

Against Imperialism, Capitalism, Fascism, Patriarchy, and all forms of Reactionism

PARTIZAN[★]

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

SEPTEMBER 2026 / #1

**THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MAO ZEDONG'S DEATH:
FIFTY YEARS OF STRUGGLE TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE
OF THE PROLETARIAT**



**Global
Contradictions, Iran,
and the Question of
Revolutionary Stance**

**INTERVIEW: "This
Process does not
resolve the Kurdish
National Question!"**

**"Who Decides the
Target of Our
Anger?"**

Editorial

We are pleased to share with you this first edition of Partizan International Journal.

Partizan International Journal is a journal composed of translations that reflect on and analyze current events from a proletarian perspective. As the great teacher of the proletariat Lenin defined it, we are in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions and precisely because in our era, the contradictions between imperialism and the broad masses of the people, as well as inter-imperialist contradictions, are only intensifying, analyzing current developments through a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist lens is of the utmost importance.

In our journal, we compile current affairs articles that reflect the development of the class struggle in Turkey and globally. Conflicts among imperialists, workers' resistance, the struggle of women and oppressed genders against patriarchy, national movements, and other current struggles will be topics regularly addressed in Partizan International Journal.

We hope that the analyses and articles presented here will enable readers to better understand the perspective of the proletarian movement in Turkey and Kurdistan of Turkey regarding the class struggle and political developments around the world.

Revolutionary greetings...

Contents

Editorial	1
ON THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF MAO TSETUNG'S DEATH: FIFTY YEARS IN STRUGGLE TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE OF THE PROLETARIAT	2
This Process Does Not Resolve The Kurdish National Question!	16
Global Contradictions, Iran, and the Question of Revolutionary Stance....	32
“WHO DETERMINES THE TARGET OF OUR ANGER?”	43

ON THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF MAO TSETUNG'S DEATH: FIFTY YEARS IN STRUGGLE TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE OF THE PROLETARIAT



On 9 September 2026, fifty years will have passed since the death of comrade Mao Tsetung. Like Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin before him, Mao has been the target of sustained vilification and demonisation from outside the revolutionary movement, his history rewritten and his legacy caricatured by those who serve the interests of capital. But the distortion has not come only from outside. Within the movement itself, currents claiming his mantle have twisted what he stood for and taught, using his name to justify positions he spent his whole life fighting against. Against both forms of attack stand the genuine proletarian forces who have defended his historic legacy, who continue to advance the theories he developed, and who are putting these lessons into practice in the class struggle today — undeterred by the overwhelming weight the offensive and persistent attacks by the capitalist-imperialist system against communism and the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao alike.

It is extremely important to study contribution to the theory and practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat, his leadership of the Chinese revolution, the struggle inside his own party over which line would be upheld before victory of revolution and then after establishment Peoples democracy in China, the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism first in the Soviet Union and later in China, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution he launched to fight it, and the distortions of his thought that followed his

death. The purpose is not merely to commemorate but to attempt at a correct summation — so that what was correctly done can be upheld, what was lost can be understood, and the correct line can be advanced and carried forward.

Let us put politics in command and advance the class struggle. Let us practise Marxism, not revisionism. Let us take up Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a guide to action, and creatively advance the proletarian revolution toward the dictatorship of the proletariat.

I. From the Paris Commune to Stalin: the Dictatorship of the Proletariat Before Mao

The dictatorship of the proletariat was not born as an abstract formula but as a lesson drawn from a real, but a brief, experience. When the proletariat of Paris took power in the spring of 1871 and held it for two months, Marx studied their experiment closely, and Engels, writing an introduction to Marx's account twenty years later, was sharp about what it had shown: those who wished to know what the dictatorship of the proletariat looked like needed only to look at the Paris Commune. From that experience Marx drew the conclusion that would separate scientific socialism from every reformist current thereafter: the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made bourgeois state machine and wield it for its own purposes. That machine — standing army, bureaucracy, police, judiciary — has to be smashed, and something new and qualitatively different put in its place: a state built on the armed people, on officials elected and subject to recall at any time, on the fusion of legislative and executive power. The Commune was defeated, but the fundamental lesson survived it.

It fell to Lenin to defend that lesson against a wholesale retreat from it. By the early twentieth century the leaders of the parties of the Second International had drifted toward the view that socialism could be reached through the peaceful, gradual conquest of the existing parliamentary state — a position Lenin identified, correctly, as a return to bourgeois reformism dressed in Marxist language. Against Kautsky above all, in *The State and Revolution*, written on the eve of October 1917, Lenin restated and developed Marx's conclusion: the bourgeois state must be smashed, not perfected; the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a departure from democracy but democracy for the working majority and dictatorship over the exploiting minority; and this transitional state is a necessity, not an optional stage, for as long as classes and the danger of capitalist restoration persist. The October Revolution then did what the Commune had not been able to do: it held power, built a new state on these principles, and survived years of civil war and foreign aggression and intervention. When Kautsky attacked the

revolution from the position he had already staked out, Lenin's reply — *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* — made the stakes explicit: the question of the state was not a secondary matter of political form but the central question separating revolutionary Marxism from its revisionist imitations.

Stalin inherited the task of defending and building on this foundation after Lenin's death in 1924, against pressures that came from two directions at once. Trotsky's insistence that socialism could not be seriously built in a single country pending revolution elsewhere risked, in practice, either a reckless external adventurism or a demoralised waiting on events beyond Soviet control; Bukharin's later accommodation to the market relations tolerated under the New Economic Policy risked drift back toward capitalist relations in the countryside. Stalin led a successful hard fought theoretical and political struggle over both currents through the later 1920s and it cleared the way for a programme of collectivisation and rapid industrialisation carried out under conditions of real capitalist encirclement, at real human cost, but with a real result: for the first time, a state exercising the dictatorship of the proletariat demonstrated in practice that it could construct, defend, and hold for decades a socialist economic system in a single, previously backward country. Each of these three moments — Marx and Engels drawing the lesson from Paris, Lenin defending and applying it against parliamentary reformism, Stalin defending and applying it against capitulation from within — met a specific historical challenge to the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat and answered it. It was into this line, and against a further and different challenge, that Mao Tsetung would make his own decisive contribution.

II. Mao's Leadership of the Chinese Revolution

The China in which the Communist Party of China was born in July 1921 was neither the advanced capitalist society Marx had studied nor the industrialising empire in which Lenin had led a revolution. Decades of unequal treaties following the Opium Wars, the collapse of the imperial state in 1911, and the subsequent fragmentation of the country under competing warlords had left China semi-feudal in its social relations and semi-colonial in its subordination to the imperialist powers. The proletariat, concentrated in a handful of treaty ports, was small; the peasantry, bound by feudal



landlordism, made up the overwhelming majority of the population. The CCP's early years followed the united front strategy pursued in cooperation with the Kuomintang against the warlords, a strategy that collapsed catastrophically in 1927

soon after Chiang Kai-shek seizing leadership of Kuomintang when he led an onslaught against the Communists and massacred them in Shanghai and elsewhere.

It was in the aftermath of this defeat that Mao's specific contribution to the revolution began to take shape. The dominant line within the party at the time, shaped by a largely mechanical transfer of the Russian experience, still looked to urban insurrection led by an industrial proletariat as the road to power — a strategy poorly suited to a country where that proletariat was such a small minority. Mao broke with this orientation. Following the defeated Autumn Harvest Uprising of September 1927, he led the remnants of communist and revolutionary forces into the Jinggangshan mountains and began building something the existing line had not anticipated: a rural revolutionary base area, defended by a Red Army, sustained by land reform that redistributed landlord holdings to the peasants who worked them. From this and the base areas that followed, Mao developed the strategic conception that the Chinese revolution would have to encircle the cities from the countryside rather than the reverse — a conception forced on the movement by the concrete balance of class forces in China rather than derived from any pre-existing formula.

This strategy survived repeated Kuomintang encirclement campaigns and, when the base areas in the south could no longer be held, the retreat known as the Long March of 1934–35, during which the bulk of the Red Army's strength was lost but its political core survived, and at the Zunyi Conference of January 1935 Mao's leadership of the party was established. From the base established at Yan'an, the party rebuilt its forces, consolidated its political line through the Rectification Movement of 1942–44, and, following the Japanese invasion, entered a second united front with the Kuomintang against the common enemy — a period during which Communist-led base areas and the forces defending them expanded substantially. When the war against Japan ended in 1945, the civil war

against the Kuomintang resumed, and within four years the Communist forces had won a decisive and, to most outside observers, unexpectedly rapid victory. On 1 October 1949, Mao proclaimed the founding of the People's Republic of China from Tiananmen Square. What had been won was not simply a military campaign but the practical vindication of a theoretical departure: that revolution in a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country with an overwhelming peasant majority required leadership, strategy and a programme adapted to that concrete reality rather than borrowed wholesale from the experience of an industrial power.

III. New Democracy, Protracted People's War, and the Method of Contradiction

The victory of 1949 rested on a body of theoretical work Mao produced in the years before it, and this body of work needs to be understood as a single connected method rather than three separate contributions.

