

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 denouncement 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 theoretical 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 English)

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 misled 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:

“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, *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:

“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, *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-revisionist 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 Bolshevik 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 Bolshevik party and the class of the proletariat. (...) The Bolshevik 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 Bolshevik 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 revolutionize 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, Ciencia 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 anticommunism", 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 yuans). 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: Trotsky: “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 - Marxista 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 (...).” (http://maoistasbolivianos.blogspot.pt/2011_05_01_archive.html, May, 2011, translated from Spanish language)

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.”

(http://maoistasbolivianos.blogspot.pt/2011_03_01_archive.html, March, 2011, translated from Spanish language)

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".



Che and Mao: two fierce enemies of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism and of the world socialist revolution - image published by the Bolivian Maoists in their site http://maoistasbolivianos.blogspot.pt/2011_03_01_archive.html

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, Khrushchev'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 thought that this tactic was also the most adequate to Latin American circumstances." (http://maoistasbolivianos.blogspot.pt/2011_03_01_archive.html, March, 2011, translated from Spanish language)

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 Il 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 Il. (...) We are sure that the WPK and the revolutionary people of North Korea will continue the path of such heroic leaders as Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il."

(http://maoistasbolivianos.blogspot.pt/2011/12/normal-0-21-false-false-false_20.html, December, 2011, translated from Spanish language)

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 working masses 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 an “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*, n° 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*, n° 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*, n° 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 Bolshevik 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.

6. Bob Avakian defends the “Theory of the Three Worlds”.

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 Chinese Revisionism*, Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists, 1979, edition in English)

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 Hoxhism, 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 is 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 worlds” 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 Bolshevik party. This concerns again the handling of his successors. It was Mao Tsetung himself who decided first Liu Schao – tshi, 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:

“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 n° 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 n° 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 “C”PGB’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 “C”PGB (“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 n° 27*, December 2008, edition in English)

“1. 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 n° 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 “C”PGB (“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 defenders 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 Panafrikan Congress, Zimbabwe News*, Volume 8, No° 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 homogeneously 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, N° 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 nations: 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, No° 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, No° 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 denounce 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 infinitely 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.newsday.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, infrastructure development and communication technologies.”
(<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/feb/01/zimbabwe-china-10-billion-economy>,
China poised to pour \$10bn into Zimbabwe's ailing economy, The Guardian, 1st November, 2011, version in English language)

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.”

(<http://www.miningreview.com/node/16779>, *US\$8 billion Chinese investment in Zimbabwe*, 20th November, 2009, version in English language)

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.” (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/feb/01/zimbabwe-china-10-billion-economy>, *China poised to pour \$10bn into Zimbabwe's ailing economy*, The Guardian, 1st November, 2011, version in English language)

“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 Mensheviks 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, 2007, edition in English)

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*, n° 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*, n° 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

So, now it is against the valiant Communist Party of Germany (KPD) led by proletarian hero Thalman 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*, n° 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 made 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*, n° 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*, n° 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

Of course, the social-fascists of the “ML”PD would never lose 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 abolition 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*, n° 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*, n° 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 loose 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"PD (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 made 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”:

Soviet countryside under comrade Stalin’s authentic socialism	Chinese countryside under Mao’s fake and reactionary “socialism”
- total abolition of private property and of the bourgeoisie as a class	- preservation of private property, including that of the great landowners
- elimination of the exploitation and	- perpetuation of peasant’s exploitation

misery which formerly heavily affected the peasants	and repression by the landowners
- the organs of the Soviet power in the countryside were at the service of the proletarian dictatorship and were firmly controlled by the heroic Soviet Marxist-Leninists who led the CPSU (B)	- Maoist “popular communes” were at the service of the dictatorship of Chinese 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 always free.” (Arnaldo Matos, *Questões da Revolução*, January, 1997, translated from Portuguese language)

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*, n° 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*, n° 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 ingenious 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.

During the summer of 1946 up to early 1947, when the White Terror [in Greece] was in full swing, Rizospastis [the still legal CPG organ newspaper] published the famous guerrilla war principles which were formulated by Mao in his work A single spark can start a prairie fire (“when the enemy advances, we retreat” etc.). (...).”(http://www.international.koel.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=22:the-influence-of-the-chinese-revolution-on-the-communist-movement-of-greece-may-2006&catid=6:communist-movement&Itemid=6, *The influence of the Chinese Revolution on the Communist Movement of Greece*, 2006, version in English)

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 contradictory 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 Comintern (S-H), *Neo-revisionism or Leninism?*, 2004, edition in English)

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.”

