

CAST AWAY ILLUSIONS, PREPARE FOR STRUGGLE!

PROLETARIANS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of the real state of our movement cannot fail to see that the elements of opportunism, accumulated in the midst of the general counter-revolutionary offensive by imperialism and revisionism, have in recent decades been increasingly adapted to the needs of the big bourgeoisie and the landowners. With greater or lesser influence, these sick dogs spread bourgeois ideology by all means and sacrifice the cardinal interests of the proletariat for the sake of the short-term interests of their sects. They divert the class and the people from the revolutionary path to the path of parliamentary cretinism, they timidly deny the omnipotence of revolutionary violence, they demand of the class and the people that they replace the conquest of power through the people's war and the establishment of New Democracy with the conquest of the groschen.

Theoretical work of the communists in formation must be done in strictest relation with the burning questions of class struggle – and only a naive fool or a conscious traitor could thwart the struggle for theoretical foundations of Marxism in the epoch of theoretical confusion through which the movement is now passing. The entire strength of the modern working men's movement is based on theoretical knowledge – and for this very reason it is in the interest of the proletarian mass to deal with the theoretical reckoning with revisionism in the most vivid and detailed way.

Revisionism is in crises, this is of course true. It did not manage to save the old order and defeat revolution. Strategically speaking, reactionary character of revisionism dooms it to defeat and to the dark graveyard of history – but tactically speaking, the experience of the international proletariat constantly proves that revisionism is not dead and that it represents the main danger for the International Communist Movement and World Proletarian Revolution. So, we must despise revisionism – but must understand every encounter with it, every struggle and every form seriously. Vulgarization, watering-down, abandonment of Marx's teachings for the sake of short-term practical gains of a small groups dealt the greatest damage to the further development of the workers' and people's movement in the former Yugoslavia.

Nobody understood the importance of theory better than the great Lenin:

“Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This idea cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity. Yet, for Russian Social-Democrats the importance of theory is enhanced by three other circumstances, which are often forgotten: first, by the fact that our Party is only in process of formation, its features are only just becoming defined, and it has as yet far from settled accounts with the other trends of revolutionary thought that threaten to divert the movement from the correct path. On the contrary, precisely the very recent past was marked by a revival of non-Social-Democratic revolutionary trends (an eventuation regarding which Axelrod long ago warned the Economists). Under these circumstances, what at first sight appears to be an “unimportant”

error may lead to most deplorable consequences, and only short-sighted people can consider factional disputes and a strict differentiation between shades of opinion inopportune or superfluous. The fate of Russian Social-Democracy for very many years to come may depend on the strengthening of one or the other “shade“.”¹

It is undeniable that the “objections” of old and new revisionism against the Party, omnipotence of revolutionary violence, dictatorship of the proletariat, New Democracy and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, boil down to distancing from socialist ideology and thus strengthening of bourgeois ideology in its various idealistic shades. To offer decisive response to those attacks, the harmful influence of revisionism within the class and the people, to expose through a two-line struggle in the heat of the class struggle in every possible way the renegatism of this sediment of the workers' movement – this is a strategic principle which, in the midst of the general revolutionary situation that is beginning to develop all over the planet, is increasingly becoming an urgent tactical obligation.

This demands that the communists in formation who seek to reconstitute the Communist Party of Yugoslavia hoist, defend and principally apply our almighty and true universal ideology – Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism – or their efforts will be in vain. As the great Lenin explains;

“Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology formulated by the working masses themselves in the process of their movement, the only choice is — **either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course** (for mankind has not created a “third” ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology). **Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology in any way, to turn aside from it in the slightest degree means to strengthen bourgeois ideology.**”²

In many terminological and conceptual aspects, at first glance, it seems that the opportunists of the different "directions" differ considerably, that they even struggle against one another. The critique of "left" and right opportunism in the revolutionary movement should clear this terrain of terminological controversy and demonstrate the common bourgeois essence of opportunism of all kinds.

Marx's doctrine is not only capable of theoretically refuting right and “left” opportunism (it is clear to any conscious communist that revisionism cannot offer any shred of new thought that Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, has not already trampled on, ridiculed, or turned into dust.) but is only capable of explaining opportunism of all kinds as a historical phenomenon, through its class roots. The temporary dominance of revisionism in the Workers' movement is thus not a consequence of theoretical impotence of Marxism – but represents a called, but unconscious tool, by which the proletariat which is marching on forward to swipe imperialism, bureaucrat capitalism and semi-feudalism from the face of the planet manifests its current volatility, only for it to in the end inevitably throw it far away from itself through peoples war.

Despite the subjective strength of the International Communist Movement and the general counter-offensive through which the world is currently passing starting with the 80s of the last century*, the objective relations of class forces reveal that we find ourselves in the Strategic Offensive** of the World Proletarian Revolution; shock brigades of the World Proletarian Revolution are rising and will rise ever-more, uncompromisingly and in cold blood smashing the illusions of decadent, parasitic and metaphysical bourgeois ideology and its loyal lackeys in the revolutionary and peoples movement!

The communists in formation united within CR-CPY, led by historical experience of the World Proletarian Revolution, understand that revisionism is the greatest danger for revolution and that the struggle against imperialism and all reaction is inseparable from the struggle against harmful influence of revisionism within class and the people. The struggle for theoretical foundations of Marxism and its basic points is inseparable from the struggle against bourgeois ideology and its influence within the International Communist Movement – and this is a struggle that we have to continuously lead so long the proletariat with its iron broom does not sweep those treacherous degenerates from the face of the earth together with imperialism and all reaction.

MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM IS THE SCIENTIFIC IDEOLOGY OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT.

To wage a resolute and correct struggle against opportunism, it is necessary not only to clarify what we oppose, but also to define the principles that form the basis of our unity. Communists have always been clear that the basic fundamental of their unity is the scientific ideology of the proletariat – today Marxism-Leninism-Maoism – and that it is precisely the unity around ideological principles that gives the organization cohesion and allows the correct and profitable conduct of the line struggle in the midst of the existence of different political lines.

This document summarizes the ideological principles on which the Committee for the Reconstitution of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is based. The peculiarities of a given concrete situation and the tasks that directly arise from that situation will determine the form of organization and methods of work, which will lead to the concretization of ideological principles for the needs of our revolution. Therefore, the reader should be aware that the aim of this document is not to make a systematic exposition of proletarian ideology and proletarian conceptions, but to clarify our positions.

