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1. Introduction

The writing of this Declaration of War Against the neo-revisionist ICMLPO (DWICMLPO) has been planned by the Comintern (SH) since many years ago. More recently, on occasion of setting our tasks to 2015, the elaboration of such an article was clearly established as an urgent purpose for us, Stalinists-Hoxhaists.

And why?

Because, as we will prove further in this text, the ICMLPO (International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations) has been and still is one of the main world sources of neo-revisionism (false “anti-revisionism” in words, but revisionism in deeds), of anti-communism, of betrayal to comrade Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, to the PLA and socialist Albania, of refusal of the Comintern and of the organizational concept of the Bolshevik world party, of enmity towards the socialist world revolution, world socialism and world communism. The false “brother-parties” constituting it were also behind the liquidation of the unity of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha. But now, thanks to this article, we are finally in the position to declare war against the liquidators of that same Movement.

In order to write it, we will base our work not only on those documents referring to the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists that we already created (like our articles “Down with Brazilian neo-revisionism!” and “Down with Cuban revisionism!”), but mainly on the unmasking of the official statements of the ICMLPO’s Conferences and of the diverse documents published by the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionist “brother-parties”. And of course, we will also focus on the criticism of the individual members of the ICMLPO. We will master all this work on a thorough scientific basis, guided and led by the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Ever Hoxha. And of course, we must never forget that the entire work of the Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement constitutes a single whole and unity, and so the reading of this text must necessarily be completed and complemented by that of the other documents of the Comintern (SH).

The DWICMLPO is the correct continuation of our Declaration of War against Maoism. It is more difficult because most of those parties were once our brother parties and were apparently supporting the PLA (Party of Labour of Albania) of
comrade Enver Hoxha. But we will master this task on the basis of our experiences with the creation of the DWM (Declaration of War on Maoism). The DWICMLPO will be a further qualitative leap in our theoretical strength and a demarcation line towards all centrist attempts, it will be a further step forward to strengthen our invincible ideological principles of Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

Long live the Comintern (SH)!

Down with the ICMLPO!

Down with neo-revisionism!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism!

2. ICMLPO - betrayal of comrade Enver Hoxha, the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism

An interesting aspect we note when we analyse the documents of the neo-revisionist ICMLPO is the silence that those belonging to and defending this organization keep on their history BEFORE the 1994 declaration of "Quito" which they propagate as their "foundation-document". However, as we will discover soon, the origins of ICMLPO’s opportunism and anti-communism can be found already in these earlier documents.

In first place, we will start by reflecting over the manner in which the neo-revisionists from the ICMLPO betrayed and deny comrade Enver Hoxha as the only genuine 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. This is as important as we know that the main basis upon which the Comintern (SH) was founded on 31st of December, 2000 was that we decided to clearly and explicitly determine comrade Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism as an essential mean to have control from the very beginning over the correct ideological basis. One of the main documents from the Comintern (SH) dealing specifically with this issue and explaining the reasons why it is necessary and inevitable to accept and embrace comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism is “Enver Hoxha, the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism and the foundation of the Comintern (ML)”, from which we present the following vital excerpt:

“We, as Marxist-Leninists all over the world have finally and urgently to put the question:
"Is Comrade Enver Hoxha the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism, yes or no?"

Why?

Because it’s the crucial key-question of our new century, in which general direction the international revolutionary class-struggle will continue to develop, a question of necessary decision, where the ideological demarcation-line has to be drawn as a minimum, to achieve the highest level of proletarian unity on the shortest way to the known goals:

Liquidation of imperialism by the world revolution, establishment and re-establishment of socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat and future realization of world-socialism and of world-communism.“ (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Enver Hoxha, the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism and the foundation of the Comintern (ML), 2001, edition in English)

The refusal of acknowledge comrade Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism is the "trademark" of all neo-revisionists, including of those from the “ICMLPO”, of course. Indeed, analysing attentively the documents from the fake “brother-parties” that would later constitute the neo-revisionist ICMLPO, we remark that in no occasion did they mentioned Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. In fact, even references to comrade Enver were relatively rare in such texts, with the exception of the phony “praises” made on occasions related to his death. For example, after presenting a sort of “biography” of comrade Enver, the Spanish neo-revisionists of the Communist Party of Spain (Marxist-Leninist) - PCE (ML) of Raoul Marco and Elena Odena - affirmed that:

“Our party respects his memory (…).” (Vanguardia Obrera, Dos Años de la Muerte de Enver Hoxha, 1986, translated from edition in Spanish)

Taking into account that we should be dealing with a party member of the Marxist-Leninist world Movement from comrade Enver Hoxha, we are allowed to ask: only that? Does it suffice to merely “respect his memory” in a rather bourgeois tone? After all, the above quotation from the Spanish neo-revisionists could have come from any corner of capitalist-revisionist world. Just like it is referred in the magazine “Albania Today” nº 2, 1985, even the Soviet revisionists sent their own “respectful condolences” on occasion of comrade Enver’s death (which were promptly refused, of course). Obviously, their intention was to prepare the way for their takeover of socialist Albania now that comrade Enver was not able to lead his people anymore. Unfortunately for Soviet social-imperialists whose empire was about to disintegrate by that time, it would be their American imperialist rivals who would manage to colonize and restore capitalism in Albania.

So, the neo-revisionists from the PCE (ML) were not the only ones to “pay respects to the memory” of comrade Enver. As we referred, also Soviet social-imperialists did it, too. And with them, also Chinese, Cuban, North Korean and
representatives of other revisionist and social-fascist countries tried to “give condolences” on occasion of the comrade Enver’s death, in what clearly reveals the nature of such “respects”. After all, let us remember that these kind of anti-socialist, social-fascist and social-imperialist criminals were those who, also like their Western imperialist rivals, while comrade Enver was alive, were never tired from calumniating him and his work as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, were never tired from doing their utmost to present comrade Enver as a “tyrant” and socialist Albania as a “hell” in order to keep world exploited and oppressed classes from knowing that comrade Enver’s Albania was the only country of authentic proletarian dictatorship of the world after Krushchevist betrayal in Soviet Union and that only the genuine socialist path followed by socialist Albania was able to liberate world proletarians and workers from all kinds of oppressions and exploitations inherent to capitalist-revisionist-imperialist system.

They did their utmost to put an end to socialism and proletarian rule in Albania by resorting to all possible means, since attempts of economic asphyxiation to military pressures and attacks against tiny Albania, which was always ready to valiantly defend itself while comrade Enver was alive and while it was engaged in a correct path of socialist construction.

But when comrade Enver finally died, they understood this as their opportunity to put their hands in Albania and accomplish two purposes: firstly, to get one more neo-colony able to provide profit maximization thanks to its workforce and resources, and secondly to eliminate the only example still in existence of a genuine and successful armed proletarian dictatorship led by a party of true Bolshevist type with the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism at its head. That’s why they shook their hands of happiness and started to shed false tears over comrade Enver’s death by sending “respectful condolences”.

Of course, this is nothing surprising taking into consideration the character and nature of world capitalist-revisionist-imperialist order. But it is indeed shocking that the supposedly “Hoxhaist comrades” from the PCE (ML) situated themselves with their wicked conduct at the same level of those mentioned capitalists-revisionists-imperialists when they comfortably step aside the necessity of recognizing Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism and laconically affirm that they will “respect his memory” instead.

In truth, after comrade Enver death and throughout the entire subsequent period of liquidation of his Marxist-Leninist World Movement and of formation of the neo-revisionist ICMLPO, his name and figure will be virtually erased from the documents of nearly all the “brother-parties”, references to him and to socialist Albania will become more and more rare until they are almost entirely inexistent by the time the infamous Quito Declaration (which we will analyze in detail later in this article) sees the daylight.

They did not any more mention comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA, but they do this without clearly stating the reasons why comrade Enver Hoxha, the PLA and
the magnificent theoretical and practical legacy of socialist Albania were shamelessly covered with silence.

They may have not explained this, but we certainly know why they did this. Exactly like any other lackeys of global capitalism-revisionism-imperialism, also the neo-revisionists from the PCE (ML) want to keep world proletarians and workers away from following and applying the immortal teachings of comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Because they know that they and their awful neo-revisionism are fully condemned if comrade Enver’s teachings are perceived not only as a “past experience” of which we “respect its memory” but as a living example of the only genuinely correct path towards socialism not only in Albania, but on a world scale. That’s why the neo-revisionists erase Enver’s name and image from their logotypes, from their documents and from everything else they can.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that:

**Hoxhaism** represents an irreplaceable and inestimable development of the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist theory and practice;

**Hoxhaism** is Marxism-Leninism about the victory of the people’s revolution against fascist occupation and its successful transition into the socialist revolution and building up socialism in a small country under conditions of the socialist world camp of Comrade Stalin;

**Hoxhaism** is furthermore the Marxist-Leninist theory and tactics of antirevisionist, anti-imperialist and antisocial-imperialist struggle in the period of revisionism at the power, in general, and the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat under conditions of capitalist-revisionist encirclement, in particular;

**Hoxhaism** is the ruling ideology of the proletariat even under the worst and most difficult conditions of global capitalist-revisionist encirclement against the only existing socialist country which was one of the smallest and most underdeveloped countries of the world;

**Hoxhaism** is therefore suitable for the construction of socialism in every other country and thus applicable on a global scale;

**Hoxhaism** is highest expression of the universality of the world proletarian ideology and guideline for the direct and prompt establishment of the dictatorship of the world proletariat.

To deny Hoxhaism means to deny socialist revolution in itself. Comrade Enver is the only authentic 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. And the rejection of the teachings of one of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism automatically means the denial of the teachings of all of them as a whole, as they all form an unbreakable unity. And the denial of the teachings of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism means the denial of scientific, materialist, dialectical communist ideology in its
entirety. The limited propagation of only 4 heads is more dangerous than that of
the alleged “5th head of Mao” because the revisionist Mao can be easy
unmasked. Hoxhaism is the only correct ideology which defends the ideology of
the “4 heads”, and is thus the ideological demarcation line in the struggle against
neo-revisionism. Today, Stalinism would fail if not completed by Hoxhaism.
Today, the world proletariat and its Bolshevik world party would be doomed to
the defeat if they would not be guided by the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism.
And this is the true reason why the 5th column of the world bourgeoisie struggles
against us – the only global standard bearer of the 5th Classic of Marxism-
Leninism.

In face of this, the nature of the neo-revisionists that would later create the
ICMLPO gets exposed.

3. ICMLPO – traitors to the PLA and socialist Albania

The role of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists as traitors to the PLA (Party of
Labour of Albania) and to socialist Albania can be allocated to a period even
before the official constitution of the ICMLPO in itself. It is closely linked with
their denial of the universal nature of the lessons and teachings put forward by
PLA leading socialist Albania during Enver’s years. Of course, this is equally
related with their blatant refusal of comrade Enver Hoxha as the only authentic
5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism.

And this because, in first place, to erase and thus deny Enver as the 5th Classic of
Marxism-Leninism means also to deny the universal character of Hoxhaism.
After all, one of the main meanings of recognizing a Classic of Marxism-
Leninism as such is precisely the automatic recognizance that the lessons,
teachings, etc. assigned to that Classic in question can be considered as universal
laws of proletarian revolution and dictatorship, of socialist and communism
construction which are generally applicable everywhere.

We know that comrade Enver’s teachings and lessons are inextricably linked
with proletarian dictatorship and socialist construction in Albania led by the
PLA. Therefore, to recognize comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-
Leninism is also to necessarily recognize the lessons and teachings of the PLA
and socialist Albania as universally applicable rules. On the contrary, if we
follow the line of the neo-revisionists and refuse the first, then we are also
automatically rejecting the second, thus reducing comrade Enver, the PLA and
socialist Albania to mere “local national experiences” that would only be suitable
to a certain place and period.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, already displayed behind any reasonable doubts that
the experiences from socialist construction in comrade Enver’s Albania and the
invincible teachings of Hoxhaism have undeniable universal character, thus they are universally applicable and can be considered as scientific determinations of objective socio-economic laws. And exactly like denying the PLA and socialist Albania means necessarily to equally deny the CPSU (B) and the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin.

What are the ideas of the future world socialism? What is the correct way towards the socialist world revolution? The ICMLPO is not at all interest in putting and answering these burning questions of the world proletariat – not to mention the creation of a general-line for the strategy and tactics of the socialist world revolution under today's conditions of globalization. Nothing kind of future prospects and guidance of the world proletariat can be found in the documents of the ICMLPO. Therefore they are not the head of the communist movement but its tail. We, Stalinist-Hoxhaists, struggle against the ICMLPO last not least because they neither propagate the achievements of socialism in the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin, nor the achievements of socialism in Albania nor the perspectives of world socialism and world communism. This means nothing else than propagating capitalist reformation instead of socialism – let alone world socialism and world communism.

This insistence of the neo-revisionists in denying Hoxhaism’s universal nature is closely related with their defense (either explicit or hidden) of so-called “specific local socialisms” (for instance, of Chavist Venezuela, of whose defense by them we will provide concrete examples further in this text) – like Maoist revisionists, who also propagates its own “Chinese socialism”, alongside with Titoist revisionists’ “Yugoslav Socialism”, with Thorez social-chauvinist “French road to socialism”, with the “Vietnamese way to socialism”, with the multiple “national ways to socialism” (which were nothing more than bourgeois empty phraseology in deeds) which emerged in Africa, Asia and Latin America and with many other shades of revisionism. These “specific socialisms” are only masks to divert the struggle of workers from genuinely communist purposes with the complicity and support of imperialist powers which want to perpetuate these mystifications as a mean to keep world laborers and world proletarians away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. These "specific socialisms" deny the universal revolutionary laws of socialist and communist revolution and construction; they are defenders of inevitably opportunist, reformist and social democratic positions. So-called “specific socialisms” refuse the teachings of the Classics on the general laws of the revolution and of socialist / communist construction following the footsteps of all other “models” and "socialist ways" like those of Tito, Castro, Khrushchev, Mao, the Eurocommunists, Sandinists (Nicaragua), Chavism, etc. as well as of the Italian, French, Spanish, Islamic, African “roads to socialism”, etc. Independently of their alleged “differences”, they all come together and agree on what really matters: total and complete denigration and rejection of the fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism – the only truly revolutionary socialist and communist ideology. Indeed, not only ideology but concretely the goal of world socialism as the only
correct way towards World communism. The Albanian socialism is the only model – beside the SU of Lenin and Stalin – which expressed its international, universal character. This rejection and denigration has the goal of always preserving capitalism in a form or another.

Of course, there can be certain national particularities which will dictate some specificities of socialist construction. However, the Classics of Marxism-Leninism always noticed 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 armed violent socialist revolution, proletarian dictatorship, the construction of socialism and communism must follow a certain and invariable line in accordance with the teachings of the Classics, regardless of place. Of course, this is even more accurate nowadays when we struggle for (and are already in) the second stage – namely that of globalized socialism. To defend and affirm the contrary - like the neo-revisionist antecessors of the ICMLPO do - means to try to prevent working classes from embracing Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism (MLSH), convincing them to rely instead on “specific socialisms” intended at covering the continuation of exploitation, oppression and wage slavery with “red” deceitful slogans. In our General-Line of the Comintern (SH), referring to Maoist / Chinese revisionism, we noted something relative to this issue that is also suitable to all other types of “national socialisms” and “national Marxism”:

“The so-called "national Marxism" is anti-Marxism, is bourgeois "Marxism", which is in antagonistic contradiction to the internationalist, proletarian Marxism. A global mixture of all revisionist ideas can therefore never replace the monolithic world-proletarian ideology. There is the only unity among all varieties of national "Marxisms", namely, the unity in the fight against the internationalist Marxism. But this "unit" is doomed to failure, because the internationalist Marxism is invincible! This has proven the history over and over again. Of course, nothing can be found in China's "general line" about the necessity and inevitability of the socialist world revolution and even less under the leadership of the Communist International.

With the XX. Congress of the CPSU, thus with Khrushchev's "possibility of different paths to socialism", the Chinese revisionists were essentially in accordance with the Khrushchevites and consequently also against the Comintern and its reconstruction. They agreed in all, to betray the line of Stalin, the path to communism. They were only in disagreement on the distribution of their power.” [General-Line of the Comintern (SH), *Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement*, Chapter VIII, 2001, edition in English]

And also comrade Enver stated about Yugoslav so-called “specific socialism” (read: revisionism and social-fascism) something that can also be applied to all other “national socialisms”:
“This state was to serve to create the idea that socialism was being built in Yugoslavia, a "specific" socialism (…), that is, precisely the kind of "socialism" which would serve as a fifth column (…).” (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, 1979, edition in English)

And with their refusal of acknowledgement of the universal nature of the teachings and lessons from the PLA and socialist Albania that comes directly from their denial of Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, those neo-revisionists are not only opening the door to the defence of the “specific local / national socialisms”, but also to the rejection of socialist revolution at a global scale by minimizing to a simple local level the universal laws drawn from the successful examples of socialist revolutions which happened in single countries, excluding them from any possibility of worldwide application. The achievements of the socialist revolution in single countries can only be guaranteed by the victory of the socialist world revolution. Keeping silent on this truth means betrayal at the socialist revolution in every individual country. True, future world socialist revolution will certainly have features different from those which occur in single countries. However, these last ones undoubtedly remain a key instrument to learn about the features of socialist revolution at a global scale. Like it is noted in our General-Line:

“Stalin defended the dialectical method of conclusions by analogy that the revolution of the one country can learn from the revolution of other countries, even if not classified as the same type of revolution. This means that we can analyse both the congruities and incongruities among the revolutions of different countries and between the revolution of an individual country and the world revolution. The possibility of conclusions by analogy (not to be mixed up by “equalization”/“identification” = fallacy) is based on the proletarian revolution with its international, universal nature (unit as a whole), whereas every proletarian revolution of the countries is organically interlinked, interacting, interdependent, complementary and correlating to the revolution in all the other countries, thus to the world revolution:

The closer the coherence between the known features of the proletarian revolution in a single country, on the one hand, and between the known features of the proletarian revolution in a single country which are in accordance with those of the world revolution (especially which go beyond), only in relation to the known features of the proletarian revolution of a single country, on the other hand, the greater is the probability that the conclusions on the unknown features of the world revolution will be correct.

If the world revolution wouldn't exist as an integral, universal whole, we couldn't use the conclusion by analogies of different proletarian revolutions in the single countries.” [General-Line of the Comintern (SH), The Strategy and Tactics of the Socialist World Revolution, Chapter II, 2001, edition in English]
Through their despises and reductions of the lessons and teachings from the PLA and socialist Albania to a simple specific and local ground, the neo-revisionists that created the ICMLPO are attempting to prevent the eventual anticipated knowledge of the features that the future world socialist revolution would embrace, thus putting at risk the acquisition of this crucial information and thus dangerously jeopardizing the advancement of the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist (MLSH) dialectical science which is the only one able to lead world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes towards its liberating victory.

In this manner, by assigning the successful socialist revolutions in Russia and Albania to mere “local specific experiences”, these neo-revisionists are trying to prevent that both these great genuine socialist revolutions can be brought to a triumphant end. Yes, because they will be never entirely finished and concluded while socialist revolution on a global scale is also not victoriously finished and concluded, freeing world exploited and oppressed classes from all kinds of oppression and exploitation. This is what those neo-revisionists that created the ICMLPO desperately want to avoid, as the faithful lackeys and servants of world capitalist-revisionist-imperialist system that they truly are.

4. ICMLPO – enemy of the world socialist revolution, world socialism and world communism

The Comintern (SH) defined the term “socialist world revolution” as follows:

“The world proletarian socialist revolution is the violent, armed overthrow of the bourgeois capitalist world and the complete destruction of its oppressive and exploitive system. It is led by the world proletariat and its Communist International. The basic purpose is to break the chains of the world's productive forces from their imperialist relations of world production – by means of global expropriation of private property at the global means of production. To realize this purpose - and to resist the danger of restoration of world capitalism -, the world proletariat establishes its own armed dictatorship, and creates a global superstructure of the own world socialist system - by support of the alliance with the poor peasants. The proletarian socialist world revolution is the most directly and shortest way to overcome world capitalism and to pave the way towards world socialism. The era of the world proletarian dictatorship is unavoidable for the whole transition-period between world capitalism and world communism - the future era of the classless world community. The proletarian, socialist world revolution makes possible the guarantee of the preventability of capitalist restoration - but its complete inevitability can still not be removed. This is guaranteed in the future communist world.
Such or similar definitions cannot be found in the documents of the ICMLPO. This is not astonishing. The world socialist revolution is simply not part of the concept of the ICMLPO. On the contrary. The political line of the ICMLPO is in opposition to the line of the Comintern (SH) concerning the socialist world revolution.

Since even before the 1994 infamous “Quito Declaration”, the neo-revisionist antecessors and creators of the future ICMLPO clearly revealed themselves as fierce enemies of the socialist world revolution, of world socialism and world communism. They have always attempted at hiding this fact from working classes though using phony “red Hoxhaist” masks and by falsely affirming themselves in words as supporters of comrade Enver’s PLA and socialist Albania. However in deeds they are the opposite of this, it suffices a look at their own documents in order to conclude this.

Besides all that we have already remarked in the above sub-chapters of this text, the neo-revisionists behind the emergence of the ICMLPO denied more essential fundamentals of MLSH theory and practice.

One of the most flagrant examples of this can be found in the documents of the PCE (ML). There we notice a certain changing concerning the party’s official logotype. The main symbol of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha was composed by a five-point star in the center of which we can found a gun, the hammer and the sickle. These two last instruments are intended to represent, respectively, the proletariat from the cities and the countryside. The sickle is sometimes also attributed to represent the peasantry, whose alliance with the proletariat always under the leadership of this is essential for triumph. For their part, the intellectuals coming from these toiling classes are represented in the star’s points.

In what respects to the gun, its purpose is to represent the armed proletarians in the conquest and defense of their power against the bourgeois class and all other exploitative and oppressive classes which will never allow workers’ and socialism’s victory of their own free will, but will always invariably try to submerge it in blood. That is, the gun in the emblem symbolizes the armament of the proletarian dictatorship.

Due to its adequacy and correctness, this logotype is also present in the red flag which is the symbol of the Comintern (SH) until nowadays. But what about the neo-revisionists from the PCE (ML) and from the other fake “brother-parties”? The truth is that even before the official foundation of the ICMLPO, they unmasked themselves and their neo-revisionist and anti-communist nature by deleting the gun in this emblem which had been – until then – used by them, too. Like we noted above, this means open and explicit rejection of the armament of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, it is synonym of refusing the violent...
essence that must be inherent to any authentic proletarian dictatorship if it wants to successfully fulfil its aim of forcibly defending the entire socialist period of transition from capitalism to complete communism from class enemies, their pressures and attacks. This constitutes an obvious proof of the anti-socialist and neo-revisionist nature of the future ICMLPO’s creators. It is not possible to achieve communism without the proletarian dictatorship and without the use of revolutionary violence which is inherent to it. And it suffices to refuse its violent and armed character to entirely reject proletarian dictatorship in itself – and that’s what these neo-revisionists do.

Proletarian dictatorship is something so essential, so crucial to achieve the definitive triumph of socialist revolution, of socialism and communism (both during the first and second stages of socialism, that is, both during the stage of socialism a “single” country and during the stage of socialism at a world / global scale) that since the moment we refuse it, we automatically reject everything related with MLSH, we automatically adhere to the side of world capitalists-imperialists-revisionists, to the side of world reactionaries. If it is not possible to eliminate exploitation and oppression without the implementation of a violent armed proletarian dictatorship, then to refuse it means to embrace perpetuation of exploitation and oppression – because everything which is not communist is automatically anti-communist. Such is the case with those neo-revisionists, who have always strived to protect bourgeois-imperialist-capitalist-revisionist rule; by rejecting proletarian dictatorship, they are rejecting socialism and communism in their entirety, they are defending the eternal maintenance of wage slavery.

Of course, proletarian dictatorship is not only some kind of abstract ideological or “cultural” victory over the bourgeoisie. No. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that it is always necessary to strengthen the proletarian dictatorship in order to smash the bourgeoisie and the oppressive classes and to totally destroy the foundations of the capitalist wage slavagist political-socio-economical-ideological system and formation. And it’s obvious that this process cannot advance without the use of revolutionary class violence by the workers and the proletariat against anti-socialist counter-revolutionary forces. Intensification of class struggle will only stop when communist society is absolutely ensured and the danger of capitalist-revisionist restoration is entirely surpassed. The proletarian dictatorship can only ensure the construction of socialism and the “superior organization of the productive work” (Lenin) through the effective, definitive and complete annihilation of the entire imperialist-capitalist-revisionist order and of all its remnants. To affirm the contrary means to defend capitulationism and anti-communism, it means to advocate the restoration of capitalist oppressive wage slavery in agreement with Khrushchevist theory according to which “socialism is irreversible”. This theory only safeguards the interests of world bourgeois class because it jeopardizes proletarian dictatorship and allows the penetration of bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist-imperialist wage slavagist anti-socialist forces, classes, influences and elements within communists’ ranks.
The truth is that proletarian dictatorship necessarily implies bloody clashes between the revolutionary and the reactionary forces, it implies the complete destruction of the capitalist, bourgeois, social-fascist, revisionist, imperialist order, it implies the complete and quick expropriation and socialization of the resources and means of production in favor of the proletariat and of the other working and oppressed classes, it implies the establishment of a centralized and planned economy, it presupposes an indomitable and fierce struggle against everything related with the old bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist exploitative system and formation. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that armed revolutionary violence is absolutely and indisputably necessary. Indeed, more than necessary, it is positive because it expresses the aim of the proletarian dictatorship in totally destroying the very foundations of the capitalist-imperialist-revisionist system and of bourgeois-reactionary classes, influences and forces. In his Critique of the Gotha Program, comrade Marx once affirmed that during the entire historical period of transition from capitalism to the classless, communist society, “the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat”. And comrade Lenin stated:

“(…) this period (the dictatorship of the proletariat) inevitably is a period of an unprecedentedly violent class struggle in unprecedentedly acute forms, and, consequently, during this period the state must inevitably be a state that is democratic in a new way (for the proletariat and the propertyless in general) and dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie).” (Lenin, The State and the Revolution, Collected Works, 1918, edition in English)

It is impossible to achieve propertyless, stateless and classless communist society without proletarian dictatorship and without the use of the revolutionary class violence which is intrinsic to it.

“Those who don’t understand the necessity of the dictatorship of every revolutionary class in order to achieve victory did not understood absolutely nothing about the history of the revolutions or don’t want to know nothing in what respects to this subject.” (Lenin, Le prolétariat et sa dictature, translated from French language)

Revolutionary armed violence is an indispensable instrument to advance socialist revolution in consonance with Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Hoxhaist teachings. Indeed, more than necessary and indispensable, it is something very positive because by exercising their armed class revolutionary violence, workers led by the proletarian communist vanguard party feel that they are now absolutely free to exercise their dictatorship, that they are not obliged by any of the oppressive burdens which existed under bourgeois rule. Workers’ revolutionary armed class violence is the expression of the proletarian dictatorship whose aim is to completely destroy and eliminate the very foundations of capitalist-imperialist-revisionist system and formation and of bourgeois-reactionary influences. Without revolutionary class violence, not only capitalism and imperialism can never be defeated and eliminated, but also the exploitative fundaments of their oppressive socio-economic system and formation and productive relations can
ever be annihilated. To reject revolutionary violence is to turn impossible the effective implementation of proletarian dictatorship, with the logical consequence of abandoning any possibility of ever accomplishing socialism and communism. Revolutionary violence is the key which opens the doors of the future classless, stateless and propertyless society – that’s why world revisionists, world capitalists and world imperialists fear it so much.

