

It is quite wrong today to try to create a Communist International, which applies democratic centralism

Last autumn, the International Communist League was formed with the ambition of functioning as a new communist international. The Declaration of Principles of the League was published on 28 December 2022 on the Internet and had been signed by 15 organisations. A crucial question is whether the initiators have correctly evaluated the experience of the Communist International (Comintern) and in particular that of the Communist Party of China (CCP) and Mao Zedong's experience of international cooperation with the fraternal parties from 1963. Indeed, all these organisations claim to pay tribute to Mao Zedong and his political line. As is well known, Mao Zedong and the CCP never took the initiative to form a new international. This is commented on in the following way in the Declaration of Principles:

“Chairman Mao and the CPCh considered that – in such circumstances – it was not adequate to conform a new Communist International because the ideological and political basis – which should be Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung thought then – was not defined. Particularly the Worker’s Party of Albania - led by Enver Hoxha – did not accept mao tsetung thought and wanted an international solely based on Marxism-Leninism, without considering the new development that it had, because essentially Hoxha was opposed to mao tsetung thought.”ⁱ

But what sources do the authors have for this claim? These are utter fantasies. The Gonzaloists are rather projecting their own frenzy of definitions and etiquette afterwards onto Mao Zedong. There is no evidence whatsoever that Mao Zedong and the CCP considered forming a new Communist International. Indeed, there are still Maoists who have first-hand knowledge and first-hand practical experience of how CCP cooperation with the fraternal parties worked in reality. It becomes downright ridiculous when they claim that Marxism-Leninism Mao Zedong’s thought was not defined then; this despite the fact that the CCP's 1945 congress stipulated it. It is obvious, according to the Gonzaloists, that the CCP and Mao Zedong never knew what they were doing and had accomplished, since Mao Zedong's theories needed to be “synthesized” by the Communist Party of Peru and Gonzalo much later. Incidentally, Mao Zedong himself disliked the term Mao Zedong's thought and definitely opposed the term Maoism.ⁱⁱ Mao Zedong's and the CCP's decision not to form a new Comintern was very well-founded and based above all on lessons learned from the negative aspects of the Comintern.

I.

Why did the Communist Party of China never form a new international?

It was right to form the Communist International, the Third International, and equally right to close it down in 1943. Mao Zedong said on the occasion of the dissolution of the Comintern in 1943:

“It is true that the Communist International was created by Lenin himself. Throughout its existence it has provided the best services to help every country organize a truly revolutionary workers' party, and it has also contributed enormously to the great cause of organizing the anti-fascist war.”ⁱⁱⁱ

This was the principal aspect. The Communist International was a world party, which applied democratic centralism. In addition to the objective of supporting the revolutionary struggles throughout the world, it was also stated that it was an imperative necessity to defend the first socialist state, the Soviet Union. This also meant that the Comintern held regular congresses in 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1924, 1928 and 1935. Between the congresses, the Comintern was led by an Executive Committee, the ECCI. It goes without saying that the Comintern and the ECCI had considerable financial and human resources, since the ECCI was based in Moscow. Many parties had permanent representatives in Moscow and the Comintern also sent representatives around the world to directly support the revolutionary struggle.

On July 14-15 1960, Zhou Enlai, on behalf of the Standing Committee of the Politburo, made a presentation at a conference convened by the CCP Central Committee to party secretaries at various levels about the Communist International and its relationship with the CCP. Zhou Enlai's analysis is, of course, in line with Mao Zedong's in other contexts. Zhou Enlai said, among other things:

“It was necessary to establish the Communist International and it was also necessary to dissolve it. From its inception to its dissolution, the Communist International existed for 24 years (1919-43), which can be divided into three eight-year periods. Comrade Mao Zedong once commented that the Communist International functioned well during the first and third periods, but not very well during the second. By that, he did not mean that everything was good during the first and third periods and nothing was good during the second. There is no question that it was necessary to establish the Communist International, which played an important role in helping to form Communist Parties in various countries and in stimulating their growth. But by the time these Parties grew up and matured, there was no longer any need for the Communist International to exist.”^{iv}

Mao Zedong also pointed out that there was no Comintern to lead the October Revolution of 1917, and that the Comintern was defunct when the CCP launched the victorious civil war against the Guomindang in 1945.

II.

The unpleasant side of Comintern

The unpleasant side of Comintern was that not even a centre could correctly analyse the politics of the whole world. Mao Zedong further stated in 1943:

“The internal situation in each country and the relations between the different countries are more complicated than they have been in the past and are changing more rapidly. It is no longer possible for a unified international organization to adapt itself to these extremely complicated and rapidly changing circumstances. Correct leadership must grow out of a

detailed analysis of these conditions, and this makes it even more necessary for the Communist Party of each country to undertake this itself. The Communist International, which is far removed from the concrete struggle in each country, was adapted to the relatively simple condition of the past, when changes took place rather slowly, but it is no longer a suitable instrument.”^v

Note that Mao Zedong's statement is titled “The Comintern has long ceased to meddle in our affairs”. This statement is fundamentally directed at the fact that the Comintern as a world party applied democratic centralism. Of course, the central organ between the congresses of a communist party, in this case a world party, which applies democratic centralism, has the right to “meddle” in the affairs of the subordinate organs.

It is by no means certain that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in advance consulted the Communist Parties of Western Europe about the non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, since there was a risk of leaks. Nevertheless, they were faced with a fait accompli. Zhou Enlai writes:

“In 1939 Hitler's Germany launched the Second World War. The mutual non-aggression pact signed by the Soviet Union and Germany placed the Parties in the capitalist countries in a difficult position and caused much ideological confusion.”^{vi}

Moreover, the national interests of some parties, such as the CPSU, could be in contradiction with the national interests of other parties and the centre could even give wrong advice. During the last civil war in China 1945–1949, Stalin advised the Chinese comrades that the Communist Party of China (CCP) and the Red Army should stop halfway and divide China into a northern and a southern part (controlled by the Guomindang).^{vii} Stalin worried about American intervention, which could spill over into the Soviet Union. In doing so, the CCP would have made the same mistake as the Viet Minh, who accepted the partition of Vietnam in 1954. Stalin later admitted in conversation with Mao Zedong that he had been wrong.

But note that the CCP considered it their own fault if they had followed bad advice. Zhou Enlai writes:

“When examining the experience of the Communist International, we should take an all-round view. Stalin was in charge for a long time, and there were many shortcomings and mistakes. But not everything during his period was wrong. Even in the second period of the International during Stalin's late years, he did more to encourage than to discourage revolutionary movements. When we held our ground, he could still accept our views and implicitly acknowledge his mistakes. Once his doubts proved to be misplaced, he was willing to change his mind. For instance, he doubted if we were genuine Marxists and if we wanted to oppose the imperialists, but he changed his views at the time of the Korean war. So Stalin was reasonable. It is true that he erred on the question of the Chinese revolution, **but the Chinese comrades should take greater responsibility for the mistakes made in that revolution, because we were the decisive factor** (our emphasis). Moreover, we have already realized and corrected our mistakes, and our revolution has already succeeded.”^{viii}

Zhou Enlai also states in the same speech:

“A country's revolution and construction depend on the practice of the people of that country. Only by integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the

country can one enrich and develop Marxism-Leninism. It is essential to sum up one's experience, both positive and negative, in the course of practice..."

"Each Party must think independently with regard to revolution and construction in its own country. Only independent thinking will prevent it from repeating the negative experience of other countries and enable it to draw on their positive experience..."

"In revolution and construction, a country should act independently and rely on its own efforts. Comrade Mao Zedong once observed that both revolutions in the two big countries, the Russian October Revolution and the Chinese revolution, succeeded when the Communist International was not in existence. **Under the present circumstances, if a new international organization should be established, it would be difficult to achieve political and economic equality among its members** (our emphasis) ..."

III.

