

On:

AN ACCUSATION OF “LEFTISM” AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

In general we are glad that the two lines struggle be able to be developed within the communist movement. “Without completely developing it, it is impossible to establish the right line and to achieve the victory in the revolutionary wars”.

The CCUMIC developed into the International Communist League. What it needs to be done, is, now, advance in our lines struggle and discuss, in the fundamental, the positions and thesis that were agreed upon in the International Conference, and to point out what differences of principles, we have with what was defined there, the differences which imposed to someone to be outside of the League.

There are topics that we already discussed previously, related with the fundamental contradiction, that, for now, we will not repeat, waiting that, internally the International Communist League, putting in practice the democratic centralism organize and allows to develop the lines struggle. We clearly establish that, although we are a militant organization of the International Communist League, all the arguments exposed here are exclusively from our organization Proletarian Power.

I. SOME AXIS OF THE CURRENT LINES STRUGGLE

1. On the principles

The comrades from the CLT -UOC¹ say:

“(…) Exists an objective base of unity, not just explicitly published by the Communist Worker’s Union (mlm) in the Proposal of Platform of Unity in May 2022, but also stated in the proposal presented by the comrades of the CCUMIC where it is clearly expressed in the following terms:

‘The demarcation line between Marxism and the new revisionism consists in: 1) acknowledging or not acknowledging Maoism as the third, new and superior stage of Marxism and the necessity to combat revisionism and all opportunism; 2) acknowledging or not acknowledging the necessity of revolutionary violence – as People’s War – to make revolution in one’s own country; 3) acknowledging or not acknowledging the necessity to demolish the old state apparatus and replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat; 4) acknowledging or not acknowledging the necessity of the revolutionary party of the proletariat.’

‘A right general formulation that differentiates itself from all kind of opportunism, to what we only would add: acknowledging or not that we live in the epoch of imperialism and the world proletarian revolution and acknowledging or not the need to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.’

¹ In this text, we will abbreviate “Commission of Theoretical Struggle – Communist Workers’ Union (mlm)” as “CLT-UOC” [Translator’s note: Comisión de Lucha Teórica – Unión Obrera Comunista (mlm)]

We highlight your expression ‘*A right general formulation that differentiates itself from all kind of opportunism*’, with the addition ‘*to what we only would add: acknowledging or not that we live in the epoch of imperialism and the world proletarian revolution and acknowledging or not the need to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat*’, emphasizing from our side that, according to this, here it is said, you acknowledge and assume as a question of principles:

- a) Acknowledging or not that we live in the epoch of imperialism and the world proletarian revolution and
- b) Acknowledging or not the necessity of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This, for us, is an advance without any kind of doubt.

We insist: is clear that if exists unity on the principles, we must be under the same democratic centralism, in the same international organization. Therefore we ask you: You, comrades, deny, that the base of unity of the Communists are the principles and that the line differences must be solved in the two line struggle within the same organization, being Party or Communist International?

This question tries to reiterate what we have been stating:

Pretend to have so many Parties or Communist Internationals as political lines (as nuances) could arose is to choose the dispersion of forces of the proletariat, and therefore, putting at the service of opportunism which maintains divided the proletariat, without the Party and the Communist International. Refuse to be a minority in the organization, with the pretext of “line differences”, and not of principles, is to do not understand the dialectic of the construction of the Party, since, within it, one it is majority or minority precisely due to line differences, including programmatic aspects. These differences are solved in spaces of the exercise of the Proletarian democracy, for example, the congresses, where -by being majority- it is defined the line that will be assumed. Only one difference of principles in the ideological aspect (in the M-L-M), put outside of the organization a militant or one group. Has to be accepted without hesitation that the Communists are gathered around the principles, and that the two lines struggle is the life itself of the Party.

Said Mao in On the Contradiction:

“Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end.”

The truly Communists we are forced to struggle for just one Party of the proletariat and for just one sole Communist International, and are the principles those which determinate who are in the ranks of the proletariat and whose outside. We insist: while there is no principles difference, we must consolidate unity. Who opposes to this dialectic is, truly, for the dispersion of the Proletarian forces and the conservation of their small and quite fief.

We call to the Communist Workers’ Union (mlm) for what, in the midst of these struggles for the right line, move forward in the concretion of the Party of the Proletariat in Colombia and the International Communist League.

2. On the epilogue of the CLT-UOC comrades:

See the words with which the text of the CLT-UOC begins:

*“In this special issue the reader will find a refutation of the **“leftist” ideas** and of **the attacks** made by the defender comrades...”* adding in the Epilogue: *“Doesn’t surprise either that the comrades from the newspaper Communist International, are echoing and give format to the **provocateur judgment** that the comrades of Proletarian Power make of us: the UOC tries to obscure the terms of the debate seeking to ignore and entering in contradiction with fundamental principles of the Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and on the top of it they put up their share of poison: to which we add, they do not talk at all about their practice in Colombia, which would allow us to verify in the practice the earthiness of what they hold in the field of theory.”* [The highlighted is ours].

At the end, in the Epilogue is said:

“Regarding the discussion method used by the comrades promoters and defenders of the Bases of Discussion, we have been forced to, in first place, to criticize the subjectivism, for being a defect of the knowledge of the objective world, defect due a dogmatic position that searches the truth in the formulas and not in the facts; and, in second place, to reject the pretension of our positions, and replace the arguments with insults.”

It must be acknowledged that we make “attacks” in the lines struggle. But, not personal ones, but, strictly to the not proletarian ideas, sticking ourselves to what its said in the text with which we controvert, taking text quotes, without making forced “interpretations” from our desires and wishes. In a former material we said that many comrades and organizations were doing the lines struggle using extremely rude adjectives, together with extremely weak arguments. The CLT-UOC comrades do not scape from this wrong way of portray debate. For example, to say that our arguments are insults and provocative judgments, is at least a monumental misunderstanding of the exposed arguments, or one way of avoiding what we are arising as essential thesis to the matter which is being controverted; very big mistake in the political debates and above all in the ideological ones. One thing is if they do not agree with our arguments, another thing is if they interpret or understand that all of our arguments are attacks and “insults”.

Now we will see the “attack” made by us against the Communist Workers Union (mlm), according to the CLT-UOC. We think what the example is very well chosen by you, because, it clearly reveals the essence of what the CLT-UOC comrades call “attacks” and which is the spirit of these “attacks”, because they clearly show that are misrepresentations, nor insults, but struggle against wrong ideas.

We see the supposed “attack” from Proletarian Power in the article we called “Delimiting and Clarifying”:

“Secondly, we can affirm that the conception of the comrades of the Coordinating Committee is in open opposition to Avakian’s New Synthesis. That the Coordinating Committee’s text states an idea or two that they have historically held in the RCPU is not sufficient reason to identify them with the New Synthesis. Moreover, that Avakian “defends” the idea that contradiction is the unique law of dialectics, (we are not certain about that Avakian defends this idea) does not make this idea wrong; nor those who defend it, Avakianists. To prove that this statement is incorrect (or that this or that organisation is Avakianist) it is not enough for the UOC to make a couple of assertions and that’s it. A profound

argumentation and counter-argumentation is unavoidable, that is to say, a struggle of lines that will lead us to all the necessary demarcations.”

From this fragment, the CLT-UOC says:

“The comrades from Proletarian Power have accused us of to point out a falsification of a quote for a assign to Mao a wrong thesis and link this such theory with the open enemies of Marxism, at the same time that they question if Avakian is a defender of such “esperpento”². Starting from the last point and only for clarify doubts, in the programmatic document of RCP of US called by them Constitution, it is said: “U.S. was left for now as the ‘sole standing’ superpower in the world”.”

The truth is that they did not achieved to clarify doubts for several reasons: the discussion was about the only law of dialectic, not about the sole superpower. This is an unexplainable mistake: how they can argue if they don't have in mind what is being discussed? And to say that **you don't have certainty** of a fact it is not to deny the fact, it is only to assert that there are no **proofs** on this regard.

We do not deny that Avakian said **“such esperpento”** (this expression is from the CLT-UOC comrades), we just said that we had no certainty. To assure that we are denying this, it is twisting an argument: words cannot be interpreted as you want; this is, literally, a misrepresentation, because there is a complete disconnection between the idea we have expressed, and what the CLT-UOC comrades understand and discuss.

In past discussions we have already repeatedly pointed out, this mistake.

In the mentioned text, it is clearly said that affirm one thing (isolated, depending on the context in which this was stated) that could be said by Avakian, it is not automatically making this thing revisionist; above all, when the practices are completely the opposite, in this case the practice of the comrades of the Coordinating Committee and the Avakianists.

