

# Critique: Maoist Unity or Opportunism in Turkey-North Kurdistan?

## Party and Party Unity

To ensure clarity, it is necessary to briefly summarize the divisions that shaped the anti-unity perspectives that emerged in Turkey-North Kurdistan. For example, the Maoist Communist Party (formerly the Communist Party of Turkey (Marxist-Leninist)) was founded on April 24, 1972, under the leadership of communist leader İbrahim Kaypakkaya, following a long struggle experience. In 2002, during its 1st Congress, the party adopted a name change. As part of the international revolutionary proletariat, the Maoist party, which hoisted the banner of communism against all forms of attack, faced its first defeat after the assassination of its leading cadre, Ali Haydar Yıldız, during the Dersim-Vartınık raid. This was followed by İbrahim Kaypakkaya being captured wounded and subsequently tortured for three months, ultimately being killed on May 18, 1973. This marked the beginning of a series of blows to the organizational structure. Although the Maoist Communist Party continued the uninterrupted class struggle, the leadership issue remained unresolved after 1973, and despite unity efforts, the party fundamentally struggled to overcome divisions.

The inability to create a core leadership within its ideological and political line, compounded by the loss of leading cadres, hindered the formation of a strong, functioning party and became an inevitable factor preventing the consolidation of forces under robust leadership. As a result, divisions rather than unity consistently emerged as a central challenge for the party, weakening the proletarian party, draining its energy, and undermining its struggle against the ruling exploitative classes. The divisions fueled by leadership issues, as well as theoretical and practical differences, were often attributed solely to the parties involved, rather than analyzing the causes and consequences in their entirety. This approach allowed divisive thoughts to gain ground instead of fostering unity.

The divisions, largely stemming from organizational reasons, worked against the interests of the revolutionary proletariat and in favor of the bourgeoisie, serving as a ground for the weakening of the workers' party. Divisions are outcomes; understanding the causes behind these divisions requires thorough analysis.

Some Key Divisions:

1) The Coordination Committee faction, which began by deviating from the theoretical and political line of Comrade İbrahim Kaypakkaya and eventually joined the anti-Maoist front of modern revisionism, was expelled from the party in 1976.

2) The Temporary Coordination Committee (TCC) faction emerged as a reaction to the rightist, pacifist line of the First Central Committee and caused significant harm and damage to the party in mid-1980.

3) An Overseas Faction, which ideologically positioned itself against Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism as represented by Comrade Mao Zedong, broke away from the party in mid-1981, just before and immediately following the 2nd Conference, where its line became systematized. Known as the Bolshevik Partisan, this Overseas Faction was deemed by the party's 2nd Conference to have been influenced by the revisionist and Trotskyist hybrid Party of Labour of Albania. The theoretical and political lines of the Overseas Faction, as well as the Coordination Committee faction expelled in 1976, overlapped in their ideological attacks on the theoretical and practical legacy of Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism, particularly opposing Mao Zedong's ideas.

4) Similarly, in 1978, three short-lived factions emerged, which soon dissolved themselves and returned to the party without significant impact. In 1986, another group declared a split abroad under the name of the "Maoist Party Center", citing political differences and distrust of the party leadership.

5) Amid ongoing inadequacies in party leadership, growing distrust, and an environment of internal chaos that poisoned organizational life, the killing of 9 comrades, including 7 conference delegates, in a clash with state forces in November 1986 intensified the crisis. Following this, the Central Committee decided to hold the conference abroad, further fueling internal political strife. These conflicts culminated in the split between the Eastern Anatolia Regional Committee (EARC) and the Conference faction in mid-1987, driven by leadership and political disagreements.

6) Between 1987 and 1992, the TKP/ML Conference faction saw another split known as the Revolutionary Partisan, which included central cadres and members with ideological and political differences. The Revolutionary Partisan advocated for the organization of the party in Kurdistan with a "two minimum, one maximum program." The Conference faction, at its 4th Conference, deemed the Revolutionary Partisan line "rightist, liquidationist, and revisionist."

7) The unification in April 1992 between the TKP (ML) EARC and the TKP/ML Conference factions was short-lived due to its lack of principled foundation and resulted in another, more severe split in 1994.

8) In 1995, yet another split occurred within TKP/ML. During the TKP (ML)-Temporary Organizing Committee (TOC) split, the 2nd Extraordinary Party Conference issued death sentences against three cadres of the TOC faction, reflecting a sectarian and non-revolutionary approach. Despite presenting revolutionary principles in rhetoric during the 1994 split, the TKP/ML showed inconsistency by issuing death sentences against weaker cadres. This sectarian policy became a defining characteristic of TKP/ML after 1994, with no self-critical acknowledgment of its errors in handling splits. In subsequent years, similar errors persisted in their approach to groups such as Güneşin Sofrası, later known as Revolutionary Transformation, and in the 2017 split between TKP/ML and TKP-ML. The TKP/ML line, particularly, maintained a flawed approach to unity and division, claiming it as the "most correct line," yet failing to achieve unity every step of the way in this 50 year long march.