The foundation was laid in *On Contradiction* (1937), Mao's restatement and development of dialectical materialism for the purpose of concrete political analysis. Its central arguments — that contradiction is universal but takes a particular form in every process; that within any complex process there is a principal contradiction whose resolution determines the resolution of the rest; that within any contradiction there is a principal aspect that gives the contradiction its character at a given moment; and that contradictions may be antagonistic or non-antagonistic, requiring correspondingly different methods of handling — were not academic philosophy for their own sake. They were the method by which Mao insisted revolutionaries must, in Lenin's phrase, concretely analyse concrete conditions rather than mechanically apply formulas developed elsewhere. It is this same method that underlies both of the theoretical developments that followed, and, later still, Mao's recognition that contradictions continue to exist and to require vigilance and careful handling under socialism itself.

Applied to the military and strategic question posed by the Japanese invasion, this method produced *On Protracted War* (1938), which rejected both those who expected a quick Chinese victory and those who despaired of any Chinese resistance at all. Mao set out a struggle proceeding through three stages — strategic defensive, strategic stalemate, and strategic counter-offensive — in which the mobilised strength of the peasant masses, rather than superior technology, would prove decisive over time, and in which guerrilla warfare was inseparable from political work among the masses that it depended on. This was not a theory confined to the war against Japan; it became the general theoretical basis for protracted people's war as a strategy

available to oppressed peoples confronting materially superior enemies, and it rested on a materialist judgement about where real power lies in a war of this character: not in weaponry alone, but in the people who must be organised and won.

Applied to the political question of what kind of revolution China needed and which classes could be united to carry it through, this same method produced *On New Democracy* (1940): the theory that revolution in a country like China had to pass through a distinct stage, led by the proletariat through its party but resting on a broad alliance of workers, peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie and even sections of the national bourgeoisie against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, without attempting to establish socialism immediately. This was not a retreat from socialism but the pre-condition for reaching it: a revolution proletarian in leadership even where its immediate tasks remained bourgeois-democratic in content, opening the road to socialism rather than, as classical bourgeois revolutions had done, closing it once capitalist relations were secured. Together, these three works gave the Chinese revolution a materialist method for reading the balance of class forces, a strategic theory adequate to a protracted struggle rooted in the peasantry, and a political programme for uniting the right forces at the right stage — and it was this same method, turned by Mao upon the entirely new problem posed by victory itself, that would generate his most far-reaching theoretical contribution of all.

IV. The Two-Line Struggle Continues From Very First Day After Victory

The question of what kind of society the revolution would build did not wait for the 1950s to become a contested one; it was present from the moment state power was won. One line within the Chinese Communist Party held that the revolution had to continue: that land reform must give way to collectivisation, that the national bourgeoisie's place within the New Democratic alliance was a temporary and diminishing one as the transition to socialism proceeded, and that the class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeois roads did not end with the seizure of state power but had to be waged with increased, not decreased, political consciousness — precisely because it would now be fought out inside the party and the state apparatus rather than against an external enemy. A second line, associated above all with Liu Shaoqi and joined increasingly by Deng Xiaoping, held in substance that China's productive forces were too backward to sustain rapid socialist transformation, that economic development along lines tolerating a substantial period of capitalist-type accumulation should take priority, and

that class struggle could be treated as largely resolved once the old exploiting classes had been formally dispossessed. This position came to be known, in the language of the Cultural Revolution that would later be waged against it, as the theory of the productive forces — a revision of historical materialism reducing the relations of production and the political superstructure to a passive reflection of technical development, and denying that political line and conscious class struggle were in fact the decisive factor.

This was not a dispute confined to theory. It shaped the concrete pace and form of agricultural collectivisation through the 1950s, the terms on which the national bourgeoisie was handled during the socialist transformation of industry and commerce in 1953–56, and the formulation adopted at the Eighth Party Congress in 1956 that China’s principal contradiction was now between an advanced socialist system and backward productive forces — a formulation later criticised precisely because it displaced class struggle from the centre of political analysis. It shaped, too, the response to the severe difficulties of the Great Leap Forward of 1958–60, which the productive-forces line used to argue for a substantial retreat from mass mobilisation and collective forms toward material incentives, expanded private plots, and tighter administrative control, carried out under Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping’s practical direction in the early 1960s. It was against this visible entrenchment of an opposing line inside the party’s own leading bodies that Mao argued, with mounting urgency through the first half of the 1960s, that a bourgeoisie had formed within the Communist Party itself, that this internal bourgeoisie now posed the principal danger of capitalist restoration, and that only the repeated mobilisation of workers and other labouring people from below, against this target, could prevent it from prevailing. This analysis would issue in 1966 in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution — but it needs to be understood, too, as the domestic counterpart of a struggle that events in the international communist movement across the same years were making still more urgent.

V. Modern Revisionism and the Restoration of Capitalism in the Soviet Union

Stalin’s death in March 1953 opened a struggle within the Soviet leadership from which Nikita Khrushchev emerged victorious, and in February 1956, at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev delivered a secret speech denouncing Stalin in terms that abandoned class analysis altogether in favour of a moralised account of individual errors and a “cult of personality.” This speech provided the opening for a broader revision of positions that had, until then, been foundational: “peaceful coexistence” was elevated from a tactical

necessity of a given period into the general line of Soviet foreign policy; “peaceful transition” to socialism through parliamentary means was advanced as a general possibility for other countries; and the Soviet state itself was redefined as a “state of the whole people,” on the claim that class antagonism inside the USSR had been resolved and the dictatorship of the proletariat was accordingly no longer necessary.

The CCP under Mao’s leadership did not respond by breaking unity at once. China participated in the 1957 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties, held to mark the fortieth anniversary of the October Revolution, and again in the Moscow Conference of eighty-one parties in 1960, on both occasions working to secure a common declaration that would hold the line against these revisions while preserving the unity of the international communist movement. Declarations were duly signed. But the underlying divergence did not close; it sharpened. The Soviet leadership pressed forward in practice: economically, through reforms reintroducing profit criteria and material incentives as guiding principles of enterprise management, reviving the law of value at the heart of what was supposed to be a planned socialist economy; internationally, through a developing rapprochement with the United States that the CCP judged, with good reason, to amount to a tacit alliance of the two nuclear superpowers at the expense of the oppressed nations and peoples of the world. In 1960 the Soviet Union unilaterally withdrew its technical advisers and assistance from China, and the dispute that the joint declarations of 1957 and 1960 had tried to paper over could no longer be contained within the framework of formal unity.

VI. The Great Polemic and the Failure of Unity

From 1963 the disagreement moved into the open. In response to an open letter from the Central Committee of the CPSU, the editorial departments of *Renmin Ribao* and *Hongqi* published a series of polemics — the Nine Commentaries — running from an account of the origin and development of the dispute in September 1963 through to a comprehensive indictment, in July 1964, of what the Chinese side termed Khrushchev’s phoney communism and its historical lessons for the world. These documents argued, point by point, that the Khrushchev leadership had abandoned Marxism-Leninism on the character of the state, on the necessity of revolution, on the nature of war and peace between systems, and on the analysis of imperialism, and that a new privileged bureaucratic stratum — enjoying the fruits of state property while escaping the discipline of genuine proletarian political control — had already consolidated itself within the Soviet party and state. What had been restored, on this analysis, was

capitalism under a socialist name: a phenomenon for which the Chinese polemics coined the term social-imperialism, socialist in words and imperialist in deeds.



The polemics were not separate from the two-line struggle developing inside China across the same years; they were its international extension, and the CCP's assessment of what had gone wrong in Moscow ran on the same logic as Mao's assessment of the danger building inside the CCP leadership. But politically, the polemics did not restore unity — they made the split final and, in most countries, public. Communist parties across the world divided between those who continued to follow the positions of the CPSU and those who sided with the Chinese critique, and through the later 1960s and 1970s new Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations were founded across Asia, Latin America, Europe and the Middle East explicitly on the basis of that critique, looking to Mao's China as the

centre of a genuinely revolutionary current within the international communist movement. That an effort at unity within a single movement had failed was itself a serious setback; what replaced it, for a period, was this looser international alignment around Mao's leadership — an alignment whose own tests, after 1976, we take up in Section X below.

VII. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

Launched formally with the “May 16 Circular” of 1966, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was Mao's practical answer to the two-line struggle traced in Section IV: if a bourgeoisie could form within the ruling communist party itself, then the dictatorship of the proletariat could be secured only by mobilising the masses, repeatedly and if necessary against the ordinary chain of party and state authority where that authority had been captured by the bourgeois line, to expose and remove capitalist roaders from positions of power — above all Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping — and to transform the underlying social relations and culture of Chinese society in a socialist direction.

