The Approach of Our Party on the Prepared Draft

TKP/ML
Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist

January 3, 2022[1]

An assessment with general lines on our perspective towards proletarian internationalism and on which ideological-political and organizational grounds the International Movement of the Proletariat (IMP) should define itself in our day on the basis of the historical experiences of the International Communist Movement.

When the imperialist capitalist system in which we live in has made itself distinct with its most fundamental characteristics in the beginning of the 20th century, it was defined by Lenin as "a colossus with feet of clay" and as "a rotting" system. The imperialist capitalist system which Lenin has made the clearest description of its quality has been able to maintain its existence as the dominant economic, political and administrative system going through various stages until our day.

The capitalist mode of production and production relations have a distinct discrepancy from other productive forces-production relations in the past by being more hegemonic and having the characteristic of subjugating the whole to itself. Expansion through spread and generating new fields of dominance is an absolute for this system to function. It cannot maintain its existence by withdrawing to itself; it has to spread, increase, constantly expand its sphere of influence, and neutralize its competitors or the ones who have the capability to become competition. On the other hand expansionism which is a requisite for the existence of the capitalist system together with gradually getting more centralized imposes becoming a gear on this wheel as an obligation. Without this expansionism and subjugation of the whole to itself, capitalism cannot exist. In this sense, it is a system of exploitation that is more complex in respect to the economic, political and social systems of the past, a system that incorporates greater number of contradictions, and a system that faces off greater number of forces. Capitalism that incorporates the process of connecting all the systems on the face of the world to itself, at the same time, creates an environment of conflict that descends onto individuals and that obliges the reality of existence-nonexistence and "existing through the destruction of its competitor." Due to the lethal competition that descends upon single producers, both among themselves and among them and the working class and toilers the contradictions are rather violent and at the same time more destructive to a greater degree. In the systems of exploitation prior to capitalism, the

[1] https://ci-ic.net/blog/2022/01/03/tkp-mls-assessment-of-the-unified-international-maoist-conference-uimc-declaration/

forms of dominance essentially based on dominance over pieces and on the basis of piece through the subjugation of other pieces, together with capitalism has created the obligation to turn the general world which constitutes the essence of the exploitation into a common market. Due to this obligatory function that is specific to capitalism, the capitalists on one hand while trying to destroy one another through market seizing wars with relentless competition in an imperative manner, on the other hand even though it looks as if they are excluding one another, at the same time are in a necessary position of "protecting one another" in order to preserve the system. Despite the relentless competition among them, this has to be this way. Even though the relentless competition is an internal and obligatory characteristic of capitalism, solidarity among capitalists in order to preserve the given system in order to protect the system from the "gravediggers," to avoid "their graves being dug," which is the condition of existence is another obligation to the same degree.

Although this seems like a contradiction, the pieces of this system that conflict with one another relentlessly and experience this conflict at the level of every produce that they produce are tied to one another with an absolute link in order to realize their partnership at the most progressed level possible and to preserve this system together. This situation directs them to an obligatory unity against the working class and other productive sections that provides for their existence and the international character of production obliges also the international character of the solidarity for capitalists.

When we take a broad look at the functioning of the system as a whole, even there we witness the generation of numerous common action mechanism in the economic-political-military framework, stretching from single monopolies to the level of states, despite the relentless competition among them. IMF, WB, APEC, OPEC, NAFTA, EU, NATO are some well-known examples of this.

Despite the gradually increasing competition both in terms of its extent and depth and the continuous crises, it is still early to talk of a direct concrete threat such as an inter-imperialist war. In this sense, the process can still be identified as a "current of revolution," not as a "current of war." The given objective situation has not yet reached the quality of being a "current of war" in between imperialist powers in terms of the extent of the inter-imperialist contradictions and competition. However, this fact does not invalidate the sharpening of the competition between imperialist in a continuous and steady manner. The armed forms of the competition in between imperialists essentially continue as local and indirect wars-conflicts, not directly. The invasions that take place in the axis of the US and Russian imperialism are in essence take the form of direct invasions in semi-colonial countries that have their own unique characteristics. On the other hand, in countries which are subjected to an invasion of an imperialist alliance (NATO) or of one or more than imperialist forces, other imperialist or imperialists instead of directly confronting one another, take part in the indirect war by mobilizing collaborator-servant forces. Consequently, as the economic war is maintained directly and explicitly, the armed aspect of the sharing takes the

aforementioned forms. Even though the evolution of the gradually increasing extent and depth of these contradictions to a direct confrontation of imperialists stands as a reality in front of us, in consideration with the stage that the war industry has reached, the reality of the destruction that is to be caused by such a confrontation would reach tremendously far beyond the destruction of the first and the second imperialist wars, requires postponing of an inter-imperialist war as much as possible. How long this "postponing" would last depends on the course of the developments. What we intend to mean is that the imperialist capitalist system could still carry the competition and conflicts that are internal to it and just as in the example of the indirect wars, could still absorb such contradictions in different forms by keeping its distance.

Despite all the infertile conditions, the imperialist capitalist system has managed to maintain its dominance by overcoming the blockages that it has experienced. The most significant reason behind this is the objective situation of the communist and revolutionary forces which is being far away from threatening the system. This situation provides for a more comfortable situation for the imperialists and their servants. This "objective comfort," in terms of the "complete perpetuity" of the imperialist capitalist system enables the maintaining of the system on the line of "preservation through conflict." The lack/inadequacy of the communist subject is at the essential determinative point of the continuation of the existence of the imperialist capitalist system. The creation of the situation that "provides for comfort within unease" of the imperialists and their servants is due to the process that is essentially in favour of bourgeoisie for a long historical period which holds ups and downs and the continuing process of gains and losses of the class struggle of proletariat, despite the successful results obtained time to time.

Within the more hundred years period of the definition of Lenin of the dominant system as **"Imperialism the Last Stage of Capitalism,"** although great historic ruptures that shook the grounds of the imperialist capitalist system, such the the 17th of October and the Chinese Revolution had had happened and nearly one third of the world population lived under socialist powers, ultimately a period had ended by the usurping of the power by capitalist-roaders in China. Together with the fall of the "Berlin Wall" which is symbolically expressed as the demarcation line between the socialist system and the capitalist system, capitalist system declared its triumph! We, namely the MLM, however define it as a defeat of revisionism and social imperialism, together with the counter-revolutionary propagandas of the propagandists and bourgeoisie, of individuals and organizations that divert from Marxism and betray MLM, faith of large masses of people to socialism has weakened together with their experiences. Moreover, neo-liberal policies that were effectively implemented all over the world by 1980s and descended upon the working class and the toiling people in 1990s, parallel to the remission of communist and revolutionary activities has brought about the serious disorganization, distancing of the workers and toilers from organizations such as unions. The weakening of this ground that brings about signif-

icant advantages of the organization of communist and revolutionary forces and the strengthening of dominance of within-the-system understandings within the existing understanding caused the weakening of the ties with the masses. Within this period, even though we have witnessed great mass demonstrations, actions of workers and peasants and sections of the society that have grievances towards the given system, due to communist forces not being able to actively exist and become an effective force in these movements in the real sense of the word, these movements have remained as movements that did not create disturbances within the whole system, that did not create threats against the whole system, and remained as movements that released the energy without obtaining results. Today too, in various parts of the world similar mass movements are taking place, however the obtained results are essentially the same. On the other hand, these movements show that once a proper leadership is created and in this or that way the dynamics of these masses that have gradual grievances towards the system are channelized towards a proper direction, there are possible opportunities to obtain results in favour of the revolution front in the short term. The mass movements in several places of the world at the same time are significant in the sense that they show existing and gradually accumulating the dynamic against the system. The oppressed masses are in search for a solution however the lack of the communist subject is also deeply felt.

Even though the rage and the reactions of the working class and oppressed toilers against the given imperialist capitalist system time to time transform into actions and resistances that pour out to the streets, the energy emerging from the masses have not yet merged with the MLM forces. The movement and the struggle of the working class and the toilers are being imprisoned into within-the-system under the activities and the leadership of the revisionist reformist and within-the-system organizations to a significant extent.

This objective situation, despite bringing about great challenges in the continuation of the struggle for revolution and socialism of MLMs, in various places of the world, MLMs and various revolutionary forces have continued to struggle against the imperialist capitalist system by not giving in to the given conditions. Particularly proletarian revolutionaries that insist on the MLM ideological and practical line continued their struggle by raising the flag of MLM high up in various parts of the world, in Peru, in Nepal, in India and in Turkey and have made significant advances. As we all know, whereas the PCP under the leadership of President Gonzalo in Peru had once again made our hopes bloom, together with the capture of Gonzalo and important leaders of the PCP, as a result of the "road accident" that took place a serious regression had happened. The People's War in Nepal that was initiated in 1996 once again made our hopes blossom. The collaborationist line of the Maoist leadership of the Communist Party of Nepal by making the gains of the revolution a present to the bourgeoisie has caused a great waste of an important opportunity. On the other hand our Party, the TKP/ML has a period of ups and downs in terms of People's War. Due to reasons

such as losses experienced at the level of leadership from time to time and not properly administering the process time to time, despite an uninterrupted persistence towards People's War has not been adequately effective. In the last years, CPI(M) that continues the People's War on the MLM line follows a consistent course of progress. Except of these parties and organization, we can also speak of the CPP that is timid in respect to directing itself to the power and its line of constant seeking of reconciliation despite its factual armed struggle and its possession of a significant armed force and activities. However it defines itself as Maoist, CPP that ideologically has a rather third-worldist line, despite its great force is far away from being an inspiration for the world revolution. The social and national liberation movement that wage armed struggle except of the ones that define themselves as MLM or with Mao Zedong Thought have essentially anchored themselves to a "armed reformist" line and have embraced a direction on the reconciliatory-peaceful line. Great guerrilla movements such as the PKK and the FARC, in the given stage by choosing to reconcile with bourgeoisie, let alone preserving the gains they have obtained, they cannot even protect their lives! Even though the PKK has the advantage of struggling in the four-pieced Kurdistan, its line of reconciliation-peace today stumbles to a great extent and experience serious challenges. We should underscore that the problems visible in the given picture of these movements are due to the results of their reconciliatory and peaceful political lines towards dominant powers rather than military defeats or regressions.

On the other hand the developments in the other front of this picture consolidate the hopes towards the future for the proletariat and the oppressed-exploited peoples. In the struggle for the realization of the world revolution of the international proletariat in various parts of the world MLM parties and organizations are being constructed, in this sense we can speak of a positive tendency. These developments reinforce our hopes towards the future and strengthen us. Together with the gradual maturation of the objective conditions, we have a strong faith and hope that these parties and organization will advance once they operate with a correct ideological-practical and organizational line and we should state that we do indeed care about them. The need of the working class and oppressed masses of toiling people to MLMs makes itself felt as an urgent need every single passing day. As long as we manage to walk on a correct line and a correct practical track, it is possible for us to lead the popular masses that experience serious problem with the system, that pour out to the streets, that are subjected to violent attacks of the state forces and to equip them with the political power oriented perspective with the command of the MLM. In order for this to happen, we need to get to know well the imperialist capitalist system that we live in, the contradictions that creates it, the class contradictions, the ground that we rise upon, the forms and instruments of our struggle, our tactical and strategic orientations, our friends, our enemies etc. In this sense, we need to put forward and present our opinions and criticisms in regards to the Draft prepared together with the desire to build unities on a more correct ground with the dynamic and existing forces that are involved in

class struggle with the command of MLM in the march of the proletariat for people's revolution, socialism and communism.