That is why we reiterate again and again in this debate with the UOC: the debates that are focused on the terms, are not Marxist, even though they bring hundreds of quotations from Marxism. To show that what is stated in a formulation made by a revolutionary organization, is a revisionist or opportunist line, or is immersed in it, it is not enough the similarity in words; analysis, including that of their practices, is necessary. We cannot forget that revisionism hides in a discourse filled with Marxist phrases.

3. On the accusation of “leftism”

Let's get into de subject of the material from the UOC.

The CLT-UOC comrades argue the accusation of “leftism” with discussions on:

*“Our divergence and central discussion in this aspect is against the reductionist conception of the proposed Basis of Discussion, shown in, to the correct recognition of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the third, new and superior stage of development of Marxism, **they hang the erroneous addition mainly Maoism.**”*

And they ask:

² Translator's note: literary word that means something grotesque, a complete nonsense or something ridiculous.

*“Does rejecting **the erroneous addition mainly Maoism** mean that we ignore the role and significance of Chairman Mao Tsetung's contributions to the development of the science of Marxism, elevating it to a third, new and higher stage?”*

Answering themselves:

“No! On the contrary, we appreciate and defend the valuable contributions of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties that are members of the RIM, especially the PCP, in the systematization of the contributions of Maoism to the development of the three component parts of Marxism, in its forging and creative application. in the practice of the revolution in China, in the face of universal problems of the World Proletarian Revolution, in incessant struggle against opportunism, especially Chinese and international revisionist, contributions that the Declaration of '93 masterfully synthesized.”

But they keep silence in this debate on the most transcendental matters in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, that the *POLITICAL DECLARATION AND THE PRINCIPLES OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST LEAGUE* set fully established:

“The fundamental of Maoism is Power, in other words, the power to the proletariat, the power to the dictatorship of the proletariat, the power based on an armed force led by the Communist Party. Notably: 1) Power under the leadership of the proletariat within the democratic revolution; 2) Power to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the socialist revolution and the successive cultural revolutions; 3) Power based on an armed force led by the communist Party, conquered and defended through People's War.”

The CLT-UOC comrades remain a dead letter. There are pages and pages where the debate points to the terms, to the name **mainly Maoism**. Although the formal recognition of words, of expressions, is important, when they aim to rigorously establish the categories, the most transcendental, the fundamental, cannot be reduced to the name, but rather the concretion that, in social practice, we make Marxism Leninism Maoism.

What do they call leftism? to the definition of *mainly Maoism*? Or to be supporters of the theory of omnipotence of revolutionary war, to consider Power as the fundamental of Maoism; to the strategic axis that assumes the popular army as the main form of organization of the masses: a new type of army that fights, mobilizes and produces? Is it “leftism” to assume the strategy of the people's war? Are both things the synthesis of leftism?

As long as this is not clarified, we will not have made progress in the contradiction between unity and demarcation. In this area, the CLT-UOC comrades believe they are aiming at the conception, but they are targeting the terms, the mere words. To this, we can attribute an expression that they themselves brought to the debate: “the pleasure of wandering towards the branches”.

The CLT-UOC comrades criticize subjectivism as a method of discussion *for being a defect in the knowledge of the objective world, a defect protected by a dogmatic position that seeks the truth in formulas not in facts*. But, apparently, the comrades do not understand their own words and look for the truth in formulas and not in facts, considering that the core of the problem is in the expression: **“mainly Maoism.”**

Those who take the fight for mere terms to the extreme, seeking substance in words and not in facts, eliminate not only all concreteness of phenomena, but also the possibility of understanding and assuming the developments and leaps that we make and can make in the history of the class struggle, specifically in the forging of our proletarian ideology. Against the expression *mainly Maoism*, the comrades bring an arsenal of quotations from Marxism, not for the concrete analysis of a concrete contradiction, of practice, but an analysis of each expression, as if it were only a problem merely framed in the territory of language, which, apparently, for you is the reality itself. The final touch to this logic is necessary: to justify yourselves, you must call us dogmatic...

An essential issue is to show the proletariat, the poor peasants and the masses in general, the need for revolution. We must provide ourselves with the exact definition, without ambiguities, of what we consequently assume as the leap made in the development of our science, our ideology, our guide, with the new content and the latest developments of Marxism, of Maoism.

The CLT-UOC comrades launch an attack against “leftism”, omitting any analysis of the people's war as a strategy for the construction of Power developed by Mao, and of the army as the main way of organizing the masses, and therefore they have to focus on the discussion by and with words, forgetting the essentials of Marxism and focusing on the merely formal, confusing a position of the left wing of Maoism with the “leftism” that they claim to combat.

Paraphrasing Lenin we say: *call it as you want, this is indifferent*, but do not betray Maoism, do not abandon the point of view of the working class, do not deny the proletarian revolution, putting aside **the people's war, Power as the fundamental, the army as the main form of organizing the masses and armed struggle as the main form of struggle**. *We are supporters of the theory of omnipotence of revolutionary war; That is not “bad”, it is Marxist*. This is what characterizes the left wing of Maoism and distinguishes it from extreme insurrectionism, that which affirms insurrection by denying the **construction** of power itself and proposes the mere “taking over of the bourgeois state” and not its destruction from the exercise of popular power with the hegemony of the proletariat.

4. On the two currents of the World Revolution and the theory of “merge”

To begin with, we must clarify that this debate on the theory of merge developed by the CLT-UOC comrades, once again, does not transcend the limits of the merely formal. It is a discussion about the terms, the words; but we must point out very clearly that the most disastrous case of merely formal struggle is the criticism for the absence of hyphens between the letters MLM that the comrades of the International Communist newspaper made to the UOC (mlm). We mention it because these debates make smaller the theoretical struggle.

Let us remember this controversy by bringing a quote from the CLT-UOC comrades:

“The comrades of the International Communist newspaper affirm that: From the name itself of the Communist Workers Union of Colombia (Marxist Leninist Maoist) or UOC (mlm), it already express a conception contrary to Marxism and its dialectical development, since by calling Marxism Leninism Maoism in mlm abbreviations, what they call “science of revolution”, without the hyphen separating the different phases, they are indicating that Marxism does not develop in leaps but rather following a flat, linear development.”

Unacceptable, it is not true that there is a cause-and-effect relation between not putting hyphens between the letters mlm and being an evolutionist. An argument from a merely formal matter cannot be

admitted as if it were of essence; this is not Marxist. The essence has a dialectical relation with the form, however, our debates cannot be developed by the forms, the words, the denominations, but by the essence, by the fundamental. A struggle over hyphens obviously undermines the theoretical debate.

Now let's analyze the discussion on the theory of "merge" because, the CLT-UOC comrades, again in this debate, fail to take it beyond the struggle for words.

First, we could make a choir with the CLT-UOC comrades and sing, over and over again, their refrain until exhaustion: *"And again, instead of accepting the exact and correct criticism as to... which becomes a stubborn defense of mistakes"* (this is an idea that the CLT-UOC comrades expressed in their criticism towards us), they dedicating the song to us and we to them. Have the UOC comrades accepted any of our arguments?

So, in order not to be singing this song to ourselves, after each intersection of arguments, the solution has to be the organizing principle of the proletariat, democratic centralism. Let the majority say which line deserves to be put into practice and cleaned with the criticism of revolutionary action. The path to prove who is right has to be articulated in practice and this is only possible in a single Party of the proletariat.

After this brief introduction let's analyze the **merge** debate. Let us remember: The Coordinating Committee for a Unified Maoist International Conference – CCIMU prepared a proposal about the balance of the International Communist Movement and its current General Political Line in which they speak of **the merge of forces, of the international proletarian movement that acts throughout the world, and of the national liberation movement of oppressed nations**. The comrades of the UOC (mlm) stated that: *"It is a great mistake to attribute to Lenin the detestable theory of the **merge** of the class struggle of the proletariat with the national struggle."* [The highlighted is ours.] And, we, intervening in the debate, "attack" this statement by the comrades of the UOC (mlm) with a quote from Lenin where he says: *"...on first place, of insurrections and national revolutionary wars; secondly, of the wars and insurrections of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie; thirdly, **of the merge of the two types of revolutionary wars, etc.**"*

What do the CLT-UOC comrades not want to accept?