In practice this meant the mobilisation, first of students as Red Guards and subsequently of workers and other groups, to criticise entrenched officials and challenge bureaucratic privilege directly at university, factory and local level; a campaign against the “four olds” — old ideas, culture, customs and habits held to sustain the old class structure within the cultural and ideological superstructure; the establishment, in many localities and enterprises, of Revolutionary Committees combining party, army and mass representation in place of the previous administrative structures; sweeping changes in education, including shortened courses, admission criteria weighted toward political commitment and practical labour rather than examination performance alone, and the linking of study directly to production; comparable changes in healthcare, most importantly the training and dispatch of barefoot doctors bringing basic medical provision to the countryside on a scale not previously attempted anywhere else in the world; and a deliberate effort to democratise decision-making on the shop floor and in the commune, drawing workers and peasants directly into management and technical innovation rather than leaving these functions to a separate and privileged technical and managerial stratum.

To sum up this tremendous revolutionary and liberating experience the Cultural Revolution represented the most far-reaching attempt made by any ruling communist party, up to that point, to prevent the specific process of bureaucratic degeneration and internal capitalist restoration that had already overtaken the Soviet Union — and that it was recognised as such, at the time, by revolutionary movements across the world, from the Naxalbari uprising in India in 1967 to the Marxist-Leninist parties founded across Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and Turkey in its wake, who saw in it confirmation that Mao had identified a real and, until then, under-theorised danger facing every socialist society after the seizure of power.

VIII. 1976 and the Restoration of Capitalism in China

Mao's death on 9 September 1976 removed the figure whose personal authority had anchored, for a decade, the mass mobilisations directed against the party's own entrenched apparatus. Within a month, in October 1976, Mao's closest comrades Jiang Qing, Zhang Chunqiao, Yao Wenyuan and Wang Hongwen, the leading figures most closely identified with continuing the Cultural Revolution's line — were arrested, labelled as the "gang of four", in a counter revolutionary action led by Hua Guofeng together with sections of the military and security apparatus, bringing to an end the political ascendancy of the line that Mao had spent the preceding decade fighting to secure. Deng Xiaoping, already purged twice during the Cultural

Revolution as its principal target after Liu Shaoqi, was rehabilitated, and by the Third Plenum of the Eleventh Central Committee in December 1978 had established the political and organisational basis for what would be presented as “reform and opening up”: the dismantling of the people’s communes in favour of household-based contracting in agriculture, the reintroduction of profit and market criteria as the basis of enterprise management, the opening of special economic zones to foreign capital, and the subordination of political criteria to the single yardstick of economic growth, encapsulated in Deng’s own remark that “it mattered little whether a cat was black or white so long as it caught mice.”

Over the following decade and beyond, this programme dismantled, step by step, the material and institutional basis of the line that had been fought for since 1949. Collective property gave way progressively to private and quasi-private accumulation; wage labour, unemployment and eventually a substantial capitalist class reappeared as normal features of Chinese economic life; and the Communist Party itself was transformed, gradually but unmistakably, from an instrument for waging class struggle against a domestic bourgeoisie into an instrument for managing the emergence of exactly such a bourgeoisie and for integrating China into the world capitalist market on steadily more favourable terms for a new stratum of party-connected capital. Measured against the two-line struggle traced earlier in this piece, what took place after 1976 was the eventual victory — some thirty years after the founding of the People’s Republic, and barely two years after Mao’s own death — of the very line Mao had identified as the internal bourgeoisie’s line: achieved, in no small irony, through some of the same administrative authority and mobilised political support with which the Cultural Revolution itself had once been waged, now turned to precisely the opposite purpose.

IX. The Three Worlds Theory: a fundamentally opposite line to Mao’s thought and line

In the years surrounding this reversal, the Chinese revisionist leadership drew on remarks Mao had made in 1974 based on economic development categorisation, in a conversation with the Zambian president Kenneth Kaunda, dividing the world into a First World of the two superpowers, a Second World of other developed capitalist countries, and a Third World comprising the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, including China itself. Elaborated and systematised after Mao’s death — most explicitly in a *People’s Daily* editorial of November 1977 announcing the theory as a “major contribution to Marxism-Leninism” — this schema

was put to a use that departed sharply from the record of Mao's own preceding several decades of struggle against both superpowers, waged through the very polemics against Soviet social-imperialism examined above.

In its elaboration, the "Three Worlds Theory" identified Soviet social-imperialism as the principal and most dangerous enemy of the world's peoples — more dangerous than American imperialism precisely because it was said to be a rising rather than a declining power — and drew from this the practical conclusion that China should seek alignment, including tacit and at times open cooperation, with the United States and with reactionary and even fascistic regimes wherever they opposed Soviet influence. Support flowed, in this period, to Mobutu's Zaire, to Pinochet's Chile, to the Shah's Iran, and to UNITA in Angola alongside apartheid South Africa and the United States against the MPLA. This was diametrically opposite the proletarian internationalism Mao had spent his life defending; it was its abandonment, carried out in his name. Where Mao's actual theory and practice had insisted on the primacy of class analysis and had refused to subordinate the interests of the workers and oppressed peoples of the world to any single axis of great-power rivalry, the systematised Three Worlds Theory did exactly that — and in doing so provided the ideological cover under which China's foreign policy, and shortly afterwards its domestic economic policy, could pivot toward accommodation with imperialism at precisely the moment capitalism was being restored at home. Genuine Marxist-Leninist parties internationally, including some who had looked to China for leadership through the polemics of the preceding decade, recognised this for what it was: a complete departure from Mao's own line and from the history of struggle traced above, advanced under his authority only once he was no longer alive to repudiate it.

X. Deviations Within Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Since 1976

The task of defending Mao's actual legacy against both external attacks and vilification and this internal distortion fell, after 1976, to those parties and organisations that had aligned with the Chinese critique of Soviet revisionism during the polemics of the 1960s. From 1980, a number of these parties began a process that produced a Joint Communiqué that year and led, in 1984, to the founding of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, conceived as a vehicle for consolidating a common Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line against Soviet revisionism and, now, against the revisionism that had triumphed in China as well, and for coordinating revolutionary practice across countries on that shared basis.

This effort at unity, like the international communist movement's own effort in 1957 and 1960, encountered real difficulties and divisions of its own. Not every party that had opposed both Soviet and Chinese revisionism reached the same assessment of the process or the same practical conclusions about how to organise it. The Communist Party of Turkey-ML, for instance, took part in the 1980 conference but held that further discussion was needed before firm conclusions could be drawn, eventually joined the resulting movement with reservations, and later found that it could not fully agree with the direction the process was taking — maintaining its commitment to the fight against revisionism while withholding full agreement with the specific international form that fight had taken.

More serious deviations followed under the same banner in the decades since. The most consequential has been the trajectory of the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist), which after leading a protracted people's war from 1996 developed, from the early 2000s, what became known as the Prachanda Path, and which, following the 2006 peace accord, entered multi-party electoral competition, dissolved its people's army into the state's own security forces, and set aside the perspective of protracted people's war and the dictatorship of the proletariat in favour of what it described as a distinct road to socialism through parliamentary participation. Most Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties internationally have assessed this trajectory not as a creative development of Mao's thought under new conditions but as a return to precisely the logic of peaceful transition that Mao spent the 1960s polemicising against in the Soviet case. These experiences — the strains within the RIM's own effort at unity, and the concrete case of Nepal — confirm that the danger Mao identified inside the Chinese Communist Party after 1949 is not a peculiarity of that one party or country: any party or movement, whatever banner it carries, can develop its own internal bourgeois line, and only conscious, sustained struggle against that danger, of the kind Mao himself insisted on, can prevent it from prevailing.

XI. Conclusion

The line running from Marx and Engels through Lenin, Stalin and Mao is a single, continuous development of the theory and practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat, tested twice in the real movement of history — in the Soviet Union for some thirty-six years, in China for twenty-seven — and twice, for now, overturned not by any external refutation of the theory but by the internal victory of a bourgeois line the theory itself had identified as the danger to be fought. Mao's specific and lasting contribution to this line — that class struggle continues under socialism, and can be lost from within

the party that leads it — is the lesson his own life's work makes most urgent to absorb from both the Soviet and the Chinese experience, and it is precisely the lesson the deviations traced in Section X show has still not been fully learned even by those who claim his banner today.

Fifty years on, with the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist-imperialist system sharper than at any point since 1949, the task this anniversary sets is not commemoration but summation: to distinguish Mao's genuine continuators from those who have distorted his line, whether from the right in the shape of the "Three Worlds Theory" and its successors or from within the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement itself, and to take up the lessons of this history — correctly and incorrectly applied alike — as the material with which a new wave of proletarian revolution, already taking uneven shape against an intensifying imperialist and reactionary counter-offensive, must be built. Let us put politics in command and advance the class struggle. Let us practise Marxism, not revisionism. Let us take up Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a guide to action and creatively advance the proletarian revolution toward the dictatorship of the proletariat in the process of the march towards communism.

This Process Does Not Resolve The Kurdish National Question!



An interview with Özgür Aren, a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Proletarian Party, was published on the organisation's official website, www.tkpml.com. We are publishing it here for our readers as it remains relevant.

Question: Hello. First of all, could you please introduce yourself?

Answer: – My name is Özgür Aren. I am a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the TKP-ML.

Q: You have announced that your party held its 2nd Congress and that you adopted resolutions on many important issues, primarily the changes taking place in Turkey's socio-economic structure. What would you like to say about the developments that have taken place since the Congress?

