

## **The Loss of Revolutionary Integrity: Isolation, Intolerance, and the Distortion of Proletarian Democracy**

Democracy is a Class Character. There is no democracy that is class-neutral or above classes. Proletarian democracy differs from bourgeois democracy in terms of the political objectives, governance style, and culture it represents. The democracy upheld by those who enslave and exploit cannot be equated or compared with the democracy established by the exploited to eliminate the exploitation-based societal system. The governance forms of these two irreconcilable classes will inherently differ according to their essence.

Any understanding of democracy that does not lead society in line with the class interests of the working class and all laboring masses, does not aim to establish an equal and free social system, and does not assume leadership for societal development is unrelated to the proletarian understanding of democracy, regardless of whether it is in power or fighting to come to power.

Communists advocate for a system where the masses are not viewed or used as a governed herd but become direct participants in governance, managing themselves. They work towards this goal. For the proletariat to play its role as a ruling class in the revolutionary transformation of society, there is only one solution: abolishing the exploitative order based on private property. Equality and proletarian democracy cannot be considered independently of property relations. As long as capitalist property relations and dictatorship persist, the promises of equality and democracy offered by reformist trends have no connection to the proletarian understanding of democracy. These promises belong to those who suspend class struggle and worship class peace.

It is clear that no revolutionary workers' organization fighting for social freedom and equality, regardless of its stage of development, can make any decision detrimental to its allied forces or the working masses, who are also the driving forces of the revolution in their quest to seize power. Such erroneous practices cannot be pursued. This is because the proletarian class struggle and its understanding of democracy reject all attitudes and forms of oppression that harm the masses. It must not be forgotten that today's lines of struggle, organization, and governance represent small-scale models of the governance that will be established in tomorrow's power.

The question of what kind of power and democracy is envisioned can be clearly answered, particularly in the context of the revolutionary movement in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, by examining several key factors. The primary condition is to understand how each party

and organization approaches differing views within its ranks. This includes whether internal democracy exists, how dissenting opinions are treated when expressed outside the organization, and most importantly, how separations are handled—whether stemming from politically resolvable issues or inevitable ideological and programmatic differences.

A crucial lens for this evaluation is how the organization approaches the masses involved in such separations and how it responds to criticisms from allies and the people. Whether an organization defines itself as communist or revolutionary, its understanding of democracy can easily be discerned through its stance on differing views and splits. This is because the way such issues are addressed is directly tied to the approach toward contradictions among the masses, who are the driving forces of the revolution. Consequently, this approach reveals the organization's true understanding of democracy and governance.

How these contradictions are managed, and how criticism and internal differences are handled, serve as a reflection of each political entity's vision of democracy and power. This approach not only impacts internal dynamics but also the broader relationship with the masses and allies, offering a clear view of the political maturity and sincerity of the revolutionary or communist project in question.

Unfortunately, in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, the political approaches and attitudes of petty-bourgeois movements regarding the resolution of contradictions among the masses are often marked by sectarianism, destructiveness, and a lack of service to revolutionary goals. Their methods for addressing internal organizational contradictions are no different from the destructive approaches employed in dealing with issues among the masses. The vicious cycle that has persisted since the 1970s has not been broken.

These political movements' monolithic (uniform) organizational understanding, fueled by petty-bourgeois opportunist ideological orientation, excludes proletarian democracy. In matters of separation and internal party issues, these petty-bourgeois movements exhibit destructive and reactionary attitudes. Maoist groups, while not identical to these trends, have also been known to take similarly sectarian and destructive stances. The critiques by the Maoist Communist Party (MCP) of these petty-bourgeois trends, and even of Maoist groups themselves when they display such behaviors, constitute a significant body of work on this issue.

Regrettably, even those who identify as Maoists have occasionally exhibited opportunistic and outright reactionary attitudes and styles—long criticized by others—in their approach to contradictions within the masses and within their own parties. These practices reveal a

profound deviation from the revolutionary and democratic principles they claim to uphold, undermining both the internal cohesion of their organizations and their relationship with the broader revolutionary movement.