Although they recognize the *"forcefulness"* of the letter, due to the quotes where Lenin speaks of the merge of the two currents of the world revolution, they are going to defend themselves like a cat upside down, at the height of the struggle for terms. Let's see how far they managed to go, says the CLT-UOC in their defense: *"The first has to do with the legitimacy of the translations and noting that there are different versions (at least in Spanish) of the texts quoted by the comrades, where you can see that in some **they translate merge**, in others **conjugation**, in others **combination**..."*

Asking for forgiveness from the comrades, we confess that, like the majority of inhabitants of the planet, we are ignorant of the Russian language and that, if we knew that language, it would be useless for us, since we also do not have access to Lenin's original texts to know if the exact word is merge, combination or conjugation. Beyond of the sarcasm that this clarification it is supposing, we wonder if the comrades have taken the trouble to look up in the dictionary what the words mean in Spanish: merge, combination, conjugation. They all have in common, as a reference, **unity**. Is it necessary to repeat that unity must always be understood dialectically, in struggle? Have the CLT-UOC comrades reflected on the number of languages into which this text has to be translated for the debate between the

militant organizations of the International Communist League and the mess they create over mere “expressions”? That makes no sense, when, frankly, the words being used could be used as synonyms.

This is a necessary clarification: the CLT-UOC comrades bring two words that no one in the International Communist League has used to refer to the relationship between national liberation struggles and the struggles of the proletariat for socialism. These are “**dissolve**” and “**dilute**.” These two words cannot be used as synonyms for “merge”, since, dissolving or diluting the struggles of the proletariat with the national liberation struggles would mean the denial of proletarian hegemony, the Party and the People's War.

Let us move forward in the analysis of this debate on “merge”.

Let's see what the CLT-UOC comrades say in a second argument against the theory of merge:

*“The second is of apparent subtile because the comrades evade a “small” detail: **Lenin refers in both to the war; and not to war in general as the comrades of the PCC (FR)³ understand but to the war that was shaking the world**; the first article was made in the combat against pacifism and the disarmament of social-traitors and vacillators; the second is addressed to the communists of Eastern Russia who had in front of them the immediate task of joining the struggle against the white armies used by the imperialists who sought to crush Soviet power and from which the Bolsheviks emerged victorious, contributing to spreading the revolution to Mongolia. **That is, Lenin was not posing the problem of the currents of the World Proletarian Revolution for a programmatic declaration, but guiding the practical actions of the communists in the midst of the world war in which the Bolsheviks had, according to Lenin, ‘characterized the proximity of the international social revolution’.**”*

The comrades, who must be recognized, are good at “rhetoric”, they will not insist on arguments about the word **merge**. Now they resort to the ingenious resource of considering those words of Lenin (that thesis) only valid “*for the war that was shaking the world.*” That is to say, Lenin was **not** raising the problem of the merge of the currents of the World Proletarian Revolution for a programmatic declaration in the era of imperialism. We clarify: this, according to what the CLT-UOC comrades say.

As they could not deny **the merge** of national liberation struggles and the struggles of the proletariat for socialism, they now consider them only valid within the framework of the First World War. That is to say, that cannot be considered in the current struggle that the peoples of the world are waging against the imperialist forces.

A good way to advance this debate is to repeat and analyze the quote from The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution, with the translation that the CLT-UOC comrades seem to like, in the attempt to understand what exactly he said, and Lenin and Leninism says:

*“In theory it would be totally wrong to forget that every war is nothing more than the continuation of politics by other means. The current imperialist war is the continuation of the imperialist policy of two groups of great powers, and that policy was engendered and nourished by the set of relations of **the imperialist era. But this same era** must also inevitably engender and nourish **a policy of struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and thus the possibility and inevitability, on first place, of the insurrections and national revolutionary wars; secondly, of wars and insurrections of the***

3 Translator’s note: Communist Party of Colombia (Red Fraction).

*proletariat against the bourgeoisie and, thirdly, of **a combination of both types of revolutionary wars**, etc.” [Bold and underlining are ours.]*

Although the text from which the quote is taken is framed in the First World War, when it refers to a *policy of struggle against national oppression and the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and insurrections, national revolutionary wars and wars insurrections of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie*; and ***the combination of both types of revolutionary war*** refers not only to the imperialist war, **but to the imperialist era**. Lenin, when he says there “**but this same time**,” makes it clear that he is raising the problem of the currents of the World Proletarian Revolution **for the time of imperialism** and not just the First World War. **Are there any doubts about the exact meaning of these words?** A different interpretation evidently distorts what Lenin says about “the theory of merge.” But, if doubts persist, we bring two quotes that maintain the same line:

“Therefore, today we must not limit ourselves to simply recognizing or proclaiming the rapprochement between the workers of the different nations, but it is necessary to develop a policy that brings about the closest **union** between the national and colonial liberation movements with Soviet Russia, ensuring that the forms of this union are in line with the degrees of development of the communist movement within the proletariat of each country or the bourgeois-democratic movement for the liberation of workers and peasants in backward countries or among the backward nationalities.” First outline of the theses on national and colonial problems, Lenin. [The highlighted is ours].

“Socialists must demand, not only an unconditional and immediate liberation without compensation of the colonies – and that demand, in its political expression, means nothing other than **the recognition of the right to self-determination**–; **the socialists must support in the most determined way the most revolutionary elements of the bourgeois-democratic movements of national liberation** in these countries and help their rebellion—and if necessary, also their revolutionary war—against the imperialist powers that oppress them.” Lenin in “The socialist revolution and the right to self-determination.” [The highlighted is ours].

The CLT-UOC comrades, insisting on the position against the “merge” theory, say:

“(…) **Imperialism left the old national problem as an internal question of some States** without foundation, merging it with the new imperialist colonial problem, in the international problem of imperialist world oppression over the colonies and semi-colonies, turning it into part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution, of the international struggle of labor against capital, of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Socialism. It is not that two come together or merge into one, on the contrary, one is divided into two, which is why the two great currents of the World Proletarian Revolution are constituted by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of all countries and the anti-imperialist revolutionary movement of the oppressed countries. Both have imperialist exploitation and domination as their common goal. Such is the identity of the contradiction between one movement and another.”

We ask: does imperialism save us the work of **uniting** the struggles against national oppression and the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and, of course, does it save us from **the combination** of the insurrections and national revolutionary wars with the wars and insurrections of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie?

According to the CLT-UOC comrades, any anti-imperialist struggle automatically becomes part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution, regardless of the inconsequences of the anti-imperialist

movement. The CLT-UOC comrades are unaware that in all national liberation struggles led by the middle bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, the target of their struggles is not imperialism as a system, but rather an imperialist nation (or several nations), and, therefore, it is an inconsistent anti-imperialism, since there is another imperialist nation ready to occupy the position of the dethroned master, often with the total approval of the “revolutionaries.”

In the same way, the CLT-UOC considers that any anti-imperialist struggle *is part of the proletarian revolution*, regardless of who (what class) assumes its leadership, and its inconsequentiality. To propose that **both struggles** (that of national liberation and that of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie) **have imperialist exploitation and domination as their common goal**, leads the CLT-UOC comrades to confuse the struggles against imperialism as a system and the struggles against a nation or imperialist bloc, again, the comrades fail to see that the target of the national liberation struggles led by the middle bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie has always been the replacement of imperialist interference, which becomes “anti-imperialism” that submits itself to the game of struggles, collusions and confrontations of one imperialist force or another... that has the complete approval of the “revolutionaries”; especially those who turn their backs on the validity of the historical necessity of proletarian hegemony. This is why the proletariat must struggle for the merge of the two types of war, it is in practice where it must demonstrate the power of its hegemony, not by theoretical definition that it comes to claim it.

This is dialectical, not metaphysical. The part that serves the proletariat is the struggle against a specific imperialist nation, it is up to the proletariat to **combine, merge** its wars and insurrections against capital, with national liberation struggles to achieve *the common goal, exploitation and imperialist domination*, that is, fight to make the struggles against a certain imperialist nation a consistent struggle against the entire imperialist system, capitalism.

The reality is not as the CLT-UOC comrades imagine it. This contradiction is not resolved by definition, where all that remains is to wait for reality to embody its capricious thesis. On the contrary, our task is to deploy the accumulated science of revolution to lead or merge the two currents of world revolution.

We emphasize it: what they present to us is not a concrete analysis of concrete reality. The truth is that the international communist movement must struggle for *the merge of both types of revolutionary wars: insurrections and national revolutionary wars and wars and insurrections of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.*

5. Reserve army of the free trade stage of capitalism.

The CLT-UOC comrades say:

*“Relative overpopulation, **the reserve army, is inseparable from the development of the productive capacity of labor.** It is not a phenomenon of countries oppressed by lack of capitalism as reformists and some communists allege, but on the contrary. **Imperialism has made the growth of the reserve army even more drastic** and has known how to take advantage of the “cheapness and abundance of available or vacant salaried workers” as well as the relative backwardness of the other productive forces in the oppressed countries, a cheapness that, as “We already said, it means super-exploitation of the proletariat in the oppressed countries, and relative backwardness that in turn is reproduced as it is compensated in the super profits for the imperialists and the native ruling classes.”*

Although they recognize that imperialism has made the growth of the reserve army more drastic, The statement: **the reserve army is inseparable from the development of the productive capacity of labor**, shows that the analysis is anchored in the free trade phase of capitalism, since it ignores that In the imperialist phase of capitalism, profits end up in the pockets of speculators, this results in de-industrialization and the loss of jobs throughout the world, which makes *the growth of the reserve army more drastic*, increasing the underemployment and growing the burial forces of imperialism.