A: Certainly. We can globally say that two main issues have come to the fore both in the world and in Turkey following the 2nd Congress. The first of these was the imperialists' preparations for a new war of partition, a trend we had already identified at our 2nd Congress as the direction of developments. The period following the Congress witnessed developments that reinforced

our party's assessment. As can be seen in the aggression of the US and Israel towards Iran, these preparations have evolved into open attacks and conflicts.

Another concrete indication that the imperialist capitalist system is preparing for a new war of partition can be seen in the steps taken by Donald Trump's presidency, particularly in parallel with the waning dominance of US imperialism on the international stage. In particular, the increase in military spending by British and EU imperialist powers, under the guise of "defence" and led by US imperialism, can be interpreted as preparation for a war of partition. The decisions taken at the most recent NATO summit held in Ankara on 6–7 July also point to this preparation.

Whilst the US and British imperialists are the main instigators of the partition war, the Chinese and Russian imperialists are currently adopting a more defensive stance. However, they too are preparing for war through the alliances they are forging and the military build-up they are undertaking. Russia's invasion of Ukraine and the war, now entering its fifth year, are not independent of the attrition war waged against Russia by EU imperialists—mostly by the UK—via NATO, using Ukraine as a proxy. The decisions taken at NATO's recent Ankara summit signal the determination of Western imperialists to continue the war against Russia through NATO.

Furthermore, the participation of South Asian countries in the same NATO summit demonstrates that the strategy of encirclement and preparation for war against China—which US imperialism has defined as its primary enemy in its strategic documents—continues. Indeed, the US's attack on Iran and its objective of regime change are not independent of the Iranian reactionary state's relations with China and Russia.

The signs that the imperialists are preparing for a new war of partition are not limited to the military aggression war and arms race taking place on the international stage. In addition, the imperialists have embarked on a campaign of annihilation and liquidation against every force that is in conflict with the capitalist system to one degree or another, and which does not fully submit to their system. Developments ranging from the crushing of the Palestinian national resistance to the disarmament of Hezbollah, and the elimination of the revolutionary dynamism of the Kurdish national

movement—thereby reducing it to a level acceptable to the capitalist system—must be assessed within this context.

More specifically, it is evident that the policy US imperialism is attempting to implement in the Middle East is to force all military forces outside the central state armies to join the central armies. The aim is both to dismantle the relatively independent political and military structures of these organizations and to exploit, for its own ends, the contradictions that would arise when forces that have at times fought one another are brought together under a single umbrella. We are faced with a different version of the “divide and rule” policy. It appears that the US, having suffered a significant and largely exposed loss of hegemony, is pursuing such a policy in the medium term as a means of recovery.

In parallel with these developments, one of the most significant indicators that the imperialists are preparing for a new war of partition is the increase in massacres and liquidation attacks targeting the communist movement on the international stage. In particular, the comprehensive campaign of massacre and liquidation attack directed against the People’s Liberation Guerrilla Army (PLGA), led by the Communist Party of India (Maoist), in its struggle for the New Democratic Revolution must be assessed in this light. This fascist aggression against the New Democratic Revolution struggle in India—one of the most advanced fronts of the communist movement—must not be assessed as independent from the imperialists’ preparations for the war of partition.

Similar aggression is also being directed against the New Democratic Revolution struggle in the Philippines, led by the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and the New People’s Army (NPA). Similarly, the fact that the fascist Turkish state carried out arrest campaigns directly targeting our party in the run-up to 1 May and the NATO summit in Ankara on 6–7 July should not be regarded as a coincidence.

These attacks by the imperialists and the reactionary forces collaborating with them against the New Democratic Revolution struggles led by the Maoists are extremely deliberate. This is because these struggles, led by Maoist parties, have emerged as concrete proof of the proletariat’s and the world’s oppressed peoples’ persistence in the struggle for revolution and

socialism following the setbacks experienced in socialism. These Maoist parties, including our own, have positioned themselves as the most advanced bastions of the struggle for revolution and socialism against imperialist-capitalist global reaction on the international stage. Furthermore, they have persisted in the practice of revolutionary armed struggle, which is defined as the greatest threat by the imperialists and reactionaries.

It is precisely for this reason that, whilst international reaction is preparing for a new imperialist war of partition, it has turned to a campaign of annihilation and liquidation against the communist movement, which it defines as its principal enemy. For the international bourgeoisie knows from its own historical experience, both before and after the First and Second Imperialist Wars of Partition, that either revolutions prevent wars or wars give rise to revolutions. For this reason, the just wars waged by the proletariat and the oppressed peoples against the unjust wars of international reaction are treated as targets to be eliminated as a matter of priority.

Consequently, these developments taking place on the international stage and in our region cannot be assessed independently of the intensifying and hardening of contradictions—a product of the crisis and competition within the imperialist capitalist system—and the increasing preparations for imperialist wars of partition.

Q: What is the second significant development you mentioned in the context of these preparations?

A: Certainly. The second significant development is the call for “Peace and a Democratic Society” by A. Öcalan, leader of the Kurdish National Movement in our country, and the Turkish state’s initiative—dubbed “Turkey without Terrorism” under the guise of “strengthening the inner front”—which is generally referred to as “the process”. It represents the decision to end the oppressed Kurdish nation’s half-century-long armed struggle against the Turkish state and the shift towards continuing the struggle in the democratic arena. On this basis, following A. Öcalan’s call, the PKK dissolved itself at its 12th Congress and declared that it had strategically brought the armed struggle to an end.

This development must be taken into account in our region in terms of the revolutionary struggle and, in particular, the armed struggle. We have

explained our party's views on A. Öcalan's call and the subsequent developments to our people from the very outset. At this point, I don't want to go into this at length again. These developments, particularly the Turkish state's approach to the issue, confirm our party's assessments of the process. The Turkish state defines the issue as 'terrorism' and regards the elimination of the Kurdish national movement as its primary objective. The 'framework law' that has been drafted also confirms our view. Whilst the Kurdish national movement speaks of integration and democratic politics, the Turkish state – let alone democratic politics – is promising a "political ban" on those who lay down their arms by enacting legislation similar to the "repentance laws" it passed in the past.

Despite all the steps taken and concessions made by the Kurdish movement, the release of A. Öcalan and his ability to freely convey his thoughts to the people are not being accepted. This is a situation which our party has objected to and deemed incorrect from the very outset of the process. Our party maintains that, regardless of the views put forward by A. Öcalan, what must be done – or the most correct "moral stance" – is for A. Öcalan to be allowed to defend his views freely and without any state interference. The process currently underway, the statements made, the "meeting notes" and so on, create uncertainty regarding who said what and who defended what, leading to the emergence of an atmosphere of mistrust.

Nevertheless, we must take into account the statements made by the structures of the Kurdish national movement. These statements and the practical stances adopted hold significant importance both at present and for the period ahead. For example, the developments in the Rojava Revolution, the anniversary of which we celebrated a month ago, or the United Revolutionary Movement of the Peoples (HBDH), in which our party is also involved alongside the Kurdish national movement, are directly affected by these developments. Consequently, the current process is significant and contains developments that will shape the future, both for Turkey and for our region.

At this point, as I mentioned earlier, our party's views on the developments and debates that followed A. Öcalan's call have been shared to the people. We do not believe that the current process has resolved the Kurdish national question. We do not believe that the most fundamental rights of the Kurdish

nation, stemming from its status as a nation, have been recognized. From our party's perspective, it is clear that in a situation where even the 'Right to Free Self-Determination' of the Kurdish nation—a principled stance within the context of the Kurdish national question—has not been brought to the table, there can be no talk of a genuine solution. At best, what will occur is a reduction in the violence of the Kurdish national contradiction. Moreover, it is clear that an “alliance” in which the privileges of the oppressor nation towards the Kurdish nation are defended with fascist determination will not eliminate the national contradiction. The national contradiction, including the Kurdish national question, will continue to exist in our region and will remain one of the agenda items of the People's Democratic Revolution.



On the other hand, in line with the new direction adopted by the Kurdish national movement following its strategic shift, the common ground for struggle with the Kurdish national movement to protect the gains achieved by the Kurdish nation in

terms of language, culture or at the local level will continue. Of course, the stance the Kurdish national movement adopts in line with its new direction will be decisive in this regard.

Nevertheless, it is clear that as long as the Kurdish national movement stands on a democratic base and maintains its alliance with left-wing socialist forces, it will naturally continue to uphold the de facto legitimate line of struggle.

The Rojava Revolution has experienced a significant breakdown

Q: In your speech just now, you mentioned the Rojava Revolution and the developments taking place. It is known that your party and the People's Army have participated in the Rojava Revolution, and that you have suffered martyrs in this struggle, foremost among them your party cadre Nubar Ozanyan. What is your evaluation of the process unfolding in Syria in general and in Rojava in particular?