In the understanding of mass line politics held by Marxists, Leninists, and Maoists, the resolution of contradictions among the people does not involve the politics of coercion. Coercion should not be understood merely as brute force, such as violence or killing. It also encompasses reactionary methods such as intimidation, slander, threats, and isolation.

For Maoists, the method of resolving contradictions among the masses and within the party cannot involve coercion, threats, suppression, prohibition, slander, or exclusion. These reactionary approaches contradict the principles of proletarian democracy and the mass line, which emphasize unity, persuasion, and a constructive engagement with differing views.

The Maoist perspective holds that contradictions among the people should be addressed through dialogue, ideological struggle, and democratic methods that respect the revolutionary potential and agency of the masses. Such an approach not only strengthens the revolutionary movement but also ensures that it remains aligned with its foundational principles of equality, justice, and collective empowerment. Using reactionary methods in resolving internal or external conflicts would undermine the very essence of the revolutionary project and alienate the masses, who are the driving force of any revolutionary transformation.

When examining the attitudes and approaches displayed in the recent splits among Maoists, it becomes evident that those claiming to be the continuators of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) have not drawn the correct lessons from its legacy in addressing differing ideas and issues of separation. Even if we were to concede that the Cultural Revolution was not adequately understood, one must ask: Were no lessons learned from the experiences of the proletarian party itself or the critiques made by our own party? It is abundantly clear that no such lessons were taken to heart.

The handling of the split within MKP (Maoist Communist Party) by the "3rd Congress" faction in 2014 and the approach of the two factions in the recent split within TKP/ML (Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist)—namely, Özgür Gelecek (Free Future) and Yeni Demokrasi (New Democracy)—show striking similarities in essence. What occurred within TKP/ML appears less like a split in a revolutionary organization and more like a

confrontation between hostile opposing camps. Regardless of who was more at fault, the methods employed—threats, slander, insults, intimidation, isolation, coercion, and attrition—paint a picture that has little to do with revolutionary principles.

Similarly, the methods adopted by the MKP "3rd Congress" faction were no different. This pattern of behavior, marked by sectarianism, destruction, and reactionary tactics, indicates a serious deviation from Maoist principles and the lessons of both the GPCR and subsequent revolutionary experiences. These approaches not only undermine the potential for resolving contradictions constructively but also harm the revolutionary movement by replicating practices that alienate the masses and erode internal unity.

Such practices starkly contrast with the revolutionary ethics and the mass line, which emphasize unity-criticism-unity, constructive engagement with opposing views, and the cultivation of a democratic culture within the party and among the masses. Without a conscious effort to learn from past mistakes and adhere to these principles, these splits risk perpetuating the very reactionary tendencies they claim to oppose.

The Maoist party has not only conducted self-criticism regarding the revolutionary methods needed to address separations but has also criticized the left-sectarian and counterproductive attitudes, decisions, and behaviors of TKP/ML toward groups such as Uzun Yürüyüş (Long March), Yeniden İnşa (Reconstruction) activists, and Devrimci Dönüşüm (Revolutionary Transformation) activists. Despite these critiques, it is apparent that both TKP/ML and MKP "3rd Congress" factions have now converged on the same left-sectarian and destructive approach in dealing with internal contradictions.

When examining the attitudes and methods employed in addressing the issue of separations, both organizations have failed to uphold revolutionary principles and methods. This failure highlights a significant deviation from the Maoist understanding of addressing contradictions constructively and in a manner aligned with revolutionary objectives.

Particularly concerning is the Halkın Günlüğü (People's Daily) line, which has discarded all evaluations and lessons the Maoist movement has made on this issue. This outright rejection not only disregards the collective experience and critique of the movement but also signals a concerning shift in the political trajectory of this line. It reflects an abandonment of the principles of proletarian democracy and revolutionary unity, instead opting for a path that deepens fragmentation and weakens the broader struggle.

