

Exposure of the "RIM"

UNITE! Info #39en: [Posted: 08.07.97]

Page | 1

INTRO NOTE:

In this Info, I've collected some extracts from earlier Info postings. They contain the main points of my criticism of that phoney "preparatory International" the "Revolutionary Internationalist Movement", "RIM", a criticism that exposes its reactionary character.

The first such criticism and the very first one at all, as far as I know, to be made, from the standpoint of Marxism, Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, of this big swindle operation, was in an 8-page article that I published in leaflet form on 12.08.1994 as "INFORMATIONSBLAD No. 24 Eng", entitled: "Why Does the RIM Help U.S. Imperialism Encircle the PCP?". It was later posted on the Net on 01.01.1996 as "UNITE! Info #3en: '94 art. on Mao, RIM, US, PCP", in 3 parts.

The extracts I'm bringing here are from that posting and from two later ones: "UNITE! Info #8en: The sinking of the 'RIMitz'", in 5 parts, of 25.04.1996 and "Do c. Adolfo & PCP need lessons from individuals?", of 14.07.1996. The latter was sent, in 5 parts, then only to the Spoon Collective's Marxism mailing list but later, on 27.10.1996, also to newsgroups, as "UNITE! Info #21en: Debate with Olaechea, '96 VII". Most of the extracts from that posting was also reproduced in "Info #31en", on 29.03.1997.

The criticism of the ideological basis of the "RIM", its reactionary "Declaration" of 1984, you'll find in parts 3/5 and 5/5 of this Info (extract No. 5 respectively 11). The extracts in part 3/5 contains more of comments by me and the one in part 5/5 more of quotes from the "Declaration".

Extract 1. (From UNITE! Info #3en, part 1/3, 01.01.1996)

As for the RIM and its politically leading participant, the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) of the USA, it must be seriously questioned whether these are genuinely revolutionary forces at all. The answers to those questions depend, among other things, on whether the comrades in the RCP and in other participants of the RIM will be able to change their respective organization's just now truly scandalous behaviour towards the PCP, or whether this will turn out to be impossible.

Another object of this article precisely is to point out some very clear reasons why the genuinely revolutionary forces in the world today should *not* look to the RIM for political guidance. Yet another is to point out where they *should* look for it.

Such guidance of course is urgently needed. And an enormous treasure of proletarian revolutionary experience today has been collected, too, in the course of several decades of struggle. Those who really want to understand what's going on in the world today and want to represent and further the common interests of the overwhelming majority of people do have access, at

least in principle, to some extremely powerful political weapons with which they can, and should, do this, even, if need be, as single individuals.

These weapons can be found, above all, in the writings of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong, in the important documents of the once-revolutionary extremely experienced Communist Party of China under the leadership of Chairman Mao and in the likewise extremely important documents of the former KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany - a party which probably is unknown to most readers but which existed as a genuinely revolutionary proletarian force, and one of quite exceptional qualities, between 1970 and, approximatively, the end of the 1980:s. (See Note on the last page [not included here].)

For a few notes on this experience, the reader is referred to the last part of the present article. One of the important very negative things which, all along, the RIM has been doing has been its massive *blockade of information* about this experience, or, in part, its *distortion* of it. Will the RIM dare discuss this publicly? Let's see.

Present-Day "Continuers" of Mao Zedong?

It will be shown here that the present behaviour of the RIM towards the PCP by no means is an "accident" but only a very clear expression of that line which has been prevailing in the RIM during its entire existence, i.e. since 1984.

That is a line of loudly lauding Mao Zedong Thought in words but in reality distorting it and openly attacking vital parts of it. It's a line of constantly misrepresenting the international situation in a way which completely negates Mao Zedong's brilliant analysis of that situation during his time and which favours important aims of U.S. imperialism and its (now half-broken) superpower partner and competitor, Russian new tsarism - formerly, Soviet social-imperialism. It's a line of ridiculously presenting such phoney "leftist" but really ultra-rightist elements as the "Gang of Four", whose line Mao Zedong combated just as intensively as he combated Deng Xiaoping's openly rightist line, as "the real revolutionaries", etc, etc.

That is the line of the RIM's basic document, the Declaration of the RIM, jointly decided on by several organizations in 1984.

Extract 2. (From UNITE! Info #3en, part 1/3, 01.01.1996)

In this situation, with the encirclement-and-suppression efforts internationally sharply confronting the efforts at supporting the PCP, what have been the actions of the RIM? Before going into this it's necessary to describe somewhat closer what the RIM is and how it functions. A closer look at the RIM shows something strange.

The Double Character of the RIM

On the one hand, the RIM is *not* an organization in its own right but only a group, set or cluster of certain parties and other organizations. These are in RIM terminology not called "members" of the RIM but only "participants" of it. They have no publicly known statutes or rules jointly decided on to regulate their cooperation with each other within this framework, the RIM, which wasn't "founded" but only "formatted", in 1984.

When it appears in this shape, "the RIM" of course cannot really be criticized, for instance, for helping U.S. imperialism encircle the PCP. It can hardly be criticized for anything, since, as an entity in this shape, it can hardly do anything at all. The only ones which, in this case, could be criticized are its "participating" parties etc, and this then separately.

On the other hand and at the same time, the RIM actually *is* an organization of some kind. It obviously does have some rules, after all, only these apparently are known only to a small number of people. That is, it's a *secret society*.

Page | 3

It's in this shape that the RIM appears, firstly, when it issues statements of its own. This doesn't occur often, but on 26.12.1993, for instance, two statements by "the RIM" were decided on. One of them had to do precisely with the matter discussed here, the struggle of the PCP. There must be some unknown rules by which the RIM's participants can be called together and can jointly make a decision.

Secondly, the RIM has an organ called the Committee of the RIM (CORIM), which obviously it somehow controls. The CORIM also issues statements and this more often, on various topics and e.g. before each May 1. It's not publicly known how the participants of the RIM jointly appoint the members of the CORIM, decide on the rights and responsibilities of that organ and of its members etc, nor who these members are.

Physicists have long debated whether light consists of waves or of particles. The preferred answer today is, that it's both of these things at the same time. The RIM's nature is similar: It's two different things at once, in the manner of a ghost, an actor playing two parts in a film or a ventriloquist plus his/her dummy.