The Communist Party of China never tried to initiate a new international

The CCP and the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA) never tried to create a new communist international together. Instead, contacts between the fraternal parties were maintained on a bilateral basis and both parties treated the fraternal parties as equals and did not try to impose their views on them. Neither the CCP nor the PLA organised any general meetings, in which all Marxist-Leninist organisations participated.

This system worked very well. The important thing was that it promoted independent thinking and not disinterested subordination. Of course, both the CCP and the PLA, especially the CCP, enjoyed the greatest influence among the Marxist-Leninist parties. This was mostly for the good, but it could also happen that one of the parties gave wrong advice. For example, the Chinese ambassador in Oslo suggested to the SKP's (Communist Party of Sweden) fraternal party AKP(m-l) in the early 1970s that it should work for Norway's accession to the EU, a piece of advice which the AKP(m-l) of course did not follow. In other cases, indirect criticism could be entirely accurate; in the context of the SKP's Unite the Left-campaign in 1973, a party delegation in China in 1974 was asked critical questions about this unprincipled campaign. The party left in the SKP was fully aware of this CCP position in the internal party struggle against the party right, but avoided referring to it in the internal party struggle against the right-wing opportunists, because we felt that we could rely entirely on our own arguments

After the split with the CCP in 1977, the PLA tried to form an international, which failed.

The KFML/SKP^x cooperated with both the CCP/PLA from 1964 to 1977. During this time we did not attend a single joint international meeting and did not adopt a single joint resolution with the CCP and PLA. The only joint resolution with other organisations adopted by the SKP was "The Nordic countries between the superpowers" in 1975, which was adopted together with AKP(m-l), KFML-Denmark, MLR-Finland, EIK-ML/Iceland and a Faroese organisation. This resolution had been very carefully prepared by the party leaderships and was based on a pre-existing consensus.

In the 1980s, SKP(m-l)/SKA^x took over the international contacts of the SKP and met the MLPD and other parties in some joint meetings. But we, as well as AKP(m-l) and KFML-Denmark, which we met separately, never signed any joint resolutions, nor did we join the MLPD-led international organisation, ICOR. The SKP(m-l)/SKA, which was formed in 1980, never tried to establish any contact with the CCP or the PLA, as both parties had degenerated.

IV.

Failed international

The Communist Party of Peru, the RCP (USA) and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoists) formed the RIM, but this international collapsed. We have no first-hand knowledge of this international, but there were apparently in practice three warring factions, who wanted to play first fiddle, and who could not unite in the long run. The distinguishing feature of many of the parties and groups that belonged to – or sympathised with – the RIM was that they pretended to be more Maoist than Mao Zedong himself, while in fact they distorted and falsified Mao Zedong's theories on several crucial points such as the question of the universality of the People's War. This was done on the basis a left dogmatism and left opportunism. At least the RIM were honest in openly criticising the CCP and Mao Zedong:

“It also is necessary to evaluate the overreaction of the Communist Party of China to the negative aspects of the Comintern that led them to refuse to play the necessary leading role in building up the organizational unity of the Marxist-Leninist forces at the international level.”^{xi}

In this context, we would like to refer to the 2017 statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of India (Maoists), “Our Stand on the Formation of an International Organization of the Proletariat”.^{xii} We consider their analysis of the RIM to be credible. It states, among other things, about the RIM:

“On the other hand, CoRIM (the leadership – our remark) became arrogant with the subjective assessment that it is absolutely correct. With its sectarian trends it created obstacles to the International Maoist movement. As we understand, this not only affected relations with other Maoist parties but caused problems within the RIM itself. Its sectarianism was manifested in a wrong attitude of deciding relations with parties solely on the basis of whether or not they accepted its Declaration...”

“As a result it publicised the revolutionary struggle of its constituents only and ignored those of others with a sectarian perspective even when they were making significant advances. It had a bad position on the unification process that led to the formation of our party. And it has given bad advice and tried to impose this on the participant parties of the RIM. It accommodated parties that were stagnating and away from revolutionary practice for decades together. The metaphysical, dogmatic, sectarian theoretical and political 10 weaknesses that continued in the leadership of RIM since the beginning, is the main reason for such severe mistakes. This obviously raised questions on its claim to be an ‘embryonic political centre’...”

“The RIM had set itself the task of advancing towards an International of a new type. It set itself the twin tasks of working out the General Line for this organization and a form of democratic centralism suited to an international organization. Both of these tasks remained unfulfilled. Serious differences on evaluation of the world situation blocked advance in the matter of formulating a General Line. The Declaration of the RIM had wrongly implied that the principle contradiction at the world level was the one between imperialist powers and that a 3rd world war was imminent. This not only gave a wrong orientation, it seriously damaged the prospects of a broader unity among Maoist parties.”

If there is an international, it must be led from a centre. But what party should lead such a centre today? Today there is not even a communist party with state power in a socialist country, which can serve as a base or an example. The two most experienced Maoist parties in the world, the Communist Party of India (Maoists) and the Communist Party of the Philippines, do not seem to have any ambition to form a new communist international with democratic centralism. This is probably because these parties give priority to the domestic class struggle over international contacts. Moreover, they have been in existence since the 1960s and are firmly rooted in a Maoist tradition and well acquainted with the policies of the

CCP and Mao Zedong. All the other parties are more or less unwritten cards, although some may be more experienced in struggle than others. A contemporary centre can no more than the ECCI in the Comintern oversee the development of the class struggle throughout the world and always make correct analyses.

V.

Proletarian internationalism requires no international

“Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out that at present the form of revolutionary organization known as the Communist International is no longer adapted to the necessities of the struggle. To continue this organizational form would, on the contrary, hinder the development of the revolutionary struggle in each country. What is needed now is the strengthening of the national Communist Party [*min-tsu kung-chan tang*] of each country, and we no longer need this international leading centre.”^{xiii}

A new communist international is still not adapted to the needs of the struggle. It is perfectly possible to still apply the CCP's line to relations with fraternal parties. The SKP (Communist Party of Sweden) met not only the CCP/PLA but also a number of other parties from all over the world, which had contacts with both of them, on a bilateral basis. As mentioned earlier, the SKP signed only **one** joint resolution, “The Nordic countries between the superpowers”, and this with the other Nordic Maoist parties and organisations. These parties knew each other well and were well acquainted with the political conditions of the other countries.

The Maoist parties formed in the capitalist and imperialist countries after 1963 were far stronger than today's MLM parties in the same countries; this without belonging to a formal international. The SKP and its youth league and student organisation in Sweden had 2500 members in 1977. Before that, thanks to its leadership of the DFFG^{xiv}, the solidarity organisation with the people of Indochina, the SKP had, for example, forced the Social Democratic government to take a stand against the US war of aggression in Indochina. In contrast, the SKP was unable to think independently when Deng Xiaoping's faction took over power in the CCP after Mao Zedong's death in 1976, whereby a revisionist party leadership majority in the SKP managed to gradually transform the party into a left-wing social democratic party.

Multilateral meetings should primarily be devoted to the exchange of experience. If resolutions are adopted at such meetings, their political line should already be well established in the respective parties. The most important thing today is for each communist party to develop political activity in its own country and develop into a powerful organisation instead of travelling around to international conferences and adopting joint statements. Communists can continue to meet with other revolutionary parties, regardless of lineage, on a bilateral basis without tying themselves to a fake international. The first step in making commitments is to adopt joint resolutions.