Now also, the reserve army is determined. This time, due to the increase in constant capital investments and the concentration of wealth in the hands, not of industrialists, as in the era of free trade capitalism, but of speculators, of the financial oligarchy. This is one of the characteristics that make imperialism the final stage of capitalism.

In this regard, Lenin says in “Imperialism, Higher Stage of Capitalism”:

“Translated into ordinary human language this means that the development of capitalism has arrived at a stage when, although commodity production still “reigns” and continues to be regarded as the basis of economic life, it has in reality been undermined and the bulk of the profits go to the “geniuses” of financial manipulation. At the basis of these manipulations and swindles lies socialised production; but the immense progress of mankind, which achieved this socialisation, goes to benefit . . . the speculators.”

That profits are fundamentally in the pockets of speculators and not in those of industrialists, is one of the most important causes of de-industrialization in many parts of the planet, and, of course, of underemployment and unemployment.

6. Deductions giving the back to the Marxist knowledge theory

The CLT-UOC comrades: on several occasions they are unaware of the role of practice in the process of knowledge. Let's look at some examples. The CLT-UOC comrades say:

*“Before concluding this section, it is necessary to mention the role of the bourgeoisie of oppressed countries. The capitalist transformation of agriculture cannot be challenged with the rigid and outdated frameworks used by the theorists of semi-feudalism. This is fundamentally because it is not possible to ignore the real role of the character of the bourgeoisie of those countries. **The behavior of the Brazilian, Indian or Filipino bourgeoisie during the last decades is not at all that of a merely comprador bourgeoisie.** For example, the Indian State is a peculiar type of post-colonial capitalist state characterized by a bourgeoisie that **is neither national (because it does not share any interest with the Indian people), nor comprador (because, it is not only a servant and intermediary of the imperialists and many examples can be cited from the Suez Canal issue, the Soviet Asia Maitri Sangh issue, to the Copenhagen Summit, etc., which demonstrate that it has taken independent political decisions in contradiction with the metropolitan imperialist bourgeoisie) and even less, an imperialist bourgeoisie** (because the import of capital by the Indian bourgeoisie is much more than its export of capital, which has undoubtedly been increasing over the last two decades). **The character and role that the Brazilian bourgeoisie has with respect to the BRICS shows that its international role is far from being that of a comprador bourgeoisie or completely subjugated to imperialism and that, within its limits, it aspires to be a regional actor that already “It manifests positions of predominance with respect to other oppressed countries.”** [The highlighted are ours].*

The CLT-UOC comrades try to interpret reality, not starting from the concrete, but from the movement of the categories *in their heads*, with a dialectic that, we think, is poorly applied, and with the worsening factor of dealing with distant realities such as Brazil, India and the Philippines. Contrary to the Marxist theory of knowledge, they do not consult, for example, what the comrades of the Communist Party of Brazil know about that reality (not to mention India and the Philippines where consultation can be more difficult). How do the research the CLT-UOC comrades? Have the proletariat of Brazil, India and the Philippines participated in the investigations carried out by them? Because we cannot forget that practice plays a determining role in the process of knowing reality.

This exposition on capital in Brazil, the Philippines and India is not an investigation but a deduction, in our opinion; it is a method that does not start from the concrete, does not need practice to know reality, but uses a formula that has been built from a logic that replaces the concrete analysis of the concrete situation with theoretical models.

II. DEBATES ON THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE SOCIAL FORMATION

1. On the Junker path

The CLT-UOC comrades say:

*“In this work, Lenin speaks of two types of capitalist transformation of agriculture: the first is the Prussian path of agrarian reforms, the reformist path, in which feudal big landlords receive the opportunity and, sometimes, they are forced to become capitalist big landlords. **This path is also called junker type transformation.** The other way is the American way of agrarian reforms. This is the revolutionary path in which the slogan of “the land for who work it” is applied. Historically, we have seen these two paths in different parts of the world and also the mixture of both paths in some countries.”*

To speak that we are in the imperialist phase of capitalism presupposes that *financial capital has spread its networks, in the literal sense of the word, to all the countries of the world; that its heavy artillery is the export of capital and that financial capital has subordinated even States that enjoy complete political independence.* That is, the world lives under the imperialist system. Consequently, we ask: what sense does it make to speak of a capitalist development path? What sense does it make to speak of a junker path? Saying that financial capital has subordinated the entire world and has penetrated all the world's economies does not leave room to talk about a supposed junker path “chosen” against the wrong direction: the world has fully and completely reached capitalism through the “way” of subordination to financial capital.

The metaphor about “the junker path” serves to illustrate a similarity between processes of social formation. However, they in no way replace the concrete analysis of reality. None of the social formations that exist, no matter how similar they may be to each other, can be correctly interpreted with a metaphor that relates them. There are no established paths to follow: there are contradictions to resolve. When the analysis of the transformations of the relations of production is carried out, a program can be defined that guides the struggle, but those who are content with interpretations that remain in *general maxims* stumble along the path of the “*flea harvest*”, as Lenin called it in the Prologue to the second edition of “The Development of Capitalism in Russia.”

Lenin speaks of the metaphor about the Junker path in the Prologue to the second edition of “The Development of Capitalism in Russia” in 1908; but he only managed to unravel all the contradictions of the last phase of capitalism in 1916, with his work “Imperialism, Highest Stage of Capitalism”, where he clearly shows that monopoly is opposed to free trade, showing the implications of this contradiction in the development of productive forces, in the imperialist phase of capitalism. Thus, one of the most important characteristics of imperialism pointed out by Lenin is the export of financial capital and the fact that imperialism marks a tendency towards stagnation, decomposition and the highest socialization of production and that, therefore, this it is very precisely the last phase of capitalism, where the possibility of a certain transitional social regime between full freedom of competition and complete socialization makes its way. With one precision: capitalism does not die a natural death. The proletariat and its party must consciously assume the task of demolishing it and to do so they must lead the entire class struggle.

2. On the industrials and the comprador bourgeoisie

The CLT-UOC comrades say:

*“It is a discussion about the apprehension of the character of society in oppressed countries where it is evident that **capitalist production relations predominate** and from which the tasks of the revolution, the strategy and tactics of the communists are derived. Some comrades argue that, despite the changes that occurred in oppressed countries, their social economic formation **remains semi-feudal and semi-colonial** since imperialism would have created **artificial capitalism, de-configured as their will.**”* [The highlighted is ours].

First, no Marxist can ignore that we are in the imperialist phase of capitalism and as Marx says:

“Capitalism is an economic power of the bourgeois society that rules everything. It must constitute an starting point and ending point, and it must be considered before than the territorial ownership. Once both have been separately considered, their mutual relation must be studied” (On the method)

Thus, it is necessary to examine the capitalism that is deployed in nations such as Colombia. However, CLT-UOC comrades dodge the concrete analysis of the specific situation and embark on a review of the Chinese experience, without much success.

CLT-UOC says:

*“Therefore, we must keep in mind that the average or national bourgeoisie is not simply a commercial, usurer or bureaucratic bourgeoisie, **but an industrial bourgeoisie.** Consequently, **an industrial bourgeoisie cannot be a comprador bourgeoisie,** that is, the industrial bourgeoisie is characterized by **being a capital exporter and by exploiting labor force.**”* [The highlighted is ours].

What it comes with industrial capital is not apprehended from reality, of the concrete, but of the logic of the CLT-UOC comrades, of the movement of the categories in their heads, which "conditions" reality. But in reality things do not happen as comrades raise, let's see.

Later the comrades say:

*“Also here, the description makes it clear that the commercial and usurer bourgeoisie is the comprador bourgeoisie; it governs in alliance with feudal big landlords under the tutelage of the Imperialists. This is only possible for a commercial and usurer bourgeoisie that behaves as such. **It is not possible for the industrial bourgeoisie because its development is against the interests of the feudal big landlords and, therefore, against total submission to imperialism.**” [The highlighted is ours].*

The CLT-UOC comrades say: *“We must to understand that this bourgeoisie (the comprador) is the one that serves the interests of foreign capital and is linked to it.”* And they have said that industrialists cannot be a comprador bourgeoisie, because, according to these comrades, industrialists, they go against the interests of feudal big landlords and against total submission to imperialism.