(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)

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 (...).”

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 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”.”

(http://www.international.koel.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=22:the-influence-of-the-chinese-revolution-on-the-communist-movement-of-greece-may-2006&catid=6:communist-movement&Itemid=6, *The influence of the Chinese Revolution on the Communist Movement of Greece*, 2006, version in English)

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 depreciatively 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.”

(http://www.international.koel.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=22:the-influence-of-the-chinese-revolution-on-the-communist-movement-of-greece-may-2006&catid=6:communist-movement&Itemid=6, *The influence of the Chinese Revolution on the Communist Movement of Greece*, 2006, version 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 peuple*, 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”:

“Nowadays, there can be no Revolutionary Marxism without Maoism and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. We honor Mao Tsetung and the Chinese communists’ struggle, we honor the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (…).” (http://www.international.koel.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=22:the-influence-of-the-chinese-revolution-on-the-communist-movement-of-greece-may-2006&catid=6:communist-movement&Itemid=6, *The influence of the Chinese Revolution on the Communist Movement of Greece*, 2006, version in English)

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 Bolshevik 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 the 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."

(http://democracyandclasstruggle.blogspot.com/2011_12_01_archive.html, *A New Communist International? The thoughts of Comrade Harsh Thakor*, December, 2011, edition in English)

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 Bolshevik party, the "B" PT is nothing more than an anti-Marxist social-fascist organization. The Turkish Maoists start by describing some of the characteristics of their country, after which they present their ultra-revisionist standpoints:

“In its first stage the revolution in Turkey/North Kurdistan will be an anti-imperialist, anti-fascist, new-democratic one.”(ICMLPO, *International Newsletter*, n° 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, *IIIe 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*, n° 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*, n° 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 with 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*, n° 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-bourgeois 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 Hoxhaist 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 Hoxhaism. By refusing it, the Turkish Maoists are rejecting Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism 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 these 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-Hoxhaist 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 (...).

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.” (ICMLPO, *International Newsletter*, n° 33, July, 2007, edition in English)

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*, n° 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*, n° 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 bourgeoisie 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 Maoists 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 Phillipines’ 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-Point Program, the only viable alternative to the anti-people program of the US-Aquino regime*, April, 2012, edition in English)

“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.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-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.philippinerevolution.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.” (<http://www.philippinerevolution.net/documents/comprehensive-agreement-on-respect-for-human-rights-and-international-humanitarian-law>, *Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law*, March, 1998, edition in English)

This incredibly reactionary statement is taken from an “agreement” signed between Philippine’s bourgeois pro-imperialist government and the NDFP (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 (...)." http://www.solrojo.org/conf2004/Conf2004_Bangla.htm, *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: How we accept it and how do we not accept it*, Md. Shahin - Adopted and circulated by the Supreme Leading Committee of the Maoist Bolshevik Reorganization Movement of the Proletarian Party of East Bengal (PBSP), October, 2004, edition in English)

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.”

http://www.solrojo.org/conf2004/Conf2004_Bangla.htm, *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: How we accept it and how do we not accept it*, Md. Shahin - Adopted and circulated by the Supreme Leading Committee of the Maoist Bolshevik Reorganization Movement of the Proletarian Party of East Bengal (PBSP), October, 2004, edition in English)

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 Marxists-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.” (http://www.solrojo.org/conf2004/Conf2004_Bangla.htm, *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: How we accept it and how do we not accept it*, Md. Shahin - Adopted and circulated by the Supreme Leading Committee of the Maoist Bolshevik Reorganization Movement of the Proletarian Party of East Bengal (PBSP), October, 2004, edition in English)

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 phenomena 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 (...).” (http://www.solrojo.org/conf2004/Conf2004_Bangla.htm, *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: How we accept it and how do we not accept it*, Md. Shahin - Adopted and circulated by the Supreme Leading Committee of the Maoist Bolshevik Reorganization Movement of the Proletarian Party of East Bengal (PBSP), October, 2004, edition in English)

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 (...).” (http://www.solrojo.org/conf2004/Conf2004_Bangla.htm, *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: How we accept it and how do we not accept it*, Md. Shahin - Adopted and circulated by the Supreme Leading Committee of the Maoist Bolshevik Reorganization Movement of the Proletarian Party of East Bengal (PBSP), October, 2004, edition in English)

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 (...).”

http://www.solrojo.org/conf2004/Conf2004_Bangla.htm, *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: How we accept it and how do we not accept it*, Md. Shahin - Adopted and circulated by the Supreme Leading Committee of the Maoist Bolshevik Reorganization Movement of the Proletarian Party of East Bengal (PBSP), October, 2004, edition in English)

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.

