

Statement of the Communist Workers Union (mlm)

On the Proposal on the Balance of the *International Communist Movement and its current General Political Line For a Unified Maoist International Conference!*

We salute the effort made by the comrades of the Coordinating Committee for a Unified Maoist International Conference – CCIMU in presenting a *proposal for the balance of the International Communist Movement and its current General Political Line*, since it corresponds to the need to advance in the unity of the communists and to the different pronouncements calling to hold a Unified International Conference of the Marxist Leninist Maoists of all the countries.

In May 2021, the Leading Committee of the Communist Workers Union (mlm) in the Editorial *For a single International Marxist Leninist Maoist Conference!* made an account of the efforts of our organization to contribute to the struggle for the unity of the communists of all countries, as well as the conditions that now allow the realization of a Unified International Conference, regarding which, it reiterated its position expressed in the proposal presented to the meeting of various organizations and parties held in January 2020 in Italy:

To fight for a single International Conference of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoists of the world is also an inescapable obligation of the communists because of their responsibility

to be the conscience and the leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat at world level and of the struggle of the countries, nations and peoples oppressed and super-exploited by imperialism in association with the lackey and reactionary ruling classes.

To fight for a single International Conference of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoists of the world is likewise a firm step in the solution of the problem of the political impotence of the communists, whose dispersion has contributed to opportunism and reformism fulfilling their objective of diverting the mass movement from its revolutionary path and perspective. (...)

We consider that the break made separately with the avakianist revisionism, main danger for the unity of the Marxist Leninist Maoists, tacitly constitutes an initial basis of common ideological unity, sustained in the intransigent defense of the principles of Marxism Leninism Maoism – the same that the avakianist revisionism has declared unsubstantial, in a general delimitation of camps with opportunist theories that falsify and dent the revolutionary edge of Marxism Leninism Maoism, in common general conclusions of the analysis of the world situation in the light of the principles, and in common general political tasks to transform the situation in the perspective of the triumph of the World Proletarian Revolution.

It is the moment to express that initial basis of ideological unity explicitly in the Platform of Unity of an International Conference of the Marxist Leninist Maoists of the world, that allows to deal with the remaining divergences in order to reach a higher degree of unity in the perspective of unity in the General Line; Platform of Unity that is the ideological basis of a Program of immediate and common political struggle of the Marxist Leninist Maoists of all countries and of the organization of a single International Center of ideological and political leadership whose orientation is followed and executed in a disciplined manner by the Marxist Leninist

Maoists of all countries.

In this sense, we consider that the proposal presented by the comrades of the Coordinating Committee for a Unified Maoist International Conference -CCIMU, does not correspond to the current situation of the Marxist Leninist Maoists; that is, it does not represent a common general basis of unity, to continue the struggle around the divergences that for now are legitimate within the revolutionary communists, since such a proposal only expresses the position of a particular shade of the communist movement.

Although the controversial issues are varied, as the comrades of the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist Leninist Party of Turkey – TKP/ML have already warned in the document *The approach of our Party* on the prepared project, we want to deal with some important issues in a timely manner:

1. On the exact denomination of the science of revolution:

We start from the adoption of Marxism Leninism Maoism as a new, third and superior stage of Marxism, and we even admit the denomination Maoist for propaganda purposes, however, we consider erroneous the expression «**mainly Maoist**» because it corresponds to the pretension of making Maoism a «synthesis» of communism and reducing scientific socialism to the contributions of Mao Tse-tung. We consider that the philosophical basis of this error lies in the pretension of reducing the general laws of movement to contradiction, interpreting that its character of being the most fundamental law of dialectics or nucleus or essence of dialectics, means that it is the «**only** law of dialectics»; wrong idea that was imposed in the extinct RIM (defended also by the «new synthesis» of Avakian) and that now the comrades of the Committee try to amend in the proposal with the words «**only fundamental** law of dialectics», but preserving the old idea of ignoring the law of negation of negation, which indicates the direction of the movement, a law openly

recognized by the masters of the proletariat: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung. In short, we defend the Marxism Leninism Maoism science in development, integral, coherent and exact.