Governing in alliance with feudal big landlords under the protection of imperialists **is not possible for the industrial bourgeoisie?** According to this deduction, the class dictatorship in Colombia has been one of the big landlords, of the commercial and usurer bourgeoisie subjected to imperialism, but not of the industrial bourgeoisie. Is the industrial bourgeoisie not committed to imperialism, the big landlords, with the paramilitaries and the bourgeois dictatorship?

Have the comrades contrasted this definition with reality? Are they not a comprador bourgeoisie in Colombia, the owners of Grupo Argos, Grupo Nutresa, Bavaria, Postobón, Pizano SA, Unipalma, Alkosto etc.? According to this, are not a comprador bourgeoisie, the Gea Business Group Antioquia, the Santo Domingo, Ardila Lulle, Sarmiento Angulo, Manuel Santiago Mejía.

For example, Manuel Santiago Mejía is the son of the founder of the GEA, and the founder of Alkosto and owner of Motos Akt, Katronic, linked to the La Carolina farm and the paramilitary group Los Doce Apóstoles. Is Manuel Santiago Mejía an industrialist or is bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie?

Let's look at other examples, the vehicle and parts industry in Colombia, only the most important. Then, according to the logic of the comrades, the development of industrial capital in Colombia of: Sofasa, GM - Colmotores, Auteco, Fanalca, Yamaha, etc. *It goes against the interests of the feudal big landlord class and, therefore, against total submission to imperialism.* However, in practice these companies have shown a great confluence of interests with feudal big landlords such as Álvaro Uribe Vélez and a total submission to imperialism. The absurdity of their thesis is obvious.

But, these deductions from the CLT-UOC comrades do not know that there are non-antagonistic and antagonistic contradictions; that they can be very sharp or not; and that in contradiction there is collusion and struggle. There are contradictions between the different bourgeoisies, big landlords and imperialism, there is no doubt, but that they are wrongly concluding that the industrial bourgeoisie cannot be a comprador, supposedly because its development goes against the interests of the feudal big landlord and, therefore, against total submission to imperialism, as if there is only a difference in interest and non-collusion of interests. This shows that comrades, on the one hand, do not apply the dialectic well, and, on the other, they have not contrasted their statements with reality.

In Colombia, the great big landlords, with the great industrial, commercial, and usurer bourgeoisie, are appendages of the financial oligarchy, while their development and survival depend on imperialism, mainly Yankee imperialism, therefore, they are comprador bourgeoisie, they represent the most backward and reactionary relations of production in Colombia, and they are an obstacle to the development of productive forces and the democratic-bourgeois revolution.

What provides them with the determining character to the different bourgeoisies, is not whether they are industrial, commercial, usurers, etc. but its relation with imperialism. The deductions proposed by the CLT-UOC on Colombian social formation represent a path that helps, without willing it, to hide the crimes of the comprador bourgeoisie that has capitals in the industry.

On the other hand, the CLT-UOC comrades presuppose that the Maoists “who defend semi-feudality” are denying capitalism (imperialism) in oppressed nations. But, they are wrong, because no Marxist can deny that imperialism has been distributed, consequently, the mode of exploitation, fundamentally, worldwide is the capitalist today in its imperialist phase. However, what it must be precisely determined is what level of development of the productive forces and what specific relations of production exist in each nation, in order to exactly determine the contradictions to be resolved and the tasks of the revolution in each country.

Determining social formation in oppressed nations is quite complex, therefore, imperialism integrates and harmonizes, much more than the free trade phase, capitalist production with pre-capitalist forms of producing. Then it is normal to find in the midst of capitalism, elements of pre-capitalist production modes. For the study of social formation in any oppressed nation we must take into account these two things: 1) The compulsion to sweep pre-capitalist relations is an important characteristic of free trade; 2) The tendency to stagnation is an important characteristic of monopoly, the imperialism.

The CLT-UOC comrades say:

*“Some comrades argue that, despite the changes that occurred in oppressed countries, their social economic formation remains semi-feudal and semi-colonial since **imperialism would have created artificial capitalism, de-configured as their will.** (...) “Theories” and names that obscure or elude the essence of phenomena have emerged: **“Late capitalism”, “underdevelopment”.**”*

Although CLT-UOC comrades recognize the error of conceiving capitalism that is being developed in the oppressed nations as de-configured **as the will** of imperialism and they criticize the theories of late, underdeveloped, rare, etc. capitalism, they take one concept that is exactly of an equal value: **relatively backward capitalist countries**, which fails to explain, from the contradiction, the causes of delay, underdevelopment, of the rare of capitalism. And consequently, they fail to understand the peculiarities of capitalism in the oppressed nations and, of course, the differences with capitalism that develops in oppressive nations. Could it be that comrades do not understand the causes of relative delay? Do you consider that there are no differences between capitalism that unfolds in the US and the one that is specified in Colombia?

Underdevelopment, late capitalism, rare capitalism, artificial capitalism, relatively backward capitalist countries is only a reference to a consequence, all expressions are the same as valid or invalid, here the most important thing is the explanation of the causes of the phenomenon, not the expression itself. So what is the cause of development or stagnation of productive forces in Colombia?

Lenin said in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism:

“ Economically, the main thing in this process is the displacement of capitalist free competition by capitalist monopoly. Free competition is the basic feature of capitalism, and of commodity production generally; monopoly is the exact opposite of free competition, but we have seen the latter being transformed into monopoly before our eyes, creating large-scale industry and forcing out small

industry, replacing large-scale by still larger- scale industry, and carrying concentration of production and capital to the point where out of it has grown and is growing monopoly.”

And later he says:

“As we have seen, the deepest economic foundation of imperialism is monopoly. This is capitalist monopoly, i.e., monopoly which has grown out of capitalism and which exists in the general environment of capitalism, commodity production and competition, in permanent and insoluble contradiction to this general environment. Nevertheless, like all monopoly, it inevitably engenders a tendency of stagnation and decay. Since monopoly prices are established, even temporarily, the motive cause of technical and, consequently, of all other progress disappears to a certain extent and, further, the economic possibility arises of deliberately retarding technical progress”.

Capitalism is ruled by laws that are independent from the will of men, therefore, the stagnation or development of productive forces is not the result of the will of men, but is a consequence of the contradictions between the old and the new ; between quantitative changes and qualitative leaps; and, the contradiction that most influences the development of productive forces in capitalism, the contradiction between free trade and monopoly. When freeing is the main aspect of contradiction, that is: where free concurrence capitalism is imposed, the effects of anarchy on production force capitalists to increase investments in constant capital (improve technology, development of productive forces) under penalty of perishing. The latter is presented as a constrictive law of competition. And, as a kind of corollary, when monopoly is the main aspect of contradiction, freeing / monopoly, the trend is stagnation, not to the development of productive forces.

With the arrival of imperialism, of monopoly, that constrictive law of competition, that compulsion, can be nullified to a certain degree, in certain places and by certain times, omitting, by force of the monopoly, the obligation to constantly improve the machinery, neutralizing, the compulsion to develop productive forces and sweep away pre-capitalist relationships. Then, development or stagnation of the productive forces will be the result of the contradiction between: monopoly and free concurrence; between the old and the new; quantitative changes and qualitative changes. But, the contradiction that most determines the development of productive forces in the imperialist stage of capitalism is contradiction, monopoly / free concurrence, where, the main aspect of this contradiction in oppressed countries is generally the monopoly.

This is the reason why the productive forces in the oppressed nations, in general, go behind the development of the productive forces of the oppressor nations, it is the same reason why capitalism in the oppressed nations does not sweep away the pre-capitalist relations that usually survive in the countryside of these nations.

Not understanding the contradiction that Marx, Lenin and Mao highlighted between the capitalist monopoly and the free concurrence will prevent the complete comprehension of why some nations develop productive forces and in others there is a *relative backwardness* (as the CLT-UOC comrades say), that obligate these nations to keep a technological, scientific, economic, etc. dependency to the imperialist nations.

The CLT-UOC comrades point out:

“One of the reasons of the stagnation of the industry in the social-imperialist Russia, of its crisis and its falling down has relation with the constant transfer of capital to the development of the weapon

industry, while other branches of the production kept stagnated, but producing a high rate of profit. The State capitalism could plan the production and led investigation and inversion to certain branches, because it could limit for a long period of time the competence, something impossible in the other countries, where the competence of the monopolies imposes the development of the productive forces.”