VI. The principal contradiction in the world

The Declaration of Principles launches the theory that the principal contradiction in the world is between imperialism and the oppressed nations:

“4) the contradiction between oppressed nations and imperialism – it is the struggle for the liberation of the oppressed nations to destroy imperialism and reaction; **it is the historically principal contradiction** (our emphasis) during the whole era of imperialism; however, any one of the four fundamental contradictions can become the principal according to specific

circumstances of class struggle, but the historically principal contradiction will again express itself as such until its final resolution”^{xv}

But what is meant by a principal contradiction? Mao Zedong writes in “On Contradiction”:

“There are many contradictions in the process of development of a complex thing, **and one of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determine or influence the existence and development of the other contradictions** (our emphasis).”^{xvi}

Mao Zedong also writes:

“Hence, if in any process there are a number of contradictions, one of them must be the principal contradiction playing the leading and decisive role, while the rest occupy a secondary and subordinate position. Therefore, in studying any complex process in which there are two or more contradictions, **we must devote every effort to funding its principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is grasped, all problems can be readily solved** (our emphasis).”^{xvii}

This means that **the principal contradiction must first be resolved before all the other contradictions can be resolved**. In a capitalist society, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is, as a rule, the principal contradiction:

“For instance, in capitalist society **the two forces in contradiction, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, form the principal contradiction** (our emphasis).”

But one principal contradiction may replace another because of external factors:

“In a semi-colonial country such as China, the relationship between the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradictions presents a complicated picture.

When imperialism launches a war of aggression against such a country, all its various classes, except for some traitors, can temporarily unite in a national war against imperialism. **At such a time, the contradiction between imperialism and the country concerned becomes the principal contradiction** (our emphasis), while all the contradictions among the various classes within the country (including what was the principal contradiction, between the feudal system and the great masses of the people) are temporarily relegated to a secondary and subordinate position.”^{xviii}

In China, the contradiction between the Chinese people and Japanese imperialism was the principal contradiction from the time of the Japanese attack in 1937 until the victory in 1945. It was absolutely necessary to resolve this principal contradiction first, before it was possible to tackle the new principal contradiction which thus arose, namely that between the working masses of China led by the CCP and the Guomindang, representing the interests of the big bourgeoisie, the comprador bourgeoisie and the big landowners.

Mao Zedong was probably the first Marxist to systematically use the concept of the principal contradiction, although Lenin also applied this theory in practice. It is vital not only to

identify the principal contradiction but also to figure out how to resolve the principal contradiction. After the February Revolution of 1917, Lenin believed that the bourgeois-democratic revolution, in which the principal contradiction was between the bourgeoisie and the working class and its allies, mainly the poor peasants, could be transformed into a socialist revolution. But how was this principal contradiction to be resolved? Lenin formulated the April Theses, in which the main slogan “All Power to the Soviets!” was raised. The Soviets had resurrected spontaneously after the February Revolution and at first Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had a majority in the Soviets. But by raising this slogan, the Bolsheviks were able to conquer the majority in the two most important soviets, the one in Petrograd and the one in Moscow. Since the war against Germany continued after the October Revolution, it was also necessary to resolve this principal contradiction. From the very beginning Lenin pushed the line in the Bolshevik Party's CC that the Soviet Union should conclude a separate peace with Germany. This line finally prevailed in the CC and the Soviet Union was given the necessary breathing space.

But is there a principal contradiction in the world today? It is extremely difficult to identify a principal contradiction in the world, given the enormity of the contradictions. “A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement”, published by the CCP in 1963, identifies four fundamental contradictions:

“What are the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world? Marxist-Leninists consistently hold that they are:

the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp;

the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries;

the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and

the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

The contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, socialism and capitalism. It is undoubtedly very sharp. But Marxist-Leninists must not regard the contradictions in the world as consisting solely and simply of the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp.”^{xix}

Note that no principal contradiction is identified in the text; on the contrary, the proposal polemicises against the notion that the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp would constitute any kind of principal contradiction, presumably because the CCP considered that the Soviet Union had already degenerated and no longer belonged to the socialist camp. Today, the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp has even disappeared, because there are no socialist states any more, only state capitalist ones.

The only time, in our opinion, that it might have been possible to identify a principal contradiction on a world scale was in the context of the Second World War, following Nazi Germany's attack on the Soviet Union and Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. Two blocs emerged: on the one hand, the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain and their associated movements and peoples, and on the other, Nazi Germany, Japan and Italy and their associated states. The contradiction between them was the principal contradiction, because it affected all other contradictions in the world. Admittedly, the American continent was never a theatre of war, but every state in the world, including the formally neutral states, had to relate

in some way to the two warring blocs. In all the countries attacked and occupied by the Axis Powers, the principal contradiction was between the aggressors and the attacked nations. In India, then a British colony, for example, there was a movement during the Second World War which claimed to be fighting for India's national liberation, but which was in fact supported by Nazi Germany. Had it succeeded, Britain's war effort against the Axis powers would naturally have been weakened.

Do the Gonzaloists really mean that the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations must first be resolved before all other contradictions can be resolved? How can this be done? That presupposes that the oppressed nations can act as a bloc (and nation is not the same as state; nations are more numerous than states). But blocs are never united or free of internal contradictions. During the First World War, even Italy switched sides. The Non-Aligned Movement, which emerged from the Bandung Conference of 1956 (in which China participated), was an alliance of Third World states, but was never a unified bloc. This movement exerted its greatest influence from the mid-1950s until the late 1970s, but of course the US, EU, China, Russia and Japan all exert influence over individual member states of the Non-Aligned Movement today.

VII.

China is a rising superpower

The Declaration of Principles declares:

“The United States currently bears the condition of sole hegemonic superpower. After the disintegration of the social-imperialist USSR in 1991, the economic weight of imperialist Russia was reduced and so did their military power, but it still maintains its character of atomic superpower. In turn, the other imperialist powers, like Germany, England, France, Japan, China, Austria, the Netherlands, Australia, Sweden, Canada, Italy, Spain, etc., altogether are also a handful of oppressing countries.”^{xx}

But Russia is an economic dwarf, with a GDP equivalent to South Korea's. Its main strength is its nuclear arsenal. The document states that “(The US's)... main strategic objective is to snatch the condition of atomic superpower from Russia, **hold down social-imperialist China and press it to widely open its economy** (our emphasis)”.^{xxi} The Gonzaloists thus portray Russia as the main enemy of the US and deny that China is a rising superpower, equating China not only with medium-sized imperialist powers like Japan, Britain and France but even with small imperialist powers like Austria and Sweden, which cannot even pursue an independent foreign policy. This puts the Gonzaloists in the same camp as some revisionists and Trotskyists.

Since 1978, China has been rapidly transformed into a capitalist and imperialist superpower. Today, China has overtaken the USA in terms of purchasing power parity (GDP (PPP)) and is second only to the USA in terms of nominal GDP. The crucial precondition for this transformation has been the bourgeois dictatorship of the Communist Party of China. The Party has enforced a complete transformation of property relations and economic policy. In contrast to the chaos in Russia after 1991, the CCP has had complete control over the economic development. Foreign ownership interests have never been allowed to dominate the economy. The role of state-owned enterprises in the economy has been gradually reduced in favour of private capitalist enterprises. China has enjoyed rapid economic growth until the Corona pandemic.

Today, China is led by a big bourgeoisie, which emerged from the CCP, consisting of party officials, monopoly capitalists with close ties, including family ties, to the party elite and

some upstarts. Forbes has had a list of 400 Chinese dollar billionaires.^{xxii} Only the US has more dollar billionaires. Four of the world's top ten companies in terms of turnover were Chinese (four American, one German and one Saudi).^{xxiii} China holds the world's largest foreign exchange reserves. While China is the world's leading exporter of goods, it is also a capital-exporting country. China invests not only in the purchase of foreign companies, ports and the construction of new infrastructure such as the Belt and Road Initiative, but also to ensure a secure supply of strategic raw materials, particularly from Africa.

China has the world's second largest military expenditure. The US with \$801 billion, China with \$293 billion, India with \$76.6 billion, the UK with \$68.4 billion and Russia with \$65.9 billion accounted for the highest military spending in the world in 2021.^{xxiv} Militarily, China is not yet on a par with the US. However, China's military build-up is faster than that of the US. Representatives of the US military establishment predict that China will surpass the US Air Force in terms of number of aircraft and have twice as many submarines by 2030. Even in terms of space and missile technology, China will surpass. In the long run, the decisive factor in a country's ability to build up a powerful conventional military capability is its economic strength. Even if China's economic growth, which lately used to be just under seven per cent a year, has now levelled off, so that China will eventually reach a GDP (PPP) per capita equivalent to that of Portugal, China's economic strength would be twice that of the US.