9) The Maoist Communist Party (MKP) underwent a split following the announcement of a "3rd Congress" by an internal faction in 2014, which represented a revisionist line openly attacking Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism. The faction rejected the theory and political line of proletarian dictatorship and MLM ideology. By 2021, the 2014 "3rd Congress" faction, led by a liquidationist exiled clique that abandoned Marxism, experienced two additional organizational splits, further fragmenting the group. (Note: This 2014 "3rd Congress" faction uses the name ***Maoist Komünist Parti*** as well as **SMF** (Socialist Councils Federation) while the left-line MKP continues using the name ***Maoist Komünist Partisi***.)

When addressing divisions, it is often observed that some individuals within the movement repeat rhetoric about the importance of principled and correct stances. They preach unity, offer advice, and adopt the role of sages. However, when confronted with similar challenges themselves, these individuals exhibit entirely different behavior. This is particularly evident in the actions of the coup-oriented, revisionist, and purging advocates of the 2014 3rd Congress line (Maoist Komünist Parti-SMF). Their approach to the party and its proletarian revolutionaries—who embody the party's deep-rooted proletarian communist line—highlights a significant inconsistency and deviation from principled stances on unity. Their methods, which lack revolutionary political understanding, reveal their lack of commitment to a principled approach to unity. A similar pattern was evident during the not-so-distant split involving Öncü Partizan (Vanguard Partisan) and DESOF (both are 2021 splitters from the Maoist Komünist Parti-SMF faction), where these former

members demonstrated a comparable lack of depth and revolutionary ethics in their polemical style.

Historical divisions within the movement provide valuable lessons. The expulsion of the Coordination Committee faction from the Maoist Party in 1976, the exile of the Bolshevik Partisan faction in 1981, and the revisionist "3rd Congress" coup orchestrated by an overseas refugee-status clique all exemplify divisions rooted in ideological and political differences. Other splits and departures within the Maoist Party, by contrast, were driven by organizational issues. These separations reveal a consistent struggle within the party to maintain internal unity, with ongoing battles against fragmentation, division, and purges. These recurring challenges underscore the importance of developing a consistent and principled approach to unity. The history of the Kaypakkaya-inspired political and ideological line demonstrates the necessity of steadfastly applying the knowledge and practice of communist unity.

Following the 1994 split, the Maoist Communist Party confronted significant internal and external challenges. At the 1996 Conference for Preparing the Congress, it uncovered and punished enemy elements that had infiltrated its ranks, drawing critical lessons about counter-revolutionary activities aimed at disrupting the party's internal unity and distorting its principles. Sectarian and erroneous approaches to division were condemned, and a perspective on unity was cultivated. Calls for unity were extended to TKP/ML, grounded in revolutionary principles rather than shared origins, given the absence of objections to these principles.

Despite these efforts, TKP/ML did not respond positively to the unity calls after 1994 and failed to develop a policy on unity. If the insistence on remaining separate is considered a policy—as it indeed appears to be—it should be recognized as a policy of division, not unity. By failing to grasp the dynamic and living essence of class struggle, the organization's perspective became stagnant following the 1994 split, unable to break free from a cycle of negativity. In contrast, progress requires focusing on the future of society and class struggle, which are inherently in motion. Approaches that prioritize the past over the present and future inevitably fall behind the masses, remaining unable to move forward and confined to the past.

Sectarian, leftist policies on division, representing clear deviations from Marxist, Leninist, and Maoist theoretical and political principles, fail to ensure internal unity. Instead, they foster new divisions, sustain purging processes, and act as a destabilizing force under the guise of unity politics. Organizational experiences have demonstrated this concretely.

The issue of division and unity can be summarized through these organizational phenomena. The lessons drawn from these historical processes, which are invoked by those who claim to continue this legacy, must be critically examined. Only by reconciling the knowledge and practices provided by these historical experiences with the international unity theory and practice of the revolutionary proletariat can they be defended appropriately. On this matter, the rhetoric and actions of Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF and TKP/ML can be analyzed from the perspective of international revolutionary class analysis, making their errors plainly evident.

### **TKP/ML Does Not Support the Policy of Unity Among Communists**

From this point, the evaluation can shift to the unprincipled and opportunistic perspective that lacks criteria on the issue of unity and division. Whether they admit it or not, TKP/ML lacks a unity policy, and its approach to divisions is sectarian. Despite calls from the organizations closest to them and with which they could potentially unite, they retreat behind the claim of "prioritizing the unity of the masses," as if others do not also prioritize mass unity. While dismissing the idea of evaluating the unity issue—including unity with those from the same organizational roots or with groups identifying as communist—they fail to present anything new. Instead, they repackage their post-1994 anti-unity stance with more convoluted ideas.

In their writing, the statement that “any ‘unity’ not based on the movement of the masses is barren” is followed by the assertion that unity among parties, organizations, or groups identifying as communist, as well as those from the same organizational tradition, involves “unity against the interests of the masses” and is therefore “futile.” Yet, they fail to explain what they mean by “unity based on the movement of the masses,” how they distinguish between unity that serves or does not serve the interests of the masses, or what these concepts mean in practice. They leave these phrases—“the interests of the masses” and “based on the movement of the masses”—undefined and vague. Even the pursuit of unity, supposedly certified as contrary to the masses' interests, is condemned as harmful. Efforts to unify two or more organizations are judged, regardless of whether their aims, theories, or programs are revisionist or Marxist-Leninist-Maoist. Unity efforts and the defense of unity policies are deemed contrary to the masses' interests without serious evaluation. Unsurprisingly, in the absence of revolutionary proletarian principles regarding the unity of communists, attempts at unity are dismissed as “wrong.”

