

# Maoism Versus Opportunism in Turkey

The article below is excerpted from a letter written by the Committee of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (CoRIM) to the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist (TKP/ML) in mid-2001. The TKP/ML is one of several political centres that emerged from the formerly united Communist Party of Turkey Marxist-Leninist (TKPML), which was a founding participant of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement in 1984.

During the course of a series of splits and realignments among Party forces, several centres of the TKPML have emerged, each of which continues to use the name of the Party and claim its heritage. The names of the two largest groupings that exist today are distinguished only by punctuation marks: the TKP(ML) and the TKP/ML. In the RIM Committee letter, reference is made to other centres that have existed in the course of the Party's history, in particular the TKP/ML (Maoist Party Centre), which continues today, and the TKP/ML East Anatolia Regional Committee, usually referred to by its Turkish initials DABK, which merged with the TKP/ML Central Committee to form the TKP/ML Provisional United Central Committee in 1994 and which subsequently split into the above-mentioned TKP/ML, which publishes *Ozgur Gelecek*, and TKP(ML). To minimise confusion concerning the names of the different Party centres, no punctuation is used when referring to the previously united TKPML of 1984 and earlier, and the other centres are referred to by the punctuation they use themselves.

As the letter makes clear, from the formation of RIM onwards serious differences emerged between the TKPML and RIM, and a long process of discussion and struggle has gone on involving the different centres that emerged from the previously united TKPML. The letter is part of the effort waged by CoRIM to clarify RIM's relations with the TKP/ML, whose positions have increasingly diverged from those of RIM as a whole and which has aligned itself with other non-RIM currents within the international communist movement.

CoRIM's letter was never answered by the TKP/ML. A subsequent CoRIM letter dated January 2002 informs the TKP/ML that, "Your political positions and approach have long become intolerable for a participating party or organisation of our Movement. Furthermore, articles in your press (and especially the interview with a leading comrade of your Party from the Black Sea region, which spoke of a "rupture") led us to believe that you no longer considered yourselves part of our Movement.... We have seen no reason to believe you are correcting the serious ideological and political errors that we have criticised in the past. For all of these reasons our Movement has, in keeping with its organisational principles, decided to expel the TKP/ML from RIM."

The excerpted letter below clarifies the political and ideological basis and the historical development behind this serious decision. The full version of the letter has been published in Turkish and will be soon available in English and Turkish in full on the *AWTW* website. The public discussion of this letter will no doubt contribute to the ongoing process of uniting all of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist forces of Turkey into a single centre of the Communist Party of Turkey Marxist-Leninist closely united in RIM. – *A World To Win*

## **Letter to the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist From the Committee of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement**

**Comrades: ....**

The formation of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM), based on its *Declaration*, represented a great victory for the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist (MLM) forces world-wide and in fact marked a major turning point in the crisis of the international communist movement. Your Party participated in this. (Here we are referring to the united Party you were part of.) The formation of RIM laid the basis for ending the process of further disintegration and collapse [of the international communist movement] and replaced it with one of higher unity and the growth of the revolutionary communists – the Maoist forces – in the world. However, shortly after that, strong trends within TKPML and its leadership opposed this basis of unity of the MLM forces.<sup>1</sup>

To this end they put forward a seriously flawed and erroneous argument: that Mao Tsetung Thought<sup>2</sup> did not represent a qualitatively higher and third stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism. On the basis of this and a series of other important criticisms, the *Declaration* was called “opportunist” by the majority of your Party leadership. Even at that time significant forces in the TKPML did not accept these attacks. It is not our intention in this letter to review the struggle that took place within the Party at that time or the actions, tactics and subsequent development of the various forces who either separated from the Party centre to form the Maoist Party Centre or others who continued to struggle for an MLM line within the framework of a single Party centre. The point is that your “centre”, the TKP/ML, is still carrying the ideological baggage of that time and it is high time it took measures to rectify this.

In addition to negating Mao Tsetung Thought, another major criticism made by the TKPML at the time was of the summation contained in the *Declaration* of Stalin’s errors. This question was closely related to the question of Maoism. It is a well-known historical fact that the negation of Mao Tsetung Thought (today Maoism) and the refusal to recognise comrade Stalin’s errors was spearheaded by Enver Hoxha [leader of the Party of Labour of Albania] after Mao’s death and the coup in China. Hoxhaite and semi-Hoxhaite trends (by semi-Hoxhaite we mean those who rejected some of Hoxha’s more outrageous conclusions but adopt his world-view and basic arguments to a large degree) raised their heads in many corners of the international communist movement during the years following Mao’s death. In the communist movement of Turkey, including in the TKPML, this trend was quite pronounced.

There were also several less central but still significant questions contained in your criticism of the *Declaration*. Among your other criticisms was the role of the national bourgeoisie in the democratic revolution in the oppressed nations. These, as well as other criticisms, were expressed in the Report of the Fifth Plenum of the Second Central Committee (CC) of the TKPML and were responded to in our 1986 letter, to which, in the interests of maintaining our focus, we will not return in this document.

As of January 2000 we were informed by your representative that your Party still holds the *Declaration* to be “opportunist”. But what is the reason for this charge now? The principal reason you gave previously for calling our *Declaration* “opportunist” was its emphasis on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought (today MLM) as a third and higher stage of the development of Marxism. Now if you really have accepted MLM as a third and higher stage of Marxism, what is the basis for continuing to hold the position that the *Declaration* is “opportunist”? Or is this a conclusion in search of a justification?

After your Party put forward its seriously wrong positions on Maoism and called the *Declaration* of RIM “opportunist”, there ensued a process of internal struggle between RIM and its parties and organisations and the TKPML, in regard to this and other cardinal questions of revolution. CoRIM [Committee of RIM] wrote a very important letter to your Party responding to your criticisms of the *Declaration*. The first Expanded Meeting of the RIM Committee approved this letter in 1986. This letter seriously criticises your Party’s centrist position on Mao and Maoism and clarifies that the RIM *Declaration* is not only not “opportunist” but is an MLM platform which draws a clear line of demarcation between Marxism and revisionism in today’s world. As we said in our 1986 letter:

“The heart of the dispute between the Communist Party of Turkey Marxist-Leninist and the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement has always been, and remains, the question of *Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought* [today MLM]... Much of the attack on the *Declaration* takes the form of a ‘defence’ of the great Marxist-Leninist Joseph Stalin and the revolutionary heritage of the Third International (Comintern). In fact, this defence is *not*, in essence, a defence of Stalin and the Comintern, and certainly not of their most revolutionary accomplishments; it is, on the contrary, an *attack* on Mao Tsetung and, specifically, on those important criticisms that Mao summed up from the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, criticisms which played an important role in the development of Mao’s most vital contribution to the science of Marxism-Leninism, his theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and which in turn laid the basis for what, in the words of the *Declaration*, represents the most advanced experience of proletarian dictatorship and the revolutionising of society – the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The *Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement* emphasised that, ‘Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism.’”