In that task, without striving for false originality, The Committee for the Reconstitution of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, on the basis of the irrefutable historical fact that Marxism-Leninism-Maoism was defined at the First Congress of the Communist Party of Peru, refers for the

* We speak of the general counter-revolutionary offensive whose goal is to thwart revolution as the main historical and political trend in the world today. Who attacks revolution? Imperialism and revisionism. But from these two, American imperialism is principal – they lead this offensive, in the attempts to establish themselves as the sole hegemonic superpower in its conflict with the atomic superpower (Russia) and other imperialist powers. This offensive is general because of two reasons: because it is unleashed everywhere by the world imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries, and because it is carried in all spheres: ideological, political and economical, even though it is focused on political. We must grasp these facts, analyze them and understand them well, just as we would do so with any question. (Gonzalo, „On the campaign of recitification based on the document „Elections, no, people’s war, yes!“ – translation ours.

** With this, we do not argue that today is the final offensive. We find ourselves in the defensive phase of the strategic offensive.

purposes of this discussion to the document "On Marxism-Leninism-Maoism" from the collection of documents of the First Congress of the Communist Party of Peru held in February 1988.

1. MANIFESTO IS OUR STARTING POINT

In the January of 1848, in the Communist manifesto which was written by Marx and Engels, the theory and program of the proletariat were established. With ingenious clarity and relief, Marx and Engels outline an entire view of the world that is the result of the continuation and completion from the position, stance and interests of the international proletariat of the three most advanced ideological currents that man has created up to that point: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, and French socialism. The Manifesto presents Marx's views that give in their entirety modern materialism and scientific socialism.

In the field of philosophy, the Manifesto represents an outstanding example of the application of modern – that is to say dialectical – materialism, demonstrating that the existence of classes is connected only with specific historical phases of the development of production. Engels explains:

“The basic thought running through the Manifesto – that economic production, and the structure of society of every historical epoch necessarily arising therefrom, constitute the foundation for the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently (ever since the dissolution of the primaeval communal ownership of land) all history has been a history of class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social evolution; that this struggle, however, has now reached a stage where the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie), without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression, class struggles – this basic thought belongs solely and exclusively to Marx.”³

The dialectic of expropriating the expropriator is shown – capital is formed through the expropriation of free producers that no longer possess the means of production – the bourgeoisie transforms individual small production into social production and creates proportionally with large industry a class of wage laborers, their own gravediggers who, Marx and Engels explain, establish individual property but on the basis of social property of land and means of production created through labor itself.

How is this point reached? Marx and Engels explain:

“If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.”⁴

Realizing the contradiction between the proletariat's aspiration for a classless society, and its lack of scientific ideology – that the proletariat can and cannot – Marx and Engels explained in these

lines that the dialectical exit consists exactly in organizing the proletariat into a party; that as a party the proletariat establishes its dictatorship; that armed with a dictatorship it abolishes classes.

In the aforementioned, Marx and Engels presented the main thing in Marx's teaching – the explanation of the world-historical role of the proletariat as the creator of socialist society. If we set ourselves the task of studying and clarifying every dialectical contradiction in the *Manifesto*, we would soon end up in the nearest madhouse. Our task is not to do this, but only to prove that the appearance of Marxism on the stage was not a historical accident, but a necessity that does not depend on human will; It is a doctrine that appears with the modern proletariat and that accompanies the latter throughout the epoch of social revolution. Marxism is a conception of the proletariat; The last class in history, whose understanding of the world is scientific. This is very important to emphasize, because if we lose sight of the fact that Marxism is a conception of the proletariat, we are tearing out of Marxism its living soul, turning it into a question of methodology, which would be at the same time a concession to the bourgeois theory of knowledge and an undermining of the theoretical foundations of Marxism. *

Thus, the Manifesto, that song of songs of Marxism, is the initial and fundamental point of the International Communist Movement, the program of the Communists to Communism – a solidly constructed edifice – an exposition which established a complete unity which later in the dialectical process of development through great leaps, of course, in the crucible of the class struggle, developed into Marxism-Leninism, and then into Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The whole experience of modern history, especially the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of all countries since the emergence of unity established in the Manifesto, has undoubtedly shown that the Marxist worldview is the only true expression of the interests and points of view of the revolutionary proletariat.

“The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. It is comprehensive and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world outlook irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction, or defence of bourgeois oppression.” ⁶

In comparison, bourgeois ideologists are always in conflict with themselves: their role is to guard the old order based on exploitation and reaction masquerading themselves in development and progressiveness. Bourgeois ideology twists reality, deforms it and thus cannot understand it as it is, cannot grasp contradictions and give answers.

“The sole conclusion to be drawn from the opinion of the Marxists that Marx's theory is an objective truth is that **by following the path of Marxist theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following any other path we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies.”** ⁷

As the great Lenin explains, by following Marx's doctrine, we are approaching objective truth. However, anyone who has the slightest insight into philosophy knows that Marxism is not a lifeless dogma, but has always developed in theory and practice towards a higher truth. It is a dialectical

* To reduce Marxism to a question of methodology would mean that it does not have a basis – which cannot be further from the truth. The great Lenin explains: „Marxism won itself the world-historic significance as the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat because Marxism did not throw away the most precious achievements of bourgeois epoch, but, on the contrary, took everything that was of value in more than two thousand year development of human mind and culture.“ (5)

process that, like other dialectical processes, develops through great leaps and bounds. There are, of course, both medium and small leaps, without which the big ones could not be understood, a mountain range does not only consist of the highest peak – but only it determines the highest point. In order to develop the unity established in the Manifesto in its entirety, therefore, a great leap is needed. Great because it develops all three constituent parts of Marxism; philosophy, political economy, and scientific socialism.

2. MARXISM-LENINISM: MARXISM IN THE ERA OF IMPERIALISM AND PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION.

The Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of one of the greatest, most difficult and, without the slightest exaggeration, world-liberating turning points in the history of mankind. It represented the end of the world bourgeois revolution and the opening of a new era, the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution – the end of the pre-revolutionary period in which the proletariat was too weak to establish its dictatorship, and was forced to stand behind the bourgeoisie in an attempt to force it to complete its own democratic revolutions and the opening of that period in which the proletariat takes on the task of destroying imperialism, bureaucratic capitalism and semi-feudalism. In other words, the opening of that period in which the proletarian revolution became a direct practical inevitability.

Leninism emerged on the scene as Marxism in these new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat. Consequently, it is necessary to point out that Lenin developed Marxist philosophy, political economy, and scientific socialism.

In the field of Marxist philosophy: Lenin, in his works "Materialism and Empirio-criticism" and "Philosophical Notebooks," establishes the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge. He also begins the task of deepening the essence of dialectics – establishing that "In the truest sense of the word, dialectic is the study of contradictions in the very essence of the subject." But this task remains unfinished until later. The great Lenin says;

“The splitting of a single whole and the cognition of its contradictory parts (see the quotation from Philo on Heraclitus at the beginning of Section III, “On Cognition,” in Lasalle’s book on Heraclitus[1]) is the essence (one of the “essentials,” one of the principal, if not the principal, characteristics or features) of dialectics. That is precisely how Hegel, too, puts the matter (Aristotle in his Metaphysics continually grapples with it and combats Heraclitus and Heraclitean ideas).