Are there unprincipled approaches to unity? Of course, but such efforts should be openly

and clearly criticized. Communists do not advocate unity with everyone under any conditions. The principles of unity in the international communist movement are well known. However, TKP/ML does not uphold the universal principles and criteria of revolutionary proletarian unity. Instead, they perpetuate the theory of eternal division, reflecting their narrow, group-focused, and experiential perspective. Generalizations like “opportunistic attitudes that approve all kinds of unity” are of little use in discussions on unity. If a party lacks a clear and well-defined policy in terms of theory, program, and political principles, it cannot properly evaluate unity efforts or unity approaches from a revolutionary class perspective. Consequently, such a party cannot distinguish between opportunistic unity and revolutionary unity. While they criticize opportunistic unity, they offer no evidence of any coherent thinking or policy regarding the unity of communists.

The issue of “mass unity” cannot be conflated with the unity of communists, communist parties, or organizations. As emphasized earlier, the unity of the working class depends on the unity of its political representatives, who may hold various tendencies. TKP/ML surely knows this. If the most advanced elements of the working class do not unite under communist principles, how will the working class, peasant workers, and the masses unite in the struggle for socialism through the Communist Party, which brings class consciousness from the outside? They cannot. A lack of proper alignment on communist unity indicates a departure from—or a failure to ever align with—the revolutionary path of the working class.

The Maoist Communist Party has long extended calls for unity to the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist (TKP/ML) with a clear and principled framework based on theory, program, revolutionary strategy, and organizational principles. Despite a lack of fundamental objections to these principles, these unity calls have gone unanswered. Instead of contributing positively to MKP’s principled and correct policy, TKP/ML persisted in unprincipled and inconsistent attitudes aimed at undermining these efforts. Yet, just as communist unity is not a secondary issue tied to organizational divisions, it is not an issue to be abandoned after divisions occur. What unites communists is ideology, a program that defines both minimum and maximum aims, and organizational principles. This is a critical step in advancing the unity of the working class. Unfortunately, TKP/ML has failed to grasp the issue of unity. Instead of analyzing the causes of division to create a stronger party unity, it has perpetuated an anti-unity policy that opposes and obstructs efforts to unite.

The roots of this anti-unity policy lie in economic and class foundations. Since this deviation opposes the revolutionary proletarian understanding of broad, internationalist perspectives, it reflects the influence of bourgeois thought. Anti-unity thinking signifies

narrowness, parochialism, and small-mindedness rather than universality, growth, and expansiveness. This flawed mindset draws the larger world into the narrow confines of small property relations. It does not reflect the interests of all the oppressed and exploited classes in society or the universal interests of the global proletariat but instead prioritizes the narrow perspective of small property relations, emphasizing the interests of limited groups and local networks. This understanding stems from the economic basis of the petty-bourgeois class.

The political stance of the organization under critique aligns with a “satisfied shopkeeper” mindset shaped by petty-bourgeois class interests and thought. Such a stance opposes the need for communist unity, causing theoretical and practical harm to the revolutionary struggle of the working class. The bourgeoisie, which seeks to atomize the proletariat and its leading forces—the communists—and block unity efforts, benefits greatly from divisions among communists. Processes that exclude unity work against the proletariat and in favor of the bourgeoisie. Departures from a unity perspective result in organizational regression, not development; weakness, not strength; and the creation of conditions that feed further divisions rather than solidifying internal unity.

### **Those Who Systematically Oppose Unity Efforts Lack a Genuine Understanding of Unity**

Those who inconsistently and baselessly oppose unity efforts while constantly revisiting past conflicts clearly lack a genuine understanding of unity. Since the tested theory and practice of the international proletariat, which establish the criteria for unity, are not defended, it remains unclear by what standard unity efforts and calls are evaluated or according to which class interests such opposition is justified. For this reason, the statements of TKP/ML through their publication organs on the issue of unity are not only indicative of confused thinking but most clearly reveal an anti-unity stance. However, if a revolutionary policy is to be discussed in alignment with the significant task of achieving unity, it must first be grounded in a clear and principled understanding of unity, guided by the criteria established by communists. All unity efforts, including calls for unity, must be evaluated based on this understanding.

The Maoist Communist Party, by contrast, has long upheld a clear and principled political solution on unity, grounded in theory, program, strategy, and organizational principles, as well as consistent efforts to achieve unity. Regarding unity, the party evaluates issues based on the established principles of the proletarian party. In light of the programmatic differences that have emerged over time with TKP/ML — a party to which unity calls were

previously extended based on shared programmatic views — the question of whether unity is now possible can be easily answered by applying the unity criteria defended by the Maoist Communist Party. When evaluated according to the established principles, the theoretical framework, and the subjective and dogmatic ideological trajectory of TKP/ML — even if Marxist, Leninist, and Maoist rhetoric is maintained — the differences regarding the nature and driving forces of the revolution, the leading and fundamental forces, the identification of the principal contradiction influencing other contradictions, the minimum and maximum goals defined within the socioeconomic conditions of opposing and irreconcilable classes, and the strategies and organizational principles for achieving these goals make organizational unity with TKP/ML impossible.