A: Our party's views on the overall situation in Syria have been made clear to the people on various occasions and in various forms. It is clear that the

Assad regime in Syria has been overthrown and power has been handed over to the Salafi-jihadist HTS mercenary. The move to overthrow the Assad regime, in which Western imperialists—led by the US and the UK—actively utilized regional reactionary forces such as Turkish fascism, has borne result. The imperialists are now taking steps to reap the rewards of their “investments”. Turkish fascism, for its part, seeks to capitalize on the crumbs that will fall to it in the Syrian market as a reward for its unconditional service to the imperialists.

It was clear that the main motivation of Turkish fascism in Syria was the gains made by the Kurdish nation in Northern Syria, and particularly in Rojava. The Turkish state viewed any status gained by the Kurdish nation in Rojava as a significant threat to its own survival and has utilized all its resources and capabilities to liquidate the Autonomous Administration of North-Eastern Syria. It is clear that it has succeeded in this regard at this stage.

Whilst our party shares the view that the Rojava Revolution has experienced a significant breakdown, it is currently discussing the ongoing process and developments internally. Our party will share its assessment of the Rojava Revolution and the developments in Northern Syria with our people in the coming period.

Q: Earlier in your speech, you mentioned the HBDH alliance, of which your party is a part alongside the Kurdish national movement and other revolutionary organizations. What would you like to say on this subject?

A: Our party is one of the founders of the HBDH alliance. It was clear that this alliance was an extremely important organizing in terms of the revolution in Turkey and Kurdistan of Turkey. Our party has reaffirmed this view at both its 1st and 2nd Congresses.

However, at this stage, it is a fact that a member—which was among the founders of the HBDH organizing and constituted a significant component of it—has dissolved itself and declared an end to armed struggle. In these circumstances, it would be more accurate to redefine the HBDH organizing in light of the new phase. This is because there are significant and decisive differences—at least in the context of the orientation of the Kurdish national movement—between the period in which the HBDH organizing was

established and the current period. The Kurdish national movement defines its own orientation as a strategic shift. This situation points to a strategic divergence from the objectives of the period in which the HBDH organizing was established. Consequently, the HBDH organizing must be addressed and assessed in the light of this new phase.

Our party's position on the HBDH organizing is clear. The HBDH organizing has fulfilled its mission. Therefore, just as with all short and long-term unities of action and alliances —past and future—it must be declared that the HBDH organizing has played its part and has run its course. This is the correct stance. Telling the truth to the people is one of our Party's fundamental principles.

This approach of ours must, of course, be assessed independently of the debate over whether or not to participate in any potential unities of action and alliances that may be formed in line with the new direction of the Kurdish national movement.

Naturally, within the new orientation of the Kurdish national movement, we support the democratic demands of the Kurdish nation. Naturally, in the new phase of the Kurdish national movement, we stand behind the democratic struggles of the Kurdish nation, prioritizing the interests of the Kurdish people above all. There is no issue here. What we regard as problematic are the claims that the Kurdish national question has been resolved and the views put forward regarding armed struggle. Our party does not subscribe to these views and does not consider them correct.

Class oppression of the Kurdish people continues unabated

Q: From what you have said, should we understand that your party views the 'process' unfolding between the Turkish state and the Kurdish national movement with scepticism, and that, fundamentally, there is no solution to the Kurdish national question as is claimed?

A: Certainly. It is not just our party but the Kurdish people themselves who view the developments referred to as the "process" with scepticism. It is only natural that anyone who knows the Turkish state should think in this way. Furthermore, it is abundantly clear that the so-called 'process' does not contain a solution to the Kurdish national question. The fact that the

“framework law” prepared as a “solution” to the Kurdish issue is modeled on the law enacted following the Sheikh Said Uprising, and that the law promises those who lay down their arms in response to A. Öcalan’s call for “democratic struggle” “supervised release” (which effectively means they can be arrested at any moment) and “ban on political activity” and so on—points not so much to the aim of a “solution” as to the aim of control and liquidation.

In parallel, statements such as the promise to establish “rehabilitation and employment centers” for those who lay down their arms alongside the “solution” law to the Kurdish issue are reminiscent of the policies the Turkish state has implemented following past Kurdish national uprisings. The Turkish state does not merely view Kurds who rise up for their national rights as “criminals”; it also regards them as “sick” in need of rehabilitation.

It is clear that, taken together, all these statements, the steps taken and the law enacted do not point to a solution to the Kurdish question.

Our party’s views on national issues in general, and the Kurdish national question in particular, are well known. It must not be forgotten that, during the period when İbrahim Kaypakkaya founded our party—at a time when the very existence of the Kurds, let alone whether they constituted a nation, was being debated, and when the Kurdish national movement had not yet emerged in such an organized manner—he declared that the Kurds in our region constituted a nation and, furthermore, that they possessed the Right to Free Self-Determination, that is, the right to secede and establish a separate state. Our party still upholds this view.

In the context of the national contradiction, our party supports the democratic struggle of the oppressed nation against the oppressing nation. In this context, it is important to correctly define the national question in general and the Kurdish national question in particular. To put it briefly, I can say the following:

Today, alongside Kurdish workers, the semi-proletariat, the poor and middle peasants, and the urban petty bourgeoisie, the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landowners also face national oppression. These classes form the ranks of the Kurdish national movement. Each class within these ranks, which have united against all forms of national oppression, naturally has its own specific

aims and objectives. At this stage, the fact that “existence has been recognized”, as is claimed, does not and cannot change this reality.

In the national contradiction in general, and in the Kurdish national contradiction in particular, the oppression directed at the working people of the oppressed nations and nationalities is two-pronged. Firstly, there is class oppression directed at the working class for class aims, primarily to exploit them further and suppress the class struggle; secondly, there is the policy of national oppression generally applied by the oppressing nation, for national aims, to almost all classes of the oppressed nations and nationalities.

Our Party distinguishes between these two forms of oppression. It does so because, for example, the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landowners oppose the second type of oppression whilst resolutely defending the first. Our Party opposes both forms of oppression and is fighting against them. Consequently, to eliminate national oppression, we support the struggle of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landowners against the oppressing nation; but, on the other hand, we maintain that it is necessary to struggle against them as well in order to eliminate class oppression.

In short, it is of the utmost importance to distinguish between the class oppression inflicted upon the Kurdish people and the national oppression inflicted upon the Kurdish nation. As I mentioned earlier, just as the content and forms of these two types of oppression differ, so too do their aims. Consequently, distinguishing between these two forms of oppression is of decisive importance in terms of adopting the correct political stance.

In conclusion, as with every national movement, the Kurdish national movement has two qualities. This is inherent in the nature of the matter. Firstly, there is the general democratic content directed against the national oppression, privileges, the privilege of state-building, tyranny and oppression of the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords; secondly, there is the reactionary content aimed at strengthening Kurdish nationalism, thereby realizing the supremacy and privileges of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords.

From its foundation to the present day, our Party, against the tyranny and privileges of the Turkish ruling classes, has unequivocally and unconditionally supported the general democratic content of the Kurdish

national movement, which aims to abolish all forms of national oppression to achieve full equality of rights for nations and nationalities. It has unconditionally supported and defended not only the Kurdish nation but also the movements of other oppressed nationalities pursuing the same objectives.

At the same time, our Party has remained entirely neutral in the struggles waged by the bourgeoisie and landlords belonging to various nations and nationalities to secure their own supremacy and class interests. Our party has never supported the tendency within the Kurdish national movement aimed at strengthening Kurdish nationalism; rather, it has fought against tendencies and discourses that reinforce bourgeois nationalism. It has categorically refused to support the struggle waged by the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords for their own class interests and privileges.

In summary, our party has confined itself to supporting the general democratic content within the Kurdish national movement, but has not gone beyond that.

At the current stage, the Kurdish national movement is framed within the claim that the “existence of the Kurdish nation” is recognized – a claim which is itself debatable, as the Kurdish nation is not recognized as a nation. At most, it is referred to as a cultural identity within the concept of the “ummah”.—It has declared that, in the Kurdish nation’s struggle over the past half-century against the oppression, tyranny and privileges of the Turkish ruling classes, it has adopted a strategic shift and has strategically brought an end to armed struggle. As a solution, a “Turkish-Kurdish Alliance” is being discussed.

Leaving aside the debate as to whether this thesis constitutes a genuine solution within the context of the national question, from our party’s perspective—as I mentioned earlier—the class oppression inflicted upon the Kurdish people is assessed separately from the national oppression inflicted upon the Kurdish nation. Class oppression directed at the Kurdish people continues unabated. Indeed, it could be argued that the Turkish state’s policy of national oppression against the Kurdish nation—manifested through killings, arrests, forced displacement and so on—is exacerbating class oppression. It is by no means a coincidence that the regions with the highest levels of unemployment and poverty in Turkey and Kurdistan of Turkey are

precisely those within Kurdistan of Turkey. This is also linked to the way in which national oppression further deepens class oppression. Consequently, whilst discussions on the “solution” to the Kurdish national question continue, the policy of class oppression is continuing at full speed. Indeed, the class interests of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and the landlords have also played a role in the continuation and deepening of this policy of oppression. Consequently, from our party’s perspective, it is clear that there has been no change in the policy of class oppression—which is the fundamental basis of both national and class oppression—within the geography of Kurdistan; indeed, in parallel with the social and economic developments taking place, class oppression has deepened even further.