There are points which we do not agree on the prepared Draft. We take both defining these separation points and presenting our understanding on these separation points as a responsibility that the international proletariat loads onto our Party. We take the discussion of the differences emerging from various subjects among MLMs as an objective for strengthening our unity. We hope that this discussion and exchange of opinions will serve this purpose.

A) On Imperialism, Analysis of the Epoch, and the Fundamental Contradiction

Fundamental contradictions around the world are mentioned in two separate sections of the prepared draft:

> Starting from the thesis of Lenin, it is estimated that the economic relations of imperialism constitute the basis of the currently existing international situation. Throughout the whole 20th Century, this new phase of capitalism, its superior and last stage, was completely defined. And that the division of the world into oppressed and oppressor countries is a distinctive feature of imperialism. Thus, to understand the current situation we cannot start from the fundamental contradiction of capitalism because we are in its superior and last phase, imperialism.
>
> There are three fundamental contradictions in the today's world:
>
> **First contradiction:** between oppressed nations, on the one hand, and imperialist superpowers and powers on the other. This is the principal contradiction in the current moment and, at the same time, the principal contradiction of the epoch. The world is divided, in one part there is a big number of oppressed nations, which are colonial or semi-colonial countries, the latter have only formal sovereignty or independence, they are economically, politically and culturally subjugated to imperialism; in the other part, there is a handful of imperialist powers, superpowers or powers, in both cases they are oppressing nations. In the part of the imperialist powers, Yankee imperialism is the sole hegemonic superpower. Russia is still an atomic superpower and there is a handful of second-tier imperialist powers.
>
> **Second contradiction:** between proletariat and bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries.
>
> **Third contradiction:** interimperialist. Just as Lenin taught us, imperialism is not one, there are different imperialist countries. In other words, there are imperialist powers and superpowers which divides the world among them according to their

> relations of economic, political and military strength; relations of strength that changes all the time and develop through collusion and contend.

Similarly in another section it says:

> In order to appraise the world in this New Era we see that four fundamental contradictions that are expressed: 1) the contradiction between capitalism and socialism–the contradiction between the two radically different systems will take this whole period and it will be one of the last to be resolved, it will last even after the seizure of Power; 2) the contradiction between bourgeoisie and proletariat–it is the contradiction between two opposed classes and will also remain after the seizure of Power, it manifests itself in various ideological, political and economic forms until its solution when we enter communism; 3) the interimperialist contradictions–these are the contradictions between the imperialists for world hegemony, it takes place between the superpowers, between the superpowers and the imperialist powers and between the imperialist powers, this contradiction will be resolved in the period of 50 to 100 years; 4) the contradiction between oppressed nations and imperialism–it is the struggle for the liberation of the oppressed nations to destroy imperialism and the reaction, its solution is also included within the 50 to 100 years, it is the historically principal contradiction during this whole period of time; however, any of the four fundamental contradictions can become the principal according to specific circumstances of class struggle, temporarily, or in certain countries, but the historically principal contradiction will again express itself as such until its final resolution.

These analyses from various difference angles require assessments. We evaluate the epoch we are in as, "Imperialism and the Epoch of Proletarian Revolutions." In our epoch the revolutionary process throughout the world is the process of proletarian world revolution. And the fundamental contradiction that marks this period is the contradiction between labor and capital. The proletariat carries the duty of resolving this contradiction through revolution on its shoulders. From the labor-capital contradiction which is the fundamental contradiction of the process of world proletarian revolution comes out a set of principal contradictions throughout the world. Here are these contradictions:

- The contradiction between the oppressed peoples and imperialism
- The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie
- The contradiction among imperialist states

We do not view the contradiction between "capitalism and socialism" which appears in the draft among the principal contradictions based on the current conditions. We are passing through a period in which we witness returns from socialism are happening and

being completed. Even though the struggle for socialism is still being waged as a lively and a dynamic struggle, there is also the reality of a nonexistence of an established socialist system where proletariat does not hold the power in any country. We have the opinion that this contradiction should be defined and should not be placed among the contradictions in the world. Within this context we do not define it at a level of power, opportunity and influence that would be placed together with principal contradictions. In consideration with the new contradictions emerging from the struggle and the process just now, namely the non-existence of a current socialist system, it would not be objective to give a place to such an analysis of contradiction in the categorization of prominent contradictions in this period. We cannot establish contradictions with our intentions and wishes. The contradictions should be determined in accordance with the given situation and we should establish a line of struggle in accordance. Viewing this contradiction among the principal contradictions is not correct, scientific and realistic.

In addition to this there are for fundamental contradiction analyses in the draft. Subsequently, based on the philosophical approach of comrade Mao through a discussion of handling of contradictions we will intend to lay down the mistakes of this approach. The fundamental contradiction, main contradiction and principal contradictions issue in the draft and their handling is not compatible with the law of contradiction of MLM. It incorporates an approach that would create blurriness of consciousness in understanding a complex process, problem.

It is not possible to remain on the field of MLM without designating the reality that our epoch is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

The epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolutions was concretized into reality with the October Revolution and process that have been ongoing since then have been shaped as the process of proletarian revolutions against imperialism and world reactionism. The process of revolutions that started with the 1917 October Revolution gained tremendous advances having created socialist powers in more than one third of the world. This period of advances and triumphs ended with returns in succession in socialist countries. The revolutions regressed. However, has the epoch ended? No, it has not. In the historical march, in the path that the proletariat marches upon these are temporary regressions and stops. The epoch has not changed however in the movement of the proletariat that marked the epoch relative descends; pauses and regressions have been observed. Only the conditions of the class struggle and the elements that play the catalytic role in the acceleration of these conditions will define how long this descending wave of revolution will last and when it will ascend back.

From our perspective since the epoch that we are inside is the "Epoch of Imperialism and Proletarian Revolutions" our analysis of the fundamental contradictions that marks this epoch is different than the fundamental contradictions stated in the Draft. We embrace the approach stated in the 10th Congress of the CPC that says, "Since Lenin's death, the world situation has undergone great changes. But the era has not

changed."[2] In this sense we defend that our epoch is still "the Epoch of Imperialism and Proletarian Revolutions."

The "epoch analysis" that is in the Draft is incorrect. It is meaningless to define our epoch only as "the epoch of proletarian revolutions," this states a piece of the phenomenon not the whole. When such a definition is made the first question that appears in the mind is that, where is the other piece of the phenomenon, namely the contradiction? To which system of dominance that encompasses economic, social, political, administrative, institutional etc. are proletarian revolutions the obligation of intervention? What is the reason behind mentioning proletarian revolutions before capitalism and proletarian revolutions of our age? To which system are proletarian revolutions contrary to as our alternative? We can go on with these questions.

Secondly, the initial shortcoming that is not visible in the Draft and that causes crooked results is setting off from "an imperialism without capitalism." This approach that rips the problem from productive forces and production relations and does not handle the imperialist aggression on this ground is outside of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Thirdly, once again, the section about the fundamental contradiction in the world and the contradictions that appear subsequently is also problematic and does not express the reality correctly and completely. In the Draft the contradictions in the world are stated and as the fundamental contradiction "the contradiction between the oppressed peoples and nations and imperialism" is determined. This sort of a fundamental contradiction analysis does not fall in with the universal realities of MLM.

Fourthly, there are some sharp distinctions among imperialists, (such as super power and powers) and from our perspective these "sharp distinctions" correspond to a problematic understanding in terms of imperialism.

Here is our approach in regards to the points of objections that we have mentions as main topic above:

In order to reach an understanding and a conclusion in regards to the epoch that we live inside and the fundamental characteristics of this epoch and its fundamental contradictions, we initially need to look at the reality of the epoch.

> I trust that this pamphlet will help the reader to understand the fundamental economic question, that of the economic essence of imperialism, for unless this is studied, it will be impossible to understand and appraise modern war and modern politics.

This emphasis that Lenin makes in the preface of the Russian edition of *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* dated April, 1917 is significant. It is significant and obligatory

[2]RedLibrary: From *Report to the Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China*, Zhou Enlai, August 1973.

in order to correctly comprehend the significant social incidents, division wars that time to time take a military form and the causes of worker and toiler movements of the epoch and to analyze the entire phenomena in the basis of developments and conflicts, to grasp the essence of the issue and to place the power struggle of the proletariat to the correct grounds.

In the RSDLP program dated May, 1917 imperialism is defined as such: "World capitalism has at the present time, i.e., since about the beginning of the twentieth century, reached the stage of imperialism. Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, is a high stage of development of the capitalist economic system, one in which monopolist associations of capitalists–syndicates, cartels and trusts–have assumed decisive importance: in which enormously concentrated banking capital has fused with industrial capital; in which the export of capital to foreign countries has assumed vast proportions: in which the whole world has been divided up territorially among the richer countries, and the economic carve-up of the world among international trusts has begun."

The definition of imperialism that is acknowledged by Marxists (MLM) is made by Lenin. In his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, the highest stage of capitalism, namely the process of imperialism is described through main lines mentioned below with its fundamental characteristics.

> (1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; (2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this "finance capital," of a financial oligarchy; (3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; (4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist associations which share the world among themselves and (5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.

Comrade Stalin, in his work that is translated to Turkish with the title *The Foundations of Leninism* as he discusses Leninism and the distinctive characteristics of Leninism states the below in regards to our discussion:

> The *first contradiction* is the contradiction between labour and capital. Imperialism is the omnipotence of the monopolist trusts and syndicates, of the banks and the financial oligarchy, in the industrial countries. In the fight against this omnipotence, the customary methods of the working class-trade unions and cooperatives, parliamentary parties and the parliamentary struggle–have proved to be totally inadequate. Either place yourself at the mercy of capital, eke out a wretched existence as of old and sink lower and lower, or adopt a new weapon-this is the

alternative imperialism puts before the vast masses of the proletariat. Imperialism brings the working class to revolution.

The *second contradiction* is the contradiction among the various financial groups and imperialist Powers in their struggle for sources of raw materials, for foreign territory. Imperialism is the export of capital to the sources of raw materials, the frenzied struggle for monopolist possession of these sources, the struggle for a re-division of the already divided world, a struggle waged with particular fury by new financial groups and Powers seeking a "place in the sun" against the old groups and Powers, which cling tenaciously to what they have seized. This frenzied struggle among the various groups of capitalists is notable in that it includes as an inevitable element imperialist wars, wars for the annexation of foreign territory. This circumstance, in its turn, is notable in that it leads to the mutual weakening of the imperialists, to the weakening of the position of capitalism in general, to the acceleration of the advent of the proletarian revolution and to the practical necessity of this revolution.