The correctness of this aspect of the content of dialectics must be tested by the history of science. This aspect of dialectics (e.g. in Plekhanov) usually receives inadequate attention: the identity of opposites is taken as the sum-total of examples [“for example, a seed,” “for example, primitive communism.” The same is true of Engels. But it is “in the interests of popularisation...”] and not as a law of cognition (and as a law of the objective world)”⁸

and further:

“The identity of opposites (it would be more correct, perhaps, to say their “unity,”— although the difference between the terms identity and unity is not particularly important here. In a certain sense both are correct) is the recognition (discovery) of the contradictory, mutually exclusive, opposite tendencies in all phenomena and processes

of nature (including mind and society). The condition for the knowledge of all processes of the world in their “self-movement,” in their spontaneous development, in their real life, is the knowledge of them as a unity of opposites. Development is the “struggle” of opposites. The two basic (or two possible? Or two historically observable?) conceptions of development (evolution) are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unity of opposites (the division of a unity into mutually exclusive opposites and their reciprocal relation).

In the first conception of motion, self - movement, its driving force, its source, its motive, remains in the shade (or this source is made external—God, subject, etc.). In the second conception the chief attention is directed precisely to knowledge of the source of “self” - movement. The first conception is lifeless, pale and dry. The second is living. The second alone furnishes the key to the “self-movement” of everything existing; it alone furnishes the key to “leaps,” to the “break in continuity,” to the “transformation into the opposite,” to the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new.”⁹

Here we see a clear tendency towards monism and one basic law of dialectics, but the task of deepening the essence of dialectics that was established by Lenin remains incomplete until chairman Mao took it up.

In the field of political economy, Lenin establishes that imperialism is new, higher, but also last stage of capitalism. He explains the emergence of monopolies, taking as starting point merging of bank and industrial capital. Dialectical unity of large industry and world market shown in the Manifesto, where large industry creates world market, and it in returns hastens its development, no longer found itself in the era of free competition – but in the era of monopolization where a handful of states took a monopolistic position within the world market thanks to high concentration of productive capital in trusts. In the search of maximum profit these states struggle for the control of the largest possible part of surplus value produced worldwide.

Struggling against revisionist – unfortunately still relevant* – theories of the “progressive tendency of imperialism”, Lenin establishes that imperialism is “reaction all along the line”, a parasitic, dying capitalism. This is the essence of imperialism, even if imperialism leads to the socialization of production, this process takes place through the intensification of national oppression, through the maintenance of feudal forms in the colonies and semi-colonies, and not through their overcoming.

“Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and of monopolies, which introduce everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. Whatever the political system, the result of these tendencies is everywhere reaction all along the line and an extreme intensification of antagonisms in this field. Particularly intensified become the yoke of national oppression and the striving for annexation...”¹⁰

* We say still relevant theories because they are still present in their various forms. An international example of this is the Unión Obrera Comunista of Colombia-MLM, which proposes the progressive tendency of imperialism in the semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries, and the essentially Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution in these countries. An example somewhat closer to us is the revisionist Partija Rada, which, denying Maoism and abandoning the teachings of Vlado Dapčević, refers now to this, now to that revisionist theory of imperialism, merging it with memorized "Maoist" phrases and "slogans", but without understanding the Marxist criteria of them – it gets a stinking eclectic deriz. Essentially, they see external phenomena glistening on the surface, and they do not see those deep forces that will determine the course of events.

The great Lenin, thus, establishes that imperialism does not resolve contradictions, but sharpens them. Not only can the imperialists not unite, but even the talks of their „attempts“ to do so are naive fairy tales.

With the development of imperialism, the fundamental contradictions in the world change. Comrade Stalin, mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory of imperialism, explained the fundamental contradictions of the world this way;

*“Lenin called imperialism "moribund capitalism." Why? Because imperialism carries the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit, beyond which revolution begins. Of these contradictions, there are three which must be regarded as the most important. **

The *first contradiction* is the contradiction between labour and capital.(...)

The *second contradiction* is the contradiction among the various financial groups and imperialist Powers in their struggle for sources of raw materials, for foreign territory. (...)

The *third contradiction* is the contradiction between the handful of ruling, "civilised" nations and the hundreds of millions of the colonial and dependent peoples of the world. (...)

*Such, in general, are the principal contradictions of imperialism which have converted the old, "flourishing" capitalism into moribund capitalism. (...)"*¹¹

It is understood that any of these fundamental contradictions can become the principal and in this way determine the development of other contradictions. In this moment, that role is played by the third contradiction, that is to say, the contradiction between oppressed nations and imperialism. It determines the super-exploitation of proletariat in oppressed and imperialist countries – at the same time, in oppressed countries the realization of maximum profit is done at the cost of profit of other imperialist powers. So, the contradiction between oppressed nations and imperialism in this moment determines the development of the contradiction between proletariat and the bourgeoisie as well as between the imperialists themselves.

In the field of scientific socialism: Explaining the changes of the fundamental contradictions in the world, the great Lenin set the foundations for strategy of the world social revolution in this period. He said that the center of the revolution moved east; that there is a fusion of forces: International Communist Movement plays a leading role, and the national liberation movement is base.

“In the program of our Party, adopted in March last year, we, characterizing the approach of the world social revolution, said that the civil war of the toilers against the imperialists and exploiters in all advanced countries is beginning to merge with

* Stalin here uses the term „principal contradictions“ as synonym for „fundamental contradictions“. With further philosophical development, now we understand that this is not correct. In all processes, situation or things there exist fundamental contradictions, and only one of them is principal contradiction in a given moment of its transformation. Today, for example, the principal contradiction in the world between oppressed nations and imperialism. This, however, does not change the correct social and political contents of Stalins formulation. [Translators note: In the Serbo-Croatian translation which the original document uses, the word „most important“ is translated as „principal“.]

the national war against international imperialism. This confirms the course of the revolution and will confirm it more and more.”¹²

and;

“The social revolution cannot take place except in the form of an epoch which unites the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries with a whole series of democratic and revolutionary movements, including national liberation, in the underdeveloped, backward and oppressed nations.”¹³

As such, the great Lenin demonstrates that the lemma of the revolutionary and peoples movement must merge the proletarian movement for the construction of socialism in imperialist countries with national liberation struggles in colonies and semi-colonies – „*Proletarians of all countries, unite!*“ becomes „*Proletarians of all countries and peoples of the world, unite!*“

Happy be the man who is allowed to make a single such gigantic discovery. But Lenins genius surpassed all heights, which is, among other things, shown by the fact that his discoveries do not end here. The great Lenin, grasping the essential meaning of the new period of open class struggles, prepared the forces for the overthrow of imperialism and conquest of power by the proletariat – masterfully formulating the party of a new type; fighting class organization based on democratic centralism, which is strengthened in the struggle against opportunism. While defining Leninism, comrade Stalin, Lenins most consistent disciple, skillfully points out the characteristics of that new party.