Obviously, this "organisational form" which the RIM has, being a mere "cluster of organizations" and at the same time a closely-knit "secret society", is extremely unsuitable, to say the least, for any forces which are really trying to represent the interests of the great majority of people. It doesn't allow any supervision of, or influence on, the decisions of the forces in question by the masses, such as did, for instance, at least in the beginning, the organisational forms of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Internationals, several decades ago.

The RIM's organisational form is one which in fact would be "suitable" only, for instance, for some representatives of reaction trying, with whatever unwitting help from well-meaning but inexperienced or ignorant people they could get, to stem up against, encircle and suppress the genuinely revolutionary forces in the world.

Extract 3. (From UNITE! Info #3en, part 2/3, 01.01.1996)

How Does the RIM Make Its Voice Heard?

The RIM has no official press organ. Pamphlets with its Declaration, of 1984, have been published, in today over 20 languages, anonymously. They can be ordered from an organ called the Information Bureau of the RIM, which, unlike the RIM itself and the CORIM, has an official address, in London, Great Britain. Advertisements for this Bureau's appear in a magazine published, since 1985, approximately half-yearly with some 90 pages per issue, the A World to Win (AwtW), which has the same address. This magazine is "inspired by" the RIM, it states, but is

"not an official organ" of it. Its latest issue so far appeared in September, 1993.

The standpoints of the RIM become known, except through the AwtW, through what press its participants may have and by means of leaflets etc distributed by them. No contact addresses of these participants' appear in the pages of the AwtW except for that of the RCP, USA, a party founded in 1975. When earlier this year I wrote to the AwtW asking for information about possibly existing such addresses, I received in reply only that of the RCP, together with the information that only this RIM participant publishes regularly in English. (See Note.)

Page | 4

The RCP publishes weekly in English and Spanish the Revolutionary Worker / Obrero Revolucionario (RW/OR), and about quarterly the magazine Revolution / Revolucion. The RW/OR has some 18 listed contact addresses in the USA including one in Hawaii. It's obviously by far the most important mouthpiece for the RIM, at least outside Peru. As various publications of the RCP indicate, this party to a great extent has dominated the RIM ideologically, too.

Within the 3rd International, the Comintern of 1919-1943, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was sometimes half-jokingly called the "father party" because of its dominating role in it. The situation in the RIM is not quite similar in this respect (either), but the RIM could rightly be described as having not only a "favourite son" - the one it's now stabbing in the back - but also an "uncle organization", the RCP, USA.

All comrades in the USA may not be aware of this, but they should be. Because of the RIM's "double trouble" organisational character, we who are outside that "movement" cannot tell whether, or how, it can be criticized from the inside. But, unless that party is a complete fraud, it is possible to criticize the RIM within the RCP. The same goes for the other RIM participants, too.

The RIM's Recent Behaviour towards the PCP

As far as can be ascertained from here at the time of writing, the actions of the RIM in relation to the PCP since October, 1993, have been:

Wholly and completely has the vital declaration of the Central Committee of the PCP of 7.10.1993 been suppressed by the RIM and by all organs over which it exercises control or in which it has an influence.

The RIM neither has published that declaration, or arranged for its being published, nor even has made the slightest reference to its existence.

Against the entire massive propaganda built up around the "negotiations and peace communications" allegedly from comrade Gonzalo and other imprisoned PCP leading cadres, not a word has been said by the RIM. This not even after this propaganda attack internationally had been developing for months, with the major openly bourgeois and revisionist media supporting it to the hilt, and despite the fact that other forces, also outside Peru, forces with much smaller propaganda resources than those media, publicly have counterattacked this propaganda manoeuvre since its start.

Why the PCP's CC's declaration wasn't immediately reproduced in, for instance, the Revolutionary Worker / Obrero Revolucionario? Why wasn't the

Committee of the RIM, for instance, convened as soon as possible to defend the PCP against this serious attack?

On December 26, 1993, the 100th anniversary of Mao Zedong's birth, the RIM itself apparently somehow convened - whatever that means. It issued two statements that same day. The first of these contained the news that the RIM was now calling Mao Zedong Thought "Maoism", as the PCP had done since 1982, later criticizing all who didn't use this terminology of the PCP's as "less revolutionary".

Thus with that statement the RIM smiled at the PCP. With the second it stabbed it in the back.

The second statement, not published immediately as was the first but only on February 6, 1994, in the RW/OR, was entitled "In Support of People's War in Peru Led by the Communist Party of Peru and in Defence of the Life of Chairman Gonzalo". It started out by stating how "proud" the RIM had always been to count the PCP in its ranks and that it considered the people's war led by that party as "the foremost struggle against imperialism and reaction in the world today".

Then what about that recent important development in this "foremost struggle", the enemy's massive propaganda attack intending to sow confusion and capitulationism? Not a word in this "support" statement. What about the crucial reply to that attack, a reply showing, among other things, that the CC of the PCP was still functioning, in the existing extremely difficult situation? "Sorry, comrades whom we're proud to have in our ranks. Your Central Committee hasn't issued any declaration. Nor should anybody outside Peru think it has."

That's the meaning of such a statement's icy silence on this point. All earlier pronouncements by the CC of the PCP had been widely propagandized by the RIM, and now there was silence. That was a vicious attack on the 7.10.1993 declaration, and on the PCP's Central Committee.

The general phrases of "support" which the statement contained could be of no assistance to the PCP when the burning question of its fight against capitulationism pointedly was ignored. Nor could the "piece of advice" which it may be read as also containing be of any help. The only sentence in the statement which perhaps, indirectly, touched on the concrete situation at the time was one which lauded the PCP for being "flexible in tactics" in "new situations". This may be read as: "You should now be flexible and try negotiations". But the struggle going on wasn't about "negotiations". It was against "negotiations and peace at any price". So this "advice" was, if anything, worse than useless.

Extract 4. (From UNITE! Info #3en, part 2/3, 01.01.1996)

However, my suggestion of 12.4.94 has still *not* been circulated. I've received no explanation why. Regrettably, the IEC's executive organ is going to the length of non-compliance with our organization's by-laws in order to prevent international knowledge of the PCP's CC declaration. Doesn't this likewise mean helping U.S. imperialism encircle the PCP?

It's natural to conclude that this quite unacceptable action has something to do with the IEC:s very close connection to the RIM. Its Coordinating Committee all along has been based at the same (accommodation) address in London which also houses the RIM-inspired magazine AWTW and the Information Bureau of the RIM. The IEC often has advertised the RIM as internationally leading defender of comrade Gonzalo's life. Conversely, its

campaign has been reported on as a major event in the world today by the organ of the RIM's "uncle party", the RCP, USA. The IEC in fact may be described as an "enlarged family circle" of the RIM's.

