

Maoism - Lives, Fights, Wins and Keeps Winning!

By the Communist Party of Turkey (Marxist-Leninist) [TKP (ML)]

The following article was first published in 1997 in the September 1-15 and 16-30 issues of *Halkın Gunlugu*, the newspaper of the Communist Party of Turkey (Marxist-Leninist) [TKP (ML)]. [It was reprinted in English in the RIM magazine *A World To Win*, #24 (1998) and posted online at: http://www.aworldtowin.org/back_issues/1998-24/maoismTKPML24Eng.htm]

On the 9th of September 1976 we physically lost Mao Tse-tung. However, Maoism still lives and fights as the leader of the proletariat and oppressed people in the world. To commemorate Mao means to defend and apply Maoism, which is a principle for each Maoist, otherwise one cannot be a communist and it is not possible to achieve victory.

After Mao's death, the problems of the proletarian revolutionary movement in the world, the international communist movement and the revolutionary movement's position have shown us the importance of Mao's leadership. Those who criticised Mao after his death, such as Enver Hoxha (who never spoke a word of criticism while Mao was still alive), actually saluted Khrushchev. History shows us their true nature and also the importance of the leadership of Maoism.

Maoism is against imperialism, its puppets and every type of reactionary in the world; in the struggle for communism it represents the highest stage. Developments in the world confirm the scientific character of Maoism. We lost our socialist countries, which in itself confirms the scientific character of Maoism - that socialism is a struggle between two roads and two classes, and that it is not clear which class is going to win in the period of socialism. Because of this, Maoism is the flag of the international proletariat in the struggle for communism. The Cultural Revolution is the starting point in the international struggle for communism and in determining whether communism is actually being defended. Although the forms are different in each country, the essence is the same. Already there is a generation of communists who have struggled against revisionism and opportunism by grasping and wielding this scientific method of Maoism.

After all this, it is clear to anyone who wants to grasp it, both before and after the seizure of power, that it is necessary to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Those who defend the theory that there are no classes and no bourgeoisie under socialism are bankrupt. It has been seen that even socialist ownership of the productive forces has not solved the problem of who is going to win. During the whole period of socialism, which is the struggle from capitalism through to communism, there is the basis for capitalism to be restored, even though there is proletarian power. The bourgeoisie and the basis for its regeneration continue to exist. Under socialism, even though the relations of public ownership have been greatly advanced, because of the existence of the party and the state the relations of production cannot be completely solved until communism is achieved world-wide. As long as the party and the state control public ownership, this is still a long way from real public ownership. Whatever our desires, this is the unavoidable reality.

The new bourgeoisie under socialism are mainly concentrated in the party and state and gain their strength from the contradictions of socialism. The new bourgeois bureaucrats such as Khrushchev, who hide behind socialist masks, show us this reality.

Now that everyone can see the danger of capitalist restoration and the theory of “no bourgeoisie under socialism” is bankrupt, it is clear that the main danger comes from the newly formed bourgeoisie in the party and the state. To sum up, the state is an instrument of one class over another. This is the case even during socialism and under proletarian power. Unfortunately, the “classless socialism” theory denies the scientific Leninist theory about the state by saying that the proletarian state’s task is merely to defend against the imperialists and outside attacks against the socialist country. It is true that the proletarian state defends the socialist country against imperialist invasion, but mainly its task is to solve all the contradictions in socialist society, in particular the antagonistic ones, although the forms and methods vary. Because of this, proletarian power is an instrument to continue the proletarian revolution. Under the power of the new bourgeoisie, who get their strength from the seeds of capitalism within socialism, there would be a U-turn on the path towards communism. Also there is the danger from the old bourgeoisie who have been overthrown but still exist.

The only guarantee that the power of the oppressed people will be used for communism is the Maoist line. Under socialism, “from each according to their work” is still a kind of bourgeois economy, and the transition to “to each according to their needs” and the withering away of the state require proletarian power and the Maoist line. It is then possible to involve and get the right of control for oppressed people directly. Like other problems, the state and bourgeois right is a result of the nature of socialism as a transitional society. Under socialism, we must not delay the tasks of eliminating class society and placing the state in the museum of antiquities until we reach the stage of “from each according to their ability, to each according to their needs.” We cannot leave this aside and say it is not a task for the present. Has not the leadership of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution shown us this? We have nothing to say to the bourgeoisie who do not want to see this. The funeral of the so-called “socialists” has already buried the social-imperialists, social-fascists and bourgeois democrats. What can we say except “God help them!” We understand the revisionist line against Maoism, but we cannot understand revolutionaries and democrats who wallow in a revisionist ideological situation – and we accept our task to liberate them from this. But they themselves have to accept the treatment. As Marx pointed out, nobody can help those who refuse to learn from their experiences and mistakes.