The *third contradiction* is the contradiction between the handful of ruling, "civilised" nations and the hundreds of millions of the colonial and dependent peoples of the world. Imperialism is the most barefaced exploitation and the most inhumane oppression of hundreds of millions of people inhabiting vast colonies and dependent countries…

Such, in general, are the principal contradictions of imperialism which have converted the old, "flourishing" capitalism into moribund capitalism.[3]

As imperialism turns every single piece of the world into a ring in the imperialist chain, it inevitably has created the opportunity to break the chain through the contradictions that it immensely sharpened. The fundamental contradiction of capitalism has become even sharper with the immense socialization of production and the concentration of ownership of means of production at the hands of few groups of finance capital. The free competition period is no longer; capitalism has reached its final stage. The most fundamental characteristic of capitalism in the stage of imperialism is its parasitic and rotten nature.

Comrade Lenin's analysis of imperialism continues to apply to this very day. We come across to views that put forward the idea that the analysis of imperialism that is presented by comrade Lenin in a crystal clear manner has gotten old and is inadequate to express the stage that it has reached today due to great advancement in technique and sciences, variations in models of production and the great development of means of communications etc. We can only speak of a development, deepening and a greater acceleration of capital movement here, not of change. The technique and scientific developments that evolve in a manner that serve the dominance of bourgeoisie and

[3] *The Foundations of Leninism*/Stalin

their interests, has not been of use besides strengthening the dominant power, namely the finance capital, deepening the exploitation and spreading its activities to the furthest points of the world. The power of monopolies has increased, and it has brought about a gradually increasing concentration of power and capital in the hands of fewer monopolies. We see the concentration of capital in the hands of fewer monopolies through the annual list of the richest, most expensive companies or statistics such as the biggest 500 companies of the world. This concentration of production and accumulation of capital at the same time deepens the contradictions, increases the exploitation and creates new dimension into search for new markets. Besides this, the periods of the crises of imperialist finance capital and production shortens and nowadays, this constant situation of the crises has become a product of the natural development course of capitalist imperialist production relations. This situation causes the intensification of all contradictions, their depth and the unavoidable duty of imperialism; namely being its own grave digger.

We see how significant it is that comrade Lenin points towards the finance capital and monopolies in how finance capital and monopoly groups intervene into the system not only through economic exploitation but also politically and practically in most of the countries in the world and how fundamental and determinative of an actor they have become as to organize military coups in order for the livelihood of their economic exploitation policies.

Consequently the fundamental characteristics and fundamental contradictions of the epoch we live through have not change, on the contrary the activities of finance capital and monopolies has become more vivid in all the pores of the system of exploitation and oppression. If we wish to wage struggle against capitalist imperialism on the correct grounds and to change the world for the favour of the working class and toilers in the correct way, then we need to define the reality correctly. MLMs cannot name the phenomenon they wish to change through the definitions they make through their intentions. The change and transformation of reality can only be done through setting off from reality. Our guide should be MLM. In this sense it is imperative that we turn our faces towards comrade Mao.

It is the law of contradiction that becomes crystal clear in comrade Mao, the representative of MLM which we acknowledge as the third stage of Marxism. It is his method of thinking and resolution that he attributes a special significance in his handling of all ideological, theoretical, political, economic, military and practical issues.

It is imperative to designate the given contradictions, to lay down the essential and secondary aspects of contradictions with all their clarity and to operate a process on this basis at every stage of the struggle of proletariat in its class war and struggle for seizing and preserving political power. This has been the method of solution President Mao, the great Master of the proletariat and all the other communist masters in regards to all the issues. It is designating the principal ring that determines all the other phenomena

and incidents, that shapes them, that directs their existence and course and it is to focus on the principal ring. The age that we live in is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. This analysis is the concrete result of the world that we live in, the course of the development of human history, the dominant mode of productions and class relations and contradictions. The reality should be described from concrete phenomena, not through our intentions. Moreover, from the perspective of MLM who has the objective and the claim to lead the class struggle, to shape it and ultimately to create the political power of proletariat and keep it alive it is imperative to describe the reality over the principle of concrete analysis of the concrete conditions, this is what give meaning to our existence. Our designations and definitions project our location what we stand upon in the arena of the class struggle. We put the productive forces and production relations in our analyses in regards to class struggle and we see it on the basis of class contradictions that are concretized on this reality. The emergence, taking form, differentiation from other theories and representation of reality of Marxism rises exactly on this base.

In the prepared Draft our epoch is defined as the "Epoch of Proletarian Revolutions." This is a deficient definition and expresses only one side of the contradictions. The process of proletarian revolutions had appeared as the resolution to the contradiction of the age where capitalism took the character of imperialism. Capitalism gave birth to the two antagonistic classes of the history and the contradiction that is concretized in these two classes which is different from the class struggles of the past for the first time in history became the ground for the ultimate battle that will end the dominances that had been shaped through exploitation. The difference and the significance of the historical role of the proletariat which is different from all the oppressed and exploited masses and classes was born on this ground In the thousands of years long history of human kind. The fact that the proletariat is the grave digger of bourgeoisie rises on this ground. We speak of the class contradiction that will result in the objective of ultimately ending the system of exploitation now, not of the replacement of one system of exploitation with another in every turn of history just as in the transition from primitive communal society to slave society, from feudal society to capitalist society. Consequently the epoch that is called the epoch of proletarian revolution is the name of the ground where the capitalist system evolves into imperialism and where the resolution to emerging contradiction from the perspective of exploited and oppressed masses becomes ultimate liberation from various exploitative forms of dominance that lasted for thousands of years. It would be a futile definition to speak of proletarian revolutions without speaking of imperialism and speaking of imperialism without speaking of capitalism and speaking of bourgeoisie without speaking of proletariat.

In order to clarify this issue it is useful to turn to comrade Mao who laid the law of contradiction in the most advanced form:

> When Marx and Engels applied the law of contradiction in things to the study of the socio-historical process, they discovered the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, they discovered the contradiction between the exploiting and exploited classes and also the resultant contradiction between the economic base and its superstructure (politics, ideology, etc.), and they discovered how these contradictions inevitably lead to different kinds of social revolution in different kinds of class society.
>
> When Marx applied this law to the study of the economic structure of capitalist society, he discovered that the basic contradiction of this society is the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of ownership. This contradiction manifests itself in the contradiction between the organized character of production in individual enterprises and the anarchic character of production in society as a whole. In terms of class relations, it manifests itself in the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat… The contradiction in the capitalist system between the social character of production and the private ownership of the means of production is common to all countries where capitalism exists and develops; as far as capitalism is concerned, this constitutes the universality of contradiction. But this contradiction of capitalism belongs only to a certain historical stage in the general development of class society; as far as the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production in class society as a whole is concerned, it constitutes the particularity of contradiction… since the particular is united with the universal and since the universality as well as the particularity of contradiction is inherent in everything… when studying an object, try to discover both the particular and the universal and their interconnection, to discover both particularity and universality and also their interconnection within the object itself, and to discover the interconnections of this object with the many objects outside it…

What is the fundamental contradiction? It is the one that marks the process. Just as the principal contradiction marks the existing stage of the of the process, the fundamental contradictions projects itself as the contradiction that gives all its quality to the whole process that is consisted of the total of stages. Namely, the fundamental contradiction is the contradiction that exists in the course of development of a thing, that determines the quality of the process, that continues its existence throughout the process, that brings about the completion of the resolution through the concentration of the process and its contradictions. Once again namely, the fundamental contradiction is the contradiction between the forces that represent the new and the old. When considered from the perspective of New Democratic Revolution the fundamental contradiction finds its base in the contradiction between the three mountains that represent the old; imperialism, comprador capitalism and landlords and large masses of people, it takes its character from here and it focuses on the resolution of this contradiction. This

fundamental contradiction gives a two sided character to New Democratic Revolution; firstly "the national revolution" due to imperialism and secondly the democratic revolution due to feudal contradictions. This is a situation caused by the semi-colonial, semi-feudal quality of a country, namely due to the alliance established by imperialism and feudalism. Once the fundamental contradictions is designated among a series of complex contradictions that mark the process, then on the contradictions that this socio-economic structure creates are determined. Within this context some particular contradictions are:

- The contradiction between feudalism and masses of people
- The contradiction between masses of people and imperialism, and besides
- The contradiction between reactionary dominant classes
- The contradiction between bourgeoisie and proletariat

There are also less significant contradictions besides the ones mentioned above however these four contradictions come into prominence as four principal contradictions in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. One of these contradictions influences both some particular contradictions and all the other contradictions, it governs their course; it determines and affects them. Exactly this appears in front of us as the principal contradiction. Not being able to determine the principal contradictions among contradictions bring together what comrade Mao states as, "being lost in the fog, not being able to comprehend the essence of the issue." Naturally, this situation bring about not comprehending the side of the principal contradiction that plays a leading role, that determines all the other contradictions, that influences and subjugates them, and the mishandling and incorrect definition of the process of social revolution. Parallel to the determining of fundamental contradiction, the principal contradiction in countries such as ours could sometimes have a complex appearance. Under the conditions where direct invasion of imperialism is not the case that there is a situation of semi-invasion, the principal contradiction is in between feudalism and masses of people. The democratic demands of the revolution determine all the other contradictions and it directs them. In the case of an imperialist invasion the principal contradiction changes and the contradiction between imperialism and the masses of people in the conditions of invasion becomes the principal contradiction.

Under normal circumstances, namely in countries that are not dependent on imperialism, once again namely the modern capitalist countries of today, the fundamental contradiction is the labour-capital contradiction; the contradiction between bourgeoisie that represents reactionary forces and the proletariat that represents the new. In these countries, this fundamental contradiction as the principal contradiction, excluding the circumstances of imperialist war and conditions of invasion, directs all the other contradiction and governs them throughout the process. The contradiction between labour and capital/bourgeoisie and proletariat plays the role of fundamental and principal contradiction that is to resolves social contradiction.

In semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries too, in the beginning of the process of social evolution, namely at times where the economic, political, cultural and military siege of imperialism does not yet shackles such countries, the fundamental contradiction in the process of economic and social progress was the contradiction between the feudal system that rises on the core of the peasantry/landlords and the large masses of people. This at the same time was also the principal contradiction of the period because it was a period in which capitalist imperialism had not yet taken the country under its economic and financial control as an external contradiction and a period in which it had not yet entered into a historical alliance with feudal forces and the trade bourgeoisie that had not yet entered a relation of dependency. However, before the completion of the historical process of every single national economic to become an internal national accumulation and an internal closed system, the process of becoming a ring in the world capitalist-imperialism chain had become. The capitalization of the process was destructed, they have been made dependent, the internal dynamic had been collapse, and namely the process of colonialism or semi-colonialism became widespread and had gained a typical character. Within the colonial and semi-colonial relation that are dependent and connected to capitalist-imperialism, the evolving and developing capitalist relation inside, especially at the stage where competitive capitalism evolved into imperialism, for the enemy classes that represent the most reactionary production relations, became the material ground for a reactionary alliances that imperialism determines. An alliance where usurer-trade bourgeoisie that claim the agent role for imperialism gains the bureaucratic-comprador quality and all social exploitation and relation leans onto feudal forces that maintain their dominance and governance. This relationship and alliance that imperialism determines turns it into a compatible servant that keeps bourgeoisie and feudal forces alive, that feeds them and at the same time through these forces realized all its economic-political-cultural-military etc. interests in the market that it established dominance. Within this framework, as an external power that wishes relentlessly to clear its path for its capital with its dominance in the market through such alliances holds place inside all political and social contradictions. This alliance determined, directed and led by imperialism has become a part of the fundamental contradiction and all the revolutionary process as an enemy to be overcome in front of the revolutions of such countries. The anti-imperialist contradiction and the consequent anti-imperialist revolution has become a must. Besides its general positioning and its interests, due to its concrete and private interests, orientation and due to a serious of reasons imperialism can carry its semi-invasion, namely semi-colonialism into a full invasion, namely colonialism. This situation is realized as a state and a development that happens within the fundamental contradiction of such countries. However, such a situation is viewed as a new stage within the fundamental contradiction that is determined by it, not as a new situation that changes the fundamental contradiction. In this case, the leading contradiction, directing and determining contradiction namely the principal contradiction undergoes changes.