An Organizer and a Discussion at the IEC's Founding Conference

It may be relevant in this context to recount two different things which I noted in the course of the IEC's founding conference, as a whole a quite successful event of considerable importance. Among those organizing that event, at the Kulturzentrum Effendi, Duisburg, on February 27-28, 1993, a small number of German-speaking persons of U.S. origin working closely together appeared to be in charge. One of them I had encountered before. Some of the conference's nearly 1000 participants may recall, among those in charge of translation, seating etc, a smallish person with a red handkerchief tied around his head.

Page | 6

This person's name is Rob Weltman - or it was, in Sweden ten years earlier. He was then the most influential leading member of the PGS, an organization in Sweden with the proclaimed aim: "For a Democratic Palestine". But it no longer supported armed struggle nor even combated zionism as such. As a member, I criticized this, pointing out, and publicly proving, that Rob Weltman was working for forces wishing to subvert the PGS. For this I was kicked out of the PGS, in 1983. But some leaflets published by me must have made Weltman's position untenable in the PGS, perhaps in Sweden, too, in the long run. His turning up in Duisburg ten years later need not mean much concerning the character of the IEC. But it does seem to indicate that some very shady forces indeed were involved in the founding of that "enlarged family circle" of the RIM's.

At the conference's IEC Steering Committee plenum, our first and so far only, one member proposed that the already developing international campaign include a call for the liberation of comrade Gonzalo. This was supported by some other members including me.

I pointed at a nearby big banner proclaiming comrade Gonzalo to be "the most important political prisoner in the world today" as an argument why of course we should demand that prisoner's freedom. But the proposal met curiously strong resistance on the part of other speakers, who argued its being "useless" since "only the people's war can liberate Abimael Guzman". The matter was not voted on.

Why this proposal was considered so "useless" by some? There are several instances of political prisoners' having been freed precisely as a result, at least in part, of national or international public-opinion pressure. One originally scheduled speaker at the conference, Jose' Maria Sison, founding chairman of the Communist Party of the Philippines, which since 1970 has led a people's war against the regime, himself had been thus released from captivity in connection with the fall of Marcos in 1986.

Originally, when issuing the call "Move Heaven and Earth to Defend the Life of Comrade Gonzalo!" immediately after his capture, the Committee of the RIM had ended it by saying: "We Need Comrade Gonzalo at His Post, in the Forefront of the Revolution in Peru and the International Communist Movement - Fight for His Liberation!". But soon afterwards, that last very natural and just call disappeared from the RIM's propaganda; by February, '93, RIM adherents were dead against it as "useless".

Why this; why the RIM's so "illogical" change of heart?

There are good reasons to suspect that those persons who behind the stage are controlling the RIM, persons who are just as faceless as were the

hooded "judges" who "sentenced" comrade Gonzalo, in reality never did want his liberation but only wanted a certain propaganda to be focused on him as someone who "guaranteed" the "correctness" of the RIM Declaration's reactionary international political line. Perhaps the IEC campaign was already growing "too" fast and being supported by "too" many people for the liking of some of its initiators, so that they now saw a "risk" that an international demand for comrade Gonzalo's freedom might actually succeed in bringing it about.

Page | 7

Why Does the RIM in Fact Help U.S. Imperialism Encircle the PCP?

Because of many facts already recounted above, it's necessary here openly to voice the suspicion that those unknown persons who control the RIM in its "secret society" shape in reality are agents of reaction and that this is the reason why today the RIM is helping U.S. imperialism encircle the PCP. These persons hereby are asked to step forward to explain their actions, so that this suspicion may be either allayed or else confirmed.

The situation for the PCP obviously is a very difficult one, both in Peru itself and internationally. For the latter part of this at least, the RIM is very much to blame. Nothing has been heard here from the CC of the PCP since its 7.10.93 declaration. Possibly, the information blockade just now is very tight. But there are reports indicating that the people's war continues.

Extract 5. (From UNITE! Info #3en, part 3/3, 01.01.1996)

The Revolutionary Line of Mao Zedong and of the Former KPD/ML (NEUE EINHEIT), and the Phoney "Marxist" Declaration of the RIM

The RIM Declaration of 1984 contains some vicious open attacks on (at least formerly) well-known correct principles of Marxism and some flagrant untruths about the then existing situation in the world and recent history, including omissions of vital facts. It's difficult to see how these things could have been the results of even gross ignorance on the part of its authors.

With particular fury, the Declaration attacks Mao Zedong's extremely successful foreign policy of a united front against imperialism in general and against one or two superpowers in particular. By the 1960s, U.S. imperialism had long been the main protagonist of reaction. Such imperialist former big powers as Great Britain, Germany, France and Japan could no longer compete for hegemony. Mao Zedong correctly analysed them as belonging to an intermediary zone between the then only hegemonic power and the socialist countries. In the well-known "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" of 1963, one of the CPC documents of "the Great Polemics" unmasking Soviet revisionism, he correctly urged the working-class in the capitalist countries which U.S. imperialism was controlling or trying to control to "direct their attacks mainly against U.S. imperialism but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests".

For heaven's sake, no! the Declaration cries out (p. 23, English version). We're all for Mao Zedong, of course, but that was one of his mistakes! Imperialist countries, you see, can have *no* legitimate "national interests" but *only* imperialist ones. Mao Zedong's "erroneous"

view "seriously affected the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement in these countries". It also "had a long history in the international communist movement", and it definitely "should be broken with" (p. 23). You must never advocate such united fronts against one or two superpowers!

Mao Zedong's view did have a long history in the communist movement. As all who have had to use Marxism to fight back against the attacks by phoney "Marxist" helpers of imperialism and social-imperialism on this point know, it was precisely the correct view of Lenin, too. His "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", for instance (in Collected Works, Vol. 22), written in 1916 in the middle of the then raging imperialist war, was aimed precisely at refuting the view of some Dutch and Polish socialists that there could be "no" *national* wars, at least not in Europe, in the imperialist period and that it was "impermissible" ever to support the national independence of an imperialist country. He wrote:

"If Belgium, let us say, is annexed by Germany in 1917, and in 1918 revolts to secure her liberation, the Polish comrades will be against her revolt on the grounds that the Belgian bourgeoisie possess 'the right to oppress foreign peoples'! - There is nothing Marxist or even revolutionary in this argument. If we do not want to betray socialism we *must* support *every* revolt against our chief enemy, the bourgeoisie of the big states, provided it is not the revolt of a reactionary class."