To grasp the rudiments of the scientific method and understand reality it is first necessary to toss aside indecision and prejudice. A picture of the proletarian science demonstrates this to us. Under proletarian leadership, the proletarian power still contains the leadership-led contradiction between the party and the masses. If we want to use the proletarian power as an instrument to advance to communism, then the Maoist ideological and political line is indisputably needed. The party and the proletarian power are a result of the old division of labour. Although the party represents the interests of the proletariat and the labouring people, and plays a decisive role as the vehicle in leading the masses to seize power, there is still the leadership-led contradiction between the party and the state on the one hand and the broad masses of people on the other. The contradictions between mental and manual labour, between leadership and led, and between the town and countryside form the reality of socialism as a

transitional society for the entire period between capitalism and communism. These contradictions are the result not of chance, but of the economic and social base. This is also the basis of alienation. Even the proletarian power has a bourgeois side to it because of this. During the revolutionary transformation of the economic, political and cultural arenas, the Maoist ideological and political line is important and necessary to transform this bourgeois side.

The Cultural Revolution is our flag in our struggle against all the kinds of bourgeoisie. With the outlook of the Cultural Revolution, it is possible to lead the people in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and their bureaucracy, to lead the masses to supervise the party and state, to enable people to discuss and organise themselves under the leadership of the vanguard, to create a lively political and ideological atmosphere in which to grasp and understand experience under Maoist leadership, and to create great initiative. To be a vanguard leadership requires a science that enables people to see the correct way forward. With the outlook of the Cultural Revolution, the party and state, which are remnants of class society, can serve the broad masses. Bureaucracy chokes people's initiative, but the proletarian vanguard is a lever to break the chains. The role of leading people is not to issue orders but to bring together people's struggles to achieve the goal.

With the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and Maoism:

A: Socialism, as a transitional society, showed that class struggle, the struggle between the two roads and the political, economic and social struggle needed the Great Proletarian - Cultural Revolution.

B: Socialism showed us the role of the party and state and the dangers associated with them, and it showed the importance of ideological and political line and the necessity of the vanguard for revolutionary transformation in practice.

C: Maoists emphasise the masses' role in making revolution and the role of the vanguard, and they fight against the mistakes of those who see the masses' role only in production and who see themselves as experts in politics and economics.

D: The principle and the essence of dialectical materialism stands against those who only have a mechanical grasp of the relationship between consciousness and matter, the transformation of matter into consciousness and of consciousness into matter. Because of this, Maoism is against those who only grasp in a vulgar materialist way the relationship between the superstructure and the economic base and between economics and politics. It criticises the line of "classless socialism" and of the monolithic party and society. It has explained in practice the causes of the contradictions between the vanguard and the masses, between mental and manual labour, and between urban and rural, which are the bourgeois laws and problems operating in society.

E: In his works "On the Ten Great Relationships" and "A Critique of Soviet Economics", Mao criticises and exposes in practice the revisionists who do not understand the relationship between heavy industry, agriculture and light industry, between central planning and local initiative, and the importance of the role of the vanguard in leading the broad masses.

In short, with Maoism, in the fields of economics, philosophy and scientific socialism, our science has reached a qualitatively higher stage. Mao neither tailed behind the masses nor stood in front of them barking orders; neither did he deny the role of the vanguard like a liberal, nor was he a bureaucrat issuing orders; he was not for vulgar central planning, nor did he defend free-market economics, which denies the role of the central united leadership. He was a concrete example of the dialectical relationship between centralisation and decentralisation. He was radically critical of bureaucratic centralisation and anarcho-trade-unionism. He saw the complex political, social and economic aspects of socialism. When he mentioned the necessity for heavy industry, he did not forget about the need for light industry also. This line did *not* cause chaos in China, with its population of over one billion people. It is only with a Maoist line that it is possible to lead people to participate in production and for the masses of labourers to actively participate in leading society forward and to fully supervise the party and state.

Mao's line towards the People's Army was that it should be a dynamic army that participates in production and carries out revolutionary tasks, not a bureaucratic army that is indifferent to the interests of the people. He knew that an army was a necessity, but not the aim. Mao's leadership did not deny the need for an army yet also organised the masses into people's militias.

We Salute Maoism under the Leadership of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution!