The Maoist communist understanding of unity does not entail forming unprincipled alliances under any conditions, even with organizations from the same tradition or with those who identify as communists. Such a notion is neither desirable nor feasible.

Furthermore, opposition to unity stems from a line shaped by opportunism and liquidationism, driven by subjective and dogmatic thinking. The political stance, tactics, and strategic decisions of any organization cannot be evaluated independently of its overall ideological and political line. For example, instead of basing its political and organizational line on concrete knowledge of the objective social conditions of Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, TKP/ML repeated the assertion at its 1st Congress that semi-feudal production relations still dominate. This reiteration demonstrates its inability to break free from the chains of dogmatic and subjective thinking. Moreover, the organization attempts to justify its subjective analyses and economic "assessments" as correct by citing K. Marx, F. Engels, V. I. Lenin, J. Stalin, and Mao Zedong, which fails to truly demonstrate a defense of MLM. Defending Marxism requires applying and upholding its dynamic spirit based on the principle of concrete analysis of concrete conditions. Referencing MLM theory inappropriately to "prove" the correctness of subjective and dogmatic assertions does not constitute a defense of Marxism.

TKP/ML replaces social reality with its own ideas and persists in presenting its flawed, opportunistic thinking as "based on Marxism." An organization that has strayed so far from the philosophical foundations of the proletariat cannot maintain a correct position on the unity of communists. The weight of the ideological and line-related issues deserving comprehensive critique extends far beyond the scope of discussions on unity. The gap between organizations of the same origin has widened significantly. According to the principles of unity upheld by the Maoist Communist Party, unity with TKP/ML, even as an organization from the same tradition, is impossible under current conditions unless



fundamental changes are made to theory, program, and principles in a way that eliminates essential objections. This conclusion is self-evident.

### **The 2014 "3rd Congress" *Maoist Komünist Parti* Line: Disruptive Internally, Pretending to Be Unifying Externally**

While many revisionist parties and organizations lack the courage to openly reject key Marxist-Leninist-Maoist principles, the faction that organized itself as the Maoist Komünist Parti has adopted a destructive and liquidationist line that rejects the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This line, which has deviated from the communist essence of Kaypakkaya's path, has caused extensive destruction and liquidation within the Maoist Communist Party. Those who disrupted and liquidated internal unity sought to conceal this destructive reality by presenting themselves to the masses as advocates of unity. However, the contradiction between their internally destructive policies and their external unifying propaganda quickly became apparent.

Theoretically, this line has fallen under the influence of bourgeois thought; politically, it has severed its ties with the revolutionary goal of proletarian power; and practically, it manifests as liquidationism internally, leftist posturing outwardly, and right-wing passivity and spontaneity in implementation. Since it is not genuinely communist, it has no real concern for communist unity. Instead, it is preoccupied with squandering the legacy of the past, and its rhetoric of unity serves only as a façade for the fragmentation it has caused.

Former comrades once claimed to support the unity of parties and organizations stemming from the Kaypakkaya tradition. However, when the principles of communist unity defended by the Maoist Communist Party are applied to their line, what emerges? To put it plainly, as long as the theories upheld by the faction are maintained, unity between them and Maoist communists is impossible. This is because the ideas of two opposing and irreconcilable classes are in conflict.

The maximum and minimum programs of the Maoist Communist Party, which reflect the political goal of the proletariat as the leading and fundamental force in society and the establishment of socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat, are irreconcilable with the liquidationist and revisionist theses upheld by this faction's modern revisionist line. These theses reject the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and several other fundamental principles of Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism. Consequently, the right-opportunist line of this party, which has detached itself from its communist essence, cannot be united with the Maoist communists.

Similarly, Halkın Günlüğü's (translates to *People's Daily*, a publication of this faction) notion of "unity with organizations from the Kaypakkaya tradition" is not suitable for achieving the unity of Marxist-Leninist-Maoists. Firstly, they do not defend the class dominance of the proletariat. As Lenin stated, anyone who does not defend the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be considered a Marxist. Therefore, only those ignorant of revolutionary theory and practice could believe that those who are not MLM can genuinely advocate for the unity of Marxist-Leninist-Maoists. Sharing the same roots or having been in the same ranks at one point is not sufficient to achieve unity on a proletarian revolutionary line or within a unified organization.

Of course, if Maoist Komunist Parti were to abandon its modern revisionist theses and adopt clear changes based on a proletarian communist program, unity on the basis of communist principles would become possible. However, in the current situation, neither the TKP/ML and TKP-ML factions — which claim to follow the Kaypakkaya tradition yet persist in their anti-unity policies — nor Maoist Komunist Parti, which adopts an ultra-unionist approach of "unity with everyone" while simultaneously attempting to conceal internal liquidation and to reorganize fragmented and alienated elements, meet the criteria for the unity of Marxist-Leninist-Maoists as defended by the Maoist Communist Party (Maoist Komunist Partisi).