This situation underscores the urgent need for a return to principled methods of addressing contradictions, emphasizing unity, self-criticism, and revolutionary ethics. Without such a shift, these organizations risk undermining the revolutionary potential of the Maoist movement and alienating both their members and the broader masses they seek to lead.

The left-sectarian, destructive, and liquidationist stance taken on the issue of separations is clear evidence of a failure to grasp the scientific method of Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism in resolving contradictions among the masses and within the party. Ignoring the dialectical understanding that separations inherently contain the potential for unity, and sidelining the political and revolutionary principle that unity is not only possible but necessary when approached on a revolutionary basis, leads to a grave error.

This failure manifests in the treatment of the opposing or minority faction as if they were enemies, rather than comrades with differing perspectives. Such an approach not only undermines revolutionary unity but also contradicts the fundamental principles of dialectical materialism, which emphasize resolving contradictions through struggle and synthesis, not through alienation or hostility.

Marxist, Leninist, and Maoist principles call for handling internal and external contradictions constructively, with an eye toward strengthening unity in the service of revolutionary goals. The abandonment of this scientific approach not only deepens divisions but also weakens the collective ability of the revolutionary movement to advance. By treating disagreements as irreconcilable hostilities, organizations risk turning ideological and political differences into personal or factional feuds, thereby diverting energy away from the revolutionary struggle and into destructive internal conflicts.

A revolutionary approach demands that separations be handled with a perspective that prioritizes unity-criticism-unity, maintaining a clear focus on common goals and principles. Failing to do so not only damages the immediate organizations involved but also sets a dangerous precedent for handling contradictions in the broader movement.

Being numerically strong does not necessarily mean being right or just. However, opportunists and those lacking Marxist theory and principles may claim that the majority is always correct. Assertions like "I am the party," "I am the majority," or "I am legitimate," followed by dismissing the other side of a split or disagreement with statements such as "You are not the party," "You are the minority," or "You are illegitimate," reflect a flawed and reactionary mindset. This approach often involves labeling, defaming, and portraying the opposing side as an enemy. It also demonstrates an inability to tolerate criticism directed

at them.

Such individuals believe they have the right to say anything they wish, while denying the other side the opportunity to defend themselves. This intolerant and undemocratic approach to criticism and debate is so distorted that even bourgeois democrats often avoid descending to such a poor standard of discussion. Yet, these self-proclaimed Maoists fail to recognize the depths of the flawed and destructive culture they have embraced.

This mentality fundamentally contradicts the revolutionary principles of Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism, which call for a scientific and dialectical approach to resolving contradictions. Instead of fostering open, principled debate, this mindset perpetuates sectarianism, alienation, and a retreat into dogmatic authoritarianism. Revolutionary ethics demand a willingness to engage in self-criticism and to address disagreements constructively, with a focus on advancing the collective struggle—not silencing dissent or dismissing opposing perspectives. The failure to uphold these principles not only weakens internal unity but also undermines the credibility and legitimacy of the revolutionary movement itself.

In normal times, concepts like the Cultural Revolution, two-line struggle, and the Maoist democratic mass line are frequently emphasized. However, in the face of an internal split, these scientific principles are quickly set aside, and a left-sectarian, authoritarian, and destructive approach takes over. For instance, during the split involving the "3rd Congress" faction, they referred to our movement with reactionary and inappropriate labels such as "a handful of people," "an insignificant group," and "unknowns." These descriptions are entirely incompatible with revolutionary culture, the Maoist mass line, and the principles of democracy.

Such behavior reflects a stark contradiction between professed principles and actual practice. The Maoist approach, rooted in scientific socialism, demands that internal contradictions and splits be addressed with revolutionary methods—through unity-criticism-unity, respectful engagement, and a focus on ideological and political advancement. Resorting to dismissive and demeaning rhetoric betrays these principles and fosters a culture of division and destructiveness.