2. On the fundamental contradiction, the main contradiction and the main aspect of the contradiction:

We defend Mao Tse-tung's idea according to which:

The fundamental contradiction of the process of development of a thing and the essence of it, determined by this contradiction, do not disappear as long as the process does not end; however, in a prolonged process of development, the situation generally varies from stage to stage. The reason is that, while neither the nature of the fundamental contradiction of the process of development of the thing nor the essence of the process changes, the fundamental contradiction becomes more acute as it passes from one stage to another in this protracted process. Moreover, of the numerous contradictions, large and small, determined by the fundamental contradiction or subject to its influence, some are sharpened and others are temporarily or partially resolved or attenuated, and some new ones arise; this is why there are stages in the process. If one does not pay attention to the stages of the process of development of a thing, one cannot properly deal with its contradictions.

We understand, therefore, that the fundamental contradiction of the capitalist system *between ever more social production and ever more private appropriation*, has marked its entire existence, is the deepest cause of its inevitable demise and can only be resolved by socializing the ownership of the means of production in socialism. Therefore there are not several fundamental contradictions as the comrades of the Committee assert in the proposal.

But in addition, objective reality shows that far from being attenuated, the fundamental contradiction of capitalism has

deepened and spread worldwide; world social production is appropriated by a handful of monopoly groups, exacerbating all the evils, problems and contradictions of imperialism. *This sharpening of contradictions is the most powerful driving force of the historical period of transition initiated with the definitive victory of world finance capital*, according to Lenin. Therefore, to consider that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie only exists in the imperialist countries, as is affirmed in the proposal of the Committee, is a **great error**, since it ignores the development in extension and depth of capitalism as a world system of oppression and exploitation, which has spread the objective existence of the proletariat in all countries, precisely the undertaker social force of capitalism, whose conditions in the oppressed countries are of super-exploitation and oppression, and whose aspirations do not » join » with those of the bourgeoisie and the landowners of these countries, but correspond to those of the world proletariat.

In accordance with the correct affirmation of Chairman Mao, we understand that **one and only one** is the **fundamental contradiction** that governs the process of development of capitalism throughout its history, both in the first phase of free competition, as in its current monopolist phase, throughout which, it runs in periods characterized by a **main contradiction**. The International Communist Movement has highlighted or recognized four contradictions as the most important contradictions of imperialism, not the fundamental ones as the comrades in the proposal affirm, nor the only ones; these contradictions inevitably determine the death of the capitalist system: the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the contradiction between imperialist countries and oppressed countries, the inter-imperialist contradiction -of the imperialist countries among themselves- and inter-monopoly -of the monopolies among themselves-, and the contradiction between the two systems, the socialist and the imperialist, latent just, after the

dissolution of the former socialist camp.

Likewise, since capitalism survives on the account of depredating the only two sources of wealth: the labor force and nature, since the end of the 20th century, the contradiction between society and nature has been highlighted as a fifth important world contradiction of imperialism. The imperialist depredation of nature has sharpened this contradiction endangering the very existence of humanity, on account of the profit for the imperialist bourgeoisie, being necessary to highlight also this contradiction in a Platform of Unity of the International Communist Movement today.

In addition to this, in the correlation of such world contradictions of imperialism, a main contradiction stands out, which characterizes each of the different periods of imperialist capitalism or dying capitalism, and which can be observed with all clarity in its long history of agony: from 1903 to 1918 was a period characterized by the inter-imperialist, as the main contradiction; from 1918 to 1948 was a period where the struggle between the monopolies was accentuated as the main contradiction; from 1948 to 1958, with the emergence of the Socialist Camp, the contradiction between the socialist system and the imperialist system was erected as the main contradiction; from 1958 to 1972, the correlation of contradictions changed, putting in the foreground the contradiction between the oppressor countries and nations and the oppressed countries and nations; the period from 1972 to 1990, was characterized by the contradiction between the imperialist countries, this time, concentrated between the United States and the Soviet Union. And according to our analysis, we are passing through a period initiated in 1990, where the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is playing the role of main world contradiction of imperialism. The economic crisis of world capitalism that broke out at the end of 2007 has confirmed and consolidated this contradiction as the main one.