4.5 – Communist Party of Bhutan (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist)

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.”

(<http://www.bannedthought.net/India/PeoplesMarch/PM19992006/archives/2003/aug2k3/bhutan.htm>, *Bhutan Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist)*, August, 2003, edition in English)

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.”(<http://www.bannedthought.net/India/PeoplesMarch/PM19992006/archives/2003/aug2k3/bhutan.htm>, *Bhutan Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist)*, August, 2003, edition in English)

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.”

(<http://www.bannedthought.net/India/PeoplesMarch/PM19992006/archives/2003/aug2k3/bhutan.htm>, *Bhutan Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist)*, August, 2003, edition in English)

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 become 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.”

(<http://www.bannedthought.net/India/PeoplesMarch/PM19992006/archives/2003/aug2k3/bhutan.htm>, *Bhutan Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist)*, August, 2003, edition in English)

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.”

<http://maobadiwatch.blogspot.pt/2009/05/interview-with-comrade-suniel-from.html>,
Interview with Comrade Sushil from the Communist Party of Bhutan (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, May, 2009, edition in English)

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:

"COMRADE SUSHIL: (...) we should aim for a Constituent Assembly, and this is our main slogan." (<http://maobadiwatch.blogspot.pt/2009/05/interview-with-comrade-suniel-from.html>, *Interview with Comrade Sushil from the Communist Party of Bhutan (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist*, May, 2009, edition in English)

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. (...)

In the achievement of anti-imperialist independence there are undoubtedly socialist components. (...) Alongside this however are smaller capitalists, farmers, businessmen, other working people. Smaller capitalists can continue under the anti-imperialist dictatorship (...).” (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.” (
<http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/statements.php?>

[subaction=showfull&id=1285674025&archive=&start_from=&ucat=6&](http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/statements.php?subaction=showfull&id=1285674025&archive=&start_from=&ucat=6&), *Salute the 61st anniversary of the formation of the People's Republic of China*, September, 2010, edition in English)

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."

( [http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/statements.php?](http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/statements.php?subaction=showfull&id=1285674025&archive=&start_from=&ucat=6&)

[subaction=showfull&id=1285674025&archive=&start_from=&ucat=6&](http://www.vanguard.net.au/2008/statements.php?subaction=showfull&id=1285674025&archive=&start_from=&ucat=6&), *Salute the 61st anniversary of the formation of the People's Republic of China*, September, 2010, edition in English)

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."
(<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)

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 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 fell 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”PA 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)

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)

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)

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 spare efforts to promote anti-communism both within the country and abroad. But the social-fascist of the “C”PA deny all this:

“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_and_Socialism, *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 managers 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 phenomenons 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 Hoxhism 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-Hoxhism.

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 victory of the socialist revolutions in the single countries.

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, *Semanario 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, theorie 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-Hoxhaim - 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)!

Index

1 – Introduction (page 1)

2 – American continent (page 3)

2.1 – Communist Workers’ Union (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) – Colombia (page 5)

2.2 – Communist Party of Bolivia (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) (page 13)

2.3 - Communist Party of Peru (Marxist-Leninist) and Communist Party of Panama (Marxist-Leninist) (page 18)

2.4 - Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and Revolutionary Communist Party of the USA (page 23)

3 – European Continent (page 32)

3.1 – Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist) (page 35)

3.2 - Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany (MLPD) (page 48)

3.3 – Portuguese Workers’ Communist Party (page 56)

3.4 - Committees to Support Resistance for Communism (CARC) and (new) Italian Communist Party (page 60)

3.5 – Communist Organization of Greece (KOE) (page 63)

3.6 - Workers’ Party of Belgium and the Russian All-Union Communist Party Bolsheviks (page 72)

4 – Asian Continent (page 75)

4.1 – Bolshevik Party of North-Kurdistan-Turkey (page 76)

4.2 – Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) (page 81)

4.3 – Communist Party of the Philippines (page 84)

4.4 - Maoist Bolshevik Reorganisation Movement of the Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party – Bangladesh (page 91)

4.5 – Communist Party of Bhutan (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) (page 95)

5 – Australasian continent (page 100)

5.1 – Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) (page 101)

5.2 – Communist Party of Aotearoa (New Zealand) (page 108)

6 – African continent (page 113)

6.1 – Communist Party of South Africa (Marxist-Leninist) (page 115)

7 – Final conclusions (page 119)