This pattern reveals a deep-seated deviation from the teachings of the Cultural Revolution and the mass line, both of which emphasize the importance of engaging with contradictions in a way that strengthens unity and develops collective revolutionary consciousness. Revolutionary organizations must hold themselves to higher standards,

ensuring that their internal struggles are resolved in a manner that reflects their stated commitment to proletarian democracy and the revolutionary transformation of society. Failing to do so not only discredits the organization but also weakens the broader revolutionary movement by perpetuating sectarianism and alienation.

All of this reflects the influence of bourgeois political practices within class politics. Those who cannot tolerate the criticisms or revolutionary opposition of groups they dismiss today as “insignificant,” “a handful of people,” or “the minority” are clearly unprepared to lead the construction of proletarian democracy in the future. Such attitudes, if given the opportunity, would suppress opposition today or tomorrow with authoritarian force.

Splits are an inevitable part of class struggle. Those who are intolerant of criticism during these divisions, who attempt to suppress, intimidate, isolate, or destroy the opposing side using non-revolutionary methods, cannot call themselves Maoists. These are reactionary practices inherited from bourgeois politics.

This does not mean that opposition or criticism is always correct or justified—criticisms may be right or wrong, valid or invalid. What matters is the maturity to respect the right of others to express those criticisms. It is deeply tragic for anyone who identifies as a communist to fall behind even bourgeois democrats in addressing internal or popular issues and in demonstrating a consciousness of democracy.

Relying on numerical strength after a split to isolate a revolutionary structure from democratic and collaborative work, and resorting to exclusionary, sectarian policies, is a stark reflection of the revolutionary movement’s flawed understanding of power and democracy in Turkey. That some petty-bourgeois organizations align with such reactionary policies further underscores the problem.

This situation not only exemplifies the ideological degeneration within certain sections of the revolutionary movement but also reveals the extent to which bourgeois influences have taken root. It serves as a dramatic example of the disconnect between proclaimed revolutionary ideals and actual practices, highlighting the urgent need for a return to revolutionary principles, grounded in proletarian democracy and dialectical methods, to address contradictions constructively and advance the struggle.

The current situation, with two MKPs and two TKP/MLs following the recent splits, highlights a profound political and ideological crisis within the revolutionary movement. Even before the split within TKP/ML, the faction aligned with the "3rd Congress" group adopted a stance

of exclusively engaging with them and refusing to engage with us, despite our continued use of the name MKP. Their refusal to recognize us and engage in dialogue, simply because we maintained our name and identity as MKP, reflects a destructive and reactionary approach, far removed from revolutionary principles.

The "3rd Congress" faction, particularly within prisons, adopted a reactionary policy of exclusion, propagating arguments like "if they are present, we are not," "do not engage with them," and "they cannot use the name of the party." This approach led to our isolation in joint events and actions. Tragically, TKP/ML was the first to align with this bourgeois-derived mindset, followed by MLKP and TKİP. As a result, in prisons where MKP "3rd Congress" members, TKP/ML, MLKP, and TKİP prisoners cooperated, MKP prisoners were systematically isolated.

The right to use our party's name, which is both a politically necessary and natural entitlement, was turned into a justification for exclusion by these so-called allies. This approach not only undermines the principles of proletarian solidarity and revolutionary unity but also demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding of the dialectical nature of contradictions within the revolutionary movement.

Such actions perpetuate sectarianism and weaken the broader struggle against the bourgeois order, reflecting an inability to transcend petty factionalism in favor of advancing collective goals. It is imperative for revolutionary organizations to critically assess and overcome these destructive tendencies, returning to a principled approach grounded in proletarian democracy, respect for internal contradictions, and the collective strength of the revolutionary movement.