“1) The Party as the leading detachment of the working class.” – The Party is the operational headquarters of the proletariat, its political and military leader, armed with revolutionary theory.

“2) The Party as an organized detachment of the working class.” – The Party is not an "organ of the class", but a part of the class. The party exists for the class and sees its purpose solely in it.

“3) The party as the highest form of the class organization of the proletariat.” – The party is the leading and organized detachment of the class, the highest form of the class organization of the proletariat which is connected with the latter through the lower forms of its organization. The party is a personnel party and has a mass character.

“4) The Party as an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” – The Party is indispensable not only for the conquest of power, but also for leading the dictatorship of the class through the entire transitional period.

“5) The party as a unity of will, incompatible with the existence of factions.” – The party is based on democratic centralism that expresses the centralization of natural ideas. The minority is subordinate to the majority, the lower organizations to the higher ones – and all to the Central Committee.

“6) The Party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunistic elements.”¹⁴ – The Party defends and strengthens its class character by purge itself of opportunistic elements. Fortresses are easiest to occupy from within.

With the constitution of revolutionary parties of this type, the proletariat for the first time broke down its immovable barricades and truly stormed the heavens. The class succeeded in breaking opportunism in its ranks, seizing power, and establishing its own dictatorship.

The great Lenin, it must be emphasized, did not achieve these great feats by creating a rupture with the Manifesto, but on the contrary by the creative application of the Manifesto. Lenin, in the strictest relationship with the pressing problems that communists and revolutionaries faced at that moment, offered concrete answers – he achieved this through a line struggle against positions and lines opposed to Marxism within the revolutionary and popular movement. He understood that the new is imposed by the defeat of the old through struggle, that the revolution does not develop as a straight line, but in sharp turns, that defeats are inevitable but should not be mourned, rather lessons should be drawn. That is why the great Lenin never abandoned the principles of Marxism, even in the midst of great defeats such as that of 1905. The great Lenin with a robust nature continued to support, defend and apply, and thus develop, the program from 1905 – thus his own guiding thought, which developed slowly from 1893 to 1905.

This shows us that by solving a seemingly specific problem of a country, an important contribution can be made to the World Proletarian Revolution, because, by dealing with them, Lenin has developed the same unity that was established in the Manifesto to a new height, and thus the ideology of the international proletariat has been concretized in Marxism-Leninism.

3. MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM: THE RED FLAG WHICH WE HOIST, DEFEND AND PRINCIPALLY APPLY

When Comrade Stalin defined Leninism as a new and higher stage of Marxism, he was met with opposition. Marxism was universally accepted, but opportunists said that Leninism was applicable only in Russia or only in backward countries, that it had no universal validity. Comrade Stalin had to lead the struggle against this cunning opportunism which did not openly reject Marxism – but in the name of defending Marxism attempted to prevent its further development, in order to prevent the development of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

Today, Maoism faces a similar situation, because since time immemorial, nothing progressive has ever been accepted in the beginning. A long way has come since the Communist Party of Peru under the leadership of comrade Gonzalo began the struggle for the recognition of Maoism: it is abundantly clear to any revolutionary who has seriously studied the development of the International Communist Movement that the universal validity of Maoism is increasingly being recognized and that Maoism has won for itself hegemony within the International Communist Movement. But there is still a struggle – isn't that just as clear? The international communist movement still suffers from the dispersion of forces, lags behind the objective power relations of the classes themselves to a greater or lesser extent (In the territory of the former Yugoslavia, the movement lags behind by many decades!), and the unsolved task of reconstituting or constituting communist parties in the vast majority of the world remains. A study of Mao Zedong's enormous contribution to the three constituent parts of Marxism: Marxist philosophy; political economy; scientific socialism – this is an extraordinary task under these conditions, in which we are lagging far behind the International Communist Movement.

We must begin with the question of philosophy, because it is the question to which we must devote the most attention in our study of Chairman Mao's theoretical contribution. In the field of philosophy, Mao Zedong took up the task that Lenin had begun, deepening the very essence of dialectic and defining the law of contradiction as the basic law of materialistic dialectics.

Chairman Mao presents the problem the following way:

*“The law of contradiction in things, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the basic law of materialist dialectics. Lenin said, “Dialectics in the proper sense is the study of contradiction in the very essence of objects.” Lenin often called this law the essence of dialectics; he also called it the kernel of dialectics. **In studying this law, therefore, we cannot but touch upon a variety of questions, upon a number of philosophical problems. If we can become clear on all these problems, we shall arrive at a fundamental understanding of materialist dialectics. The problems are: the two world outlooks, the universality of contradiction, the particularity of contradiction, the principal contradiction and the principal aspect of a contradiction, the identity and struggle of the aspects of a contradiction, and the place of antagonism in contradiction.**”*¹⁵

Chairman Mao thus establishes that Lenin has begun the right task and that certain questions of dialectic that he posed need to be resolved. Chairman Mao successfully solves these problems and comes to the conclusion:

*“We may now say a few words to sum up. The law of contradiction in things, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the fundamental law of nature and of society and therefore also the fundamental law of thought. It stands opposed to the metaphysical world outlook. It represents a great revolution in the history of human knowledge. According to dialectical materialism, contradiction is present in all processes of objectively existing things and of subjective thought and permeates all these processes from beginning to end; this is the universality and absoluteness of contradiction. Each contradiction and each of its aspects have their respective characteristics; this is the particularity and relativity of contradiction. In given conditions, opposites possess identity, and consequently can coexist in a single entity and can transform themselves into each other; this again is the particularity and relativity of contradiction. But the struggle of opposites is ceaseless, it goes on both when the opposites are coexisting and when they are transforming themselves into each other, and becomes especially conspicuous when they are transforming themselves into one another; this again is the universality and absoluteness of contradiction. In studying the particularity and relativity of contradiction, we must give attention to the distinction between the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradictions and to the distinction between the principal aspect and the non-principal aspect of a contradiction; in studying the universality of contradiction and the struggle of opposites in contradiction, we must give attention to the distinction between the different forms of struggle. Otherwise we shall make mistakes.”*¹⁶

From this we see that materialistic dialectic is the study of the law of contradiction and of it alone. The rest of the laws are just derived from this one basic one. It is a philosophical development of the most far-reaching importance that we must come in terms with.