The perspective is clear: under all conditions, parties claiming to uphold MLM theory and the revolutionary goal of communism must unite on the basis of a communist program and principles. This universal understanding of unity, rooted in the principles of the proletariat, requires fidelity to MLM theory and the revolutionary mission.

### **The Path to Unity Lies Through the Approach to Division**

Politically, divisions can transform into unity, and unity can turn into division. Examining the trajectory of party forces demonstrates this dialectical relationship: the Maoist party split in 1987, reunited in 1992, split again in 1994, and unfortunately, experienced another division in 2014. These events alone are sufficient to illustrate the interplay between division and unity. It is essential to examine a party's policies on unity. Unity and division are interdependent opposites, each defining the other. Those who fail to understand this cannot advance on the correct path for the benefit of the masses. Ultimately, revolution is a social and political act that unites the oppressed and exploited classes around a common purpose, overthrowing the power of the exploitative ruling class. It is an action that dismantles the old and establishes the new.

An approach to division must be shaped by a perspective of uniting class forces. The political and theoretical understanding of the issue is of great importance. Unity cannot be achieved merely by endlessly debating the details of past divisions; unity is built not for the past but for the future. With this correct understanding, the Maoist Communist Party advocates addressing the issue through the perspective of unity in MLM ideology, program, and organizational principles. This entails defending unity around an MLM program.

Division inevitably involves deviations, opportunism, and lack of principles. The realities constructed and conclusions drawn by the dividing parties cannot be presented as obstacles to unity. Unity is achieved on a basis where the theoretical and programmatic framework provided by Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism takes precedence over the subjective conclusions of individual parties or groups. Progress cannot be made unless the focus shifts from "what conclusions are drawn by whom" to "what principles must form the basis of unity."

When examining the socialist-oriented revolutionary movements in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, with their numerous organizations, it becomes evident that a fundamentally correct understanding of unity is lacking. Almost every organization, group, or party views unity as contingent upon others accepting its own conclusions and arguments. This flawed and opportunistic understanding, devoid of unity theory and principles and far from proletarian democracy, perpetuates a mindset of division.

For instance, organizations that resorted to counter-revolutionary methods such as armed violence against each other during past divisions have yet to offer self-criticism. These include organizations that used violence, intimidation, bans, isolation, suppression, defamation, and other coercive policies that ultimately escalated into violence. They have not condemned these actions or presented self-criticism to the masses. The Maoist Party, however, avoided the error of employing armed methods during divisions. It conducted a self-assessment of its sectarian attitudes and approaches, made self-criticism, and corrected its mistakes. The party has strengthened its commitment to the principle that issues, even those between revolutionary organizations, must be resolved not through violence but through criticism, self-criticism, persuasion, education, and ideological struggle between organizations. It has consistently reinforced this principle as the approach that should be adopted in divisions.

The Maoist Party continues to refine and consolidate its understanding of the approach to divisions with each passing day. It rejects the use of violence in resolving disputes, even

within revolutionary organizations, and emphasizes self-criticism and ideological struggle as the fundamental means of overcoming divisions.

The use of armed violence in the name of revolution, against parties, organizations, groups, and circles that represent various class tendencies, due to separation issues or other reasons, constitutes — whether recognized or not — an attack on the unification and struggle of all popular masses under the leadership of the working class, which is essential for the goal of socialism. This is unacceptable. No structure that is not categorized as an enemy of the class, nor individual revolutionary figures, can be subjected to violence.

We still see that in separations, many petty-bourgeois organizations align in favor of the relatively stronger party and against the weaker, adopting a stance that includes non-recognition, isolation, and forming alliances aimed at the dissolution of the weaker side. This anti-democratic style, embodied in alliances and actions, persists and is essentially a form of organized pressure wrapped in a veneer of Marxism. It is clear that such an approach is not revolutionary. The notion that there will never be unity again between separated parties, and their mutual exclusion, are consequences of straying from the principles of proletarian democracy and class stance, which are foundational to the idea of proletarian unity.

TKP/ML operates with a position that treats those who split off from it as nearly enemies, demonstrating its anti-unity stance through its sectarian policies that include various forms of violence. This is what we mean when we say the contradiction between separation and unity defines each other. Despite all calls, the lack of effort by TKP/ML after 1994 to unite Maoist communists is a result of its erroneous line with ideological and political roots. The sectarian approaches of both sides in the TKP/ML and TKP-ML split, stemming from the same source, demonstrate that no significant progress has been made in addressing separation issues with unity policies. Those who prioritize threats, non-recognition, isolation, intimidation, and violence in separation, shelving ideological struggle, have no unity policy. This style and approach, which significantly harm class struggle aimed at achieving power, are criticized by the Maoist party.

What is noteworthy is that TKP/ML, in separations within other parties unrelated to itself, acts almost as a notary, siding quantitatively with the party it perceives as stronger and against the weaker, taking the stronger side as a reference and ignoring the other faction. It has fallen so far as to adopt a policy of non-recognition and non-engagement. By doing so, it has extended its non-Marxist-Leninist-Maoist opportunistic, unprincipled, and liquidating understanding of opposition to separation within itself to a practical task of taking sides in

the separations occurring in other parties and organizations.