Our party is fully aware that within the national question, national contradiction and class contradictions are intertwined. It is our view that what the leadership of the national movement is currently promoting as a “solution” does not resolve the Kurdish national question; that the Kurdish national bourgeoisie is seeking a “solution”, particularly under the influence of international developments; and that the Turkish ruling classes currently view the issue as the “elimination of terrorism” and are taking practical steps accordingly. This “solution” undoubtedly fails to eliminate the policy of class oppression directed against the Kurdish people and even serves to reproduce it in other forms.

This is the contradiction our party is primarily concerned with, and the resolution of this contradiction is among the tasks of the People’s Democratic Revolution under our party’s leadership.

The arrest of revolutionaries is being portrayed as legitimate

Q: In your speech a short while ago, you referred to the NATO meeting held in Ankara on 6–7 July. Prior to this meeting, the Turkish state carried out an intensive campaign of detentions and arrests. In this fascist campaign of arrests, the Turkish state singled out revolutionary parties, foremost among them your party, the TKP-ML, as targets. What would you like to say in response to this fascist aggression and wave of arrests, which were carried out under the pretext of targeting your party?

A: Yes, first of all, from our party’s perspective, being subjected to this fascist aggression is nothing new. Given the nature of the Turkish state and, in

particular, its style of conducting politics, we must state that this aggression directed at the masses comes as no surprise to our party. What is surprising is the stance of those who define themselves as left-wing, progressive or opposition in the face of the Turkish state's fascist aggression.

However, before responding to this stance and your question, it must be emphasized once again that the events and statements made during and after the NATO summit have demonstrated that Western imperialists are preparing for a new war of partition; that NATO—the imperialists' organization for occupation and aggression—will be actively utilized in this war of partition; and that the Turkish state is, once again, ready to serve as a useful tool for imperialist interests, particularly in our region.

Consequently, the fascist Turkish state, in order not to fail in its service to its imperialist masters and to demonstrate that it is highly useful from the perspective of imperialist interests, has sought to show that it has not raised the slightest objection against the imperialists or NATO, their organization for occupation and war. In their own words, they have perpetrated acts of terror against the people “to prove that Turkey is not a country associated with terrorism”. They have not hesitated for a single moment to attack their own people in order to ensure they do not fall short in serving their imperialist masters.

Given that we are faced with a state structure that is a semi-colony of the imperialists and an enemy of the people, it was a foreseeable situation that aggression against the people would be escalated days before the NATO summit. Because the Turkish Republic is not only a fascist state structure. Politic, too, is conducted through fascist methods. Let alone revolutionary violence; even the slightest objection or dissenting stance is met with fascist attacks.

Indeed, the fact that fascist attacks has escalated to this extent is also linked to the absence of revolutionary violence.

When one considers that the Turkish ruling classes have resorted to arrests and imprisonment even in their internal factional struggles—and have even, in the past, hanged their own prime minister and ministers—it is clear that those who attack their own class are, and will continue to be, engaged in fascist aggression against the people and revolutionaries. From this

perspective, there is nothing surprising about the attacks directed at the people in the run-up to the NATO summit.

What is surprising, as I mentioned earlier, is the stance of those who call themselves left-wing or opposition in the face of this arrest campaign. Undoubtedly, during these attacks, the bourgeois media displayed its familiar class



stance. The fact that members of an organization called the “TEMA Foundation” were among those subjected to the Turkish state’s fascist terror and arrest campaign has been sensationalized, with headlines such as “The Maoist Aunts’ Organization” appearing. Furthermore, whilst the gravity of the arrests of TEMA Foundation members—cited as being carried out on NATO grounds—was emphasized, the aim was to create a narrative suggesting that the arrests of revolutionaries were “legitimate”.

At the same time, the approach adopted by certain circles that describe themselves as left-wing, progressive and opposition in the face of the Turkish state’s fascist aggression prior to the NATO summit is also noteworthy. The fascist Turkish state’s arrest campaign has been attempted to be explained as stemming from “AKP reaction”. This approach points to a confusion regarding the Turkish state’s relationship with imperialism and its nature.

It must not be forgotten that the Turkish ruling classes and their state apparatus have, from the day of their establishment to the present, been built upon collaboration with imperialist capital and hostility towards the people. For this reason, the ruling-class clique in power is compelled, on the one hand, to serve imperialist capital, safeguard its interests in the Turkish market and, in return for this role, secure a certain share of the spoils of exploitation and plunder; and, on the other hand, to exert repression on the people in order to ensure the security of both imperialist capital’s and its own interests. For this reason, the fascist Turkish state treats everyone as a “potential terrorist”. This is an objective reality. The century-long history of the republic is replete with countless practical examples of this.

Consequently, NATO's aggressive stance towards the people in the run-up to its summit is consistent with the nature of the regime and came as no surprise to our party. In our region, the anti-imperialist struggle is inextricably linked to the anti-fascist struggle. To reduce the anti-imperialist struggle to mere rhetoric and practice is to ignore the fact that the Turkish state is a semi-colony of imperialism and, moreover, a member of NATO. This situation points to a contradiction: protesting against NATO whilst, at the same time, carrying the flag of a NATO member state.

On the other hand, we must also point out that, despite all the aggression and the terror of arrests by the imperialists and the fascist Turkish state, the masses have protested against NATO. This indicates that, despite all the efforts of the imperialists and the fascist Turkish state, they have been unable to suppress the masses' anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggle.

It is this dynamic that our Party values and aims to learn from and unite around.

Q: To conclude, what would you like to say about your Party's direction following the 2nd Congress?

A: Our party is continuing its activities in line with the orientation set out at the 2nd Congress. As is well known, our 2nd Congress highlighted the threat of imperialist war on the international stage and emphasized the necessity of organizing and struggling against this threat in various forms and with different content, both internationally and within our country. We can state that steps consistent with this orientation have been taken following the 2nd Congress.

Internationally, we have undertaken initiatives both to strengthen the organization of the International Communist Movement and to establish anti-imperialist and anti-fascist alliances and fronts against the threat of imperialist war.

In our country, we have adopted a practical approach of acting in solidarity with the broadest possible sections of society, as exemplified by the protest against the recent NATO summit.

Our Party remains determined to confront the coming period and continue the struggle alongside the broadest possible sections of society with whom

we can unite and act in common. This approach is consistent with the orientation of the 2nd Congress.

To this end, we maintain our approach of acting together and intensifying our joint struggle with various parties and organizations within the Turkish revolutionary movement on the basis of unities of action.

From our Party's perspective, our organizational orientation—in line with the direction set by the 2nd Congress—continues, starting with those closest to us. We believe this orientation is of fundamental importance, particularly in countering the attacks we will face in the coming period.

To quote Comrade İbrahim, “*difficult but glorious days of struggle lie ahead*”. All our preparations are being made with this in mind.

Q: Thank you for answering our questions.

A: We thank you for giving us this opportunity.

Global Contradictions, Iran, and the Question of Revolutionary Stance



The current debates surrounding Iran cannot be understood by looking solely at the immediate conflict between the Islamic Republic and the U.S.-Israel bloc. Similarly, they cannot be understood based solely on the Iranian people's anger toward the regime and their rejection of it. Both are true. Both are important. However, if they are addressed separately or if one is mechanically superimposed on the other, the analysis becomes one-sided and politically dangerous.

A concrete analysis of the concrete situation must begin with today's contradictions. Iran is not an isolated country outside of global capitalism, nor is it an exception or an anomaly. It exists within a world system dominated by imperialists. While the internal contradictions of Iranian society are shaped by this system, it also possesses its own specific class, historical, national, religious, and political forms. For this reason, we must move from the global situation to the regional situation, and only then to the concrete conditions in Iran.

Capitalism's *fundamental contradiction* is the contradiction between labor and capital—or, to put it more broadly, between socialized production and capitalist ownership. This contradiction has existed since the inception of capitalism and remains the deepest contradiction of the capitalist mode of

production. When capitalism transforms into imperialism, this contradiction does not disappear. On the contrary, imperialism intensifies this contradiction and spreads it throughout the world.

Under imperialism, capital is no longer organized solely within national borders. It manifests itself through monopolies, banks, financial capital, multinational corporations, capital export, control of markets, sanctions, military bases, debt, unequal trade, control of technology, exploitation of resources, and the division and redivision of the world among the great powers. Consequently, the labor-capital contradiction manifests not only within each country but also through the domination of the peoples oppressed by local reactionary ruling classes tied to imperialism and the world capitalist system.

This fundamental contradiction is not merely an economic category. It determines the ultimate direction of revolutionary transformation. Without resolving the contradiction between labor and capital, all other contradictions can be reorganized but cannot be overcome. A monarchy can be replaced by a republic. A religious regime can be replaced by a secular one. One faction of capital may take the place of another. One imperialist alliance may give way to another. However, as long as capital remains in power, exploitation and oppression will continue in new forms.

For this reason, the labor-capital contradiction must occupy a central place in our analysis. This does not mean that every urgent political issue can be reduced to wages or factory struggles. It means that the ultimate direction of all democratic, national, anti-imperialist, women's, youth, and popular struggles is determined by whether they remain within the bounds of capital or move toward the independent power of the working class and oppressed masses under proletarian leadership.