Every thing and every phenomenon is a unity of opposites – one that splits into two. In the formation of this unity, the new initially appears as fragile and weak, while the old becomes dominant and determines the quality of the thing itself. Through the struggle of the new against the old, the new is imposed and strengthened while the old loses ground and weakens – the new becomes dominant and a change in the quality of things or phenomena arises – but the struggle still continues in the new conditions until the old dies out completely.

We have mentioned earlier the dialectic of expropriating the expropriators, which is mentioned hundreds of times in the Manifesto, Capital, and Anti-Dühring – we will use it as an example to demonstrate that the passage of quantity into quality and the negation of negation are derived from a single fundamental law, that is, the law of contradiction.

Explaining the relation of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as a unity of opposites, Marx writes:

*“Proletariat and wealth are opposites; **as such they form a single whole**. They are both creations of the world of private property. (...)*

*Private property as private property, as wealth, **is compelled to maintain itself, and thereby its opposite, the proletariat, in existence. That is the positive side of the contradiction**, self-satisfied private property.*

*The proletariat, on the contrary, is compelled as proletariat to abolish itself and thereby its opposite, private property, which determines its existence, and which makes it proletariat. **It is the negative side of the contradiction**, its restlessness within its very self, dissolved and self-dissolving private property. (...)*

Within this contradiction the private property-owner is therefore the conservative side, the proletarian the destructive side. From the former arises the action of preserving the antithesis, from the latter the action of annihilating it.”¹⁷

Here, therefore, we see clearly that the proletariat and the bourgeoisie form a unity of opposites, in which the bourgeoisie is the dominant, conservative side of the contradiction, and therefore compelled to maintain this unity of opposites. On the other hand, the proletariat makes the negative, destructive side of contradiction – it cries out to abolish itself as a class, and therefore it cries out to revolutionarily deny the unity of opposites. The bourgeoisie affirms the unity of opposites, and the proletariat negates it.

The proletariat, as a misery aware of its spiritual and physical misery, executes the verdict on private property that it has imposed on itself by creating the proletariat as a class – armed with a dictatorship, it carries out the expropriation of the expropriators by abolishing the capitalist property that dominates social production. This is the negation of the expropriation of free producers, the negation of the negation. It is clear, then, that in so far as the negation of negation explains the development and resolution of two or more contradictions in a chain of development, it is a powerful tool for understanding matter in motion. In this way Marx makes use of the negation of the negation through his Capital, but it is understood that the negation of the negation does not in itself determine the development of the contradictions with which it is concerned.

One divides into two, this is the essence of the law of contradiction, which reveals that the transition of quantity into quality and affirmations into negation do not constitute separate laws

separate from the law of contradiction. This enormous contribution to deepening the essence of dialectic belongs exclusively to Chairman Mao Zedong.

Chairman Mao Zedong, starting from the teachings of Engels and Lenin, applied the law of contradiction to the Marxist theory of knowledge, completing its development. He comes to the conclusion that social practice and knowledge form a unity of opposites in the process of knowledge – being is determined by consciousness – and consciousness then becomes a material force capable of transforming the world.

“Discover the truth through practice, and again through practice verify and develop the truth. Start from perceptual knowledge and actively develop it into rational knowledge; then start from rational knowledge and actively guide revolutionary practice to change both the subjective and the objective world. Practice, knowledge, again practice, and again knowledge. This form repeats itself in endless cycles, and with each cycle the content of practice and knowledge rises to a higher level. Such is the whole of the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge, and such is the dialectical-materialist theory of the unity of knowing and doing.”¹⁸

In the field of political economy, in addition to making a major contribution to the construction of socialism, Chairman Mao developed in detail the Marxist-Leninist theory of imperialism. He analyzes that in oppressed countries, capitalism did not develop on a revolutionary, democratic path of development, but linked to finance capital in alliance with imperialism and native landowners. The ruling class in these countries is the big bourgeoisie, which forms a subordinate but indispensable part of the super-exploitation of the proletariat of the oppressed countries. This big bourgeoisie is divided into two factions – comprador and bureaucratic – and while it cannot measure up to the imperialist bourgeoisie, it is rewarded for its slavery by exercising a monopoly on the domestic market, therefore it is a monopoly bourgeoisie and makes a monopoly profit in relation to the middle, that is, national, bourgeoisie.

This big monopolistic bureaucratic-comprador bourgeoisie uses its monopoly to serve imperialism: through a monopoly on foreign trade in cooperation with finance capital; through the control of industry, where the aim is to maintain large estates and monopolistic property relations; through the restriction of the middle bourgeoisie, whose political privileges it restricts and forces to earn a minimum profit.

Imperialism suppresses capitalist land rent and ensures the existence of a semi-feudal land monopoly – maintaining a devastated peasant economy that produces basic food and sets the low wages of the proletariat. This devastated peasant economy is the source of the constant export of the population to the urban centers, which allows the super-exploitation of the proletariat. At the same time, the suppression of capitalist land rent allows the imperialists to exploit the natural resources of the oppressed country much cheaper.

The reason for maintaining a devastated peasant economy in oppressed countries, therefore, does not lie in the fact that individual peasant production is more efficient than large-scale mechanized production, but in the fact that isolated peasantry cannot compel the monopolized capitalist market to buy its product except for a price lower than the price of production. It is a dry circle that ensures the oppression of the peasants, their miserable living conditions, and the export of labor to the cities.

This is a bureaucratic capitalism that has developed in all the oppressed countries of the world explicitly linked to semi-feudality. No matter how small the devastated peasant economy may be, maintaining feudality in oppressed countries is necessary for imperialism to extract maximum profits. Feudality is camouflaged by changing shapes, but it remains.

The interdependence of imperialism, bureaucratic capitalism and semi-feudalism described above makes it impossible to establish a capitalist society of bourgeois dictatorship in oppressed countries. This means that the democratic tasks in these countries can only be solved by a democratic revolution of a new type, one led by the proletariat and uninterruptedly advancing towards socialism.

*“True enough, this is the period of the final struggle of dying imperialism – imperialism is „moribund capitalism“. **But just because it is dying, it is all the more dependent on colonies and semi-colonies for survival and will certainly not allow any colony or semi-colony to establish anything like a capitalist society under the dictatorship of its own bourgeoisie.**”*¹⁹

From here we begin with Mao Zedong's contribution to scientific socialism – where Chairman Mao developed the Marxist theory of the state, establishing the new democratic revolution as a bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type in all colonial and semi-colonial countries as an inseparable part of the World Proletarian Revolution.