Your Party also challenged the fact that it was Mao who developed the strategy and tactics of making proletarian revolution in the semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. From the fact that Lenin and Stalin both paid considerable attention to summing up the initial development of a revolutionary movement in these countries and made a series of extremely important observations concerning the revolution there, you wrongly implied that, therefore, Mao did not make a qualitative development of Marxism-Leninism in this field. At that time (in our 1986 letter) we warned that centrism over MLM would lead to abandoning the strategy of people’s war. In fact, at different junctures this centrism led the leadership of TKP/ML to question the possibility and necessity of waging people’s war in Turkey.

Another argument of your Party for calling the *Declaration* “opportunist” was that the *Declaration* boldly sums up the deviations of the Comintern during the Second World War and in the course of adopting the policy of the United Front Against Fascism. In response to this we said that the Party leadership’s blind defence of the Comintern is, “above all, a reflection of the TKPML’s *open rejection* of the conception of Mao Tsetung Thought and its failure to really grasp Mao’s *qualitative contribution* to the science of Marxism-Leninism. In order to pull Mao down it is necessary to build up Stalin and the Comintern and more than that, protect them from any real, critical summation of practice.”

These were the outstanding ideological and political differences between the line of your Party and the line of our Movement. They constituted your Party’s basis for calling the RIM *Declaration* an “opportunist” document since 1985.

Are we arguing that there were no errors in the *Declaration* written in 1984? Of course not, that would be a Hoxhaite failure to see the contradiction in everything. In the course of vigorous debate in the years following the formation of our Movement, we have developed our collective understanding on a number of important questions concerning the analysis of the situation in the world and making revolution. The most far-reaching of these developments are reflected in the document *Long Live*

*Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!* which our Movement adopted in 1993. Not only does that document correctly adopt the term Maoism instead of Mao Tsetung Thought, it explains the content of that change. Through practice in revolutionary struggle and lively internal debate we raised our understanding of the Maoist line for making revolution in the oppressed countries, the universality of people's war and other questions, and this higher understanding was reflected in that document. Important developments have taken place in our analysis of the world situation, including reaching a unified position on the principal contradiction in the world today. Along with these advances in our ideological and political understanding and unity, our Movement has gained precious experience in fulfilling its task as the embryonic centre of the Maoist forces and leading the process of the formation of a new communist international. RIM has made corresponding organisational advances, and its parties and organisations and the Movement as a whole have grown stronger and more capable of fulfilling their responsibilities.

This process has been driven by vigorous internal struggle waged by RIM's parties and organisations. Certainly, various forces in the TKPML have participated directly or indirectly in this process of unity-struggle-unity. But the negative attitude and approach to RIM that your Party is championing did not contribute to this process; rather it can be said that it was an obstacle. The advance of RIM in all aspects, including its ability to overcome earlier errors and weaknesses, is testimony to the strength of the MLM basis on which it was founded.

Since 1985 your Party has gone through many changes of leadership. Every time you called the previous leadership "rightist" or "opportunist". But you never argued, either in meetings with us or in the writings of your Party, that these previous leaderships had a fundamental problem – centrism in regard to life-and-death questions of socialist revolution and Marxism. Even after your Party adopted MLM you did not base this position on a summation of your past deviations on this question. Even after you adopted MLM you refused to drop your position against the *Declaration* or explain why – this time on the basis of calling yourself MLM – you think the *Declaration* is "opportunist". In the following sections we will see how, despite calling yourself MLM, your understanding of our scientific ideology still lapses in important aspects.

## **Your Summation of the TKP/ML's History Shows Your Line**

We believe that the history of advances and problems of TKP/ML must be evaluated mainly in relation to Mao and MLM. Not because of our subjective desire but because it is the reality. We wholeheartedly unite with the position of TKP(ML) in its letter to RIM which said whenever the Party departed from MLM it caused crisis and serious damage. (From the letter of the CC of TKP(ML) to RIM, January 2001).

Only this can be a correct summation of the history of your Party, and it must be taken as a guideline. In your account of "The Brief History of TKP/ML" [from a document entitled, *Hail the Glorious Achievements of Our Party on the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of its Founding and Struggle*, July 1997], this approach is absent. In this account of the TKP/ML history you list numerous problems your Party had had, where you also toss in the question of Mao Tsetung in a very ambiguous way. The failure to recognise the root cause of the problems leads to an eclectic line. The characteristic of an eclectic line is that it muddles together the correct and incorrect. Thus, the partial truths that are expressed become mere demagoguery in the service of what is wrong. This kind of line only confuses minds. Since it pays lip service to some correct points it hopes to prevent the revolutionary masses from seeing its fundamentally wrong essence. Because it mixes primary and secondary problems together, it diverts attention from the essence of the problem. That is why eclecticism has often been the vehicle used by right opportunism when the open advocacy of an overtly opportunist line is difficult – we saw this same situation in China when the revolutionary left had to sharply struggle against the eclecticism serving as a

Trojan Horse for the right opportunist line of Deng Xiao-ping. One would expect that, especially when a document is only a “Brief History”, it would deal with the principal problem at each turning point of the Party’s history.

Your account of Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya’s split from the Shafak revisionists [a group of pro-Soviet revisionists] lacks decisive aspects of historical truth. You fail to underline the fact that the formation of the Party was principally related to the world-wide struggle between Marxism and revisionism. You fail to grasp what Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya stressed, that, “It must be emphatically said that the TKPML is a product of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.” It was under the influence of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and his grasp of MLM that Ibrahim Kaypakkaya could recognise the revisionist essence of the Shafak group even while they were covering their revisionism in a garb of pro-Mao posturing. Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya exposed the reformist, legalist and economist activities of the Shafak revisionists and ruthlessly uncovered their poisonous revisionist eclecticism. He convincingly argued that “these gentlemen think that by changing the name they can change the content”.

