

On Liquidationism

Liquidationism has emerged not only as a pressing issue of today but has also historically posed a persistent obstacle to the struggle for revolution. However, it is worth noting that at no point in history has it infiltrated so destructively. Liquidationism is like a virus—skilled in corrupting and degenerating whatever it attaches to, making it resemble itself. It aims to destroy the tissue it occupies, render it dysfunctional, and spread throughout the entire body. In this context, early diagnosis and revolutionary intervention are crucial. One could say—it saves lives. While accurate diagnosis is the first step, the correct intervention is the second. Diagnosis alone holds no real meaning. A good surgeon is not the one who merely identifies a clogged artery, but the one who intervenes and opens it. That is what we mean by life-saving intervention. Unfortunately, composing lofty words or making general observations about liquidationism—a general ailment of the period we are currently living through—does not eliminate this urgent problem. Only a precise and accurate diagnosis followed by the most appropriate intervention can do so. Unless this is achieved, every new day will dawn with destruction.

One of the fundamental illnesses of the revolutionary sphere is its tendency to treat all damage as external, blaming every problem on conditions outside itself. This approach, which philosophically waves the flag of idealism, is of course bound to be far from dialectical when it comes to dealing with problems. It can do no more than add yet another link to an already complex chain of issues.

Contradictions are united in struggle, and struggles derive from their unity. Everything external is also, at the same time, internal. Conversely, the internal is intertwined with the external. This is not our assumption or hypothetical speculation; it is inherent to the nature of contradiction. Unity and struggle are continuous and fundamental. The fact that one takes precedence at times does not mean the other ceases to exist or never existed at all. From this perspective, explaining processes solely through external contradictions or observations is not only incomplete but also lacks a dialectical approach. Lighting a match to a piece of wood is an external intervention, but what transforms the wood's potential energy into kinetic energy lies within the wood itself. The energy to burn belongs inherently to the wood. The same fire cannot ignite water, because water does not contain that energy. However, water too can evaporate when exposed to appropriate heat. The tendency to evaporate is related to the nature of water itself. When it receives sufficient heat, its molecules break apart and transform into another form of energy.

A communist party cannot explain the destruction it experiences—its defeats or setbacks—solely through external causes. The same applies to the process of liquidation. As stated from the beginning, liquidationism attacks like a virus, targeting the weakest part of the body. It settles stealthily into a damaged organ and completely decays it. This tendency of the virus is external. However, the damaged organ is internal. No organ of a healthy body that maintains its integrity would accept this virus; it would reject it immediately. In such a case, the virus's tendency to attack, corrode, and spread would be rendered ineffective. Saying things like, *"My body was very healthy, yet the virus settled inside me,"* or *"I'm perfectly sound, but there's a general outbreak and everyone suffers from this illness,"* reflects an unscientific, self-excusing attitude—and this is not the way of Marxists.

From this perspective, liquidation stands before us not as an externally imposed event, but as a phenomenon that develops from within. Our class enemies continuously attack Communist parties—or any force they see as a threat to their power—using every means at their disposal: military, organizational, and ideological. This is no secret. The attacks are constant, and every attack aims at liquidation. The targets of these attacks are always the weak points and vulnerabilities of the Communist parties. Although the intensity of liquidation attacks may vary depending on the circumstances, they are constant and ongoing. As we said, this is not surprising—it is normal, part of the nature of irreconcilable contradictions. After all, the fundamental orientation and goal of Communist parties is also aligned with this: strike, break off a piece, settle in that breach... until you destroy and crush your enemy. The war between opposing forces is also a war of liquidation.

Therefore, if we fail to recognize or choose to ignore the deformed, deteriorated aspects within ourselves—and if we do not intervene and fortify these areas—then our enemy will intervene and fortify themselves there. Because the revolutionary struggle allows no vacuum. What we refer to as liquidation—whether on a small or large scale—is a multifaceted practice of action. It has organizational, military, ideological, and various other dimensions. But fundamentally, it all comes down to a matter of political line. Liquidation cannot be understood as a localized or spontaneous process. It has a soil that it feeds on, roots that it extends into. And this is a question of line. In the scope of this article, we aim to unpack and discuss liquidation—understood as an internal phenomenon—to the best of our awareness and ability.

The Mentality That Buried the Revolution in Soviet Soil Took Root from Within

There is hardly a literary expression with as deep a philosophical meaning as the saying: *"The Don River didn't freeze overnight."* This phrase points to the fact that behind every qualitative explosion lies a process of quantitative accumulation. It also serves as a

critique of the Soviet revolution. The decisions made at the 1956 congress—which programmatically brought Khrushchev’s revisionism to power—were not made overnight. They had a long historical background and a process of quantitative buildup behind them. Khrushchev was a figure who left his mark on history, but he was not unique in himself. That character, that spirit, reincarnated in many figures across different regions after him.