Chairman Mao establishes:

*“However, for a certain historical period, this form **[of proletarian dictatorship] is not suitable for the revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.** During this period, therefore, a third form of state must be adopted in the revolutions of **all colonial and semi-colonial countries, namely, the new-democratic republic.** This form suits a certain historical period and is therefore transitional; nevertheless, it is a form which is necessary and cannot be dispensed with.”*²⁰

and;

*“Although such a revolution in a colonial and semi-colonial country is still fundamentally bourgeois-democratic in its social character during its first stage or first step, and although its objective mission is to clear the path for the development of capitalism, it is no longer a revolution of the old type led by the bourgeoisie with the aim of establishing a capitalist society and a state under bourgeois dictatorship. It belongs to the new type of revolution led by the proletariat with the aim, in the first stage, of establishing a new-democratic society and a state under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes. **Thus this revolution actually serves the purpose of clearing a still wider path for the development of socialism. In the course of its progress, there may be a number of further sub-stages, because of changes on the enemy's side and within the ranks of our allies, but the fundamental character of the revolution remains unchanged.**”*²¹

The democratic phase of the revolution in semi-colonial countries is primarily a revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism, it therefore opens the way for the development of capitalism and real industrialization, but this is not its content. The new democratic revolution does not belong to the old bourgeois revolutions, but its content is proletarian – to widen the way

for the development of socialism. The republic of the new democracy begins to carry out socialist tasks and is uninterruptedly advancing into a socialist revolution. This is a Marxist teaching on the relationship between democratic and socialist revolutions that were enriched and developed by the great Lenin and Chairman Mao.

“Firmly establish the new-democratic social order.” That's a harmful formulation. In the transition period changes are taking place all the time and socialist factors are emerging every day. How can this „new-democratic social order“ be „firmly established“? It would be very difficult indeed to „establish“ it „firmly“! For instance, private industry and commerce are being transformed, and if an order is „established“ in the second half of the year, it will no longer hold „firm“ next year. And changes are taking place in mutual aid and co-operation in agriculture from year to year too. The period of transition is full of contradictions and struggles. Our present revolutionary struggle is even more profound than the revolutionary armed struggle of the past. It is a revolution that will bury the capitalist system and all other systems of exploitation once and for all. The idea, „Firmly establish the new-democratic social order“, goes against the realities of our struggle and hinders the progress of the socialist cause.”²²

Starting from Marx and Lenin, this is also how comrade Vlado Dapčević understood things. Understanding the relationship between democratic and socialist revolutions already developed in the Manifesto, he said that stages in history cannot be skipped, that on the agenda in the countries of the former Yugoslavia is a democratic revolution for the establishment of true democracy and full equality of peoples. This great thesis has been elaborated and enriched within the process of the struggle of the new against the old, through a two-line and class struggle primarily through a deeper understanding of the teachings of Chairman Mao Zedong. The Yugoslav People's Revolution will take no form other than a people's war for the establishment of a republic of a new democracy. By the way, the same goes for all other colonial and semi-colonial countries – the Philippines, Turkey, India, Poland, Chile, etc.

The opportunists of all countries are today so confident in their control of the revolutionary and workers' movement that they dare to negate the semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of the oppressed countries. In doing so, they support sickly Trotskyite revisionism, negate imperialism itself, or give it a „progressive“ side. They justify their betrayal with „new situations“ and „changes in the world“ – which they substantiate with falsifications.

The reader remembers, however, that Lenin categorized imperialism as a „reaction all along the line“ – a reaction that hinders national development, the liquidation of old relations and the establishment of new ones. It will not be surprising to the reader, then, that Chairman Mao, contrary to these revisionist fantasies, established that:

“It is certainly not the purpose of the imperialist powers invading China to transform feudal China into capitalist China. On the contrary, their purpose is to transform China into their own semi-colony or colony.”²³

And so we see! The New Democratic Revolution is a democratic revolution of a new type led by the proletariat against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism. A popular revolution under the leadership of the proletariat, which unites the great majority of the masses of the people to establish a joint dictatorship of all revolutionary classes based on the alliance of workers and

peasants. It is a transitional form of the state that inevitably gives way to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is quite clear that, just as the great Lenin did, by solving the seemingly specific problems of a country, Chairman Mao Zedong made an important contribution to the World Proletarian Revolution. This shows us: it is indispensable that the universal ideology of the international proletariat be applied to concrete conditions, because without such concretization there can be no revolution. The Chinese Revolution would never have been victorious if Marxism-Leninism had not been concretized in accordance with Chinese circumstances in Mao Zedong's thought.

With the establishment of the republic of the new democracy and the overthrow of the landlord and bureaucratic capitalist class, Chairman Mao Zedong establishes that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has become the principal contradiction in China. The vast masses of the people, led by the proletariat, moved like human rivers through China, carrying out the revolution and promoting production – they laid the economic foundations of socialism.

The proletariat had become the ruler of its own future. It had to learn to manage the entire complicated economic, political and cultural life of the vast Chinese country. The task of the proletariat, however, was not to merely govern, but to revolutionize. Socialism is not a dairy cow, socialism is a life and death struggle between nascent communism and dying capitalism.

The task of the dictatorship of the proletariat consists in the abolition of classes in general, the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, the abolition of all social relations corresponding to these relations of production, the revolutionization of all ideas arising from these social relations. In other words, that communism in becoming subordinates to itself all the elements of society and creates from them the organs that are still missing, so that each relationship presupposes each other in its communist form. This is how Marx explains the matter.

“It must be kept in mind that the new forces of production and relations of production do not develop out of nothing, nor drop from the sky, nor from the womb of the self-positing Idea; but from within and in antithesis to the existing development of production and the inherited, traditional relations of property. While in the completed bourgeois system every economic relation presupposes every other in its bourgeois economic form, and everything posited is thus also a presupposition, this is the case with every organic system. This organic system itself, as a totality, has its presuppositions, and its development to its totality consists precisely in subordinating all elements of society to itself, or in creating out of it the organs which it still lacks. This is historically how it becomes a totality.”²⁴

Until this process is completed, the class struggle continues, and the proletariat, unless it wants all its struggles to be in vain, must maintain its own dictatorship.

“We spoke of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we said that the proletariat must be the class that rules over all other classes. We cannot destroy the differences between classes until communism is completely built.”²⁵

“In his Critique of the Gotha Programme Marx wrote: “Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.” Up to now this

axiom has never been disputed by Socialists, and yet it implies the recognition of the existence of the state right up to the time when victorious socialism has grown into complete communism.”²⁶

Thus, Marx emphasizes the permanence of the revolution, imagining the socialist revolution as a series of successive great leaps. Yet, despite many major struggles by the proletariat, the problem remained unresolved until 1966, when the Chinese proletariat and people found a way, under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong at the head of the glorious Communist Party of China. This was the essence of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution – to solve the question of how to wage the class struggle under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to develop communism and prevent the danger of the restoration of capitalism through successive cultural revolutions.