We know that there are divergences among Marxist-Leninist-Maoists regarding the problem of which is the main contradiction in the world today, however, in the proposal of the comrades of the Coordinating Committee, on the one hand, the existence of four contradictions is formally admitted, but in reality only the contradiction between the imperialist countries and the oppressed countries is always recognized as the main contradiction:

...the contradiction between oppressed nations and imperialism, the struggle for the liberation of the oppressed nations to destroy imperialism and reaction, whose solution is also framed within 50 to 100 years, is the historically principal contradiction during all this time; but, any of the four fundamental contradictions can become principal according to the specific circumstances of the class struggle, temporarily or in certain countries, but the principal contradiction will historically express itself as such again, until its complete resolution.

If we do not pay attention to the stages of the process of development of a thing, you cannot properly deal with its contradictions, said Mao, and in this case, by transposing the contradictions of imperialism and only recognizing one contradiction in reality, you cannot trace a correct orientation for the international struggle of the proletariat.

On the other hand, the proposal states: *There are two forces operating in the revolutionary movement throughout the world: the international proletarian movement and the national liberation movement, the first is directive and the second is base.*

An incorrect and confused formulation that misrepresents the approach to the problem of the **two great currents** of the World Proletarian Revolution: the Socialist Revolution of the Proletariat and the Revolutionary Anti-imperialist Movement. They are not «two forces» that «operate» in any general «revolutionary movement», but constitute the historical

currents that will give an end or solution to the problem of imperialist capitalism.

3. On the fusion of contradictions and the dissolution of the class struggle in the oppressed countries:

Hand in hand with these erroneous ideas regarding the two currents of the World Proletarian Revolution, go other erroneous ideas linked to the same problem. The comrades of the Coordinating Committee say in the proposal:

*The national liberation movement is the force at work in nations oppressed by imperialism and reaction. In the 1910s, Lenin paid the greatest attention to the struggle in India, China, Persia positing that the socialist revolution would not be solely and exclusively of the proletarians against their bourgeoisie, but of all the colonies against their oppressors. He says that there is a **fusion** of forces, the international proletarian movement acting throughout the world, and the national liberation movement of the oppressed nations; and that being the mass in the oppressed nations the majority of the population on the globe will be decisive weight in the world revolution. He comes to the conclusion that the revolution moves to the oppressed nations, but does not deny the revolution in the imperialist countries, besides demonstrating that a socialist state, as was the USSR, could develop in the midst of the imperialist encirclement. Thus the law of the unequal development of the revolution in the world is followed.*

It is a great mistake to attribute to Lenin the detestable theory of the **fusion** of the class struggle of the proletariat with the national struggle. Lenin made it clear from the *Theses on the National and Colonial Problems* at the Second Congress of the Communist International:

... the necessity to fight resolutely against the attempts to give a communist tinge to the bourgeois-democratic currents of liberation in the backward countries; the Communist International must support the national bourgeois-democratic

*movements in the colonial and backward countries, only on condition that the elements of the future proletarian parties, communist not only by name, are grouped and educated in all the backward countries in the consciousness of the special mission incumbent upon them: to fight against the bourgeois-democratic movements within their nations; the Communist International must seal a temporary alliance with the bourgeois democracy of the colonial and backward countries, **but it must not merge with it** and must unconditionally maintain the independence of the proletarian movement even in its most embryonic forms (bold ours).*