Khrushchev gathered around himself every “lowly element” within the party. Some he intimidated or coerced into submission through blackmail or threats. Others were his accomplices from the beginning. What united most of them were their shared organizational crimes. They knew: “If Khrushchev falls, we all fall.” This gang, brought together by shared guilt, bourgeois ambitions, and wretched, non-communist spirits, was gnawing away at the party from within. Khrushchev, however, was a master of his craft. He waved the banner of communism while targeting communists, appealing not to the advanced sentiments of the party base, but to their most backward instincts, doing everything in his power to organize his own status quo. He was the one who once called Stalin the “father of the revolution” and even of all the Soviets, but right after Stalin’s death, he delivered the infamous speech on “Stalin’s cult of personality” and “Stalin’s crimes,” blaming all the faults and mistakes of the past on Stalin alone and walking away unscathed. From the very beginning, he discredited and eliminated any communist cadre he saw as a rival—branding critics as capitalist-roaders or agents of foreign powers within the party. Some he placed before cold gun barrels, others he locked away in cold prison cells. And he carried out all of this under the cover of intense manipulation. He was extremely skilled in manipulating communist cadres, discrediting them, and turning them into enemies.

Undoubtedly, a political line that enabled such practices was dominant within the Communist Party. The party had become detached from the masses; those among the masses who voiced criticism were branded as agents or capitalist sympathizers and cast out. Bureaucratism grew unchecked. The dictatorship of the proletariat was replaced with a dictatorship of the party. A privileged class of elites emerged. All of these go beyond the scope of this article, so here we will focus solely on the liquidation aspect through the example of Khrushchev. Of course, in terms of program, ideology, organizational structure, and what defines a communist party, such liquidating, destructive figures who aim to turn the wheel of history backward have no place. The disease was internal and deeply rooted. What Khrushchev did was simply take up residence in that already diseased part.

The only thing that sustains a communist party is the masses. The fruit of a tree whose roots grow deep in the soil of the people is revolution. The moment the Soviet revolution became detached and alienated from the masses, Khrushchev—the miserable knight of

hesitation and despair—took the stage and turned his sword on the communists. Using organizational authority as his shield, he sacrificed the communists within the party, so to speak. Because a tremendous authoritarianism had taken root within the party, and it was flourishing through organizational power. Individuals who held both seats on the Party Central Committee and heads of various “state commissions” wielded immense power.

Marxism advocates the transfer of authority and power to the masses and the shrinking of the state. The eventual disappearance of the state as an apparatus can only occur through the involvement and empowerment of the masses. If you centralize authority and spawn new state institutions, that cannot be called Marxism. It simply isn't.

Hell's Guardians Dressed in Heaven's Robes

Though names and geographies change, every land has its own Khrushchevs. Just as Marxism is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions, so is liquidationism; it analyzes conditions insidiously, waits patiently, and settles into any gap it can find at the first opportunity.

Deng Xiaoping was one of the key figures in the Chinese Communist Party. He served on the Central Committee for many years and held the post of Prime Minister between 1952 and 1966 after the revolution. However, he was clearly uncomfortable with Mao's communist revolutionary stance, both socially and economically. And without a doubt, he followed in the footsteps of his comrade Khrushchev. He carved out a political space for himself within the party. His first targets were, of course, the Marxists. And while purging Marxists, he claimed he was doing so in the name of Marxism. He masterfully inherited and implemented Khrushchev's legacy.

Likewise, Liu Shaoqi employed the same methods and tried to organize his liquidationist ideas—ideas that foresaw the dismantling of the revolution—within the party. Liu also served as vice chairman both within the party and the state bureaucracy and was appointed to the most important roles within the party. And alongside all this, he was a skilled liquidationist. In his view, the party belonged to him personally. He saw the party as his private property and treated everyone else as mere guests. The right to lead the party and take it in whatever direction he wished belonged to him alone. In short, the common trait among these conciliatory and revisionist elements was their intent to liquidate the communists.

The Cultural Revolution, which began in 1966, was also a cleansing movement. The goal was to purge the party of revisionist, destructive, and liquidationist elements like Liu and Deng, and to continue the struggle with genuine Marxists—and so it happened. Liu, Deng, and their comrades were expelled from the party, stripped of all state positions, and

publicly exposed. The communists they had slandered and cast aside were reinstated and returned to their duties. Though the excesses that occurred during the Cultural Revolution have been the subject of criticism, justice was served in the case of these harmful weeds.

However, sadly, the party was unable to fully transform itself from within. Cadres who shared the same views as Liu and Deng concealed their true beliefs, engaged in full-blown dissimulation, and even became the most zealous defenders of the Cultural Revolution—going so far as to attack people like Liu and Deng with the greatest intensity. Beneath the rose garden lay a hidden field of thorns; hell roamed within the party dressed in heavenly robes. These elements were the Trojan horses of the external capitalist army.