In 1979, the Party had correctly pointed out that: “In the fight against Khrushchevite modern revisionism, young Marxist-Leninist parties were born in many countries under the influence of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.... Our Party was born under such conditions [following a reference to, among other things, the “world-wide effects of the Cultural Revolution”] in Turkey and the world.” The formation of the TKPML was part of the whole Marxist-Leninist movement that, to quote the *Declaration*, “has as its origins this historic appeal [referring to the *Proposal for a General Line of the International Communist Movement*] and the polemics that accompanied it.” It was precisely the inspiration of the Cultural Revolution that played a key role in the development of a vanguard party in Turkey. For, as in a great many countries, the history of the communist parties that had been part of the Third International was far from revolutionary. As we said in our 1986 letter: “In the case of Turkey, it seems evident that, on the ideological level as well as in practice, Ibrahim Kaypakkaya represented the kind of rupture with revisionism that was the precondition to the development of a real Marxist-Leninist movement. In fact, the great contribution of Ibrahim Kaypakkaya was to bring Mao Tsetung Thought to Turkey, to begin the process of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought with the concrete realities of Turkey, and, on that basis, to launch the first real and serious efforts to establish red political power amidst the flames of people’s war” [quoted from the 1986 CoRIM letter to TKPML].

## **Grasping the Key Link**

Again, in your account of the Party's history from 1978 onwards, the key link is not grasped.

After the death of Mao and the counter-revolutionary coup in China a crisis broke out in the International Communist Movement and within the communist parties and organisations that had been formed in the midst of the international struggle led by the Communist Party of China and Mao against the modern revisionists in the USSR. This crisis took another leap when the revisionist Enver Hoxha launched a vicious attack against Mao and MLM.

The problem of Mao and Maoism in the Party since then is rooted in that crisis. In some parties there were splits between Marxist-Leninist-Maoists and those that sided with Hua Kuo-feng and Deng Xiao-ping and called China socialist. Some of the that parties that denounced the revisionist nature of the new rulers in China were unable to extend this to digging deeper into Mao and MLM and resolutely upholding and applying MLM. As a result a centrist tendency developed towards MLM in some communist parties and organisations. In some cases this happened because a strong pro-Hoxha trend

developed. In other cases it happened without an explicit pro-Hoxha grouping developing. Nonetheless, whether they openly upheld Hoxha or not, they shared a common line and outlook on vital issues regarding the international communist movement and revolution. Within TKPML there developed a liquidationist and centrist trend concerning Mao and Maoism. The liquidationist tendency was represented by those who were openly pro-Hoxha. But even after Hoxha's attacks against Mao were rebuffed, the TKPML dropped Mao Tsetung Thought. TKPML continued to defend Mao and his contributions but refrained from restoring Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the ideological basis on which, in fact, the Party had been formed.

In your whole account of your "Brief History" there is no mention of this! There is no mention that your Party dropped Mao Tsetung Thought and did not restore it for more than 10 years. Your Party only called itself Marxist-Leninist and even criticised the *Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement* as "opportunist" for upholding Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. It is amazing that you can keep quiet about this long lapse and not sum it up in your "Brief History" even while you deal with diverse (real or imaginary) kinds of deviations of different sections of TKPML in that "Brief History". You treat this long lapse in dropping Maoism as a very minor misunderstanding! You keep quiet about this but you cannot pass up celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of Hoxha's birth in your legal paper, *Ozgur Gelecek!* Is this not amazing?

In your "Brief History" you recount the important and correct struggle of TKPML in 1976 against those who later became Halkin Birligi [who until 1994 called themselves TKP/ML Hareketi, or TKP/ML Movement]. You say: "...the views of this faction and those of the Party were diametrically opposed. These differences were on the analysis of socio-economic structure of the country, the path of revolution, the character of revolution, the preparation for revolution, the main contradiction, and Mao Tse-Tung" [cited from the English translation of *Hail the Glorious...*, 1997]

You correctly call this group a "revisionist" group. But what was the principal reason for their revisionism? If it was liquidation of Mao, then why are you mentioning it last, and referring to the Mao question as one of the differences with this group? In fact it may well be true that your Party at the time dealt with this difference as only one among many. But to treat the difference on this question merely as one of the differences was and is wrong. It is a sign of your centrist line on the cardinality of Mao and Maoism in the fight against revisionism. At that time (as well as now) that was the *key* problem of your Party. Every other problem that you listed in your article boiled down from liquidating Mao. The negation of Ibrahim Kaypakkaya's line flowed from liquidating Mao. If this is not grasped you will not be able to make a correct summation of the Party's history. You will always end up with an eclectic summation. You should follow what Mao taught: grasp the key link! Once one grasps the key link everything else will fall into place.

In the "Brief History" you sum up the February 1978 Conference of your Party in this way: "This Conference was particularly important as a decision was taken to stop organising locally and begin organising centrally. The initial period of the First CC...was qualitatively MLM. Nevertheless, at the fourth meeting, the CC departed from the MLM line and went towards the right.... Despite discussions about People's War, the idea would only stay in theory."

It is true that this Conference was very important in terms of reorganisation of the TKPML. But it is amazing that you *forget* to mention that it was this Conference which changed the guiding ideology of TKPML from Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to Marxism-Leninism. It was this Conference that dropped Mao Tsetung Thought and lowered Mao to the ranks of Dimitrov [a Bulgarian communist who was a leading figure in the international communist movement in the 1930s] and even Hoxha. In 1978 the First Conference of the TKPML published a document entitled "Self-criticism of the TKPML"

addressed to the “Marxist-Leninists of the world”. This document, which examines some questions of the history of the Party, tries to link the conception of Mao Tsetung Thought to the erroneous view put forward by Lin Piao regarding “a new era”. The First Conference stated: “...although F. Engels, J.V. Stalin, G. Dimitrov, E. Hoxha and Mao Tsetung are great teachers, they have not contributed to the theory on a new basis for they have not lived in a new era different from Marx’s or Lenin’s.”