In a special issue of Partizan, the 3rd Congress theses defended by the right-liquidationist faction that separated from MKP were identified as a revisionist line. However, TKP/ML, despite labeling them as revisionist and as having departed from the Kaypakkaya line, acted in alignment with the faction line and, during the 2014 split, pursued a policy of “non-recognition” against the Maoist Communist Party, which opposed the revisionist line. They did not make an institutional statement on this issue but, in practice, were seen in a de facto alliance with the revisionist coup plotters, rather than with those defending the proletarian revolutionary line. Those who exhibit the audacity of “non-recognition” have yet to learn that no organization has the authority to determine whether another organization is legitimate, what it represents, what name it may or may not use, or whether it can continue under a specific name. To “not recognize” what is revolutionary in politics essentially alienates and narrows the scope of those who do not recognize. Instead of passing judgment on others, it would be more appropriate to evaluate their own organizational situation. As disconnected as they are from social reality, it is no secret that they are also disconnected from their organizational reality. An advice that could be said to those friends who position themselves atop a mountain is to act with moderation and adhere to the standards of respect inherent in relations between organizations.

Revolutionary class struggle demands not ignoring or rejecting class forces, but uniting with them, advancing together, and expanding the common struggle. The “non-recognition” attitude cannot affect us in the slightest, but those who adopt this stance will suffer harm due to their errors. This is because such attitudes and practices, which serve counter-revolutionary class enemies and contradict the class interests of the masses, do not lead to organizational development. For us, this is not a matter of debate; we only feel the need to explain to the revolutionary masses the owners of this “non-recognition” (!) mindset, which has shown through their actions that they have lost the consistency and ability to act in accordance with the communist line and political principles of the Kaypakkaya tradition.

The root cause drawing these friends into a de facto alliance with the 2014 “3rd Congress” Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF-Halkın Günlüğü line, in the divergence between bourgeois coup methods and insistence on proletarian democracy, between the revisionist line and the proletarian revolutionary line, is their petty-bourgeois class stance. This reflects a lack of communist leadership, revolutionary theoretical production, and perspective on the general interests of the proletariat. For this reason, they have distanced themselves from communist proletarian principles to the extent that they can adopt an even worse “non-recognition” sectarianism than the revisionist line they criticize, and have veered towards

right liquidationism. In this situation, TKP/ML appears to criticize the faction. Every political stance has ideological and political foundations. Moreover, while slogans are decorated with propaganda against right liquidationism and reformism, aid is extended to the revisionists who dilute Marxist ideology from the right.

Communists, wherever they may be, always side with the communist line in the divergence between revisionism and the communist line, without hesitation and regardless of quantitative strength, and they do everything in their power to strengthen it. They do not join hands with those they call revisionists and partake in policies aimed at the liquidation of communists. All of this demonstrates that TKP/ML's left-sectarian policy on separation issues defines its anti-unity stance. It is the duty of Maoists to remind them that they must free themselves from the subjective and dogmatic thinking that has caused this deviation in their understanding of unity.

**The Differences Between the Anti-Unity TKP/ML and the "Unity-Oriented" Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF at the Conclusion of Unity are Formal; in essence, they share the same line**

From the proletariat's class perspective, in the contradiction between unity and separation, the principal aspect is unity and merging. However, this does not mean that, under the guise of unity, parties in any separation should be portrayed as enemies. On the contrary, in this contradiction that defines itself mutually, the issue of separation requires being addressed with principles and seriousness. Criticism is not for digging up old issues but to overcome the problems that caused the separation, to find a path for proletarian elements to unite, and to explain to the masses the revisionist tendencies where unity is impossible while developing policies on this matter. Organizations like TKP/ML and others, which see themselves as a notary certifying who represents what, who has the right to represent the party name in separations within other organizations, may forget the inevitability of splits and unions within class-based political tendencies due to their petty-bourgeois perspective. They may fall into the illusion of making revolution alone. In such cases, the class-conscious proletariat must not neglect its duty to critique such deviations.

The primary target of criticism should be those who, while claiming to be communist, adopt and implement the method and policy of using violence over the issue of separation. Violence used against revolutionaries under the guise of "revolution and party values," along with policies that demonize, ignore, and aim to liquidate them, constitutes the greatest harm to the revolutionary cause.

When it comes to the use of violence, it is generally understood as armed attack. This perception is incorrect and incomplete. Killing a revolutionary due to separation is a grave crime against the proletarian cause. It serves not the revolutionary aim but the bourgeoisie and counter-revolution. Beyond this, acts such as ignoring or not recognizing parties involved in internal or external separations, defamation, threats, manipulation, hindering their activities, calling on other organizations to support these flawed policies, and garnering support for them, as well as exerting pressure in all areas with the mindset of "if they exist, we won't"—all of these are forms of violence in the context of separation issues. Replacing ideological struggle with violent methods is a bourgeois tactic and harms the unity and struggle of the working class. An organization that adopts bourgeois methods in separation issues — whatever its name — cannot and does not have any connection with the approach and principles of communists on unity and separation issues. For this reason, we insist that when it comes to unity, one should look at the views and stances of the party discussing unity during separations. This way, when divisive and disruptive elements appear on the stage with new masks as "unity advocates" and wave their flags, it becomes easier to see their true nature. This issue is directly related to the communist party's understanding of proletarian democracy and organization. The stance taken in separation determines whether the principle of proletarian democracy is upheld in unity politics. When the issue is posed in this way, let's examine the gap between the rhetoric and actions of Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF, which waves the flag of "unity."