DHKP/C, in contrast to the "3rd Congress" group's reactionary demands, did not partake in these exclusionary policies. Similarly, the PKK maintained revolutionary and amicable relations. However, the organizations we mentioned—still trapped in a petty-bourgeois mindset, a narrow experiential cycle, and the superficiality of equating the struggle solely with themselves—persisted in their policy of isolating our prisoners.

Those who consider "severing social relations" with a revolutionary organization to be a revolutionary policy continue to isolate the communist prisoners of our party, who remain steadfast in their revolutionary stance, culture, and principles. They refuse to establish political and ideological connections, mistaking this isolation for revolutionary practice.

So detached are they from reality that they fail to attend commemorations to which they



are invited, and they exclude neighboring prisoners from memorials for fallen revolutionaries. Such behavior, in stark contrast to the values of unity and solidarity held dear by conscious masses, alienates the people and risks turning them away from revolutionary structures.

For these comrades to call their approach revolutionary politics is a serious misjudgment. Who are you to decide what name we can or cannot use? Is there a theory that grants naming rights to the numerically larger faction in splits? Beyond that, what benefit does your policy of isolation bring to the revolutionary movement? We believe it would be beneficial for you to reflect on this matter.

The isolation and suppression policies aimed at us, which cannot hinder or regress our struggle, serve as a reflection of the flawed understanding of democracy held by those who implement them. As class-conscious masses evaluate their approach, we fulfill our duty to critique these practices. No party or organization has the right to dictate how another party defines, expresses itself, or chooses its name.

In the case of a split within a party, it is neither logical nor revolutionary to deem one faction legitimate and the other illegitimate based solely on numerical strength. Treating the name as legitimate for one side but prohibited for the other, isolating and excluding one faction from revolutionary platforms and activities, and enforcing a form of name censorship is entirely incompatible with revolutionary politics.

This attitude not only betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of democracy but also undermines the principles of solidarity, respect for differing views, and the collective struggle. Revolutionary politics should aim to build bridges, foster unity, and resolve contradictions through dialogue and constructive engagement—not through exclusionary tactics that mimic the oppressive practices of the bourgeois order. Such policies do more harm than good, alienating comrades and weakening the broader revolutionary movement.

The question of which faction of TKP/ML should be recognized or engaged with following its split is a reflection of a flawed, opportunistic, and liquidationist approach to revolutionary politics. According to this distorted logic, one side must be deemed legitimate while the other is dismissed, despite both factions continuing to use the same name. In practice, this has resulted in absurd contradictions, such as "Yeni Demokrasi" accusing "Özgür Gelecek" of factionalism, refusal to recognize authority, and coup-mongering, while "Özgür Gelecek" counters with accusations of bureaucratic liquidationism, seizure of the Central Committee, factionalism, and various other claims. So, which is legitimate?

This question itself is juvenile because no one has the authority to dictate the legitimacy or naming rights of another organization. Yet, the petty-bourgeois structures that have sought to isolate and suppress our party—both ideologically and politically—had no issue with the two factions of TKP/ML using the same name. Furthermore, these same structures maintained closer relations with "Özgür Gelecek" despite the accusations and ideological disagreements they themselves harbored.

This exposes a glaring contradiction: if TKP/ML refuses to engage with us because we share the same name as the "3rd Congress" group, then consistency would demand that they also refuse to engage with either faction of TKP/ML, both of which also use the same name. Yet both factions of TKP/ML, despite continuing to use the same name, have been allowed to maintain relations with others, including parties and organizations that claim to uphold revolutionary principles.

This opportunistic double standard is an example of inconsistency and lack of principle. Organizations like MLKP, TKİP, and others have hypocritically aligned with the "3rd Congress" group while refusing to apply the same standards to the TKP/ML factions. Even more troubling is TKP/ML's own opportunistic and liquidationist stance in isolating our party, despite ostensibly holding a Maoist ideological line and even branding the "3rd Congress" group as revisionist in their evaluations.