The law of the uneven development of capitalism has so far shown that sooner or later rising imperialist powers will come into conflict with previously dominant powers. The rivalry between two imperialist blocs resulted in two world wars. But must rivalry between imperialist superpowers always end in world war? No, the rivalry between US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism, which was particularly intense in the 1970s, ended with the collapse of Soviet social imperialism in 1991 due to internal factors.

There is another possible scenario. The US overtook Britain in terms of GDP in the 1890s, but the US could not compete with Britain for naval supremacy even until the Second World War. The only way for Britain to prevent being overtaken by the US would have been to give the South resolute support during the American Civil War. Only after the Second World War did the US completely overtake Britain and France as well as dismantle the colonial empires of the latter. Germany and Japan had been defeated. Britain and France could no longer wage independent wars, for example in Greece and Indochina.

It is already too late for the US to start a pre-emptive war against China. Since Deng Xiaoping came to power, China has been pursuing a very cautious economic, political and military build-up. In 1990, he formulated the so-called 24-character strategy:

“Observe calmly; secure our position; cope with affairs calmly; hide our capacities and bide our time; be good at maintaining a low profile; and never claim leadership.”^{xxv}

Contrary to Soviet social imperialism, China has not so far gotten into any proxy local wars with the US, let alone recaptured Taiwan. But surely China will eventually “claim leadership.”

It is impossible to predict today exactly what shapes the continuing rivalry between the US and China will take. But there will be plenty of grounds for conflicts, including over the

control of certain strategic commodities. It also depends on what alliance policies the US and China will pursue in the future.

The likelihood, however, is that China will outperform the US on all fronts, except perhaps GDP per capita, with the US unable to do anything about it.

Parties such as the Communist Party of India (Maoist)^{xxvi} and the Communist Party of the Philippines^{xxvii} have taken a very clear stand against China as an imperial superpower. Maoists in Sweden claimed as early as 2005 that China was a superpower in the making.^{xxviii}

VIII. The world situation

The description of the world situation in the Declaration of Principles is subjectivist, idealistic and almost religious; one gets the impression that the International Communist League is a secular version of the Latter-day Saints and that world developments are rapidly approaching Armageddon.^{xxix} Already in the introduction there is talk of the “New Great Wave of the Proletarian World Revolution” - capital letters are used just in case.

At one point in the Declaration of Principles it is therefore significantly stated:

“Since the beginning of this decade (our emphasis) the crisis of imperialism and bureaucratic capitalism has been further aggravated throughout the world. Whenever its disintegration deepens, all contradictions are sharpened, creating a more revolutionary situation with uneven development throughout the world. The situation is expressed by the great activity of the masses, the explosiveness of which makes all reactionaries and their revisionist lackeys tremble. **It is expressed everywhere by great explosions never seen before** (our emphasis). The objective situation is rapidly confronting the subjective factor – mainly the process of the communist parties, as Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties of a new type, to launch new people's wars. Thus a new opportunity, a period of revolutions as part of the New Great Wave of the World Proletarian Revolution, is opening up. This situation determines the tasks, strategy and tactics of the communist parties throughout the world.”^{xxx}

These are just self-serving incantations and babble completely devoid of concrete analysis. As such, the Gonzaloist claim that the international communist movement is on a strategic offensive on a world scale does not explicitly recur in the text, but this is as close as one can get without actually using the term itself. Exactly what has happened in the last decade? What “great explosions”? Can they be compared to the “great explosion” of the First World War, which led to the October Revolution? Can they be compared with the second “great explosion” of the Second World War, which led to the expansion of the socialist camp to include one third of humanity? Can they be compared with another “great explosion”, the Indochina War, which ended with the first major defeat of US imperialism in 1975? The participants in the founding conference of the International Communist League seem to imagine that the formation of this international would have any effect on the international class struggle. This is despite the fact that the two most experienced Maoist parties in the world, the Communist Party of India (Maoist) and the Communist Party of the Philippines, both of which have been waging people's wars since the 1960s, did not attend the meeting at

all. Neither of them is on a strategic offensive according to themselves. This is despite the fact that several of the European Maoist organisations attending the meeting have no mass influence at all and can only count on double-digit membership. This is despite the fact that the Communist Party of Brazil (Red Fraction), which seems to play first fiddle among these organisations, has not itself launched a people's war. This is despite the fact that the Communist Party of Peru, Chairman Gonzalo's party, has not yet been reconstituted or resumed the people's war in Peru. ^{xxxi} The latter phenomenon is described as a “delayed strategic task” in the text.

The Gonzaloists interpret some of Mao's statements literally, including those of 1962:

“The next 50-100 years, starting today, will be a great epoch of radical change in the world's social system, an epoch that will shake the earth, an epoch that no other previous historical epoch can compare with. Living in such an epoch, we must be prepared to fight a great struggle whose forms will have many different characteristics from those of the past.” ^{xxxii}

But Mao Zedong was not a genius who could see into the future:

“The question of genius is a theoretical one. Their theory (Mao Zedong referring to Lin Biao and others – our remark) was idealistic apriorism. Someone has said that to oppose genius is to oppose me. But I am not a genius.” ^{xxxiii}

Anyone who interprets everything Mao Zedong said literally, especially on ceremonial occasions or for the purpose of mobilizing the Party cadres, is trying to degrade Mao Zedong into a fool, but is really only acting like a fool themselves. At the 1945 CCP Congress, Mao Zedong gave a closing speech in which he retold the fable of “The Foolish Old Man Who Removed the Mountains”. ^{xxxiv} The Foolish Old Man had set out to dig away two mountains. When he was criticized for it, he replied that if he did not succeed, his sons and their grandsons, and their grandsons' sons and grandsons, would continue until the mountains were dug away, i.e. four generations hence. Finally, God was moved by the old man's decision and sent down two angels, who carried the mountains away on their backs. The participants at the congress surely understood that Mao Zedong was urging the Party cadres to persevere in the struggle for China's liberation rather than interpreting Mao Zedong literally. The liberation took only four more years – not four generations.

In another context, Mao Zedong pointed out that it could take 10,000 years to achieve communism. Anyone who interprets this statement too literally may therefore be giving up the fight for communism today. It is only in the short term that accurate predictions can be made. The parties of the Second International foresaw the outbreak of the First World War, but chose completely different ways to fight it. The Great Depression of 1929 was predicted by the Comintern. The Comintern also foresaw the outbreak of the Second World War and the policy of the Soviet Union was to prevent this outbreak.