In such countries, since feudalism is the economic, political and social foundation of imperialism and since imperialism is the base that keeps feudalism alive and sustains it, the struggle against imperialism and the struggle against feudalism are inseparable and consequently the duty of national and democratic revolution unifies and gives the process its character. Sometimes one, sometimes both of the contradiction that incorporate two sides and that appear in front of us as the fundamental contradiction due to the pressure of the circumstances of the moment becomes prominent as the principal contradiction of the unique stage. It is understood that anti-imperialist and anti-feudal base due to the semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism gives its characters to the process until the completion of the Democratic Revolution process and at the same time depending on the given stage of the revolution, every single one of both becomes the principal contradiction.

In the analyses of contradiction, understanding and comprehending comrade Mao is very important, it is illuminating in regards to how we should look at the issue of contradiction as MLMs.

Consequentially, we can state the fundamental and principal contradictions as such:

The labour-capital contradiction is the fundamental contradiction that marks the "epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions" and gives it its quality. All the other contradictions rise on this ground. Here are the principal contradictions of the process that is determined by the fundamental contradiction at this unique stage of our day.

- The contradiction between imperialism and oppressed peoples
- The inter-imperialist contradiction
- The contradiction between proletariat and bourgeoisie

We do not view the analysis of a principal contradiction in the world as correct. As we have defined above, the principal contradiction is the one that determines, directs and subjugates all the other contradictions. It gives its colour to a process, to a stage and determines the quality of revolution. The analysis of principal contradiction is a necessity in order to catch the ain ring of a revolutionary process, namely in order to realize a revolution. The world proletarian revolution is going to develop, mature and throughout this process at one point is going to unify as a result of a complex, various, different processes of revolution and contradictions that differ in each and every country. Today we are at the stage of two types of proletarian revolutions throughout the world; New Democratic Revolution and Socialist Revolution. Although, New Democratic Revolution that applies to semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries is the centre of the storm, every country will have unique processes of revolutions. Making a world-wide principal contradiction would create a confrontation of the unique contradiction of each and every single country with the universal one and would create a state of confusion. An analysis of a principal contradiction at the world scale for the Proletarian World Revolution harbours the danger of isolating the principal contradictions that are unique to every country and to their different revolutionary processes. The analysis

of a principal contradiction in each and every country is necessary, obligatory and is a need for revolution whereas the analysis of a worldwide principal contradiction would cause hazardous results in the conditions that "the current of revolution is essential." It would snatch the international proletariat away from accomplishing a revolution in its own country and on the basis of its own social contradiction.

An analysis of a worldwide principal contradiction would cause one-sidedness in the relationship between revolutionary processes of different countries for international proletariat and would create incomprehension in regards to the relationship in between processes of revolutions. It would allow for a ground to appear to distinguish between essential and secondary in terms of different revolutionary processes. It would remove the responsibility to develop revolutions in each and every country and the possibility to base the revolution on the unique social structure of each and every country. It would reduce internationalism to one-sidedness, would create turning faces that fit into the principal contradiction that is external to one's country and lead to forgetting of the essential responsibility in their own class struggle. It would be neglecting the law unequal development that each and every country and society experiences. Due to all these reasons, not making an analysis of a worldwide principal contradiction but making an analysis of a fundamental contradiction that characterizes the epoch and lays down the fundamental contradiction of the world proletarian revolution and its quality should be embraced the as correct method.

Lenin, emphasizing the dividedness of the world into a bunch of "civilized" nations and oppressed nations of hundreds of millions of people as one of the most characteristic features of imperialism considers the struggle of oppressed nations in the age of imperialism as the substitute force of the struggle of the proletarian revolution and oppressed nations as the international allies of the proletariat. If the workers of Europe and America had not join together in their struggle against the capital with hundreds of millions of "colonial" slaves that are oppressed by the capital tightly and completely, the revolutionary movement in the progressive countries would have actually been phony" says Lenin who makes a motto out of the significance and meaning of this unity. And his slogan of **"Workers and the Oppressed Peoples of All Countries Unite"** is a valuable legacy and a path illuminating light for the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement.

B) Our Opinion on the Analysis That "ICM Is at the Stage of Strategic Offensive"

Laying down our opinions in regards to this issue in reference with the masters of MLM would serve a better understanding and comprehension for the problem at hand. Based on which data do communists evaluate their own situations and the situations of their enemies and based on what they essentially determine the power relations? Let us initially try to clarify the problem in reference to comrade Mao who holds a special

position in determining the strategic and tactical orientations of the class struggle besides the general characteristics of the class struggle.

Comrade Mao who defines imperialism as "the paper tiger" states;

"Just as there is not a single thing in the world without a dual nature (this is the law of the unity of opposites), so imperialism and all reactionaries have a dual nature–they are real tigers and paper tigers at the same time… Hence, imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a long-term point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are–paper tigers. On this, we should build our strategic thinking. On the other hand, they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers that can devour people. On this, we should build our tactical thinking." and thus provides as a concise approach towards the issue and on the other hand he states in the Moscow Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties of 1957:

"We have developed a concept over a long period for the struggle against the enemy, namely, strategically we should despise all our enemies, but tactically we should take them all seriously. In other words, with regard to the whole we must despise the enemy, but with regard to each specific problem we must take him seriously. If we do not despise him with regard to the whole, we shall commit opportunist errors. Marx and Engels were but two individuals, and yet in those early days they already declared that capitalism would be overthrown throughout the world. But with regard to specific problems and specific enemies, if we do not take them seriously, we shall commit adventurist errors." And he clearly expresses how we should handle this issue.

Another similar approach is as such: "Here we would add that, similarly, all successful revolutionaries in history have been successful not only because they dared to despise the enemy but also because on each particular question and in each specific struggle they took the enemy seriously and adopted a prudent attitude. In general, unless revolutionaries, and proletarian revolutionaries in particular, are able to do this, they cannot steer the revolution forward smoothly, but are liable to commit the error of adventurism, thus bringing losses or even defeat to the revolution. Throughout their life-long struggles in the cause of the proletariat, Marx, Engels and Lenin always despised the enemy strategically, while taking full account of him tactically. They always fought on two fronts according to the concrete circumstances against Right opportunism and capitulationism and also against "Left" adventurism. In this respect, they are magnificent models for us."[4]

If we return to the Draft once again, we think that the analysis that ICM is at the stage of "strategic offensive" is an exaggerated assessment. It is no doubt that communist should always be hopeful and optimistic. However, this cannot bring about living in an imaginary world. The state of communist and revolutionary movement is far away from the advancement that corresponds to "strategic offensive" as stated in the Draft.

[4] *Workers of All Countries, Unite*, CPC Official Documents

If we try to define generally the front of revolutionary and the communist movement based on the fact that capitalism is a system that is collapsing/rotting with the words "imperialism is in the throes of death," and it seems so, we should realized this is not a healthy resolution. This kind of an assessment and a resolution would be defining the reality with only one side and with simplest way put, it is not the MLM method and perspective. It is possible that the proletariat is at the stage of offensive in ideological terms, but this also makes sense in the sense that it is the representative of the future and the reality. The depth of the contradictions of the imperialist capitalist system and its rotting state is a visible reality however it is also clear that the communist and revolutionary forces do not hold a position to encompass these contradictions and direct them to the axis of revolution and socialism, to lead the spontaneous movement or to establish their authorities on worker and toiler masses. On the other hand the forces that wage peoples wars on the MLM line have a very limited sphere of influence. The People's War of PCP that was carried to a very serious point was disrupted by the capture of comrade Gonzalo and the leading cadres of PCP by the enemy, the People's War in Nepal under the leadership of NCP(M) has been neutralized by the reconciliation with bourgeoisie and selling out to bourgeoisie. In the given state the People's War conducted in India and the struggle that experiences line problems in the Philippines and the People's War waged by our Party for long years are existent. Besides these the new process initiated by our Brazilian comrades is significant and the re-activation efforts of PCP are encouraging. Again, even though it has not yet become practical, the existence of various groups that have the claim to realize a line of People's War is present however is it possible to speak of a strategic offensive in consideration with all these? It is clear that this analysis is subjective; it is a resolution that exaggerates the situation of the communist and revolutionary forces. It is not enough to provide justification for the stage of strategic offensive only with the consideration that we are ideologically strong, we represent the future, the depth of the contradictions of the oppressed and the exploited with the system and the widespread mass movement all over the world. All these constitute only one side of the contradiction that is to be resolved and show that the contradictions are maturing. The other side of the contradiction requires a concrete phenomenon and that is a strong party-parties. Our definition of strong party-parties is clear; they are parties that have tight relations with masses, that are organized widespread in accordance with the concrete conditions of their countries, that govern armed forces, and that have influence etc. over the working class and the toiling people. It is natural that when one speaks of "a stage of strategic offensive" all around the world, one means the existence and prevalence of such parties and their activities together with the loss of power of the counter-revolution front and its regression. Concisely, a process that could be acknowledged as "Strategic Offensive," in terms of logic, requires very serious and extensive moves of forces of revolution against the counter-revolution. There is no such existing situation. It would be meaningless to speak of a strategic offensive as long as the revolutionary

subject, MLM parties do not govern the process and organize and recruit masses on the axis of People's War and revolutionary power clearly, even though how deep the contradiction between the classes are all over the world. Exaggerating our own situation means underestimating the power of the enemy and this would cause us to let go off our vigilance against the enemy, to ignore the concrete reality and to embrace political, organizational and practical positions that fall outside of reality. The strategic defence, strategic equilibrium and strategic offensive terms that comrade Mao uses while attributing stages to the People's War are not defined through the weakness of the enemy or the revolutionary situation that express the objective situation. It is defined through the power of the Party, organizing the masses and making them fight, the relationship of the subjective condition with the process of power namely the power of the communist revolutionary movement and its situation. Otherwise it would not have been possible for him to carry the revolutionary war to success, to create correct tactics, instruments of struggle and organization, and to direct the masses to the correct objective. Ultimately he would have been faced with defeat, not triumph. On this axis, the sufficiency of the conditions of strategic offensive is at the same time directly in connection and is connected to the subjective situation of the CPs. We can briefly say that this is a left approach. As comrade Mao says, "The 'left' hurriedness tendency that ignore both subjective and objective factors is hazardous for a revolutionary war, consequently to every revolutionary movement…"