This inconsistency demonstrates that these organizations lack a coherent and principled approach to handling splits, whether within themselves or externally. Their inability to uphold revolutionary principles when dealing with ideological or organizational contradictions is a stark indicator of their failure to embody genuine proletarian democracy. Instead, they have embraced exclusionary, reactionary policies rooted in ideological opportunism and political calculations. This highlights the urgent need for a serious reckoning with the principles of democracy, unity, and revolutionary ethics within the revolutionary movement.

On this occasion, let us summarize our understanding based on the Maoist Party's evaluation during its 1st Congress in 2002:

We do not claim the right to question whether any political structure, which defines itself as a party or organization based on its own principles and ideological perspective, is indeed a party or organization. Similarly, we do not have the right to debate, in the case of splits within parties or organizations external to us, who is legitimate, who is not, who has

the right to use a name, and who does not.

Our prerogative is limited to determining, within the framework of proletarian revolutionary mass politics and our understanding of alliances, how and where we can collaborate with these political structures or, if collaboration is not possible, to clearly state the reasons why.

To clarify with an example: the fact that both factions resulting from the split within TKP/ML use the same name is not, and cannot be, a matter of debate for us. However, we retain the right to shape our relationships based on our evaluations of revolutionary, comradely, and allied parties and organizations.

This stance reflects the principles of proletarian democracy and revolutionary ethics, emphasizing respect for other organizations' self-definition while maintaining clarity and independence in our own relationships and collaborations. It prioritizes political and ideological integrity over sectarian or exclusionary practices, ensuring that our approach aligns with the collective interests of the revolutionary struggle.

In the 1990s, discussions emerged in prison councils about whether certain political structures qualified as organizations and, consequently, whether they could participate in these councils. Similar debates resurfaced in the early 2000s within the prisoner front. The Maoist Party condemned such subjective and exclusionary debates. The notion that "three-person organizations are influencing the fate of groups numbering in the hundreds or thousands" was quite popular at the time, reflecting a flawed and elitist approach to representation and collaboration.

The Maoist Party critically evaluated and denounced these problematic aspects of democracy and power dynamics. These discussions were not about strengthening revolutionary unity but instead fostered division and sectarianism. The party recognized that such attitudes were not only detrimental to solidarity but also contradicted the principles of proletarian democracy and revolutionary ethics.

Unfortunately, the architects of Eurocommunist concepts and their adherents have long forgotten these lessons, perpetuating exclusionary and elitist practices. By rejecting these sectarian and reactionary tendencies, the Maoist Party reaffirmed its commitment to a mass line that prioritizes unity, constructive engagement, and respect for the political agency of all revolutionary structures, regardless of size or influence. This stance underscores the necessity of moving beyond petty factionalism and toward a genuinely

collective revolutionary practice.

In summary, interfering with how any political structure defines itself, imposing restrictions on its chosen name, and using these actions as a justification to isolate or exclude that structure is not revolutionary politics.

Such practices are antithetical to the principles of proletarian democracy and revolutionary ethics. Revolutionary politics should prioritize unity, constructive dialogue, and respect for the self-determination of all revolutionary organizations, focusing on collective advancement rather than exclusion or alienation. This approach not only fosters solidarity but also strengthens the revolutionary movement as a whole, ensuring that ideological differences are resolved through principled engagement rather than reactionary methods.

Isolation, suppression, defamation, manipulation, smear campaigns, and labeling others as enemies—how far can this vicious cycle really go? Those who persist with this mindset will only see the democratic deficits within their own structures grow, along with their other weaknesses.

Such practices not only deepen internal contradictions but also erode the credibility and revolutionary potential of the organizations that employ them. Instead of addressing disagreements through principled struggle, dialogue, and unity, reliance on these reactionary methods fosters division, alienates allies, and weakens the broader revolutionary movement.