It should not merge but unconditionally maintain the independence of the proletarian movement. Such was Lenin's express orientation which obeys the profound understanding of the problem between two currents of a different nature: the interests of the proletariat and the interests of the nation, are of a different character. The former are the interests of a given class; the latter, the interests of the various classes of a nation. The one and the other are the material basis of two struggles of a different nature, which come closer, strengthen, ally, converge, **but do not dissolve, nor replace each other**. The conception of the world of the proletarian party in relation to the national problem is internationalism; not nationalism. The experience of the proletarian revolution in continuous combat to the nationalist propensity of the petty bourgeoisie and opportunism, has highlighted the difference and relationship between class interests and the interests of the nation, the unity of opposites between the civil war and the national war, between the class struggle and the national struggle, between the proletarian revolution and the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement.

Unity of opposites whose identity lies in being the two historical currents of the World Proletarian Revolution; in their confluence towards the same target, imperialism, whose

exploitative and oppressive world character, objectively diminishes the exclusively nationalist dye of the struggle of the oppressed peoples; in having in the proletariat the only class that by its position and conception, is consistently anti-imperialist and fighter to ally the anti-imperialist revolutionary movement to its class struggle against the power of capital, a condition for the true triumph of the national struggle.

The erroneous theory of «merging the class struggle into the national struggle», was defended by Prachandist revisionism before the betrayal in Nepal, this being a revamped version of the old opportunism in the face of the national problem in the imperialist phase. Such a theoretical absurdity cannot be attributed to Lenin, who always denounced this «fusion» as a ***fatal error*** for the proletarian revolution. Even in the conditions of a national war against an imperialist aggression, the class struggle is subordinated to the national struggle, **but it does not merge, it does not dissolve in it**; the proletariat can never renounce its class independence, its program and self-decision within the united front. In Mao's words: *Any theory that attempts to deny the existence of the class struggle is completely erroneous.*

For these reasons the proletariat does not support the national movement for the mere fact of being anti-imperialist; it supports it and allies itself with it, on condition that it is a truly revolutionary anti-imperialist movement, that it does not oppose the workers' struggle against capital, does not impede its independent struggle and organization, nor hinder the agitation and propaganda of its Program in the education and revolutionary organization of the great popular masses, especially of the peasants in order to establish with them a solid class alliance.

4. On the single hegemonic superpower and the theory of the three worlds:

The confusion regarding the problems of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the essential distinction between imperialist countries and oppressed countries, the inter-imperialist dispute and the unequal development of the imperialist countries, leads to erecting other incorrect theses as truths, with the aggravating factor of assigning them to Mao. The comrades of the Committee say in the proposal:

As Chairman Mao pointed out in 1958, «imperialism is still alive and U.S. imperialism, as the sole hegemonic superpower and world counterrevolutionary gendarme, is the main enemy of the peoples of the world; it still makes and unmakes in Africa, Asia and Latin America; it still occupies colonies by force, establishes its military bases in all parts of the world and imposes a war of plunder; it continues to oppress the masses of the people in its own country.» And all this is even more acute today than it was 60 years ago. But the same situation is also becoming more and more untenable and it is inevitable that sooner or later more than 90% of the world population will rise up against imperialism and the reactionaries, and this, in hard struggle and uneven development, is already underway as a New Great Wave of the World Proletarian Revolution.

Here the comrades resort to an inadmissible falsification to defend a wrong idea. What Chairman Mao said in the *Interview with a correspondent of the Sinjua News Agency* on September 29, 1958, was:

Imperialism will not live long because it perpetrates all kinds of infamies. It stubbornly supports the reactionaries of the various countries, hostile to the peoples. It occupies by force many colonies, semi-colonies and military bases. It threatens peace with atomic war. Thus, forced by imperialism, more than 90 percent of the world's population is rising or will rise en masse to fight against it. But imperialism is still alive; it still makes and breaks in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the Western world, the imperialists continue

to oppress the masses of people in their own countries. This situation must change. It is the task of the peoples of the whole world to put an end to the aggression and oppression carried out by imperialism, principally U.S. imperialism. (See, Quotations from Chairman Mao, VI. Imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers).

