice before defending the interests of the internal and external oppressors of South African toiling masses. If the South African Maoists were genuine revolutionaries, they would not criticize the ANC not only because of its “compradorization” but mainly because of its intrinsically pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist and anti-socialist nature. But as the South African Maoists are only there to promote the ascension of their country’s national bourgeoisie, they are only worried about the
“compradorization”, that is, about the strengthening of that branch of the South African bourgeoisie they aim to defeat:

“The South African economy is stagnant viewed from the long-term basis (...). And when talk of growth is being bandied about, this refers mostly to investments in shares in the stock exchange (Johannesburg) and the creation of new millionaires who do the running for the supermonopolies and their banks - the compradorisation of former trade union leaders and former members of parliament including ex-ministers. In such a situation “job creation” is a mythical phrase!” (http://www.icmlpo.de/, ICMLPO 8th International Conference - Contribution of CPSA (ML) – Country report South Africa, May, 2004, edition in English)

So, far from advocating authentically revolutionary changes, far from defending socialism and the end of all repression and exploitation, the South African Maoists just scream about “neo-colonization and compradorization” – obviously trying to attract South African workers to the side of the national bourgeoisie. In fact, South African black and white proletarians live in the most absolute penury and the slogans of the “C”PSA (“ML”) supposedly against imperialism and neo-colonialism certainly sound appealing to them. They even may feel tempted to support South African Maoists without knowing that the “C”PSA (“ML”) merely aims to conquer them to foster the seizure of power by the national bourgeoisie, thus replacing one exploitative rule by another. And the same happens relatively to the compradorization of South African trade unions. The social-fascists of the “C”PSA (“ML”) don’t criticize it because they want to found genuinely Marxist-Leninist red trade unions. Quite on the contrary, they perceive that South African revisionist trade unions are under the dominance of the bourgeoisie comprador and they want to change this situation by putting those trade unions under the control of the national bourgeoisie. As can be concluded, everything here is solely related with inter-bourgeois contradictions and rivalries.

Indeed, the counter-revolutionaries of the “C”PSA (“ML”) try to catch workers in their revisionist trap by pretending to “denounce recolonization”:

“All these activities of the South African government and its masters in the form of the supermonopolies and their megabanks do not have much impact on the lessening of the unemployment levels because less secure, contract labour is employed in fewer numbers than the more consistent joblosses as a result of the structural crisis of imperialism and lean production on the basis of the reorganisation of international production and recolonization.” (http://www.icmlpo.de/, ICMLPO 8th International Conference - Contribution of CPSA (ML) – Country report South Africa, May, 2004, edition in English)

As can be observed, South African Maoists engage in typically reformist complaints about job flexibilization and unemployment. Both these phenomena are inherent to capitalism and can only be definitively abolished when capitalism itself is annihilated. And this because capitalist-imperialist search for maximum profits ultimately dictates the perpetuation of these two evils. Of course, it is not wrong for a Marxist-Leninist party to combat labour flexibilization and unemployment under the condition of always subordinating this struggle to the higher final objectives of socialism and communism. But the South African Maoists do just the opposite by presenting this kind of social-democratic garbage as an end in itself.

As we had already mentioned, the South African proletariat is undoubtedly among the most exploited and tortured proletariats of the whole world. Both black and white South African workers have endured awful misery and have felt the harshest forms of capitalist repression and exploitation in their own skin. Therefore, we Stalinist-Hoxhaists firmly believe that they will soon realize the gigantic anti-Marxist fraud that Maoism in general and South African Maoism in particular truly are.

7 – Final conclusions
The purpose of this Declaration of War against the Maoists III is to denounce the anti-socialist and reactionary nature of Maoist revisionism throughout the world. In order to accomplish this objective, we tried to present a sufficiently comprehensive collection of Maoist parties and organizations from all continents. And in the end, we conclude that despite the differences inherent to the socio-economic development of each country, the main counter-revolutionaries principles of Maoism are always present in all those parties: systematic refusal of proletarian power and hegemony, staunch defence of the “new democracy” as a mean to neutralise any possibility of socialist revolution, support of the “theory of the two revolutions” in order to ensure the consolidation of the socio-economic dominion of the national bourgeoisie, etc… In truth, one of the main characteristics of virtually all Maoist parties is their firm defence of the interests of the national bourgeoisie in their respective countries. This is the true reason behind their “anti-imperialist” phraseology. This stand is far from being surprising. After all, Maoist revisionism was born precisely to promote and advance the interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, and therefore the Maoist parties are playing the same role within their own nations.

We exposed the Maoists by applying to the dialectical teaching on the contradiction between the different interests of the national bourgeoisie and the comprador bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries where the Maoist parties are active. Of course, Maoism is not only useful for the elements of the national bourgeoisie, however for the whole bourgeois class. In conclusion, we point to the important teaching of Hoxhaism that the proletariat will refuse every subordination under the patronage of the one elements of the bourgeoisie who are in struggle against the other elements of the bourgeoisie. The overthrow of capitalism is only possible if the exploited and oppressed classes subordinate under the patronage of the only revolutionary class - the proletariat.

To improve the conditions for the victory of the socialist revolution, the proletariat takes advantage of this contradiction between different elements of the bourgeoisie, however only in such a way that this will improve the overall conditions for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie as a whole class. The socialist revolution means overthrow of the whole class of the bourgeoisie, thus includes both the national and comprador elements.

If the existence of the whole bourgeoisie is endangered by the socialist revolution of the proletariat, then the Maoists will be forced to defend the whole bourgeoisie - including the comprador bourgeoisie. Because: in the last consequence the Maoists support all counter-revolutionary forces to thwart the victory of the socialist revolution, to thwart the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeois class.