Everything is one that divides into two and the Communist Party is no exception. As long as the class struggle continues, it will be reflected in the ranks of the Party. The existence of a proletarian and bourgeois line in the party and the formation of bourgeois factions is an inevitable phenomenon – wherever there is an incorrect tendency, sooner or later individuals will come forward to advocate it, to formulate it into a developed line and to fight for this wrong line to replace the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line of the party. Understanding this enables the socialist proletariat to recognize this process and to take decisive action against it. This struggle is being waged in the ideological, cultural and educational fields. Therefore, the question of who will prevail, the proletariat or the bourgeoisie, revolutionary transformation or reaction, is not resolved and is always in the air.

When the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was launched in 1966, the revisionist headquarters in the party led by Liu Shaoqi managed to usurp power in many cities, key industries, and was dominant on the cultural and educational fronts. This situation allowed the bourgeois headquarters to thwart Chairman Mao Zedong's revolutionary line and use the organizational structures of the Chinese Communist Party as a weapon to suppress and control the revolutionary popular masses. This situation could not be changed by issuing a directive – the proletarian headquarters of the Communist Party of China, under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong, won a majority in the Central Committee and, relying directly on the socialist proletariat and its allies, unleashed a torrent of revolutionary struggle of unprecedented proportions. The proletariat struck back at the capitalist headquarters in the Party, smashing and expelling its organizations, carrying out a revolutionary transformation in all areas.

By invoking the restoration of capitalism in China, revisionism attempts to negate this contribution to the treasury of Marxism. But let us remember that the revolution does not develop as a straight line, but in sharp turns, that defeats are inevitable but should not be mourned, but lessons should be drawn. The struggle of counter-revolution and revolution does not negate the solution of the problem of the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The forms of this struggle arise from the peculiarities of the given situation.

Finally, we will conclude this section on Chairman Mao Zedong's contributions to scientific socialism with the military theory of the international proletariat – where the chairman's extraordinary discoveries in military science accumulated into the theory of a protracted people's war.

Marx and Engels had already predicted that the proletariat would inevitably develop its own military theory.

*“Modern warfare presupposes, therefore, the emancipation of the bourgeois and the peasant, it is a military expression of that emancipation. **The emancipation of the proletariat, too, will have its particular military expression, it will give rise to a specific, new method of warfare.**”*²⁷

In the victories of world-historical significance won by the Chinese Communist Party, under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong, it created a whole series of strategies and tactics by which the proletariat, wrestling for power with the bourgeoisie, used its strong points to attack the opponent on its weak point. This is how military science develops, each class develops a superior strategy arising from its material position, which the old classes cannot cope with.

The bourgeoisie is initially strong, and the supremacy of the forces is on its side. In accordance with its own method of warfare, it relies on modern weapons, logistical and production capabilities. On the other hand, the proletariat is initially weak and the supremacy of forces is not on its side, it relies on highly conscious revolutionary people and its ability to lead the revolutionary people's movement. The relation of forces is therefore not in favour of the proletariat, but this initial supremacy of the enemy forces is not absolute, but relative. The strength of the enemy is undermined by other, unfavorable factors for him, at the same time compensating for our weakness. With the changes in this balance of power, development arises in the stages of the war itself, and this is the reason for its protracted nature.

*“The exponents of quick victory, however, do not realize that war is a contest of strength, and that before a certain change has taken place in the relative strength of the belligerents, there is no basis for trying to fight strategically decisive battles and shorten the road to liberation. Were their ideas to be put into practice, we should inevitably run our heads into a brick wall.”*²⁸

and;

*“The first stage covers the period of the enemy's strategic offensive and our strategic defensive. The second stage will be the period of the enemy's strategic consolidation and our preparation for the counter-offensive. The third stage will be the period of our strategic counter-offensive and the enemy's strategic retreat.”*²⁹

The driving force behind this development is the proper handling of the contradictions that the warring parties face. The Party must rely on the masses of the people and establish appropriate methods of working with changes in an objective situation, so as not to create organizational shackles for the further development of a protracted people's war. The Party has only one basic goal – the conquest of power – and here the dialectic of construction and destruction is fully emphasized. The Party and its People's Army conquer base areas of support with revolutionary violence and, through the organizations of the united front, create new power, subsequently developing new relations.

In the first stage of strategic defense, there is a great difference between our forces and the forces of the enemy, guerrilla warfare becomes the only way to initiate and apply all the strength of the people against the enemy, to exhaust and demoralize the enemy for a long time, and to conquer

new power on the ruins of the old state. When the opponent wants to fight with us, we do not allow him that pleasure and he cannot even find us, but when we want to fight the opponent, we will make sure that we attack only when there is a huge chance of success, when the engagement will not last long and our forces will be preserved. In this way, we will degrade and worsen the position of the enemy during a protracted conflict, while at the same time building a new power brick by brick and preparing for future, larger conflicts.

“The second stage may be termed one of strategic stalemate. At the tail end of the first stage, the enemy will be forced to fix certain terminal points to his strategic offensive owing to his shortage of troops and our firm resistance, and upon reaching them he will stop his strategic offensive and enter the stage of safeguarding his occupied areas. (...)

But again he will be confronted with stubborn guerrilla warfare. Taking advantage of the fact that the enemy's rear is unguarded, our guerrilla warfare will develop extensively in the first stage, and many base areas will be established, seriously threatening the enemy's consolidation of the occupied areas, and so in the second stage there will still be widespread fighting. In this stage, our form of fighting will be primarily guerrilla warfare, supplemented by mobile warfare. (...)

The duration of this stage will depend on the degree to which the balance of power between us and the enemy has changed, and also on changes in the international situation.” ³⁰

In the second stage, our forces are equal to those of the enemy. The state of the United Front is gaining more and more support as the old state becomes increasingly fragile, fragmented and unable to survive. At this stage, guerrilla warfare is supplemented by maneuver warfare, but it remains the basic form of combat operations.

“Our primary form of fighting will still be mobile warfare, but positional warfare will rise to importance. While positional defence cannot be regarded as important in the first stage because of the prevailing circumstances, positional attack will become quite important in the third stage because of the changed conditions and the requirements of the task. In the third stage guerrilla warfare will again provide strategic support by supplementing mobile and positional warfare, but it will not be the primary form as in the second stage.” ³¹

In the third stage, the supremacy of forces is on our side. The main feature of this stage is that the Communist Party is advancing forward to conquer total power in the country, and the enemy is losing it entirely. Thus, through three stages, a long-lasting revolutionary process will take place, through which the class and the people will defeat a far stronger enemy.

May we now be allowed to part with our subject. The nature of the subject itself is extensive and much more could be written, but our task is already clear to the reader. With this, we come to the end of our section on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

THE RECONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF YUGOSLAVIA UNDER MAOISM IS THE TASK OF THE CONSCIOUS SOCIALIST PROLETARIAT.