Was this unknown to the RIM Declaration's authors? If you read some of the many articles and books by the chairman of and one other "theoretician" (RW/OR) of the RCP, USA, comrades Bob Avakian and Raymond Lotta, you can see that they at least are very well read in the works of Marx and Lenin. Did they have a hand in, in 1984? This is unknown but does seem likely. Anyway, calling that Declaration "Marxist-Leninist" is a lie.

China's successful foreign policy under the leadership of Mao Zedong, which helped the proletariat in the world and the oppressed peoples and nations enormously and which gave China itself an international prestige which was never greater than in 1976, was one of the important achievements of the Chinese revolution in general and of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, 1966-1976, in particular, which made the leadership remain in the hands of the revolutionary proletariat.

The last five years even have seen an enormous "posthumous victory", so to speak, of that foreign policy. By 1974, the situation in the world described above had developed further so that, against a rising tide of national liberation struggles in or by countries of the third world, of revolutionary struggles by the masses in many other countries as well and even some struggles by capitalist/imperialist countries to shake off foreign domination, the entire imperialist system was being upheld mainly by two superpowers, which also were contending with each other for hegemony, Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism.

Mao Zedong in that year presented his famous and correct analysis of the countries' in the world being divided into three groups, three worlds, neither then nor later forgetting the class struggle continuing also within the different countries, never ceasing to advocate revolutionary war as the way for the proletariat to seize power. And he was at that time already advocating the forging of a broad international united front against the two superpowers, in particular against social-imperialism, and later sought to include not only small and medium-sized imperialist countries, those of the second world, but even certain forces of U.S. imperialism into a united front against Soviet social-imperialism as the then most dangerous source of war, which had put its economy on a military footing and above all was threatening an aggression against Western Europe.

The danger of a war in Europe being started by social-imperialism was a very serious threat in the mid-'70:s. Mao Zedong's China and, in Europe itself, above all the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), whose genuinely proletarian revolutionary character enabled it to see the facts, persistently warned about it, while almost the entire bourgeoisie pretended there was "detente". When the Russian new tsarists could not realize their hegemonic plans, their entire empire got into increasing difficulties and by 1989 started to crack. The masses oppressed by it revolted.

Page | 9

The recent partial downfall of that pillar of reaction, Soviet social-imperialism and social-fascism, on the whole greatly has improved the world situation. This upheaval also has caused further economic misery but it will in the long run be very beneficial for the peoples of the world. Bourgeois leaders as one man are calling it "a defeat of communism". That's a good one. Most of those people licked social-imperialism's boots while Mao Zedong and his adherents told all how like Hitler fascism it was.

"Never Unite the Many to Defeat the Few!"
Superpower Lackeys Are the Real Revolutionaries!"

Even more loudly than at Mao Zedong's correct analysis of the world situation in the '60s, the RIM Declaration howls at his correct analysis of the situation in the '70s and at the immensely important foreign policy decisions which followed from it, which were intensely disliked by that group within U.S. imperialism which had connived at the social-imperialists' aggressive plans because they suited its own counterrevolutionary aims.

These decisions weren't Mao Zedong's at all, you see! It was "the revisionists" in China who then "to a large degree" "controlled" its diplomacy! (p. 25) (Precisely when in fact Chairman Mao was receiving more foreign heads of state than ever, precisely when more people than ever listened to his words.) And to advocate unity of the third world was "all wrong"! To portray countries of the second world as intermediate forces was even - "counterrevolutionary"! "The Marxist-Leninists" (who? - perhaps the above-mentioned "uncle" comrades Avakian and Lotta, who both had published books with such attempts) have "correctly refuted" the "revisionist slander" that "the 'Three Worlds Theory' was put forward by" Mao Zedong! (p. 25) It was indeed a "nasty" theory to the superpowers and their helpers.

Here again, one basic principle of this Declaration stands out: By no means should there be a united front against those reactionary forces in the world which at the time are the most dangerous! This "principle" is being upheld by today's "RIMlers", too.

The Declaration does contain many phrases which may look very revolutionary. It even repeats some important truths, including *some* of those extremely important principles concerning inner-party struggle which were stressed by the Documents of the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC), in 1973. However, it never refers directly to those Documents, which, like practically all the other very important CPC documents of the 1966-76 period, the RIM always has been discouraging people from studying in the original.

And, significantly, it leaves one thing out which, precisely hits at the RIM's line:

"It is imperative to note that one tendency covers another. The opposition to Chen Tu-Hsiu's Right opportunism which advocated 'all

alliance, no struggle' covered Wang Ming's 'Left' opportunism which advocated 'all struggle, no alliance'. The rectification of Wang Ming's 'Left' deviation covered Wang Ming's Right deviation. The struggle against Liu Shao-chi's revisionism covered Lin Piao's revisionism." (CPC's 10th Congress, Zhou Enlai's report, *Peking Review* 35-36/1973, p. 21)

This element, one tendency covering another, also was present in the struggle within the CPC at that time and played a significant role in the later overthrow of socialism in China, in 1976-78. Here, too, the RIM Declaration grossly falsifies the demonstrable facts of what happened, this time in order to justify the admiration which the RIM has always tried making people feel for its quite particular "heroes", the phoney "leftist", in reality ultra-rightist, group of persons who had degenerated into becoming superpower lackeys, known as the "Gang of Four".

Page | 10

The "gang" was named so by Mao Zedong, who in 1974 repeatedly urged them to stop functioning as such. Their leader, Jiang Qing, in 1972 already, through a series of secret unauthorized interviews with historian Roxane Witke, had started seeking U.S. support for herself as "Dowager Empress" after Mao Zedong's death. Even better suited their line social-imperialism. The CPC's CC's two decisions, proposed by Mao Zedong, on 7.4.1976 to dismiss the publicly criticized openly-rightist Deng Xiaoping and to appoint Hua Guofeng First Vice-Chairman also hit the "gang", whose member Zhang Chunqiao had "outranked" Hua Guofeng but was "bypassed" as less to be trusted.

Mao Zedong at CPC meetings towards the end of his life repeatedly sharply criticized not only Deng Xiaoping and his "right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts" of 1975-76 but also Jiang Qing's phoney "left" reactionary line, explicitly warning against her "wild ambitions" of "becoming CPC chairman" and even saying: "After I die, she will make trouble".