In contrast to the anti-unity stance of both TKP/ML and TKP-ML, Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF appears to be theoretically an ardent advocate of unity. However, in essence, it aligns with anti-unity in the same line. With an unprincipled and inconsistent policy suited to their subjective future designs, their revisionist-opportunist line dilutes and corrupts the revolutionary content of a critical issue like the unity of communists with expectations of gains. These former comrades, who say, "The leadership of the proletariat and the communist party is not necessary in socialism" and even grant leadership to the petty bourgeoisie, act consistently with their rusty and subjective ideas, which constitute an attack on Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology, adopting a practical attitude as if they could unite with anyone under any conditions. In their socialist vision, instead of the proletariat's class dominance, they consider "joint leadership of all segments" possible. This approach manifests in current politics as replacing the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat and its singular weapon, the communist party, in class struggle with the joint leadership of all segments, whether it be the capitalist government or others opposing the inequalities and evils of the capitalist system to some extent.

Chairman Mao Zedong's dialectical law of the unity and struggle of opposites, expressed

as "one divides into two," has entirely transformed in Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF into the opportunist unprincipledness of "two become one." This perspective, which unites the duality of proletariat and bourgeoisie, finds its political form in contemporary policy when it is stated that "the leadership of the communist party is not necessary" in the establishment of the United Front of the People. Many failed to grasp the theoretical and principled significance of this revisionist thesis. Yet, these were the "new" openings corresponding to the contemporary political implications of their subjective socialist design. The result: those who hold these views are left with one foot here and one foot there.

The fact that Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF has one hand in the excessively nationalist camp, competing with Doğu Perinçek's Vatan Partisi, which rivals MHP in extreme nationalism, alongside the social-chauvinist TKP led by Kemal Okuyan and similar groups, while its other hand is engaged with HDP, the political representatives of the Kurdish national bourgeoisie seeking reconciliation with the Turkish bourgeoisie, and yet proclaims unity with organizations from the Kaypakkaya tradition, demonstrates the political outcomes of the revisionist theses we have emphasized. Being with everyone ultimately means not being oneself.

Similarly, the policy of temporary action alliances in struggles for partial and variable demands for basic rights is being presented as if it were the unity of communists or the establishment of a class alliance, wrapped in the propaganda dough of "unity." Without considering whether it aligns with the goals of the proletariat's class struggle, roses are being offered to all sides. Regardless of the conditions, no matter the cost, it does not matter who holds the initiative, whose class interests are being served, or whether it adheres to the revolutionary goal — as long as there is "unity." Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF, with its policy of being ready to unite under any circumstances, has essentially placed itself within the current of reformism. Being everywhere has resulted in being nowhere, and uniting with everyone has been established at the expense of fragmenting its internal unity.

Communists, of course, seek to "unite" with all forces that can potentially align with the revolutionary front—but not at any cost! Not under any conditions! Not by abandoning their principles and objectives! Not by losing independence through reliance on someone else's strength, by surrendering initiative, or by tailing the bourgeoisie!

Communists do not form alliances that are incompatible with their revolutionary programs and objectives. Temporary and partial agreements based on action alliances or various struggle platforms are only acceptable if they align with the proletariat's general political



demands and contribute to the revolutionary agitation, consciousness-raising, and organization of the masses. For us, the policy of achieving democracy through struggle is, in every respect, tied to the communist goal of liberating the working class and society, and ultimately to the revolutionary objective.

Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF demonstrates an inconsistent and unprincipled approach to the issue of communist unity. While criticizing TKP/ML for its flawed stance in separations, it adopts a lecturing tone and selectively critiques issues published by TKP/ML in a self-serving manner. However, it forgets its own principles while reminding others of theirs. The understanding of unity tied to principled positions on separations, as upheld by the Maoist party, was abandoned by Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF during the 2014 separation. In the separation, Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF advocated manipulative, restrictive, obstructive, threatening, and defamatory policies that aimed to create distrust and discredit within the masses. With a proprietary mentality, they insisted on the misconception that the party name belonged solely to them and pressured others to adopt a "non-recognition" policy and sever relations with the Maoist party (Maoist Komunist Partisi). While they outwardly expressed "best wishes" to appear democratic, in practice, they implemented a "non-recognition" policy. Concrete facts and experiences of separation reveal that Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF is no different from the criticized flawed approach of TKP/ML. When it comes to others, "democracy" and "principles" are invoked in separations, but when it comes to themselves, they resort to impositions, manipulation, defamation, bans, threats, and so on — a peak of inconsistency and unprincipled behavior. They have quickly forgotten that it is impossible to unite with forces portrayed as enemies. Isn't it fair to ask: if you were truly advocating unity in the party, why did you resort to coup methods to impose your ideas, shattering the party's strength? If you are truly committed to unity, why don't you start by engaging in self-criticism over the mistakes that led to the separation?

The phrase in TKP/ML's critique, "the unity approach of divisive and destructive elements is opportunistic," aptly describes the unity approach of the Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF line. Actors who dissolve and fragment party strength have no concern for unity. Those who lack internal unity cannot unite with others.