The Gonzaloists think very highly of themselves and write:

“The new international organization is a center of ideological, political and organizational

coordination based on democratic centralism and problem-solving through mutual and permanent consultation between the parties and organizations that are part of it, and it will extend this procedure to all those who - while participating with the same principles and aims - are outside it. The task of the new international organization is to struggle **to impose Maoism as the sole command** (our emphasis) and guide of the world proletarian revolution, which serves to constitute or reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Parties (the delayed strategic task) and serves to launch, develop and coordinate the people's wars of the world towards the re-creation of the Communist International.”^{xxxv}

The International Communist League thus wants to “impose Maoism as the sole command” of the world proletarian revolution. **Firstly**, this approach is merely pathetic, given that none of the signatory organisations is on a strategic offensive in its own countries, that hardly any of them has any mass influence, and that some of the organisations in Europe have only double-digit membership. **Secondly**, these organisations do not stand for a Maoist line but for a “left” revisionist line, which in words professes Maoism, but revises Mao Zedong's principled politics on crucial points (more on this later). **Thirdly**, this international organisation has not adopted a political programme. It has adopted eleven principles, the first of which is “Contradiction - the only fundamental law of the perpetual transformation of eternal matter”! This is a question for dialectics, but should it be included in a programme? The same applies, for example, to principles such as “Go against the current”, which in itself is correct, but does it belong to a program? The historically interested should study the various resolutions of the Comintern,^{xxxvi} and perhaps begin with Lenin's opening speech at the First Congress of the Comintern ii as a comparison. Then one sees that the Gonzaloists are at the level of nursery. **Finally**, what is meant by “imposing” Maoism? It is not possible to impose an ideology on someone else, a people, a class or a group of people. On the contrary, you have to convince them; communist parties must in practice prove the correctness of the line by taking the lead in the struggle of the working masses, voluntarily convincing those concerned of the correctness of the communists' policy. Anything else goes against the mass line:

“Commandism is wrong in any type of work, because in overstepping the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of voluntary mass action it reflects the disease of impetuosity. Our comrades must not assume that everything they themselves understand is understood by the masses. Whether the masses understand it and are ready to take action can be discovered only by going into their midst and making investigations.”^{xxxvii}

It is revealing that the mass line, which really characterised Mao Zedong's politics, is not mentioned at all in the voluminous document.

IX.

Subjectivism and idealism systematised

Although the document never explicitly claims the universality of the People's War, the most prominent dogma of Gonzalism, the People's War is consistently presented as a panacea. Quite rightly, the document ends with the words – and two exclamation marks:

“The First International Maoist Conference is a base and marches relentlessly towards the reunification of the Communists in the international Communist movement - a war machine -

a fighting machine that hoists the flags of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and **the invincible People's War!!!** (our emphasis)”

It is absurd to assert that a certain strategy, whether it be the path of the October Revolution or the path of the People's War, is invincible. After the October Revolution, a series of revolutionary attempts were made, Germany, Finland, Hungary, Estonia and China, etc., all of which failed. Nor is a war of liberation or a People's War, in which the cities are surrounded by the countryside, a guarantee of success. This is demonstrated by the liberation and people's wars in Greece (1946-1949), Malaysia (1948-1960), Peru (1980-1992) and, most recently, Nepal. A given strategy can only succeed if the Communist Party has correctly assessed both objective and subjective factors and formulated a correct political line, which wins mass support, i.e. proves correct in practice, and leads to victory and a seizure of power.

Mao Zedong completely rejected the theory that the People's War was universal. Already in a conversation in 1956 with representatives of some Latin American Communist Parties, Mao Zedong stressed:

“The experience of the Chinese revolution - i.e. building base areas in the countryside, surrounding the cities from the countryside and finally seizing the cities - may not be entirely useful in many of your countries, but it can serve as a reference material for you. I advise you not to mechanically transplant the Chinese experience. The experience of another country can only serve as a reference and must not be regarded as dogma. The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and the concrete conditions in your own countries - the two must be united.”^{xxxviii}

The theory that the People's War is universal, i.e. also applicable in capitalist and imperialist countries, would have devastating consequences for the communists and the proletariat in these countries. In these countries the principal contradiction is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which can only be resolved by the method of socialist revolution, for in these countries the proletariat is the largest class, while the peasantry is a small minority, and moreover – like political power – the proletariat is concentrated in the cities. So far, no Gonzaloist organisation has even attempted to initiate a People's War in any advanced capitalist country, as long as the principal contradiction has been between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, nor will they ever do so. The principal contradiction in these countries may, of course, change, as it did during the Second World War. When Germany and Italy attacked relatively backward feudal-capitalist countries with large peasant populations like Albania, Yugoslavia and Greece, this led to popular wars of liberation led by the communists. In other Nazi-occupied parts of Europe, too, an advanced resistance struggle developed, in which the Communists usually played a leading role.

Nor does the document dispel the Gonzaloist theory that the international communist movement is today on “a strategic offensive”. The only time the document addresses this issue it states:

“With the Great Chinese Revolution, a new relationship of **strategic equilibrium** (our emphasis) emerged between the world forces of capitalism and socialism. The whole period after the Second World War was marked by bitter struggles between imperialism and socialism.”

If we are to apply the three concepts, strategic defensive, strategic equilibrium and strategic offensive, originally used by Mao Zedong in connection with his theories on the People's War, to the history of the revolutionary movement, the result is quite different. Indeed, the international workers' movement began its strategic offensive with the Communist Manifesto of 1848 and the formation of the First International in 1864 (defunct in 1876). The Second International was formed in 1889 (disbanded in 1912), but by then several social democratic parties had already been created, particularly in Europe. The First World War led to the break-up of the Second International, but above all to the October Revolution of 1917, the creation of the first socialist state and the formation of the Comintern. The Comintern inspired the formation of communist parties throughout the world, including in China. During the interwar period, the communist parties were pushed back in various Nazi and fascist states; in China, the CCP and the Red Army were forced to join the Long March in 1935. The Second World War led to the enormous growth of the socialist camp. In addition to China and North Vietnam, the people's democracies of Eastern Europe and Yugoslavia and Albania, which had liberated themselves, were added. Since North Korea, China and the Soviet Union joined forces to repel the US-led aggression on the Korean Peninsula in 1951-53, it could be said that **the socialist camp had never been as strong as it was in 1953.**

With the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956, when Khrushchev attacked Stalin, the contradictions between the CPSU and the CCP began, leading to an open break between the two parties in 1963 and the collapse of the socialist bloc. This meant that a kind of strategic equilibrium was established between the forces of imperialism on the one hand and remaining socialist states such as China and Albania, and the oppressed nations and peoples on the other. At the same time, it must be remembered that a number of former colonies, notably in Africa, became independent in the 1960s and 1970s. Some states and liberation movements were also able to exploit the contradictions between US imperialism and the emerging Soviet social imperialism. The victory of the Indochinese peoples in 1975 was a crushing defeat for US imperialism.

The post-1978 development, on the other hand, can be characterised as a strategic defensive by the international communist movement. The degeneration of the Soviet Union and its transformation into a social-imperialist superpower had already led to the transformation of a number of former communist parties outside the Soviet bloc into left reformist parties. The split between the CCP and the PLA in 1977, in turn, first led to the break-up of the international Marxist-Leninist movement. Deng Xiaoping's final seizure of power in the CCP in 1978^{xxxix} meant that his influence spread among those parties, particularly in the imperialist bloc, that had taken a pro-CCP and anti-PLA stance. This resulted in the disillusionment and demise of many Marxist-Leninist parties in the 1980s and 1990s.

Today, there are very few strong Maoist parties on a world scale. The strongest outside the imperialist and social-imperialist bloc would be the Communist Party of India (Maoist) and the Communist Party of the Philippines.

Maoism is a scientific ideology – not a religion

There is nothing to suggest that the International Communist League will be able to develop into a powerful Communist international. Basically, it is a number of pro-Gonzaloist parties, which have joined forces in the belief that together they could achieve some sort of synergy, but if one blind leads another blind, they will both end up in a pit.

The International Communist League is not based on Maoism at all, but on Gonzaloism. This was also highlighted at their founding conference in the form of the “Resolution for Special Recognition of President Gonzalo and the Communist Party of Peru”, which tellingly also stated;

“We, as delegates to the International Conference of the International Communist League, pay special tribute to this great leader of the proletariat, we raise to his summit the unconquered banner, we vow to follow his extraordinary example of consistent and total devotion to our cause, the struggle and the unceasing toil for communism.”^{xl}

The statement has almost the character of a profession of faith.