The Classics of Marxism-Leninism always insisted on that exploiters never surrender their class power and privileges in a peaceful and voluntary manner, therefore, proletarian dictatorship will be workers’ best weapon in the war against all exploiters who want to have wage slavagist order back. By refusing this, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists become the greatest hidden supporters of capitalist-imperialist class dictatorship, they become the greatest hidden defenders of all kinds of oppression and exploitation. They become the greatest hidden enemies of world socialist revolution, of world socialism and world communism.

In general, the ICMLPO propagates the dictatorship of the proletariat even very seldom. However the ICMLPO betrays the armed socialist revolution as the only way towards dictatorship of the proletariat. Instead, the ICMLPO propagates the neo-revisionist version of the so called “people's front” as a purely collaboration pact with the bourgeoisie and its revisionist lackeys. The ICMLPO has withdrawn from criticism on revisionism - as enemies of the armed socialist revolution - to pave the way to collaboration with them which is already practiced by its members.

5. ICMLPO – liquidators of the unity of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha

Besides all this, it is now obvious that, by their own intrinsically anti-communist and bourgeois, neo-revisionist, pro-Trotskyist nature, the creators of the ICMLPO were surely among the main liquidators of the unity of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha.

Once more, this truth is closely linked with the aspects to which we previously referred above.

Like we already noted, the refusal of a Classic of Marxism-Leninism, no matter what, is synonym of refusal of them all as a whole and inevitably leads to defeat and liquidation. In respect to this, we recall the example of the Communist Party of Germany / Marxist-Leninist (KPD / ML), in whose IV Congress in 1978 not only Mao but ALSO comrade Enver Hoxha were deleted from the party program. This was a very serious mistake, because the reduction to 4 Classics was one of the main reasons for the consequent invasion of Trotskyist liquidationism
suffered by this party because the degeneration by Trotskyism will doom the fate of the ICMLPO.

This was not only the basis for the liquidation of the party, but - drawing a parallel to the ICMLPO - an international basis for the liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha. What happened with the Marxist-Leninist World Movement WITHOUT Enver Hoxha? Its liquidation. Therefore, reducing the Classics on 4 heads is the main betrayal of the ICMLPO. This shows that the Trotskyite aims of splitting were verified on a global scale, though with different complementary tactics. The false "contradictions" that at the time seemed to appear between the PCE (ML) and the Trotskyite leadership of the KPD / ML was a feint manoeuvre. Both sides agreed in dropping comrade Enver Hoxha and to reduce the ideological basis of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement only on the teachings of 4 Classics. The only difference was, that the Trotskyites in our party did not stop until they had deleted also the 4 Classics, while the ICMLPO misuse still the 4 Classics as a dummy behind which they hide their neo-revisionism.

Indeed, in the letter from the KPD / ML to the party to the PCE (ML) from 21. 7. 1982, we can already perceive a letter with rightist tendencies. The united front with the revisionists was already decided by H.-D. Koch, the Trotskyite leader of the KPD /ML. This was hypocritically “criticized” by the PCE (ML) and misused as a dummy to hide behind its own Trotskyism.

And the same can be applied to the tendencies of the so-called "people's front" (which we will analyse more in detail later in this article) and which expressed liquidationist tendencies in the international Marxist-Leninist Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha. At the same time, the neo-revisionist predecessors of the ICMLPO started to use censorship concerning the work of those brother-parties which were against them and which struggled to maintain the unity and purity of principles of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. They did this by selecting and publishing articles and documents solely from those “parties” which were also engaged in the path of liquidationist treason and Trotskyist deviations.

However, under the influence of these neo-revisionists, this overall tendency towards division between neo-revisionists and authentic communists and towards liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha started also to be visible in the internal sphere of the brother-parties which still remained faithful. To take the example of the KPD / ML again, we must remember that the splitting group of Möller (liquidator of the party since 1985/1986 - and today publisher of "Arbeit-Zukunft") was affiliated with all those neo-revisionist and Trotskyist parties which would later form the ICMLPO. Möller would sign also the declaration of Quito in 1994 while the genuine Bolshevist comrades who were fighting against this road of betrayal remained excluded from all these activities of those parties.
On the other hand, they were equally excluded from publishing articles in "Theory and Practice" (inclusively the PLA itself), as this organ was mainly in the hands of the pro-Trotskyist and neo-revisionist PCE (ML), whose leader Raoul Marco never answered the requests for discussing differences and proposals of clarification of different standpoints of view with the comrades who remained faithful to a true Bolshevist line.

In 1986, the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the KPD / ML wrote a critical comment on the article of the neo-revisionist leader of the PCE (ML) Elena Odena, clearly and correctly unmasking it as being Trotskyite infiltration within the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and its disengagement away from comrade Enver Hoxha, the PLA and socialist Albania:

“It seems that Elena Odena here enters in contradiction when she tries to reconcile Marxism-Leninism with Trotskyism on the question of proletarian internationalism, to replace the Marxist-Leninist point of view of relations between our parties by a Trotskyist perspective, which works in benefit of liquidationism.” (Documents of the KPD / ML, Is our Spanish brother-party planning the creation of a 4 and ½ International?, 1986, translated from German language)

Of course, the neo-revisionists feared the open ideological struggle with authentic communists. They knew who was defending the correct line of comrade Enver Hoxha. And therefore, they swept away what was not of use for them. More than that, they feared that such would smash their liquidationist intentions. And this silence against genuine Bolshevist comrades was kept also in times after the ICMLPO was founded over twenty years ago (by the way, we must remark that under these conditions, the foundation of the new Comintern WITH SUCH SPANISH TRAITORS would be like suicide. Therefore the authentic Bolshevist communist comrades defended the standpoint of the PLA - not to form the Comintern in such a moment. They waited for the most correct and opportune time to do it… in the year 2000).

The prolonged arm of those neo-revisionists in Germany for the ICMLPO was and still is the liquidator Möller (Arbeit-Zukunft) who was once member of the KPD / ML:

“In 1985 the »Möller/KPD« split from the C P Germany [ML] to organize the ongoing attempts of the final liquidation of the C P Germany [ML].” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Enver Hoxha, the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism and the foundation of the Comintern (ML), 2001, edition in English)

Moreover, on April 1986, the comrades from the KPD / ML published a letter suggestively entitled: “The proletarian internationalism is an ideology and weapon of the proletariat against Trotskyism”:
“The mutual solidarity is not interference in the inner affairs of each party but the strengthening of the unity. Comrade Enver Hoxha said on the 8th congress: "The strength of the communist, Marxist-Leninist movement in the world consists in the correctness of ideas, for those they struggle and in their unity." Let's all stand together in this sense and defend our Marxist-Leninist principles against Trotskyism. The Trotskyists meet in Paris at Whitsuntide. Let us repel all their future attempts to split the Marxist-Leninist movement.

**Victory to the Marxist-Leninist movement in the world!**” (Documents of the KPD / ML, *The proletarian internationalism is an ideology and weapon of the proletariat against Trotskyism*, 1986, edition in English)

This document expressing a veritable Marxist-Leninist line was sent to all brother-parties of the Marxist-Leninist World movement but NO single sister party of the Marxist-Leninist world movement had answered to this letter.

Of course, this speaks immensely about the sad situation of our party in 1986 and about the liquidationist tendencies within the whole Marxist-Leninist World Movement in which true communist comrades were already totally isolated. The PLA was on the path towards liquidation of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement.

Many of the sister parties were already organized under the Trotskyite influence of the PCE (ML), especially all the parties in Latin America.

And the already referred "Möller-KPD" group who split the KPD / ML in December 1985, was also affiliated to the international grouping around the PCE (ML) - later called ICMLPO since 1994.

In this context, alone and disregarded by all comrades of the world, we, the authentic communist comrades that still remained faithful to Bolshevist principles and against Trotskyism and liquidation, fought a brave struggle.

Of course, like we had already noticed, within this period, the official organ from the PCE (ML) “Vanguardia Obrera” was publishing NOTHING about the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism or the communist world movement with the Comintern at the head. No propaganda of communism. Nothing about Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin. And on comrade Enver Hoxha only a little "article" on his second Day of Death. About Albania only documents of Ramiz Alia and official copies of ATA (Albanian Telegram-News). The PCE (ML) belonged to the parties which were invited and represented on the 9th Congress of the PLA. (Other parties like the KPD / ML were not invited any more).

In that time, Toufan (Iran) was still on our side as the only brother party. At least, Toufan continued to struggle with the KPD / ML in Germany. And in Germany was also the central bureau of Toufan with whom we had several meetings. However, on occasion of the death celebration of Hamid Chitgar at the grave yard in Paris, Toufan invited also the Möller-faction to this event. After a last meeting
with them in Sweden (Stockholm), Toufan embraced the side of neo-revisionists and traitors in the end of the 80ies and beginning 90ies. In that time, also our Turkish comrades were suffering under the same illness of splittings. Tigray’s party was situated on "both sides" (PCE - ML and us) assuming a conciliationist position between liquidationism and Marxism-Leninism that only proved Tigray’s party’s own anti-socialism and betrayal of Bolshevist line of uncompromising struggle against neo-revisionism, Trotskyism and liquidationism of all kinds.

The Swedish party (founded in 1982) was affiliated with the PCE (ML), but some years later dissolved by itself. The Canadian party supported Ramiz Alia and isolated because of their open rightist opportunism.

The Party of New Zealand collected all party material of the PLA after the death of comrade Enver Hoxha and criticized the deviation of Ramiz Alia. But they did this on the basis of Trotskyism - namely to criticize the line of comrade Enver Hoxha which would be allegedly the source and cause of the degeneration of the PLA. This poisoning material from New Zealand was sent to all parties and that with bad influence. The party of New Zealand refused to follow our proposal to re-unite the Marxist-Leninist World Movement on the basis of the lessons of comrade Enver Hoxha. New Zealand's aim was split and not re-unification.

Like we already mentioned, the Latin American parties followed the PCE (ML), and also the French party, the party of Surinam and the African parties did the same.

And in spite of "old" neighbouring contradictions parallel to special ties between the PCE (ML) and the Portuguese PCP (R), also this last one followed the path of degeneration and dissolution, liquidating itself in 1992 (for more information about this issue, please read our text about the “90th anniversary of the P “C” P”). The Italian party was liquidated by the leader Focus Denucci who was later outed as an "agent provocateur". The Norwegian party was very small and nearly without influence. In all the other countries did not exist a Hoxhaist party or at least small groupings or individual comrades.

The Danish party was not yet allied neither with the PCE (ML) (after the PCE – ML) had attacked the Danish comrades on the international Youth camp) at that time, neither with us. They were present on our 6th Congress in December 1985 on which Möller split the KPD / ML. After the expulsion of the Moller-group by the Marxist-Leninist leadership that was still ruling the KPD / ML, the Danish comrades demanded re-unification between the German comrades and the liquidationist Möller. After some meetings with the Danish party, the Danish comrades allied with neo-revisionist Möller ("Arbeit-Zukunft").

Thus, most parties of the split Marxist-Leninist World Movement followed the Spanish neo-revisionists from the PCE (ML) and the anti-socialist tendencies we have been noting in their texts and documents were sadly embraced by the major-
ity of the other “brother-parties”. It is very relevant that these neo-revisionists would be among the main founders of the ICMLPO. This reveals much both about their nature before its foundation and also about the ICMLPO’s own character…

The year 1977 was the best year of unification and strength of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. In the 80ies, this positive development stopped (particularly by the PLA which published less and less documents of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement). In this entire difficult situation, authentic communist comrades and parties became more and more isolated. Nobody seemed to be left who would have interest in re-unification of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement on the basis of the lessons of comrade Enver Hoxha. Nearly all the parties followed their own individual course, after the destruction of socialist Albania.

So, it is crystal clear that the international Marxist-Leninist world movement was already split especially after the death of comrade Enver Hoxha – and also before the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Albania in 1990. An important part of the responsibility for this liquidation and for the several years of dark stagnation known by the world communist movement can be assigned to the Trotskyist, neo-revisionists of what would later be the infamous ICMLPO.

6. Never centrist unity between ICMLPO and other neo-revisionist organizations with the Comintern (SH)!

Like we had noted in the beginning of this article, neo-revisionism is false “anti-revisionism” in words but revisionism in deeds. Therefore, all kinds of attempts of “reconciling” it with Stalinist-Hoxhaism only favor the interests of world bourgeois class and its exploitative and oppressive aims. World bourgeoisie was glad to see how its former modern revisionist lackeys changed her skin to become neo-revisionists when their former masks could not mislead workers anymore.

The Comintern (SH) refuses all shades of anti-socialist centrist “reconciliationism” with neo-revisionists and their infamous organizations such as the ICMLPO. In our documents, our positions relatively to this have always been very firm and unwavering:

“Centrist reconciliation with Enver Hoxha is class-reconciliation with the Bourgeoisie

Neo-Revisionism is - as we know now - not an international phenomenon, that firstly appeared after the death of Enver Hoxha, but began in fact with that day, when Modern Revisionism was born, because this bourgeois ideol-
ogy was objectively condemned to fall down from the very beginning and only able to survive if it is re-masked (a new mask upon the old mask), if it would be able to cast its skin after the skin was hurt, if it would be un-masked and exposed by the Marxist-Leninists. The first branch of Neo-Revisionism was developed by Mao, when he needed to hide his own Chinese revisionism behind the struggle against Modern Revisionism.

And this was not only a national phenomenon, because Neo-Revisionism was spread all over the world still influencing the Marxist-Leninist World Movement. Neo-Revisionism began to spread worldwide at that time, when Modern Revisionism finally was not yet exposed and finished off completely. Neo-Revisionism was and is still a thorn in the flesh of Marxism-Leninism in the struggle against Modern Revisionism., in the struggle for building up and rebuilds the Marxist-Leninist Parties and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement that developed in demarcation to Modern Revisionism. (…)

So it is clear: You cannot rely on one branch of Neo-Revisionism to get rid of the other branch of Neo-Revisionism. You can never come to terms in reconciliation with bourgeois ideology without betrayal on the proletariat. All branches of revisionism have to be attacked simultaneously exclusively from the position of Marxism-Leninism, otherwise you will be captured in the spider-net of revisionism. Modern Revisionism was the doctor at the sick-bed of capitalism - Neo-Revisionism finally the doctor at the death-bed of capitalism; illness will never be curable.

The languishing state of capitalism depends on the last word of the world-proletariat. And we have now also everything said what it was to be said. We need ideological clearness on the base of the 5 Architects of Marxism-Leninism, who are the leading symbol of the Comintern [ML]. The lessons of Enver Hoxha became the demarcation line with the foundation of the Comintern [ML].” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Enver Hoxha, the 5th Architect of Marxism-Leninism and the foundation of the Comintern (ML), 2001, edition in English)

“We should never under-estimate or even play down the danger of Neo-revisionism as the reconciliators do to drift us into the arms of the revisionists. Strategically revisionism is a stinking dead body of world imperialism, but tactically we should not under-estimate the danger of the still existing reminders of revisionism which are able and decided to cast its skin within the new upcoming of the anti-imperialist resistance, within the reorganization of the struggle for proletarian socialism.

The neo-revisionism is a lethal poison within the ranks of the revolutionary movement of today. It is the continuation of the struggle between Revisionism and Marxism-Leninism – a struggle alive or dead. Neo-revisionism or Leninism? – this is the question which decides on the future of communism. (…) Every reconciliation and opportunism towards Neo-revisionism fills up
this poisoned reservoir – is counter-revolutionary! This truth we have to teach the world proletariat in the daily international class-struggle. (…) 

What about those comrades who followed Lenin on the road of the Marxist-Leninist world movement of comrade Enver Hoxha? Most of them have retired and withdrew from the Marxist-Leninist world movement of comrade Enver Hoxha and suffer from the poison of neo-revisionism. Others openly became renegades, became dangerous forces who are busy to criticize the Marxist-Leninist world movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, other relapsed into reconciliation with Maoism or even became Neo-Maoists. Some others are busy to cause the Marxist-Leninist world movement of comrade Enver Hoxha to die. How can this happen? (…) 

To withdraw from the strong Marxist-Leninist world movement of comrade Enver Hoxha proved in the result as a total capitulation of the anti-revisionist struggle and led by reconciliation straight into the arms of the neo-revisionists. Only a minority of determined Marxist-Leninists defended comrade Enver Hoxha and had – from then on - to cope with the pressure of the renegades who threw the teachings of comrade Enver Hoxha over board and who supported – openly or disguised - the social-fascists and social-imperialists to survive.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-Revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English) 

Our strategy and tactics concerning struggle against neo-revisionism in general are of course inextricably linked with the struggle against Maoist revisionism in particular, and so the lessons put forward by the Comintern (SH) relatively to this last one are also applicable to the former one in which struggle against ICMLP and its organizations are included: 

“The reconciliation of different opportunist trends serves the bloc-construction against the world proletariat and not against world bourgeoisie. (…) Nothing bourgeois shall fall if it is not forced by the proletariat to fall - not even revisionism. The history of revisionism is the history of the futile attempts of the bourgeoisie, to force the Communists' struggle against revisionism into capitulation. In regard of this general historical experience we can define Maoism in particular as an ideology which creeps into the Marxist-Leninist movement, with the intention to grind the sharpness of our anti-revisionist weapons away, to prepare the reconciliation with revisionism. Maoists recruit re-conciliatory forces, to lead them against the forces of the Marxist-Leninists. By this means the Maoists try to bring our Marxist-Leninist World Movement under the rule of the Maoist movements. Maoists criticize revisionism in words, however, they want the withdrawal from our anti-revisionist struggle in deeds. The neo-revisionism is the agency of the bourgeoisie within the anti-revisionist movement – the current main danger within the Communist Movement. (…)
On the basis of the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism we have to fight resolutely against the general trend of reconciliation with neo-revisionism and we must defend, maintain and sharpen our clear demarcation-line against Maoism, Trotskyism and other anti-Stalinist-Hoxhaist currents – without neglecting the old danger of modern revisionism with its Menshevik, reformist and social democratic roots. The Maoists had risen from the beginning, the dirty banner of Trotskyism.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Declaration of War against Maoism, part I, 2011, edition in English)

“(…) all the attempts of reconciliation between comrade Enver Hoxha and Mao Tsetung are anti-Leninist streamings. Lenin purified the Marxist world movement from opportunism in the struggle against centrist-bourgeois ideology of the disguised opportunists. If you reconcile Enver Hoxha with Mao Tsetung then the world proletariat gives up Enver Hoxha as a great Marxist-Leninist, as a classic of Marxism-Leninism, and leaves him to the world bourgeoisie. This is unacceptable for us Marxist-Leninists and we shall never tolerate this betrayal.

A united font which counts on Mao Tsetung as a „Marxist-Leninist“ is only a united front against the world proletariat, against Marxism-Leninism, against the united front of the Marxist-Leninist world movement of comrade Enver Hoxha.”

“We are not Neo-revisionists because we criticize the reconciliation between Marxism-Leninism and the „Mao Tsetung Ideas“. (…) Neo-Revisionists are mixing up Marxism-Leninism with revisionism, and Maoism is completely revisionism.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Neo-Revisionism or Leninism?, 2004, edition in English)

In these last excerpts, just replace Mao, “Mao Zedong Ideas” and Maoism by the ICMLPO and its organizations and everything will continue to make complete sense… By the way: the ICMLPO has withdrawn from the anti-Maoist lessons of comrade Enver Hoxha and has ceased his anti-Maoist struggle. In the contrary, individual members of the ICMLPO openly cooperate with the ICOR (international Maoist camp).

And moreover, our Programmatic Platform of the Comintern (SH) also makes crystal clear what must be our positions concerning centrist “reconciliation” with the neo-revisionists:

“The centrists work wonders assimilating new theorems in order to reconcile it with the old theorems. But one can develop as much as outstanding new Marxist ideas and set up brilliant world-revolutionary slogans, nevertheless their effect will be thwarted by each outdated idea, by each outdated slogan, to which one did not say good-bye. There are the centrists, who make a principle from this error, and that's why we must
expose and fight their anti-Marxist, eclectic method of this centrist 'general-revision'. We Stalinists-Hoxhaists destroy the neo-revisionist world movements who attack us as "sectarians" outside their "united fronts".

In the name of “unity and struggle” they split unity and struggle indeed by their reconciliation with revisionism, by abandoning the world revolution. The neo-revisionists combine both processes of deformation and degeneration of Marxism-Leninism. However, in return, we combine both processes of reconstruction and new theoretical beginning. Therefore, the neo-revisionists are the most dangerous enemies in our own ranks of the new Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Camp: They use the cloak of "Stalinism-Hoxhaism" to paralyze split and liquidate our Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement. (…)

Neo-revisionists follow the anti-revisionist teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism in words, however with the aim of reconciliation with revisionism in deeds - this is the characteristic of globalized modern revisionism that casted its skin into neo-revisionism.

Neo-revisionism is eclecticism, is bourgeois ideology which is intended to deceive the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism (…). It is the application of the class-reconciliatory policy of peaceful coexistence between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism, the peaceful existence between Stalinism-Hoxhaism and neo-revisionism.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Programmatic Platform, 2009, edition in English)

From the moment that we know that neo-revisionism is an inherently and necessarily pro-bourgeois and anti-communist doctrine, any “unity” or reconciliation with it means in fact to surrender ourselves to the side of world bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist system. And this because, under wage slavery order, socio-political-economic power belongs to the class which owns the means of production, the class who controls the productive relations which constitute the material base of society. While this control of the economical and material means of production is not conquered by the proletariat through revolutionary armed violence, it will always belong to the bourgeois exploitative class. If we aim at centrist “unity” with pro-bourgeois forces like the neo-revisionist ICMLPO and its organizations and phony “brother-parties”, we are automatically favoring bourgeois dictatorship and those who support it. This happens because the proletarian dictatorship is the only way to definitively eliminate bourgeois dictatorship; therefore, if we try to “reconcile ourselves” with those who, like we already proved, deny the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, then we are maintaining and serving the bourgeois dictatorship with all its inherent evils (all kinds of exploitations, oppressions, enslavements, capitalism, fascism, social-fascism, imperialism, social-imperialism, revisionism, neo-revisionism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, war, unemployment, etc.). What is not revolutionary, it is necessarily reactionary. All those who are not in favor of the
proletarian dictatorship and in favor of the communist society are necessarily in favor of bourgeois dictatorship and of capitalist-imperialist-wage enslaving system.

So, if we want to defend our purity of principles based on the invincible teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, if we want to preserve the authentic Bolshevist proletarian nature of the Comintern (SH) as the leader of world proletariat towards global socialist revolution, global proletarian dictatorship, global socialism and communism, we must staunchly refuse all kinds of reconciliations between us Stalinists-Hoxhaists and the neo-revisionist ICMLPO and its organizations. We must always highlight this as much as we can, as there must there not be any doubts or ambiguities relatively to this.

7. ICMLPO – enemy of the Comintern and the organizational concept of the Bolshevist world party

The main task of this chapter is the declaration of war against the opportunist position of the ICMLPO in the organizational question.

The opportunism of the ICMLPO both in programmatic and tactical questions cannot be isolated from the opportunism in organizational questions. In this chapter we declare war against the ICMLPO and its Menshevism in matters of organization. We must therefore draw our organizational demarcation-line against the ICMLPO in defense of the Bolshevik world party and its organizational principles and norms.

We begin with the truism of the organizational question: Lenin, for the first time in the history of Marxism elaborated the doctrine of the Party as the leading organization of the proletariat, as the principal weapon of the proletariat, without which the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be won.

The world proletariat has no other weapon in the struggle for world power than its world organizations. The proletarian world organizations combine and centralize the fighting units of all countries. The force of the world proletariat is its world organizations. Without world organizations the world proletariat is nothing. The world organizations aim at the integration and unification of all the actions of the world proletariat, serve the unity of his revolutionary thinking and practical action.

What does Lenin teach us on the organizational principles of the world party?

“In order to function properly and to guide the masses systematically, the Party must be organized on the principle of centralism, having one set of
rules and uniform Party discipline, one leading organ -- the Party Congress, and in the intervals between congresses -- the Central Committee of the Party; the minority must submit to the majority, the various organizations must submit to the centre, and lower organizations to higher organizations. Failing these conditions, the party of the working class cannot be a real party and cannot carry out its tasks in guiding the class.” (Stalin, History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) - Short Course, Moscow, 1938, edition in English)

In contrast, the ICMLPO denies the necessity of the proletarian world organizations and confines itself on national parties which exchange their opinions on international conferences. They publish occasionally nonbinding statements of lowest common denominator. In this way, the ICMLPO ignores totally the hegemonial role of the world proletariat not only ideologically and politically but also organizationally.

The hegemonial role of the world proletariat cannot be separated from the organizational role of the Communist International. Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the further developed ideology of the hegemony of the world proletariat. Stalinism-Hoxhaism is the theory and tactics of the world proletarian revolution, in general and the theory and tactics of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, in particular.

The hegemony of the world proletariat cannot be achieved and established without the Stalinist-Hoxhaist world party. You cannot appreciate the hegemony of the world proletariat, if you refuse to appreciate its vanguard, the Communist International. The disorganizational ideas of mixing up the hegemony of the world proletariat and the hegemony of the proletariat of single countries are harmful for all the organizations of the proletariat; no matter whether for the Communist International or for its Sections of single countries. They are harmful for the socialist revolution in a country, in particular, as well as for the world revolution on a global scale. The single interests of the proletariat of one country, or group interests in specific countries, are subordinated to the general interests of the world proletariat, and not vice versa.

We cannot serve the world proletariat without simultaneously getting rid of certain nationalist, self-serving, obstructive tendencies of such organizations like the ICMLPO. The socialist world revolution needs a centralized Communist International and not a loose alliance of autonomous national parties. In defense of the Bolshevik character of our communist world party we apply to the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism on the organizational question and to the according documents of the Comintern.

In particular, we refer to:

Marx/Engels: Manifesto of the Communist Party
The ICMLPO is neither based on the organizational lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism nor on that of the Proletarian International. The ICMLPO is not a Stalinist-Hoxhaist world party. Hegemony of the world proletariat is therefore impossible under the leadership of the ICMLPO. The proletarians of all countries need the world dictatorship over the world bourgeoisie. And they can only achieve this by organising themselves as divisions of a centralized world army - led by the global staff headquarters and accompanied by all its class allies.

The new type of the Communist International is determined by the new type of the globalized proletariat which we defined as follows:

"The world proletariat is the globalising working class that consists of the proletarians from all the countries and who grow together to one global class which results from global mode of production. The world proletariat is the decisive world revolutionary mainspring and the most exploited and oppressed class; the world proletariat confronts, overthrows and liquidates the regnant world bourgeoisie.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Programmatic Platform, 2009, edition in English)

According to this definition, the Communist International of today is based on the further developed world proletariat as the carrier of global production, as the carrier of global class-struggle, as the leader of the socialist world revolution, as the dominant global class of the historical epoch of world socialism.

There is only one world proletariat. That's why there is needed only one single Bolshevik party - namely the Bolshevik World Party and its Sections in every country. The world proletariat needs types of world organizations which implement most efficiently the global class-struggle and the overthrow of the world bourgeoisie by the socialist world revolution.
What is the organizational principle of globalized class-struggle in general and of the socialist world revolution in particular?