In the imperialist era, there are several major contradictions stemming from this fundamental contradiction and developing around it. In capitalist and imperialist countries, there is a contradiction between labor and capital. There is a contradiction between oppressed nations and peoples on one side and imperialism and local reactionary and comprador ruling classes on the other. There are also contradictions among imperialist powers and blocs as they struggle over markets, resources, spheres of influence, military

positions, trade routes, energy, technology, and political control. Additionally, when genuine socialist states exist, a contradiction will also arise between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp.

However, today we cannot mechanically speak of a socialist camp in the old sense. There is no world socialist camp similar to the period following the October Revolution or the emergence of socialist China. The contradiction between socialism and imperialism persists in ideological, political, and historical terms; for the legacy of the October and Chinese revolutions—the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialist construction, and the struggle against revisionism—continues to occupy a central place in the world revolutionary movement. This is debatable because the analysis of contradictions—or the “unity of opposites”—may be viewed as a subjective rather than an objective factor upon which it is based or should be based.

This is one of the fundamental errors of “campism.” It confuses interstate conflict with anti-imperialism. It assumes that any force in conflict with the U.S. must be progressive or, at the very least, must be defended as part of the anti-imperialist camp. This is not Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It is geopolitical tailism. It places the working class and oppressed peoples behind states and ruling classes that do not represent them.

The fundamental contradiction at any given stage must be identified through concrete analysis. It cannot be declared based on emotion, habit, or inherited formulas. Mao teaches that in a complex process, there are many contradictions; however, the existence and development of one of them causes it to become the principal contradiction because it determines or influences the others. Yet he also teaches that this changes depending on the conditions. A contradiction that is principal at one stage may become secondary at another. A secondary contradiction may become principal when conditions change. Therefore, the concrete analysis of concrete conditions is fundamental.

The mistake lies in reducing Mao’s teachings to a static formula. Some argue as follows: When imperialism attacks a country, the contradiction between that country and imperialism automatically becomes the principal contradiction, and all classes within the country must unite behind the existing state. This is a mechanical interpretation. In fact, Mao’s own analysis

was more concrete. He differentiated between the various forms of imperialist oppression and the different relationships between foreign imperialism, domestic reaction, and the masses. Under certain conditions—particularly during direct occupation or under occupation—a broad national resistance may come to the front. Under other conditions, internal reactionary forces form an alliance with imperialism or certain sectors of the imperialist world system, and the masses struggle against both foreign domination and internal reaction.

This difference is of crucial importance for Iran.

What is the situation in Iran?

Iran is not currently under occupation by the U.S.-Israel bloc. The U.S. and Israel are bombing, threatening, and pressuring Iran with the aim of weakening, disciplining, restructuring, or extracting concessions from the reactionary and backward-looking regime. Their goal



is not the liberation of the Iranian people. Their goals are regional hegemony, strategic control, the defense of Zionist expansion, and the protection of imperialist interests. For this reason, we must clearly and unhesitatingly oppose all imperialist aggression, bombings, sanctions, regime-change plans, and plans for division.

However, this does not make the Islamic Republic an anti-imperialist representative of the Iranian people. The Islamic Republic is not a national revolutionary state. It is a reactionary, dependent capitalist regime. It arose from the defeat and usurpation of the 1979 people revolution. Its power is based on an alliance with the clerical establishment, the “bazaar”* (* In Iran, “bazaar” refers not only to a physical marketplace but also to the network of merchants, wholesalers, and shopkeepers that constitute traditional commercial capital), capital and other comprador interests, the elimination of revolutionary and democratic forces, the oppression of workers, women,

and oppressed nations, and subsequently through the expansion of the Revolutionary Guards, quasi-state foundations, the economic networks of the clergy, and state-linked capital.

The regime's conflict with the U.S.-Israel bloc is real, but this is not the same as the contradiction between the Iranian people and imperialism. The regime opposes the U.S. when its own existence, regional influence, and bargaining power are threatened. However, from the perspective of workers and oppressed peoples, it does not oppose imperialism. Even while clashing with one imperialist bloc, it has integrated itself into the global capitalist system by forming alliances, negotiating, and trading with others.

It is precisely at this point that both the reactionary pro-imperialist political line and the opportunist "campist" political line fail in their analyses. The pro-imperialist line argues that, because the Islamic Republic is reactionary, any force that weakens it—even U.S.-Israeli aggression—can be welcomed. This leads directly to dependence on imperialism. The campist or social-chauvinist line, on the other hand, argues that the Islamic Republic must be defended as the Iranian state precisely because the U.S.-Israel bloc is attacking Iran. This, in turn, leads directly to the defense of internal reaction.

Both lines take the side of one part of the enemy. Both wipe out the independent role of the Iranian people. Both ignore the workers, women, oppressed nations, youth, intellectuals, and poor masses—who are the main actors in the class struggle—and treat them as secondary elements in the struggle between states.

A Marxist-Leninist-Maoist stance must categorically reject both. It must say: No to U.S.-Israeli aggression, no to sanctions, no to bombing, no to occupation, no to imperialist regime-change plans.

At the same time, it must also say: No to the political defense of the Islamic Republic; no to remaining silent in the face of its repression; no to unity with the regime against the people; and no to accepting the lie that opposition to the regime automatically amounts to collaboration with imperialism.

Correctly identifying the contradictions is decisive!

The oppressed people of Iran are not betraying anti-imperialism by fighting against this regime. They are fighting against the concrete forms—capitalist

exploitation, religious reaction, national oppression, women oppression, state terrorism, and imperialist dependency—that have been organized in Iran for over forty years. Therefore, their struggle against the Islamic Republic is inseparable from the struggle against imperialist domination. It is one of its necessary internal forms.

In Iran, as is the case everywhere in the world today, the fundamental contradiction is between labor and capital. This manifests as the exploitation of workers, the impoverishment of the masses, privatization, subcontracting, triple-digit inflation, unemployment, unpaid wages, the dismantling of social rights, and the dominance of state-linked capital, the role of capital linked to the Revolutionary Guards, religious endowments, capital linked to the bazaar, private comprador networks, and the Iranian economy's growing dependence on the global capitalist system.

The fundamental contradiction at the current political stage is the contradiction between the workers and other oppressed peoples of Iran and the Islamic Republic regime. The reason for this is that the regime is the direct political organizer of exploitation and repression. The regime controls the armed forces, the Revolutionary Guards, the police, the courts, prisons, the education system, the official media, and the main instruments of political, religious, and economic domination. In other words, it is the concentrated political form of the current dependent capitalist order in Iran.

The most significant external contradiction is the one between the Iranian people and imperialist aggression—specifically the bombings, sanctions, threats, and hegemonic plans of the U.S.-Israel bloc. This contradiction is acute in nature and must be opposed. However, this does not eliminate the fundamental internal contradiction between the people and the regime. Nor does it alter the class character of the Islamic Republic.

This is the key point. The contradiction between the U.S.-Israel bloc and the Islamic Republic is not the same as the contradiction between imperialism and the Iranian people. The former is a contradiction between the imperialist-Zionist bloc and a reactionary state with its own regional ambitions and international alliances. The latter, however, is the contradiction between the oppressed people and the imperialist world system that subjugates, threatens,

imposes sanctions on, bombs, and manipulates their country. These two contradictions may intersect, but they are not the same.

If we confuse them, we fall into a political error. If we claim that the contradiction between the U.S.-Israel bloc and the Islamic Republic is the fundamental contradiction, we run the risk of aligning the Iranian people with their own oppressors.

If we claim that the contradiction between the people and the regime is the only contradiction, we run the risk of ignoring imperialist aggression and opening the door to liberal or pro-Western illusions. The correct stance must hold both truths together: imperialist aggression must be opposed, and the Islamic Republic must not be defended—on the contrary, it must be opposed.

The situation in the Middle East makes this even clearer. The region is one of the sharpest focal points of global contradictions. Imperialist hegemony, Zionist settler-colonial expansion, the genocide of the Palestinian nation, reactionary Arab regional states, the Kurdish national question, oil and gas routes, military bases, religious reaction, sectarian manipulation, migration, poverty, war, and competition among the U.S., Israel, Europe, Russia, China, Turkey, Iran, and the Gulf states are all concentrated in this region.

The Middle East cannot be understood through a simplistic formula such as the “U.S. camp versus the Axis of Resistance.” This formula eliminates the people—the main actors in the equation. It turns the region into a chessboard for states and wipes out workers, women, oppressed nations, ethnicities, and beliefs, refugees, peasants, youth, intellectuals, and revolutionary-democratic forces. The correct question is not which state is standing up to the U.S. at any given moment.

The right question is this: Which class forces have mobilized, which forces are suppressing the people, which forces are manipulating the people, and how can the oppressed develop their own independent organizations and programs?