Again the in Draft the analysis that is mentioned as "between fifty to a hundred years" by comrade Mao we can say that it had been said in the atmosphere of fight for revolution and socialism that had reached enormous dimensions and partly it should be seen as an expression of the belief that the revolution would win. The developments since the time that these words had been uttered clearly project us the real picture. It doesn't matter with which argument we would define it, the period that we can call the first stage of socialist powers has resulted in defeat in the practical sense. Even though the contradictions of the imperialist capitalist system are deepening, the Communist Movement is rather at the stage of regrouping. In comrade Mao's time there had been socialist powers or powers that they called themselves socialists and there had been active and organized revolutionary forces almost all around the world. Today, there is a different picture. In the face of all these realities we need to make more realistic definitions in regards to our own positions and generally in regards to the position of the communist movement against the imperialist capitalist system. Otherwise, as experiences quite often, it would be inevitable to fall into right and left deviations. MLMs define objectivity over scientific data and position themselves through this scientific data, and they do have to. If we shut our eyes to reality and try to determine the current situation and our position over the reality that we design, it is clear that we would take part in a process that is to end in frustration. Insisting on this analysis would mean that we would have an organizational-practical stance that has a right line in the sense that it is "radical revolutionary" in appearance but limited in practically

carrying out the duties of revolution, that limits the connections and instruments that is to be established with masses and consequently unable to carry out the duties of the revolutionary by being disconnected from masses and exaggerating the situation of the subjective force. Let us not forget that right and left are twins.

C) To Serve the Unity of the Communists and the World Revolution, but How and on What Basis?

Marxists emerged on the stage of history by clarifying the role of the proletariat, in other words, the emergence of the proletariat brought the emergence of Marxism. The process of formulation of Marxism by Marx and Engels, coincides with the period in which the fact that capitalism/the bourgeoisie, which has become more and more evident in parts one by one and spread to the farthest parts of the world, especially the main centers all over the world, is the main productive power and relation of production that charts the course for the world, established itself.

The scientific world view of the Proletariat, the most revolutionary class that history has ever seen, Marxism (Leninism-Maoism), has illuminated the past and future of human history and invalidated all ideologies other than itself. Described by Lenin as "the ones who brought the historical role of the proletariat to light," Marx and Engels, in their jointly written *Communist Manifesto*, said, "But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons–the modern working class–the proletarians," have clearly indicated this revolutionary feature of the proletariat and at the same time exposed the impasse of capitalism. The proletariat, which is the leading force of the social transformation moving forward, is the only class that can eliminate all classes and all divisions with itself, beyond being the carrier of the features that can defeat the bourgeoisie.

The fact that the place of the proletariat in society, the role it plays in the social struggle and its purpose are one and the same creates the objective ground for the joint struggle and solidarity of its parts in all countries against capitalist exploitation, which has an international character, on which this struggle will rise. Emphasizing that the proletariat is an international class and its struggle has an internationalist character in its core, with the call of "Workers of All Countries Unite," Marx and Engels created Marxism, the scientific world view of the working class, and removed the working class from being a class spontaneously and became a class for itself. The consciousness of being a class for itself is also intertwined with getting rid of locality and grasping the universal character of the features embodied in it. While realizing the awareness of one's own reality, a part of this realization or vice versa, it has become a necessity to comprehend the universal characteristics of the proletariat in order to achieve this realization. Without being able to see this necessary universal character, the qualifications of the proletariat could not be defined.

Since the founders of Marxism were aware of the vital importance of internationalism in the struggle for political power of the proletariat, they gave importance to the international unity of the proletariat, made efforts to ensure this unity, and gave importance to the formation of the First Communist International in concrete terms. The slogan "Workers of All Countries Unite" is not only a political slogan, but also a summary of what the practical stance of the proletariat should be. In terms of both hostile and antagonistic classes, these associations have been clearly identified as a necessity. This reality continues to this day.

Marxism, which was created as a result of the joint efforts of Marx and Engels on the basis of the synthesis of the accumulations of the history of civilization until that day (we use this concept with a meaning that we mean the forms it takes and the forms it can take in the ongoing process), until the proletariat creates a communist society, that is, until it abolishes all classes together with itself. It is the most fundamental and indispensable weapon in the class struggle that it will continue.

One of the cornerstones of the ideology of the proletariat in its struggle to change the world is proletarian internationalism. Proletarian internationalism is clearly defined by Engels as "the strongest international bond of the entire proletariat is its ideological unity." In a sense, it is the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology itself. Like Marxism, it does not go out of the daily course of the class struggle. Therefore, it requires learning and understanding with special effort. If the international solidarity and struggle of the proletariat is not combined with the proletarian internationalist consciousness, it will have a spontaneous character and will be imprisoned within the boundaries of the bourgeois order. Only when the proletariat is equipped with an internationalist consciousness and stamps this consciousness on its struggle, only then can it achieve its true goals and objectives.

Our party is aware of this reality and has created itself as a part of this reality. The founding process of our party, which is the representative of the international proletariat in Turkey, coincides with the period when international conflicts between Marxism-Leninism (Maoism) and revisionism were experienced at the most advanced points and on various fronts. In the fight against revisionism on the international level under the guidance of Comrade Mao Zedong, it determined its side in line with Marxism-Leninism and the thoughts of Comrade Mao, and the foundations of its establishment were realized in the struggle against revisionism, reformism, parliamentarism and philistineism, and became the representative of the war against revisionism led by Comrade Mao in our country.

This process also included all the features of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism-(Maoism) and revisionism in the international arena. Therefore, beyond a generalization, we have built ourselves as a part of the international proletariat on the ideological-political-practical plane from the foundation/formation stage. The fact that our party's founder and theoretical leader İbrahim Kaypakkaya defined our party as the

product of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is the most concrete response to this reality. Our party has seen the ideological, political and practical issues on the international front as an important part of the class struggle it carries out, and has been sensitive to the developments. Due to the developments in our party, the processes and organizations that will serve the world revolution have always been important for our party, even though there have been difficulties in the systematic of relations from time to time. We attach great importance to this process in this sense.

as Marxist-Leninist-Maoists can determine the form and content that proletarian internationalism will take, while preserving the basic essence, based on a concrete analysis of concrete conditions in every historical section. What does this mean in the times we live in? Ultimately, the importance and meaning of the internationalist character and struggle of the proletariat struggling for the common goal of abolishing classes became much more evident in the imperialist phase of capitalism, when capitalist exploitation and organization became a world system. The contradiction embodied in the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the two irreconcilable and irreconcilable classes of the age we live in, also presents the ground on which the oppressed, exploited and oppressed workers and laborers who have to march on communist society will rise. The proletariat has taken on the responsibility of this universal task; It is responsible for carrying out the People's Democratic Revolution, Socialism and Communism march. The mission imposed by the most important and most difficult responsibility in the history of the class struggle has brought to consider the proletariat as the most revolutionary class in the political sense. The universal character of the struggle of the proletariat, which will ensure the emancipation of all humanity with it, is the objective ground for the vitalism and necessity of international cooperation that will enable the communists to act together against their common enemies in the international arena.

On the other hand, it is necessary to see that the communists have the main task of realizing the capitalist system by breaking it off one by one in order for the proletariat to achieve its international goals. The main ground for the liberation of the whole is the liberation of the parts.The international unity and total emancipation of the proletariat will be realized to the extent that this is understood. Otherwise, we are faced with a "beautiful" deception at the level of slogans, such as "wholesale liberation," which means not realizing the revolution by ignoring the differences at the level of countries and the conditions of realizing the revolution in these countries, which are the results of the uneven development law of capitalism, but an invalid deception in the face of reality. As a matter of fact, similar discussions took place before the October Revolution, and despite all the experiences today, similar nonsense continues to be marketed under the name of "regional revolutions." This is what happened and the theory was made in Nepal. An important part of our country's revolutionary movement acts with a similar orientation and understanding. In essence, the disbelief that a revolution can be made and the presentation of this disbelief as reality for various reasons, and ultimately the understanding that "Socialism in One Country" cannot be

realized, presents itself once again as an obstacle to the struggle for revolution and socialism in different geographies of the world.

Contrary to the rhetoric of the demagogues of bourgeois ideologues, the imperialist capitalist system's giving a more international character to production and exploitation and making all countries tighter links of the imperialist capitalist system does not destroy or reduce differences at the level of individual countries. On the contrary, it realizes a deepening ground against semi-colonial and dependent nations continuously and by reproducing. The gap between imperialist capitalist centers and the rest of the world widens more and more in every process. Imperialist capitalism is the main subject of deepening these differences. It is precisely because of this reality that while communists determine the form and content of the power struggle of the proletariat, taking into account the uneven development law of capitalism, based on the objectivity of each country, they also aim to resolve the common contradiction by resolving the contradiction in parts. Communists continue their struggle for political power, mainly by targeting political power in their own countries, in the direction of overthrowing the dominant political power within their given geographical boundaries and establishing a political power under the leadership of the proletariat. Serving the world revolution finds its true meaning here. Communists have to grasp the division of the world into countries and nations as an objective situation and place their struggle for their ultimate goals on this objective ground. The masters of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism also draw special attention to this point: "The proletariat of each country must first seize political power in its own country, assert itself as the ruling class of the nation, and become the nation itself, and it still retains its nationality, never in the bourgeois sense of the word but in this sense."[5]

Seeing this objective situation, Marx and Engels said, "Although not according to its content, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie according to its form is first of all a national struggle. Naturally, the proletariat of every country must first settle an account against its own bourgeoisie."

Again, Mao said, "Communists are internationalists because they are Marxists; but we can only apply Marxism when it has acquired a definite national form and is fused with the concrete features of our country. The great strength of Marxism-Leninism lies in its integration into the concrete revolutionary practice of all countries."[6] presented his point of view.

Lenin, on the other hand, expresses these objective differences and what they mean for the proletariat and the tasks they bring: "As long as there are national and political differences between peoples and countries, which will continue for a long, long time even after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat on a world scale, the international tactical unity of the communist working-class movement of all countries

[5]K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.

[6]*Selected Works*, p. 217-218 Mao Zedong.

is aimed not at the eradication of these differences, but the destruction of national differences. But on the contrary, the fundamental principles of communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) require an application that will correctly replace these principles in specific questions, adapt them correctly, and apply them to national and national-state differences."

This objective truth, which the Marxist leaders made very clearly, is at the same time the necessary objective basis for the organization of the proletariat at the level of countries. As a result of these objective differences, communist parties organized at the level of countries are faced with the task of breaking the imperialist capitalist chain in their own people. This is the definition of objectivity, not the result of a subjective desire, and is the necessary first step for communists to realize the proletarian world revolution in their own people and to reach the final goal.