The organizational principle of globalized class-struggle, of the socialist world revolution, this is a combination of two components

a) Centralization from top to bottom as well as democratization from bottom to top [in general];

b) Centralization from the top of the world down to the bottom of the country, as well as democratization from bottom of the country to the top of the world [in particular].

This organizational principle cannot be implemented by an association which is limited in “holding conferences” - like the ICMLPO. Organizational principles of the world proletariat can only be implemented by the Communist International – as the Bolshevik avant-garde of the world proletariat. We are a fighting Bolshevik world party and not an association of international conferences.

In the course of globalization, the predominant law of motion of the international workers' movement is determining factor for the dependency of the workers' movement in every single country. The principled relationship between the Communist International and the Sections in every single country is nothing other!

The ruling world bourgeoisie handed over to the world proletariat not only new global weapons to fight against the world bourgeoisie, abolished not only the national borders and divisive position as a proletariat of isolated countries, but above all, helped us establish quite another new position, namely the global position of the workers - to be recognized as a world party, the Communist International. The communist world party will never divide its leading force with other parties or associations of other parties. The Comintern (SH) is the most important instrument of the dictatorship of the world proletariat.

The new type of Stalinist – Hoxhaist organisations is a type of a world Bolshevist party of the world proletariat for the purpose to unite and lead the struggle of the proletarian detachments in all countries with the common goal to overthrow the world bourgeoisie, to establish the world dictatorship of the proletariat and to create globally socialism.

The highest form of the world proletarian class organisation is the Stalinist - Hoxhaist World Party, the Communist International of new type, the Comintern (SH). The Stalinist - Hoxhaist World Party is the conscious bearer of the Stalinist Hoxhaist class movement of the world proletariat. The Comintern (SH) continues the glorious tradition of the Communist International of Lenin and Stalin. Without Stalinist - Hoxhaist World Party - no victory of the socialist world revolution, no dictatorship of the world proletariat, no world socialism, no world communism. Stalin emphasized that "The Communist Party of the proletariat
And so the Communist International is formed of one piece of the world proletariat and not a party of blocks of various class elements with opportunistic tendencies in various countries around the world. We declare war against every organization, every group, every movement (whether locally or globally organized), which struggles against the indispensable reconstruction of the Communist International. Communists are only those who fight for the Bolshevik world party. "For or against" the leadership of a Bolshevik World Party – this is the demarcation-line between opportunism and Stalinism-Hoxhaism in the organizational question of the socialist world revolution.

The organisational concept of the ICMLPO can be characterized by three main features:

1) 'primitiveness of circles' on an international stage (see: Lenin's criticism in: "What is to be done?"). The opportunists defended then the local autonomous circle principle against the Leninist centralized national party. The ICMLPO transforms this outdated local autonomous circle-concept on an international scale by defending the autonomy of national parties to the disadvantage of the centralized international party; umbrella organisation of different political and ideological currents and bolt-holes for class-foreign elements;

2) international alliance instead of international party, loose organizational forms, celebration of non-binding common events of different groupings of countries that are managed horizontally;

3) fraternal federal connections; international combinations of independent organizations (Bundism)

This is de-centralized 'headless putting' of the ICMLPO, federalist remnants of autonomism (see Lenin's criticism on the “Bundists”) of some opportunist organizations of different countries. The ICMLPO infringes the internationalist meaning of Lenin's writing: “What is to be done?” – related on a global scale. Essentially there is no difference between Lenin’s opponents against the Bolshevik organization in former Russia, and today, the ICMLPO as opponent of the Bolshevik world party.

The ICMLPO defends autonomism against centralism which is, in principle, the character of every opportunism in the organizational question. The ICMLPO has neither a Statute, nor norms of democratic centralism, nor clearly defined organizational principles, has neither a central organ nor a central committee and centralized organizations of control and accountability. This is also typically for opportunist organisations – namely the vagueness and uncertainty in organizational questions. Stalin wrote in his “Short Course”:

“… a large number of the local committees and their members would have nothing to do with anything but their local, petty practical activities, did not
realize the harm caused by the absence of organizational and ideological unity in the Party, were accustomed to the disunity and ideological confusion that prevailed within it, and believed that they could get along quite well without a united centralized party. If a centralized party was to be created, this backwardness, inertia, and narrow outlook of the local bodies had to be overcome.”

We quoted Stalin because the ICMLPO also does not realize its harm caused by the absence of organizational and ideological unity of the world party.

The opportunist theory of global associations of ‘independent’ national parties is totally contradictory to the world-proletarian theory and practice of the Comintern (SH).

Assumed that the ICMLPO would be based on the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism (and we publish this article to prove that this is absolutely not the case) the special organizational type of a “conferences” could be only an interim stage for preparing the reconstruction of the Comintern. After experience of 20 years of a “conference”-like organisation, nobody can really believe that the ICMLPO was needed for the preparation of the reconstruction of the Comintern. In the contrary, these 20 years showed impressively that this “conference”-type of international association was used to thwart the rebuilding of the Comintern, and is thus an instrument of the world bourgeoisie against the world proletariat.

The Communist International consists of a global system of Bolshevist organisations, their unification in all forms as a united whole. The Communist International is the highest but not the only class-organization of the world proletariat. All our global organisations serve the world proletariat in this way or other. As the highest form of class-organization the Communist International determines the general political line and its application through achievement of uniformity of global leadership. The political leadership of the Communist International spans all forms of the organizations of the world proletariat. The Communist International is the most important and central instrument of the Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement.

The Communist International is called to create and lead all other forms of international organization of proletarians of all countries.

These other international proletarian organizations – for their part - unite the organization of the proletarians of all countries on a global stage (youth organizations, labour unions, aid organizations etc.). The ICMLPO denies the necessity of all the international proletarian organizations, centrally guided by the Comintern (SH).

"Formerly," Lenin wrote, "our Party was not a formally organized whole, but only the sum of separate groups, and, therefore, no other relations except those of ideological influence were possible between these groups. Now we have become an organized Party, and this implies the establishment
of authority, the transformation of the power of ideas into the power of authority, the subordination of lower Party bodies to higher Party bodies."

The ICMLPO, too, must be considered as a „sum of separate groups“ on an international scale which are not subordinated to higher Party bodies. The world proletariat is unable to lead and coordinate its fighting attachments in the countries for the global battle-fields of class-struggle without its general staff, without its world party, without the Comintern.

The globalised world socialist revolution will fail without global leadership of the world party. The global victory of socialism is impossible if the world proletariat would renounce its Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Party which is free from opportunism, irreconcilably against compromisers and capitulationists, revolutionary in opposition to the hostile world bourgeoisie and merciless to any exploitation and oppression.

The unity of the world proletarian movement can only be achieved by the most extreme revolutionary party of Stalinism – Hoxhaism, can only be achieved by its most relentless struggle against all the other parties and organisations. There is no other unity of communists all over the world than their unity of recreating the Communist International!

We cannot tolerate opportunistic elements and tendencies within our world revolutionary movement and we have to purify our movement from opportunistic elements. It would mean the death of any movement if it keeps enemies in its own ranks.

The victory of the world proletarian revolution is impossible without defeating neo-revisionism and without defeating all organisations which are guided by neo-revisionism.

Without understanding the theory of the role of the Bolshevist world party, the final victory of the October Revolution on a global scale cannot be guaranteed.

"To fulfil the historic requirement for an international organization of revolutionary proletarians, the gravedigger of the capitalist system, the Communist International is the only global power, whose program is the dictatorship of the proletariat and communism, and who is openly acting as organizer of the international proletarian revolution."  (Program of the Comintern, 1928)

In time of comrade Enver Hoxha, the defence of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin was immanent part of the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement against modern revisionism. The liquidation of the Comintern was a deadly sin. Those parties which founded the ICMLPO were responsible for the subversion and degradation and splitting of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement especially after the death of comrade Enver Hoxha. They sowed distrust among the parties and destroyed, last not least, the organizational structures within the sister parties.
Today, the defence of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin is immanent part of the struggle of the Stalinist-Hoxhaist World Movement against the neo-revisionist ICMLPO. We defend the organisational principles of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin in general, and struggle against its liquidation through the traitor Dimitrov in particular. Moreover, we struggle against all those neo-revisionist organisations of today that make a virtue out of the deadly sin of the Comintern's liquidation, and against those who struggle by all means against the reconstruction of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin.

In the time of the "Quito Declaration" we were a minority of opposition. The world proletariat had not yet formed its own vanguard, the proletarian world party. However, at latest after the foundation of the Comintern (SH) in 2000, all such international forms of organizations like that of the ICMLPO, based on “circle principle”, have no justification for their further existence.

After 15 years of the Comintern (SH) we leave our defensive positions and declare war against the ICMLPO. We will attack the ICMLPO especially in the countries where it is represented by its affiliated organizations, and destroy them by means of new Sections of the Comintern (SH). We will convince all true communists that the world proletariat needs only one party, namely the Communist International and its Sections. The Stalinist-Hoxhaist organizations will win over the opportunist organizations all over the world, especially over the ICMLPO. Our Bolshevik world party is the only force in the world which is suitable for successful overcoming of all kinds of national narrow-mindedness and "circle-mentality", projected on an international scale. The organizational concept of the ICMLPO is doomed to fail. The organizational concept of the Communist International is irreplaceable. As world communists we fight for overcoming national borders of organizations and other obligatory dividing walls. Proletarian internationalism degenerates to a phrase if it is not anchored on Stalinist-Hoxhaist organizational solid ground. And this solid ground can only be achieved by ruthless struggle against the opportunist concept of the organization of the ICMLPO.

8. Critique of official Documents of the ICMLPO

8.1. First Documents (until 1994)

In the sub-chapters of this article previously presented above, we already provided examples and critical analyses of the official documents published by the future founders and “brother-parties” of the ICMLPO before 1994.

Concerning this, we conclude that the entirely neo-revisionist nature that exudes from each of those documents is very significant and clearly unmask the also
totally neo-revisionist, pro-bourgeois-capitalist and anti-communist character of the future ICMLPO. And relatively to the 1994 Quito Declaration and the other subsequent official documents of the ICMLPO? That’s what we will reflect about right now.

8.2. The Quito Declaration (1994)

The 1994 Quito Declaration can be considered as one of the most – if not the most – relevant and meaningful document ever published by the ICMLPO. It reveals a lot about this organization’s aims and nature, even because it is officially considered by its leaders as ICMLPO’s “foundation document” (in spite of all pre-1994 texts that we already analyzed…). Simultaneously with the foundation of the Comintern (SH) in 2000, we exposed the "Quito-Declaration" as a neo-revisionist declaration. And in our Programmatic Platform, we remarked:

“Already before the conference in Quito there were obvious tendencies by its organizers, to reduce our Marxist-Leninist struggle against modern revisionism. However the declaration of Quito itself became a document of anti-revisionist capitulation. The whole revolutionary spirit of comrade Enver Hoxha was buried in the declaration of Quito. Many years have gone since the declaration of Quito and it turned out to be an open door for reconciliation between revisionism and Marxism-Leninism. This led the movement of the ICMLPO into the arms of the revisionists, to degeneration and capitulation, to the estrangement from the former heroic goals of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha. Capitulation to the neo-revisionism is counter-revolutionary and means nothing other than subjection to the ideology of the class enemy. Right after the Quito declaration was published, we at first believed in cooperation for turning back to the old political general line of comrade Enver Hoxha.

However, the ICMLPO has not left its neo-revisionist line for decades, in the contrary. We proceed to openly unmask the opportunist leaders as traitors. From now on we openly fight against the ICMLPO as one of the dangerous bearers of the neo-revisionist world movement. We hold a mirror up to them, to remind them what they treated so shamefully, the glorious history of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of Comrade Enver Hoxha. Not we, the Comintern, have left Marxism-Leninism, but just this ICMLPO-Camp of former Marxist-Leninist parties and their henchmen. Unity with the opportunism is unity with the bourgeoisie, is the splitting in the international revolutionary working class.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Programmatic Platform, 2009, edition in English)
But even before the Comintern (SH) was founded, we provided our criticism against the Quito Declaration as early as 1999. However, we made our critique in that time "moderate" because of our tactical course for the purpose to convince upright Marxist-Leninists of re-organizing the Marxist-Leninist World Movement upon the principles of Stalinism-Hoxhaism. We wanted to undercut the neo-revisionist leaders of ICMLPO by smuggling us into that organization – without success. Until today, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, do not "exist" for the neo-revisionist ICMLPO. Today, 16 years later – we draw our sharp demarcation line without limited tactical considerations – ICMLPO is an anti-Stalinist-Hoxhaist organization – enemy of socialism and communism, enemy of the world proletariat!

In first place, after some empty phraseology about “workers”, and about bourgeois-sounding concepts like “democracy and freedom”, the neo-revisionist leaders of the ICMLPO strikingly affirm that:

“Everything that has occurred since the October Revolution of 1917 (...) the Chinese, Vietnamese and other revolutions (...) - all these confirm the Leninist thesis about the epoch in which we live. The fundamental contradictions remain as before.” (Documents of the ICMLPO, Quito Declaration, 1994, edition in English)

It is interesting to observe that, from all historical examples they could have chosen, the ICMLPO’ neo-revisionists managed to select precisely those who not only did not lead to socialism, but foremost constituted revisionist and even social-fascist deviations from it. The Chinese and Vietnamese “revolutions” have absolutely nothing to do with proletarian dictatorship, neither with socialism or communism. They were bourgeois revolutions who did not follow in the least Lenin’s path. Here it is the definition of Leninism:

“Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. More exactly: Leninism is the theory and tactic of the proletarian revolution in general and the theory and tactic of the dictatorship of the proletariat particularly.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), On The Occasion of the 80th Anniversary of the Comintern, 19 Theses, 1996-1999, edition in English)

Relatively to the supposed Chinese 1949 “revolution”, in our DWM, we have already unmasked its true character from a Stalinist-Hoxhaist point of view and concluded that it was and remains a bourgeois-capitalist revolution that not only entirely refused proletarian dictatorship from the very start in both theory and practice but, moreover, it greatly contributed to the replacement of the class rule of Chinese bourgeoisie compradore by that of the “national” bourgeoisie that would later transform its country into an imperialist superpower willing to exploit, oppress and colonize Chinese laborers and those of other nations as
much as any other imperialism. In the meantime, Chinese proletarians and workers were deceived by talking about alleged “Chinese socialism” that never existed, with Maoist revisionism playing a key-role in the entire process as one of the major instruments used by the new Chinese bourgeois class in power.

Therefore, it follows that Chinese “revolution” could have never anything to do with proletarian dictatorship, as socio-economic-political power in China was never in proletariat’s hands but only passed over from one part of the bourgeois class to another one. Nothing more than this. And from the moment it had never anything to do with proletarian dictatorship, it is clear that it could never have anything to do with Leninism, contrary to what the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists insinuate. We advise our readers to attentively read all the four parts of our DWM, because there we prove what we are stating here through historic documents, quotations from the Classics and scientific figures.

In what respects to the false Vietnamese “revolution”, it can be put side by side with any other bourgeois-revisionist “revolution” that eventually led its countries to social-fascism. In its essence, Vietnamese “revolution” is not different from Cuban and North Korean “revolutions”. They differ from Chinese revolution solely in that they were never able to transform its countries into imperialist superpowers, but remained instead as neo-colonies of world capitalist-imperialist system and bourgeois class due to the limited geographical and demographical (resources, workforce, etc.) dimensions of those relatively small countries compared to China.

In Vietnam’s particular case, its “revolution” has from the very beginning been influenced by Leduanist kind of revisionism. Leduanism, or Vietnamese revisionism, is named after Le Duan, who was General/First Secretary of the Vietnamese Workers Party (now the Vietnamese Communist Party) from 1960 until his death in 1986. The Proclamation of Independence of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam was written by comrade Ho Chi Minh on September 2, 1945 – after the defeat of the Japanese imperialists). And in July 1976 North and South Vietnam were unified into the so-called Socialist Republic of Vietnam on the basis of Leduanism.

Leduanism follows Maoism in denying and rejecting Marxism-Leninism, the strategy of working for the formation of a state which is a joint dictatorship of several classes, including the national bourgeoisie:

"Our Party guided the workers and peasants to establish a national united front with the bourgeoisie.” (Le Duan, Leninism and Vietnam's Revolution, in: On the Socialist Revolution in Vietnam, Volume 1, Hanoi, 1965, p. 34, edition in English)

So, according to Le Duan, all the “revolutionary classes” should collaborate in the “national united front”. But what does he means with “all the revolutionary
classes”? With this affirmation, Vietnamese revisionists are permitting that the revolutionary process can be guided by the national bourgeoisie, because in the context of a bourgeois-democratic revolution against feudalism and colonialism, the national patriotic bourgeoisie can perfectly be considered as a “revolutionary class”. What Le Duan is saying is that the proletariat should closely collaborate with the national bourgeoisie in the development of the supposed “socialist revolution”. To affirm that the proletariat should be dependent of the help of the bourgeoisie to open the path to socialism is a complete negation of the most basic Leninist principles. The truth is that the political power belongs to the class who controls the means of production and the productive relations which form the material base of society, and because of that, in the genuine proletarian dictatorship, the revolutionary proletarian classes will refuse to share the power with the bourgeoisie, no matter if it is with the reactionary bourgeoisie or with the “progressive” bourgeoisie. In an authentic proletarian dictatorship, the proletariat will never let the “progressive” bourgeoisie lead the revolution; indeed, the main task of the proletarian dictatorship is to eliminate the bourgeoisie not only as a class, but also to eliminate all its ideological and cultural influences, because there is no other way to assure the victory of socialism and communism. Le Duan seems to think that it’s positive for the proletariat to collaborate and to share the power with the “progressive” national bourgeoisie, and this means that, with the help of the Vietnamese revisionists, the bourgeoisie will continue to exist as a class. If the bourgeoisie will continue to exist as a class, then it will certainly control the means of production in a manner detrimental to the proletariat, it will still maintain political-socio-economic power in its hands!

Leduanism also follows Maoism in putting forward the program of the peaceful transition to socialism through state capitalism, by the formation, in cooperation with the national capitalists, of joint state-private enterprises. Participation in these, according to Leduanism, would transform the national capitalists into workers:

"The national bourgeoisie are willing to accept socialist transformation, therefore our Party’s policy is peacefully to transform capitalist trade and industry, gradually to transform capitalist ownership into socialist ownership, through State capitalism, and to transform the bourgeoisie from exploiters into genuine workers through ideological education and participation in productive labor.” (Le Duan, Leninism and Vietnam’s Revolution, in: On the Socialist Revolution in Vietnam, Volume 2, Hanoi, 1965, p. 39, edition in English)

Firstly, this statement is an example of the many aspects that Leduanism has in common with Maoism and Boukharinism. They support the idea of the “peaceful” integration and inclusion of capitalism and capitalist elements within socialism, it is based on the idea of the “joint government” of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in order to undermine the edification of socialism through
capitulation to bourgeois and non-proletarian influences and elements. They also advocate the presumption that the exploitative tendencies of the bourgeoisie can be gradually removed and that the bourgeois elements can be turned into inoffensive working elements “through ideological education and participation in productive labor”. Here comes the idea of the “reeducation of the bourgeoisie” which is so dear to Maoism and Leduanism. But the bourgeois class (either at a national or at a global scale) doesn’t exist to be educated. The lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism teach us that it never surrenders its power voluntarily and it exists to be exterminated by the proletariat through revolutionary violence! Lenin once said that the great problems of humanity were always solved through violence and this is foremost applicable to the elimination of the bourgeoisie, to the annihilation of the capitalist system and to the edification of socialism and communism. This capitulationism idea is closely related with the “theory” of the “peaceful transition” to socialism through bourgeois means; it is linked with the Eurocommunist and reformist idea of “humanizing” and “educating” capitalism. The image of the “civilized” capitalism is common to all revisionist currents and Leduanism, Maoism and their ICMLPO’s neo-revisionist supporters are no exception.

Secondly, comrade Enver and the Albanian Marxists-Leninists teach us that true socialist revolution and construction does not involve state capitalism:

“The essential fundament of Albanian nationalizations was the deeply revolutionary method through which they were accomplished: the method of total and immediate expropriation without providing capitalist owners any kind of indemnizations. (...) Thus, in Albania we did not resorted to transitory neither to intermediary stages and we also always refused state capitalism. Obviously, we firmly rejected any attempts of total or partial indemnization towards the capitalist owners (...). To indemnify them and to accept cooperation with them – under any form – would mean allowing them to use their money and their privileged positions in order to achieve monetary accumulation.” (Documents of the Party of Labor of Albania (PLA), Etudes politiques et sociales, translated from version in French language)

Anyway, in our DWM, we had already denounced the anti-communist and bourgeois character of these kind of positions, but it is very significant to note what kind of “revolutions” the neo-revisionists from the ICMLPO’s support. By eulogizing the Chinese / Maoist and Vietnamese / Leduanist revisionists, the ICMLPO is automatically and inevitably defending and embracing all their reactionary theories and practices, including the social-fascist repression that they launch against exploited and oppressed toiling classes in those countries. And needless to observe that they do not mention socialist Albania. So, they refuse to refer to the authentic socialist constructions of Leninist-Stalinist type, but they gladly praise bourgeois-revisionist and social-fascist false “revolutions” as being allegedly “proof of Lenin’s teachings”.
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In this Declaration, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists also affirm that “Communist parties are inalienable instruments to organize the revolution in all our countries”. But if the Marxist-Leninist parties are only to organize the revolution in their country this renders their work a purely national affair. However, communists are internationalists and the Marxist-Leninist parties are not exclusively national phenomena. To restrict and limit them to purely national boundaries means to affirm the inevitability of capitalist-imperialist-revisionist restoration at a global scale, because the only manner to avoid this is through world socialist revolution, world proletarian dictatorship, world socialism and world communism. The future international Bolshevik party can never be restricted to national definitions because from the moment that we adopt ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists’ positions and impose national limitations to the communist movement, we are automatically and necessarily denying all those things, and thus putting ourselves directly and irrevocably within the camp of world bourgeois class, of world capitalist-imperialist-revisionist exploitative, oppressive, repressive, wage slavagist system, perpetuating it and all evils inherent to it (war, fascism, colonialism, etc.).

And needless to observe that the neo-revisionists from the ICMLPO do not even remark the main contradiction between capital and labor (from which all the others are born), they only talk about unspecified “fundamental contradictions”.

Indeed, this is not the only occasion when the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists get unspecified. For example, in this Quito Declaration one can hardly find a word about the history of the communist movement from a genuine anti-revisionist perspective. Instead, we find some vague references to the URSS, to Eastern Europe and that’s all. Even when they mention revisionism and opportunism, they do their utmost to hide from workers the most essential issue: what were and are the causes of revisionism and opportunism? How did world bourgeois class use them to degenerate and then liquidate the Communist Internationals, Stalinist world camp and the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha? What must be done to prevent the inevitability of revisionism and opportunism? What kinds of revisionism and opportunism exist and what is the dimension of each one’s influence among the proletariat? These are solely a few questions to which the Quito Declaration should pose and should at least try to answer if it happened to be a truly Bolshevist statement. But that was never the case:

“6. The declaration of Quito speaks of “necessary people movements against this imperialistic war politics” and of the necessity to organize and support this peoples’ movement. We doubt that this is a sufficient and only way to oppose imperialist wars successfully. The slogans of Proletarian Internationalism against imperialist wars are combinations of:
1. Transmission into a civil war that consists of the armed struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, of expropriation of the capitalist class in the developed countries and;

2. Of democratic revolutions in the undeveloped countries.

7. The declaration talks of »alliances«. The world proletariat and the peoples ask: »With whom and not with whom and to what time? «There is no answer on this question. This is again a weakness of the declaration of Quito. The alliance with the poor peasants isn't mentioned at all. Even with kind regards we have to come to the conclusion that some tendencies of opportunism are present. We perceive uncertainty and indistinctness. The declaration of Quito avoids clear and irrevocable interrogative statements. Further weaknesses can be cited, but we confine ourselves to the above arguments. Our criticism of single parties which have signed this declaration will not be discussed here either.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), On The Occasion of the 80th Anniversary of the Comintern, 19 Theses, 1996-1999, edition in English)

Of course, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists did all this with very clear intentions of misleading workers, confusing them and thus contributing to keep world capitalist-imperialist system alive and well by keeping them away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. In fact, that’s why they openly refuse armed proletarian dictatorship (replacing with the “amazing” expression “peoples’ democratic forms of the dictatorship of the workers class”…) and why they don’t even mention comrade Enver a single time in their infamous Declaration. They don’t refer him, let alone recognizing him as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. In the previous sub-chapters of this article, we already described what are the causes and consequences of refusing violent proletarian dictatorship and of rejecting comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. We will only add that all this is quite understandable within the scope of the neo-revisionist nature and goals of the ICMLPO as lackey of global capitalist-imperialist order and as fierce enemy of future world communism.

8.3. The International Situation and the tasks assigned to the revolutionary proletarians (2013)

The characteristics and aspects that we noted in the 1994 Quito Declaration are also present in other documents of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists.

In this occasion, we will point out another text from them entitled “The International Situation and the tasks assigned to the revolutionary proletarians” from the year 2013, that is, a recent document.
When we analyze the mentioned article, amidst empty phraseology about “socialism”, “communism”, “the tasks of Marxists-Leninists and proletarian revolutionaries” and other phrases intended to deceive world proletariat and world workers, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists affirm their solidarity towards Cuban Castroist-Guevarist revisionism:

“USA imperialism and its allies (...) continue their blockade against Cuba.”
(Official Documents of the ICMLPO, La Situación Internacional y las Tareas de los revolucionarios proletarios, 2013, translated from Spanish language)

So, after having praised to the skies Maoist and Leduanist revisionisms in their wicked Quito Declaration, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists continue to do the same in their subsequent texts. This time, they reach the point of openly defending Cuban Castroist-Guevarist social-fascism while affirming to be “genuine Marxist-Leninists”. In our article “Down with Cuban revisionism!”, we have already explained the causes, development and consequences of this variety of revisionism which has brought so much damage to the cause of world proletariat, of world exploited and oppressed classes, of global socialism and communism. We will only refer that since the beginning, Cuban Castroist “revolution” had nothing to do with proletarian dictatorship, neither with socialism or communism.

Fidel Castro, Che Guevara and the other Cuban “revolutionaries” were the representatives of the “radical” section of the Cuban national bourgeoisie which wanted to occupy a more favorable place within the capitalist world market, an intention which was being thwarted by the ostensibly pro-American puppet regime of Batista supported by the bourgeoisie compradore and its American imperialist bosses. It is important to recall a very famous statement made by the Cuban revisionists during the late 50’s in which they affirmed that their social-fascist movement “is not communist nor capitalist, but humanist”. This declaration is so explicitly counter-revolutionary that it doesn’t even need our commentaries. It speaks for itself and says everything about the nature not only of the odious Cuban revisionism but also of all those fake “Marxist-Leninists” which, like the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists, always insisted and continue to insist that bourgeois-capitalist neo-colonial Cuba is a “socialist country”. Like comrade Enver correctly noted:

“The Latin-American peoples cherished many hopes, had many illusions, about the victory of the Cuban people, which became an inspiration and encouragement to them in their struggle to shake off the yoke of the local capitalist and landowner rulers and American imperialists. However, these hopes and this inspiration soon faded when they saw that Castroite Cuba was not developing on the road of socialism but on that of revisionist-type capitalism, and faded even more quickly when Cuba became the vassal and
mercenary of Soviet social-imperialism.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

In fact, shortly since its anti-socialist and bourgeois-capitalist “revolution” in 1959, Castroite Cuba had been a veritable colony of Soviet social-imperialism. Castroist Cuba supplied the Soviet Union and its other social-fascist satellites mainly with sugar and in return the Soviet social-imperialists literally submerged the country with their capitalist credits, turning Cuban economy into nothing more than a mere appendix of the Soviet economy, in what amounted to a typically colonialist relationship.