Each democracy is a class power. Each power is a democracy. There is no democracy that is above class power. This means that every state is an instrument of dictatorship against the other classes, apart from the class it represents. For us, it is clear who the proletarian democracy represents, whom it dictates to and what its aim is. It is a democracy for the labourers. Under Mao's leadership, the aim is to seize power, to supervise and guarantee the power and to continue to make revolution, and it is a total dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. It is a weapon to achieve the final goal of communism. It is most important who controls the organs of power in the period of socialism, which is a means of getting to communism. It is very important to have Maoist leadership to transform society towards communism and to represent the interests and rights of the people. If opportunism and revisionism control and lead the power, they will turn things back and restore capitalism. It is our aim to establish the proletarian power, but it will not happen by itself without a communist vanguard. Those who pit the vanguard and the masses against each other deny Maoist vanguard leadership and use a vulgar materialist philosophy and political economic method. The so-called "left" liberals, who try to send an invoice to our science for the crimes of the "new" bourgeoisie who developed out of the former socialist countries, are vulgar crooks. They attack especially the role of the communist party under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which we cannot abandon. Their world outlook prevents them from seeing the contradictions in socialist society, which is a transitional period between capitalism and communism. Because of their spontaneous outlook, they draw up a profit-and-loss account for our science and even reach the point of those who say, "communism is dead and defeated". Nonetheless, the communists have of course made mistakes.

When Mao explained the contradictions in socialist society he drew lessons from the mistakes of socialists and others on this question. He showed that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was the way to continue the revolution until communism. He explained the basis for

the development of the “new” bourgeoisie under socialism. He showed how habits, ideas and customs have caused the masses to degenerate, and he showed that the solution was to persist in carrying out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, because it has been seen that the bourgeoisie can exist and exercise control from within the organs of the proletarian power. Because of that, it is necessary to revolutionise the whole sphere of the superstructure in the state power and society. Can we make revolution without a party? The importance of the role of the vanguard is demonstrated in leading the people to make revolution with the correct line. The liberal “left” use the mistakes and weaknesses of the communists (such as not understanding well enough the role of the masses or the dialectical materialist relationship between the vanguard and the masses) to exaggerate the masses’ role and close their eyes to and turn their back on the vanguard role. In a word, the revolution cannot go forward with this theory because it focuses on the masses only. The initiative of the revolutionary masses needs a vanguard and is not opposed to it. The synthesis that needs to be reached is the unity of the communist vanguard and the masses, not pitting the one against the other.

The form is important but cannot be put above the essence. Did not Khrushchev make use of the people’s ownership in the Soviet form? Yes, the form is important, but the essence is the key factor. This or that form can be used by the Khrushchev or Deng revisionists, which means that if there is no Maoist line and vanguard leadership, the people’s interests cannot be represented and guaranteed by the form alone.

In the name of the struggle against bureaucracy, you cannot deny the vanguard role; otherwise, it would be an operation in giving power to the bourgeoisie.

The so-called liberal “left” use the Paris Commune example, but they use its weaknesses that need to be overcome. One of these weaknesses was that there was not a communist vanguard. Those who raise the historical weaknesses of the Commune and enshrine them as theory are inviting us into a tunnel without a light! But Maoism is the sunlight on the road and represents our scientific inheritance. It shows us how to defend the Paris Commune with the people’s commune under the leadership of the party, how to exercise power through the method of the revolutionary committee, and how to lead people to participate in production in practice, etc.

Those who promote anarchism are mere chatterboxes who cannot break with the system, but merely keep people tied to it in theory and practice.

Yesterday and today, we defend the Paris Commune as a milestone, but not like the anarchists. It is not enough today just to be a communist, to only defend and accept the dictatorship of the proletariat, we must at the same time be for the continuation of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is very important to grasp, understand and apply this in practice, such as the example of continuing the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Of course dictatorship does not only mean violence. The form of the proletarian dictatorship and whether the bourgeoisie are given any rights at all (such as elections, etc.) is entirely dependent on the specific conditions. We must understand that the differences between the examples in the Soviet Union and China, in form but not in essence, are because of the differences in the specific conditions.

The principle of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be denied. The remnants of capitalism under socialism are concrete phenomena, as shown by past experience. As Mao said, where the broom does not reach, the dust will remain; the dust does not vanish by itself.

Therefore, it is not enough merely to grasp the class struggle, we have to accept the need for proletarian dictatorship and carry it out in practice, from the perspective of carrying out the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Otherwise, the doctrine or theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat will be distorted.

There are many people who join the communist party and proletarian power organisationally but who get their strength from the habits of the old society and who are not with the proletariat ideologically. These people, especially in the socialist period, use this to their own advantage, especially at leading levels of the party, while still raising the red flag.

Thus, we ourselves cannot avoid using dictatorship to halt the old and “new” bourgeoisie. For us, revolution is a right and a duty. It is right to rebel against reactionaries. But to carry out this right against the working people is to distort this.

There are many attacks against the Cultural Revolution. It is very natural for the reactionaries to attack this great political revolution under Mao’s leadership, which has scared to death even the biggest reactionary “Kings of Hell!”