Seizing the opportunity created by the power vacuum following Mao's death, these hellish figures in heaven's garb flung open the party's gates and welcomed back all those who had been expelled by communists. They gradually liquidated the communists. Worse still, they restored the reputations of ideologically bankrupt figures like Liu and Deng and condemned the Cultural Revolution. At the 11th Central Committee meeting in 1977, they readmitted Deng into the party by emphasizing that he supported a socialist orientation critical of Mao's ideology, and paved the way for him to assume major political positions, such as vice chairman.

Undoubtedly, there are many complex reasons behind this entire process. And the causes leading to these outcomes are not external—they are internal. The Nazis, with all their tanks and artillery, couldn't defeat the Soviets—but Khrushchev and his cronies brought it to ruin from within. The revolution that Chiang Kai-shek and Japanese imperialism failed to crush was eaten away and destroyed from the inside.

God Sold the Revolution

The ability of the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) to unite fragmented forces and opposition groups across Nepal was a remarkable historical experience. As the poet says, *"A single snowflake may be nothing, but thousands can form an avalanche,"* and this illustrates how unity and growth lead to transformation. Our class enemies relish our fragmentation precisely because they fear the avalanche. By uniting these scattered movements with the masses, the CPN (Maoist) launched a ten-year war in 1996, directing the full force of the people and the revolutionary movement against the monarchy. In a short time, they captured Nepal's rural regions through the Maoist People's War strategy and reached an extraordinary position. Now, the guns of victory roared at the gates of Kathmandu, and the bells of doom tolled for the monarchy and feudal lords who had offered the people nothing but servitude and submission. The Nepalese revolution advanced with determination, firmly within the orbit of the Maoist People's War strategy.

They had correctly analyzed the concrete conditions of the country and developed tactics and strategies tailored to those conditions.

Inside, the feudal lords and bourgeoisie, and outside, the imperialist capitalist forces, joined together to destroy and liquidate the revolution. But the downfall of the revolution wasn't the success of the bourgeoisie—it was the failure of the CPN. The revolution collapsed the moment they deviated from Mao's path. As we've said before, once you begin to shake the foundations of bourgeois rule, they will not sit idly by. They will attack with all their might, with every weapon, aiming at your weakest link, trying to liquidate you. That's normal. What's not normal is failing to resist these attacks.

The bourgeoisie sought to turn Prachanda into a barricade in front of the Nepalese revolution—and they succeeded. But Prachanda's surrender cannot be explained by him alone. The CPN (Maoist) effectively added Prachanda to Nepal's pantheon of thousands of gods. They saw him as a divinity beyond question. They even spoke of the "Prachanda Path," claiming he had made new contributions to science and was guiding it into a new stage. But revolution belongs not to individuals or parties—it is the work of the masses. History has shown that any political line or ideology that reverses the tool-and-purpose relationship plays a destructive role.

Fetishizing individuals or parties, adopting a fanatical loyalty to them, destroys free thinking and the spirit of questioning. It cloaks the instrument with a veil of untouchability—this is the liquidation of science and reason. For communists, nothing is untouchable; no one is beyond the reach of criticism. But the CPN followed a political line that granted Prachanda such immunity. They equated touching Prachanda with touching the revolution itself. And tragically, it was Prachanda who touched the revolution—who sold it off for pennies in a bourgeois marketplace. He and his comrades burned the red flag atop the world in the bourgeoisie's fireplace.

To say the bourgeoisie "seized" the revolution is a one-sided, flawed view. The truth is: **a god sold the revolution.** No god stands with the people. Yes, the disarming of thousands of guerrillas—under the guise of reintegrating them into society as though communists are bloodthirsty lovers of death and disconnected from the people—was a liquidationist move initiated from within, from the very top. The revolution was not destroyed from the outside—it was dismantled from the inside.

Given the wealth of clear and concrete historical evidence showing how the fetishization of individuals and parties corrodes and destroys revolutions, it is not normal that, nearly a century later, communist parties still walk this path. Individuals come and go. Parties are merely necessary tools of the present moment. When too much meaning is placed on the

tool, it begins to take on the role of the goal. Organizing people not for the revolution, but for a party or an individual, becomes the norm. The idea that “the party is everything” replaces the ideal of communism itself. The space for vibrant political debate and the mechanism of criticism and self-criticism is dismantled, paving the way for party dictatorship. The masses—who are everything—are reduced to nothing.