Soviet social-imperialists had total control over Castroist Cuba’s political and economic affairs and consequently, the only branches of the Cuban economy which were permitted to develop were the ones which could bring profits to the Soviet social-fascist bourgeoisie. Due to this, the capitalist-revisionist economic system that Castroist bourgeoisie imposed over Cuba was never able to totally recover from the disappearance of Soviet neo-colonialist empire, despite Cuba’s recent rapprochement to social-imperialist China. Of course, these facts are sufficient proof not only of the reactionary and pro-imperialist character of the Castroist regime, but also of those who – like the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists – try to depict social-fascist, neo-colonial Cuba as being some kind of “victim” of global imperialist “blockade”. This is entirely false. With this assertion, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists are treacherously attempting at presenting the blockade and embargo which has been faced by social-fascist and counter-revolutionary Castroist-Guevarist Cuba as supposed “proof” that it would represent a “different anti-capitalist system” (that is, socialism) in opposition to the one symbolized by American capitalist-imperialist bourgeoisie class. In truth, the purpose of American embargo and blockade against Cuba is not to destroy an allegedly “different social system”, because there are no substantial differences between Castroist capitalism and American capitalism. Its aim is to regain former absolute and exclusive colonial dominion over Cuba, is to install there a pro-American puppet regime entirely faithful to the interests and desires of American monopoly tycoons.

Indeed, despite US embargo, there were many American companies which were interested in investing in Cuba and in taking profits from the nation’s resources. However, American imperialist bourgeoisie class never agreed with the requests of Castroist bourgeoisie to put an end to its embargo against Cuba, which is maintained until nowadays. As we had already explained in this article, Castroist Cuba continued to face American embargo even after social-imperialist Soviet Union disappeared due to the fact that Castroist-Guevarist bourgeoisie class always refused American imperialists’ demands for recovering their former exclusive control over Cuba, as this would involve an acute risk of being quickly overthrown from power (we cannot forget that American imperialists keeps Cuban pro-American bourgeoisie compradore of Miami waiting for the first opportunity to expel Castroists from power).
Contrary to what the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists insinuate, the task of the authentic Marxists-Leninists nowadays is not to defend the interests of the Cuban Castroist-Guevarist anti-communist and pro-imperialist regime, but to support the Cuban toiling classes, which are being oppressed and exploited by the social-fascist Cuban bourgeoisie, with the aim of helping them to understand that the only way to defeat Castroist reactionary tyranny is through violent socialist revolution, is through the establishment of the armed proletarian dictatorship which will open the path towards classless, propertyless and stateless communist society not only in Cuba but all over the world.

We must realize that it is perfectly comprehensible that the neo-revisionists from ICMLPO strongly eulogize revisionist, social-fascist, neo-colonial, pro-imperialist Cuba in their anti-socialist documents. After all, they and Castroist revisionists share the same reactionary opinions and stands. They are ideological twins. Both try to mislead the working classes through the use of “revolutionary” and “progressive” phraseology which serves as a disguise to their perverse purposes of perpetuating the imperialist system which slaughters and represses the world proletariat in favor of the capitalist profit maximization and also both fervently embrace bourgeois anti-communism.

Furthermore, in the 2013 article that we are reflecting about, we can also notice that the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists behave as lackeys and supporters of the new imperialist and social-imperialist powers like Russia, China, Brazil, South Africa, etc. through explicitly hiding their imperialist exploitative nature. In their document they state that:

“Since some time ago that Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa have formed the group pf BRICS. (...) The economic strength of Russia and China has emerged.” (Documents of the ICMLPO, *La Situación Internacional y las Tareas de los revolucionarios proletarios*, 2013, translated from Spanish language)

This is everything they have to say about the new imperialist powers and superpowers that are rivalling with the Western “traditional” ones for absolute and complete dominance over the world’s resources and workforce in order to attain maximum profits – like inevitably occurs with any kind of imperialism. In particular, Chinese social-imperialism (whose origins can be found in Maoist revisionism) is nowadays reaching a global scale and is on the verge of replacing U.S.A as the world dominant imperialist superpower.

These positions from the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists are intended to support the tactic practiced by the new emergent imperialisms – Brazil, China, India, South Africa, Russia, etc… – which are trying to depict themselves as “progressive”, “democratic” and even “socialist”, as opposing to the old traditional imperialist powers in decline, which are “colonialist” and “reactionary”. Needless to say that this “theory” is ridiculous. As we have already explained in the beginning of this
text, all kinds of imperialism are invariably anti-democratic, reactionary and anti-socialist (indeed, anti-socialism is something inherent to imperialism because the very essence of imperialism is the total and complete negation of socialism in all senses). It is important to underline this because, due also to the propaganda of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists, many workers regard emergent imperialisms as being “progressive”, as not having imperialist pretensions in the more “traditional” sense of the term. On the contrary, they try to spread the image of being some kind of benefactor of the other peoples, a benefactor which would use its geographical dimensions, demographical capacities and natural resources to “protect” them against old American and European imperialisms. The imperialist procedures of the new emergent powers are as bloody, oppressive, tyrannical and exploitative as that of the old traditional imperialist powers, with the difference that the strategy of the new imperialist bourgeoisie can be more deceitful and treacherous than that of the old traditional ones.

Indeed, we can affirm that to hide the inherently exploitative, oppressive, repressive and imperialist nature of the new emergent powers in order to advance the interests of their dominant bourgeoisie class constitutes one of the major characteristics of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists. Here we note one more similarity between them and the Maoist revisionists. Just like these invented the “three world theory” (whose nature and aims we unmasked in our DWM and in other articles) the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists promote the “North-South theory”. This theory has nothing to do with geographical notions, but it was put forward by the new emergent imperialist powers to mislead the world workers, fabricating an opposition between the “South”, which is allegedly composed by “anti-imperialist” and “progressive” nations; and the “North”, which is purportedly composed by the old “imperialist” and “reactionary” states. Of course, this entire scheme was conceived in order to include the new imperialist bourgeoisie in the “democratic”, “progressive” and “anti-imperialist” South, but what we must underline is the manner in which this “North-South concept” tries to overlook the existence of exploiters in the “South” and of exploiters in the “North”. Everything happens as if the “South” includes all the exploited and oppressed and as if the “North” includes all the exploiters and oppressors. Obviously, this is totally false. This division of the world between a supposedly “anti-imperialist South” and a supposedly imperialist “North” is completely fabricated. In the countries included in this “South” there are exploiters and exploited, just like occurs in the countries included in the “North”. Indeed, the efforts made by the new emergent bourgeoisie of the “South” in order to inculcate this anti-socialist concept in the minds of the proletarians are an admission of the fact that this “North-South theory” only serves to cover their predatory imperialist policies with a “progressive” and even “anti-imperialist” mask in order to put workers off their guard and therefore facilitate the imposition of their oppressive and wage enslaving neo-colonialist rule to the entire world. That’s why it is so dangerous and that is why its embracing completely reveals the neo-revisionist ICMLPO’s entirely anti-communist, pro-imperialist and pro-colonialist character.
Once more, it is never too much to highlight that, contrary to what the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists affirm, all types of imperialism without exception share the same characteristics and objectives, irrespective of distinct dimensions and eventual misleading cloaks. Indeed, we can affirm that all imperialism have fundamentally similar exploitative purposes, notwithstanding the secondary differences arising from the circumstances in which each imperialism developed (for example, a neo-imperialist power will use different methods and tactics from those utilized by more “traditional” imperialism, but, once more, imperialism’s oppressive and rapacious objectives are common to both). It is very important to bear this in mind because the emergent imperialisms like the ones mentioned above are doing their utmost to depict themselves as being supposedly “different” from the “traditional tyrannical” imperialism, as being allegedly “progressive” and “democratic”. And like we have the opportunity to observe, they count with their neo-revisionist servants from the ICMLPO to help them spreading this lie in order to deceive world proletarians and to keep them away from authentic world socialist revolution, world armed proletarian dictatorship, world socialism and world communism based on the invincible teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

8.4. About Women’s Work (October, 2014)

Shortly after having published the text we analyzed in previous sub-chapter, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists authored another one, this time relatively to their supposed “work among feminine masses”. This text is from October, 2014, it is very recent. In it we can find the usual anti-communist and reactionary stands.

In first place, they falsely pretend to “defend the accomplishments of feminine movement”, but they don’t even mention a single time comrade Enver’s socialist Albania, where working women enjoyed true freedom and were moving fast towards their total emancipation within the frame of proletarian dictatorship. The Union of Albanian Women (UAW), an association dependent on the PLA, united and organized Albanian women as one of the most revolutionary and powerful forces at the service of socialist construction in the country, preparing them as a valiant detachment against internal and external class enemies. Comrade Enver always clearly and correctly remarked that:

“Our Party has always given very great importance to the problem of women, this exceptionally big social problem with which the destiny of our people, socialism and communism and the future of our country are linked. The problems of women are not peculiar, in the sense of specific, separate and isolated from the other problems of society, are not easily solved problems that can be taken lightly, or, even worse, ignored. The problem of
women is not just a problem of sentiments and, hence, to be treated in a sentimental and romantic way.

It is a major problem of life, of the dialectical materialist development of the history of mankind. That is why Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and all their disciples have given first-rate importance to the problem of women, to their liberation and emancipation, to the formation of their personality in a free society, without oppressors and exploiters. Far from ever neglecting or underrating the problem of the Albanian woman, our Party, throughout its whole struggle and in every aspect of its struggle, has taken special care to stress, and not in a sentimental way, the great role of women, both in the war for liberation and in the struggle for the construction of socialism.” (Enver Hoxha, *On Some Aspects of the Problem of Albanian Women*, 1967, in: *Selected Works*, Volume IV, 1982, edition in English)

But the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists despise and rejected all this. After all, they refuse comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, there is nothing surprising in these positions from them concerning the struggle of Albanian working women.

In fact, everything related to authentic socialist struggle and genuine Bolshevism causes “allergy” to the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists. Instead, they prefer to provide us with statements like this:

“We must accomplish unity between women coming from different classes (...) we cannot divide feminine movement.” (Documents of the ICMLPO, *Sobre el Trabajo de las Mujeres*, October, 2014, translated from Spanish language)

So, we can observe that the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists are already explicitly advocating union between “women from different classes” as an open mean to keep bourgeois-capitalist feminist movement unbothered and quiet. This position is so counter-revolutionary and anti-proletarian that we don’t know where to start criticizing it. The ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists seem to “forget” that all oppressive classes in general and world bourgeois class in particular also include women among its willing members. These women must be considered as exploitative elements exactly like men from the same class. We can never use the fact that they are from the feminine gender to justify or to “overlook” the fact that they are class enemies of the world proletariat, they are class enemies of global proletarian dictatorship, of world socialism and world communism. The priority factor is always class and never gender, ethnic origins, etc.

The ICMLPO unmask its petty bourgeois character also in the question of women: The petty bourgeoisie fears both the power of proletarian and bourgeois women just as the petty bourgeoisie fears the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Both classes deprive the existence of the petty
bourgeoisie. So they neither want to be subordinated under the movement of the proletarian nor under that of the bourgeois women. The re-conciliatory so called “unity of women independent of different class affiliation” is therefore obviously in the interest of maintaining the position of the petty bourgeoisie. The ICMLPO is both against the rule of the women of the proletarian class and of the bourgeois class, because both powers cut back the position of the women of the petty bourgeoisie which they defend. The petty bourgeoisie always tried to support such balance of classes: “neutralized”, “peaceful coexistence” between proletariat and bourgeoisie is one of the means for the survival of the petty bourgeoisie as a class. Without the liberation of the proletarian women there is no liberation of the proletariat and all the other toilers. Hegemony of the proletarian women is integral part of the hegemony of the proletariat. Those who deny the hegemony of the proletarian women in particular, deny the hegemony of the proletariat in general, especially as the petty bourgeoisie does.

But if we follow ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists and promote the formation of a supposed “unity” between proletarian / working women and bourgeois women what will happen? It will happen no different thing from which occurs with the alleged “unity” between the proletariat and the bourgeois class that is proposed by revisionists of all kinds and about which we already reflected in this article: if the bourgeoisie is allowed to continue to exist as a class, then it will continue to hold the major means of production in its hands, to oppress and exploit the working classes and to exercise its heavy ideological influence over laborers keeping them away from MLSH. This issue is very closely linked with the denial of proletarian leadership in the revolution in favor of “unity” with the bourgeois class. Indeed, if we don’t totally annihilate the bourgeois class together with all its forces and influences and we don’t firmly establish the leadership role that must always, inevitably and necessarily belong to the proletariat class (both to its masculine and feminine members), which is the world’s only consistently revolutionary class, during the entire revolutionary process from the preparation of socialist revolution until the final victory of communist society, our triumph will be impossible. It is therefore indispensable to annihilate without mercy ALL oppressive and exploitative classes (the imperialist bourgeoisie, the great land owners, the petty-bourgeoisie, the reactionary bourgeoisie, the “progressive” bourgeoisie etc. etc…). Moreover, through denying the leading role of the proletariat and replacing it with alleged “unity” between the exploitative bourgeoisie and the exploited proletariat (two classes with irreconcilable interests), the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists are also rejecting that in the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there can be only one party: the proletarian party, the vanguard party of the working class which is leading the oppressed masses towards socialism and communism. After the establishment and consolidation of the proletarian power, it’s illogical and reactionary to admit and defend the existence of any other parties representing non-proletarian classes. The proletarian party must lead the exploited classes and it constitutes one of the main instruments through which the proletariat exercises the revolutionary armed violence against the bourgeois and oppressive classes. That’s why nearly all
kinds of reactionary currents (including the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists) deny the leading role of the proletarian and communist party. It is very interesting to observe how the Marxist-Leninist conceptions of Comrade Enver Hoxha regarding the leading role of the proletariat and of the Bolshevist proletarian party of Leninist-Stalinist type are in total contrast with those of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists:

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

Therefore, the leading role in the proletarian revolution should always belong to the proletariat. If the revolution is not led by the proletariat that means that the revolution has not a Marxist-Leninist and communist character, even because this repudiation of the leading role of the proletarian class leads directly to the negation of the necessity of the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Indeed, these notions are intimately related with the bourgeois-revisionist-voluntarist theories of “letting the masses liberate themselves”, supposedly with the objective of “avoiding bureaucratic deviations”. This “theory” is embraced by all those who, like the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists, don’t accept what they call “socialism imposed from above”, or in other words, which don’t accept the leading role of the communist party as the vanguard of the proletariat in alliance with the other exploited classes.

Anyone who denies the leading role of the proletariat in the socialist revolution is anti-communist, it is pro-bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist and must be implacably fought, and the truth is that Maoism rejected the leading role of the proletariat both in theory and in practice. Indeed, it would always be impossible to speak about the defense of the leading role of the proletariat in an organization like the ICMLPO, whose neo-revisionist nature is obvious, which refuses to recognize comrade Enver Hoxha as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, which denies the necessity of the Comintern and of a genuinely Bolshevik party and which consequently promotes the perpetuation of the enslaving capitalist-imperialist exploitative and oppressive global system and tries to keep world proletariat from accomplishing victorious world violent socialist revolution, world armed proletarian dictatorship, world socialism and world communism. In these conditions, it is crystal clear that the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists could only inevitably support the bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist “feminist movement” whose purpose is to precisely to maintain proletarian women from all over the world away from the MLSH path, the only path to their authentic liberation from all kinds of oppressions and exploitations. And by doing this, it and its
ICMLPO’s neo-revisionist defenders gravely jeopardize the emancipation of world proletariat as a whole, because masculine proletariat can never be entirely free as long as repression and enslavement persists among feminine proletariat and vice-versa.

8.5. About People’s Fronts (October, 2014)

Another recent document from the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists is the one about so-called “people’s fronts”. If there were still doubts about the anti-socialist and opportunist nature of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists, this text provides us with the final answer.

When we read, we understand that, in this occasion, we really don’t need to dedicate ourselves to complex interpretative exercises neither to comparisons between ICMLPO and other revisionist and neo-revisionist branches. This time, we are safeguarded from all this. And why? Due to a very simple reason: in the document above mentioned, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists declare openly their own character by explicitly announcing their support and defense of Dimitrov’s revisionism. Amidst the ridiculous “warnings against leftism, dogmatism and sectarianism” which are so usual among rightist opportunists, they shamelessly affirm that:

“In his report to the VII Congress of the Comintern (1935), Dimitrov insisted in the urgent necessity of formation of popular fronts against nazi-fascist emergence (...). This report, in spite of the years gone by and the events that subsequently occurred, it is of great importance and can serve as general guidance for our parties. The immense validity and relevance of Dimitrov’s report is undoubtable. (...) We must defend it (...) Dimitrov is one of the greatest communist leaders.” (Documents of the ICMLPO, Sobre Los Frentes Populares, October, 2014, translated from Spanish language)

In first place, it is very interesting to note the prompt willingness of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists to qualify rightist opportunist Dimitrov as “one of the greatest communist leaders”. So, comrade Enver Hoxha is not even mentioned in their documents, they not only refuse to recognize it as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, in fact, they also barely recognize that socialist Albania existed. Enver’s immeasurable theoretical legacy and PLA’s practical teachings are completely despised and ignored by the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists. However, they are always ready and happy to dedicate whole documents to eulogize Dimitrov’s revisionist “united front theories” whose counter-revolutionary and even pro-fascist nature we have already concluded in the sub-chapter 7 of this article and equally in other official texts from the
Comintern (SH). Indeed, these positions from ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists are far from being “exceptions” but constitute instead a truly constant and permanent ideological line from them.

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, have always done our utmost to call the attention of all exploited and oppressed classes in general and of world proletariat in particular to the ultra-opportunist nature of Dimitrov’s “theories”. For example, in our General-Line we remark that:

“Everybody knows the bitter historical results of the so called "Popular Front" of Dimitrov. The bourgeoisie needed the revisionist concept of the Popular Front for the purpose to prevent the proletariat from overthrowing the bourgeoisie and to acquire political power by means if its revolutionary anti-fascist united front. Without the revisionists, the bourgeoisie would not be in a position to exercise significant influence over the working masses. And so the anti-fascist united front of the revolutionary proletarians were cheated by the revisionists. Dimitrov concealed this truth at the Seventh World Congress, and for that reason we criticize the VII World Congress. We communists will never forget that the workers came from the rain (= fascism) to worse (= social fascism). This was a double crime against the working class! (…) Hitler's fascism was not the last fascism, in particular, and fascism will be restored unavoidably, in general, if the proletariat would furthermore follow the revisionist "anti-fascist" united front tactics of Dimitrov. To eliminate Nazism, one would have to eliminate the German imperialism. Stalin brought the Hitler-Fascists to their knees with socialist weapons and thus created excellent conditions for the destruction of the German imperialism. (…) The social-fascism of the modern revisionists was not the last social fascism, and will not be the last social-fascism, if the world proletariat would follow furthermore the class-reconciliatory line of Dimitrov. In order to prevent social-fascism, the revolutionary proletariat had to overthrow the revisionist Cliques in their countries by means of the socialist revolution - namely under the leadership of a truly Bolshevik Party.

The Stalinist-Hoxhaist restoration of the dictatorship of the proletariat is now on the agenda of the anti-fascist united front of the world proletariat. The fatal experience of the fusion of social democracy and modern revisionists in the past has shown that there can be no unity or fusion with the neo-revisionists at present and in future. Those who want to form a world-front of anti-fascism together with the revisionists and neo-revisionists (let alone the "united front" with social-fascist states!), will never be able to abolish world capitalism and its replacement by world socialism. That is the Stalinist-Hoxhaist lesson of the betrayal of Dimitrov.”[General-Line of the Comintern (SH), Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement, Chapter VIII, 2001, edition in English]

And even within the ranks of the former Marxist-Leninist Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, it was noted that:
“Moreover, even if we rely solely on the arguments that have been published, the Resolution of the Presidium and the final communique signed by Dimitrov clearly reveal already loomed rightist positions. It was a vindication of positions which later led to the degeneration of most parties, including of the CPSU (B). (...) It is certain that revisionism and opportunism did not only arise after the death of Stalin, as some affirm in a simplistic form. And those who could explain something more are unable to do so because they have their own betrayal to conceal.” (Documents of the Marxist-Leninist Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, PCEML, 1984, translated from German language)

Dimitrov’s revisionism was also responsible for the annihilation of the glorious Comintern and also of RILU (two organizations whose structure, functions and objectives make them absolutely crucial for the very existence of the communist movement) that had been established and whose Bolshevization had been fostered by comrades Lenin and Stalin themselves. This was an enormous victory for world bourgeois class and for its fascist and social-democratic (social-fascist) lackeys – who gained free reign to infiltrate their bourgeois reactionary influences within the ranks of the proletariat thanks to Dimitrov’s 1935 report’s elimination of the correct Stalinist thesis of fascism and social-democracy (social-fascism) as being ideological twins that had prevented that situation until that moment. And the dire consequences brought by Dimitrov’s opportunism at that time (when we were still in the first stage of socialism “in a single country”) are still present nowadays despite substantial differences resulting from globalization and the entrance in the second stage of world socialism:

“This day, the bourgeoisie is engaged in the restoration of fascism against the insurgent exploited classes (...). The restoration of fascism and the globalization of war and fascism by the world bourgeoisie must be combated by a new global front of anti-fascism - as a powerful lever for the socialist, proletarian world revolution. Hitler fascism is still alive because of German imperialism has survived. The imperialist world order developed new covert and overt forms of fascism. (...) Just as capitalism evolves into world capitalism, fascism also evolves into world fascism. Accordingly, the anti-fascism evolves into anti-world-fascism. Just as fascism emanated from nationalist roots, world fascism emanates from roots of the bourgeois world order.

Crucial for the anti-fascist struggle in the present conditions of globalization that is the trend of globalized fascism. This trend developed towards a dominant trend. The social-fascist elements of the Social Democratism and revisionism, and also that of the eco-fascism, they all together pave the way towards world fascism with the intention to save the capitalist world order from ruin - against the uprising of the world proletariat and the toiling masses. Fascism is the outmost emergency brake to stop the socialist world revolution. (...) Anti-fascists and anti-imperialists! Turn away from the path
of the VII World Congress! No fooling pacts with the bourgeoisie! Forward with the socialist world revolution!

The elimination of the inevitability of social fascism begins with the destruction of the influence of revisionism in one's own country and this struggle is finally completed on a world scale through the victory of the socialist world revolution. The era of revisionism in power ends as an epoch of social fascism in power. Fascism differs from social fascism only in its open and hidden form - in essence they are the same. It goes without saying that the Comintern (SH) - conditioned by globalized character of fascism - will have a far greater importance than the Comintern in the fight against Nazism. Suffice it to say that, today, we have additionally to cope with social-fascist states which were not yet the case at the time of the Comintern. The elimination of the inevitability of world fascism thus requires an anti-fascist struggle of a more complex global type, of a powerful lever of world socialist revolution. To eliminate the inevitability of the social-fascist ideology, i.e., particular its spread throughout the world, means last not least to destroy the inevitability of the ideology of neo-revisionism on a world scale. So if one does not want to learn from the mistakes of the VII World Congress, then one will inevitably go the bourgeois way, the capitalist road, will perish, so as the Comintern of Dimitrov perished.” [General-Line of the Comintern (SH), Historical teachings of the Comintern and of the Communist World Movement, Chapter VIII, 2001, edition in English]

Moreover, the neo-revisionist ICMLPO and its predecessors were and are indeed also among the worst enemies of the Comintern and the organizational concept of the Bolshevist world party. In our documents expressing the lessons taken from our experiences in the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, we noted relatively to those neo-revisionist leaders and forces that created the infamous “Quito Declaration” that:

“The opportunist leaders promise solemnly the redemption by the 'Promised Land'. These leaders wait and pray, they pray and wait, but they cannot answer to the question of a worker, where this ‘Promised land’ shall come from? And so they withdraw themselves to the capitulationist incantation: 'Mind your own socialism!' Is this constructive internationalism? Is this the formula for a strong world-revolutionary movement? The opportunists are fighting a losing battle as long as they do not throw away the wrong formula, that basis and lever of world revolution would forever remain in the hands of socialism in 'a' country!

The leftovers of the old parties of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement repress their memories about the heroic role of the Marxist-Leninist party in their country in times of comrade Enver Hoxha. In fact, their opportunist 'era' began with the 'world-centre of Quito'.
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Their opportunist leaders see the world with the eyes of their own interests. They organize regularly 'international conferences' and publish an organ with articles of common interests. In their own central organs they give regularly informations about the associated organizations. However, they play their cards close to the chest. They know to turn down the heat if too many contradictions among themselves are threatening to boil up.

Some hide their “communist” flag more, and less the others. They all keep the socialist revolution rather in the background. They bind forces at inner affairs of the country to withdrawn them from the necessary global class struggle of the world proletariat. So they really do not need any Communist International who struggles for world-socialism instead of socialism in 'their own' country.

Vice versa: The Communist International cannot lead global class struggle with such kinds of nationally orientated group-autonimism. This way the victory of the world-revolution is impossible.

The Communist International – on her part – expresses the overall interests of the revolutionary world proletariat and shall force these groupings to assume a defensive position of their own interests. These groupings don't let themselves be 'monopolized' by the Communist International. They want to resists the 'competing' role of the Communist International. They better prefer reconciliation with the revisionists in their own country than to be 'subdued' by a world organization 'from outside' which would be head and shoulder above them.

All this is expression of petty-bourgeois class-character, is capitulation, is betrayal at the interests of the proletariat in their own countries and moreover betrayal at the global class-interests of the world proletariat, and all this is not far away from 'autonomy' of Maoism. Today, the world-proletariat needs only such kinds of Communist parties in the countries who unconditionally serve the world revolution in first line by placing their own proletarian divisions to the proposal of the proletarian world army.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), Programmatic Platform, 2009, edition in English)

In first place, true defenders of a world party of Bolshevist type never waver in supporting struggle against all kinds of revisionism and neo-revisionism, even when it comes from an unexpected source. But when Ramiz Alia and his clique started to restore capitalism in Albania, liquidating proletarian dictatorship in the country and betraying comrade Enver’s immortal path and invincible teachings, the future ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists praised him to the skies without stint:

“Recently, our party and all Marxist-Leninists we celebrated the 80th anniversary of the birth of Enver Hoxha, his epic national liberation
struggle and the construction of socialism in Albania, his defence and enrichment of Marxism-Leninism, and the struggles of the Marxist-Leninist parties and progressive forces around the world. This reminds us once again that Socialist Albania is a living example of Marxism-Leninism, and that its people and Party, led by Comrade Ramiz Alia, are marching forward without departing from the path set by Enver Hoxha. This gives us an example and inspires all peoples fighting for their rights and freedom, for independence and the victory of the revolution and socialism, which is the centre of our movement and great support for our Marxist-Leninist parties and peoples in struggle all over the world.” (Vanguardia Obrera, V Congreso, 1988, translated from Spanish language)

At the beginning, even honest communists were misled by Ramiz Alia and its falsely “Hoxhaist” phraseology. But with time, Alia’s clique true pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist neo-revisionist nature became more and more evident and authentic comrades could not help but starting to fight against it. But the future founders of the ICMLPO didn’t do that. They never unmasked Alia’s clique seriously and correctly, even because they were and are ideological twins with it in all aspects.