This the Gang of Four did. Less than a month after Mao Zedong's death (9.9.1976) they attempted a coup to seize power.

How Was Socialism Overthrown in China, How Did the Marxist-Leninists Analyze This and What Has Been the RIM's Fairy Tale About It?

The phoney "left" gang was dealt a decisive blow and its coup attempt foiled when all its four members were arrested on 6.10.1976 by the forces of Hua Guofeng, who publicly promised to continue Mao Zedong's line completely and thus also continue the criticism against the "traditional"-rightist Deng Xiaoping.

This blow against the long-hated Gang of Four, therefore, received massive and enthusiastic support from the Chinese people and also from genuinely Marxist-Leninist forces abroad.

But the RIM, e.g. in its Declaration (pp. 25-27), portrays this blow as "the counterrevolutionary coup d'e'tat in China". This "theory" is not only obviously very strange, it also defies the facts. How could suddenly, in revolutionary China, a coup d'e'tat have succeeded without at least great turmoil; why wasn't there mass resistance against the action hitting Mao Zedong's "closest comrades in arms"(!), as the Declaration calls the gang? What really is inferred here, together with the untruth that China's diplomacy "to a large degree" was controlled by revisionists, is: The great beacon of the early '70s, China, was "half revisionist". It's pure fantasy, aimed at promoting "Gang-of-Four-ism" today.

What actually took place was that Deng Xiaoping's right-deviationist group utilized the damage caused and threatened by the phoney "left" clique and the intense hatred it caused, to further their own purposes step by step, secretly being joined by Hua Guofeng's group, who as early as in November, 1976, started breaking their promise wholly to uphold Mao Zedong's line.

Page | 11

One revolutionary party in the world - as far as I know - analyzed this correctly: the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany. Comrade Gonzalo's PCP (fraction), for instance, never did show an understanding of it. It never distanced itself from the Gang of Four and, even before its "RIM days", held some correspondingly phoney "left" views on international issues.

Such a stand, as taken by an isolated revolutionary party in a comparatively backward country like Peru, may well be judged to be an honest and relatively harmless mistake.

It takes on a different character when propagandized internationally and systematically since 1984 by an entity such as the RIM. This all comrades inside or outside the RIM must see.

The RIM's Utter Silence on a Historic Reverse by the Bourgeoisie, Led by U.S. Imperialism, and What This Reverse Must Mean

During the decade before the RIM Declaration was written, a series of mutually interconnected issues had risen to great importance, at least in Europe: The extremely reactionary anti-growth, anti-nuclear-energy, anti-science, anti-technology and anti-industry campaigns instigated by the most right-wing bourgeoisie, including the revisionists, in general and by U.S. imperialism in particular.

And it was the preceding phoney "Marxists" who had provided and misled those groups of ignorant people who supported these assaults on vital interests of the masses, mainly under the upside-down pretext of "environmental protection".

These attacks, which continue today, with ever more bourgeois forces behind them, stem from the bourgeoisie's fear that the technological and industrial development might make conditions ripe for a revolutionary workers' movement which would endanger their entire rule in the world. Marx even noted the beginnings of this fear some 140 years ago, pointing out: "Steam, electricity and spinning machine were revolutionaries of a much more dangerous character than even the citizens Barbe*s, Raspail and Blanqui." (Speech in London, 14.4.1856)

Today the bourgeoisie on certain vital points already completely have reversed their earlier striving for more and more industry, better and better technology. In most so-called "advanced" countries, they are retreating from nuclear energy, in part even from the use of oil; they are advancing backwards into the coal age, even into the windmill age, are systematically creating mass unemployment and tearing down earlier welfare systems.

Clearly, all this calls for radical counterattack by the Marxist-Leninists. Such has been delivered by one, only one, party, the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), which thereby also, when it was still revolutionary, gruesomely further unmasked the earlier phoney-"Marxists". And what do the RIM and its Declaration say on this enormous subject? Not one word. Again, the RIM's standpoint greatly pleases, above all, U.S. imperialism, which is engineering anti-nuclear-energy campaigns and other foul things in the

world and greatly fears those counterattacks against them which only our ideology, actual Marxism, makes possible.

In order also to reverse the reversal, the proletariat must strike down the bourgeoisie's rule in the world completely, and the genuine Marxist-Leninists must begin do some uniting.

Page | 12

Extract 6. (From UNITE! Info #8en, part 1/5, 25.04.1996)

The important thing with the WWMC call is that its line is essentially correct and that it signals at least a partial break-away from that quite big "aircraft carrier" of subversion against the international Marxist-Leninist movement which has been pestering the political seas and continents for more than an entire decade now, ever since its launching by some camouflaged reactionary forces in March 1984 in fact, but which this call now is contributing to sink, the so-called "Revolutionary Internationalist Movement", or "RIMitz", as it may suitably be called (no insult intended on my part to the crew of any actual ship).

I'll comment more on the RIMitz and why it has to be destroyed completely, later in this article. It's based on a phoney "Marxist" reactionary document, the "RIM Declaration" of March 1984, which vilely attacks and slanders Mao Zedong's correct line. Today it has been translated into more than 20 languages. Unfortunately, its authors managed to trick also the PCP into signing it, later in 1984. This was a serious error on the part of the PCP, which its leading comrades have still not corrected. My UNITE! Info #3en of 01.01.96, with an article first published in the leaflet INFORMATIONSBLAD No. 24 Eng on 12.08.1994, "Why Does the RIM Help U.S. Imperialism Encircle the PCP?", above all dealt with these questions.

Altogether some 15 parties and other organizations are "participants" of the "RIM", which calls itself a "movement" and which in fact is neither an organization nor not an organization but something ghost-like in between the two, and whose leaders from the very beginning have formed a so-called "Committee of the RIM" or "CoRIM", about which nobody outside of those persons' own small circle even knows how its members get appointed or deposed, since the entire RIMitz never had any publicly known rules or statutes at all but always was "organized" not according to proletarian principles but according to such "principles" on which mafias are organized.

>From late 1993 on, the CoRIM openly stabbed the PCP and the people's war it has led against the reactionary regime in Peru since 1980 in the back. It supported the reactionaries' "peace accord" hoax by flagrantly suppressing the PCP's Central Committee's declaration of 07.10.93 which exposed it. The CoRIM tried to make people believe that this intelligence service plot was a matter of a "two-line struggle" within the PCP.