Thus; Evaluating the problem from a proletarian internationalist point of view, "not from my own country point of view," but from the point of view of my participation in the preparation, propaganda and approach to the revolution of the world proletarian revolution, "it is my duty, the duty of the representative of the revolutionary proletariat," Lenin said, "For the development and support of revolutions in all countries,[7] to do as much as possible."

In order to carry out the proletarian world revolution, the imperialist chain must be severed from its weakest links. In order for communists to lead these struggles, it requires researching and examining the national and specific conditions of each country with the analytical method of Marxism-Leninism and establishing the correct policy that accommodates the general in accordance with these specific parts. Comrade Lenin expresses the necessary necessity of this as follows:

> To seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle a *single* international task: victory over opportunism and Left doctrinairism within the working-class movement; the overthrow of the bourgeoisie; the establishment of a Soviet republic and a proletarian dictatorship—such is the basic task in the historical period that all the advanced countries (and not they alone) are going through.

On the other hand, Marxist-Leninist-Maoists cannot be content with the task of carrying out and continuing the revolution in their own country as a link to reach the proletarian world revolution. At the same time, they try with all their strength to support the forces in other parts of the world fighting for the same purpose, on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line. Marxist-Leninist-Maoists understand that the essence and purpose of all struggles waged on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist-

[7] J. Stalin in his own country.

Maoist line is the same no matter in which part of the world they are, and in this sense, they cannot put the differences between the struggles before the common essence and purpose. The revolutionary struggles and revolution being waged in a country are meaningful to the extent that they are a part of the general struggle of the proletariat, that is, the struggle for the proletarian world revolution, to the extent that it develops it. The interests of the part must be subordinated to the interests of the whole, that is, of the worldwide struggle. This is only possible if the problem is approached not from the point of view of "my country," but from the point of view of "my share" in the struggles waged around the world.

The history of the world communist movement has not followed a straight course. In the international arena, the struggles against imperialism and reaction have taken different forms in parallel with the developments in the conditions. With the changes in the objective situation, the international communist movement has followed a variety of different tactics, both worldwide and in individual parts.

Many international organizations have been established until today in order to ensure the tactical and strategic unity of the communist forces operating in individual parts, to coordinate their struggle and solidarity, and to strengthen the ideological and political unity between these forces. Although the aims and objectives of such organizations, which are the worldwide organization of proletarian internationalism, are one and the same, they have taken different forms, corresponding to the different tasks they have to fulfill, due to the different objective conditions on which they rise and the specific situation of the communist forces. It is possible to see this situation when the First, Second and Third International and also the Cominform processes are examined.

Despite all these differences among themselves, the powers that felt the lack of a common international movement in the international arena and wanted it to be eliminated, announced the establishment of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement to the public with their statement in March 1984. After many years, the establishment of RIM had an important and historical meaning for the unity of international proletarian movements. RIM, revealing and defending the contributions of Comrade Mao to ML and making them reach wide masses, the three components of Marxism; recognition of his contributions in the fields of scientific socialism, political economy and philosophy, widespread propaganda of people's wars, etc achieved significant achievements. In this process, the prestige created by the People's War in Peru, which was initiated under the leadership of Comrade Gonzalo and made tremendous progress, and Comrade Gonzalo's clear and persistent presentation of Comrade Mao's contributions to ML played an important role in its acceptance the third and final stage of Maoism, Marxism-Leninism. This insistence and effort was of historical importance for the understanding and acceptance of the communist line, namely MLM, among the ML forces that defended the ideas of Comrade Mao in various ways. In addition to these positive aspects, as a result of the deepening of the ideological-theoretical and organi-

zational-administrative problems and the inability to realize the right solutions, RIM became dysfunctional and lost its mission.

The RIM process is a process that needs to be carefully studied as it can enable us to draw correct conclusions while organizing a new and similar process for us, since it was created by recent history and by those who were followers of Comrade Mao in some way. It will also serve to make us understand that reality cannot be defined by intentions alone and steps forward cannot be taken. We should not lose sight of the stance of Comrade Mao, who experienced the reality of the disintegration of the Third International, to be very cautious at the point of forming a joint organization with a tightly centralized character in this direction of the international communist movement. It is important to pay attention to the fact that Comrade Mao, whose importance we cannot doubt attach to the international solidarity of the proletariat, deals with cooperation and solidarity among communists in different forms and more in the context of mutual relations, rather than an organization with a tightly centralized character. Moreover, despite all the past experiences in the RIM process, when we consider the practical process of the component that makes up the RIM KOM, which looks down on the RIM components and tries to dominate them, it will be seen that it is very difficult to draw lessons from the past. We do not want to make this mistake again and we think that it is necessary to learn from the experiences. On the other hand, we do not intend to put ourselves in a situation where we will give up on international associations just because all these have happened; we are only trying to learn from our past and be more cautious and create international associations without ignoring the concrete situation.

At the current stage, the need for parties and organizations that define themselves as MLM to come together under a common roof imposes itself as a necessity. There is a consensus in this sense, but it is important how the content and form of this union or the joint organization to be formed will be. As can be seen, there are differences of opinion between the powers that define themselves as MLM on various points. As long as they do not correspond to the principle points, it is acceptable to have differences in some issues, it is normal, and it will be in the ongoing processes. We can overcome these differences in the ongoing course of the class struggle, with discussions based on the concern of the proletariat to advance the cause of revolution and socialism, and we can form higher-level associations. That's one side of the problem. The other and essential thing is that while forming such a union, the main links of MLM should be defined correctly and a serious ideological struggle should be waged on this basis. Otherwise, it will not be able to move forward without a formation/organization that is seemingly united around common ideals but has contradictions that will destroy itself over time. There is no doubt that the main link in the formation of such an organizational unity in the present period is the intense ideological struggle that must be waged between the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist forces. A new organization of International Communist Movement can only be built on this struggle. In our opinion, the ground on which we

will rise, our ideological reference point, the third and highest stage of Marxism-Lenism should be MLM. Because, Comrade Mao is the one who made an integral contribution to the three components of Marxism in the fields of philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism. A reference point other than MLM does not serve unity, it causes new divergences. At the same time, defining the issue of Maoism as People's War equals Maoism and saying that this equating is sufficient is an approach that narrows Comrade Mao's contributions to ML and is inaccurate, 'narrowing' Comrade Mao. In order to better understand what we are talking about, we can open it as follows; While People's War means Maoism, Maoism cannot be understood only with People's War. While attributing importance to the People's War or trying to embody its importance, it is necessary not to trivialize the whole with the concern of caring for the part. Maoism makes sense of itself in the whole of the contributions made by Comrade Mao in the fields of Marxist philosophy, scientific socialism, and political economy. Therefore, our approach to MLM is in this unity.

Another important point that needs to be emphasized is our approach to the forces that are outside of this platform and define themselves as MLM. On the one hand, it is necessary to fight against ideological deviations, not to fall into the opportunist understanding of "it is necessary to act together no matter what," and to clearly express the points of distinction, on the other hand, not to forget that there are forces that define themselves as MLM outside of this platform, MLM strives to ensure the partnership of the forces. It should have a purpose, target and sensitivity such as trying to repair the problems experienced in relationships as much as possible.

D) ON THE ASSESSMENT OF Comrade Stalin in the *DRAFT*

In the *Draft*, "Comrade Stalin would continue the work of Lenin and in the process of the construction of socialism in the USSR, he will struggle against opportunism and the treason of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukarin. Stalin developed this struggle for 13 years and it is false that he solved things administratively" is stated. It should be noted that the task of evaluating Comrade Stalin, detecting his mistakes, and the task that Comrade Mao suspended due to revisionist attacks is a task that stands in the way of Maoist movements. However, we do not find it appropriate to discuss Stalin, the great master of Marxism, in such a formation process. This is an important issue that deserves extensive and thorough examination and discussion. Therefore, we think that a planning and discussion process on this subject should be carried out separately. This is a need. However, it is not healthy to do this in the declaration of an important international organization with a superficial approach. It would be the most correct and healthy method for such an international formation to organize a discussion that will clarify this problem. This should take place as a discussion that will contribute

to the ideological-theoretical development of the international communist movement, and that the right is fully given.

Therefore, we propose that the evaluation of Comrade Stalin be removed from the declaration altogether.

E) Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Principally Maoism?

This debate, which took place almost simultaneously with the acceptance of Maoism as the third stage of Marxism-Leninism, is nothing new for us. In the past years, we have given answers on which of these definitions is correct for us or why we should use which one. It is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that we see as correct and insist on using. We deal with the issue in the context of the contributions made to the three main components of the Marxist theory in the power struggle of the proletariat, which has continued from the formation of Marxism as the theory of the liberation of the proletariat to the present, and we name the issue based on this unbreakable continuity. Although it seems like a consistency in itself to put special emphasis on Mao in the sense that Marxism reached its peak with Mao's contributions from its emergence, on the other hand, we can refer to the fact that even Mao himself refers to it as Marxism-Leninism when describing Marxism. Therefore, it is more correct for us to use the definition of MLM, which expresses continuity and that Mao carried Marxism-Leninism further, rather than making a definition that would mean placing Mao in a different place from them.

F) On the Definition of Universality of the People's War

The issue of armed struggle/war/revolutionary violence is a problem that all communists have to deal with diligently in their class struggle. "The seizure of power by force of arms, the solution of the problem by war, is the chief task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution applies both to China and to all countries."[8] As Chairman Mao has made perfectly clear, revolutionary violence is a principle without exception, and this applies to all countries. No bourgeois government will surrender its political power to the proletariat in a peaceful process. Neither in the semi-colonial, semi-feudal, capitalist, nor capitalist-imperialist countries, the revolution will not progress and conclude without civil war. If this is an undeniable fact, how can the revolutionary violence and armed struggle be determined in the communists' struggle for political power, and what should be the theory of war that should be taken as a basis, and according to what? For MLMs, People's War theory is the most advanced synthesis of all war experiences from history to the present. The proletariat and the workers thus acquired an invincible weapon. The reality of war and communist approaches to war; The form of the ideological, political, practical and organizational

[8]Mao Zedong.

relationship that the communist party will establish with the war and the leadership of the CP in the war, the relationship between war and politics, the purpose and principles of war, the problems of strategy in war, the dynamic role of man in war, initiative, flexibility, planning, approach to the problem of alliance, the positioning of classes, forms of power, etc. The People's War is a powerful weapon that contains the basic theses, principles and some basic methods and forms of struggle in the struggle of the proletariat to take power. It is the strategy of war for the only revolutionary power of the proletariat that has become systematized.