The fact that today your Party evaluates this period of the First CC as “qualitatively Maoist” shows that your understanding of Maoism is still marred by more than a few remnants of Hoxhaism. One expects that when you start criticising the First CC because it “departed from MLM and went to the right” you would mention the fact that it developed a semi-Hoxhaite centrist line on Mao and that it openly negated the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution’s universal application. Instead you beat around the bush in order to avoid the principal deviation of the First CC. Why do you do that? Is it not because you still have not grasped the essence of Maoism despite the fact that you have adopted the name? Your “Brief History” criticises the First CC for not implementing people’s war. While this was an extremely important deviation, it was not the cause but the result. Dropping Mao Tsetung Thought from the guiding line of your Party and negating the universality of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution by your First CC meant that your Party leadership was confused about the nature of its goal: socialism and communism. Dropping Mao Tsetung Thought, especially in the climate of Enver Hoxha’s assault on Mao for “war without perspective” and “populism” (by which he means “based on the peasantry”), also meant dropping people’s war and the basic line Mao developed for revolution in semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries. Unfortunately your Party is still unable to see this fundamental problem. We should stress that your account of this history avoids key questions, reverses the primary and secondary and cause and effect, and sows confusion.

This First TKPML Central Committee correctly opposed the reactionary attacks of Hoxha on Mao Tsetung. But despite the refusal of the TKPML Central Committee to adopt Hoxha’s conclusions, Hoxhaite thinking and approach continued to exert influence. In fact a key feature of the First CC of TKPML was that it tried to strike a “middle ground”. On the one hand it rejected the reactionary attacks of the Hoxhaite on Mao and on the other hand it developed a line *against* accepting Mao’s developments of Marxism-Leninism. Look what it says against Mao indirectly: “Similarly, the idea that links the class struggle to the existence of the bourgeoisie as a class and the idea that propounds its continued existence as a class throughout the historical stage of socialism, are also ideas that constitute a deviation from Marxism-Leninism.” [From the Report of the Ninth Plenum of the First CC of TKPML.] Your account of history misses this important fact of the history of your Party in an astonishing manner! We deeply believe that this is not just a misunderstanding but a line question. Your First CC in a number of its documents rejected Mao’s cardinal analysis of the existence of classes and class struggle under socialism, two-line struggle in the party and the universal significance of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution....

The First CC openly criticised Mao and the Communist Party of China on the vital question of the two-line struggle in the party and put out a “classic” Hoxhaite line that: “The Chinese Communist Party regarded the struggle between the ‘two lines’, i.e. the proletarian line and the bourgeois line, as legitimate. This is not a correct understanding. What is legitimate is ideological struggle within the Party. Whether this turns into a struggle between two lines is dependent on a series of objective and subjective factors.” As we know, neither Enver Hoxha nor the First CC of the TKPML was correct in saying that Mao held that the existence of the bourgeois line was “legitimate”. Rather, he held that such a struggle was inevitable, had material roots, and if not paid attention to would lead to disaster for the proletariat. Mao’s correct understanding was linked to his whole dialectical materialist approach and its application to understanding the laws of socialist society.

In the face of Hoxhaite attacks against Mao, the Party did not firmly defend Mao but took the position that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution does not have universal application. The “Report of the Ninth Plenum” said: “It is to create a theoretical dogma, for instance, to present the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as it took shape in China – which was a product of the specific circumstances in China – as a universal principle.” This position went against the foundations of the TKPML, which was a product of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This kind of position went against the urgent need for drawing a clear line of demarcation between Marxism and revisionism. Compare this position with the sharp and clear position of the *Declaration* that you call an “opportunist” document: “Lenin said, ‘Only he/she is a Marxist who *extends* the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*.’ In the light of the invaluable lessons and advances achieved through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution led by Mao Tsetung, this criterion put forward by Lenin has been further sharpened. Now it can be said that only he/she is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to the recognition of the objective existence of classes, antagonistic class contradictions and of the continuation of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat throughout the whole period of socialism until communism. And as Mao so powerfully stated, ‘*Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism.*’”

Therefore, your “Brief History” definitely closes its eyes when it says that, “The initial period of the First CC... was qualitatively MLM...” and links the departure of the Fourth Plenum of the CC from the “MLM line” to not taking steps towards starting armed struggle and not foreseeing the military coup, etc., problems which however important were not the source but the results. Rather, it could be said that those errors were the logical conclusion of the line adopted earlier.

It was shortly after the Ninth Central Committee meeting of the TKPML that the First International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organisations took place in 1980. In this International Conference the TKPML participated as observers. The TKPML delegation played an extremely negative role in the Conference, parroting Hoxhaite attacks on Mao Tsetung Thought, and masquerading as defenders of Stalin and the Comintern. The TKPML refused to sign the Joint Communiqué produced by the First International Conference. This is another part of your Party’s history that you have dubiously forgotten to mention.

During this entire period various forces in the international communist movement continued to struggle with the comrades of the TKPML, to demonstrate their erroneous positions and the dangers involved in such a centrist approach.

The Second Conference of the TKPML was held in January 1981. At this meeting the “Bolshevik” faction in the Central Committee criticised Mao Tsetung and declared that Mao Tsetung, unlike Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, could not be considered a “classic”. The “Bolsheviks” were defeated in this Conference and Mao was upheld as a “classic”. The “Bolshevik” faction was expelled from the Party. In the aftermath of the Second Conference, the newly elected Central Committee re-examined the position that had been taken by the previous Central Committee regarding the Joint Communiqué and decided to sign the Communiqué with some reservations (which were reprinted in the second issue of *A World to Win* (first pre-RIM series)). Similarly, the Second Plenum of the TKPML Central Committee criticised itself for not having fulfilled its responsibilities in relation to the international communist movement and pledged to make further efforts. The victory over the “Bolshevik” line was testimony to the strong influence of Mao and Maoism within the TKPML as well as the heritage of Ibrahim Kaypakkaya. It was a sign that the revolutionary leaders and members of the Party, unlike bourgeois democrats, want to fight for a genuine revolution and not something else.

We agree with your “Brief History” that, “The most important issue dealt with by this Second Conference was the defence of Mao against the attacks from the Enver Hoxha fraction.... In short Mao and his teachings were resolutely defended in this conference.” *But* we should emphasise the fact that this Conference did not succeed in uprooting the centrist line on Mao and MLM. Even after the expulsion of the Hoxhaite revisionists from the Party, the TKPML continued to refrain from recognising Mao Tsetung Thought or Maoism as a qualitatively new and higher stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism. A great many discussions were held between various Maoist parties who had signed the Joint Communiqué and representatives of the TKPML on a whole series of outstanding questions, most of all on Mao Tsetung Thought.