Another evidence of the future founders of the ICMLPO’s total despise for everything having to do with a genuine world party of authentic Bolshevist party is their opportunist proposals of alliances irrespectively of any true proletarian principles. Indeed, a correct strategy and tactics of alliances constitutes one of the aspects which distinguish a genuine party of Leninist-Stalinist kind from all the revisionist, neo-revisionist and opportunist garbage “parties”. But this is what those neo-revisionists affirm about their strategy and tactics of alliances:

“We have shown with this tribute to the victims of Francoism that we are not sectarian and that at all times we respected our word, and the coalitions and compromises we called involving all anti-fascist forces without exception and without any impositions.” (Vanguardia Obrera, Intervención de Raoul Marco, 1988, translated from Spanish language)

This quotation was taken from an occasion in what the neo-revisionists of the PCE / ML called for the formation of a supposed “anti-fascist” coalition composed of the “victims of the Francoist regime without exception and without any kind of impositions”.

This “anti-fascist coalition without exceptions” reminds us of the sadly famous revisionist “united front theories” of Dimitrov which also defended “anti-fascist unity” irrespective of irreconcilable class interests and which opened the path to the liquidation of the glorious Comintern of Lenin and Stalin, to the coming to power of modern revisionists, and to the annihilation of the Stalinist world camp in favor of the exploitative and oppressive interests of world bourgeois class and of its exploitative and oppressive capitalist-imperialist system. And the origins of
this enormous step back for the world proletariat, for world socialist revolution and for world communism can be found precisely in such revisionist, opportunist and social-fascist “theories” from Dimitrov that the neo-revisionists from the ICMLPO and its “parties” insist in reviving, as they serve to mislead and deceive world exploited and oppressed workers and keep them away from the path of MLSH, the only one which is able to ensure their total liberation from wage slavery.

The Dimitrov’s ultra-opportunist report from which his infamous opportunist “united front theories” appeared first emerged in a very difficult moment for the communist movement. In 1935, fascism was dangerously spread in Europe and the Soviet Marxist-Leninists knew that, due to fascism’s own nature, it would be only a question of time before the nazi-fascist imperialist powers launched a potent military attack against the USSR, as indeed happened. Dimitrov’s ultra-opportunist report defended the alliance between the revolutionary communist parties and the other bourgeois “anti-fascist” forces with the alleged purpose of preventing fascism from expanding even more.

In first place, the ways through which Dimitrov defends that the objective of “preventing fascism” should be accomplished are highly questionable because, let us repeat, fascism is a direct product of capitalism and it will never be totally and irreversibly defeated as long as the capitalist-imperialist system exists. Therefore, the bourgeois and pro-capitalist forces with which Dimitrov proposes that the communist parties should ally are of the same nature of fascism itself; those bourgeois forces and fascism derive from capitalism. Concluding, Dimitrov argues that the communist parties should rely on forces which, despite their fake “anti-fascist” phraseology, are at the service of the same social-economical system which created fascism in order to struggle against that same fascism! The least that we can say is that it does not make any sense, because we are dealing here with class interests which are totally and inevitably irreconcilable, as the class interests of the bourgeois class and of the proletariat / working classes are in complete and unsolvable contradiction among them.

If fascism, which is an instrument used by bourgeois class to continue and keep alive its exploitative and oppressive reign by all means, results directly from the bourgeois-capitalist system, the logical solution would be that, in order to wage an efficient combat against fascism, communist parties should struggle against all forces and influences which are related to the economical and ideological system which gave birth to fascism. Of course that this solution is totally incompatible with Dimitrov’s “suggestions” of coalition between the revolutionary communist parties of the authentic Bolshevik type and the pro-bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist forces which auto-qualified as “anti-fascist” with the objective of deceiving the oppressed and exploited proletariat about the true class character of fascism.
Unsurprisingly, the practical application of the conclusions of the Dimitrov’s report caused some of the worst anti-socialist deviations that occurred in a great number of communist parties and eventually led them to revisionism, not to speak of the fact that since the Congress of 1935 the Dimitrov’s report has become one of the main “arguments” used by the revisionists to “confirm” their opportunist theories. In fact, Dimitrov’s anti-socialist positions (which negated the essential independence which must exist between the proletarian party and the petty-bourgeois forces) are commonly utilized by all kinds of revisionists, and it is very interesting to see that the same future ICMLPO neo-revisionists that eulogize Ramiz Alia’s counter-revolutionary clique equally support Dimitrov’s reactionary “united front tactics”. This because both are inextricably linked with each other:

“Ramiz Alia has eliminated the anti-revisionist struggle and turned him into an anti-Marxist-Leninist struggle, has gone on the same path that Dimitrov had gone on the VII. World Congress of the Communist International [Dimitrov's thesis of "guaranteed" victory of socialism in the Soviet Union is directly related to the thesis of Ramiz Alia of "guaranteed" victory over revisionism].

What is true for the victory of socialism in one country - that it is only ensured by the complete victory of socialism on a world scale - also applies for the victory over revisionism in a country – it is only ensured by the definitive victory over the restoration of capitalism on a world scale!! Here the revisionist “theories” and “thesis” of Dimitrov are closely related with those of Ramiz Alia!!” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), 50 Years in struggle against modern revisionism" - 1956-2006, edition in English)

And there is more:

“The modern revisionists celebrated and still celebrate the capitulation of Dimitrov and the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern as THEIR anti-Stalinist "victory", as the beginning of the end of the glorious Comintern of Lenin and Stalin. (...) 

Based on the theory of social-fascism, the Comintern tried to push back the bourgeois influence in the working class. This was the only way to overcome the split of the working class. And precisely because of this, the Comintern was accused by all its enemies, namely to be (by itself) "responsible for the split of the working class and consequently for the seizure of fascism".

Dimitrov and the VII. World Congress did not resist this increasing pressure on the part of the social-democracy against the Comintern. They discarded the thesis of social-fascism and violated thus the decisions of the VI. World Congress. This was a heavy betrayal at the Comintern. Thus, the Marxist-Leninist, proletarian united front-strategy of the Comintern was
abandoned. This was replaced by an opportunistic bloc with the Social-Democrats, thus by a bourgeois popular front-strategy.

Those comrades who defended instead the Marxist-Leninist principles of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, those comrades who defended the establishment of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist world revolution etc. - they were all removed as "sectarians". (Documents of the Comintern (SH), General-Line, chapter VIII, 2013, edition in English)

And as we can observe in the PCE / ML’s quotation from above, exactly like occurred with Dimitrov, also that party’s neo-revisionist leaders have nightmares about being called “dogmatists” and / or “sectarians” by bourgeois-capitalist forces and so they shamelessly surrendered to them by proclaiming not to be “sectarians” and offering as proof of this their prompt throwing of any remnants of Bolshevist principles overboard by calling “an anti-fascist front without exceptions” in the best old Dimitrov’s style.

So, in deeds, those future ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists staunchly defend this “united front theories and tactics” which was responsible for the strengthening of fascism, for the liquidation of the glorious Comintern of Lenin and Stalin and, of course, for the de facto annihilation of what would be the best model available for the future Bolshevist world party: the Communist Party of Soviet Union (Bolshevist) – CPSU (B). With this, they clearly reveal themselves once more as being among the worst enemies of the Comintern and of the concept of Bolshevist world party and display their ugly pro-bourgeois-capitalist and anti-communist face.

8.6. Declaration of the XX Plenum of the ICMLPO (November, 2014)

Finally, it is now time to analyze the most recent document from the ICMLPO that we have: the Declaration of the XX Plenum of the ICMLPO of November, 2014.

When reading it, we must admit that the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists did well their misleading job. In this also resides their abhorrent opportunism: they take advantage of their past affiliation with the Marxist-Leninist World Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha in order to cover themselves with “red” colors that make their unmasking more difficult than that of other revisionist branches, thus deceiving world proletariat and other exploited and oppressed classes much better. And with this, they pay enormous favors to the world bourgeois class, as they help keeping world capitalist-imperialist exploitative, oppressive and enslaving system alive while detaching workers from the only path that could
definitely and totally emancipate them: the MLSH path, the path of the 5 Classic of Marxism-Leninism.

Particularly concerning their “Declaration of the XX Plenum”, they vomit an entire array of apparently correct “Bolshevist” “Marxist-Leninist” and “communist” slogans, directives and general phraseology. The reactionary and anti-socialist nature of the ICMLPO can only be perceived if one looks at the entire picture not only of their texts, but also of their actions and practical positions since even before its existence. That’s what we have been trying to do in this article.

However, even in this “Declaration of the XX Plenum”, it is possible to note at least one concrete sign of ICMLPO’s ultra-opportunism and counter-revolutionary stand. Such is the case of its open and explicit eulogizing of Chavism:

“The socio-economic measures taken by Chavez’ governments have always been significant in benefit of the people (...). After Chavez physical disappearance, his successors are now facing an aggressive campaign of destabilization promoted by reaction and by USA imperialism.” (Documents of the ICMLPO, Declaración de la XX Plenaria de la ICMLPO, November, 2014, translated from Spanish language)

This statement could perfectly have been uttered by one of those Chavist social-fascist ministers that are nowadays exploiting and oppressing Venezuelan proletariat and workers to the bone in favor of the interests of the section of Venezuelan bourgeois class that is presently selling its country to Chinese social-imperialism. Instead, it was published by their ideological twins: the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists. And we must take into consideration that the Declaration of the XX Plenum that includes these assertions has been officially signed by the so-called “Communist” Party of Venezuela (Marxist-Leninist)! Of course, it is totally obvious that such party is “communist” and “Marxist-Leninist” only in name (exactly like happens with all other ICMLPO’s “brother-parties”, by the way…).

Chavist social-fascist and anti-communist ideology of “Latin American and Venezuelan road to socialism” reminds us of Black Africa’s, Asia’s and Middle East’s "ways" and "paths" leading to "specific socialism". These “specific socialisms” were and are closely related to the “non-aligned movement” and they are only masks to divert the struggle of workers from genuinely communist purposes with the complicity and support of imperialist powers which want to perpetuate these mystifications as a mean to keep world laborers and world proletarians away from Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. These "specific socialisms" such as that of Chavez deny the universal revolutionary laws of socialist and communist revolution and construction; they are defenders of inevitably opportunist, reformist and social democratic positions. So-called
“specific socialisms” like that of Chavez refuse the teachings of the Classics on the general laws of the revolution and of socialist / communist construction following the footsteps of all other “models” and "socialist ways" like those of Tito, Castro, Khrushchev, Mao, the Eurocommunists, Sandinists (Nicaragua), etc. as well as of the Italian, French, Spanish, Islamic, African “roads to socialism”, etc. Independently of their differences, they all (including Chavist Venezuelan / Latin American “specific 21st century socialism”) come together and agree on what really matters: total and complete denigration and rejection of the fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism – the only truly revolutionary socialist and communist ideology. This rejection and denigration has the goal of always preserving capitalism in a form or another.

The glorious 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism were absolutely right when they considered that these kind of bourgeois mystifications represent a huge risk for the victory of the true anti-imperialist struggle, that is to say, for the victory of the socialist revolution. These pseudo "socialist revolutions" or "ways to socialism" provide in effect the imperialist bourgeoisie and its indigenous accomplices (like Chavist pro-Chinese compradore bourgeoisie in Venezuela) with assurance that nothing will fundamentally change while treacherously making working classes of the neo-colonial dependent nations feel (sometimes sincerely) that things will really change! Life itself has shown that these imperialist-revisionist mystifications of which Chavist “socialism” is among the latest examples have not the slightest intention to challenge capitalist-imperialist world order. On the contrary, their purpose is to keep it eternally alive. And what could we expect from “movements” which base themselves on the factual defense of wage slavery?

According to the Classics, socialism necessarily includes abolition of private property of the means of production and of wage labor. Now, it is evident that the fake “leftist revolutions” in Chavist Venezuela and in Latin America have not done, are not doing and won’t do anything of this. They are not intended to overthrow the oppressive, slavagist and exploitative predatory capitalist-imperialist production relations and forces and to replace them by socialist and communist ones. On the contrary, they only encourage the exacerbation of inter-imperialist rivalries in order to obtain some additional crumbs. The essence of the Chavist "Bolivarian socialist revolution" is composed by the interests of the Venezuelan pro-Chinese bourgeoisie compradore disguised under the mask of petty-bourgeois populism to deceive world workers / proletarians in general and Venezuelan workers / proletarians in particular. Indeed, Chavist “specific road to socialism” is nothing more than bourgeois-capitalist pro-imperialist anti-communism. As we have already said, just like occurred with all other “specific socialisms”, also Chavist “Venezuelan and Latin American socialism” is a mere pseudo-popular “movement” led by the Venezuelan pro-Chinese bourgeoisie with the aim of facilitating the exploitation of Venezuela by rapacious Chinese social-fascists and social-imperialists which are already surpassing American imperialists as the world’s most powerful superpower. In spite of everything, not
all bourgeois-capitalist countries can achieve political-socio-economic world domination, as this has being restricted to a few large blocks and major imperialist powers, among which are the U.S., E.U, Japan and, most recently, China. The other bourgeois-capitalist nations like Chavist Venezuela are condemned to be attached to the sphere of influence of this or that imperialist candidate to global hegemony which will do anything to maintain world colonial wage enslaving, exploitative capitalist-imperialist status quo.

In our articles about Chavism, we noted that:

“(…) contrary to misleading appearances conferred by the phony “anti-imperialist” and even “socialist” nature which revisionists automatically attribute to any bourgeois-capitalist regime which apparently “criticizes” the hegemony of American imperialism, Venezuelan Chavist bourgeoisie could not be more dependent on world imperialism: it provides complete creditor insurance to imperialists and it even keeps previous neo-colonialist and exploitative commitments to the IMF! Its entire laughable “leftist” or even “socialist” phraseology is only intended to fool workers and proletarians!

And the attempts of American imperialism to destabilize Chavez regime and others of the same kind change nothing to their bourgeois compradore character. This only shows that Chavist bourgeoisie refuses the former exclusive domination of American imperialism, preferring to replace it by that of Chinese imperialism. Unfortunately, there is not an authentic communist party in Venezuela. All the so-called “communist” and “Marxist-Leninist” movements are totally influenced by the policies of local Chavist pro-Chinese compradore bourgeoisie and they support Chinese social-imperialist colonization. This undoubtedly displays the necessity of the formation of a genuine Stalinist-Hoxhaist party in Venezuela which is able to fulfill the revolutionary tasks indicated by the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism.” [Documents of the Comintern (SH), Statement of the Comintern (SH) on Hugo Chavez’s death, 2013, edition in English]

And relatively to the situation of Venezuela under Chavez’s social-fascist successor Maduro, we remarked:

“So, (according to the neo-revisionists), Maduro is a “democrat” and Chavez was a “patriot” defended by the “revolutionary people” against the “bourgeois aggression by US imperialism”. Not a single word about Chinese social-imperialism and its transformation of Venezuela into its neo-colony, not a word about its Venezuelan bourgeois compradore lackeys, not a word about the exploitative, pro-capitalist and counter-revolutionary nature of Chavez and Maduro’s regimes which could only “win” the “elections” through using social-fascist violence and deceive against the oppressed laboring masses. Not a word of condemnation against Chavist anti-
communism and not even a single word of praise for the brave Venezuelan proletarians that are rising up in revolt against unbearable social-fascist and pro-imperialist neo-colonial slavery. When we read that kind of documents and think that the parties constituting ICMLPO were once part of the Marxist-Leninist Movement of comrade Enver Hoxha, it is truly a great outrage and a great sadness.

Neo-revisionists like those from the ICMLPO and the Maoists from the MLM cause enormous damage to the cause of world socialist revolution, because they hide their anti-socialist reactionary character behind “anti-revisionist”, “Stalinist” and sometimes even “Hoxhaist” cloaks. They try to convince workers of the “correctness” of their path to “socialism” which would be supposedly “free from from sectarianisms and dogmatisms”. In truth, all they want is to deviate world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes from the only authentic path to liberation from all kinds of evils inherent to capitalist-imperialist-revisionist world system. In truth, all they want is to deviate them from the only way to accomplish true socialism and true communism: Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism. If we don’t follow and apply the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, we will end up with nothing more than with some Chavist-type “socialism”.

The events in Venezuela unmask exemplarily the pro-imperialist, social-fascist character of neo-revisionists on a global scale who support world imperialism and who encourage a new imperialist war. Our position is clear: "War against imperialist war in Venezuela!" Our line is clear: The Albanian anti-fascist, anti-imperialist struggle was victorious because of the revolutionary line of comrade Enver Hoxha. We propagate that the Venezuelan people must learn from the victory of the Albanian people, the Venezuelan people must go in the spirit of the Albanian revolutionary liberation struggle. The aim is clear: Construction of socialism in the spirit of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism!!!" [Documents of the Comintern (SH), Statement of the Comintern (SH) about events in Venezuela, 2014, edition in English]

World workers / proletarians in general and Venezuelan workers / proletarians in particular must know that the only way to their total and definitive liberation from all kinds of exploitation, oppression and wage slavery is to struggle against all kinds of anti-socialist illusions and trickeries promoted by bourgeois-capitalist, pro-imperialist “populist” anti-communist regimes of the Chavist kind and to fully embrace Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism with the objective of ensuring the triumph of the world socialist revolution and of the world proletarian dictatorship towards world socialism and world communism – always under the steel leadership of the Comintern (SH), the only faithful standard bearer and defender of authentic proletarian and communist ideology. That’s why it is so important to found a Section of the Comintern (SH) not only in Venezuela
and in other nations under the influence of ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists but in every country of the world.

9. Critique of the individual affiliated parties

On these sub-chapters of our article, we will now elaborate criticisms against ICPOML’s neo-revisionist and ultra-opportunist affiliated parties from an authentically Stalinist-Hoxhaist perspective.

9.1. Communist Party of Benin

The first individual party-member of the ICMLPO that we will analyze will be the so-called “Communist Party of Benin”. This neo-revisionist African party is certainly one of the factors used by the ICMLPO’s leaders to provide a Maoist-like “third world appeal” to their anti-socialist organization in order to mislead workers from countries like Benin.

But let’s return to the “C” PB in particular. When we enter its site in bourgeois-capitalist “Wikipedia” ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communist_Party_of_Benin](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communist_Party_of_Benin)), we are immediately told that the CPB is supposedly a “Hoxhaist”, “anti-revisionist” party that “is affiliated with the ICMLPO”. That the CPB is affiliated with the ICMLPO we already knew. But by now, we also already know for sure that to be affiliated with the ICMLPO does not mean at all to be “Hoxhaist” or “anti-revisionist”. Quite on the contrary, if it means something, it is to be opportunist and neo-revisionist.

In the same “Wikipedia” page, we are informed that the “official organ” of the CPB is called “La Flamme” ([www.la-flamme.org](http://www.la-flamme.org)) and that it contains information about the party’s positions. When we access the site, the very first thing which we note is the big picture in the superior part of the site showing the photos of the first four Classics of Marxism-Leninism.

We tried to search in the entire site for an image of comrade Enver or for anything having to do with socialist Albanian and with the PLA but we must confess that our efforts were worthless. Indeed, even concerning the other Classics of Marxism-Leninism, the only things related to them were the already mentioned photos and nothing more. We could not find a single document authored by the Classics, neither a single article in which they or their teachings were referred to. This is indeed usual to all ICMLPO’s “brother-parties”.

61
A badly informed reader would have been perhaps surprised that a “Hoxhaist” and “anti-revisionist” party does not even mention the texts and documents from the Classics who were the foundation documents of the anti-revisionist movement in its official and central informative organ. But to those who know the nature and character of the ICMLPO, who know very well its purposes and goals, this situation is widely expected.

In past sub-chapters of this article and also in other texts, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, repeated thousands of times that without explicitly embracing and applying the undying teachings of the Classics in general (and of comrade Enver in particular…), all presumptions to qualify a certain party, organization or individual as “communist” are doomed to fail. Therefore, the name “communist” that the neo-revisionists from Benin give to their own party is only intended to deceive toilers.

So, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists from Benin publish a site in which no references to the Classics (besides some irrelevant photos…) are made. Instead, they prefer to fulfill it with all kinds of anti-communist garbage of which we will provide our readers with two examples. The first of them can be found in a text entitled “Imperialists and the peoples” elaborated during the times when Western imperialism was trying to get rid of Gadhafi’s clique:

“Since some months, (…) imperialist powers are committing aggressions against world peoples and their leaders (…) just like happens with Libya. (…) Therefore, we promote a pacific demonstration against it (…)”


As can be observed, the CPB’s neo-revisionists are qualifying social-fascist Gadhaffi as “peoples’ leader against whom imperialism commits aggression” (and they are not the only ones, the other ICMLPO’s “brother-parties” like the Voltaic “Revolutionary Communist” Party from Burkina-Faso – which we will analyze later in this article – embrace this very same position)! Yes, Western imperialism attacked him and its clique, but not because they represented any kind of “peoples’ power” and much less anything related with socialism. On the contrary, Gadhafi’s clique was a perfect example of a social-fascist exploiting and oppressive regime which exercised brutal violence against laboring classes. Its “revolutionary” appeal came from the fact that it represented Libya’s “nationalistic” bourgeois class who wanted to get a bigger part of the profits instead of having to give the lionshare of it to world imperialists and their neo-colonialist lackeys in Libya. And it was precisely this that world imperialists did not admit and what caused them to use military means to overthrow it and to replace it with a more faithful and reliable bourgeois-compradore clique that
rules Libya until this moment. We are therefore very far from “people’s rule” or anything like that.

And with their defense of social-fascist Gadhafi and their presentation of him and others like him as being “peoples’ leaders”, the CPB’s neo-revisionists are attempting at preparing the grounds not only for the implementation of their own social-fascist rule, but to also present it as “peoples’ power” (like occurs with nearly all social-fascist regimes, by the way…). And needless to say that all these stands must be attributed also the ICMLPO as a whole, because the CPB is an official “brother-party” of this same bourgeois-capitalist, opportunist, pro-imperialist, neo-revisionist, social-fascist and anti-communist organization, and therefore, all these adjectives and qualifications can be equally attributed to all and each of its member “brother-parties”, too. And the CPB’s neo-revisionists not only openly support social-fascism but they also support the darkest feudalism and tribalism. In fact, as for 2015, they are part of an opportunistic “alliance”, the ANG (Alliance pour une Nouvelle Gouvernance – Allies to a New Government) together with other bourgeois-capitalist parties. Just like advocated by Dimitrov (to whom all ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists and social-fascists are never tired of praising), the CPB gladly embraces the worst reactionarism in name of “unity”. For instance, the ANG affirms that one of its main objectives is to:

“Provide recognizance to the values and persons who constitute our traditions concerning administrative power, law, security, etc. (namely to kings, nobles, notable hunters, witchcrafts…).”[http://www.ccdb-benin.org/index.php/informations-fpfg/214-programme-de-l-alliance-pour-une-nouvelle-gouvernance, Programme du ANG, 2015, translated from French language]

And now, with what face with the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists and their lackeys in Benin will continue to affirm without blushing that they are “Hoxhaists”, “Marxists-Leninists” and “anti-revisionists”? Here, they do not even bother to maintain minimally credible cloaks, they openly assume their defense of middle-age barbarism, monarchic-feudalist yoke and backward superstitious obscurity as being “traditional values”! Comrade Enver once remarked that:

“(…) the class struggle it is a many-sided struggle which is, first and foremost, an ideological struggle today, a struggle for the minds and hearts of people, a struggle against bourgeois and revisionist degeneration, against all alien remnants and phenomena which still exist and manifest themselves in various degrees among all our people — it is a struggle for the triumph of our communist ideology and morality. The struggle against (…) prejudices, superstitions and backward customs, (…) against idealism and metaphysics, against various «isms» of the decadent bourgeois and revisionist art and culture, against the political and ideological influence of external enemies,
etc., etc., all these things are parts of the class struggle.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the V Congress of the PLA, 1966, edition in English)

And as if this was not enough, the CPB neo-revisionists state that another crucial purpose of the ANG’s program is to:


If there were still doubts relatively to the entirely bourgeois-capitalist and anti-socialist nature of the ICMLPO’s representatives in Benin, this provides us with the final answer. Even if we admit that they defend capitalist development in order because they embrace the famous theory according to which it is allegedly necessary “to accelerate the fulfillment of objective and subjective conditions to the achievement of socialist revolution”, even if such was the case, they would never cease from being completely counter-revolutionary and neo-revisionist in character because this “theory” is not new and it comes already from Maoist revisionism which, just like Trotskyism, tries to glorify and perpetuate bourgeois dictatorship by arguing that socialist revolution is impossible without the development of capitalism. Both revisionisms attempted to convince the exploited and oppressed laboring classes that it is possible to rely on non-proletarian forces to successfully achieve socialism. The October revolution was the historical precedent which permitted that Lenin noted:

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

Furthermore, the examples of the Bolshevist Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin and socialist Albania of comrade Enver Hoxha show clearly the ultra-revisionist character of Mao’s affirmation that:

“One cannot construct socialism without passing through the democratic phase, this is a Marxist law.” (Mao Zedong, Du gouvernement de coalition, Œuvres choisies, Pékin, 1968, translated from French language)

As can be noted, this assertion from Mao is equivalent to the ones issued by the CPB’s neo-revisionists. To it we must answer that both Bolshevist Soviet Union and socialist Albania had backward politic-socio-economic systems with feudal and semi-feudal characteristics. However, neither Lenin, neither Stalin, neither Enver Hoxha ever thought of postponing the socialist revolution simply because capitalism were still not sufficiently developed in their respective countries. To
defend the contrary is nothing more than renouncing to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to the construction of socialism and communism.

Like comrade Enver Hoxha significantly remarked:

“The experience of Albania shows that even a small country, with a backward material-technical base, can achieve a very rapid and all-round economic and cultural development, can ensure its independence and withstand the attacks of world capitalism and imperialism when it is led by a truly Marxist-Leninist party, when it is determined to fight to the end for its ideals, and has faith in its ability to achieve them.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, Tirana, 1981, edition in English)

And like the Party of Labor of Albania correctly understood:

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

When the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists from the CPB affirm that they want to “promote capitalist development”, they simply 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. Using the excuse of “not skipping stages” and of “the necessity of developing capitalism before socialist revolution can be accomplished”, the Maoists, Trotskyists, CPB and ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists, etc, try to paralyze the revolutionary communist and proletarian movement, they prevent socialist revolution, proletarian dictatorship and communism by eternally postponing them, thus permitting the free development of wage enslaving, bourgeois and capitalist relations and elements. It is not by chance that we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, say that they support a bourgeois-capitalist ideology. Their aim is really to preserve exploitative and oppressive capitalist-imperialist global system under fake “socialistic” cloaks.