Thus the RIMitz "leaders" have stood publicly exposed as enemies of the proletariat for more than two years now. Their attempt last spring to save themselves with a sudden 180 degrees turn, while pretending that their treason hadn't taken place at all, could fool nobody. But it hasn't been until quite recently that some real organisatorical consequences of this treason have begun to be drawn by some of those comrades who until then had functioned as a kind of galley slaves on board this pirate ship, which was always precisely such contradictory a construction as an "aircraft carrier propelled by oars".

Extract 7. (From UNITE! Info #8en, part 2/5, 25.04.1996)

In one of those capitalist/imperialist countries which, more than 20 years ago, Mao Zedong correctly analyzed as being part of the second world, in an intermediate position between the then first world consisting of the two superpowers on the one hand and the third world countries on the other, namely, Germany, there at that time did exist a genuinely Marxist-Leninist party, the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT). It always was extremely small. But, at least here in Europe, it was this party and - as far as I know - only this party that upheld Mao Zedong's correct line and it continued to do so, for a long time, also after the overthrow of socialism in China in 1976-78.

Page | 13

Its documents from the '70s and early/mid-'80s, which unfortunately are practically all only in German but which contain vital guidance for the Marxist-Leninists even today, clearly show this. In the late '80s, it tragically degenerated and became bourgeois. (See also my Infos #1, #3 and #4 on this party's experience.)

The RIMitz, which pretended to uphold Mao Zedong's correct line but which never contacted precisely that - only - party in Europe which really did this, obviously was created not least with the intention most foully internationally to encircle and suppress precisely the then still correct KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany.

Extract 8A. (From UNITE! Info #8en, part 3/5, 25.04.1996)

In my opinion, the main dividing line in the present debate among those who state their adherence to the line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong is between supporting the call for a World Wide Mobilisation Committee (WWMC) to support the revolution in Peru and opposing it.

The call has an essentially correct line and signals a break-away from that big "aircraft carrier" of subversion against the proletarian revolutionary forces which has been pestering the political oceans and continents for much too long already, the "RIMitz".

On this I refer again to my posting to newsgroups on 01.01.96 which I've recently also sent to this list, "UNITE! Info #3en".

Extract 8B. (From UNITE! Info #8en, part 3/5, 25.04.1996)

The people's war led by the PCP against the reactionary regime in Peru since 1980 in my opinion is a just cause and must be supported. At the same time, it's necessary to criticize the PCP for its signing of the phoney "Marxist" reactionary "RIM Declaration", which attacks Mao Zedong's correct line and presents a distortion of it as the line which the international proletariat should follow.

The PCP leading comrades and other comrades who have made the same error should be informed about their mistake as soon as possible, so that they can investigate the matter more closely and correct this error.

It has been stated in the debate that the PCP signed the "RIM Declaration", which has since then been translated into more than 20 languages, with certain reservations. As I've already pointed out, the documents in connection with that signing show that this was not the case.

Extract 8C. (From UNITE! Info #8en, part 3/5, 25.04.1996)

Mr. Quispe apparently fears this criticism and wants to keep the RIMitz afloat as long as possible. This at least is the most obvious explanation for his violent reaction to that criticism and for his declining to support the WWMC call. On 20.04 he wrote that "the masses are being confused"(!) by my criticizing the reactionary RIMitz paper. This of course is ridiculous and upside-down. It's precisely that document that confuses them.

Page | 14

Extract 9. (From UNITE! Info #8en, part 5/5, 25.04.1996)

In 1979-80, because of the facts mentioned in point 11 and in other points above, the reactionaries had to fear even more than before that the ideas represented by the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), that is, genuine Marxism, might spread to other countries than (West) Germany.

So obviously it was no coincidence that in 1980, Avakian - or to be more precise, those forces who were using him as their tool or representative or however these things may have functioned - collected together a so-called "First Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organisations". Its platform, as published in a document, was "blatantly trotskyite", in comrade Olaechea's no doubt correct judgement, stated in a document on the struggle of the present London Sol-Peru Committee members against the Avakianist tendency which he has sent by e-mail to me, among others. (I even before I got it had suspected that this was the reason why in later years the RIMitz leaders never even dared show that 1980 document to people.)

An important purpose of the 1980 "Conference" obviously was internationally to encircle and suppress the KPD/ML (NEUE EINHEIT), which alone among European parties upheld and advocated Mao Zedong's correct line but which - of course - was never contacted that "Conference"'s organizers.

To me, when in 1993 I first saw the 1984 "RIM Declaration" and compared it with the information from the CPC in the Peking Review issues of 1973-76 and that in the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) documents of the '70s and early/mid-'80s, also trying to apply whatever experience of my own I might have gathered in my then some 20 years of political activity on the basis of their political line, the handwriting of the CIA appeared quite obvious in that RIMitz paper, or to be more exact, that of that fraction within the CIA which wanted cooperation with the KGB rather than rivalry with it, in order to combat the revolutionary forces. The earlier Avakianist creation, the 1980 document, clearly was even easier to identify as phoney "Marxist" and reactionary.

As was stated in some later PCP documents, in 1983 the PCP was first approached by Avakian, who proposed it sign the 1980 (Trotskyite, Avakianist or phoney "Marxist") document, which however was refused. There wasn't even any "Mao Zedong Thought" red paint poured over that document's reactionary theses, it seems.

But then in 1984, the PCP most unfortunately did swallow an "improved", more "luminous" bait, the actual RIMitz contraption, with which this Operation Subversion, therefore, started to become comparatively successful. Not until nine years - and more than 20 translations of the RIMitz paper into different languages - later was it that the CoRIM found it necessary really to make the PCP itself feel the hook.

Comrade Olaechea has told all that his London group did see through the Avakianists from the start but that they "didn't want to put their noses against" the CC of the PCP which, he writes, advocated unity with those

persons, whose exclusion from such unity the London group found it wrong to put forward as a demand.

Should today this "acceptance" of Avakian etc by the London group be criticized? I cannot tell. But I'd like to point out that the question really isn't whether to "accept" those or those *persons* or not - except in cases where there's clear proof of their reactionary character. The main question is: On the basis of what *line* do you unite with them? Had they realized that the document to be signed was a *reactionary* one, and - obviously - only a somewhat better camouflaged version of the earlier, the London comrades of course indeed *should* have "put their noses against" Marx, the Pope, Jesus, the Devil and his grandmother or what-have-you, and pointed this out. But it seems they didn't see this.