Again, your account of this period of the history of the Party obscures and covers over the main problem. You do not even mention that, despite defending Mao against the “Bolshevik fraction”, that conference failed to re-inscribe MLM on the banner of the Party. This is how you describe this period in your “Brief History”: “One side of contradiction was right opportunism and the other side was ‘left’ opportunism. One side of contradiction was bureaucratism and the other side was sectarianism. While both the right and ‘left’ opportunism seriously affected the Party, it was the right that posed the main danger.” The fact that political-ideological polarisation within the Party crystallised around these secondary issues rather than the root cause was itself a problem. It was an important sign that the key link was not grasped. In your “Brief History” you still fail to grasp the key source of the different deviations that sprang up in the Party. Again, not accepting MLM (at the time Mao Tsetung Thought) as the guiding ideology of TKPML and not defining the contributions of Mao as the third and qualitatively higher stage of development of Marxism-Leninism was not just a minor misunderstanding on your part. It was an obvious sign of not grasping/accepting the truth of Mao’s contributions. It was a wrong line and it must be stated as such. The fact that today you dismiss this criticism and run away from it, the fact that you do not want to look it in the eye and sum it up in order to get rid of all of its manifestations, shows that despite the fact that you have adopted the term you have not grasped the essence of MLM.

Your “Brief History” continues to miss major turning points in the life of the TKPML. In 1984 the Party joined the efforts to convene the Second International Conference and form RIM. At the Second International Conference, the Party was represented by top Party leadership. The Party was actively involved in drafting the *Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement*. It played an important role both in struggling for its positions and in uniting with the consensus of the Conference.

This was another big victory for the TKPML and could have cleared the way for the total victory of MLM in the Party, but instead the Party continued to maintain its core understanding on Mao Tsetung Thought. Notably, soon after the formation of RIM the Turkish edition of the *Declaration* was printed with a statement expressing the TKPML’s disagreement with Mao Tsetung Thought. Later, the viewpoint of the TKPML Central Committee evolved into the extreme position put forward in their Report holding the *Declaration* to be “opportunist”.

In a strange manner your “Brief History” jumps over this rather important period! There is not even a word about it. The years 1984-1986 simply do not exist in your “Brief History”.

Even though sharp differences existed within the TKPML, unfortunately these differences did not crystallise mainly around MLM. A third Conference was held by the CC of the TKPML in 1987. Your Brief History says: “This conference was a milestone as it swept away the effects of the 12 September coup within the Party and united the Party. This Conference decided that guerrilla war was the main task. The Third Conference on the one hand criticised and condemned right opportunism within the Party and on the other hand analysed DABK [East Anatolia Regional Committee]. Although DABK’s wrong tendency and departure from MLM was openly identified, this conference regarded them as one of the

forces within the Party. Therefore, the Third Conference did not understand the true nature of the DABK. The DABK was seen to be MLM in theory and in defence of the Party programme but this was on the surface.”

This account of the Party's history really surprises us. No doubt there are important lessons that should be understood and summed up from the division of the Party into the CC and the DABK centres at that time. But one thing is sure: summation of this question also must be based on putting the problem of MLM at the centre. Otherwise, it will fail to get to the heart of the problems.

As far as we know, the Third Conference of your Party adopted the term Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. However it is very clear that the Hoxhaite trend and thinking continued to exert considerable influence in your Party. Just to give one example we will quote your Party's amazing summation of the nature of the Party of Labour of Albania: “Within the parties and states who claimed to be communists, the position of the Labour Party and the People's Republic of Albania was less decayed, therefore they had more positive aspects in the country's life. It also deviated from ML and became revisionist, however it was not as bad as other revisionism. [...] It didn't have an exploiter class and a privileged section. There was not any serious proof showing that the Party of Labour of Albania has started revisionist-capitalist restoration. [...] up to now we have not said that Albania is not a socialist country. [...] It was the only country that kept socialism alive and was less influenced by the liberal-bourgeois wind.” (“Ibrahim Kaypakkaya”, *Worker Peasant Liberation*, 1990, number 95, page 27.)

After unity of the two sides – between the CC and DABK – in 1993, the united Party adopted MLM instead of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. Your “Brief History” says: “One of the important decisions of this First Extraordinary Conference [in 1993] was to accept MLM instead of Mao Tsetung Thought.” In our opinion this was a great advance. But it was not clear on the basis of what line struggles within the Party this was adopted and how the Party summed up its past centrism on this question. In fact, your “Brief History” implies that no summation was (and is) seen as necessary. You imply this by saying: “Although the content of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought had been understood correctly, the naming of it had been incomplete.”

We wish this were true. But unfortunately it seems that the Hoxhaite legacy had not been uprooted properly even at this point. The least sign of it is that even after your Party adopted MLM it also celebrated the hundredth birthday of Hoxha with a large photograph of him in your journal *Ozgur Gelecek* in 1994. In our meeting with your Party's delegation we seriously criticised you for celebrating this revisionist who spared no effort to attack Maoism and confuse the international communist movement. But you did not accept our criticism. Your representative told us that Hoxha was a Marxist-Leninist in the past and you were celebrating his birthday for his past contributions. Astonishing! Imagine celebrating Kautsky, Liu Shao-chi and other big revisionists for their revolutionary past. That can only mean celebrating Hoxha today in the guise of respecting his past!

The disturbing signs do not stop here. In fact, publishing Hoxha's picture and celebrating his birth were only an aesthetic expression of what line your leadership held. Almost at the same time a series of articles were published in your monthly theoretical journal *Partizan*. In these articles (“The Truth About Stalin”, *Partizan*, 1994, numbers 13, 14 and 15), one of your theoreticians/leaders elaborates a Hoxhaite line on important questions that are at the heart of the dispute over MLM. This series of articles continue to repeat the same centrist line of the First Central Committee but this time under a mask of MLM. They uphold Comrade Stalin's wrong line on the cardinal questions regarding the nature of socialism and class struggle under socialism and attack Mao's line without naming Mao. Fortunately, shortly after the appearance of these articles another article called “On Comrade Stalin” (*Partizan*, September 1994) written by TKP(ML) comrades responded sharply to this line. This refreshing response removed the