The fear created by the Great October Revolution, in which the power of the proletariat became reality for the first time, caused the bourgeoisie to make serious changes in the hegemony apparatus and organization of the dominant structure. The bourgeoisie and the ruling classes have centralized violence both within their given borders and in the international arena and have created an international network. Just as the proletariat has created a new synthesis based on the experiences in the power struggle, as in the theory of the People's War, the bourgeoisie has equipped itself with methods and tools that will maintain its dominance in its own domination apparatus, ensure its continuity and neutralize counter-attacks. And just as the communists look at the world revolutionary struggle processes and learn from the lived experiences and turn them into political and practical experiences for themselves, the bourgeoisie does the same. When we look at the problem by narrowing it in the axis of war and violence, we see that the bourgeoisie has formed international violence organizations not only within its own borders, but also in the international arena to protect the dominant structure. The establishment of the bourgeoisie's international joint protection and attack organization in the military sense under the name of NATO is a concrete example in this sense. We know that since its establishment, it has made all kinds of practices to stifle the revolutionary struggles that have developed in socialist countries, especially in the CCCP, and in all countries of the world. The bourgeoisie has constantly developed its instruments of violence, first in the Paris Commune of 1871, and then, especially in parallel with the revolutions that took place during and after the Great October Revolution.

The struggle for power of the proletariat has to include revolutionary violence from the very beginning, equipping itself with the violence of the proletariat against the violence of the counter-revolution. As Comrade Mao put it very clearly, "The revolution is not a dinner. It is not a literary event. It is not a painting or an embroidery. It cannot be done gracefully or gracefully. Revolution is an act of violence." 'We agree on this point, but here comes another question that awaits an answer: Since the economic, social, cultural and traditional dynamics of each country are different and the unequal development of capitalism continues to prevail, how will the power struggle of the proletariat, which is carried out on the basis of countries, handle the problem of violence and organize it? If the People's War is the most advanced form of taking power by the proletariat, shall we consider the People's War theory formulated by Comrade Mao as the only formula

for the organization of the revolution with universal validity? Or shall we define the entire revolutionary violence-war, which is an indisputable necessity in the struggle for power of the proletariat, as People's War? We see that the prevailing perspective in this component, in which we are involved, presents the People's War as the only and only way of revolution for all countries of the world. The resources we can reach regarding this formulation, which is presented as "The Universality of the People's War," do not allow us to reach satisfactory results. As far as we can see, the words of Comrade Mao, which we have quoted before, are taken as the main starting point. We, on the other hand, understand Comrade Mao's formulation as the indispensable necessity of revolutionary violence in the struggle for political power. Revolutionary violence is a necessity in the struggle for political power of the proletariat, but given the fact that the uneven development law of capitalism prevails in every part of the planet and the numerous contradictions arising over this law of uneven development cause serious differences even in countries that are socio-economically close or similar to each other, our planet's It is not realistic to suggest the same revolution for all. The examples given in the writings presenting the People's War as the only model for making revolution universally are not satisfactory. The examples of armed struggle from the USA, Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, Ireland, France are meaningful only in terms of seeing that revolutionary violence can be organized, not in the sense that a People's War can be waged. Moreover, in two of these countries (Spain and Ireland), the national liberation struggle was being fought and they were the forces that created themselves through the broad mass support that objectively existed in every national movement. Others were forces with strong revolutionary feelings, but essentially reactive, far from being a communist movement, and moreover, without such a direct target and trying to create themselves through individual actions, which risked paying a great price. Therefore, they are organizations that will not set an example for a CP. Likewise, guerrilla wars and civil wars in the developed capitalist countries during the second imperialist war cannot be used as healthy data to "prove" the "Universality of the People's War." The process is the process of imperialist wars and occupations. In such processes, various social forces, classes and strata, even some of the ruling classes, take part in the revolutionary front or in alliance with the revolutionaries, albeit periodically. Therefore, conditions and dynamics are "unusual." "Extraordinary" processes necessitated taking an "unusual" position. In fact, we can also say that the attitude of communists and revolutionaries at that time was created by creating tools and methods to dominate objectivity by defining objectivity correctly.

Again, as far as we can see, street demonstrations, strikes, various protests, that is, almost every movement against the system is considered as People's War. This point of view is not correct in our opinion. Mass actions, various protests, strikes, etc. It can be formulated as parts of the revolutionary struggle, it is correct to do so, but the People's War is a theory that includes these, but the organization of revolutionary violence in the form of Guerrilla War at its center, the advancement by establishing political

power-domination over the parts, the creation of areas cleared from the enemy, and the CP in the center and under the leadership of all these. and the People's Army is a set of stages.

If we take it this way, that is, if we take the form that Comrade Mao formulated and outlined in detail in his writings, then it is not possible to talk about the universality of the People's War as we know it. Because the formulation of Comrade Mao is clear; Comrade Mao embodies the problem of the way of revolution in his article titled *Problems of War and Strategy* dated November 6, 1938:

1. China's Characteristics and Revolutionary War

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.

But while the principle remains the same, its application by the party of the proletariat finds expression in varying ways according to the varying conditions. Internally, capitalist countries practice bourgeois democracy (not feudalism) when they are not fascist or not at war; in their external relations, they are not oppressed by, but themselves oppress, other nations. Because of these characteristics, it is the task of the party of the proletariat in the capitalist countries to educate the workers and build up strength through a long period of legal struggle, and thus prepare for the final overthrow of capitalism. In these countries, the question is one of a long legal struggle, of utilizing parliament as a platform, of economic and political strikes, of organizing trade unions and educating the workers. There the form of organization is legal and the form of struggle bloodless (non-military). On the issue of war, the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries oppose the imperialist wars waged by their own countries; if such wars occur, the policy of these Parties is to bring about the defeat of the reactionary governments of their own countries. The one war they want to fight is the civil war for which they are preparing. But this insurrection and war should not be launched until the bourgeoisie becomes really helpless, until the majority of the proletariat are determined to rise in arms and fight, and until the rural masses are giving willing help to the proletariat. And when the time comes to launch such an insurrection and war, the first step will be to seize the cities, and then advance into the countryside' and not the other way about. All this has been done by Communist Parties in capitalist countries, and it has been proved correct by the October Revolution in Russia.

China is different however. The characteristics of China are that she is not independent and democratic but semi-colonial and semi-feudal, that internally she has no democracy but is under feudal oppression and that in her external relations she has no national independence but is oppressed by imperialism. It

> follows that we have no parliament to make use of and no legal right to organize the workers to strike. Basically, the task of the Communist Party here is not to go through a long period of legal struggle before launching insurrection and war, and not to seize the big cities first and then occupy the countryside, but the reverse. "In China the armed revolution is fighting the armed counterrevolution. That is one of the specific features and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution." This thesis of Comrade Stalin's is perfectly correct and is equally valid for the Northern Expedition, the War of Agrarian Revolution, and the present War of Resistance Against Japan. They are all revolutionary wars; all directed against counter-revolutionaries and all waged mainly by the revolutionary people, differing only in the sense that a civil war differs from a national war, and that a war conducted by the Communist Party differs from a war it conducts jointly with the Kuomintang. Of course, these differences are important. They indicate the breadth of the main forces in the war (an alliance of the workers and peasants, or of the workers, peasants and bourgeoisie) and whether our antagonist in the war is internal or external (whether the war is against domestic or foreign foes, and, if domestic, whether against the Northern warlords or against the Kuomintang); they also indicate that the content of China's revolutionary war differs at different stages of its history. But all these wars are instances of armed revolution fighting armed counterrevolution, they are all revolutionary wars, and all exhibit the specific features and advantages of the Chinese revolution. The thesis that revolutionary war "is one of the specific features and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution" fits China's conditions perfectly. The main task of the party of the Chinese proletariat, a task confronting it almost from its very inception, has been to unite with as many allies as possible and, according to the circumstances, to organize armed struggles for national and social liberation against armed counterrevolution, whether internal or external. Without armed struggle the proletariat and the Communist Party would have no standing at all in China, and it would be impossible to accomplish any revolutionary task.

We will either deal with this problem as Comrade Mao, the theorist and practical practitioner of the "People's War" put forward, or we will express that we treat this theory differently and enter into appropriate definitions. When it is advocated that the People's War, as it is known in developed capitalist countries, should be taken as a basis from the beginning, it is necessary to talk about realizing such components as guerrilla warfare, mass support, which is the sine qua non of the guerrilla, the peasant mass that created itself through feudal contradictions, base areas, red political powers, the creation of the red army. To claim that these conditions can be fulfilled when we exclude the imperialist war and occupation conditions and take today's given reality as a basis is not a finding that is compatible with the reality. It is one thing to define the organization of the CP in imperialist countries with a formulation such as the party's

positioning its main body illegally from the very beginning, organizing itself with the reality of a belligerent party, organizing revolutionary violence, it is another thing to define the existence of the CP in imperialist countries with the classical formulation of the People's War. National, ethnic and sectarian problems are also quite evident in these countries, and all these are factors that impede the development of armed struggle, guerrilla warfare or the People's War as a whole. Ultimately, the socio-social conditions that brought the People's War into existence are semi-colonial semi-feudal conditions. Comrade Mao later brought the problem to a state of extension that it would be valid for countries where there were no feudal remnants, but which had fallen into the clutches of imperialist capital and had become dependent. In this context, People's War is a war strategy that is valid for all semi-colonial countries. After the Chinese revolution, countries with similar conditions developed the struggle through the People's War and succeeded in taking power in some places. Likewise, countries such as Peru, India, Philippines, Nepal, and Turkey can wage the People's War based on the reality of the similar socio-economic structure and make progress and development. Despite being in different geographies of the world, the "unique feature" of these countries is that their socio-economic structures overlap. It is precisely for this reason that it is possible to implement the People's War strategy in these countries. In the imperialist capitalist countries, these contradictions, which we have mentioned roughly, are largely absent. Therefore, semi-colonial, semi-feudal or imperialist countries cannot be put in the same basket and a solution cannot be offered with the same recipe. Because there are serious differences in the contradictions that we will rise over. The way of revolution takes place through the determination of these contradictions.

The question of the universality of the People's War is "What is the war strategy of the proletariat?" and "does the proletariat have a completed war strategy or should it be? controversial questions. In our opinion, the People's War is a long-term, anti-feudal-anti-imperialist or anti-imperialist revolutionary war strategy carried out from the countryside to the cities under the leadership of the CP. It cannot be applied in developed capitalist countries where the revolution would start in the cities and spread to the countryside with a great uprising as a valid war strategy in the conditions of semi-colonial, semi-feudal or colonial countries. Because the revolutionary war in the developed capitalist countries will take place at the end of a protracted "peaceful" struggle; to engage in an armed struggle without such a struggle is not the right strategy in this country's conditions. This difference causes us to define the universality of People's War as a war strategy involving semi-colonial and semi-feudal or colonial countries. However, we fully believe that a war-like process will take place in the developed capitalist countries as well. Because revolutionary violence is a principle without exception, it has certainly been proven. The differences between the form that revolutionary violence will take in developed capitalist countries and the form it will take in semi-colonial and semi-feudal or colonial countries are at the level of quality. Considering the confusion they cause, we disapprove of expansions that would

lead to ignoring these qualitative differences, and moreover, strategy definitions not formulated by Mao Zedong.