Moreover, calls are being made for "unity with organizations from the Kaypakkaya tradition." However, Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF avoids addressing the ideological struggles over the existing differences between itself and these parties and organizations, which have different programs, theories, and strategies. Instead, it waves the flag of unity to a demagogic degree, as if these organizations were on similar lines regarding fundamental issues. Unity propaganda is used as a tool to mask its divisive nature. Maoist Komunist

Parti-SMF cannot have forgotten that the unity of communist parties and organizations is based on programs, theories, and political principles. Is it not clear enough that, as long as organizations defending the Democratic Revolution program and those advocating the Socialist Revolution program maintain their current positions, they cannot unite? To us, Maoist communists, this is as clear as the sun. If there are deviations in programs and principles, or if they lag behind societal and economic realities, ideological struggle must be conducted. To engage in demagogic unity propaganda under such circumstances is pure deception and fraud.

For some time now, organizations from the Kaypakkaya tradition have been grappling with deepening internal crises, fragmentation, and disarray. This reality has made the need for consolidation and overcoming these crises more pressing, strengthening the tendency for unity against separations that deplete our strength. Alongside this, elements prone to reformist influence, seeking havens for their drift and separations, provide the propagandistic ground for Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF's unprincipled and inconsistent unity policy.

Making calls for "unity" to groups whose unification is impossible due to fundamental programmatic and principled differences and exploiting the significant concept of unity for such purposes cannot be accepted. Halkın Günlüğü has been avoiding ideological struggle. Criticisms directed at it in publications such as Devrimci Halkın Günlüğü (Revolutionary People's Daily), Devrimci Demokrasi (Revolutionary Democracy), and Sınıf Perspektifi (Class Perspective) - publications of the left-line MKP - regarding theoretical and political issues have been ignored. At the same time, a "non-recognition" policy has been directed against the Maoist Communists. Yet, the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line of the Maoist Communist Party serves as a clear foundation for the unification of communists. The party has fulfilled its duty of ideological struggle by challenging the revisionist tendencies that have disconnected Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF from its communist historical roots. However, Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF has avoided addressing fundamental theoretical and political issues in a manner reflecting a petty bourgeois approach.

An organization genuinely committed to advocating for communist unity would take ideological criticisms seriously. From the proletarian perspective, it would work to overcome its errors. These qualities, however, are absent in Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF. Instead, its treatment of those who have separated involves insults, threats, manipulation, defamation, and attempts to mislead the masses. These actions expose Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF's lack of a genuine revolutionary unity policy. Despite its rhetorical differences, the line it follows is essentially the same as the two factions of TKP/ML and TKP-ML in their

left-sectarian stance on separation. Both extremes — right and left — converge on the same opportunistic understanding of unity and separation. The inconsistency and opportunism in their approaches to unity and separation unite these organizations in their shared “non-recognition” policy.

In conclusion, the Maoist Communist Party (Maoist Komunist Partisi) has articulated clear and principled criteria for unity, consistent with the revolutionary aims of the working class. According to this understanding, simply adhering to the Kaypakkaya tradition is insufficient for principled unity. Therefore, instead of making unfounded declarations of unity, efforts must focus on achieving unity through ideological struggle based on theory, program, and political line. While the Maoist Communist Party supports the unification of parties, organizations, and groups that claim to follow Comrade Kaypakkaya’s communist line, such unity must not be pursued “at any cost” or “under any conditions.” Unity must be established on Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory, a revolutionary program, a strategy rooted in the concrete analysis of the societal and economic conditions of Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, and the organizational principles of a party capable of implementing these goals.

From the perspective of universal criteria for revolutionary proletarian unity, organizations that genuinely advocate for unity must clarify significant differences with the groups they see as potential allies. If these differences are evident and resolvable, they should engage in ideological struggle to correct errors and establish a theoretical and principled basis for unity around the working class’s revolutionary program. Those who act contrary to this approach, promoting unity propaganda despite clear programmatic differences, exploit the concept of unity to conceal their divisive and destructive nature.

The Maoist Communist Party remains committed to advocating for the unity of Marxist-Leninist-Maoists. The program adopted at the party’s 2020 3rd Congress clearly outlines theoretical and programmatic differences with other organizations within the same tradition. Whether it is groups that appear to advocate unity while being disruptive or those that oppose unity outright, the obstacles to unity stem from deviations from Marxism, rejection or distortion of fundamental principles, or adherence to dogmatic and subjective thinking under the guise of fervent MLM advocacy. The party continues its ideological struggle against the liquidationist and opportunist thought underlying these harmful tendencies.

Furthermore, revolutionary elements within these organizations must decisively challenge the dogmatic and subjective thinking and revisionist theses that dominate their theoretical

and political lines. Revolutionary theory and political line remain decisive in the class struggle. Organizations such as TKP/ML and TKP-ML, which persist in their flawed claim that "feudalism dominates" rather than recognizing the reality of bureaucratic capitalist society and production relations, and Maoist Komunist Parti-SMF, which maintains a revisionist line rejecting principles such as the dictatorship of the proletariat, cannot become part of a process of unity around a communist program. Overcoming subjectivism, revisionist theory, and politics within these organizations is a prerequisite for unity on the revolutionary line of proletarian struggle.