

# On the Joint Communiqué

## Open Letter to the Coordinating Committee of the International Journal A World to Win

—Türkiye Komünist Partisi-Marksist-Leninist  
[Communist Party of Turkey Marxist-Leninist]

Dear Comrades:

The vanguard organisation of the proletariat in Turkey, the Communist Party of Turkey Marxist-Leninist, was founded in 1972 by the great communist leader Ibrahim Kaypakkaya. The Party was founded in the struggle against modern revisionism in general and in the struggle against the revisionist-Trotskyite "Safak" line in particular. Our Party has witnessed fierce two-line struggles since its founding. The last of these line struggles was the struggle against the "YD-line." This line was developed particularly around the negation of the contributions of Comrade Mao Tsetung to Marxism-Leninism and around the negation of the Marxist-Leninist legacy of the struggle against modern revisionism. This line thus found itself in contradiction with all principal questions of the Marxist-Leninist theses of the minimal and maximum programme of our Party. The Second Conference of our Party exposed this line as revisionist-Trotskyite. Furthermore, the Second Conference has come to the conclusion that the new front of attack against Marxism-Leninism, under the worldwide leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania, played an important part in the development of this line.

Because of the fact that the "YD-line" was dominant in the section of the Party responsible for international relations and had strong influence within the Central Committee of our Party, there were significant shortcomings in the defence of Marxism-Leninism in the person of Mao Tsetung conducted by our Party in the international communist movement. Our Party put forth a unified call in the fall of 1978 around the slogan, "Without the defence of Mao Tsetung, Marxism-Leninism cannot be defended!" Despite this call, because of the gathering dark clouds of the modern revisionist-Trotskyite storm of renunciation that was growing on the horizon at the time, the Party showed inconsistency in fulfilling this task in the two years that followed.

The behaviour of the participants of our Party at the conference where the "Joint Communiqué" of the 13 signed organisations was made should be seen in this historical framework. For this reason we have re-analysed and re-assessed the "Joint Communiqué" and we are sending you the results of this re-assessment in the form of an open letter so that it can be evaluated by all Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary organisations.

### A General Assessment of the Joint Communiqué

Today the class-conscious proletariat stands before a crucial question. The main contradictions in the world are intensifying in such a

way that they are becoming more and more concentrated. While this development is leading to the fact that on the one hand the objective conditions in the phase of the proletarian world revolution are increasing on a day-to-day basis, on the other hand the subjective factor is greatly lagging behind this development. The international Marxist-Leninist movement has been weakened by the modern-revisionist and Trotskyite treachery. As a result of this a significant amount of confusion has arisen in the ideological arena. In this situation the striving for ideological unity in the international Marxist-Leninist movement must prevail and this is one of the immediate tasks that lie before communists. In order to attain ideological unity, one must bring together these forces, against those who are leading the three fronts that are hostile toward Marxism-Leninism. These three fronts which are today stepping up their attacks on Marxism-Leninism, are:

- The modern revisionist front of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev style
- The modern revisionist front of the "Three Worlds Theory"
- The new opportunist front, which has gathered around the modern revisionist-Trotskyite line of the PLA.

A strong ideological struggle of the highest level amongst the revolutionary forces with the purpose of attaining unity is one important practical task. It is our opinion that the international conference that was convened in Autumn 1980 was an important and positive step in this direction.

The results of this conference are summarized in the "Joint Communiqué" of the 13 signed organisations. Our Party has assessed this "Joint Communiqué" as a document that defends Marxism-Leninism and its main characteristics in relation to the present task. The essential aspect of this "Joint Communiqué" is that it upholds the fact that our epoch is still the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, that Leninism is the Marxism of our epoch, that Lenin's principles are not outdated, but rather still hold their validity, that in particular the three main fronts that are presently attacking Marxism-Leninism have been exposed, and that along with this it exemplifies the importance of the defence of the contributions of Mao Tsetung to Marxism-Leninism.

But we would also like to point out that the "Joint Communiqué" is lacking on some points, and contains some views on other points that we do not agree with. Our views and criticisms of these points are commented on below. We regard these criticisms as necessary for the progress of unity.

Our Party intends to sign the "Joint Communiqué" with the reservation of our points of criticism listed below. At the same time, we hail the initiative to publish an international journal with the purpose

of advancing the ideological struggle in the international arena. We will try to use all possible forces to contribute to this discussion. As a first step in this direction we ask you to publish this open letter from us.