Mao had specifically stated that the revolutionary struggle in developed countries would go through a protracted "peaceful" period. This feature remains valid. While accepting that the way the proletarian world revolution takes place is not completely predictable, it is a known or accepted reality that the places of world revolution that are ready to ignite and flare up in a short time are semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. As long as the fire in these areas does not take on a real character, the "peaceful" struggle period will continue to be essential in developed countries. It is wrong if the communist parties in these countries prefer armed struggle to "peaceful" struggle, as it will cause defeats and reduce the revolution, which is the action of the masses, to the vanguard actions of a handful of armed militants, causing the revolution to be grasped mainly outside the masses. It is a great mistake to dictate such thoughts within the universality of the People's War. If it is said that "People's War includes valid and even compulsory armed warfare in the last stage of the long-term peaceful struggle in developed countries," this content should be specifically mentioned. Although we see this content outside of the People's War understanding we advocate, we distinguish it from the wrong approaches we have just mentioned and do not reject it on the basis of principle. The definition of the People's War as the universal war strategy of the proletariat requires that its basic principles be determined by specifying the qualitative differences between countries, which we have explained above. To be able to conduct the revolutionary war with the understanding of the People's War, the original form that it will take in every country requires that the principles of the People's War be different from what is known or what we know. Accordingly, the long-term armed struggle for power, advancing from the countryside to the cities, based on red political bases, and the peasant guerrilla warfare as the inevitable starting form of this, should not be the principles of the People's War Strategy. The principles of the People's War must be emphasized and precisely stated. Accepting the People's War as valid on the whole world scale with a theory based on the principles determined by Comrade Mao will not fit the reality, it will also result in an idealism of "I said it happened." Therefore, a discussion on this axis requires a new theoretical discussion and determining new principles for the People's War. On this axis, future approaches and new attitudes will undoubtedly be open to discussion.

The Declaration mentions four fundamental questions for the People's War:

1) Proletarian ideology, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism applied to the concrete practice and features of the revolution,

2) The necessity of the Communist Party leading the People's War,

3) Characteristics and course of political strategy in the Democratic or Socialist revolution,

4) Support bases… These four main points mentioned seem important as we assume that they embody the principles of People's War. The last two of these fundamental problems are also the reason why we do not see the People's War as possible in the advanced capitalist countries. Although the political strategy of the socialist revolution will eventually evolve into an armed struggle, it brings a long-term peaceful struggle to the agenda. Therefore, the armed struggle, which includes the building of a power that develops from the beginning to the end, from small to large, is not the "main problem" of this revolution. In these countries, communists wage a "peaceful" struggle against the expansionist and occupying policies of the ruling classes, and only after a short-term preparation for an armed mass uprising do they start a revolutionary situation. Therefore, support bases will not be in the nature of "Red Political Bases" in these countries. For here the armed struggle must be short-lived; conditions in these countries are not suitable for a protracted armed struggle. We say this on the basis of the conditions of class struggle, which are carried out under normal conditions. Likewise, the necessity of the illegal organization of the CP is accepted by us as a necessity and even a necessity. The fact that the main core and major organs of the CP are illegal is a necessity even from the point of view of being protected from the enemy. In addition, it requires determining how, where and with what social force the support bases will be built, how the Army, which is one of the three weapons of the revolution, will be organized and how it will gain its course of action. It will not be a healthy discussion ground to discuss the validity of the People's War on a whole world scale without establishing a theoretical discussion and a set of principles that will close all these gaps and be compatible with the objective situation.

We recognize that Maoism offers important, decisive approaches to the advanced capitalist countries in terms of continuing and concluding the revolutionary war and maintaining the new revolutionary power. In this sense, we argue that the Maoist revolutionary war theory has a content that includes these countries; but we object to this being explained with the claim of "universality of the People's War." Because there are also serious left revisionist comments brought by this claim. One of them includes that the proletarian world revolution is possible with a certain people's war that will take place all over the world at the same time. We see that this interpretation, which also opens the door to the Trotskyist understanding of world revolution, was not rejected in the Declaration. According to this, the communists "must oppose the imperialist world war with a world people's war if it breaks out!" If the imperialist world war breaks out, the communists in every country will oppose it with the understanding of waging a power struggle against their rulers, but mainly with the aim of putting an end to this world war. This does not condition a People's War that will start in every country. In order to start the People's War, the communist parties in each country must have determined the revolutionary situation, and of course, communist parties must have been built in these countries before that. In semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries,

the communist party will be built in war, while in developed capitalist countries it will be built in a long-term peaceful struggle. This brings before us the problem that communist parties, especially in the developed capitalist countries, are not prepared for the People's War, which will start at the same time as the imperialist world war and is formulated as the only form of opposing this war. In this case, it is not possible to defend the understanding that the communists in the developed capitalist countries have to start the "People's War" immediately. This needs to be determined in concrete terms and these terms will be significantly related to the specificity of the countries. In many countries the struggle against the imperialist world war may and will have to be waged without the People's War. It is a kind of dogmatism to have determined them beforehand, independently of the circumstances, and dogmatism only produces dogma and inevitably loses it. Such problems or unique situations were neglected in the declaration. Neglecting these and not explaining them with warnings will pave the way for familiar leftist interpretations of the People's War; It even appears to have been opened. However, it is of decisive importance not to fall for left revisionism while standing against right revisionism.

In addition, although the "Universality of the People's War" is mentioned both in this document and in some other articles, there is no clear program, set of principles, organization and way of action that we can see on how this will happen in imperialist-capitalist countries. If the "People's War" is the only strategy that should be applied universally, and if the imperialist capitalist countries are also included in it, then how this will happen in any imperialist country, along which military and political line, must be revealed.

G) Three Worlds or World Divided into Two?

Concepts such as "third world" and "third world countries" are frequently used in the draft to describe the storm centers of the revolution. As we do not see this concept as correct, we think that depending on this concept, the door will be opened to erroneous approaches in the issue of fundamental contradiction in the world (or multiple fundamental contradictions as it is misplaced in the draft). In this context, the use of this concept evokes the "three world theory," provides a basis for it, and shows that a strong and full confrontation with this reactionary theory has not yet taken place. We think that the approach that divides the world into three poles, to determine a world system and a series of contradictions based on it, is fundamentally wrong. It provides a basis for an approach that confuses the working class and the oppressed peoples of the world, blurs the distinction between friend and foe, and in this sense, may cause problems in the separation of imperialist powers and all reactionary forces that are the link of that system. We are of the opinion that the Dengist "Three Worlds Theory" is a harmful residue that finds its reflection in communist movements.

It is seen that this concept is used based on an approach based on this definition of the world by Chairman Mao and the CCP he leads. However, it should be noted

that Chairman Mao and the CCP he led, as a foreign policy of the period, included a scientific attitude that determined the main point of distinction between revolutionary forces and counter-revolutionary forces, revealed the points of distinction between counter-revolutionary forces, and revealed the line of relationship and struggle with these forces. This scientific approach was first exposed to reactionary left opportonist-revisionist abuse by Lin Piao. Later on, it was put forward as a counter-revolutionary theory that became creatively complete and integrated by Deng Xiaoping, the leader of the right revisionist line, the architect of counter-revolutionary, capitalist restoration. The Dengist line, beyond supporting this theory with a few sentences of Comrade Mao, fell into the baseness of basing it by referencing Comrade Mao without being able to prove it as a line belonging to him. Against Comrade Mao's Communist red flag, he waved the white flag of revisionism with this theory.

The misinterpretation of the 1971 CCP foreign policy document titled "Some Remarks on the Foreign Policy of the People's Republic of China" forms the basis of approaches that divide the world into three. This document has a scientific substance, which includes the clarification of the People and counter-revolutionary forces, and then the contradictions between the other forces and the policy to be applied against them. It has an approach based on class analysis with clear and precise lines. However, this approach is based on Deng Xiaoping's speech at the United Nations in 1974, while Comrade Mao was still alive, and instead of the relations of production, the class differences on which they are based, the nature of the ruling classes in the countries, the rich, the developed, the underdeveloped, the poor, the productive forces and the production forces, divided into three worlds based on the distinction of the development of their relations. In 1976, the CCP announced it as a strategic approach in a speech at the United Nations. Accordingly, the world is under the domination of two "superpowers" such as the USA and Russian Social Imperialism, and these are the first world. Developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America and other regions make up the third world. The developed countries that fall between these two form the second world. The contradiction between the first world and the third world is essential, the third world countries are the revolutionary impetus that turns the wheel of world history and are at war with the first world. The main strength of the world united front is the third world countries. Second world countries are forces to be won. This is the basic theory of counter-revolutionary, treacherous Dengism.

Lenin, Stalin, and Chairman Mao essentially and fundamentally divide the world into two fundamental poles. It is the imperialist-capitalist camp that represents the old, the rotten and the crumbling, the reactionary forces that are a link in their chain, and the proletariat, the masses of the people and the oppressed nations that represent the new. Comrade Lenin, Stalin and Mao made this fundamental distinction, and after identifying the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces, they developed an attitude that examines, determines and tries to take advantage of the contradictions between the counter-revolutionary forces. In this context, two hostile poles, counter-revolution

forces and the pole of revolutionary forces are evident in their class-based distinctions and approaches. In the conditions where the states and sovereignty of the proletariat were formed, this approach left its mark on their foreign policy and became a guiding approach. The tactic of creating fragmentation for the counter-revolutionary ranks, its approach and the policy of making use of the contradictions between them, is based on strengthening its own front and weakening the other front. This is the opposite of the three-pole approach to defining the world. The division of the bipolar world, of the enemy camp, should not bring three points of view as a whole strategic approach. We should point out precisely in his general approach that Chairman Mao has been misinterpreted at this point.

We advocate following the path of our masters. Underdeveloped, highly developed, developed when dividing the world into poles; rich and poor; We consider discriminating on the basis of the development and weakness of the productive forces and making three world definitions out of it is harmful, dangerous and dangerous as it will lead to class collaborationist approaches, confusion of alliance policies, tactical and strategic approaches. Separating the world into first, second, and third worlds will weaken the qualities of the ruling classes in the second and third world countries, the ground to fight them, and will create a situation that will lead to confusion. We advocate treating the world with a sharp distinction between class-based imperialism and all forms of reaction, as well as oppressed peoples and nations. We do not find it correct to divide the concepts of highly developed, developed and underdeveloped into three categories based on these. We think that these concepts should be first in defining the reactionary forces of each country, the relations between the imperialist powers and the dominant powers that are their servants, to distinguish them as imperialist-capitalist countries and semi-colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries.

In this respect, we do not find the approach in the declaration dividing the world into three poles, categorizing countries according to wealth and poverty, development and weakness of productive forces, and defining the relationship between these countries accordingly. No matter what purpose this concept is used for, it is a concept that does not describe the real situation and does not make class distinctions clear. The concept that will express the storm centers of the revolution should be the concept of semi-colonial semi-feudal countries. This is the most clear and precise class distinction concept. It will include an approach that will capture the main link in the struggle against the class and real enemy in the fight against imperialism, its lackeys, and the "first world" or "second world" powers that establish hegemony in individual countries. This revolutionary struggle will provide a proper and full determination of which powers, the imperialist powers whose dominance level has changed in each country. Otherwise, it will lead to class struggle, struggle and problems in the alliances and orientation that it requires.