Not only is it wrong to attribute to Chairman Mao something he did not say, it is even more wrong to accept a thesis of revisionism to introduce it as the acquis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. This theory of the «single hegemonic superpower» emerged after the collapse of Russian social-imperialism and the period of expansion of imperialist capitalism at the end of the last century and coincides in essence with the belief that imperialist capitalism had been reborn. From such a reactionary conclusion emerged the openly bourgeois ideas of «neo-liberalism» and «globalization»; the theory of «Empire» of the petty bourgeois Negri and Hardt; from it are derived the revisionist theories of the «unipolar world» of the MLs, of the «globalized state of US imperialism» of Prachanda and of the «single hegemonic superpower» of Avakian.

All these «modern» theories are based on the old Kautskyist theory of «ultra-imperialism», according to which imperialism could overcome itself and resolve all its contradictions in a single monopolistic center.

At bottom, these theories are nothing more than an apology for the supposed good health of imperialism, omnipotent and unbeatable, and against which one can only resist. With the argument of this supposed invincibility of imperialism and the pretended impossibility of triumphing, the Revolution and the People's War in Nepal were betrayed.

The comrades of the Committee try to distance themselves from these theories by juggling to show the existence of other imperialist powers, recognizing the existence of the struggle between the different imperialist countries and defending the

correct thesis of the inter-imperialist contradiction and the struggle for a new distribution of the world already distributed. Something that can explain **itself**, showing one of the most important contradictions of imperialism **in itself** without the need to resort to «innovatives» theories that obscure the consciousness of the proletariat.

Although the United States has the greatest number of nuclear weapons, the other imperialist countries are advancing in the arms race; Chinese social imperialism is today disputing in the world arena the first place in the economic field; in addition there is an offensive by the latter together with the Russian imperialists, to undermine the power of the Americans in their «backyard» in Latin America, as is shown by the facts in Venezuela, Cuba, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Ecuador... at the same time, the U.S. imperialists try to undermine the power of the Russian imperialists in the subjugated countries of the former Soviet Union, and they all collude and dispute in the Middle East. In fact, in objective reality, there is an inter-imperialist dispute which calls into question the supposed «single hegemonic superpower».

The same happens with the reactionary «Theory of the Three Worlds», concocted by the Chinese revisionists in the midst of the Cultural Revolution, but fraudulently presented by Teng Siao Ping as if it were the work of Chairman Mao and unfortunately taken by some comrades as a fundamental part of Maoism; in this case the comrades of the Coordinating Committee say, when they are talking about the contradictions of imperialism at present:

For its part, the Third World is home to the largest and poorest population, subjected to the oppression of imperialism, living in conditions that do not correspond to the level of development achieved by humanity, suffering the degradation of their living conditions, the natural environment and are hit by the systematic wars of plunder of imperialism and its local lackeys.

And it is astonishing that in the whole document the comrades make **no allusion** to a **second world** that should exist somewhere according to «the theory of three worlds». Why then persist in an idea that has no support whatsoever?

For Mao Tse-tung and all communists since Lenin, imperialism divided the world into a handful of imperialist countries, which by their great economic wealth and military might are dominant, oppressors, exploiters, usurers; and a vast majority of oppressed, subjugated, dependent, exploited countries. Such is the essential and inevitable distinction of the countries under imperialism, diametrically opposed to the bourgeois and opportunist preachings that cover up the semi-colonial financial enslavement of the oppressed countries and deny their antagonistic contradiction with the imperialist countries.