The path forward must involve breaking free from this cycle, embracing a culture of open debate, mutual respect, and proletarian democracy. Without addressing these democratic shortcomings, these structures will continue to face internal stagnation, ideological decay, and an inability to effectively lead or engage with the masses. Revolutionary organizations must adopt methods that prioritize collective strength, principled engagement, and a focus on the ultimate goal of societal transformation.

In theory, every organization appears to oppose “leftist internal violence,” yet when a split occurs, all the democratic rhetoric about this issue is quickly discarded. Nearly all revolutionary organizations criticize violence practiced outside their own ranks, but when dealing with internal splits, they often engage in behaviors ranging from imposing political bans, beatings, and isolation, to outright confiscation of materials and resources. Decisions for elimination, whether figurative or literal, replace ideological criticism,

revealing a practice rife with everything but principled engagement.

The revolutionary movement, trapped in a cycle of left-sectarian liquidationism during splits, seems to have reached a tacit consensus on this issue. For instance, when a split occurs, there's an unspoken agreement to disregard any violence or undemocratic actions taken against the smaller, separated faction. This attitude, which prioritizes numerical strength and pragmatic alliances, essentially amounts to an anti-democratic pact of mutual convenience: "I supported you during your split; now you should do the same for me."

These practices are shaped not by scientific or principled approaches but by conditions and opportunistic calculations. A stark example is how, during our party's recent split, TKP/ML took on a sectarian and exclusionary stance against us, aligning itself with the "3rd Congress" group in a way that mirrored their own opportunistic calculations. However, when TKP/ML experienced its own split, the "3rd Congress" group maintained relations with the Özgür Gelecek faction, leaving the Yeni Demokrasi faction frustrated, essentially saying, "We disregarded those who split from you, so why don't you do the same for us?"

Such practices expose the fundamentally reactionary and bourgeois nature of these approaches, which have nothing in common with the proletariat's class democracy. They highlight how the revolutionary purpose and class struggle have been disconnected from the practices of those who tolerate and perpetuate these behaviors.

Using splits as a basis for heavy accusations, labeling the other side as enemies, and organizing perceptions to isolate factions within revolutionary organizations is outright reactionary behavior. It abandons ideological struggle in favor of practices rooted in manipulation, defamation, and exclusion. These actions, no matter who perpetrates them, are unacceptable and contradict the principles of revolutionary integrity and proletarian democracy.

Revolutionary organizations must reject these reactionary methods and prioritize ideological struggle, principled engagement, and unity-criticism-unity as the basis for addressing contradictions and splits. Anything less undermines the revolutionary movement and aligns with bourgeois methods of division and suppression.

Whether directed at groups, circles, or individual revolutionary breakaways, no pressure can be applied or politics of threats pursued under the guise of demagogic arguments. Such approaches inflict significant harm on the revolutionary movement. Every force,

regardless of size, that struggles against the system within its own framework of principles is a close ally of the communist proletarian movement.

The exclusion, isolation, or subjection to political prohibitions of any revolutionary structure for any reason constitutes an attack on the stance, culture, and understanding of democracy rooted in proletarian revolutionary principles. Such practices are fundamentally incompatible with proletarian class revolutionary ethics and are categorically unacceptable.

The proletarian party holds clear and unequivocal views on its relationships with allies and democratic principles. Our critiques are grounded in the proletariat's vision of democracy and power, reflecting a commitment to fostering solidarity, respect, and principled collaboration among revolutionary forces.

To deviate from this approach by engaging in exclusionary or oppressive practices not only weakens the movement as a whole but also undermines the very essence of proletarian unity and democracy. It is imperative to uphold these values in both criticism and practice, ensuring that revolutionary actions are aligned with the ultimate goal of collective liberation and the advancement of the working class struggle.

A revolutionary party that lacks an understanding of establishing principled relations with allied forces within its mass line cannot credibly claim to be revolutionary; its assertions are merely rhetorical. A party that determines its approach to another revolutionary structure based on the attitudes and actions of a third party has already compromised its ability to lead the democratic system it claims to aspire to build.