It is truly remarkable that there is a movement which elevates the leader of a party, the Communist Party of Peru, who was not only imprisoned but also, as a result thereof, the party collapsed, to the status of a beacon and an example to be followed. The correctness of the Communist Party of Peru was thus never confirmed in practice; this is contrary to the political line of Lenin and Mao Zedong. In practice, the Gonzaloists put Gonzalo above Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong. The normal thing when leaders of communist parties are captured or killed is that these parties can be reconstituted, because there are cadres to replace them – see, for example, Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Ernst Thälman in Germany and Antonio Gramsci in Italy. A communist party does not stand or fall with one person. It is also normal for communists to self-critically review their politics in the event of defeat, but the Communist Party of Peru has never done this. Since the Communist Party of Peru has not yet been reconstituted and the people's War has not resumed, the party's problems must be more profound.

Mao Zedong's line was that the Communists should “develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and combat die-hard forces.”^{xli} Mao Zedong applied this line not only in the context of the war of liberation against Japan but in a number of other contexts, including the internal party struggle. There is much evidence that the Communist Party of Peru did not apply this line, especially towards the various strata of the peasantry and towards progressive organisations and progressive individuals opposed to the Peruvian regime – see the Maoist Communist Union's review in this regard.^{xlii} This meant that the Communist Party of Peru pushed the middle forces into the arms of the far right, which also has implications for how the working masses in Peru today perceive the Communist Party of Peru and probably explains why the party has not been reconstituted so far.

The Communist Workers' Association and individual members of the Communist Workers' Association have in the past criticised Gonzaloism on a number of issues ^{xliii}, so we confine ourselves to a few remarks in this context.

The line of the Communist Party of Peru, Gonzalo and the International Communist League differs on question after question from the general line of the international communist movement, as formulated by the classics, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong. On every point where the Gonzaloists differ from the classics and the Comintern, they also end up in revisionist, Trotskyist, anarchist or ultra-left positions.

This is the case with the notion of the theory about the universality of people's war, the theories about the militarised Communist Party, concentric circles and the necessity of imposing Maoism on the masses, all of which imply a revision of Maoism from the “left”, i.e. pure “left” revisionism.

The Gonzaloists completely ignore the experience of the Communist Party of China and Mao Zedong with the Comintern, especially its shortcomings and mistakes, and have not at all understood the line of the CCP and Mao Zedong not to initiate a new International.

The Gonzaloists launch the idealistic jefatura theory, the theory of great leadership, which elevates certain leaders, in their case Gonzalo, to the status of infallible leaders. This is in direct contradiction to the collective leadership advocated by the classics, such as Mao Zedong, and all genuine communist parties.

The International Communist League is incapable of correctly assessing the world situation and the principal contradiction, underestimates China as an ascendant social-imperialist superpower and overestimates the strength of the international communist movement. The Gonzaloists dream of a “global people's war” under their leadership, which is similar to Trotsky's permanent revolution. They see the transitional socialist society as a militarised society and this kind of war communism echoes Trotsky's and Bukharin's deeply mistaken line after the civil war in the Soviet Union, a line that both Lenin and Stalin successfully fought.^{xliv}

The Gonzaloist line is extremely sectarian. In bourgeois-democratic countries, they advocate a principled boycott of elections, which is the traditional line of anarchism and which was never advocated by the classics of Marxism or the Comintern, nor, of course, by Mao Zedong – see “A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement” (1963).^{xlv} Communists have always advocated the use of all kinds of methods of struggle to achieve the ultimate goal.

The Gonzaloists reduce politics to a matter of labels and definitions. **But the ideological and political line is decisive in everything.** What does it matter that these parties describe themselves as Marxist-Leninist-Maoist (MLM) – sometimes with the addition of “principally Maoist” – if at the same time they claim that the people's war is universal, a strategy that is completely misguided in capitalist and imperialist countries, in which the principal contradiction is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie? The KFML (later SKP) in Sweden wrote Mao Zedong's thought into its founding principles as early as 1967, but this did not automatically generate any successes. On the contrary, it was the ideological and political line, which the KFML/SKP^{xlvi} applied until 1978, that led to the party's successes. This was inspired by the CCP's struggle against modern Soviet revisionism during the Great Debate and the Cultural Revolution, as well as by Mao Zedong's mass line and united front tactics. The latter meant that the KFML/SKP constantly sought to unite its struggle with that of the working masses.

The Gonzaloists are full-blooded dogmatists. Mao Zedong wrote in “On Contradictions”:

“Marxist-Leninists must carefully follow the principle of using different methods to resolve different contradictions. The dogmatists do not follow this principle. They do not understand that the conditions are different in different kinds of revolutions, and therefore do not understand that different methods should be used to solve different contradictions. On the contrary, they always add to what they imagine to be an immutable formula and apply it arbitrarily everywhere, which only leads to setbacks for the revolution or makes a miserable mess of what could have been done well.”^{xlvi}

The Gonzaloists are even so confused that they label certain concepts as revisionist in themselves without examining how they have been defined. They claim that “imperialist blocs” by definition imply that they are as uniform as stones, as if definitions were already given in a Platonic world of ideas. They also label the concept of neo-colonialism as revisionist, despite the fact that the fourth commentary of the Communist Party of China during the Great Debate was precisely titled “Defender of Neo-colonialism”. This is just one of several veiled attacks on the CCP and Mao Zedong. Another veiled attack on Mao Zedong is the statement in the document that “Stalin developed this struggle (i.e. against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukharin – our remark) over thirteen years and **it is wrong to claim that he solved things administratively**” (our emphasis). But in fact Mao Zedong criticised Stalin precisely for his administrative methods. One example will suffice:

“Secondly, Stalin regarded the mass line as tail policy; [he] did not recognize the good sides of the mass line, and **he used administrative methods to solve many problems** (our emphasis)... But we communists are materialists; we recognize that it is the masses who create everything and are the masters of history. [For us] there are no individual heroes; only when the masses are united can there be strength. In fact, since Lenin's death, the mass line has been forgotten in the Soviet Union.”^{xlvi}

The Gonzaloists' attitude to Stalin is reminiscent of that of Enver Hoxha and the Albanian Workers' Party. The CCP and the PLA were in an alliance against modern Soviet revisionism from 1957 to 1977. During this period, the PLA in practice always treated Stalin as a greater thinker than Mao Zedong, and the PLA also resolved the contradictions within the party by administrative methods in the same way as Stalin, i.e. ultimately by executing leading opponents. In the CCP, no member of the Central Committee was executed as long as Mao Zedong was alive.

The Gonzaloists also distort the theory of the two-line struggle and present it as if there were always two clearly defined lines. On the contrary, a wrong line begins to develop in the form of “left” or “right” errors, which can be combated even at the initial stage by theoretical struggle and criticism and self-criticism. If one fails to do this for various reasons, a line naturally emerges. In the Communist Party of Sweden (SKP), line struggles arose in 1968, 1970, 1972, 1975–1977 and 1978–1980. But until 1978 the main line was correct. In the CCP, Mao Zedong reacted as early as 1966^{xlix} against Lin Biao's genius cult of him, but the principal contradiction in the internal party struggle in the CCP at that time was between those who supported Mao Zedong's line and the capitalist roaders headed by Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. It was not until 1971 that Lin Biao was decisively dealt with.

In the international Marxist-Leninist movement, in which the CCP and the PLA played the leading role from 1963 to 1977, there was, as has been pointed out, never any open polemic, i.e. open line struggle between the parties. Criticism was raised in bilateral meetings between the parties:

“The leaders of the CPSU have completely disregarded the principle of achieving unity through consultation between the fraternal parties and have made a habit of making dictatorial decisions and ordering others around. They have ruthlessly torn up joint agreements with fraternal parties, arbitrarily made decisions on important issues of common interest to the fraternal parties and imposed fait accompli on them. The leaders of the CPSU have broken the principle that differences between fraternal parties should be resolved through internal party consultations. They used first their own party congress and then the congresses of other fraternal parties as tribunes for large-scale public attacks against those fraternal parties which adhere steadfastly to Marxism-Leninism.”¹

Mao Zedong and the CCP maintained this line even after the split with the CPSU and in their own contacts with the fraternal parties. The Gonzaloists, on the other hand, elevate the international two-line line struggle within the international communist movement to the status of a guiding principle. But the situation was completely different in Lenin's time because the Second International had degenerated and it was absolutely necessary to engage in open polemics against the social-chauvinists and reformists, since these also influenced the situation in Tsarist Russia. It was the same for the CCP during the Great Debate, when in fact the modern revisionists in the CPSU were the first to publicly attack the CCP and the PLA. The CCP's line in fact encouraged the then fraternal parties to focus on developing the class struggle and on theoretical struggle against all kinds of opportunist tendencies in their own country, instead of devoting the main attention to the possible faults and shortcomings of the fraternal parties.