The essential Leninist distinction between imperialist and oppressed countries -under imperialism- is diametrically opposed to the old and new social-democratic and revisionist theories; all of them, heirs of the Kautskyist separation between the economy and the politics of imperialism, which reduce the difference to «rich and poor», «advanced and backward», «developed, underdeveloped or on the way of developed» countries, restricting the struggle exclusively against the economic monopolies, without attacking the semi-colonial political power of imperialism; or merely against national oppression, evading the deep semi-colonial economic relations of the metropolises with the social economic formation of the oppressed countries. They deny the imperialist character of some countries, under the pretext of unequal development; or pretend to pass them off as «progressive» imperialists. Therefore, such a theory is reactionary and does not constitute part of the arsenal of the revolutionary proletariat. Why persist in such a monstrosity and why attribute it to Chairman Mao?

5. On the erroneous method of avoiding the concrete analysis of

the concrete situation:

Throughout the proposal of the comrades of the Coordinating Committee there are general formulations that elude the *concrete analysis of the concrete situation* and that evidence the incorrect method of subjectivism.

We have already referred to the class character of the «theory of the three worlds», now it is necessary to dwell on some mistaken and contradictory formulations which do not correspond to the present situation and, therefore, do not contribute to shed light on the struggle of the international proletariat. The comrades say in the proposal, referring to the «third world countries»:

In these countries, on a semi-feudal, colonial or semi-colonial basis, bureaucratic capitalism develops, which generates the corresponding political and ideological modalities and systematically prevents national development, exploits the proletariat, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie and restricts the middle bourgeoisie.

What does this mean, is it not the capitalist mode of production, but a superstructure of semi-feudalism? And they continue in the next paragraph:

Without recognizing the semi-feudal character of the oppressed countries and, therefore, the need for an agrarian war to resolve it, we end up denying the need for democratic revolution in these countries, the need to develop the people's war as a unitary war, in which the countryside is the principal and the city is a necessary complement, to put an end to imperialism, bureaucratic capitalism and semi-feudalism.

That is to say, there is no capitalism (of any kind) but semi-feudalism which is the economic basis of society in ALL oppressed countries. Where therefore it is necessary to develop a «democratic revolution», not of New Democracy, a «unitary war» (sic!). And they finish off with an outburst:

The Third World countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, as Chairman Mao has pointed out, are revolutionary storm zones and the basis of the world proletarian revolution, and it should be noted that the Third World extends (sic) to Europe itself.

Marx said in 1858: *The specific task of bourgeois society is to establish, at least as a general plan, a world market and production based on that world market.* He also stressed that free competition led to concentration and monopoly.

When reaching its imperialist phase, the fundamental characteristics of capitalism were accentuated, becoming a world system of exploitation and oppression. A truth admitted by all Marxist Leninist Maoists. However, the comrades of the Coordinating Committee in the proposal for the bases of unity overlook the implications of this objective recognition:

To begin with, that imperialism, as an internationalized mode of production, chained all countries – with their specific modes of production – into a single world economy, where the economy of each country is a link in a single chain, which obeys and serves the production, the realization of surplus value, the accumulation and centralization of world capital. That is to say, the social character of production is already a world fact, which is brutally opposed to private appropriation.

Likewise, the process of chaining, expansion and deepening of capitalist relations in the world has brought with it not only the integration of all countries into a single world market of capital, goods and labor power, but also the emergence and expansion of industry in the oppressed countries and the introduction of major changes in agriculture, destroying the traditional systems of production and accelerating the process of decomposition of the peasantry, causing at the same time the accelerated urbanization of the oppressed countries, the development of the cities and increasing the international

migration of the proletariat.

A confirmation of the idea expressed by Lenin in *Imperialism Higher Stage of Capitalism* in 1916:

The export of capital influences the development of capitalism in the countries in which it is invested, accelerating it extraordinarily. If, for this reason, such export can, to a certain extent, cause a certain stagnation of development in the exporting countries, this can only occur at the cost of the further extension and deepening of the development of capitalism throughout the world.