Page | 15

Strangely, in all those years in which I was in close contact with the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), i.e., up until April 1990, I never once heard my then comrades mention anything about the "RIM". We did in the late '80:s sometimes discuss the PCP in Peru, which seemed to me to be perhaps a positive factor in contrast to all known parties or groups in the European vicinity, which proved to be reactionary phonies, every one of them. But I then never heard of a way of contacting, or even reading the documents of, the PCP.

In 1990, I criticized the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) as now bourgeois. I wrote a criticism of it in German in Aug-Sept '90, "EINE KRITIK....".

At the IEC conference in Duisburg in 1993, I learned for the first time of the existence of a group in Germany which made propaganda for the "RIM" and said that it supported the PCP. It called itself "Revolutionäre Kommunisten (BRD)". An anonymous undated publication (obviously from 1991) with its name on it and a big picture of Jiang Quing on the front page, called "Auftstand!", reported that it had been taking part in 1 May demonstrations in Berlin(West) since 1987.

The KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), therefore, must have known about the "RIM Declaration" at least since 1987 or 1988. It would have been very easy for that experienced party publicly to have torn that reactionary document into shreds. It didn't do so, but kept completely quiet about it, and it never, as far as I know, publicly stated its support of the PCP or made any evaluation of the line of the PCP. But this means that (at least) from sometime in 1987-88 on, the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) was no longer a proletarian revolutionary party but now a phoney "Marxist", in reality bourgeois one.

However, the formation of the above-mentioned group "Revolutionäre Kommunisten (BRD)" in Germany, obviously before 1 May 1987, with no attempt whatever on its part to justify its formation instead of its members uniting with the already long-existing party in that country, was obviously quite unjustified, from the proletarian revolutionary standpoint. Even if it had considered that existing party to have already degenerated it would have had to say so and to prove this to people.

In fact there have been fairly credible reports to the effect that this newer group, generally called the "RIMlers", consistently has behaved very badly indeed on demonstrations, unprovoked (and not in self-defence, for instance) attacking other demonstration participants physically. For this, then, all direct defenders of the RIM, in the first place, and my ex-comrades of the degenerated KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), in the second, since they have indirectly supported the "RIM Declaration" and the "RIMlers" with their complete silence on both counts, must be held co-responsible.

CUTOUT 10. (From UNITE! Info #8en, part 5/5, 25.04.1996)

In the present situation, when they see that main big vessel of theirs for subversion against the revolutionaries finally foundering, namely, the RIMitz, which now has done service for some 12 years already and against whose eventual sinking they must have been making contingency plans for (at least) over two years by now, what steps will the CIA and the other reactionaries behind it take in order to keep that subversion going?

Page | 16

For they absolutely must and they will keep that subversion going, that's perfectly clear. They obviously have several possibilities, and obviously to start with will exclude none of the possible lines of action from being used.

One of their lines of action would be, to defend the "RIM" as far as they possibly can. They have invested much prestige in it and certainly will not let it sink without a fight.

They most probably since some time now have been preparing one or several "reserve" phoney "Internationals". There is today one other "ship" afloat which may be suspected to be one of these, the "MIMitz" ("Maoist Internationalist Movement"). I don't know for how long this entity has been in existence.

This "MIMitz" class vessel of course is considerably smaller and less known than the RIMitz. Politically it's characterized by its maintaining that those super profits which the imperialists extract from the oppressed peoples, and which still are being handed out to a considerable part of the masses in the imperialist countries, are making it impossible to win these masses for revolution - which is not the case - and by an "upside-down" racism. Organisationally it resembles the RIMitz in that one cannot tell what it really is - is it a kind of party in the USA or an international group or organization of several parties or what? But whether it's more of a fishy fowl or more of a fowly fish probably doesn't matter much, since it seems unlikely to get to play a bigger role than that of a distracting factor.

Interestingly, and IMO revealingly enough, the MIMitz and the RIMitz haven't been firing at each other at all. If one of them were a genuine attempt, on the part of its leading forces, at creating an Internationale, then certainly it would be important for it to show people why the existence of that other entity was unjustified - or else, why shouldn't everyone join it instead?

The "MLPD" in Germany seems to be somehow associated with the "MIM". And some months ago, both the RIMitz and the MIMitz could be observed to engage in some heavy wooing of the Communist Party of the Philippines. I don't know what, if anything, came out of it.

There also is another entity of the (supposed) "International- attempt" type which doesn't seem to have been called by any name (yet) and which in fact appears to have been launched by some friends of the (more or less) "competing firm". In Brussels on 2-4 May 1995, more than 100 representatives from 60 supposedly "marxist-leninist" parties in various parts of the world assembled in order to "discuss the unification of all communists in the world".

The weekly "Solidaire" of the host organization, the Parti du Travail de Belgique (PTB - whose chairman happens to be a namesake - no relation - of mine, Ludo Martens), however didn't find that event important enough to

have even the slightest notice about it on the first page of the issue in which it was reported (No. 25, of 21.06.95) - or else wasn't overly proud of some of the participating parties such as the Russian one led by Nina Andreyevna, so this entity will perhaps not play any more interesting role in relation to the actual communists either.

And naturally the subversionists will send some representatives into, or find some in, the WWMC too - although that organization of course will not be an International, such as is also needed by the proletariat, but will be precisely one for actual and not phoney defence of the revolution in Peru. There's IMO no need to be overly concerned about such things, which have always been "a fact of life". If all comrades strive to unite on the basis of the correct line, it seems at least to me that there are good possibilities for some progress.

Page | 17

Extract 11. (From "Do c. Adolfo & PCP need lessons from individuals?" 14.07.1996, later reproduced in Info #21en; parts of this extract also reproduced in #31en)

C) *What was and is the "RIM"?*

On this, I've already written in many postings and also in part 1 above. You wrote that the "RIM" indeed "can be" a prison but that it in the past "has been a trench of combat too", that its "Declaration" was a "relative" "basis of unity", that "the revisionist content" of some "Maoists (only) in words" who also endorsed it "took years for ALL and sundry to see", and even, if I've understood you correctly, that the "RIM" has been a "United Front"(!).

But, to take that last thing first, of course the "RIM", as a purported "International" or at least an "embryo" of one, has *never* presented itself as a "united front", which is something altogether different. One mustn't confuse those two things, as you're doing here!