What was expected of the Cultural Revolution? Could the Cultural Revolutionary Movement have ever avoided touching the bourgeoisie who had taken up positions of power in the proletarian state!? It is a revolutionary task to rebel against reactionaries, and the Cultural Revolution has taught us how to do this.

The liberal-left and their tears support the imperialists and their puppets who attack the Cultural Revolution for destroying the “new” bourgeoisie by leading the revolutionary masses with Maoism. It is no surprise for us that the new liberal-left trend swears at the revolution and distorts the essence of the GPCR. In China, the poor peasants, who rebelled against the big landlords and their power, were looked down upon as rabble and a mob by their opponents. Also, for example, during the 1996 Mayday demonstration in Istanbul, the liberal-left trade-union leader condemned the workers’ rebellion against the police (in the same way as in China, - ideologically).

As Mao said about those who condemn the rebellion of the masses, they think revolution is a dinner party. Of course, in a revolutionary period, we do not say that there are no extremist or excessive acts or that we have no task to educate people, but any excesses there may be are not the principal factor or the essence of the rebellion.

It is a crime *not* to strike at the reactionaries but to avoid them instead. During the Cultural Revolution period, striking down capitalist-roaders was a means, but it was not the aim. The aim was to change the world outlook of the people, to promote communism. Even Liu Shao-chi and Deng Xiao-Ping, who were the main targets of the Cultural Revolution, were not killed,

putting the lie to the image of the Cultural Revolution as excessively violent and bloodthirsty. For the communist, the relation between the aims and the means of achieving them is a question of principle and it must be explained to those who do not understand. We must explain that we have and we will continue to have a *class* enemy and opponents, but we do *not* have any *individual* enemy. Because of this outlook, even within our ranks we cannot make class struggle into an individual struggle. We will not accept anything that is against our aims. For example, inhuman treatment of others, torture, the destruction of the environment, financing struggle against the oppressed people and the proletariat, the drugs trade - all these are the tasks of the bourgeoisie.

To sum up, in order to continue their regime the exploiters defend the reactionary pragmatic philosophy of using any means to continue their rule. The generation of the Cultural Revolution never said, “the party and power above all else”. They used the party and state power for the freedom of the oppressed and poor people and as a weapon for achieving a classless society in order to change the world. The people’s interest is always and everywhere the guiding principle. The communists struggled with the pragmatist philosophy of Deng Xiao-ping, which stated, “It doesn’t matter if it is a black cat or a white cat, as long as it catches mice.” To change the opinion of the masses, we cannot avoid ideological struggle. We know that in all societies the dominant culture is that of the dominant class. The Cultural Revolution means breaking with the old habits and customs and it is the key to achieving this.

The revisionists think that the Cultural Revolution was absolute terror. The imperialists and their puppets claim that the revolution was against the people. It is very important not to let anyone mix up who is an enemy and who is a friend in the revolutionary period, and to be able to actually defeat the enemy it is important to have unity with our friends while struggling over their mistakes and applying our class line. This is a question of principle.

Using violence against the people is a crime and it was *not* done in the GPCR. Any obstacle or barrier to unleashing the revolutionary enthusiasm and initiative of the people was cleared out of the way, and the GPCR was the most excellent example of a people’s democracy in the history of the proletarian revolution.

The Cultural Revolution cadres were elected and supervised and could be removed from their positions by the people. As we explained before, overturning people is a means, not the aim. Even as applied to the revisionists, this means changing their world outlook, re-educating them, putting them into production, and having them supervised by the people.

For the masses, and for people who have made mistakes, it is very important for Maoist culture to “cure the sickness to save the patient” and to use their mistakes as an opportunity to educate them. For Maoists, apart from those people who cannot be cured or helped to advance, we approach people “like a doctor”. Does a doctor have a right to shout at a sick patient? Such a “doctor” would not know his duty and would be stupid. What is this duty? To discover the patient’s sickness and then to carry out the appropriate treatment. As a matter of fact, some sectarians, who use force to impose their authority, criticise Mao as a liberal. However, Mao never avoided struggling over mistakes. On the contrary, Mao used the method of *unity-struggle-unity*, both within the party and in society, to struggle over mistakes to reach a higher level of

unity. The proud “high and mighty” bureaucrats couldn’t understand why Mao trusted 95% of the population as good and honest people. The haughty bureaucrats never care about the sources of the mistakes and people’s real conditions. Those who think they never make mistakes and who have a furious greed for god-like power become an enemy of all the people and take an aggressive line against the masses. In general, the main mistakes come from them. Lin Piao was a typical concrete example. He organised a gangster clique supposedly to sharply continue the Cultural Revolution against Deng Xiao-ping, but in reality this served the Deng forces. Lin Piao was a “super-Maoist!” with the slogan “smash and burn everything!” Lin Piao carried out cheating and intrigues in his personal fight for power.