MLM mask of “The Truth About Stalin” and made an uplifting defence of true Maoism. (At this time you and the comrades of TKP(ML) were still in the unified Party, which split soon after.) This response was a sign that the MLM forces within your Party are fighting against the pernicious Hoxhaite influence. It shows that the principal historical two-line struggle within your Party still needs to be settled in a clear-cut way once and for all and that the task of uprooting Hoxhaite influences and reviving genuine Maoism in the TKP/ML still remains. “On Comrade Stalin” adequately exposes a wrong trend in your Party, which under the garb of defending Stalin is, in fact, attacking Mao and consecrating Comrade Stalin’s grave errors. It exposes how still strong forces within your Party are trying to sneak in Hoxha’s influence through the back door by adopting the wrong aspects of Stalin’s understanding of socialism. “On Comrade Stalin” makes a strong defence of Mao’s analysis of classes and class struggle under socialism, his analysis of the political economy of socialism, and the Maoist concept of two-line struggle in the communist party – all based on defending Mao’s criticisms of Comrade Stalin’s line and practice in these matters. It sharply points out that the problem of the line under criticism is not “only the Party of Labour of Albania question; they cannot break with Khrushchevism, with which the Labour Party of Albania shares a common legacy as well.” And it continues, “You cannot empty Mao and call it defence of Mao! To impose revisionism by putting an empty shell of Mao in between two eyebrows and eyes is not Maoism.” The article says: “The ‘Truth about Stalin’ tries to impose the line of the First CC and *Bolshevik Partisan* which systematised its errors under the cover of the MLM brand.” And “this is not ‘Maoism’ but an expression of the centrism of the First CC and the systematisation of its errors and the defence of *Bolshevik Partisan*, all of which in internal and external party struggles had been repudiated and rejected. This is the same line even though it hurls curse words at *Bolshevik Partisan*...” (“On Comrade Stalin”, section on Two-Line Struggle, page 40 in Turkish). The article exposes the pro-Party of Labour of Albania essence of this line in many aspects. It shows how this trend “like the revisionists attaches itself to the errors of Stalin”. It shows how this line tries to use a Trotskyite blanket to cover Stalin’s errors and attack Mao’s line on socialism. It exposes this line’s wrong understanding of two-line struggle in the party and demonstrates the Hoxhaite outlook of the author(s) on this question. For example it says: “Those friends who in the name of defending Maoism criticise the Party of Labour of Albania are in fact repeating the Party of Labour of Albania’s line. That is why it is useless for these friends to separate themselves from the Party of Labour of Albania in words. They are sitting in the same room. They cannot change this reality by hanging a Mao picture on the walls of this room! Their views are only different in words and not in essence” (“On Comrade Stalin”, Section 5). The article seriously defends and reaffirms Mao’s criticisms of Stalin’s errors. Obviously, your Party, TKP/ML, owes this critique an answer if you believe in the necessity of two-line struggle.

## **Mao’s Development of Marxism According to TKP/ML**

In a different section of your 1997 document you put forward your views on Maoism. We agree with most (not all) of what you say, that “it is not enough to recognise only Marxism-Leninism or theories of Marx-Lenin-Stalin. It is also important to take this understanding one step further by the recognition of Maoism.” We agree that Maoism must be recognised as the third and highest stage of Marxism up to now. However, we do not agree that Comrade Stalin can be put on the same level as Mao. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism was developed mainly by Marx, Lenin and Mao. It is better to talk about “three (Marx, Lenin, Mao) plus two (Engels, Stalin)” as the formula to emphasise the central role of Marx, Lenin and Mao in relation to the development of MLM. We also do not think that Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is simply “one step further” than Marx-Lenin-Stalin. Certainly, Mao could not have developed Marxism without learning from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. But nor could he have developed Marxism without taking some steps *away* from Comrade Stalin. We do not agree entirely with your statement that: “He [Mao] continued the work that was started by the four great masters of the class.” We do not emphasise only *continuity* but also *rupture* – that is, Maoism also developed because Mao did *not* follow Stalin in very important aspects. In fact the centrist and semi-Hoxhaite trend within TKP/ML has always opposed

the criticisms that Mao made of Stalin's view of the nature and dynamics of socialism and the political economy of socialism. They insisted that Mao's contributions to Marxism are a simple extension and continuation of those of Stalin.

Mao made the very important criticism that Stalin's thinking contained a significant amount of metaphysics and that he "taught others metaphysics". In short, the negation of Stalin's errors is a decisive element in Mao's development of Marxism to a whole new stage. This point was elaborated in our 1986 letter to you and it has been clearly raised by other comrades who have waged struggle against this centrist and semi-Hoxhaite influence in the TKP/ML. This is not a minor disagreement between your and our understanding. It has to do with deeply grasping Maoism and the lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

[The section cut from here expounded on Mao's understanding of the political economy of socialism. – AWTW]

## **How the Proletariat Leads**

In our 1986 letter to the Party we warned that centrism regarding MLM would lead to abandoning people's war. As is known, in different periods the TKP/ML leadership questioned the possibility and necessity of waging people's war in Turkey. This was a serious result of negating the universality of Maoism. As our 1986 letter to you emphasised, "any attempt to negate the universality of Mao Tsetung Thought carries with it the danger of abandoning the concept of People's War and the need to develop red political power." We should remember that one of Enver Hoxha's vicious attacks against Mao was over the strategy of people's war. He mocked it as "a war without perspective" and a "peasant war", implying that it did not have anything to do with the leadership of the proletariat in the new-democratic revolution. The TKP/ML's negation of the universality of people's war was not unrelated to the Hoxhaite influence within it....

The title of your document – "TKP/ML: New World Order, Working Class, and its Leading Role" – promises to explain how the working class should play its leading role in the world. Through this document we find out that the TKP/ML thinks that the leading role of the working class is expressed through organising militant trade union movements. This document goes on and on about the history and evolution of the trade union movement, the role that communists should play in developing the trade union movement and its role in achieving victory (what kind?) for the proletariat. This document fails to mention even once the central task of revolutionary communists – the seizure of power by armed force – and its centrality in establishing the leading role of the working class under the leadership of its communist party. Lenin made the point that the class-conscious worker should not be a trade union secretary but a tribune of the people. In order to apply the Leninist line – as it was developed in his work *What is To Be Done?* and applied in the practice of making revolution in Russia – the working class should put itself at the head of the democratic revolution. In China, Mao took that Leninist line and raised it to the level that the working class should lead the people, especially the peasants, in people's war in order to carry out new-democratic revolution and establish socialism. But your document does not even once mention the task of the working class in leading the new-democratic revolution and the role of people's war, as though this has nothing to do with "achieving victory" for the working class – or perhaps you think this is a "peasant" matter and does not have anything to do with the working class "leadership" or "achieving victory"!