Indeed, if the activities of the Maoists in the single countries are very important to understand the dreadful anti-communist role played by them, we can never forget the dialectical relationship that exists between the global and national tactics of the Maoists in regard of their common struggle against the socialist world revolution, against the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha. In fact, the Maoists are in first line a global enemy of the whole world proletariat in its struggle for the world revolutionary overthrow of the world bourgeoisie (this without minimizing their role as lackeys of the national bourgeoisie and enemies of the socialist revolution in the single countries, of course). Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to combat the Maoist World Movement dialectically both on an international and national scale.

The final aim of all the revisionist tricks and misleading invented by the Maoists in the single countries is to prevent the outcome of the world socialist revolution. It is impossible to accomplish socialist victory at a world scale without achieving victory in the single countries. That’s why the Maoists do their utmost to paralyse our efforts to promote the genial principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

Nonetheless, there is a division among the Maoists relatively to the tactic used by them to avoid world socialist revolution and the world proletarian dictatorship: some Maoists defend the creation of a Maoist “Communist International” in order to neutralise and defeat the revolutionary influence of the Comintern (SH) at a world scale; while other Maoists reject this idea and continue to perceive their counter-revolutionary activities in the single countries as being sufficient to prevent the expansion of the Comintern (SH). Of course, this division does not represent any kind of substantial split among the Maoists: they all have as final goal to avoid world socialist revolution. This division respects to mere tactical disagreements within the Maoist movement. Both Maoist tactics (as a whole global counter-revolutionary system) are dangerous for the world revolution which cannot be victorious without the
One of the main Maoist organizations which supports the foundation of a Maoist “Communist International” is the Colombian “Communist” Workers’ Union Marxist-Leninist-Maoist [in Spanish: Revolución Obrera Comunista (Marxista-Leninista-Maoista)], whose ultra-reactionary character we have already unmasked in this text. It is obvious that the objective of the Colombian Maoists is to combat us, Stalinist-Hoxhaists. For this reason, they don’t lose a single opportunity to slander our glorious and invincible Hoxhaist ideology:

“(…) a Communist International of new type is an essential instrument to (…) prevent the catastrophe to which imperialism has led us. But against this purpose (…) there is opportunism, which is nothing more than bourgeois ideology and politics within working class movement (…). This is precisely the role of the Trotskyite and Hoxhaist currents (…) whose theories betrayed revolution and surrendered in front of the dominant classes.” (Documents of the CWU, Mensaje Conjunto a los Obreros de Todos los Países ¡Al Combate por el Triunfo de la Revolución Proletaria Mundial!, May, 2012, translated from Spanish language)

“(…) there is an objective tendency within the international communist movement towards the reorganization of the Marxist-Leninists-Maoists (…) Therefore, we understand the desperation of the Hoxhaist International (Comintern SH) which on 6th of February published a “Declaration of War against the Maoists”, an attack which, as happened with the trotskyists, shows the wicked face of the bourgeois detachments inside the communist movement (…).” (Documents of the CWU, Semanário Revolución Obrera, 18th April, 2011, translated from Spanish language)

Both these abject statements from the Colombian Maoists are totally understandable. Their “project” of founding a Maoist International has the purpose of struggling against our heroic Stalinist-Hoxhaist International, which is the only capable of allowing the world proletariat to play its historical role as the vanguard of the world oppressed masses. The Colombian social-fascists use the horrendous calumny which consists in equating the brilliant Hoxhaist ideology with Trotskyism and in qualifying the true Marxist-Leninists as “bourgeois lackeys”. Unfortunately for them, reality is the opposite of what they idealize in their pathologically pro-capitalist minds. It is Maoism which plays the same pro-bourgeois role of Trotskyism, and the Maoists are the ones who shamelessly deceive world workers through hiding their abhorrent reactionarism behind fake “leftist” phraseology and “socialistic” masks. The Albanian Marxist-Leninists once made an affirmation which perfectly synthesizes the origins and aims of Maoist revisionism:

“Life shows that Mao Zedong was indeed in favor of the maintenance and strengthening of the Chinese bourgeoisie, so China could become an imperialist superpower. The restitution of the means of production, wealth, profits and surplus value to the business men and to the industrials which created the conditions to the perpetuation of the oppression and exploitation of the working class was not a fortuity measure; quite on the contrary, it was the expression of the opportunist stands of Mao Zedong. Indeed, as an anti-proletarian theory and practice, the “Mao Zedong thought” has also become a strong supporter of capitalism at an international scale.” (Naun Guxho, La Pensée MaoTseToung, théorie et pratique antiproletariennes, 1979, translated from the French language)

Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism is a genuinely revolutionary and communist ideology which will lead the world proletarians towards the complete abolition of all forms of oppression and exploitation, towards the implementation of the world proletarian dictatorship, towards world socialism and world communism. During this process, world proletarians led by the Comintern (SH) will struggle against world capitalism-imperialism with all their forces and they will stop at nothing until the world bourgeoisie and everything related with it are totally and definitively exterminated. They will wage uncountable fierce and gory battles, but in the end they will undoubtedly triumph over the world exploitative reactionary classes, of which the Maoists are among the most dangerous representatives.
World workers - unite!

Don’t be deceived by Maoist treachery!

Maoists are the lackeys of the world capitalist-imperialist oppressors!

Maoist revisionism only wants to perpetuate tyrannical wage slavery!

Maoism gave birth to Chinese social-imperialism which exercises excruciating repression over the world proletariat!

Let’s combat Maoist social-fascism with all your might!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism - the only authentically revolutionary ideology!

Long live the world proletariat!

Long live world socialist revolution!

Long live world proletarian dictatorship!

Long live world socialism and world communism!

Long live the Comintern (SH)!
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