Using our science to solve the contradictions in the party and society, what we must do and what we must not do is:

“Practice Marxism, not revisionism. Unite, don’t split. Don’t intrigue and conspire but be open, honest and above-board.”

As Marx said about the character of private property, it is always timid and cowardly because it has no soul.

On Politics

Those who do not say anything about their history and literature cannot learn and take lessons. Didn’t “they” say that philosophy is not as simple as Mao explained in “On Contradiction”, “On Practice” and his other works on philosophy? The writings of the great Maoist, Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, in the 1972 Manifesto, which includes the Kurecik Area Report and the worker-peasant movement articles, provide a very concrete and important example to be learnt from.

The masses cannot be led by abstract directions. Power can be seized only through the conscious struggle of the people to win power. We cannot avoid leading people ourselves in the class struggle with the correct line. Revolutionary war is a practical example of how to achieve this. People’s war and the new democratic revolution have a dialectical relationship to carrying out these tasks for the new democratic power. When we say the people’s war is not only a military task, but also an economic, political and social task to carry out the revolution, we mean this. The relationship between war and politics explains this reality. Revolutionary war is a means of continuing revolutionary politics. We must leave behind our weaknesses and deficiencies very quickly. During the preparation of the GPCR, the slogan was raised to struggle against the “Four Old Things”. We must learn from this and bring it into our concrete practice. Weaknesses and difficulties are a unity of opposites with winning and the bright future. Once we analyse these correctly, everything can be solved. We must not be like those who only see the problems and difficulties but do not organise a solution or see the bright future nor like those who are too haughty and proud to see and overcome their own weaknesses. The GPCR cannot accept that there are problems with no solution. It is very clear for us what we must do and what we must not do. We will now discuss this.

Facing the Attacks

The liberal attacks against the proletariat and working people from the weapons of Kautsky and Bernstein are rotten bullets. They can only shoot themselves with these weapons. The liberals applaud democracy in the abstract and swear at the powerful working people under the leadership of the proletariat, while at the same time they shed tears for any restrictions placed on the bourgeois classes. Today we understand better than yesterday the necessity to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. We know the damage that the parties of the Second International caused.

As for their Eurocentric view that grows out of the theory of the productive forces, which holds that the proletariat should not try to seize power in countries where it is not the majority of the population - they can keep this suggestion to themselves, to put it politely! Those who explain capitalist restoration in the former socialist countries by this Eurocentric theory are “civilised” ignoramuses, and with this theory they are not going to see any revolution in their lifetimes!

There are reformist evolutionaries within this system who are examples of how *not* to be revolutionary, i.e., the “new liberal left”, who make propaganda for the “New World Order”, and who are expecting to receive warmth and support from the imperialists. We congratulate them on their reformism! For us, line is a guide for what we do in practice, and practice is principal. Thus, the Leninist method means:

- The unity of theory and practice.
- That the content of actions, not slogans, is the essence.
- That under the leadership of the party, the masses must be prepared and aroused for revolution.
- That one must dare to learn from experiences, mistakes and errors.
- That one must always continue towards communism.

We stand radically opposed to the Parties of the Second International and defend the Leninist understanding of the party, but we are not limited to this, as we have adopted the Maoist understanding of the party, which has opened a new door.

It is through this understanding and line that we fight against the understanding of the party and society as “monolithic”. Through unity, struggle and unity, struggle, persuasion and transformation, we can represent this line within the party and the masses and through this the struggle between the two roads and between right and wrong lines can be grasped. It is never possible to achieve absolute total unity within the party and society, and without struggle it is not possible to be strong. We must understand this. Also, with our determination and our unity of

action we can co-ordinate the practice in the party and under socialism. The party is not a federation of rulers and landlords! The Maoist party understanding is based on unity between the party and the masses and is a means to enable the people to act in a vanguard way and to advance to a society where there is no further need for a party or state.

Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Is Our Guide!

Mao Tse-tung defended the inheritance of comrades Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and under Mao's leadership the experience of the GPCR showed that our science had reached a new and qualitatively higher stage. The revisionists who do not understand our proletarian science, which is the universal basis for communism throughout the world, distort the GPCR as if the GPCR were only relevant to China.

When Mao explained the need to make Marxism particular to China, he indicated that we needed to wield our universal ideology and science and apply it to our particular situation. Because of the imbalance in this imperialist world we live in, the division between the oppressed nations and the oppressor nations, and other factors, the forms of the proletarian struggle in each country vary according to the concrete conditions.

Marxism gives "concrete solutions to concrete problems". It is a science of action, and idealists who try to turn our science upside-down inevitably fail because our science has already been proven in practice.