... We do not negate the role that genuine trade union struggles of the workers at times can play as a school of war, as Lenin put it. However, when the war itself is absent from the picture no schooling will help. Through studying this document we see a serious lack of understanding of the MLM guideline that

all revolutionary activities –including workers’ militant economic struggles – before the initiation of people’s war should serve its initiation and after initiation should serve its development.... At best it can be said you do not relate your trade union activities to carrying out the New Democratic Revolution and people’s war, and their place in this strategy. Your document fails to mention that the most important “intervention” of the revolutionary communists in the spontaneous struggles of the workers is to make them serve the revolutionary struggle for the seizure of power. You mention once the need for “the intervention of the communists and revolutionaries in the light of MLM” but you reduce this to intervention in helping bring about the “class trade union” organisation of the workers. However just the struggle of the workers in Turkey to have their independent trade unions may be, this struggle, even if led by MLM forces, can never establish the leading role of the working class. In this 57-page document about the leading role of working class and how it should achieve victory there is nothing about the fact that without state power the working class can do nothing, that without state power all is illusion and that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun, and that without a people’s army the people have nothing even if they have powerful trade unions....

In stressing the need for the trade union movement for making proletarian revolution in both types of countries [imperialist and oppressed countries – AWTW] your document takes note of the degeneration of the trade unions in the imperialist countries and how they have become part of “the corporate structure”. It goes on and on about the numerous major changes produced by the development of capitalism/imperialism and the relations of all these to the evolution in the nature of trade unions. It “forgets” Lenin’s decisive analysis of imperialism and the most important change in the class configuration in these countries as a result of the development of capitalism into imperialist capitalism – the split in the working class in the imperialist countries with the appearance of a labour aristocracy, which is an ally of the bourgeoisie. The TKP/ML paints the “working class” in the imperialist countries as an undifferentiated whole. Therefore it is unable to explain the material basis of the trade unions becoming part of “the corporate structure”. The TKP/ML says that the privileges provided by the bourgeoisie to the working class after the Second World War “led to the imagination” [illusions] that its aims could be realised within the system. There is absolutely no mention of a split in the working class and a shift in class alliances in the imperialist countries. The TKP/ML explains this phenomenon only in the sphere of ideology as though it does not have a material basis....

Not seeing the class basis for this degeneration has made many communist parties in the imperialist countries follow the false road of competing with the social-democratic and revisionist parties of the ruling classes in the imperialist countries on labour aristocratic terms and in the same fields of trade unions and elections – for example, look at the Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany’s (MLPD) strategy in Germany. As far as we know in the last elections in Germany your Party called upon the masses to vote for Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany candidates!

The TKP/ML only mentions the struggles of certain strata of the working class in the imperialist countries, such as the strike of the Bridgestone workers on 12 July 1994 and the UPS strike in the US. But there is nothing about the Los Angeles uprising of proletarian masses in 1992 and the numerous walk-outs and struggles of the lowest strata of workers made up heavily of Hispanic immigrants and Blacks in that country. This conception of the “workers struggle” has striking similarities to a trend in the international movement which proposes reformist, trade union struggle in the imperialist countries while accepting a mixture of the same thing plus a circumscribed “armed struggle” for the semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries – trends represented by such parties as the Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany and the Party of Labour of Belgium (PTB)....

[The section cut from here is on the international communist movement and RIM – AWTW]

## Your Line on the International Communist Movement is Eclectic

...In your article (in the 4-17 September 1998 issue of *Ozgur Gelecek*) you make an evaluation of the international communist movement, including RIM. In the introduction to this part you say, “serious new alignments are under way” in the international communist movement, but you totally fail to say what is the character of each: Marxist or revisionist? Let us take a look at your evaluation of international communist movement forces:

“1- RIM...which bases itself on the MLM formula, and which our Party and the Peruvian Communist Party are still in a way members of, and which, however, is going through a lot more and serious problems because of the self-serving, pragmatist, hegemonistic conduct of its leadership that has grown far from fulfilling its leadership mission and thus from being capable of acting on numerous possibilities that have developed in the past ten years and whose many members have become increasingly passive.

“2- The ‘Marxist-Leninist platform’ where the Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany and Communist Party of the Philippines are influential, which bases itself on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, although there are also parties and organisations within it that are based on MLM, is experiencing serious political-ideological problems but still demonstrates a positive tendency in the three alignments, and has over 20 members today.

“3-The ‘Marxist-Leninist platform’ that takes as its basis the minimum criteria of unity as organised by the Party of Labour of Belgium in May every year, with the participation of organisations that have different lines, and where membership is growing but the level of quality is falling.

“4- The ‘Marxist-Leninist platform’ that principally follows the line of the Party of Labour of Albania....”

You glaringly fail to put forward an ideological and political yardstick for evaluating different forces in the international communist movement. First you paint an eclectic, hodgepodge picture of the international communist movement forces. And then you leak out your position that among different alignments, despite the fact that RIM is based on MLM and your Party “in a way is a member” (is it?), RIM should be “isolated” because of “self-serving, pragmatist, hegemonistic” conduct!! Is not all this just for the purpose of muddying the ideological and political lines of demarcation that are necessary for recognising who are Marxists and who are revisionists in this world?

Your harshest criticisms are reserved for the thoroughgoing MLM forces, in other words, RIM. And you have a slap on the wrist for openly revisionist forces – for example the alignment that the Party of Labour of Belgium and a party from Russia are trying to forge. (For a critique of this alignment, see the editorial in *AWTW* 1998/23, as well as a critique of the Russian Party, the All-Union Party of Communist Bolsheviks.) In this document you express a positive inclination for the International Conference of Marxist-Leninists (ICML), within which there is an array of Maoists and revisionists and which itself suffers from the lack of an ideological and political basis of unity capable of regrouping Marxists on a clearly revolutionary communist basis. Such a basis can only be MLM – not MLM as a “formula” (as you put it) but as content, as a revolutionary line for making revolution in the different types of countries.