With all this, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists and their lackeys try to detach world and local proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes from MLSH through presenting themselves as “Hoxhaists”, “Marxists-Leninists” and “anti-revisionists” while being engaged in a totally social-fascist, reactionary, bourgeois-capitalist path. Let’s admit: who would support Hoxhaism and anti-revisionism if the example one has of it is provided by a party like the CPB? Working people of Benin are perhaps wrongly associating the only path that could liberate them with their own bourgeois-capitalist-feudal-tribal exploiters and oppressors. And the ICMLPO’s and the CPB’s neo-revisionists are
responsible for this. Consequently, it is the duty of the Comintern (SH) to clarify this situation and to prevent Benin and world proletariat from being misled.

9.2. Revolutionary Communist Party (Brazil)

Now, it is time to unmask the Brazilian “brother-party” of the ICMLPO. The so-called “RC” P presents itself as “the only genuine communist party remaining in Brazil”. And in fact, we must admit that the cloaks used by these Brazilian neo-revisionists from the RCP are still considerably more ingenious and misleading than the openly revisionist and anti-communist slogans utilized by the Brazilian “Communist” Party and by the “Communist” Party of Brazil. At least, this is what seems at first sight.

Just like also occurred with Benin’s party, the PCR equally possesses a “Wikipedia” site (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Revolutionary_Communist_Party_(Brazil)&oldid=638235080) in which it is described as “a party of strong Stalinist tendencies”. By this time, we already know what means to be “Stalinist” within the ICMLPO: “Stalinist” in words, but anti-Stalinist in deeds.

And in fact, when we enter RCP’s official site, the first thing we noticed is their proud announcement that the party’s “publishing house” has just rendered a new edition of Dimitrov’s report to the VII Congress [whose totally opportunist, bourgeois-capitalist, social-fascist and anti-communist nature we already exposed in this and in other articles of the Comintern (SH)]. The Brazilian ICMLPO neo-revisionists stress that:

“Dimitrov’s report is entirely valid and its teachings must be followed by all genuine revolutionaries.” (http://pcrbrasil.org/edicoes-ccml-lanca-livro-a-unidade-operaria-contra-o-fascismo/, Edições CCML lança livro A Unidade Operária Contra o Fascismo, translated from Portuguese language)

To publish a book containing the report which promotes the liquidation of proletarian dictatorship, of the proletarian party, of the Comintern of Lenin and Stalin, of Bolshevist Soviet Union and of the world communist movement? Are these the “strong Stalinist tendencies” above mentioned? To eulogize the work of one of the greatest anti-Stalinists that ever lived? But one can ask: if the Brazilian neo-revisionists are so eager to praise Dimitrov and to publish his reactionary, pro-fascist and ultra-opportunist report in a “deluxe edition”, what about their attitude towards the writings of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism? Are they also making efforts to publish them in “special editions” available to all? No. The RCP’s neo-revisionists barely mention the Classics in their texts and documents. Sometimes, they make some isolated references to Marx, Engels and Lenin, but
Stalin’s and Enver’s names are totally absent from their sites. The only exception to this perceived by us was a reference to the Trotskyist bourgeois-capitalist archive www.marxists.org in which, accordingly with the Brazilian neo-revisionists, we can find “texts from Stalin, Enver Hoxha, Fidel Castro, Guevara and Ho Chi Minh”. So, comrades Stalin and Enver Hoxha – the 4th and the 5th Classics of Marxism-Leninism – are located at the same level of social-fascists Castro, Guevara and Ho Chi Minh (these last ones are even given “tributes” by the Brazilian RCP’s neo-revisionists). The very fact that comrades Stalin and Enver struggled for and represented a system (socialism and communism) which is entirely irreconcilable and opposite to the one represented by Castro, Guevara and Ho Chi Minh is something which Brazilian neo-revisionists apparently want to ignore. With this, they clearly want to deceive Brazilian and world proletarians, making them believe that social-fascist and revisionist regimes around the world have anything to do with socialist revolution, with all the inevitable discrediting consequences for authentic socialism that we already explained in this and in other texts.

In fact, Brazilian neo-revisionists explicitly assume that they are the greatest fans of the worst kinds of social-fascism:

“Imperialism is trying to manipulate public opinion in order to attack North Korea (…) locally, its first military targets will be the country’s monuments to the leaders, which are symbols of the nation’s leadership and dignity.”

So, according to the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists (it is never too much to repeat that all anti-communist garbage that we find in the multiple “brother-parties” official sites must be directly attributed to the ICMLPO in itself, as they constitute a single whole), North Korean monarchic-feudal, neo-colonial regime is an “anti-imperialist” victim and North Korean fascist leaders are “symbols of dignity”. In our article “Down with Korean revisionism!”, we already denounced the nature and purposes of Kim Il Sungism, displaying how it has absolutely nothing to do with anti-imperialism neither with socialism, and how it effectively serves both imperialism and anti-socialism. We will solely remark that since the end of the Korean War in 1953, the Korean peninsula has been divided in two states: South Korea, a capitalist-bourgeois state of fascist type with regional imperialist ambitions but under the influence of American / Western imperialism; and North Korea, a capitalist-bourgeois state of the social-fascist type which during several decades was a satellite of soviet social-imperialism and which is now under the sway of Chinese social-imperialism. Since the very beginning, the North Korean “Workers’ Party” entirely refused anything to do with proletarian dictatorship or with veritable socialist construction. At no time it ever was a Bolshevik party of Leninist-Stalinist type. And this is not surprising because a party which represents and defends the interests of the North Korean national
bourgeoisie can never simultaneously embrace a correct communist and proletarian line; on the contrary, such an anti-socialist and pro-capitalist party will necessarily endure the aggravation of its own degeneration. This is the case of the North Korean “Workers’ Party”. In his book “The Krushchevists”, Comrade Enver recalls:

“On September 7 (of 1956) we arrived in Pyongyang. They put on a splendid welcome, with people, with gongs, with flowers, and with portraits of Kim Il Sung everywhere. You had to look hard to find some portrait of Lenin, tucked away in some obscure corner. (...) the revisionist wasp had begun to implant its poisonous sting there, too.” (Enver Hoxha, The Khrushchevists, Tirana, 1980, edition in English)

Therefore, we can see that one of the main characteristics of Kim-Il-Sungism (the North Korean variety of revisionism) was already present: the intense personality cult organized around Kim Il Sung with the consequent minimization of the true Classics of Marxism-Leninism like Lenin. This is what Brazilian neo-revisionists qualify as Korea’s “national dignity”. In his brilliant book “Reflections on China”, Comrade Enver Hoxha perfectly and accurately described Kim Il Sung as being a “vacillant, megalomaniac revisionist” and bluntly said that:

“Kim Il Sung, (...) is a pseudo-Marxist.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, August 21, 1975, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

As time passed, Kim-Il-Sungism proved to be a deeply reactionary branch of revisionism, whose treason was rightly understood by comrade Enver:

“The leadership of the Communist Party of China has betrayed (socialism). In Korea, too, we can say that the leadership of the Korean Workers' Party is wallowing in the same waters.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, June 7, 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

When the Soviet revisionists conquered power and started to spread their neo-colonialist enslaving poison, the North Korean revisionists and social-fascists that still dominate the country tried to give an image of “loyal Marxists” and affirmed to be “totally against revisionism”. But this was just empty talk. During many years, North Korea was completely dependent on Soviet social-imperialism and on foreign capitalist credits. Comrade Enver understood this and by occasion of Tito’s visit to North Korea he analysed that:

“(…) Tito is going to Korea to carry out negotiations on behalf of American imperialism with Kim Il Sung and not to get credits, because there are no strong-rooms in Korea from which Tito can get them. Korea is so deeply in debt itself that it is unable to meet its repayments.” (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, Volume II, June 7, 1977, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)
With the fall of Soviet social-fascism and social-imperialism in 1989-1991, North Korea continued to be a highly indebted country which is nowadays being invaded by Chinese social-imperialist credits. North Korea’s external debt is of many millions of dollars and the country’s commercial balance suffers from a significant and systematic deficit. This situation is totally opposed to that of Socialist Albania of Comrade Enver Hoxha which relied on its own internal forces and was never dependent of foreign credits and “aids”. The Albanian Marxist-Leninists struggled to keep the country’s commercial balance always positive and they accomplished this task. Even bourgeois ideologues were impressed by the way a tiny country like Albania not only was plainly self-sufficient but also effectively refused to be integrated in the world capitalist market. In truth, every veritable socialist country in the context of imperialist-capitalist-revisionist encirclement (as was the case of Socialist Albania) has to fight for its self-reliance because otherwise international imperialism would immediately invade the country through capitalist credits, thus preventing and destroying proletarian dictatorship and the building of socialism. As comrade Enver Hoxha clearly asserts:

“In order to disguise the export of capital, the imperialist powers also resort to the practice of according credits. Through these so-called credits or aid, the big capitalist concerns and the states to which they belong bring great pressure to bear on the recipient states and peoples, and keep them under control. (...) The credits the new states receive are links of the imperialist chain around the necks of their own peoples. (...)

Capitalism never makes investments, provides loans, or exports capital to other countries without first calculating the profits it will realize for itself. (...) There are also other forms of according credits, like those practiced with those pseudo-socialist states which are trying to disguise the capitalist course on which they are proceeding. (...) In no case do the capitalists provide their credits for the construction of socialism. They provide them to destroy socialism. Therefore, a genuine socialist country never accepts credits, in any form, from a capitalist, bourgeois, or revisionist country.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

This principled and Marxist-Leninist stand is on the antipodes of that adopted by the bourgeois-capitalist North Korean regime. Indeed, North Korean anti-socialist ruling classes even “officialized” their country’s total dependence on foreign imperialist credits:

“The State shall encourage institutions, enterprises or associations of the DPRK to establish and operate equity and contractual joint venture enterprises with corporations or individuals of foreign countries within a special economic zone.” (*Article 37 of the DPRK’s Constitution*, September of 1998, edition in English)
As we can see, the social-fascists which rule North Korea not even try to hide their complete allegiance and subordination to world imperialism, on the contrary, they gladly and openly assume it in their own Constitution. This article of the DPRK’s Constitution affirms the exact opposite of what the article 28 of the Constitution of Socialist Albania states:

“The granting of concessions to, and the creation of, foreign economic and financial companies and other institutions or ones formed jointly with bourgeois and revisionist capitalist monopolies and states, as well as obtaining credits from them, are prohibited in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania.” (Article 28 of the Constitution of People’s Socialist Republic of Albania, December of 1976, edition in English)

In face of all this, it is incredible how the Brazilian neo-revisionists still dare to affirm that reactionary North Korea is an “anti-imperialist country” when it is more than obvious that, far from being “isolated”, revisionist, social-fascist, neocolonial North Korea is totally assimilated in the mechanisms of the globalized bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist world system! Brazilian ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists must soon invent other anti-socialist cloaks to deceive workers, because these ones are getting very evident…

The North Korean anti-communist regime has absolutely nothing to do with socialism. The power structures in North Korean are similar to those of the most backward capitalist-feudal states. When Kim Il Sung died, his son Kim Jong Il was his successor and today it is already known that Kim Jong Il’s son will replace his father in the North Korean throne. Yes, throne is the correct word because North Korea’s political and economic system can be rightly defined as a fascist reactionary monarchy which oppresses and exploits North Korean workers while the monarcho-fascist bourgeois class lives luxuriously.

For example, in the early 90’s, counter-revolutionary North Korea faced a severe famine caused by the appalling weakness of the country’s capitalist economy. This crisis was a consequence of the disappearance of Soviet social-imperialism on which North Korea was totally reliant. And while large numbers of North Korean workers were literally dying of hunger, Kim Il Sung, his son and the other members of the monarcho-fascist bourgeoisie were organizing opulent parties with included magnificent feasts where they received the representatives of the revisionist and neo-revisionist parties. And these representatives of the revisionist and neo-revisionist parties are the ones which are capable of affirming without blushing that North Korea is a “country which is building communism”. To say that North Korea is a socialist country, that is “the last Stalinist state in the world” means to blatantly insult Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, it means to try to discred it communist ideology with the aim of maintaining capitalism’s tyrannical and totalitarian world rule. Today there are no socialist countries in the world; this is the truth whether the revisionists, neo-revisionists and all other types of anti-communists like it or not.
And as if this was not enough, Brazilian neo-revisionists from the RCP continue furthermore to mislead proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes through attempting at convincing them that their complete emancipation can be achieved through reform of the bourgeois-capitalist tax system:

“If more taxes were applied to the most valuable private source of incomes, we could obtain around 20 $R billions to benefit the impoverished working masses.” (http://averdade.org.br/2015/01/imposto-sobre-grandes-fortunas-poderia-arrecadar-mais-de-r-20-bilhoes/, Imposto sobre as grandes fortunas poderia arrecadar 20 biliões de $R, 2015, translated from Portuguese language)

So, Brazilian neo-revisionists defend that what benefits the impoverished working classes is not to know and apply the teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, but on the contrary, is to remain faithfully within the limits of bourgeois-capitalist system without ever questioning it and is to support Keynesianistic and reformist “welfare social measures”. This idea of “taxing the rich” is not new and can be found in nearly all types of revisionism and opportunism. With this, Brazilian ICMPO neo-revisionists from the RCP 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 repressive tax system (like already happened in comrade Enver’s socialist Albania, where taxes were eradicated…) which is nothing more than an instrument of class enslavement used against laboring classes, exactly like they would demand the annihilation of all forms of exploitation and oppression. But as they are nothing more than bourgeois-capitalist reformists, 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 profit maximization of the world bourgeois-imperialist-capitalist class.

9.3. Voltaic Revolutionary Communist Party (Burkina-Faso)

The V “RC” P from Burkina-Faso is one more “brother-party” of the ICMLPO that exercises its neo-revisionist influence over laboring classes in general, and those of its country in particular.

The damages made by the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists in Africa is particularly severe, because African workers still mostly lack any genuine MLSH consciousness, and therefore the efforts made by the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists
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in general, and by those of the VRCP in special are relevant and dangerous for the advancement and strengthening of the revolutionary subjective factor, which is still unfortunately so weak in Africa.

Like usual, also the VRCP affirms that it follows:

“(…)) the political line of the Albanian Party of Labor, anti-revisionist Marxism-Leninism. It promoted 'National Democratic and Popular Revolution' (RNDP).”

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voltaic_Revolutionary_Commmunist_Party, VRCP, 2015, edition in English)

In what respects to the first statement, it is false. Being a member of the neo-revisionist ICMLPO means that it entirely refuses anything to do with the PLA or with anti-revisionist Marxism-Leninism. Our text so far has already revealed this. But even if such was not the case, in their official documents and sites, the neo-revisionists of the VRCP do not publish a single text, work or quotation from the Classics. On the contrary, they don’t even mention them. Such is the standard line of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists: they affirm to follow the Classics only in words while rejecting their teachings in deeds. Previously, we had already concluded what truly means to keep silence and denial over the Classics, it is not necessary to repeat it one more time.

But we must certainly reflect about the second remark made by the VRCP opportunists in their “Wikipedia” page, namely that their explicit assumption that they promote “National Democratic and Popular Revolution”. But what do they mean with this? Looking attentively at their declarations, we note that they apparently seem to be engaged in a fervent “anti-imperialist” zeal.

“The working class and the people more and more convinced that the power represented only a minority clan of predators who took the economy of our country hostage and had established a dictatorship to oppress and exploit the people for their imperialist masters (...).”

The change advocated (...) is to reform the neocolonial power while preserving and strengthening the stranglehold of French imperialism in particular on our country. It is clear that this type of change does not affect the causes of poverty and oppression of our people: the plundering of the resources of our country by international imperialism and its allies in the reactionary bourgeoisie, the dictates of the IMF, World Bank, and WTO.”

“The change proposed by the PCRV, Marxist-Leninist Communist Party is to overthrow the power of French imperialism (...), replace it with a Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) (...). The Provisional Revolutionary Government will convene a Constituent Assembly, representatives of the people, and of which the allies of imperialism will be

Exactly like also occurs with Maoist revisionism, also the VRCP’s opportunists attempt at painting the “anti-imperialist national revolution” as the final objective which justified the permanent alliance with the “progressive” and “patriotic” national bourgeoisie. ICMLPO’s phony “anti-imperialism” was never based on an authentic socialist ideology. By advocating and promoting the union between toiling classes and the “national patriotic” bourgeois class, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists prevent the anti-imperialist struggle of the workers from acquiring a genuine communist nature, it prevented that anti-imperialist struggle from surpassing the limits of capitalism. This actually meant that they do their utmost to avoid 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 national bourgeoisie, to whose class interests the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists and their VRCP members in Burkina-Faso faithfully serve.

Of course, like happens in many other countries, also in Burkina-Faso the ICMLPO’s social-fascists represent the interests of the “patriotic” national bourgeoisie which is dispossessed from the control of the main means of production because of the dominion of the bourgeoisie comprador at the service of world imperialism in general and of French imperialism in particular. In face of this, they 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 ICMLPO and of the VRCP try to depict their defense of the “patriotic national” bourgeois class as “anti-imperialism”.

Consequently, by promoting and encouraging the struggle against foreign world imperialism in general and against French imperialism in particular, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists are once again doing their utmost to cover the greedy intentions of Burkina–Faso’s national bourgeoisie with “anti-imperialist” and even “progressive, national-popular” masks. They do this in order to make Burkina Faso’s 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. These references to the “biggest number of people” and to the “broadest alliance” are clear signs of their opportunistic and pragmatic nature, for whom the anti-imperialist struggle must be a chaos which will include all kinds of reactionaries and which will promote the interests of Burkina Faso’s 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.
Through their “red”, “socialist” and even “Hoxhaist” masks, the ICMLPO and VRCP provide the national, “patriotic” bourgeois class with important means not only to get rid of their imperialist compradore rivals but also to deceive the country’s proletariat and to keep a climate of “social peace” in which exploitation and wage slavery can be peacefully exercised. Their “anti-imperialist” rhetoric and “socialistic” outlook are aimed at contributing greatly to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie by the oppressed masses. True, it can happen that in a certain limited context of struggle against imperialism and its bourgeois compradore lackeys, the proletariat and other exploited and oppressed laboring classes may be on the side of the national bourgeoisie, but, contrary to what the ICMLPO and VRCP social-fascists and opportunists try to promote, those two classes always continue to have inevitably irreconcilable interests and this situation does not change just because they temporarily unite in the context of a determined historical period of struggle against imperialist oppressors. Of course, the ICMLPO’s and VRCP’s neo-revisionists attempt at perpetuating the “union” between the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie in the interests of the last one, they propagate the false and impossible idea of the “sharing of power” between those two classes in order to eliminate class struggle and to disguise capitalist exploitation under a “revolutionary” and even “Hoxhaist anti-revisionist” facade.

And the references to the “Constituent Assembly” in which “everybody with the exception of imperialists will be included” sounds like Dimitrov’s “broadest alliance” (just replace fascism by imperialism and similarities are striking…) are clear signs of the opportunistic nature of the ICMLPO’s VRCP representatives in Burkina-Faso, for whom the anti-imperialist struggle must include all kinds of reactionaries and which will promote the interests of the country’s national “patriotic” bourgeoisie while preventing that same anti-imperialist struggle from advancing towards an authentically revolutionary and MLSH combat against all kinds of oppression and exploitation, against the bourgeoisie in its entirety and not only against a certain part of it.

The above mentioned declarations represent an attempt by the ICMLPO and the VRCP to put the anti-imperialist struggle under the control of the “patriotic national” bourgeois class from Burkina-Faso. This is in equally total agreement with Mao’s infamous theory of the “new democratic revolution” in which the national bourgeoisie would be the ruling “anti-imperialist” class and whose counter-revolutionary and anti-socialist nature we unmasked in other articles. Concluding, when the ICMLPO’s and the VRCP’s neo-revisionists and opportunists say that the “revolution” must undergo an “anti-imperialist, national-democratic popular” 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, national” bourgeoisie.
The first Latin-American “brother-party” of the ICMLPO about which we will reflect is the “C”PC (“ML”). About this party it is affirmed that:

“It was originally of Maoist orientation, but later it evolved a pro-Albanian stance. PCC (ml) is an underground party and a Hoxhaist follower.”

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communist_Party_of_Colombia_(Marxist-%E2%80%93Leninist), CPC (ML), 2015, edition in English)

So, the CPC (ML) was originally an openly Maoist party, and only later it apparently started following an Hoxhaist line. And we state “apparently” because, analyzing the party’s documents, we clearly understand that the influence of Maoist revisionism is overwhelming within the party many years after it had allegedly “changed its Maoist line into an Hoxhaist one”.

When we access the party’s site, it is almost unnecessary to note that, like occurs with the other ICMLPO’s opportunists, there is no mention whatsoever to any of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism. The party’s logotype is composed by the hammer and the sickle (without the rifle…) and the first official text from the party’s leadership that it is presented to readers immediately after the site is opened is an explicit defense of Venezuelan social-fascism:

“The people of Venezuela consolidates its cause (…) struggling for national and social liberation, for people’s power and for socialism.”

(http://www.pcedcml.org/, Venezuela y dos estilos de gobierno, 2010, translated from Spanish language)

Therefore, according with the words from Colombian ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists, Venezuelan bourgeois class and its exploitative and oppressive Chavist rule that is selling the country to Chinese social-imperialism can be considered as “promoting social and national liberation of Venezuelan people” and even “socialism”. Of course, this is nothing astonishing if we take into account the Maoist roots of the CPC (ML). After all, a party who explicitly eulogizes the neo-colonization of Venezuela by Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie as being synonym of “people’s power” and of “socialism” is definitively entirely submerged under the yoke of Maoist darkest social-fascism. No doubt about it.

Far from being the “socialist hero” that revisionists and neo-revisionists all over the world love to praise, Chavez and his successors are in truth the representatives of the initially “patriotic” wing of Venezuelan bourgeoisie whose purpose was to overthrow the exclusive power that the bourgeoisie compradore at the service of American imperialism was holding over the country. However, in a world dominated by imperialist superpowers which spread their webs all over this earth it is impossible for a bourgeois-capitalist country like Venezuela to remain truly independent. And so, the “patriotic” bourgeoisie to whom
Chavists represented quickly became a pro-Chinese bourgeoisie of compradore type. Chinese social-imperialism is on the edge of world domination and is about to replace American imperialism as the world’s dominant superpower.

Despite the false claims by the Chavists and their allies in other countries [among which the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists in general and the CPC (ML)’s opportunists in particular can be found] that “Venezuela is on the road of socialist development”, the truth is that this country remains a typical bourgeois-capitalist compradore country and is becoming a neo-colony of Chinese imperialism where laboring masses live in the most abhorrent poverty, what makes Venezuela one of weakest links of imperialist chain in Latin America.

And as if this was not enough, the Colombian CPC (ML)’s neo-revisionists publish a document in which they openly support the Maoist-Guevarist adventurer FARC - EP (“Revolutionary” Armed Forces of Colombia – “People’s” Army – RAFC - PA) and the social-fascist pro-Krushchevist Colombian “Communist” Party, as they are closely related to both these organizations. By occasion of the death of Raúl Reyes – who was one of the social-fascist leaders of the RAFC – PA the CPC (ML)’s neo-revisionists affirm that:

“We are convinced that the commanders and fighters of the FARC-EP and the militancy of the Clandestine Colombian Communist Party know turn their grief into strength to pay the best tribute to the fallen in battle: to continue the struggle they paid with firmness, determination and confidence in victory, as he did the commander Raul. (…) The memory of Comrade Raul Reyes adds to the noble cause of the revolutionaries of Colombia, Latin America and the world.” (http://www.pcdecml.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=86:carta-a-las-farc&catid=53:2008&Itemid=93, Carta a las FARC, translated from Spanish language)

Like we already referred, the RAFC – PA are an anti-socialist organization which aims at overthrowing Colombia’s bourgeois-capitalist compradore regime at the service of American imperialism and to replace it with a social-fascist order of Castroist-Guevarist type in which Colombian proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes would be continue to be subjected to the harshest exploitations and oppressions under “red” masks and “Marxists-Leninist” cloaks. The RAFC embrace Castroist-Guevarist “theories” according to which “revolution” can perfectly be made through some tiny guerrilla groups. These small bourgeois-intellectualist foquist guerrilla groups are also intended to “replace” the authentically proletarian communist party of Leninist-Stalinist type and its collective discipline. They also describe themselves as a “peasant army”, thus adopting Maoist counter-revolutionary theories of placing peasantry at the head of the so-called “revolutionary movement” which is a complete masquerade, as the Maoists, Castroists-Guevarists and their followers of the
RAFC – PA and of the ICMLPO / CPC (ML) are all without exception influenced by bourgeois ideology. They only use a “pro-peasant” mask in order to win the peasantry to their side (as they have to avoid resorting to the help of the tiny but inherently revolutionary proletariat). Through false promises about an alleged “peasant revolution” and “peasant power”, they manage to conquer repressed peasants to their side. These peasants believe that to support them would ensure them the end of millenary exploitation affecting them. When they finally realize that far from relieving them from exploitation, they are in fact intensifying it even more, it is too late. The social-fascist bourgeois-revisionist state power and its repressive apparatus are already consolidated.

Indeed, it is quite comprehensible the use of a “pro-peasant” phraseology by the RAFC - PA – after all, we cannot forget that a very important part – if not the majority - of population not only in Colombia, but also all over Latin America is composed by peasantry. In order to accomplish support of the majority of Latin American toiling masses (which were peasant masses) and to use them as a powerful massive instrument against class rivals, they quickly understood they have to attract and seduce peasants. Once more, also Maoists used and applied this same strategy / tactic to deceive peasants. We had already analyzed how Maoist organizations accomplished this in our DWM I, II and III. Such are the foquist reactionary theories (that were also used by many other bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist, pro-imperialist, social-fascist and anti-communist cliques such as those of reactionary Nicaraguan Sandinistas, of anti-socialist Vietnam, etc.) which give complete predominance to rural areas as “genuinely revolutionary arenas” in detriment of urban areas and of the proletariat in denial of the most basic principles of MSLH that Colombian ICMLPO neo-revisionists from the CPC (ML) staunchly defend.

Indeed, RAFC’s efforts to enslave the laboring classes can be found already in the areas controlled by it, where slave labor in drug plantations is commonplace. Indeed, RAFC finances itself through drug trafficking:

“As a result of the strategic alliance with drug traffickers, the RAFC were consolidated as a new poster, which gradually controls all phases of the process (…).

The RAFC are considered the main drug cartel by the fact that its two main - Oriental and South blocks are deployed and controlled areas of the Eastern Plains and the Amazon where 70% of illicit coca crops are located and almost all the poppy, and in equal proportion the crystallizing, routes and clandestine airstrips.

Annual revenues for RAFC coming from drug trafficking range from US $ 500 to US $ 600 million, and allowed the RAFC to take a quantum leap in its armed apparatus, with which it managed to complete their strategic
deployment, as a preliminary to the escalation of the conflict and preparation of their offensive.

Drug trafficking is allowing the RAFC to have an enormous capacity to continue developing its armed apparatus with which deploy new structures with which to implement and maintain the population under control in the areas of drug-planting and drug-trafficking and to keep them working under constant vigilance.”