The argument that one of the reasons of the stagnation of the industry in social-imperialist Russia has something to do with the constant transfer of capital to the development of the weapon industry is extremely weak. Because which imperialist country do not transfer huge capital investment to its weapon industry? Did the comrades do not look to a table of the gross military expenses in relation with the GDP of each imperialist nation, to corroborate the validity of the argument?

The second part of the paragraph is on the contradiction that boosts and stagnates the development of the productive forces, but, they do not go to the core of the issue. It is true that a State capitalism can limit the competence, it is, to limit the anarchy in production, and so, to limit the compulsion to develop productive forces and, in consequence, to be behind the competitors, to bankrupt and disappear.

On the other hand, the development of the productive forces, or *relative backwardness* or the emergence of a imperialist nation as China, will fundamentally depend on how the contradiction is developed: monopoly/free concurrence, and it is not, as the CLT-UOC comrades assure, because of the existence of maquilas, outsourcing, over-exploitation. As if this characteristics are not a constant in all the world, in Haiti, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, China, Colombia, etc. but, only some countries develop the huge productive forces.

Now, to solve the contradiction between free competence and monopoly is not possible over the base of the individual desires, the only possible solution to this contradiction comes from the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship that overturn the monopolies, the dictatorship against the free-trade. In terms of our revolution, the task is concretized at the overthrow of the imperialist domination and its lackeys, the bureaucratic and comprador bourgeoisie. To eliminate the monopoly to conclude the national revolution, and to make the agrarian revolution to eliminate the oppression and exploitation of peasantry and broad masses by the big landlords, unleashing the productive forces, the people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat to eliminate the pre-capitalist relations and to control, limit the free trade.

Not understanding that the contradiction between the free trade and the monopoly cannot be modified at free will, and that it is only possible to modify it over the base of a revolutionary process led by the Party of the proletariat, has led lots of revolutionaries to think that a well-intentioned president can achieve the control of this contradiction in favor of the masses and save the world from a massive extinction done by imperialism.

3. Financial capital, comprador capital, bureaucratic capital

The CLT-UOC comrades, when talking on capitalism, they seem to unknown the difference and relations that exists among capitalism that develops in the oppressed nations and its relation with capitalism that develops in the imperialist nations, dismissing the concept of bureaucratic capital, completely hiding the main aspect of comprador capital.

That the financial capital has made its networks, in the textual sense of the word, to all the countries in the world, that is heavy artillery is the capital exportation, this does not mean that the financial capital its is not deeply rooted, in the national aspect. The financial oligarchy conforms a collective capital, firstly and fundamentally, in the imperialist nation from where it comes from. That makes that the armed forces of the imperialist nations are the backbone of the imperialist State, and, of course, they put the interests of their financial oligarchy as their priority. To unknown this phenomena is to darken the limits of each imperialist nation and its inter-imperialist contradictions.

But, if there are contradictions and differences among different imperialist nations, it is true that there are differences and contradictions among the oppressed nations and the imperialist nations.

The financial oligarchy borns with the financial capital and is a particular characteristic of the imperialist nations, the rentist-States, that are a grab of very wealthy or really strong nations. The oppressed nations are subordinated to financial capital, to the oppressor nations, mainly to Yankee imperialism. The financial capital (the financial oligarchy) is concentrated in few hands and makes its networks over every oppressed country generating fully submissive oligarchies to financial capital.

This does not deny that the oppressed and exploited classes in the territories of this oppressor nation are part of the proletariat or must be under its hegemony, and, over all, we cannot advance without them.

Lenin, speaking on the fourth main characteristics of monopolist capitalism of the epoch of imperialism, said:

*“Thirdly, monopoly has sprung from the banks. The banks have developed from modest intermediary enterprises into the monopolists of finance capital. From three to five of the biggest banks in each of the foremost capitalist countries have achieved the “personal link-up” between industrial and bank capital, and have concentrated in their hands the control of thousands of millions which form the greater part of the capital and income of the whole country. A **financial oligarchy, which makes a close network of dependence relationships over all the economic and political institutions of present-day bourgeois society without exception**—such is the most striking manifestation of this monopoly.”* [The highlighted is ours].

¿Is this network extended by the financial oligarchy in the oppressed nations as Colombia? Yes, in general we see how this network is presented: the financial oligarchy **does no** generate in the oppressed nations **an own capitalism of the free trade era**, nor a “local financial oligarchy” to export its capital; this is naive. It generates a **receptor oligarchy** of its financial capital, receptor of its goods, that allows the extraction of its natural resources of the nation at the will of the financial oligarchy, that puts the State at the service of this capital accumulation for its own interests and mainly the interests of Yankee imperialism; and that manages the power depending on the imperialist and its lackeys dominations. Additionally, the national production will be fundamentally subjected, not to the free trade laws, but to impositions of the monopolies, mainly of the financial capital.

To imperialism, the important is that the creole oligarchy has the power of the State, in function of its interest and to have “partner” lackeys. It is secondary to imperialism that the creole oligarchy is composed by industrials, traders, bankers or big landlords, what is a *sine qua non* condition is that it is bureaucratic and comprador bourgeoisie. In other words, that it is an appendix bourgeoisie of the

financial oligarchy that runs the State in a tight link to **(foreign) imperialism**, *subordinated to it* and assumes it as a tool for earning rents.

A part from the capitals in tight link to imperialism, capitalism, constantly, inexorably (as a law) generates accumulations that creates small capitals, not monopolist, with contradictions with the financial capital, with contradiction with the monopolies in capitals, lands and other rent sources.

Lenin, in *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism* says:

*“The enormous dimensions of finance capital concentrated in a few hands and **creating an extraordinarily dense and widespread network of relationships and connections which subordinates** not only the small and medium, but also the very small capitalists and small masters, on the one hand, and the increasingly intense struggle waged against other national state groups of financiers for the division of the world and **domination over other countries**, on the other hand, cause the propertied classes to go over entirely to the side of imperialism”.*

Then... how this vast network controls our nation? The key is among the ruling classes, the creole **oligarchy**. Over a base of big landlord domination, inherited from the Spanish colonial dominance process and preserved after the independence, since the firsts growths of an emerging capitalist development, is where penetrates and emerges the powerful financial capital, setting itself as the dominant **exploitation** mode of the nation. And it does not generate a financial oligarchy (as some comrades seem to say). It does it over the base of the big landlord oligarchy inherited from the colony, it generates a bureaucratic, comprador, big landlord oligarchy, for its interests of domination. Corroborating that capitalism (imperialism) is *an economic power of the bourgeois society that dominates everything and makes that the owner classes go to the site of imperialism, mainly Yankee.*

But, the CLT-UOC comrades say:

*“Imperialism, as a internationalized mode of production, **chained all the countries** – with their specific modes of production – to a sole world economy, where the economy of each country is a link of a unique chain, that obeys and serves to production, the implementation of the plusvalue, the accumulation and centralization of world capital. **Ignoring that capitalism in each country is nothing more than an aspect of the imperialist capitalism, leads to some communists to deny its real existence in other oppressed countries, calling them** “not classic”, “deformed”, “rare” or “**bureaucratic**”, equivalent to the petit-bourgeoisie longing of **ideal capital, independent** that it is not possible anymore. And in politics, to deny the existence of capitalism in the oppressed countries, leads to safeguard the interests of the bourgeoisie against the interests of the proletariat” [The highlighted is ours].*

Although the CLT-UOC comrades recognize that capitalism that develops in each country is nothing more than an **aspect of the imperialist capitalism**, they deny to recognize the **evident** and essential differences that exists in the different “**aspects**” of the current capitalism. They consider, wrongly, that this “**aspects**” of imperialist capitalism have no difference. It is, these comrades do not see difference between capitalism of an oppressed nation and capitalism of an oppressor nation and their link; they believe that searching this differences is a demonstration of the desire of having **AN IDEAL AND INDEPENDENT CAPITAL**, but they do not explain the reasons why the bureaucratic capital

represents the longing of an “ideal and independent” capital when, on the contrary, the name of **bureaucratic** highlights the undeniable subordination to imperialism and an inclemency against the masses. The category of “Bureaucratic Capitalism” is longing of an ideal and independent capitalism? Mao or any other comrade has mention bureaucratic capitalism as a longing of an ideal and independent capital? *This is to twist the arguments.* “Longing an ideal and independent capital” is calling the capitals of the oppressed nations – simply – industrial, trader, usurer capital... and that’s it.