Therefore, to ignore that capitalism in each country is only an aspect of imperialist capitalism, to resort to the euphemism of calling it «bureaucratic», to deny its real existence in the oppressed countries, can only come from the petty-bourgeois longing for an ideal, independent capitalism, which is no longer possible in the epoch of imperialism. And in politics, to deny the existence of capitalism in the oppressed countries, leads to safeguarding the interests of the bourgeoisie against the interests of the proletariat. Something inadmissible among those who want to represent the interests of the working class.

But to this great error of the comrades of making the «democratic revolution», even in the oppressed capitalist countries, are added others of no less importance, such as affirming that *the countryside is the principal and the city is a necessary complement* in the revolutionary war, which in practical terms would lead not to carry out the war of the masses that make up the majority of society and are concentrated in the cities, but a war with the minority of the population, as it is distributed in most Latin American countries where the population in the countryside is negligible as in Argentina 7%, Brazil 13%, Chile 12%, Mexico and Colombia 19%.

Error taken to absurdity when affirming that, such is the

characterization of society, of the revolution and the way of the same, in the countries of Europe that enter in that supposed «third world», the case of Ireland for example, where to propose a Revolution of New Democracy would be a reactionary pretension, since it would be equivalent to pretending to turn back the wheel of history.

An affirmation that goes against the whole experience of the workers' movement and even against the Proposition on the General Line of the International Communist Movement, or Charter of the 25 Points that the comrades of the Committee claim to defend and feel themselves heirs to:

In the imperialist and capitalist countries, in order to definitively resolve the contradictions of capitalist society, it is indispensable to carry out the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(...)

In the capitalist countries that U.S. imperialism controls or tries to control, the working class and the popular masses direct their main blow against U.S. imperialism, as well as against the monopoly bourgeoisie and other internal reactionary forces that betray national interests.

A situation that today is not restricted to the countries that U.S. imperialism dominates or tries to dominate, but also to the capitalist countries oppressed by the other imperialists throughout the world.

Another matter that reveals subjectivism is the idea of the «strategic offensive» of the revolution, as the comrades of the TKP/ML correctly point out in their observations. It is correct to preserve the revolutionary optimism that characterizes the communists, as well as necessary to emphasize the current upsurge of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples of the world; however, what characterizes a strategic offensive of the revolution, is not only the existence of the objective conditions but also the subjective conditions, especially, of the situation of the

communists.

It is a fact that after the defeat of the proletariat in Russia and later in China the socialist camp was dissolved and the workers movement entered into a deep crisis. Crisis that had important signs of recovery with the international meetings of the Communists such as the Autumn Conference of 1980 and the Foundation of RIM in 1984, with the beginning of the People's War in Peru and the adoption of Marxism Leninism Maoism as the new, third and higher stage of Marxism in 1993, which allowed the advance in overcoming the ideological confusion and the construction of new organizations and parties in different countries. However, the bankruptcy and dissolution of RIM led to a new dispersion of the forces of the revolutionary proletariat that only in recent years is trying to overcome in a new Unified International Conference, at the same time that all the existing parties and organizations have problems as correctly summarized by the comrades of Turkey. In these conditions, to speak of the «strategic offensive» of the revolution at the present time is a subjective wish.

Regarding the problems of Strategy, Tactics and People's War the comrades of the Committee say in the proposal:

The people's war is the superior form of struggle, through which the fundamental problems of the revolution are resolved, from it comes everything good for the people; it is the military strategy corresponding to the political strategy (to conquer power) to transform society for the benefit of the class and the people; it is the main form of struggle and the people's army, the main form of organization, an army of a new type that fights, mobilizes, politicizes, organizes and arms the masses, and produces. The people's war is mass war led by the Communist Party to conquer the New Power, concretized in popular committees and support bases for the conquest of power throughout the country.

To carry out the people's war it is necessary to take into

account four fundamental problems: 1) ideology of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, applied to the concrete practice and the particularities of the revolution in each country, whether oppressed or imperialist countries; 2) the need for the Communist Party that leads the people's war; 3) to specify the political strategy in the democratic or socialist revolution and the road; 4) support bases. The New Power or Front-New State, formed in the bases of support, is the marrow of the people's war.