If this is not social-fascism’s ugliest face, then what is? If everything else lacked, this is proof of the totally anti-communist and reactionary nature of the RAFC and of all those who – like the neo-revisionists from ICMLPO and the CPC (ML) – shamelessly support them. Drug trafficking and addictions are typical from capitalist-imperialist system, they constitute a very dangerous form of alienation to the evils inherent to it, and thus a mean of hampering and delaying the acquisition of authentically MLSH consciousness. This without mentioning the fact that drugs constitute a very important mean of enrichment and of profit maximization for world imperialist-capitalist bourgeois class both at a global and at a more local scale – while destroying the lives and health of immense numbers of toilers who still resort to them trying to easily escape for a moment to the miseries that wage enslaving system imposes on them. Consequently, far from keenly fostering it like the neo-revisionists and the social-fascists do, we, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, strive to definitively put an end to it though world socialist revolution. But being the CPC (ML) so intimately close to the RAFC – PA, we can consider that the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists are one of the main active supporters of what is considered as perhaps the biggest drug cartel of Latin-America. Shame on them and on all those who support them!

9.5. Workers' Communist Party (Denmark)

The “Workers’ Communist” Party of Denmark is one more “brother-party” of the ICMLPO. In its documents we can find the usual neo-revisionist and anti-socialist tendencies that are inherent to it.

Having a look at their website, we note that there are a lot of published texts from comrade Enver Hoxha and the other classics of Marxism-Leninism – we mention this not in defense of the AKP but in demonstrating the difference of the variegated tactics among the affiliated organizations of the ICMLPO. The AKP needs more “Hoxhaist” masks than other organizations of the ICMLPO because there are a lot of Albanian migrants in Denmark for whom the AKP published
Enver Hoxha text's for the purpose to deceive these Albanian migrants. Besides, Denmark is a small country like Albania. Therefore, the former correct brother party, DKP/ML maintained deep friendship with comrade Enver Hoxha. All the more we must condemn the betrayal of the AKP at comrade Enver Hoxha and the PLA.

The Danish ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists assume a reactionary stand of refusing globalization as a whole:

“On the threshold of a new millennium, the global class struggle is characterized by the intensification of the offensive of imperialism and the monopolies with the slogan of "globalization", which means the absolute hegemony of imperialism and the multinationals over the workers, peoples and nations of the world.” (http://www.apk2000.dk/, All Together against Capital, 2000, edition in English)

Once more, we must repeat that the position of the WCP’s opportunists concerning globalization is entirely counter-revolutionary and it automatically unmasks any pretentions and presumptions of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists to mislead workers through “revolutionary” and “leftist” phraseology. 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 and multinational corporations. But this is not true. Although it may be highly noxious in its present capitalist-imperialist, neo-colonialist form, globalization is the key which will allow the world proletariat to open the doors of the world socialist revolution towards world proletarian dictatorship, world socialism and world communism. As the Platform of the Comintern (SH) correctly remarks:

“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 (SH), Platform – world programmatic declaration, November, 2009, edition in English]
To say that globalization is something purely and inevitably negative for the interests of world proletariat, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes is to fully embrace petty-bourgeois nationalistic views which are in total opposition to the genuinely revolutionary Stalinist-Hoxhaist ideology.

And these worlds from the Comintern (SH)’s platform are completely suitable to the very same attitude adopted towards the EU by the Danish ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists. In fact, exactly like occurs with globalization, the WCP’s social-fascists perceive the EU as always being necessarily an inherently anti-communist organization:

“Denmark out of the EU! In its essence, the EU is the project of big capital, solely benefiting the interests of the monopolies, the bureaucrats and the pro-EU politicians.” (http://www.apk2000.dk/, All Together against Capital, 2000, edition in English)

While this is undoubtedly true relatively to present bourgeois “European Union” at the service of Europe’s and world’s capitalists-imperialists, such will not be the case with future socialist European Union in an united socialist world. In the Joint Collective Appeal of the German and Portuguese Sections of the Comintern (SH) on the occasion of the elections to the European Parliament in May, 2014, we note:

“The EU is an imperialist alliance of countries - not only for the exploitation and oppression of the own European peoples, but also of all other peoples in the world. And for what? To make more and more maximum profit! And what does the Comintern (SH) stand for? We stand for a non-capitalist, thus socialist Europe.

The teachings of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism, Bolshevism, the hegemony of the proletariat through its vanguard of the International Communist (Stalinist-Hoxhaist) - form the cornerstone of the policies of European socialism. (...) without the construction of a socialist Europe, it is not possible to build a socialist world

The capitalist-imperialist European Union will be replaced by the socialist European Union. European socialist republic will be established, an Union of Socialist States, a new socialist Soviet state - system of new type.” [Documents of the Comintern (SH), Collective Appeal of the German and Portuguese Sections of the Comintern (SH) on the occasion of the elections to the European Parliamnet, 2014, edition in English]

Consequently, if without a socialist European Union it is not possible to accomplish an united socialist world, then to refuse a priori and in a complete manner the possibility of an United Europe means in fact to reject world socialism and world communism and to transform them into mere utopias, it
means in fact to depict capitalists-imperialists world system, globalization and EU as being unsurpassable realities that will allegedly last forever. The ICMLPO’s and WCP’s neo-revisionists intentionally attempt at doing this by refusing to distinguish between capitalist-imperialist globalization and socialist-communist globalization, between capitalist-imperialist EU and socialist-communist EU. By displaying them as being always harmful to the interests of world proletarians and laboring classes, they are denying the entire materialist-scientific outlook through presenting the socio-economic structure behind globalization and the EU as having no relevance to define their character. Indeed, according to ICMLPO’s and WCP’s social-fascists, both globalization and the EU are always exploitative and imperialist, no matter what is the socio-economic system and structure behind them.

And as if this was not enough, the ICMLPO’s and WCP’s opportunists also state that:

“If Denmark shall be able to refuse more Union, there is only one answer: We must get out of the EU! Denmark cannot put the brake on the Union roulette, but it can say yes to become an independent country again.”
(http://www.apk2000.dk/, Defend the No! No Nice Treaty! Nice Means More Union!, edition in English)

So, they don’t promote the struggle for a socialist European Union. Instead, they prefer to foster reactionary bourgeois-nationalistic feelings of a supposedly “independence” that is simply impossible within the context of a globalized capitalist-imperialist system.

An independent Denmark is only possible in a socialist Denmark under the dictatorship of the proletariat – thus by means of the violent socialist revolution - everything else is petty-bourgeois garbage.


The Movement for the Reorganization of the “Communist” Party of Greece is also a member of the ICMLPO, sharing all anti-communist vices common to its “brother-parties”. Like occurs with the others, also the MRCPG describes itself as being an “Hoxhaist”, “anti-revisionist” party. However, the truth is just the opposite.

In what concerns the MRCPG, we can rely on the information took in situ by our Greek comrades, by the Stalinists-Hoxhaists from Greece, who correctly and accurately remark that "Movement for Reorganization of Communist Party of
Greece 1918 - 56" ("Anasintaxi") is a petty-bourgeois pseudo-Hoxhaist group (founded on 2000) which is continuity of "Organization of Communist Marxists - Leninists of Greece" ("OCMLG") which was founded on 1982 by some ex-members of revisionist and social-fascist "Communist" Party of Greece. During the first period, "OCMLG" "supported" in words Socialist Albania and comrade Enver Hoxha but never worked on the direction of class reorganization of workers’ movement, never worked on the direction of revolutionary class reorganization, never behaved politically as an authentic Marxist - Leninist party of the working class in Greece [socialism in words, capitalism and (neo) revisionism in practice]. The "OCMLG" was never recognized as a brother-party of Enver Hoxha’s Party of Labor of Albania.

Today, "Anasintaxi" is member of the neo-revisionist pseudo-Hoxhaist caricature IC"ML"PO. Relatively to Greek reality and massive workers’ movement, "Anasintaxi" defends (like all Greek social-fascists, revisionists and opportunists enemies do) a reformist - counter revolutionary line of "Way out of European Union - Euro - Economical Monetary Union" without a violent armed proletarian revolution as part of the violent armed socialist world revolution. That reformist line deceives the Greek working class and people because without overthrowing capitalism through a violent proletarian revolution, world imperialist system cannot be abolished. Therefore, this is a strategic choice of the Greek neo-revisionists, who are supporters of American - European imperialists and of Greek bourgeois class at their service.

"Anasintaxi" also deceived Greek people and working class telling them that a possible victory of SYRIZA - Kerensky on January 2015 bourgeois elections "maybe will change, even if minimally, the social situation of working masses" and characterized SYRIZA as an anti-fascist petty - bourgeois party (!) and not as a bourgeois social-democratic party as it is in fact. By this time, it’s already well known all over the world that SYRIZA - Kerensky won the elections, made government with a reactionary semi-fascist nationalist party-gang and continues just the same memorandum’s policy of capitalistic barbarity... As the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism teach us, in the epoch of imperialism the national question is absolutely part of violent proletarian revolution’s question and not of bourgeois-democratic revolution! Thus, the national question of dependent countries towards imperialism can be solved totally only by the world violent socialist and proletarian revolution in Greece and all over the world!

At a global scale, "Anasintaxi" supports (like the whole IC"ML"PO) the social-fascist and demagogic regimes like Venezuala’s Chavist Maduro’s regime, Ecuadorian Correa’s regime, North Korean monarcho-fascist regime, Cuban social-fascist regime and other supposedly "anti - imperialist" forces... In its official site, these Greek neo-revisionists and opportunists publish a text defending social-fascist Honduran “President” Zelaya who represented his country’s national bourgeois class and who was ousted from power by compradore forces at the service of American imperialism. Instead of denouncing
Zelaya’s veritable nature and of revealing the inherent and inevitably exploitative and oppressive character of all sections of the bourgeois class without exception (no matter if “national patriotic” or if compradore), they qualify Zelaya’s “nationalistic” bourgeois-capitalist regime (together with those of Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, etc.) as being “democratic”, “progressive” and proof of “people’s victory”:

“(…) repudiate the coup d’état against the government of José Manuel Zelaya. This action, which was known by and had the support of the U.S. government, is not only an attempt to put a brake on the democratic process that had begun in that Central American country; it is also a test and a warning of what the reactionary forces are willing to do to halt and reverse the victories won by the peoples of Latin America, which have resulted in the formation of progressive and democratic governments in various countries in the region.” (http://anasintaxi-en.blogspot.pt/2009/10/we-condemn-coup-detat-and-support.html, We condemn the coup d’état and support the struggle of the workers and people of Honduras, 2009, edition in English)

And Greek neo-revisionists and social-fascists also support, as the whole IC"ML"PO, the pseudo-anti-fascist camp (Russian imperialists in fact) in Ukraine’s reactionary unjust war between Western and Eastern imperialisms. Nobody forgets (only the false "anti-imperialists" of "ICMLPO" do so!) that Donbas rebels’ leader, Gubarev, was member of "Russian Nation’s Unity" - a criminal nazi-fascist group...

In 2008, "Anasintaxi" refused Albanian Kosovars’ self-administration rights providing pseudo-Marxists excuses: that was a safety sign of petty - bourgeois nationalism of that group. Recognizing every oppressed nation’s right for self-administration is an every true communist’s unnegotiable duty, according to comrade Lenin.

Every year, "Anasintaxi" publishes in its garbage website greeting messages by their friends, the Russian social-fascists named “All - Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks" ("AUCPB") who are stooges of Putin’s imperialist semi-fascist regime and hold similar positions to other Russian monarcho-fascists about the "domination of Zionist capital in Russia", etc. ...

All these short remarks unmask the reactionary petty-bourgeois character of this Greek pseudo-Hoxhaist group and denounces the whole IC"ML"PO as a neo-revisionist camp at the service of the world bourgeois class - a camp which must be smashed by today’s genuine Stalinists-Hoxhaists revolutionaries!
9.7. Communist Platform (Italy)

The Italian “brother-party” of the ICMLPO also displays obvious signs of anti-socialist and neo-revisionist tendencies. It affirms to be an “Hoxhaist” and “communist” party, but the positions it stresses in official documents offer the view of a contrary reality.

We can provide a concrete example of the party’s anti-Hoxhaism. Besides openly supporting all kinds of revisionist, social-fascist regimes around the world and of saluting opportunist Greece’s SYRIZA as being a “party of people’s change” (http://www.piattaformacomunista.com/SYRIZA_26.1.15_eng.pdf), the Italian neo-revisionists explicitly praise anti-communist Trotskyist Gramsci:

“Antonio Gramsci was a great revolutionary leader of proletariat, a giant of the communist thought and action who always fought the anti-Leninist deviations, who always defended the proletarian dictatorship.” (http://www.piattaformacomunista.com/Gramsci_a_bolshevik.pdf, Gramsci, a Bolshevist, 2014, edition in English)

We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), is still nowadays tremendously dear to all revisionists, neo-revisionists and anti-communists. The revisionists in general, and the Italian ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists in particular try to depict Gramsci as being a “true communist” whose “revolutionary talent” had allegedly been thwarted by Stalin, the “cruel tyrant” who supposedly “refused to accept Gramsci outstanding creative genius” allegedly because “the truly Marxist views of Gramsci were in total opposition to the system of totalitarian personal power which Stalin had created”. Italian neo-revisionists treated the fact that Gramsci Works were not published in the Stalinist Soviet Union as a proof that Gramsci was a “victim of Stalinist repression”.

Of course that this is nothing more than hateful lies. Comrade Stalin refused to publish Gramsci Works because he understood very well who Gramsci truly was, because comrade Stalin correctly perceived Gramsci “creative theories” as the amount of pro-bourgeois and pro-capitalist garbage they really were. Gramsci totally rejects the crucial Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist theory which considers class and class struggle as a central concept. Indeed, Gramsci even openly refuses the principle of the proletarian dictatorship, replacing it with the ridiculous and abstract idea of the “proletarian hegemony”. Accordingly with Gramsci, the entire transition of capitalism to socialism will have mostly to do not with proletarian rule and repression of the capitalist exploiting class, but with some kind of “cultural struggle” in which the proletariat will finally achieve “cultural hegemony” over the capitalists. It is obvious that this theory is totally fallacious. A class can only have cultural supremacy if it has absolute control and power over all means of production, over the material and productive basis of society. Therefore, the proletariat can only achieve cultural dominance if it has
overthrown and defeated the bourgeoisie, if it has dispossessed the bourgeoisie from all means of production, if it has implemented the proletariat dictatorship in order to repress the exploiters and to smash the foundations of the capitalist order. Indeed, the proletariat will only have total cultural supremacy in a more or less advanced stage of socialism, because in the earlier socialist phases, the proletariat will have to harshly struggle against bourgeois-capitalist cultural influences which may still hold sway over the masses during some time, despite the fact that the bourgeoisie as a class will no longer exist. Even bourgeois ideologues affirm about Gramsci that:

“Gramsci rejected the “economistic” views of Marx and Lenin and did not treat class conflict as a central concept, preferring to develop a more “nuanced analysis” based on cultural hegemony.” (Michael Parenti, Blackshirts and Reds, 1997, edition in English)

The fact that Gramsci died in fascist prisons may also help the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists from the “Communist” Platform (Italy) to present him as an “anti-fascist heroic martyr”. However, the truth is that there was never a real contradiction between the fascists and Gramsci. Both supported reactionary theories which have exactly the same final objective: to perpetuate capitalist oppressive and exploitative tyranny.

9.8. Marxist–Leninist Group Revolution (Norway)

Relatively to the Norwegian ICMLPO neo-revisionists, we will be very brief. They present themselves also as “Marxists-Leninists” and “anti-revisionists” while acting as if none of the 5 Classics ever existed. One just has to take a quick look to their documents to confirm this.

Unfortunately, all their official texts and site are, as far as we perceived, completely in Norwegian language whose translations are not very reliable for us. Anyway, it is common to say that an image is worth a thousand words, and that’s what we think when we find the pro-Dimitrov propaganda image published by the “ML” G “R” social-fascists:
In this and in other articles, we have already explained the purposes and nature of the opportunist and pro-fascist Dimitrov’s “united front theories”. We will only note how our conclusions and criticisms against Dimitrov’s anti-communist “ideas” and against those who support them are entirely suitable to the Norwegian ICLPO neo-revisionists from the “ML” G “R”.

9.9. Communist Party of Spain (Marxist–Leninist)

The “C”PS (“ML”) about which we will reflect right now is, in theory, not the same one whose stands we analyzed in the beginning sub-chapters of this article. That one was dissolved in 1992 and only in 2006 it was “re-born” thanks to the “union” between several small groups of Spanish neo-revisionists who eventually affiliated with the ICMLPO.

In spite of this, the truth is that between the former neo-revisionist “C”PS (“ML”) and the present neo-revisionist “C”PS (“ML”) there is no relevant difference. This last one is the first’s direct heir and it entirely follows the same opportunistic and anti-socialist line of the former. Indeed, most former “leaders” are nowadays in this so-called “new party” with the reactionary Raoul Marco being one of them.

One example of this can be found in a text from these Spanish ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists about civil war in Yemen. We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that this war is between world imperialism in general and Western imperialism in particular and Yemen’s “patriotic” wing of the bourgeois class. However, the
social-fascists from the CPS (ML) try to depict it as being a battle between Western imperialism and “Yemen’s people”, thus presenting “patriotic” bourgeoisie as an allegedly “progressive” and “popular” force, as undifferentiated from working classes, therefore completely despising its necessarily exploitative and oppressive character. They affirm:

“With the support from imperialist USA, Saudi Arabia has launched fierce attacks against Yemen’s cities and has invaded the country (…) in such conditions, Yemen’s people has united and rebelled against it.” (http://www.pceml.info/actual/index.php/internacional/178-yemen-violacion-de-las-leyes-internacionales-y-acto-de-agresion, Violación de las leyes internacionales en Yemen, 2015, translated from Spanish language)

In truth, one of the main characteristics of virtually all ICMLPO’s false “brother-parties” (including the Spanish one) is their firm defense of the interests of the national bourgeoisie in their respective countries. This is the true reason behind their “anti-imperialist” phraseology.

We denounce it 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 ICMLPO’s phony “brother-parties” parties are active. Of course, they are not only useful for the elements of the national bourgeoisie, however for the whole bourgeois class. In conclusion, we point to the important teaching of Hoxhaism that the proletariat will refuse every subordinations 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 ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists in each country will be forced to defend the whole bourgeoisie - including the comprador bourgeoisie. Because: in the last consequence they 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 ICMLPO’s opportunists 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 their global
and national tactics 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 ICMLPO’s social-fascists and anti-communists 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 ICMLPO dialectically both on an international and national scale.

And relatively to the clash between Western and Russian imperialism in Ukraine, they even present Putin and his social-fascist Ukrainian lackeys as being some kind of “resistance” against USA imperialists:

“We must say it: the USA are the empire, and those who oppose it are the “barbarians” which must be defeated at all costs.”


But contrary to what the Spanish ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists insinuate by searching for analogies with the ancient Roman empire, fascist Putin is very far from being some kind of Spartacus leading the slaves against imperial repressors. On the contrary, he represents Russian bourgeois class, the direct heir of Soviet social-imperialism and whose own imperialist ambitions and interests are in contradiction with those of USA imperialists concerning Ukraine. This is the true cause of civil war in that country. It has nothing of “heroic”, of “resistant” or of a “fair war”. No, it is merely the visible sign of rivalry between two great imperialist powers. Of course, we could not expect Spanish ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists to embrace correct Bolshevist positions, because this is not expectable from a party which qualifies itself as “Hoxhaist” while recognizing only the first four Classics and while expelling the rifle from their official logotype:
We already explained the meaning of such kind of stands in this text. Relatively to the CPS (ML), we will solely note its attitude towards republic vs monarchy. In fact, Spanish ICMLPO’s opportunists describe the implementation of a republican regime as being synonym of “fundamental change”:

So, “without republic, without rupture, there will be no changes”, they state. With this, CPS (ML)’s neo-revisionists are attempting at inculcating Spanish workers’ mind with the false idea that the replacement of the monarchic form of bourgeois dictatorship by the republican form of bourgeois dictatorship will definitively solve all their problems and sufferings when the truth is that only socialist revolution in Spain and in the world can do it. True, the Classics
remarked that conditions for proletarian and laborers’ struggle might be better under a bourgeois republic than under monarchy. But that’s all. Like comrade affirmed:

“And people think they have taken quite an extraordinary bold step forward when they have rid themselves of belief in hereditary monarchy and swear by the democratic republic. In reality, however, the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy (...).” (Friedrich Engels, *The Civil War in France - 1891 Introduction by Frederick Engels On the 20th Anniversary of the Paris Commune*, 1891, edition in English)

**9.10. Revolutionary Communist Party of Turkey**

The “Revolutionary Communist” Party of Turkey is another fake “brother-party” of the ICMILPO. Like happens with all others, also the Turkish neo-revisionists do their utmost to deceive their country’s and world’s proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes by using fake “red” and “revolutionary” cloaks.

Even the RCPT’s name – which includes the words “Revolutionary Communist” – is a clear intent to deceive Turkish workers by trying to convince them that the RCPT is a genuine communist party of Bolshevist type. Moreover, as Turkey is under the fascist form of bourgeois class’s dictatorship and Turkish bourgeois class has illegalized the “B”PT, this contributes to give the Turkish ICMILPO’s neo-revisionists a somewhat “anti-fascist” and “anti-revisionist” 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 ICMILPO charlatans that claim to be “Marxist-Leninists”.

But such masks will inevitably fade away. Unfortunately, the number of texts and documents published on their site by the Turkish ICMPO’s opportunists is very limited. However, we can note that they don’t mention comrade Enver and the PLA a single time. On the contrary, in the only text available in English language at their site, they solely refer to pro-fascist Dimitrov:

“Proletarian solidarity which has been vigorously defended by Lenin, Stalin, Dimitrov, etc.”([http://web.archive.org/web/20130925055823/http://www.tdkp.org/90th_anniversary_great_revolution.htm](http://web.archive.org/web/20130925055823/http://www.tdkp.org/90th_anniversary_great_revolution.htm), *Hail the 90th anniversary of the Great October Revolution*, 2007, edition in English)

Was proletarian solidarity vigorously defended by Dimitrov? We, Stalinists-Hoxhaists, know that the only thing revisionist Dimitrov defended “vigorously” was the liquidation and disappearance of the glorious former Comintern of
comrades Lenin and Stalin in first place; and of world communist movement in second place. His opportunist “united front theories” promote exactly this. Indeed, relatively to Turkey specific situation, these eulogizes made by the RCPT’s social-fascists towards Dimitrov contribute to the consolidation and maintenance of Turkish fascist bourgeois-compradore regime at the service of Western imperialism. And this because the only manner through which Turkish laborers can definitively and totally get rid of both fascists and social-fascists is by fully embracing MLSH:

“Not by means of Dimitrov, but by means of the teachings of the 5 classics of Marxism-Leninism, can fascism / social-fascism be abolished irretrievably on a global scale. Therefore, the general-line of the Comintern (SH) says expressively:

The revolutionary world proletariat has to destroy world imperialism to eliminate the inevitability of world fascism. The revolutionary world proletariat has to eliminate world's social imperialism to eliminate the inevitability of world's social fascism. The essence is that fascism cannot be abolished without the victory over social-fascism.

This is the path of the Comintern (SH) which will finally guarantee the victory over fascism. The Dimitrov’s way, however, leads into the capitulation, leads to the maintenance of the domination of the world bourgeoisie. On the way of Dimitrov the fall of world imperialism will not be shortened but delayed - with the familiar consequences of the further repetition of war and fascism. (...) The nature of the decisions of the Seventh Congress that was the limitation to a temporary elimination of fascism and thus undermining the removal of its inevitability. Thus, the decisions of the Seventh Congress served the maintenance of the power of the bourgeoisie, in general, and as a pioneer of the later social fascism in power, in particular.” (Documents of the Comintern (SH), General-Line, chapter VIII, 2013, edition in English)

Of course, Turkish ICMLPO neo-revisionists have absolutely nothing to do with authentic anti-fascism, but on the contrary, they encourage both fascism and social-fascism through their anti-communist positions. One just has to look to the photos published by them on occasion of the 20th anniversary of the IC"ML"PO in Turkey (Istanbul) on 23/11/2014:
In this photo, we can observe that only Marx and Lenin are there. So, here, the ICMLPO neo-revisionists don’t even bother in trying to present themselves with minimally deceitful “anti-revisionist” cloaks by placing comrades Stalin and Enver Hoxha together with the other Classics. On this occasion, they even display themselves as having the same logotype of the revisionists and social-fascists of more “traditional” and explicit type... This also proves in symbolical aspect the opportunist, social-fascist and anti-socialist nature of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists. In this and other articles, we already explained the significance and consequences of such type of positions. Concerning this case in particular, we will solely remark that we have no doubts that, if they could, the ICMLPO’s anti-communists would love to erase even also comrades Marx and Lenin. They only keep mentioning them to avoid being immediately unmasked as the social-fascist and anti-socialists they are. What they really wanted is to totally expunge also the names of the First and Third Classics of Marxism-Leninism, but they don’t dare to do that because if they denied the work of Marx and Lenin they would lose even the smallest remnants of the “communist” and “revolutionary” masquerade which they use as a disguise to their social-fascist ideology and to mislead toiling classes.

And their reactionary tendencies even manage to surpass those of more “classic” revisionists when we note that, besides comrades Stalin and Enver, comrade Engels was also obliterated from their logotype. Not even the social-fascists of open type dare to do this, to treat the irreplaceable and valuable work of comrade...
Engels – which is, let us never forget, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Classic of Marxism-Leninism - in such a dreadfully counter-revolutionary way.

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

9.11. “Expresso-Stalinists” (USA)

The site ridiculously named “Expresso Stalinist” claims to support the ICMLPO, although it is not officially affiliated with it. However, in what respects to neo-revisionism, opportunism and anti-communism, it certainly doesn’t lag behind any of the ICMLPO “brother-parties”.

The site: \url{http://espressostalinist.wordpress.com} is one of those phony “anti-revisionist” sites that pretend to be defending true socialism and communism. In other articles, we have already unmasked and denounced the counter-revolutionary misleading anti-proletarian tendencies of it. The referred site even apparently praises comrade Enver’s socialist Albania and deceitfully talks about “the 5 Heads of Marxism-Leninism” (although it does not recognize Enver Hoxha as a Classic, but only refers to his “valuable contributions to Marxism-Leninism” – therefore, to unmask this site means also to contribute to the implementation of our slogan: "Down with the 4 and 1/2ists!" The 4 and1/2ists are those who don’t recognize comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, but only as someone who made “enriching contributions” to it. This stand is synonym of complete anti-communism because to refuse one of the Classics means to reject all of them as a whole. Contrary to the neo-revisionists of the “Expresso Stalinists”, we cannot merely consider comrade Enver Hoxha as having made mere “valuable contributions” to communist movement and ideology. It is absolutely necessary and indispensable to recognize him as the authentic 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism, as the proletarian leader that truly developed of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin after the death of this last one and in the context of world capitalist-imperialist-revisionist encirclement). The referred site publishes amounts of apparently “anti-revisionist” slogans and articles. But far from being anti-revisionist, this site is in fact neo-revisionist (“anti-revisionist” in words, but revisionist in deeds). One just has to quickly observe it to conclude this. Let’s remark what they have to affirm about monarcho-fascist North Korea:
“What is our standpoint towards the Peoples Republic of Korea? Solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle.” (http://espressostalinist.com/marxism-leninism-versus-revisionism/korean-revisionism/, Our Standpoint Towards the Peoples Republic of Korea, edition in English)

So, according to the “Expresso Stalinists”, North Korea is supposedly some kind of symbol of an alleged “anti-imperialist struggle”, a country supposedly “heroically resisting” world capitalist-imperialist encircling system. In other documents of the Comintern (SH), particularly in our article “Down with Korean revisionism!”, we showed that this country is entirely incorporated in global imperialism and its totally neo-colonized by world bourgeois class through its North Korean social-fascist lackeys.