The party is the unity between revolutionary theory and social practice, to build a party is to build a revolutionary movement. Our Committee considers the concentric construction of the three instruments of revolution developed by Comrade Gonzalo to be an expression of the laws governing the construction of the Party, and regards it as a guide to action. Everything rests with the Communist Party, and its reconstitution is an extraordinary task that our front work must serve.

The Committee for the Reconstitution of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, convinced in its path and conscious of its goal, proceeds from the fact that the main need of the class struggle of the Yugoslav proletariat is the reconstitution of its class party. This is necessary because the class interests of the proletariat require it to be the leader and hegemon of the Yugoslav People's revolution.

But what exactly does it mean to reconstitute the Communist Party of Yugoslavia? To establish a task, but to leave its content undefined, is no two-line struggle, but formal radicalism reminiscent of the "radicalism" of the petty bourgeoisie and its various political expressions. The reconstitution of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia today is, in short, the recognition of the great historical role and value of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia – taking its basis and working on the development of its ideological-political basis, adapting organizational to political. All this with the aim of developing a protracted people's war.

Comrade Vlado Dapčević was the forerunner of this great task. In his efforts to do so, he united around his leadership the Marxist-Leninists of the former Yugoslavia and founded the Partija Rada. Although Partija Rada became a revisionist organization after the death of comrade Vlado Dapčević, he played a significant role in laying the basis for a qualitative break with revisionism within the Yugoslav communist movement. He established the way for the Yugoslav revolution, and it was this last struggle of Vlado Dapčević that opened the way for the recognition of Maoism and the establishment of our committee, which in its development changes, perfects and enriches certain obsolete thesis of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia with new thesis that correspond to the new historical conditions.

The supremacy of The Committee for the Reconstitution of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia over revisionist organizations consists precisely in the fact that it considered the organizational forms of party work historically, in accordance with the concrete historical situation and in an inseparable connection with the conditions of the class struggle and current political tasks. All this while constantly enriching itself with international heritage and harmonizing with practice.

The Committee for the Reconstitution of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia makes no secret of its aims, we openly declare before our people, and especially the workers and peasants, that it is our duty to reject the monstrous illusions of revisionism and imperialism and to prepare for struggle in the midst of the international storm of class struggle!

The road is long and arduous, but we are condemned to win!

DEATH TO REVISIONISM! LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM!
FOR THE RECONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
YUGOSLAVIA!

CAST AWAY ILLUSIONS, PREPARE FOR STRUGGLE!

- 1 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u dva tomova. Tom I. Knj. 1, Šta da se radi?* Beograd: Kultura, 1948, str. 182.
- 2 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u dva tomova. Tom I. Knj. 1, Šta da se radi?* Beograd: Kultura, 1948, str. 195.
- 3 K. Marks i F. Engels, *Komunistički manifest*. Beograd: Mladost, 1974, str. 60.
- 4 K. Marks i F. Engels, *Komunistički manifest*. Beograd: Mladost, 1974, str. 41.
- 5 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 14, Oktobar 1920 - Mart 1923, O proleterskoj kulturi*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 38.
- 6 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela. Tom. 1. Knj. 1, Tri izvora i tri sastavna dela marksizma*. Beograd: Kultura, 1948, str. 60.
- 7 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 7, Materijalizam i empiriokriticizam: kritičke primedbe o jednoj reakcionarnoj filozofiji*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 130.
- 8 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 15, Filozofske sveske*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 351.
- 9 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 15, Filozofske sveske*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 352.
- 10 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u dva tomova. Tom I. Knj. 2*. Beograd: Kultura, 1948, str. 430, 431.
- 11 J. Staljin, *Pitanja lenjinizma*, 11. izd. Beograd: Kultura, 1946, str. 13, 14.
- 12 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 13, Mart 1919 - septembar 1920, II Kongres naroda istoka*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 308.
- 13 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 10, Jun 1916 - jun 1917, O karikaturi marksizma i o >>imperijalističkom ekonomizmu<<*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 212.
- 14 J. Staljin, *Pitanja lenjinizma*, 11. izd. Beograd: Kultura, 1946, str. 74, 76, 78, 81, 82.
- 15 C. T. Mao, *Izabrana dela, Knj. 1, tom 9*. Beograd: Vojno delo, 1957, str. 269
- 16 C. T. Mao, *Izabrana dela, Knj. 1, tom 9*. Beograd: Vojno delo, 1957, str. 297
- 17 F. Engels, Karl Marks, *Sveta porodica: ili kritika kritične kritike protiv Bruna Bauera i drugova*. Beograd: Kultura, 1964, str. 37.
- 18 C. T. Mao, *Izabrana dela, Knj. 1, tom 9*. Beograd: Vojno delo, 1957, str. 268.
- 19 C. T. Mao, *Kineska revolucija i socijalizam, tom. 12*. Zagreb: Globus, 1981, str. 217
- 20 C. T. Mao, *Kineska revolucija i socijalizam, tom. 12*. Zagreb: Globus, 1981, str. 213.
- 21 C. T. Mao, *Kineska revolucija i socijalizam, tom. 12*. Zagreb: Globus, 1981, str. 207.
- 22 C. T. Mao, *Kineska revolucija i socijalizam, tom. 12*. Zagreb: Globus, 1981, str. 421, 422.
- 23 C. T. Mao, *Kineska revolucija i socijalizam, tom. 12*. Zagreb: Globus, 1981, str. 180.
- 24 K. Marks i F. Engels, *Dela. Tom. 19, Osnovi kritike političke ekonomije: (ekonomski rukopisi 1857-1859), deo 1*. Beograd: Institut za međunarodni radnički pokret; Prosveta, 1979, str. 158.
- 25 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 12, Novembar 1917 - februar 1919, Skupština partiskog aktiva Mosvke 27 novembra 1918*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 347.
- 26 V. I. Lenjin, *Izabrana dela u 16 tomova. Tom. 10, Jun 1916 - jun 1917, Rezultati diskusije o samoopredeljenju*. Beograd: Kultura, 1960, str. 149.
- 27 K. Marks i F. Engels, *Dela. Tom. 10, Avgust 1849 – jun 1851, Preduslovi i izgledi za rat Svete alijanse protiv revolucionarne Francuske u godini 1852*. Beograd: Institut za međunarodni radnički pokret; Prosveta, 1975, str.

28 C. T. Mao, *Izabrana dela, Knj. 1, tom 9. Beograd: Vojno delo, 1957, str. 419.*

29 C. T. Mao, *Izabrana dela, Knj. 1, tom 9. Beograd: Vojno delo, 1957, str. 412.*

30 C. T. Mao, *Izabrana dela, Knj. 1, tom 9. Beograd: Vojno delo, 1957, str. 413.*

31 C. T. Mao, *Izabrana dela, Knj. 1, tom 9. Beograd: Vojno delo, 1957, str. 416.*

(Every emphasis is ours.)