You criticise the alliance of the Party of Labour of Belgium and the Russian Party (who want to rebuild their International on the basis of Marx, Lenin and Stalin) for their falling “level of quality”. What is the content of this “falling quality” in terms of MLM? As far as we are concerned their level falls from revisionism to more revisionism. In your evaluation there is no mention of the fundamental and principal

feature of this alliance. Their main feature is that they reject the struggle waged by the revolutionary communists of the world under the leadership of Mao and the Communist Party of China against Khrushchevite revisionism. The starting point for evaluating any international grouping or party that claims to be a part of the international communist movement is the recognition that *Mao rescued the international communist movement from the morass of revisionism, first by the great struggle against modern revisionism and then by leading the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution*. But in your evaluation of these groupings no such criteria are used. There is no mention of the fact that today's revolutionary communist movement is a *direct result* of, above all, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which, in the words of the *Declaration*, "gave rise to a whole new generation of Marxist-Leninists". In fact, the TKPML itself is a product of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The fact that in evaluating the international groupings you do feel obliged to talk about the "self-serving, pragmatist, hegemonistic conduct" of RIM's "leadership" but that you "forget" cardinal lines of demarcation between Marxism and revisionism in evaluating "Marxist-Leninist platforms" is astounding! This does not look like the legacy of Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya but the legacy of the Hoxhaite tendencies which hoped to take over TKPML. This shows that it is not enough to talk about MLM. One should apply it to everything. This shows that one cannot look at MLM as a "formula" – it is a complete outlook, stand and method for understanding and, more importantly, for changing the world....

Not to focus on cardinal questions of line which have been the basis of the estrangement between your Party and our Movement and instead to use secondary criticisms – whose content is camouflaged and/or left as swear words rather than substantive criticisms – is not an MLM method of waging two-line struggle. It is a method that is only good for spreading confusion among the rank and file and for preventing them from consciously monitoring the line and practice of their leadership....

You charge RIM with not acting "on the numerous possibilities that have developed in the past ten years". But speak openly and frankly: what do you mean by this? Does this mean that RIM saw new "serious alignments" taking shape after the break-up of the Soviet social-imperialist bloc but was not willing to liquidate its line and jump on the bandwagon? And was not willing to grade the international communist movement on the basis of the bits and pieces of Marxism each grouping appears to uphold? Do you think we should have changed our evaluation of who is Marxist and who is revisionist in the world in order to be able "to act on the numerous possibilities that have developed in the past ten years"? Or what do you mean by "pragmatism"? If RIM was "pragmatist" now, it would be making a lot of alliances with all kinds of forces calling themselves Marxist-Leninist regardless of their position on dividing-line struggles concerning the history of the international communist movement. Please spare us; we are unable to make such "serious contributions". We want to win a new society, not give the old one a face-lift. That is why we put decisive importance on clarifying who is Marxist and who is revisionist....

...[W]e call upon you to substantiate and clearly state why the International Conference of Marxist-Leninists "demonstrates a positive tendency" over RIM. Even though there are parties within the International Conference of Marxist-Leninists that we consider MLM parties, notably the Communist Party of the Philippines and Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) (People's War), the main feature of this international grouping is that it consists of Maoist parties on the one end and revisionists on the other end. At first this group included the notorious counter-revolutionary Patria Roja from Peru, which has distinguished itself by opposing the People's War in that country. As of the International Conference of Marxist-Leninists's Fifth Conference, the Communist Party of Nepal (United Marxist-Leninists), which has been part of several reactionary governments in Nepal and was directly entrusted with the suppression of the People's War there, was a member in good standing. The International Conference of Marxist-Leninists' basis of unity and method of uniting is structured to allow such an alliance. Therefore, despite whatever intentions, it cannot serve the regrouping of genuine revolutionary communists world-wide. It cannot fulfil the requirements of the proletarian revolution, the need to forge

and strengthen genuine communist vanguards in every country. Because this means to be armed with the fullest and most scientifically correct understanding achieved by the proletariat to date – Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The International Conference of Marxist-Leninists can in no way serve the goal of the formation of a communist international of a new type. In fact it does not accept the validity of that goal.... (See *AWTW* 2000/26 for the Committee of RIM's critique of the Resolutions of the Fifth International Conference of Marxist-Leninists.)

It is true that we considered the Resolutions of the Fifth Conference as an overall positive advance. But why? Because for the first time the International Conference of Marxist-Leninists took a clear position against the revisionist rulers in China and upheld Mao Tsetung's development of Marxism and many other correct new directions. You will agree that for the parties that kept quiet for so long on the capitalist nature of China and the turning point of 1976, this was an advance. However, it is quite a regression for your Party to join the International Conference of Marxist-Leninists. It is not an advance but an unfortunate setback....

## **Conclusion**

The attempts to undermine the *Declaration* and RIM went hand in hand with muddying the line of Ibrahim Kaypakkaya in order to blur and modify TKPML's basic political line. All this caused confusion among the ranks of the Party. Many difficulties and problems of revolution — such as the setbacks suffered – were misused to strengthen a centrist line.

...Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought [today MLM] is the basic compass that charts the road ahead. It is this basic orientation that is embodied by the *Declaration* of RIM [supplemented by *Long Live MLM!*]. By persevering on this path, strengthening the unity of the proletariat on a world scale as well as its contingents in each country, by striving to correctly assimilate the lessons of the past, we can march ahead victoriously!" ... (Committee of RIM message – see *AWTW* 1985/3).

Comrades: Fourteen years is a long time to wait for your response. The conditions are now favourable for the broad ranks of the TKPML to unite under a correct MLM line and a single organisational centre. And this will happen as the major erroneous lines that caused such damage in the TKPML are repudiated. We call on the comrades of the TKP/ML to sweep away the cobwebs of the past erroneous lines and fight wholeheartedly to put Marxism-Leninism-Maoism clearly in command of the revolution in Turkey, which the masses of your country and around the world so desperately needs.

## **Committee of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement**

### **Endnotes**

1 See the preface to the Turkish edition of the RIM *Declaration* published by TKPML in 1984 and the Report of the Fifth Plenum of the Second TKPML Central Committee (CC).

2 Since 1993 our Movement has adopted Maoism instead of Mao Tsetung Thought.

[From the RIM magazine *A World To Win*, #28, 2002, online at:  
[http://www.aworldtowin.org/back\\_issues/2002-28/28\\_OGsPolemic.htm](http://www.aworldtowin.org/back_issues/2002-28/28_OGsPolemic.htm) ]