This is also important with regard to the “bazaar” in Iran. The bazaar should neither be romanticized as a collection of small merchant blocs nor treated as a single, immutable class force. Historically, the bazaar included powerful merchants, credit networks, import-export companies, and institutions with

close ties to religious institutions. It played a significant role in the alliance that helped consolidate the Islamic Republic's power after 1979. However, today the bazaar is internally divided. It comprises large merchants, capital linked to the regime, small merchants, indebted shop owners, tenants, family workers, and laborers. While some sectors face conflicts with capital linked to the Revolutionary Guards and state-controlled monopolies, others have become integrated into the regime's economic networks.

Therefore, the real question is not whether the "bazaar" as a whole is progressive or reactionary. The real question is which class forces within and around the bazaar are moving in which political direction, and under what pressures. The working class must not subordinate itself to bazaar capital, liberal capital, monarchist forces, reformist groups, religious groups, or the imperialist-backed opposition. It must develop its own independent line.

The same applies to all other contradictions in Iran. The women's struggle is of central importance, but its full emancipation is not possible under the capitalist order. The national question is of central importance, but it cannot be fully resolved under comprador capitalism, central chauvinism, and imperialist manipulation.

The democratic question is of central importance, but it cannot be fully resolved as long as the capitalist state controls the media, the courts, prisons, the armed forces, and the economy. The struggle against religious reaction is of central importance, but this struggle cannot be completed merely by secular capital replacing religious capital. The struggle against imperialism is of central importance, but this struggle cannot be completed as long as the country remains in the hands of the ruling classes, whose existence depends on their place within the world capitalist system. For this reason, the labor-capital contradiction determines the ultimate direction of the resolution of all other contradictions. Without this, even if the people eliminate one form of oppression, they may face another.

Even if it breaks free from religious domination, it may fall under liberal-capitalist subjugation. Even if it defeats one faction of the regime, it may come under the domination of another faction. It may reject the Islamic Republic only to fall into the trap of monarchist, nationalist, imperialist, or

reformist forces. It may gain a partial democratic space but lose the possibility of deeper social liberation.

For this reason, the decisive question is not merely whether the Islamic Republic will fall. The decisive question is which class force will emerge from the struggle—with what program, through what organization, and in what direction. If the working class and oppressed masses do not become an independent political force, the outcome will be determined by other forces: imperialism, regional powers, regime factions, the liberal opposition, monarchists, bourgeois nationalists, or comprador capital.

This brings us to the subjective contradiction of the era. Objective contradictions are sharpening everywhere. Imperialist competition is deepening. Wars are spreading. Poverty and inequality are rising. States are becoming more repressive. The masses are rising up in protest time and again. However, revolutionary organization is weak, fragmented, or nonexistent in many places. This contradiction between the intensifying objective crisis and the weak subjective revolutionary leadership is one of the central issues of our time.

As a result

this issue is particularly urgent in Iran. Workers, women, oppressed nations, ethnic and religious minorities, youth, teachers, retirees, intellectuals, prisoners, and the poor masses have shown courage and resistance. However, courage alone is not enough. Spontaneous struggle can shake the regime, but without organization and a program, it will not achieve its goal. The people need an independent organization, a democratic and revolutionary unity, class clarity, and a program that unites the struggle against the Islamic Republic with the struggle against imperialist domination and capitalist exploitation.

This is where Mao's method remains of indispensable importance. We must not treat contradictions as a mere list. We must identify the connections between them, their stages, their fundamental aspects, and the class forces on both sides. The primary contradiction does not, for a moment, eliminate the fundamental contradiction. The external contradiction does not erase the internal contradiction. The struggle against imperialism does not require

defending domestic reaction. The struggle against domestic reaction does not justify dependence on imperialism.

Therefore, a correct line on Iran must be based on the following understanding.

The fundamental contradiction is between labor and capital. This holds true everywhere under capitalism and determines the ultimate direction of all other contradictions.

At world level, today's fundamental contradiction can be understood as the contradiction between the imperialist world system and the workers, oppressed nations, and oppressed peoples. However, this should not be simplified into supporting any state that opposes the United States. Oppressed peoples are not the same as reactionary states.

At the regional level, the Middle East is marked by imperialist domination, Zionist expansionism, reactionary states, national oppression, religious reaction, inter-imperialist competition, and the absence of strong revolutionary leadership.

In Iran, the fundamental contradiction at the current political stage lies between the oppressed people and the Islamic Republic regime, because this regime is the direct architect of capitalist exploitation, religious reaction, the oppression of women, and national oppression and tyranny.

The most significant external contradiction is between the Iranian people and imperialist aggression—particularly the bombings, sanctions, threats, and plans for domination by the U.S.-Israel bloc.

The contradiction between the U.S.-Israel bloc and the Islamic Republic regime is real, but it is not the same as the contradiction between the Iranian people and imperialism.

The strategic task is to strengthen the independent organization of workers, women, oppressed nations, youth, intellectuals, and democratic anti-imperialist forces by building their program and unity.

The correct stance can be clearly articulated: No to imperialist aggression; no to sanctions, bombings, occupation, partition, and regime-change plans; no to the political defense of the Islamic Republic; no to siding with either

side of the enemy; yes to the independent struggle of the workers and oppressed people of Iran.

This stance is not neutrality. It is active revolutionary opposition against both imperialist aggression and internal reaction. It does not allow the Iranian people to be exploited by either Washington and Tel Aviv or Tehran. It argues that Iran's liberation can only come from the organized struggle of its own workers and oppressed masses, in conjunction with the struggles of the peoples of the region and the international working class.

Only such a stance is consistent with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the dialectical method of MLM, and proletarian internationalism. This stance takes the contradictions in the world as its starting point, examines their specific manifestations in Iran, and refuses to sacrifice the people to any of the enemy's camps.

“WHO DETERMINES THE TARGET OF OUR ANGER?”



Almost every day on social media, we come across a post blaming a woman who has experienced violence or labeling a woman receiving alimony as a “parasite who exploits men.”

We get angry, we object, we comment on the post to respond—and before we know it, we’ve taken the bait and diverted our anger away from exactly where it should be directed.

In the new order of social media, this is called **rage bait**: content that deliberately provokes people, pits them against one another, and capitalizes on that conflict to generate engagement.

But the issue isn’t merely a matter of a few provocateurs wanting more clicks; every day, a new enemy figure is pitted against the oppressed, the victims of violence, and those whose rights are being taken away.

While those who oppose the slaughter of animals are pitted against “animal haters,” women who speak out against male violence are pitted against “so-called victims,” the poor are pitted against other poor people, and workers are pitted against one another—the sharp tip of the arrow misses its true

target. **Perhaps what we need to question most today is how we've been taught what we should be angry about.**

Because the true art of “rage bait” is not to make people angry, but to **shift the focus of that anger**. It takes a real social contradiction, reduces it to the simplest possible opposition, and presents us with an enemy that's easy to debate. Instead of defending animals' right to life, we start debating “Are humans more important than animals?”

Instead of discussing women's economic and legal security, a stereotype of women is created based on “women who receive alimony” and isolated individual examples. Instead of questioning how male violence operates, the conversation turns to why the abused woman didn't leave her abuser, why she returned to him, and why she “forgave” him.

Thus, a structural problem is reduced to the victim's behavior.

Why did she go back?

Why didn't she ask for help?

Why didn't she leave sooner?

Yet understanding the cycle of violence requires going beyond these very questions. Violence is not limited to physical assault; economic dependence, threats, isolation, pressure exerted through the children, housing issues, and lack of access to state mechanisms also restrict a woman's freedom of action.

When a woman returns to the person who abused her, it is not a sign that she deserved the violence she experienced, but rather—in most cases—an indication of just how difficult it is to escape that abusive relationship.

Moreover, economic freedom alone is not enough. While having her own income certainly empowers a woman, that income does not always translate into true independence as long as precarious work, low wages, the burden of care, housing costs, and responsibility for children persist.

The ability to escape violence is also determined by class-based opportunities.

Whether a woman has a safe place to go when she experiences violence, a daycare center where she can leave her child, free legal support, and an

income to sustain her life can change the answer to the question, “Why didn’t she leave?”

We see the same mechanism at work in the issue of animals. Problems that have remained unresolved for years through public policies are ultimately debated through a discourse that targets animals. An equation is established in which those defending animals’ right to life are inevitably pitted against those defending human safety. Yet pitting victims against one another is not the same as holding those responsible for finding solutions accountable.

This is precisely where social media’s economic logic comes into play. Algorithms reward anger itself because anger keeps people glued to the screen, prompts them to comment, and drives them to respond and share. Rage bait does not reveal existing social contradictions; it **commodifies, sharpens, and circulates them**. Complex problems are replaced by quickly consumable hostilities.

Then everyone yells at each other: women at men, workers at other workers, animal lovers at animal opponents, the poor at other poor people...

That’s why the issue isn’t about giving up our anger. On the contrary, it’s about **reclaiming our anger**. Instead of being dragged along by content that pits us against one another, we must reexamine the source and direction of that anger.

Because sometimes the greatest manipulation isn’t lying to us; it’s **shifting the target of an anger we’re right to feel**.

Against Imperialism, Capitalism, Fascism, Patriarchy, and all forms of Reactionism

PARTIZAN