The great Maoist and leader of the proletariat and oppressed peoples in Turkey and Kurdistan, Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, applied Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to our concrete situation and illuminated our path with his red line.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the international communist movement, who analysed the seizure of power in the Soviet Union by the "new" bourgeoisie, has forged a very sharp weapon for us. The GPCR is the summit of our science. Without this understanding it is not possible to be a proletarian revolutionary.

"Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." With this slogan from Mao Tse-tung we see that although the forms of seizing power are different, revolutionary violence itself is a universal necessity.

The form of revolutionary violence necessary in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is people's war; this is the cornerstone of a revolutionary line. Imperialism and its puppets, who with their theory and practice want to prevent proletarian revolution, attack the people's war as their main target. This fact alone shows us very clearly the necessity of people's war!

Through Mao's strategy of people's war under the leadership of the communist party, all kinds of miracles can be achieved; this stands opposed to those who become enslaved by and captive to the theory of the productive forces and who believe that guns, not people, are principal. Mao showed that under the leadership of the communist party "people, not weapons, are decisive," and this illuminated our path.

As Mao said, “The East wind will prevail over the West wind.” He explained the concrete reality of the world we live in, as opposed to others who refused to recognise that the colonial and semi-colonial countries are the “storm centre” of the world revolution. Look at Peru, Turkey, The Philippines, Nepal and other examples . . . come off it, what more proof is needed!

This Eurocentric so-called socialist understanding which distorts the proletarian world revolutionary struggle also means preventing socialist revolution in the imperialist/capitalist countries.

The GPCR, in the socialist transition from capitalism to communism, is the means to continue the revolution and the dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, and under the Maoist vanguard leadership it is the flag of the revolutionary masses’ line which is the basis for the revolutionary masses’ initiative.

Those who put machines and technology in command naturally do not want to understand Mao and refuse the line of putting revolution in command. The Maoist line is a necessity for those who want to march to communism. On the other hand, even for those who want socialism but who have not yet grasped this understanding, it is a strong possibility that they will sit on the inequalities remaining among the people under socialism and become a “new” bourgeoisie, leading to the restoration of capitalism. Lenin represents real Marxism against those who defend the line of the Second International and hide their economist face with a “Marxist” mask. Lenin’s line has illuminated the proletarian revolution in the century of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The Great October Revolution, which opened the way for proletarian revolution this century, has smashed the Second International’s revisionist productive forces theory. This inheritance, and the GPCR, which is a qualitative leap in our science, enable us to understand the problems of revolution deeply.

The GPCR has shown us that during the period from capitalism to communism classes exist and thus that the class struggle needs to continue. The class struggle does not come from outside but is based on the realities within socialist society. Before Mao, it was not possible to analyse these problems correctly. Knowledge depends on social conditions, it cannot be understood in a straight-line way. The relationship between matter and consciousness cannot and should not be understood in a mechanical materialist way, because in reality they are related dialectically.

The followers of the Second International perspective take a position against Maoism (and all the lessons learnt from socialist transformation, which has taken our science to a higher stage), and fight it with so-called “Marxism”. Our science has developed greatly through these experiences, but revisionism does not want to understand this, despite reality.

Even after socialist ownership of the means of production has been established, it is still possible to return to capitalism. History proves it is Maoism that is correct, and not those other views that say such a return is impossible. Who stands against the view that capitalist restoration is possible?

History is a witness for scientific Maoism, not for those “civilised” ignoramuses who look down prejudicially on the revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, which are the driving force for revolution around the world.

History has *not* proven correct those who say socialism is not possible in one country but it *has* proven correct the leadership of Lenin, Stalin and Mao, who have carried out revolution successfully, and it has proven correct the science of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The Khrushchev coup in the Soviet Union and the other seizures of power by his puppets in Eastern Europe, as well as other problems in China which Mao has explained, show that:

1) Socialism itself is a transitional society, not a stable society. Problems do not cease even after socialist transformation and the establishment of socialist ownership relations. These two steps, socialist transformation and the establishment of socialist ownership relations, are very important in removing the exploiting forces from the ownership of production. But this does *not* mean that all the problems of the production relations have been solved. There are still contradictions in the relations between the producers, for example, between the leadership and led . . .

Therefore, although the people’s ownership is an important step to establish, this is still far from the *real* control of society (by the whole people). This is the reality of socialism, even with these important radical steps. In socialist society, it cannot be any other way. The old class (the bourgeoisie) who have been smashed and the danger they pose for seizing power again can be understood by every ordinary person, but the main dangers and sneaky attacks come from the “new” bourgeoisie who are fed with the contradictions within socialist society. The “new” bourgeoisie amass in the state and the party. Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Deng are real concrete examples of this. Now we would like to ask:

a) Which is correct? The line which claims that the main dangers come from the “new” bourgeoisie who are on the capitalist road? Or, the line that claims the main dangers come only from imperialist invasion and from the old ruling class which has been overthrown? Which line has been proven correct?