## Our Points of Criticism on the "Joint Communiqué"

### On Section I: "The Current Situation"

We want to address two points here: First, clarity must be established on the statement that "all the other imperialist powers are also driven by their nature toward war." (Page 2, English edition.) The correct formulation is in our opinion, "Other big imperialists by nature (West Germany, France, England and Japan) participate in the drive towards war." If all big and small imperialists are in their essence the same and if they are all equally the enemy of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples, it is still, as Lenin said, the "big imperialist powers" which propagate the imperialist war to redivide the world and which could wage such a war. Belgium is, for example, an imperialist country which exploits the proletariat and attacks the struggles of the oppressed peoples—in this respect there is no qualitative difference between it and other imperialists, but it is not in a position to propagate a new imperialist war of redivision. Today U.S. imperialism and Russian social-imperialism have leadership in the propagation of imperialist war as well as leadership of the two imperialist military blocs. Besides them, though, other imperialist big powers are preparing for imperialist war. This should be clearly stated.

Secondly, it is stated "The objective conditions for revolution are ripening throughout the world and in some countries these conditions are already mature." (Page 3) In general, this statement is correct. But it must be additionally determined where the weakest links in the chain of imperialism are. In our opinion the focal points of revolution are still in the areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

### On Section II: "Tasks of Marxist-Leninists"

In this part the following statement is made, "The armed struggle must be carried out as a war of the masses and through it the masses must be prepared ideologically, politically and organisationally to exercise political power." (Pages 4-5) In our opinion this statement is not entirely clear. A vital part of preparing the masses for the seizure of power are armed and unarmed forms of political struggles. The relationship between these two forms of struggle varies according to the social-economic structure of the respective country and depends on which stage the revolution has reached. A few well-known examples: in China, which had a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal social-economic structure, armed struggle played the decisive role throughout the entire period of the national democratic revolution. Armed struggle was essential to the ideological, political and organisational preparation of the masses for the exercise of political power. But at the same time the non-bloody forms of the political struggle of the masses were very important. We also see that in the case of the preparation of the masses for the revolution in Tsarist Russia, non-bloody struggles were emphasised for long periods of time. What was valid for Tsarist Russia is all the more valid for imperialist countries. But the formulation above can be dangerously misinterpreted in such a way that for such countries the means of preparing the masses for revolution is, generally speaking, armed struggle.

Secondly: The countries are divided into two groups, according to the "important distinctions in the path of the revolution." In our opinion the classification is insufficient although the acknowledgement of these distinctions is very important. In accordance with the circumstances of the time, the Comintern programme prepared under the guidance of Stalin (1928) divides the countries roughly into two groups, namely imperialist countries and countries under the yoke of imperialism. The latter category is then divided into three groups depending upon the path and road of the revolution in the respective countries. In

our view this classification was correct given the circumstances of that time. And that is how Marxist-Leninists should approach this issue even today, that is, those countries that are, in one way or another, under the yoke of imperialism should be divided into various categories on the basis of a careful analysis of the actual situation in each respective country. We think it is possible to divide the dependent countries into at least two different types. Furthermore, one should analyse the common elements of the revolutions in these countries.

Our conclusion to this, based on our analysis which is still not completed, is the following. The oppressed countries should be divided into at least two types. One type includes countries in which capitalism is inextricably bound up with imperialism, which is to a greater or lesser degree dominant in the economic base. At the same time there are remnants of feudalism in the economic base and the superstructure, even if feudalism itself is not the main aspect. As far as we know, for instance, Argentina, Chile, Brazil, Portugal and Greece belong to this type of country. Though in countries of this type the proletariat has not yet completed the task of democratic revolution, the crucial task of the new-democratic revolution is to attain national independence and political democracy. In this context the strategic slogan in countries of this type should be the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants." And as far as the question of the path of the revolution in these countries, the relationship between protracted people's war and popular insurrection must in turn be examined in concrete terms.

The countries of the second type are the semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. Even if comprador capitalism has developed in these countries to a greater or lesser extent, their production relations are still predominantly feudal and semi-feudal. The two main tasks of the new-democratic revolution in these countries are the attainment of national independence and the abolition of feudalism by means of the agrarian revolution, and the principal strategic slogan for these countries must generally be "people's democratic dictatorship." In this context, the path of revolution in these countries will generally be protracted people's war.