XI.

Final words

The International Communist League will never succeed in forming a new communist international; it will probably implode even faster than the RIM.

Firstly, the ICL starts from a “left” revisionist platform, i.e. Maoism is revised from the “left”, and is in practice only a modified version of Gonzalism. This is characterised by vulgarised dogmatism, idealism and subjectivism. The International Communist League has not even adopted a political programme. An International based on Gonzalism will never be able to lead a world people's war or a world revolution.

Secondly, all the organisations in the ICL that signed the resolution are unwritten cards. None of them has yet triumphed, i.e. the correctness of their ideological and political line has not been proven in practice. Their standard-bearer, the Communist Party of Peru, has already suffered defeat once and has not yet succeeded in reconstituting the party. Yet the International Communist League is proclaiming all the victories in advance. These parties claim that the people's war is universal, but hardly any of them has yet launched a people's war. Most European organisations in the ICL are insignificant, lack experience of class struggle and mass influence and have only double-digit membership. There is, of course, nothing wrong with communist organisations having a limited membership in the initial stages; only if it risks remaining a permanent condition. Significantly, the Communist Party of India (Maoists) and the Communist Party of the Philippines, the two most experienced Maoist parties in the world, never attended the founding conference, although they were invited.

Finally, the International Communist League is starting from completely the wrong end, i.e. from above and without any real base, when it proclaims its organisation. We fully support the perspective of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) when it writes:

“We call on all communist parties and organizations to wage revolutionary struggle in their own countries as the most important contribution to the international proletarian revolution (our emphasis). With powerful revolutionary movements accumulating successes and victories in all forms of struggle throughout the world, the building of international unity through theoretical and polemical exchanges and the creation of various forms of cooperation between communist parties and groups can become more productive and anchored in practice.

In order to achieve greater international unity and cooperation, the CPP encourages communist parties and organizations to hold bilateral meetings and multilateral conferences and consultations, where important issues of theory and practice can be discussed, examined and agreed upon, while setting aside differing opinions for further study and discussion. We must always strive to build unity on the basis of upholding Marxism-Leninism, promoting Maoism as the third stage in the development of proletarian ideology, exposing and combating revisionism, advancing the struggle against imperialism and all reaction, and advancing the new democratic and socialist revolutions.”ⁱⁱ

Today it is as easy as it gets to access the theoretical texts, statements and political struggles of other Maoist parties on the internet, but at the same time it is also easy to give the impression that a party has much more influence than it has, even though it may just be a few desk-bound Marxists who have created a website. In fact, the formation of the International Communist League and its presumptuous pretensions to lead the international communist movement and the world proletariat will only lead to the intensification of the theoretical struggle against Gonzaloism, because Gonzaloism discredits Maoism and can only end in a dead end. Already organisations in Canada, Norway and Sweden, for example, have split.

Concluding remark

It's funny that the Gonzaloists still use the Wade-Giles transcription system, which was designed in the 19th century (1867 and 1892), instead of the pinyin system. It is still popular in the Anglo-Saxon world and – Taiwan! So they write Mao Tse-tung and Peking instead of Mao Zedong and Beijing. The decision to develop the pinyin system was taken in China as early as 1950, a year after the founding of the People's Republic, became official in 1958, but was not fully implemented until 1979, after Mao's death. Anyone can listen online to the pronunciation of China's capitalⁱⁱⁱ and it is quite clear that Beijing is the closest to the Chinese pronunciation.

Communist Workers' Union/Kommunistiska Arbetarföreningen

Sweden/Sverige

<https://arbetarforeningen.se/>

28/2 2023

- i [Historical News of the successful Holding of the Unified Maoist International Conference: the International Communist League was founded! – Communist International \(ci-ic.org\)](#)
- ii For example: *Conversation between chairman Mao and comrades Hysni Kapo and Beqir Ballaku*:
<https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/memorandum-conversation-between-chairman-mao-zedong-and-comrades-hysni-kapo-and-beqir>
- iii *The Comintern has long ceased to meddle in our affairs*:
https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-6/mswv6_36.htm
- iv <https://bannedthought.net/China/Individuals/ZhouEnlai/SelectedWorksOfZhouEnlai-V2-Searchable.pdf> – see pages 306 – 319.
- v *The Comintern has long ceased to meddle in our affairs*:
https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-6/mswv6_36.htm
- vi <https://bannedthought.net/China/Individuals/ZhouEnlai/SelectedWorksOfZhouEnlai-V2-Searchable.pdf> – page 318
- vii ” In the late 1940s and well into the 1950s, Mao and other Chinese Party leaders repeatedly contended that Mikoyan [in his secret visit on Stalin’s behalf to Mao in early 1949] had recommended that the PLA not cross the Yangtze. “ See
<https://www.massline.org/SingleSpark/Stalin/StalinMaoEval.htm>
- viii <https://bannedthought.net/China/Individuals/ZhouEnlai/SelectedWorksOfZhouEnlai-V2-Searchable.pdf> – page 308
- ix KFML, that is Communist League (Marxist-Leninist), the predecessor of SKP
- x https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communist_Workers%27_Party_of_Sweden
- xi Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement 1984
– https://ia800201.us.archive.org/22/items/DeclarationOfTheRevolutionaryInternationalistMovement_292/DeclarationOfTheRevolutionaryInternationalistMovement_292.pdf
- xii See ”Our Stand on the Formation of an International Organisation of the Proletariat”, February 2017
– <https://www.bannedthought.net/India/CPI-Maoist-Docs/index.htm#2017>
- xiii https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-6/mswv6_36.htm
- xiv De Förenade FNL-grupperna – United NLF-Groups. See
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_NLF_Groups
- xv <https://www.bannedthought.net/International/ICL/MajorDocs/HistoricNews-ICL-Founded-2022-Eng.pdf> , page 7
- xvi https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm
- xvii In the passage quoted
- xviii In the passage quoted
- xix <https://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sino-soviet-split/cpc/proposal.htm>
- xx [Historical News of the successful Holding of the Unified Maoist International Conference: the International Communist League was founded! – Communist International \(ci-ic.org\)](#)
- xxi In the passage quoted
- xxii <https://www.forbes.com/china-billionaires/list/#tab:overall>
- xxiii https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_largest_companies_by_revenue
- xxiv https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2022-04/milex_press_release_swe.pdf
- xxv <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/china/24-character.htm>
- xxvi China – a new Social-Imperialist power! It is integral to the World Capitalist Imperialist system! –
<https://www.bannedthought.net/India/CPI-Maoist-Docs/Books/China-Social-Imperialism-CPI-Maoist-2021-Eng-view.pdf>
- xxvii *On The Centennial Of The Once Great Communist Party Of China -*
<https://www.redspark.nu/en/imperialist-states/cpp-on-the-centennial-of-the-once-great-communist-party-of-china/>
- xxviii <https://arbetarforeningen.se/kina-en-supermakt-i-vardande/> – only in Swedish
- xxix <https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Armageddon>
- xxx [Historical News of the successful Holding of the Unified Maoist International Conference: the International Communist League was founded! – Communist International \(ci-ic.org\)](#)

xxxi“It serves us to propagandize the struggle for the general reorganization of the PCP and the people’s war as the only way out for the proletariat and our people, against...”