Maoism has been proven correct. And as for those who still cling to their rotten revisionist weapons, what can we say except that their revisionist line should be smashed over their heads!

b) The revisionist line defends the “no bourgeoisie under socialism” line. They argue that there is no contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat under socialism. And they do not want to know how this struggle in the party and the state is proceeding, because they do not want themselves to be identified. They portray the bourgeoisie simply as the “old” bourgeoisie with their factory-owner top-hats!

Their class brothers, the modern revisionist, bureaucratic dictators, do not say who won out, but we say that Maoism won out.

c) For years we have explained that the bureaucratic bourgeois dictatorships have used our science as a mask to mislead the masses. But the revisionists did not understand. They continue to say that these countries are socialist, but Maoism has won out because the modern revisionists have taken their masks off and are now gathering under the flag of free-market, classical capitalism.

2) For years we also explained that the problems of socialism, with its old division of labour, its remaining inequalities and alienation, the contradictions between mental and manual labour, between urban and rural, etc, are remnants of the old society. We have also explained how we can restrict these contradictions. Thus, we have explained many times the key role of ideological and political line, the necessity of controlling the power, and the importance of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. So who won out? Those who say that the old class has been overthrown, and the problem is finished? Or, Maoism? Again, it is clear that Maoism has won out.

As we have said before, the organising principle of distribution under socialism (i.e. from each according to their ability, to each according to their *work*) still has inequality within the apparent equality. By exercising control over the question of whether or not the definition of rights are to be obeyed, the state (as in the case of the economy) had a bourgeois side to it. That is to say: one of the aspects which constituted this state was bourgeois. In any event, this was inescapable. It is therefore necessary to make sure that the revolution which defends the proletarian character of the political power continues without interruption, so as not to allow the bourgeois aspect of the state and of the economy to develop in the wrong direction and act as a bridge towards capitalist restoration. Political power is a weapon to continue the revolution. It is a weapon to lead the people towards communism. The proletarian power does *not* reconcile classes. Our duty was the GPCR, which we carried out in China and which stopped capitalist restoration for 10 years. With what?

With Maoism! . . . But even during the GPCR's successful days, we still said it was not clear who was going to win. So history has again proved that Maoism won out.

3) It was "goulash socialism" that was defeated, but because ordinary people did not understand its nature they reacted to this by reacting against real socialism also.

Maoist leadership is the flag of all the oppressed in the struggle to change the world to reach classless society. Especially today, when economism comes under the imperialist flag in the imperialist countries, the destiny of social chauvinists is surrender to imperialism. What about Maoism? . . . Who is welcoming the bright future for the world? Aren't Munzur, and Ayacucho in the Andean mountains, the main strongholds?

The Cultural Revolution, as opposed to the economist line, is struggling to change the world. Under the correct line, the masses are the force that is capable of solving any problem. This is the essence of the Maoist mass line.

The metaphysicians, who cover their faces with the mask of dialectical materialism, are in reality completely opposed to it. The essence of dialectical materialism is the unity of

opposites in nature and society. The philosophical idealists who distort this essence are far from understanding that things are “lively, conditional and in motion” or the “unity and identity” of objects. Because of this, their thinking is limited to seeing the tactical strength of the reactionary forces, and they are blind to the strategic superiority of the oppressed people. During the time of the Second International, in a “relatively voiceless” situation, they declared that revolution was an imaginary ghost.

Kaypakkaya’s Line Is Our Vanguard!

Kaypakkaya was a great Maoist. The TKP (ML), which was a product of the GPCR and its founding leader Kaypakkaya, has deepened its understanding of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and carried it out in practice. Because of this, it has been possible to raise high the TKP (ML) manifesto concerning both the short-term programme of democratic revolution and the long-term programme of achieving communism. Kaypakkaya cannot be defended without defending Maoism. On the contrary, defending any other line is a sham.

Because of their vulgar materialism and their positivist-economist understanding of political-economic relations, some people cannot understand why the revolutionary proletarian vanguard was a result of the GPCR.

The fact that the class struggle objectively comes from class society is not open to discussion. The class struggle is not due to anyone’s will but instead is a result of humanity being divided into classes. The formation of the proletariat is a result of a particular stage of development of human society, in which the proletariat will become the gravediggers of the bourgeoisie. The aim of our conscious proletarian class struggle includes finally removing the proletariat (along with all other classes!) from the stage of history. If a proletarian class exists, it explains the objective existence of the proletarian parties. The party of the proletariat cannot be formed spontaneously from the proletarian struggle, but results from the *conscious* proletarian revolutionary struggle. The party is a *conscious* weapon of the revolutionary proletariat. With this weapon the proletariat can guide its struggle on the correct line, and can analyse, grasp, change and light up the future of the world with the science of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLM).