Monarcho-fascist North Korea is far from being an “isolationist” country. Those pro-American ideologues use this kind of lies with the purpose of struggling against the competition first of Soviet social-imperialism and then of Chinese social-imperialism which is currently the main supporter of the North Korean bourgeois regime. As we have already observed, far from being “isolated”, revisionist, social-fascist and anti-communist North Korea is totally integrated in the mechanisms of the globalized capitalist-imperialist exploitative oppressive anti-socialist system and formation, order and formation. In fact, at least in the bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist sense, neo-colonial North Korea is indeed and was always absolutely “open”: open to capitalist exploitation and oppression, open to bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist class tyranny which condemns North Korean proletariat and workers to a miserable existence, open to all kinds of bourgeois-capitalist degeneration, open to enormous social inequalities, open to absolute predominance of monocultural and parasitic activities which only increase revisionist North Korea’s colossal debts towards world finance capitalists, open to the supreme and unlimited rule of imperialist and social-imperialist corporations/multinationals in all aspects (political, economic, social, ideological, etc.), open to the absolute control of world imperialism, open to neo-colonial exploitative subservience towards imperialism and social-imperialism, etc.

Indeed, we must also remark that, according with the neo-revisionists and anti-communists from the “Expresso Stalinist” site, there are no other imperialisms in the world besides American imperialism. This is the one they notice and refer to towards all the others (Russian, Chinese, Brazilian, etc.) they act as if these simply don’t exist. Of course, we understand the consequences implicit to this position: the “Expresso Stalinists” neo-revisionists are attempting at presenting the other imperialisms and social-imperialisms as being “progressive” forces that, due to this, cannot be considered as imperialisms. Only USA imperialism is regarded as deserving this definition. This stand is common to reformists and opportunists of all kinds, and we already mentioned and explained it in previous sub-chapters of this text and in other documents.
Moreover, behind their false “Leninist-Stalinist” and even “Hoxhaist” masks, the “Expresso Stalinist” opportunists don’t hesitate before openly defending Vietnamese revisionism. We earlier referred to Leduanist revisionism and in fact, in the “Expresso Stalinist” site, we are faced with explicit support for it. It is very interesting to see that no matter how much efforts neo-revisionists put in depicting themselves with “red” and “anti-revisionist” cloaks, in the end they it is always impossible for them to completely hide their anti-socialist nature.

Vietnam is a capitalist state. It never experienced genuine proletarian dictatorship and it never experienced authentic socialist construction. This fact is directly traceable to the nationalist deviation of Ho Chi Minh. Vietnamese workers are enslaved by Vietnamese bourgeoisie and enslaved by foreign imperialists – by the Western imperialists through IMF, but mostly by the Chinese social-imperialist neo-colonialist network emanating from Beijing.

Without wanting to minimize the heroic struggle that the Vietnamese people waged against the French, American and Chinese imperialists and social-imperialists, we have to note that Vietnam was never a truly socialist country. Since the beginning, the so-called “Communist” Party of Vietnam always embraced an ideology which is infinitely more close to bourgeois anti-imperialist nationalism than to MLSH. Actually, revisionist, neo-colonial Vietnam is completely subjected to the dominance of world imperialism in general and of Chinese social-imperialism in particular.

Vietnamese social-fascist bourgeois class which rules the country is solely worried about ensuring maximum profits for itself and for its imperialist bosses, contrary to what the neo-revisionists from the “Expresso Stalinists” insinuate by depicting it and its representative Ho Chi Minh as having anything to do with anti-revisionism. For example, in November 1976, the Deputy Prime Minister Nguyen Co Thach told a meeting in Paris of the National Council of French Employers that under a new code for foreign investors:

“Investments would be guaranteed for 15 years; profits might be repatriated (...) and investors would have the right to repatriate their capital.”
(Keesing’s Contemporary Archives, Volume 23, p. 28, edition in English)

This situation is totally opposed to that of comrade Enver’s socialist Albania which relied on its own internal forces and was never dependent of foreign credits, “aids” or of “investors” who are in truth imperialist neo-colonizers. The Albanian Marxist-Leninists struggled to keep the country’s commercial balance always positive and they accomplished this task. Even bourgeois ideologues were impressed by the way a tiny country like Albania not only was plainly auto-sufficient but also effectively refused to be integrated in the world capitalist-imperialist system. In truth, every veritable socialist country in the context of capitalist-revisionist encirclement (as was the case of comrade Enver’s socialist
Albania) has to fight for its self-reliance because otherwise international imperialism would immediately invade the country through capitalist credits, “aids” and “investments”, thus preventing and destroying proletarian dictatorship and the building of socialism under the leadership of a proletarian vanguard party of Bolshevist Leninist-Stalinist type (as was the case with Enver’s PLA). As comrade Enver Hoxha clearly and correctly declares:

“Capitalism never makes investments, provides loans, or exports capital to other countries without first calculating the profits it will realize for itself. (...) It provides them to destroy socialism. Therefore, a genuine socialist country never accepts them, in any form, from a capitalist, bourgeois, or revisionist country.” (Enver Hoxha, *Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, 1979, edition in English)

This principled and Marxist-Leninist stand is on the antipodes of that adopted by the bourgeois-capitalist and pro-imperialist Vietnamese regime. And the anti-communist crimes committed by Vietnamese revisionist bourgeois class can also be assigned to all those who support it, like occurs with the “Expresso Stalinists”.

We could add much more about this issue, but we will not do it right now. In the future, we plan to write an entire article dedicated to the origins, development and consequences of Vietnamese / Leduanist revisionism. Anyway, what we mentioned in this occasion suffices to prove the intrinsically counter-revolutionary nature of the “Expresso Stalinist” neo-revisionists and anti-socialists.


The “Marxist-Leninist Communist” Party of Venezuela is the Venezuelan “brother-party” of the ICMLPO. Following the example of those from other countries, also this neo-revisionist organization describes itself as, “anti-revisionist” and “anti-imperialist” when the truth is very far from this.

Indeed, the MLCPV is an open supporter of Chavist (and Maduro’s) social-fascists and, consequently, of their Chinese social-imperialist bosses. So much for their fake “anti-imperialist” phraseology:
Therefore, about this party we will only leave brief notes, because the main criticism directed against it – namely, the reactionary and anti-communist essence of Chavism - was already analyzed by us beforehand in this same article and also in others from the Comintern (SH).

In fact, the Venezuelan ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists explicitly defend “peaceful transition to socialism” and qualify as “socialist” some of the main revisionist countries that still exist:

“From the Central Committee of the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Venezuela, expression of the ICMLPO in our country, we see with great optimism and good wishes those firm steps in the consolidation of a policy of agreements, alliances and unity begins to be established between Venezuelan revolutionary leftist organizations regardless of the forms of struggle they use. (…)

To believe in the benefits of the imperialist bourgeoisie (…) is to forget the lessons of successful socialist revolutions in the world as the Chinese, Vietnamese, North Korean or Cuban.”

In what concerns the attempt at presenting to world and Venezuelan workers social-fascists and anti-communists Vietnam, Cuba, North Korea and China as being “revolutionary socialist” nations, it even exempts our commentaries. Our positions relatively to the alleged "revolutionary”, “socialist” and “anti-
imperialist” nature of such regimes and of those who, around the world, support them (like happens with the ICMLPO’ opportunists) are well-known and we will not repeat them once more.

But besides this, we can clearly note the embracement (again…) of Dimitrov’s “united front theories” in the Venezuelan ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists affirmations about their “optimism” and “good wishes” relatively to the “union, agreement and alliance between revolutionary leftist organizations, no matter what their forms of struggle are”. In first place, while there is no Venezuelan Section of the Comintern (SH), that means that there is not a single organization in that country deserving to be called “revolutionary”. In second place, Dimitrov’s “ideas” support alliance and coalition between the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist communist parties and the pro-capitalist forces which auto-qualify themselves as “anti-fascist” with the objective of misleading the oppressed and exploited proletariat and working classes about the true class character of the fascist form of bourgeois dictatorship. In fact, the anti-communist and pro-fascist nature of Dimitrov’s thesis can be concluded from the fact that fascism is a direct inevitable product of capitalism and it will never be totally and definitively defeated as long as the capitalist-imperialist exploitative and wage slavagist system and formation exists. Thus, Dimitrov defends that the communist parties should trust and rely on forces which, despite their fake “anti-fascist” appearance and phraseology, are at the service of the same political-social-economic-ideological order which gave birth to fascism in order to struggle against that same fascism! And this because the bourgeois and pro-capitalist forces with whom Dimitrov proposes that the communist parties should become allies are of the same nature of fascism itself; those bourgeois forces and fascism both inescapably derive from the same capitalist-imperialist oppressive system and formation. If fascism is a direct and unavoidable result of the bourgeois-capitalist order, the reasonable and principled solution would be that, in order to wage an efficient and fruitful combat against fascism with the goal of accomplishing the abolition of its inevitability, communist parties should struggle against all forces and influences which are related to the economical and ideological system and formation which originates fascism. And just like Dimitrov advocates a counter-revolutionary “union” with those false “progressive anti-fascist” (read: bourgeois) forces with the phony pretext of “defeating fascism”, Venezuelan ICMLPO’s social-fascists of the MLCPV also advocate reactionary “union” with the “Venezuelan leftist revolutionary organizations” (read: with the Chavist pro-Chinese imperialist bourgeoisie) with the sham pretext of defeating the pro-American imperialism bourgeoisie. As can be observe, it is all a question of misleading proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes in order to replace certain capitalist exploiters by others, to replace certain imperialist oppressors by others. The ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists in Venezuela and in other countries don’t want anything more than this.
And as if this was not enough, they even boast of “not giving importance to what forms of struggle we use”, therefore intentionally accepting the so-called “peaceful ways to socialism” already promoted by Soviet / Krushchevists and also by other kinds of revisionists whose purpose was and is to strengthen the bourgeois class and its capitalist-imperialist system against world communist movement. Our beloved comrade Enver once made an affirmation that is totally applicable also to this stand of the Venezuelan ICMLPO’s anti-communists:

“Kautsky in Germany, Otto Bauer and Karl Renner in Austria, Léon Blum and Paul Boncourt in France, rose in fury against the October Revolution and the Leninist strategy and tactics of the revolution. They called the October Revolution unlawful, a diversion from the course of historical development and a deviation from the Marxist theory. They preached the peaceful revolution without violence and bloodshed, the taking of power through the majority in parliament; they were against the transformation of the proletariat into a ruling class. They praised bourgeois democracy to the heavens and attacked the dictatorship of the proletariat. (…)

Equally in favor of imperialism and the bourgeoisie and harmful to the revolution was the other thesis of the 20th Congress of the CPSU about "peaceful coexistence", which the Khrushchevites tried to impose on the whole communist movement, extending it even to relations between classes, and between the peoples and their imperialist oppressors. The Khrushchevites preached that at the present stage, the main road of transition to socialism was the peaceful road. They advised the communist parties to follow the policy of class conciliation and collaboration with social-democracy and other political forces of the bourgeoisie. This line assisted the attainment of those objectives for which imperialism and capital had long been fighting with every means, including arms and ideological diversion. (…) With their preachings of the peaceful road to socialism, the Khrushchevites sought to impede the communists and the revolutionaries of the world from preparing for and carrying out the revolution and wanted them to reduce all their work to propaganda, to debates and electoral manoeuvres, to trade-union demonstrations and day-today demands.” (Enver Hoxha, Eurocommunism is Anticommunism, Tirana 1980, edition in English)

9.13. Other affiliated organizations

Lastly, we will now analyze some positions embraced by two more organizations related with the ICMLPO: Tunisian “Workers”’ Party and Germany’s “Arbeit-Zukunft”.
In what respects to the first one, its entirely anti-communist nature is evident if we take into account the fact that it deliberately erased the word “communist” from the party’s official name. Until some time ago, Tunisian neo-revisionists tried to mislead workers a bit more through calling themselves “Communist Workers’” Party of Tunisia. But by now they don’t even bother in hiding their reactionary tendencies and so we are informed that:

“Tunisia’s eminent communist political party, the Tunisian Communist Workers Party (POCT), has officially changed its name to Tunisian Workers Party (POT). POT decided to omit the word “communist” from their title (...). “Our goal is to avoid the stereotype most Tunisians would think of when hearing the word ‘communist’,” said Mohamed Mzam, a representative of POT.

Mzam stated that the name change came as a response to, “numerous admirers of the party who were suspicious about our ideology.” Mzam explained that programs and agendas of political parties are more important than their ideologies.” (https://web.archive.org/web/20120717075533/http://www.tunisia-live.net/2012/07/11/tunisian-communist-party-changes-its-name-to-tunisian-workers-party/, Tunisian “Communist” Party Changes Name to Tunisian Workers’ Party, 2012, edition in English)

Thus, “programs and agendas” are more important than ideologies…. This reminds us of reformist Bernstein – one of revisionism’s fathers – and of his infamous quotation: “the objective is nothing, the movement is everything”. The similarities are crystal clear and they don’t even need our further commentaries.

And sure, ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists from Tunisia (and also those from all other countries…) are always and inevitably opportunists and social-fascists, no matter if they use the word “communist” in their name or not. But we cannot fail noticing their explicit admission of their refusal of anything related with authentic Bolshevist theory and practice.

We could never fail to note this confession of failure, this evidence of incapacity, this betrayal of communism. In fact, in the special site that the Comintern (SH) dedicates to Tunisia (http://ciml.250x.com/africa/tunisia.html), we had already reflected about this “name changing” and remarked that it is symptomatic for the petty-bourgeoisie - afraid of communism. Allegedly, voters cannot be wooed with "communism".

The name changing cannot hide the fact that this party is in essence a neo-revisionist party from the very beginning of its existence. This party is anti-revisionist in words and revisionist in deeds. The TWP is not even approximately "leftist" in the broadest sense. Hama Hammami is not a Marxist-Leninist. He neither fights against capitalism nor for socialism.
"The aim is to rally a large group of the population around a clear program and not simply around the issue of faith," he said [cited by the (!!) Chinese social-fascist "Xinhua.Net" - and the chinadaily.com].

This radical-democratic, petty bourgeois party is borne by the waves of the revolution in Tunisia. And this party will be inevitably submerged by the waves of the socialist revolution which will follow unavoidably. When the workers of Tunisia establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, the TWP will fall into obscurity. At present, this neo-revisionist party and its bad influence in Africa should not be underestimated because it undermines the necessary transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the proletarian socialist revolution. It is absolutely necessary to unmask the neo-revisionist character of the TWP on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism.

There will develop some brave proletarian revolutionary elements who criticize the revisionist betrayal of the TWP and who do not hesitate to march further towards the socialist revolution on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Therefore the Comintern (SH) will absolutely support these Stalinist-Hoxhaist comrades in Tunisia.

As far as we were able to translate the Arab website of the TWP, we could only discover one sole (!) communist publication: Marx and Engels: "Communist Manifesto".

And the TWP denies what Marx and Engels have written in this famous book:

"The communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!"

Lenin taught us:

"One should know how to combine the struggle for democracy and the struggle for the socialist revolution, subordinating the first to the second. In this lies the whole difficulty; in this is the whole essence. Don’t lose sight of the main thing (the socialist revolution); put it first; put all the democratic demands, but subordinating them to it, coordinating them with it." (Lenin, Collected Works, Volume 35, page 269, edition in English)

The TWP did not and will not understand this clear and principled Leninist compass of the Tunisian revolution.

The TWP is affiliated with the neo-revisionist association of the ICMLPO which betrayed comrade Enver Hoxha - the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, the
leader of the Marxist-Leninist World Movement and the leader of Socialist Albania. The facelift of the Tunisian Workers Party is showing the white feather instead of the revolutionary red banner of the communist world proletariat!

So, in order “not to frighten Tunisian people” with such a scary word like “communist”, ICMLPO’s anti-socialists didn’t hesitate in throwing overboard the last remnants of their “red” masks. In our opinion, they are miscalculating. Tunisian proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes are certainly not anti-communist paranoiacs. On the contrary, they recognize that they only be definitively and totally free with the accomplishment of a stateless, classless and propertyless society – that is, with communism. Therefore, the elimination of the word “communist” from their official name may only apparently please Tunisian and global bourgeois class and other exploitative classes. However, without the already mentioned “red”, “communist” cloaks, the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists in Tunisia considerably lose their ability to deceive laboring classes, to penetrate within their ranks in order to keep them away from MLSH. Thus, they lose also their usefulness to those oppressive classes, who will cease from supporting them and what will probably lead to their disappearance as a party and their replacement by other anti-proletarian and anti-socialist instruments easy to be managed by the bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist system and better able to deceive and mislead workers with that referred purpose.

Lastly, we come now to the “Arbeit-Zukunft”, a German neo-revisionist and opportunist organization. This organization is obviously influenced by Maoist revisionism and, as far as we perceived, even in those articles pretending to “denounce China’s expansionism”, it avoids explicitly mentioning Chinese social-imperialism, thus denying today’s China intrinsically imperialist nature. For example, this occurs with the text contained in this link: http://www.arbeit-zukunft.de/index.php?itemid=1583.

Moreover, these German social-fascists also openly praise individuals obviously belonging to capitalist ideology and culture like is the case with Stephane Hessel, a well-known bourgeois ideologue admirer of monarcho-fascist Churchill, of nationalists Jean Moulin and De Gaulle, of social-fascist Mandela and of feudal-aristocratic leader Dalai Lama. He is also famous for his anti-Stalinism, of course:

“Hessel’s inspirations are Jean Moulin, Charles de Gaulle and later the Dalai Lama and Nelson Mandela. In his books, he takes stands against Stalin’s policies (…). Hessel’s writings are an accusation against capitalist system, and therefore, he is among those bourgeois forces with which we should be.” (http://www.arbeit-zukunft.de/index.php?itemid=1656, Buchvorstellung: Stephane Hessel- “Empört Euch!”), 2011, translated from German language)
Here, we are provided with evidence concerning the anti-Stalinist (and thus necessarily anti-communist) essence of the “Arbeit-Zukunft” neo-revisionists when they affirm: “Hessel is anti-Stalinist, but that’s fine, we must unite with him and with others like him.” In first place, from the moment we refuse Stalinism, accomplishment of world socialist revolution, of world proletarian dictatorship, of world socialism and of world communism will be impossible, as none of these things can be achieved without resolute adherence and unwavering defense of the brilliant revolutionary teachings of comrade Stalin, the 4th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Stalinism represents an irreplaceable and inestimable development of the Marxist-Leninist theory, and to deny Comrade Stalin’s contribution means to deny socialist revolution in itself.

It can be mentioned that the leader of “Arbeit-Zukunft”, Diethard Möller, was once member of our former German brother-party, the KPD/ML. Diethard Möller accused comrade Ernst Aust that he would allegedly have “betrayed” (!!) comrade Stalin (see: Möller's motion No 242 to the 5th Congress of the KPD/ML). Comrade Ernst Aust was the greatest German Stalinist after the death of comrade Ernst Thälmann!

Of course, we defended comrade Ernst Aust against accusations of Diethard Möller. We declared war against Diethard Möller already 30 years ago! Today “Arbeit-Zukunft” collaborates with many other anti-communist organizations, for example with the old Krushchevite party D"K"P. Diethard Möller did also cooperate with StaSi (social-fascist GDR)! This liquidator, Diethard Möller, had split our party after the victorious struggle against the Koch-Trotzkyite leaders in the end of 1985 - namely in service and with the direct help of Turkish elements of the RCPT who were co-founders of the ICMLPO. Diethard Möller cooperated with leaders of our brother parties against the KPD/ML even 10 years before these leaders had founded the ICMLPO.

Concerning “Arbeit-Zukunft” it is more than clear that ICMLPO was and still is an organization of liquidators within the communist movement – a 5th column of the international counterrevolution! “Arbeit-Zukunft” is one of the German neo-revisionist groups which openly attack the German Section of the Comintern (SH). Diethard Möller had committed so many crimes against our party that there would not be enough space to list them up in this article!

Stalinism is the vital and decisive factor which permits the victorious implementation and survival of the proletarian dictatorship. Consequently, to reject it is synonym of choosing the side of world capitalism-imperialism, of world reaction and counter-revolution, of world anti-communism, of world bourgeoisie, is synonym of striving to condemn workers to endless subjugation to wage slavagist totalitarian, anti-socialist, oppressive and exploitative bourgeois capitalist-revisionist-imperialist order. To refuse Stalinist ideology means to deny the possibility of successful socialist revolution; and the negation of the possibility of successful socialist revolution is synonym of considering
communism as an unrealizable utopia because the accomplishment of communism is dependent on the success of the socialist construction and on the revolutionary fierceness of proletarian dictatorship.

Finally, relatively to this support for bourgeois cultural “personalities” by the German neo-revisionists from the “Arbeit-Zukunft”, it is synonym of their complete surrender to capitalist ideology and fostering of bourgeois “way of life”, thus contributing to the perpetuation of both.

Our best answer to them is to quote comrade Enver about this issue:

“In our country the proletarian socialist ideology is the ideology in power which sets the general tone for all the life and activity of our working people. Despite the successes achieved, however, we are conscious that the struggle in this field is protracted and difficult. V.I. Lenin said:

«Our task is to overcome all the resistance of the capitalists, not only their military and political resistance but also their ideological resistance, which is the strongest and most deeply entrenched.»

The old idealist ideology of the exploiting society still has deep roots and exerts a powerful and continuous influence. When we speak of this influence, it is not just a matter of «a few remnants and alien manifestations that appear here and there», as it is often wrongly described in our propaganda, but the influence of a whole alien ideology which is expressed in all sorts of alien concepts, customs and attitudes, which are retained for a long time as a heritage from the past, have social support in the former exploiting classes and their remnants, in the tendencies to petty-bourgeois spontaneity, and are nurtured in various forms by the capitalist and revisionist world which surrounds us.

As long as the complete victory of the socialist revolution in the field of ideology and culture has not been ensured, the achievements of the socialist revolution in the political and economic fields cannot be secure and guaranteed, either. Therefore, in the final analysis, the struggle on the ideological front for the complete defeat of bourgeois and revisionist ideology has to do with the question: will socialism and communism be built and the restoration of capitalism be avoided, or will the door be opened to the spread of bourgeois and revisionist ideology and the return to capitalism be permitted. The ideological and cultural revolution is a part of the general class struggle to carry the socialist revolution through to the end in all fields.” (Enver Hoxha, Report to the V Congress of the PLA, 1966, in: Selected Works, Volume IV, 1982, edition in English)
10. Conclusions

The purpose of this DWICMLPO is to denounce the anti-socialist and reactionary nature of ICMLPO’s neo-revisionism throughout the world. It aims at being a valuable theoretical contribution for the struggle of the Comintern (SH) against the ICMLPO. In order to accomplish this objective, we tried to analyze this organization’s past and some of its main official documents. Moreover, we also presented concrete examples of ICMLPO’s opportunism taken from a reasonably comprehensive collection of ICMLPO parties and organizations from various countries.

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 ICMLPO’s neo-revisionism are always present in all those parties: staunch refusal of comrade Enver as the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism, systematic embracement of Dimitrov’s pro-fascist and opportunist “united front theories”, firm defense of the class interests of the “national, patriotic” bourgeoisie in their respective countries (this is indeed the true reason behind their false “anti-imperialist” phraseology), etc. In what respects to this, we can provide an example when, recently, Indian ICMLPO’s anti-socialists attempted at abusively interfering in the own websites of the Comintern (SH).

This happened when Viyai Singh, the representative of the ICMLPO in India (he signs for the "Indian Stalin-Friendship Association" on Facebook), tried to place the May-Resolution of the ICMLPO on our facebook-site "Comintern (SH)" which was - of course - deleted at once. Unsurprisingly, this "May-Resolution" of the ICMLPO is mainly composed of reformist appeals to "people's front" while containing nothing about the violent armed socialist revolution, not to speak about the socialist world revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the world proletariat… This is one more proof of the systematic similarity of the anti-communist aims that “unite” all ICMLPO’s member organizations and “brother-parties”.

We are very proud to tackle this great theoretical polemic against our most dangerous enemies - the neo-revisionists who have betrayed the 5th Classic of Marxism-Leninism. Furthermore, drawing our demarcation-line to ICMLPO will make it more difficult for all the centrist groups who raised all kind of opportunist dither between Comintern (SH) and ICMLPO up to a dangerous level of an alleged "principled ideological line".

These centrists are henchmen of the neo-revisionists. There is a law of ideological struggle which says:

**The higher the level of our ideological demarcation line to the ICMLPO - the more difficult it will be for centrism to fish in troubled waters. Without**
defeat of the ICMLPO - no advanced development of the Stalinist-Hoxhaist world movement.

The ICMLPO is an enemy which must not be underestimated. These organizations are "clever" (in the sense of: equipped with "two-faces -skills" in misusing Hoxhaist ideology. These criminals will do everything possible to "appear" as the "true" Hoxhaists" who "defend" comrade Enver Hoxha "against" the "sectarian", "Trotskyite", "dogmatist" etc. etc.... Comintern (SH). Therefore, our DWICMLPO must be ABSOLUTELY impermeable and "waterproof" by HIGHEST STANDARD of Stalinism-Hoxhaism.

The final aim of all the revisionist tricks and misleading invented by the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists in the single countries and worldwide 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 ICMLPO’s social-fascists do their utmost to paralyze our efforts to promote the genial principles of MLSH, 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, it is absolutely crucial to found a Section of the Comintern (SH) in each country, because only in this manner world proletarians, workers and other exploited and oppressed classes are under the centralized leadership of the Comintern (SH), the only world party of authentically Leninist-Stalinist, Bolshevist type, the only genuinely proletarian and communist organization existing in today’s world. Only this way can they 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 ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists, social-fascists and anti-communists are among the most dangerous representatives.

After 20 years which have already passed after the foundation of the ICMLPO, we unmasked this counter-revolutionary organization. This theoretical contribution of the DWCMLPO totally ensures that these traitors now got what they fully deserve!

We unmasked the ICMLPO as that what it really is: a 5th column of the counterrevolution in the ranks of the communist world movement. Therefore, we appeal for all communists in the world: Support this Declaration of War against the ICMLPO!
World workers, peasants and soldiers - unite!

Don’t be deceived by the lies of the ICMLPO’s neo-revisionists!

Fight against ICMLPO’s opportunists, who are the lackeys of world capitalism-imperialism, of world bourgeois class!

ICMLPO’s drug trafficking social-fascists only want to perpetuate wage exploitation and oppression worldwide!

They help world capitalists-imperialists to maximize their bloody profits through enslavement and misleading of world laborers!

Death to all kinds of revisionism and anti-communism in general and to ICMLPO’s neo-revisionism and anti-communism in particular!

Under the leadership of the Comintern (SH), world proletariat will tear ICMLPO into pieces!

For the foundation of a Section of the Comintern (SH) in each country!

Long live world socialist and proletarian revolution!

Long live world armed and violent proletarian dictatorship!

Long live world socialism and world communism!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism-Hoxhaism!

Long live the invincible and immortal lessons of the 5 Classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Enver Hoxha!

Long live the Comintern (SH), the only truly communist organization in the world, the only global vanguard party of the world proletariat!
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