This industrial capital without interferences from imperialism is, nothing more than an independent capital, an ideal capital. The CLT-UOC comrades are correct in their adjectives of ideal and independent capital, but not to bureaucratic capital, but to this category of “*pure*” *industrial capital, that it is said that exists in Colombia, but it only lives in their heads.*

Mao says on the bureaucratic capital in “The present situation and our tasks”:

*“Confiscate the land of the feudal class and turn it over to the peasants. Confiscate monopoly capital, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, T. V. Soong, H. H. Kung and Chen Li-fu, and turn it over to the new-democratic state. Protect the industry and commerce of the national bourgeoisie. These are the three major economic policies of the new-democratic revolution. During their twenty-year rule, the four big families, Chiang, Soong, Kung and Chen, have piled up enormous fortunes valued at ten to twenty thousand million U.S. dollars and monopolized the economic lifelines of the whole country. **This monopoly capital, combined with state power, has become state-monopoly capitalism. This monopoly capitalism, closely tied up with foreign imperialism, the domestic landlord class and the old-type rich peasants, has become comprador, feudal, state-monopoly capitalism.** Such is the economic base of Chiang Kai-shek's reactionary regime. This state-monopoly capitalism oppresses not only the workers and peasants but also the urban petty bourgeoisie, and it injures the middle bourgeoisie. This state-monopoly capitalism reached the peak of its development during the War of Resistance and after the Japanese surrender; it has prepared ample material conditions for the new-democratic revolution. **This capital is popularly known in China as bureaucrat-capital. This capitalist class, known as the 1bureaucrat-capitalist class, is the big bourgeoisie of China.**”* [The highlighted is ours].

The “*name*” of *bureaucratic capitalism* highlights the subjugation that it has with imperialism. The CLT-UOC comrades consider an error to call them bureaucratic capital, unknowing the necessity to difference one capital from the others, and limiting themselves to simply call them industrial capital, usurer capital, trade capital. But, in this way of not calling the capitals by the “*name*” that shows its relation with imperialism, with the imperialist nations, with the financial oligarchies, they decide to dark the imperialist domination and the way of loot the wealth of the subjugated nation, they dark the character of the oppressed nation, showing an equal capitalism everywhere, without substantial differences, except among industrial, usurer, trade and financial capitals: a same capitalism all over the world... and dot.

How *they want* to call those capitals that are in the hands of the local Colombian oligarchy pro-imperialist? Mao call this phenomena and its process, bureaucratic capitalism, comprador capital. You can call it as you want, but, you cannot limit yourselves to call it industrial, usurer, trade capital because these capitals can or cannot be linked to imperialism and, in the case of capitals subjugated under the command of imperialism, there are different stages of subordination.

Definitively, what cannot be accepted is the use of names of euphemisms that hide the relations of domination of the Colombian nation to imperialism. Using the words of the CLT-UOC comrades, but, now from the proletarian point of view, we say: *in politics, to deny the existence of **bureaucratic and comprador** capitalism in the oppressed countries, leads to safeguard the interests of the bourgeoisie against the interests of the proletariat: it is to betray the revolution.*

With which path you embellish the raw reality? The biggest capitalists and former presidents in Colombia, Luis Carlos Sarmiento Angulo, Carlos Ardila Lülle, Julio Mario Santo Domingo, the Pastrana, the Gómez, the López, the Santos, the Gaviria, the Turbay, Álvaro Uribe Vélez together with his sons and more... are simply entrepreneurs, industrialists, traders, bankers, and former presidents or are part of the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie?

For example, the case of Luis Carlos Sarmiento Angulo is really significant, because was one of the latest corruption scandals of Odebrecht case, and it was exposed that the main aspect of the capital accumulation is not through its companies, not even for being an usurer owner of several banks: it is possible to place presidents, judges, congressman, prosecutors, governors, majors, etc., with the aim of accumulate capital through the State. Some will say that “those” are only “corruption”, a moral problem, and that they have nothing to do with the structure of the type of capitalism that they deploy. That is why we say: it is due to be bureaucratic bourgeoisie. In other words, the most important company of the Colombian oligarchy are the State and the elections to place in the different power branches (executive, legislative, judicial) its key people. This is how, fundamentally, they accumulate their immense fortunes.

This bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie is also owner of the so-called “fourth power”. For example, Luis Carlos Sarmiento Angulo is owner of the newspaper El Tiempo, Carlos Ardila Lülle of TV RCN, the business group Santo Domingo of TV Caracol and the newspaper El Espectador, Manuel Santiago Mejía of the newspaper El Colombiano. All, with a intricate network of **disinformation** media at the service of the exploitation that the bureaucratic, comprador bourgeoisie, big landlords and imperialism, mainly Yankee exercise.

So, calling Luis Carlos Sarmiento Angulo, or the sons of Álvaro Uribe Vélez, for saying two dramatic examples, industrialists, traders or bankers, is to embellish this bureaucratic, comprador class. They have industries, banks, and they participate actively in the trade and construction, but the main aspect of the accumulation is linked to be a lackey of imperialism and to accumulate through the handle of the Colombian State. Which position is romanticizing the exploitation in Colombia, the one that calls the sons of Uribe bureaucratic bourgeoisie, or the one that uses euphemisms to name them?

III. CONTROVERSY ON SOME ISSUES OF THE AGRARIAN PROBLEM

The CLT-UOC comrades say: “*Lenin explains with great detail in his work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* that **any form of landownership is an insuperable obstacle to the development of capitalism in the agriculture.**”*

But, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party had to develop the democratic tasks in the October revolution, because the development of capitalism in the agriculture did not reach all the Russian countryside.

Now, in Colombia and other oppressed countries, the development of capitalism, the development of the productive forces has not reached all the countryside.

On this issue, Lenin stated in “Imperialism, Higher stage of Capitalism” that Imperialist Russia was “*a country, the most economically backward (Russia), where modern capitalist imperialism is enmeshed, so to speak, in a particularly close network of pre-capitalist relations.*”

The comrades can not interpret that, as *any form of landownership is an insuperable obstacle for the development of capitalism in agriculture*, so, automatically, capitalism is the way of to produce everything in the countryside. Not even the imperialist Russia achieved to sweep away the pre-capitalism in the countryside. On the contrary, as Lenin highlighted: it reproduced it.

All who stand the thesis that we are confronting, must have to take away several dogmas to check, in practice, how much development of the productive forces exist in the countryside and under which articulations of relations of production are being produced. We say it: the scheme that here we critique does not correctly interpret the reality.

1. Which contradiction determines the class struggle in the Colombian countryside? The democratic problem or the capital/labor contradiction?

The contradiction between monopoly/free competition, where monopoly is the main aspect, directly affecting to the development of the productive forces in the countryside and the city in the oppressed nations, makes nearly impossible that the same capitalism eliminates the pre-capitalist relations and to solve the agrarian problem. This task remains exclusively in the hands of the Communist Party and the People’s War, as the only that can truly solve such contradiction from the correct characterization of the ongoing contradictions.

The CLT-UOC comrades show an ignorance on the reality of the countryside in Colombia, describing what they consider that must happen in a capitalist country, without any contrast with the reality.

They say:

*“Most of the current struggles of peasants, rural communities and indigenous peoples **are not against the feudal lords, but against big native capitalists (bourgeois and big landlords) and the imperialist monopolies that destroy territories, communities, peoples and cultures in its greedy appetite of profits.**”*

If there is a consensus in the global academy on the Colombian reality, is in the acknowledgment that exists an *agrarian problem* and that agrarian problem is the fundamental cause of the armed conflict that affect the Colombian people from 200 years ago, along the whole republican existence; if we do not refer to the epoch of the colony or the conquest. That means, is a problem of “lack of democracy” or of the *character* of the democracy, the cause of the armed conflict, and not the mere contradiction capital-labor.

In other words, *most part of **the struggle** of the peasants, agrarian communities and indigenous peoples currently **is for the land***; problem of the land which has one of the worst Gini coefficient of the world: 0.89 (coefficient of distribution of the agrarian ownership, 1 means full inequality), with the worsening condition that are generally unproductive latifundiums or without proper use. The

contradiction capital-labor, it is not even importantly represented in the countryside, for example, in struggle of resistance, in struggles for wage increase.

After the “euphemism” or “periphrasis” of *no existence of feudal lords*, the comrades are hiding one of the most important causes of the classes struggle in Colombia: the distribution of the ownership, the ways of appropriation and use of the land and concentration of the most fertile lands in very few hands. Because of this they argue that it is the contradiction capital-labor the one which determines the struggle (armed struggle) in Colombia, hiding the so-called “agrarian question”.

We see the data from the magazine SEMILLAS’ editorial of June of 2011:

“The situation of high inequality in the country – and what puts it as one of the most unequals of the world- has allowed that the 64.3% of the rural population is poor, while one third of the men, women and children live in misery. Between 1997 and 2010 more than 3,6 millions of people were evicted from their lands, what meant 350.000 properties, what means 8,5 millions of hectares. If this is not enough, the phenomenon of re-concentration of land and micro-ownership of land has increased. According to the Geographical Institute Agustín Codazzi, in 2009 the 78,3 per cent of the owners from 1 till 5 hectares were less than 6 per cent of the registered lands, while the 55 per cent belonged to the 0,15 per cent of owners of properties bigger than 1.000 hectares.”