The 15-16 of June Movement had created the objective conditions for taking leaps forward in consciousness. Why didn’t the organisations of the People’s Liberation Army of Turkey (THKO) and the Turkish People’s Liberation Party - Front (THKP-C) draw the necessary lessons and reach the synthesis of MLM? Why couldn’t they take up the long-term strategic programme of MLM? The answer to these questions is their outlook. Kaypakkaya was a Maoist because of his Maoist outlook. The favourable objective conditions were an advantage, but if Kaypakkaya had not grasped the GPCR, then it would not have been possible to produce our 1972 Manifesto or our short- and long-term programmes, despite this advantageous situation. There have been many favourable lessons that have proven our science and led to leaps forward in practice in the world (for example, the lessons of capitalist restoration and the necessity of continuing the GPCR under the dictatorship of the proletariat), so why do these forces still not understand Maoism? Because of their outlook.

With our science, which has reached a new and qualitatively higher stage with the GPCR under Maoist leadership, and with the leadership of Kaypakkaya, a new and qualitatively higher line in Turkey and Kurdistan in Turkey has been achieved. Before Kaypakkaya, the official ideology of the Turkish state, which is Kemalism, was recognised as a progressive inheritance by the forces who call themselves revolutionary democrats and “communists”. Furthermore, the Kemalist repressive movement was recognised as a “progressive movement to smash reactionary fundamentalism”. Even despite the important radical actions of the THKO and the THKP-C in 1971, they were unable to gain a correct understanding and achieve a correct analysis of the character of the Turkish republic and its army, because of their outlook. In the international arena in the battle between MLM and revisionism, they hold a middle line. This is their other weakness. This movement considered the leadership of the modern revisionist “new” bourgeois dictatorship in the Soviet Union as socialist. But practice has shown the importance of Kaypakkaya’s line, which is easy to grasp for anyone who wants to. Those lovers of the Kemalist ideology and Kemalist army, the Turkish Revolutionary Workers and Peasants’ Party (TIHKP), have nothing at all in common with Mao despite their phrase-mongering. Their line is reformist, parliamentarist and state “leftist”, and distorts the Maoist new democratic revolution, people’s war and other teachings of Mao. Kaypakkaya indicated its character and line even in 1971. After Mustafa Suphi’s death, the Turkish Communist Party (TKP) became revisionist and then became a puppet of Soviet social-imperialism. All of these things show us the importance of Kaypakkaya’s line, which was a qualitative leap forward in the revolution in Turkey and Kurdistan of Turkey. Now we ask:

- 1) Before Kaypakkaya, was there anyone who had recognised Kemalist ideology as a fascist movement of the Turkish comprador-bourgeoisie and the big landlords?
- 2) Before Kaypakkaya, was there anyone who had recognised and supported the democratic character of the Kurdish national movement as well as supported Seyh Sait, Dersim, Agri, Kocgiri and other Kurdish uprisings, and opposed the repression of the Kemalist military?
- 3) Because of the errors on the Kemalist question, on the Kurdish national question and other minority questions, could the “left” overcome its chauvinism enough?
- 4) Before Kaypakkaya, were the positions of others towards the state, the military and the revolution correct? (As for the TKP and the TIHKP, since the essence of these organisations has already been exposed, it is not necessary to discuss them further.)
 - a) Why did they love and applaud the coups of 27 May and 1971?
 - b) How can their policy of unity in a civilian-military alliance with the Kemalist army command be explained?
 - c) What does it mean to treat the Turkish state and army on the basis of the Kemalist inheritance?
- 5) Is there anyone - including the armed struggle in 1971 against pacifism – who grasped the strategy of people’s war for revolution in Turkey and Kurdistan of Turkey, which is the line

of victory and which has already been scientifically proven in practice, even though some are still debating this? Is there anyone before Kaypakkaya who grasped the new democratic revolution, the new democratic people's power and these strategic weapons: the party, the army and the united front, on the basis of MLM?

We ask:

a) Compared with the revolutionary teaching of MLM, can there be any place for the military's coups, projects, and practice?

b) Can the proletariat support one or another of the cliques in the bourgeois state and army – and, moreover, support and take the side of the Kemalist headquarters?

c) In terms of the proletariat's policy on allying those who want to smash the system, can they in the meantime also have an alliance with the system's army?

6) Before Kaypakkaya, was there anyone who grasped the character of the social-imperialist camp and held a proletarian revolutionary position against it?

These questions can be discussed further, but we think this is enough for those who want to see reality: reality is that with Kaypakkaya, a period of qualitatively higher resistance has begun in Turkey and Kurdistan of Turkey.