Third: It is possible to establish certain distinctions among the imperialist countries themselves, and these should not be regarded merely as different stages of the revolution. The "Joint Communiqué" does not deal with the situation in imperialist countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and other countries under the influence of Russian social-imperialism. In our view the strategy and tactics of the path of the October Revolution is also valid for these countries. But above and beyond that, the political, financial and military influence of the Russian social-imperialists has a particular significance. In revisionist-capitalist countries of this type, the proletarian revolution, in attacking the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, must at the same time set its sights on Russian social-imperialism because the two are bound together by a thousand threads. And this aspect will influence the tactics to be followed on a number of questions of the class struggle, such as alliances, military strategy, etc., etc. In our opinion it is necessary—especially in view of the growing revolutionary situation in Poland—for the world's Marxist-Leninists to take up this issue and subject it to close scrutiny.

Fourth: After a series of arguments in defence of a thorough understanding of Lenin's line on the masses, the following statement is made in connection with revolutionary work in the imperialist countries: "It's also necessary to study and apply Mao's teachings on the need to base oneself on the profound sentiments of the masses to liberate themselves." (Page 8) In effect, we consider this corollary superfluous because Mao Tsetung's interpretation of the mass line is no different and contains no other doctrine than Lenin's, whereas such a passage might create the impression that the two great teachers of the mass line, Lenin and Mao, are in conflict with each other. And that would be extremely detrimental.

### On Section III: "On the Unity of the Marxist-Leninists"

The first point we want to take up in this part in the Communiqué concerns the formulation "Mao Tsetung Thought." It is said that "We are still living in the era of Leninism, of imperialism and the proletarian revolution; at the same time we affirm that Mao Tsetung Thought is a new stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism." (Page 10) At its First Conference in February 1978 our Party took a position against this formulation which, as we affirmed, is used by many enemies of Marxism-Leninism to distort the contributions made by Comrade Mao as being the "Marxism-Leninism of a new epoch." Thus, this formulation is cunningly used to spread the belief that the epoch has changed; it has become a tool in the hands of those who would separate Mao Tsetung's teachings from Marxism-Leninism as Khrushchev and Hoxha tried to do with the invention of the spectre of Maoism, of revisionists and Trotskyites waving the red book in their hands. That is why we have taken a position against this formulation. We propose instead that Mao Tsetung be defended in concrete terms as one of the five great teachers of Marxism-Leninism. The formulation in the "Joint Communiqué" does not satisfy us. It gives the impression that such detrimental tendencies might be present and that such a formulation might have been agreed on merely as a compromise.

Second: When the talk turns to the ideological roots of the leadership of the PLA, Trotskyism is mentioned. In our opinion another peculiarity of this anti-Marxist line is modern-day revisionism, just as important as Trotskyism. Their attacks are on the contributions of Mao Tsetung in relation to the analysis of the contradictions within socialist society and of the continuation of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Their views on the communist party, their thesis of "decolonization" and their interpretation of the thesis the "two superpowers are the enemies of the peoples of the world" are the cornerstones of the modern-day revisionism of their line. The

"Joint Communiqué" should be clearer on this point.

Third: In order to further the struggle against modern revisionism, which constantly appears in new forms, the necessity to study the world communist movement and the experiences of various proletarian dictatorships, both their negative and positive aspects, is emphasised. This is correct. We should truly assess our past, analyse it and learn from it.

The point that we want to criticise here is the one-sided approach to this question in the "Joint Communiqué". It is demanded that the self-dissolution of the Comintern, the conciliatory tendencies during and after World War 2, the capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union and in a list of other socialist countries, and the degeneration of the majority of parties of the Third International must be analysed. But why after the final break from the modern revisionism of Khrushchev was no new International founded? Also questions like the rise of the "Three Worlds Theory", statements which refer to Mao Tsetung's last battles which aren't documented, etc., etc.—the necessity to analyse these questions is not mentioned in the "Joint Communiqué."

We are of the opinion that with a dialectical method and a historical-materialist approach to these Marxist-Leninist legacies, one can also take up and learn from a broad analysis and research of these questions, without giving Trotskyism and modern revisionism the slightest possibility to influence the analysis.

The last point which we want to mention is regarding the draft text for discussion prepared jointly by the RCP, USA and the RCP, Chile. Unfortunately we have not yet been able to translate and study this text. We therefore cannot comment on this at the moment.

With Communist Greetings,  
The Central Committee of the TKPM-L  
May 20, 1981