The leadership at the top of the party begins to behave as though it owns both the party and the revolution. A rigid status quo becomes firmly entrenched. From this point on, governing becomes an obsession embedded in the cadres’ very being. All their energy is directed toward preserving their rank and status. They surround themselves with like-minded people and wage war against those who are not like them. Every criticism is perceived as a threat to their seat. From this point, any cadre who has established their own domain of power refuses to be reassigned. They will not abandon their personal kingdom. Rather than organizing at lower levels, they would rather quit the struggle altogether. That is preferable to them. They refuse to be led by those they’ve trained—because they are not communists.

For a true communist, distributing newspapers on the street is no different from holding a leadership position in the organization. But for these gentlemen, it is not the same—because **they are not communists.**

In Conclusion

Today, as the winds have turned into storms under the weight of historical conditions, a ghost haunts the skies over us—the ghost of Khrushchev. And without a doubt, the students of this mentality that now dominates the communist and leftist movement are continuing to walk the same pathetic path as their ideological ancestors—Khrushchev and his historical ilk.

It’s worth reminding once again: every political line produces its own leadership, its own cadre type, its own culture—and everything within the organization and struggle reflects this political line. Unfortunately, the Communist Party is not a monolithic, unified, or complete organism. People from different classes and social strata join the party. And they bring with them the thought patterns and behaviors of the class they come from. In a party with well-established organizational mechanisms and strong ideological grounding, these individuals can quickly be transformed into soldiers of the working class and become engines driving the revolution forward. But in ideologically weak parties that stumble through the revolutionary struggle, such individuals not only fail to transform—they rise to the upper ranks at the first opportunity and begin organizing around their own ideas. They follow a conciliatory rather than combative path.

It's no coincidence that such tendencies emerge during every crisis in revolutionary movements. That's exactly what we are experiencing today. For our geography, Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, any communist who sees themselves as responsible for organizing the revolution must understand that the current ideological crisis in the revolutionary movement is rooted in its class character. The revolutionary movement has fallen under the dominance of petty bourgeois cadres—many of whom are neck-deep in the mire of private property and comfort in Europe. That's why this ideological breakdown has become a permanent condition. This is precisely where liquidation is taking place. Every political line has an ideological texture and a class nature. No analysis can be separated from this class character. When current leaderships or cadres who are themselves liquidationist cry “liquidation!”—what else is that if not a sleight of hand? They declare every group that leaves, every individual who breaks away, as liquidationist.

Sorry, but those are your creations. The type of people produced by a liquidationist leadership is unfortunately just that. And if everyone who leaves is truly a liquidationist in the literal sense, that is entirely your creation—and your problem. Because the audience you seek to reach and organize is not the working class. You have not even a single thread of organization within the working class. If you lean on a paper pillar, don't wail when it collapses. Because that was your conscious choice. And moreover, the class you've allied yourself with is the petty bourgeoisie. That is precisely why you have no unity of destiny with communists. The radical stance of the working class and its representatives—the communists—disturbs you.

Therefore, the liquidation movement within the communist community originates from the very top. And this top bureaucracy is the human product of that political line. Claiming to bring down the system without first tearing down the bourgeois power in your own mind is like something out of a box-office hit with a laughable plot. And still, despite this clear and visible reality, searching for liquidationists “out there” is nothing more than a way to hide from your own truth.

The saying “*even mountains can't withstand the burden of inheritance*” isn't ours—it belongs to the people. This mentality has already exhausted the inheritance of the past. The mountains are gone, the vineyards too. If they've turned a lush green valley into barren wasteland, it's entirely due to their class character. Any other explanation is empty and driven by agenda. That's why they label every dissenting line and individual as a liquidationist, just like a thief accusing the homeowner of theft to silence them.

From all this, we can clearly state:

- Any line that disconnects the party from the masses is liquidationist.
- Any leadership that fails to unite with its comrades is, in itself, liquidationist.
- A line that hands over powers—even greater than those held in wartime command—to one or two individuals living abroad away from the struggle is **not Maoist**.
- A party leadership that has lost its capacity to unite, that continues to shrink and divide instead of growing, and doesn't even bother to address it, has lost the initiative to be communist—it is the host at the table of liquidation.

Wherever you see a party from which communists have been pushed out, marginalized, and excluded—know that the miserable, worthless architects of this rotten order are at work there. A ship whose sails are filled with the winds of capitalism can only end up docking in the harbor of the bourgeoisie.

There's a particularly meaningful folk tale about the Soviet Revolution. The story goes like this:

Lenin took the controls of the Soviet train and said, "Comrades, let's all throw coal into the boiler together. No matter what happens, this revolution train must not stop."

After Lenin, Stalin came to the front and said, "Let's throw more coal in, comrades, the train seems to be slowing down."

Then came Khrushchev, who said, "Draw the curtains so no one notices the train has stopped, comrades," and then quietly exited the train...

This article was originally published in *Maoist Perspektif (Maoist Perspective)* journal.

<https://maoistperspektif.com/tasfiyecilik-uzerine/>