The "3rd Congress" group, which in 2014 branded Soviet power as "party dictatorship" and Stalin as a "dictator who isolated opponents," while declaring that "isolation is a crime against humanity," has itself practiced isolation, suppression, and discrediting politics against Maoist communists. Revolutionary organizations that became accomplices in this isolationist and liquidationist policy must now abandon any claims about the democratic nature of the power they claim to aim for.

The use of discrediting and negative labels to marginalize our party, combined with the consensus reached between the "3rd Congress" group and other revolutionary organizations like TKP/ML, MLKP, and TKİP, has manifested in a united front of opportunism. Nowhere is this more evident than in the prisoner front, where Maoist communist prisoners have faced systemic isolation at the hands of this bloc. This is a glaring and extreme

example of the anti-democratic practices employed against those who refuse to conform to sectarian and opportunistic politics.

These practices starkly contradict the principles of proletarian democracy, revolutionary ethics, and solidarity. They demonstrate how far removed some organizations have become from the ideals they profess, raising serious questions about their ability to lead any genuine revolutionary or democratic transformation. Revolutionary politics must prioritize principled engagement, respect for differing views, and a commitment to collective progress over factionalism and exclusion. Anything less undermines the broader revolutionary movement and the values it is meant to uphold.

In the unique conditions of prisons, the tradition of various parties, organizations, individual revolutionaries, and even those who maintain a revolutionary stance without any organizational ties, standing together in solidarity against attacks, has been cast aside by these organizations. This tradition of collective struggle is the product of a heroic and extraordinary history of resistance.

And yet, what are these organizations doing today? They play the "three monkeys" game—see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil—when it comes to the communist prisoners of an organization that resists, is thrown into isolation cells, exiled, and subjected to attacks.

Dear comrades, such behavior and attitudes have nothing to do with revolutionary principles. Ignoring or refusing to support those who resist oppression and attacks not only betrays the tradition of solidarity but also undermines the collective strength of the revolutionary movement. Moreover, there is no value or justification in being "more royalist than the king," adopting stances that serve reactionary interests rather than revolutionary unity.

Revolutionary ethics demand solidarity, mutual respect, and a commitment to defending all those who resist oppression, regardless of their organizational or ideological affiliations. To abandon these principles in favor of sectarianism or opportunism is to betray the legacy of past struggles and weaken the foundations of the revolutionary cause. It is imperative for all revolutionary organizations to return to these principles, fostering unity and collective resistance in the face of oppression and attacks.

It is essential to avoid subjective evaluations based on the biased and manipulated information disseminated by one side in the context of splits. Supporting one side while ignoring the other for pragmatic and opportunistic reasons amounts, in essence, to a

liquidation of revolutionary principles. Criticism and analysis must be rooted in publicly declared understandings and practices shared with the masses, not based on hearsay or the assertions of third parties. A party, organization, group, or circle can only be evaluated through its own declarations and actions.

The politics of isolation does not weaken Maoist communists in their political work or defenses. However, we will continue our critique of revolutionary organizations, calling them to consistency. Instead of hesitating, we will fulfill our duty to openly and honestly explain matters to the masses. We place great importance on exposing the intolerance that plagues the revolutionary movement and continuing critiques on this issue. Let it be clear: we do not limit this discussion to our specific situation. After all, declaring a political force as "non-existent" does not erase that force from existence.

We desire for the revolutionary movement to overcome its weaknesses, and our evaluations reflect this aspiration. The struggle to construct proletarian democracy with a new culture, a new life, and a new scientific strength requires an unwavering commitment to observing social phenomena and their political expressions with clarity and honesty. It also necessitates a strict adherence to truth.

We remind all components of the class movement of the necessity to remain faithful to reality. Only through a principled and truth-oriented approach can the revolutionary movement transcend its weaknesses, fulfill its potential, and genuinely serve the cause of societal transformation.