“Let us apply the boycott as the policy of hindering the elections, undermining and preventing them wherever possible, as the tactic of using the elections **as a function of the general reorganisation of the party in and for developing the people’s war** (our emphasis) to seize power throughout the country.” See *Don’t vote! Elections. no! People’s war, yes!* av MPP (Movimiento Popular Perú) den 22/9 2022 : <https://ci-ic.org/blog/2022/09/30/mpp-dont-vote-elections-no-peoples-war-yes/>

xxxiiMao Zedong: “From a speech in front of a meeting with 7000 cadres in 1962” – quoted via [Historical News of the successful Holding of the Unified Maoist International Conference: the International Communist League was founded!](https://ci-ic.org/blog/2022/09/30/mpp-dont-vote-elections-no-peoples-war-yes/) – Communist International (ci-ic.org)

xxxiiiSummary of Talks with Responsible Comrades at Various Places During Provincial Tour (1971), Mao Tse-tung: Selected Works, volume IX, page. 414

xxxiv https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-3/mswv3_26.htm

xxxv [Historical News of the successful Holding of the Unified Maoist International Conference: the International Communist League was founded!](https://ci-ic.org/blog/2022/09/30/mpp-dont-vote-elections-no-peoples-war-yes/) – Communist International (ci-ic.org)

xxxvi <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/mar/comintern>

xxxvii” On coalition government”(24 april 1945), Selected Works, volume III, chapter V:

https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-3/mswv3_25.htm

xxxviii Selected Works, volume V, page 320

xxxixThis date is used here because Deng Xiaoping's economic reforms were adopted then, at the same time as Hua Guofeng's centrist faction was removed from all political influence in the leadership. Thus began the definitive restoration of capitalism in China. See here, for example:

<https://bannedthought.net/China/Maoism/2022/ChinaRevolutionAndRestoration-English-2022.pdf>

xl <https://ci-ic.org/blog/2022/12/28/resolution-of-special-acknowledgment-to-chairman-gonzalo-and-the-pcp/>

xli”Current problems of tactics in the anti-Japanese united front”, Mao Tse-tung, Selected works. Volume II, page.422

xliiSe ”A Critical Evaluation of Gonzaloism”, Red Pages number 3, pages 13 – 60

<https://www.bannedthought.net/USA/MCU/index.htm>

xliii**Thomas Berg:**

Gonzalisten – en ”vänster”revisionistisk avvikelse – 23/11 2022 – <https://arbetarforeningen.se/?p=419>

In English:<http://www.bannedthought.net/Sweden/MF/2022/Gonzaloism-A-Left-Revisionist-Deviation-Berg-3rd-Ed-2022-OCR.pdf>

Ingen kompromiss om principer – Enhet på marxismen-leninismen-maoismens grund – Kommunistiska Arbetarföreningen 24/11 2022 – <https://arbetarforeningen.se/?p=430>.

Kommunistiska Arbetarföreningen:

En gonzalistisk riktning har tagit över Kommunistiska Föreningen – 19/11 2022 –

<https://arbetarforeningen.se/?p=299>

Rickard B. Turesson:

Görs revolution utifrån etiketter? – Marxistiskt Forum 1/2017 –

<https://marxforum.se/index.php/2021/07/07/gors-revolution-utifran-etiketter/>

Kan Mao Zedongs vidareutveckling av marxismen-leninismen reduceras till en katekes? – Marxistiskt Forum 1/2018 – <https://marxforum.se/index.php/2021/07/07/kan-mao-zedongs-vidareutveckling-av->

[marxismen-leninismen-reduceras-till-en-katekes/](#)

Stackars Mao Zedong, som inte ens var maoist – Marxistiskt Forum nr 1/2019

-<https://marxforum.se/index.php/2021/07/08/stackars-mao-zedong-som-inte-ens-var-maoist/> In

English:<http://www.bannedthought.net/Sweden/MF/2019/PoorMaoZedongWhoWasn'tEvenAMaoist-Turesson-2019-OCR.pdf>

Folkkriget är ingen universalstrategi – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 26/12 2021 –

<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2021/12/26/11749622-folkkriget-ar-absolut-ingen-universalstrategi/>

Teorin om att folkkriget är universellt kan visst leda till äventyrspolitik (originally published on 28/2 2022) – <https://arbetarforeningen.se/?p=321>

Lärdomar av den revolutionära kampen i Nepal – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 27/3 2022 –

<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/03/27/11756960-lardomar-av-den-revolutionara-kampen-i-nepal/>

Bör folkkriget prövas i Sverige? – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 16/7 2022

-<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/07/16/11772711-bor-folkkriget-provas-i-sverige-idag/>

Mer om genikulten och jefatura – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 30/7 2022 –

<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/07/30/11763866-mer-om-genikulten-och-jefatura/>

Fanns det överhuvudtaget någon i KFML/SKP som förespråkade folkkrigets universalitet? – Nya

Arbetartidningens blogg 4/10 2022 – <http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/11/04/11771336-fanns-det-overhuvudtaget-nagon-i-kfml-skp-som-foresprakade-folkkrigets-universalitet/>

Thomas Berg har helt rätt – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 11/10 2022

<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/10/11/11772714-thomas-berg-har-helt-ratt/>

Ajith om folkkrigen 2014 – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 19/10 2022 –

<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/10/19/11770051-ajith-om-folkkrigen-2014/>

Kan Gonzalos tänkande vägleda världsrevolutionen? – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 23/10 2022 –

<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/10/23/11770402-kan-gonzalos-tankande-vagleda-varldsrevolutionen/>

Vilka förvränger maoismen? – Nya Arbetartidningens blogg 5/11 2022

-<http://nyaarbetartidningen.bloggplatsen.se/2022/11/05/11771436-vilka-forvranger-maoismen/>

Mera om Mao Zedongs tänkande – 21/11 2022 – <https://arbetarforeningen.se/?p=317>

Gonzalo avslöjar själv att han är fel ute – 21/11 2022 – <https://arbetarforeningen.se/?p=319>

Befinner sig den revolutionära rörelsen i världsmåttstock på en strategisk offensiv? – 23/11 2022 –

<https://arbetarforeningen.se/?p=293>

xliv See "A Critical Evaluation of Gonzaloism", Red Pages number 3, sid. 54 – 60

<https://www.bannedthought.net/USA/MCU/index.htm>

xlv <https://www.marxists.org/subject/china/documents/polemic/neocolon.htm>

xlvi KFML = Communist League (Marxist-Leninist) 1967 – 1973, SKP = Communist Party of Sweden 1973 – 1986

xlvii *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Volume I, page 322 or

https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm

xlviii" Speech at the Second Plenum of the Eight Central Committee" (Nov. 15, 1956), Version II, WMZ2, pp. 185-6 – quoted via <https://massline.org/SingleSpark/Stalin/StalinMaoEval.htm>

xlixMao Tse-tung's private letter to Chiang Ch'ing (July 8, 1966):

<https://www.bannedthought.net/China/Individuals/MaoZedong/Letters/Mao'sLetterToJiangQing-660708-Alt1-sm.pdf>

i *The Leaders Of The CPSU Are the Greatest Splitters Of Our Time Comment On The Open Letter Of The Central Committee Of The CPSU (VII)*

<https://www.marxists.org/subject/china/documents/polemic/splitters.htm>

ii <https://philippinerevolution.nu/statements/on-the-announced-formation-by-the-international-communist-league/>

iii [https://www.google.com/search?](https://www.google.com/search?q=Beijing+pronunciation&rlz=1C1GGGE_svSE475SE476&oq=Beijing+pronunciation&aqs=chrom)

[q=Beijing+pronunciation&rlz=1C1GGGE_svSE475SE476&oq=Beijing+pronunciation&aqs=chrom](https://www.google.com/search?q=Beijing+pronunciation&rlz=1C1GGGE_svSE475SE476&oq=Beijing+pronunciation&aqs=chrom)