The proposed WMC, according to the call for it, will not be a "united front" either. The point No. 6 on its tasks states that it is also to call together a broad conference for the support of the people's war in Peru. And *that* conference will then be one of a united front. But the WMC itself, as proposed, is *not* to be a united front but is to be an organization both for support of the revolution in Peru and also for leadership of the international proletariat, as indicated by the other points on its tasks.

And on a declaration such as the 1984 one of the "RIM", which purports to be a *general programme for the entire international struggle of the proletariat*, you cannot have "relative" unity either. You either endorse it or you don't.

In the case of the PCP, the documents show that it has endorsed, still is endorsing, the "RIM Declaration", in its entirety, and that all talk of "relative unity" in this respect is really a pretext and something which in itself must be criticized too, since it only serves to confuse the issue.

The question here - I repeat one more time - is this: The line is the key.

Concerning the "RIM", the main question is *not* whether or not the "revisionist content", as you wrote, of some of its "participants", who were "Maoists (only) in words", took years "for ALL and sundry to see". The

question is not about the "contents" of different people or parties. The main question is: What are the contents of the *programme* agreed on, what is the *line*?

D) *Can those who signed the "RIM Declaration" in 1984 and who still are endorsing that document, or are not criticizing it, really in justice call themselves "genuine Maoists" in all respects?*

Page | 18

As all comrades know, this "Declaration" is a document which has purported, and still is purporting, to do nothing less than provide basic guidance for the entire international proletariat in its struggle, and which in recent years has been disseminated in more than 20 languages.

Here is what this document says, on a number of points which were vitally important when it was written and still are so today:

[QUOTES FROM THE "RIM DECLARATION", 1984]

On the important 1963 CPC document, *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement* (the 25-point letter) and in general on the differentiation by Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong of various forces and their advocacy of uniting with all such forces as can be united against the main reactionaries, p. 22-23 (of the English-edition pamphlet):

"Yet, on a number of questions, the criticism of revisionism was not thorough enough and some erroneous views were incorporated even when criticising others. Exactly because of the important role these polemics and Mao and the Chinese Communist Party played in giving birth to a new Marxist-Leninist movement it is correct and necessary to consider the secondary, negative aspect in the polemics and in the struggle waged by the Communist Party of China in the international communist movement."

"In relation to the imperialist countries, the *Proposal* put forward the view that 'In the capitalist countries which US imperialism controls or is trying to control, the working class and the people should direct their attacks mainly against US imperialism, but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests.'"

"This view, which seriously affected the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement in these types of countries, obscures the fact that in imperialist countries the 'national interests' are imperialist interests and are not betrayed, but on the contrary defended, by the ruling monopoly capitalist class despite whatever alliances it may make with other imperialist powers and despite the inevitably unequal nature of such an alliance."

"The proletariat of these countries is thus encouraged to strive to outbid the imperialist bourgeoisie as the best defenders of its own interests. This view had a long history in the international communist movement and should be broken with."

On Chairman Mao's brilliantly successful, genuinely internationalist proletarian revolutionary foreign policy in the early-mid'70s, p.25:

"Despite the tremendous victories of the Cultural Revolution the revisionists in the Chinese party and state continued to maintain important positions and promoted lines and policies which did considerable harm to

the still fragile efforts to rebuild a genuine international communist movement. The revisionists in China, who controlled to a large degree its diplomacy and the relations between the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties, turned their backs on the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples or tried to subordinate these struggles to the state interests of China."

Page | 19

On the unity of the Third World, on the struggle against the hegemonism of the two superpowers, on the differentiation into intermediary zones and the Three Worlds, p. 25:

"Reactionary despots were falsely labelled as 'anti-imperialists' and increasingly under the banner of a worldwide struggle against 'hegemonism' certain imperialist powers of the Western bloc were portrayed as intermediary or even positive forces in the world."

On the broad international united front against the superpowers and in particular against Soviet social-imperialism as the then most dangerous source of war, which above all was posing a grave threat of military aggression against Western Europe, p. 25:

"Even during that period many of the pro-Chinese Marxist-Leninist parties supported by the revisionists in the CPC began to shamelessly tail the bourgeoisie and even support or acquiesce in imperialist adventures and war preparations aimed at the Soviet Union which was increasingly seen as the 'main enemy' in the whole world."

Once again on Mao Zedong's 1974 analysis, by him always based on the upholding of class struggle as key link, of the world as then divided into three parts, three worlds, p. 25:

"The Marxist-Leninists have correctly refuted the revisionist slander that the 'Three Worlds Theory' was put forward by Mao Tsetung."

On the same analysis and also on the 4-Gang, p. 25:

"Here it is important to note that the revisionist usurpers had to publicly condemn Mao's closest comrades in arms for opposing this counter-revolutionary theory."

On the big blow against the counter-revolutionary 4-Gang in October 1976, p. 26:

"In 1976 shortly after the death of Mao Tsetung the capitalist roaders in China launched a vicious coup d'etat which reversed the verdicts of the Cultural Revolution, overthrew the revolutionaries in the leadership of the CPC, instituted an all-round revisionist programme and capitulated to imperialism."

On the "green" warfare by the main forces of the bourgeoisie against the peoples of the world, a very large and important question at least since the mid-'70s and, in the following years, increasingly so:

"....." (Absolutely nothing)

These things were what I criticized and refuted in my 12.08.94 article, posted on 01.01.96 as "UNITE! Info #3en".

It's quite clear that the PCP, by its endorsement of this counter-revolutionary document, which above all vilely attacks the proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao, has caused considerable damage to the international proletariat. This is the negative side of the PCP's actions so far, and it's by no means an unimportant one.

Page | 20

When those people who're supporting *this* document, or who're *not* criticizing it, are saying: "We are the genuine Maoists", that's something which must be taken with several grains of salt, to say the least.

Such a thing can be excused, if it can be excused at all, only by the comparative ignorance of such comrades who, because of the imperialists' massive suppression of information and their cutting off of the different forces from each other, have been unable to see the erroneous and completely reactionary character of the things I quoted.

UNITE! /

Advocates the political line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong.
Each item # will be posted in one or more language(s) en/de/fr/es/se
series: Leaflets in the INFORMATIONSBLAD series mainly in Swedish, since
1975 are available on request.

Postal address:
Rolf Martens
Nobelvaegen 38
S - 214 33 Malmoe
SWEDEN
Tel: +46 - 40 - 124832