To establish the bases of support, Chairman Mao establishes three fundamental requirements: 1) to have armed forces, 2) to defeat the enemy, 3) to mobilize the masses. That is, to develop guerrilla warfare, to annihilate the living forces of the enemy, thus creating a vacuum of power to establish, build and defend the new power, destroying the old social relations of production and building new ones. From there the contradiction New Power/New State – Old State is developed by means of reestablishments and counter-establishments, following the fluidity of war.

Three paragraphs that in essence replace any concrete analysis of the concrete situation, evade the need to analyze countries, societies and concrete situations because everything is reduced to taking the armed struggle as the main form of struggle always and at all times, taking the popular army as the main form of organization, building support bases and gradually destroying the old power and establishing the new one, destroying the old relations and building new ones, until victory is won throughout the country.

A formula that does not correspond to the reality of all countries and therefore does not solve the real problems of the struggle of the working class: Which are the parties that really have armed struggle as the main form of struggle? Where does the popular army exist as the main form of organization? What support bases do the communists have at present? Is it possible to build support bases in capitalist countries and

destroy the power of the enemy by parts and build new relations without destroying the central power?

To these formulas that do not contribute to clarify the tasks to advance the struggle of the proletariat are added other militarist statements:

Chairman Mao Tsetung developed the construction of the Party around the rifle.

The fundamental of Maoism is Power... Power based on an armed force led by the Communist Party, conquered and defended by means of the people's war. For Marxism the problem of power is indeed the central problem of the revolution, whose conquest cannot be made in any other way than through the revolutionary violence of the masses, through the people's war; equally correct is the affirmation that the new power, the dictatorship of the proletariat can only be defended with the armed force of the masses; But from there to affirming that it is defended with the people's war, is to surreptitiously introduce the mistaken idea of some comrades who speak of «people's war until communism», which is not separated from the erroneous idea of armed struggle as the principal form of struggle at all times.

It is a «leftist» and militarist idea, not because it is not possible that wars may arise to defend the new power and even international wars, as happened during the Second World War, but to generalize such an idea does not correspond to the development of the class struggle in the socialist countries, where the cultural revolutions, which are also necessary to defend the dictatorship of the proletariat, at least in what the experience in China shows, do not take the form of armed struggle or people's war. In this regard, in *Questions of Leninism*, Stalin, quoting Lenin, says:

But, naturally, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not reduced only to violence, although without violence there can be no dictatorship.

Dictatorship,» says Lenin, «does not mean violence alone,

although the former is not possible without violence; it also means an organization of labor superior to the preceding one» (see t. XXIV, p. 305).

«The dictatorship of the proletariat... is not only the exercise of violence over the exploiters, it is not even primarily violence. The economic basis of this revolutionary violence, the guarantee of its vitality and its success, lies in the fact that the proletariat represents and puts into practice a higher type of social organization of labor than that of capitalism. This is essential. Therein lies the strength and the guarantee of the inevitable and complete triumph of communism» (see t. XXIV, pp. 335-336).

In the proposal of the comrades of the Coordinating Committee for the Unified Maoist International Conference there are other inaccuracies in the formulations, but they are of secondary order and perfectly could be corrected and for this reason we did not dwell on them.

We have made reference to some errors that we consider do not correspond to the position, method and point of view of Marxism Leninism Maoism, but to metaphysical positions; ideas that in politics lead to dogmatism and «leftist» sectarianism, and that from the class point of view correspond to the petty bourgeoisie and not to the revolutionary proletariat.

These are the considerations for which we warn from the beginning that the proposal presented by the comrades does not represent a general Base of Unity of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoists at the present time, which would allow to apply the method of Unity – Struggle – Unity to continue the struggle around the divergences that for now are legitimate in the bosom of the revolutionary communists.

Leadership Committee – Communist Workers Union (mlm)
Colombia, January 24, 2022