In “The problems of the unproductive lands of Colombia”, written by Aura Bolívar and Angélica Rodríguez, in 1st of November, of 2021, they say:

“Regarding the concentration of land, the Agrarian National Census (CNA) of 2019, found that 73,8 % of the hectares are concentrated in the 0,2% of the Agrarian Producers Units (UPA), what points out a big concentration of the ownership of the land in Colombia. According to the figures of the third CNA published by the DANE, the productive land is 50 millions of hectares, and from them, the 77,9% is for livestock activities.”

That means, in Colombia, 73,8% of the land is in very few hands and are used fundamentally for extensive livestock.

And, in “Rights of agrarian property, concentration of the land and agrarian productivity in Colombia”, Wilson Vergara from the University of La Salle from Bogota, says:

*“The extensive livestock. In Colombia the 80% of the agrarian area is grasslands for livestock, and most part is of extensive character. The extensive livestock in Colombia is an activity of **very low productive efficiency and its technological level is very low**. Generally the extensive livestock is responsible of generate a high pressure on the natural resources as soil, water, forests and bio-diversity. The table 5.3 shows an strong RI in the livestock, the value of production in livestock for the properties of 1.000 and 2.000 hectares is, in average three times less than the properties of less than 5 hectares. The livestock uses 38 millions of hectares in Colombia, but according to the agrarian use of the soils, the country should just have 8 millions of hectares used for livestock (UPRA, 2016). **For its extensive character, the livestock generates very few employment per hectare and a big pressure on the bio-diversity. The social cost of livestock is bigger if it is taken into account the problem of the concentration of land and its direct links with the armed conflict.**” [The highlighted is ours].*

And there is this footnote:

*“Note. 43: The technological level of Colombian livestock is very low since it uses a lot of land for each animal, **low investment in infrastructure and machinery, and small use of labor.** This is reflected in the low productive parameters that make Colombian livestock below the world average in productivity. In Colombia, a hectare in crops produces several times more than one hectare in livestock (Vergara, 2012)». [The highlighted is ours].*

This, in Marxist terms is: extensive livestock in Colombia uses very little constant capital and very little variable capital. **Then, in 38 million hectares of the Colombian countryside there are very few workers and many landless peasants.** Is the contradiction for the land or capital-labor? These data can be controversial.

Do CLT-UOC comrades understand this phenomenon?

But let's see, then, how are the sales of extensive livestock: despite the fact that Colombia has 38 million hectares in extensive livestock, **livestock and pig companies**, (the Revista Dinero in June 2019 analyzes these two sectors together), which classify among the 5,000 largest in Colombia, are only 22, there are three among the 500 largest, but do not produce cattle (in extensive livestock) but pigs; that is, no cow classified between those produced by the 500 largest companies and many of the 22 that are between 5,000 produce pigs, not cows.

The 5,000 largest companies in Colombia are ordered by sales billing. That means that extensive livestock has a great social impact to deepen economic and social inequality, but the impact on economy and economic growth is very small. There are many millions of hectares concentrated in so few hands with very small economic results for the whole production. The inefficiency in livestock is against bourgeois rationality.

What is the reason why 38 million hectares are destined for an inefficient "company"?

The answer has to be: in general, the farmers do not care about the inefficiency of their latifundiums. Their profits come from activities other than livestock. Their lands do not use them, fundamentally, as a constituent part of capitalist production, but as a **means of concentrating political power**. The mean that ends up being the main among big landlords in Colombia to accumulate wealth is the management of the State, as congressmen, deputies, councilors, among others; controlling the State bureaucracy, controlling State contracts, controlling all powers of the State, with influence peddling and extracting income with jobs.

The very tiny investments of constant and variable capital in extensive livestock in Colombia, imply that reproduction is not extended but simple. And, this, according to Marxism, can only be explained in a social formation where pre-capitalist forms reproduce.

2. Let's look at land rent and capital / labor contradiction

The CLT-UOC comrades say:

*“What is capitalist agricultural income? The income of the capitalist land is the income of the soil that originates when **the land becomes merchandise and is used for the production of merchandise through the exploitation of wage labor.**”*

Exact: *the land, as long as it is not exploited as a means of production, does not represent a capital (Marx). Land that does not produce has no rent, differential rent, or absolute rent.* If there is no production, there is no merchandise, there is no price difference from goods, there is no differential or absolute rent.

It will be that CLT-UOC comrades are unaware that unproductive lands in Colombia are up to 16 million hectares, while only 7 million hectares are exploited with **low intensity**, that is, with very **low capital investments**.

Data from the Agustín Codazzi Geographical Institute (IGAC), of 6th of February of 2023, admit that there are 15 million underused or wasted hectares; and, Caracol Radio (a medium of the bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie that tries to make more beautiful with lies this exploitation system) recognizes that unproductive hectares are up to 16 million.

Let's see:

*“The director of the Dian, Juan Ricardo Ortega, revealed that in Colombia there are about 23 million hectares with productive capacity, of which only 7 are being **exploited with low intensity...**”*

These unproductive lands are fundamentally in the hands of latifundists who have the means to make them productive. However, they accumulate wealth, not because they make the lands to produce and then they obtain differential or absolute rent, but for being owners of the land. Why the CLT-UOC omits any reference to this reality?

3. The Vocation of the land

A proof of how alien is the property of the land in Colombia towards the capitalist rationality, is the divorce that exists between vocation and its use. For example, 12.7% of the land has an agricultural vocation; however, only 4.66% is used. The lands with livestock vocation are 16.8 %, while the lands destined for livestock are 35.11 %. (IGAC, Corpoica 2002.)

This imbalance between the vocation and the effective use given to land shows a low bourgeois rationality.

As a summary: Colombia has 114 million hectares, but has only managed to intervene significantly 53.6 million hectares. Of these, 38 million are in extensive livestock, of which only 8 million hectares have livestock vocation. Meanwhile, 15 to 16 million hectares are undersued or wasted; that is, these lands have characteristics for production, but it does not occur in them.

Unproductive lands or with very low productivity, which are practically not touched by capital, can in no way be an indicative of the introduction of capitalist production relations in the countryside. This is absurd. There are no capitalist relations without capital, without capitalist rationality (or irrationality). What they have not been able to understand the CLT-UOC comrades, is that there are relations of imperialist **exploitation**, with **production and basically pre-capitalist production relations in the countryside**; that is, **without necessarily all the production in the countryside being capitalist**.

In short, trying to conciliate the different data of the different institutions of the State and of the different investigations is not an easy task; however, they show us an unequivocal tendency: Colombia has about 16 million unproductive hectares and, in general, an inappropriate use of land.

4. A worsening: the fragmentation of political power

The CLT-UOC comrades say:

“Another important characteristic of the semi-feudal and semi-colonial society is the fragmentation of political power. In fact, this fragmentation is one of the reasons for which Mao argued that the path of the Chinese revolution and, by extension, that of all revolutions in semi-feudal and semi-colonial formations could not be the armed insurrection centered in the city, but a protracted people’s war in that the cities would be surrounded by the villages.”

Could it be that the existence of private armies of paramilitaries can be denied in Colombia? To deny this is to beautify this bureaucratic-comprador dictatorship.

All this panorama of the Colombian countryside of concentration of the best lands in few hands, inefficient extensive livestock and unproductive lands, is worsened with the private armies of big landlords, drug traffickers, of the bureaucratic and comprador bourgeoisie.

5. Depopulation of the countryside

The CLT-UOC comrades against the semi-feudality theory say: *“Marx left clear that every advance of capitalist production in the countryside leads to its depopulation.”*

The CLT-UOC comrades also say: *the depopulation of the countryside is indicative of the introduction of capitalist relations in the countryside. To say that capitalist production in the countryside leads to its depopulation, does not necessarily imply that the depopulation of the countryside is an indicative of the introduction of capitalist relations.* CLT-UOC comrades use both ideas as if they were the same.

In Colombia, for example, they took away from the peasants from 6 to 8.5 million hectares of land, leaving a total until 2012 of 5,701,996 displaced people (CODHES).

Although Colombia has one of the largest displacements in the countryside in the world, its average annual growth, between 1990 - 2011, of agricultural GDP, is one of the worst in Latin America. We only surpassed Venezuela, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Mexico, El Salvador and Panama (Development of Colombian Agriculture, Roberto Junguito, 2014). If the depopulation of the countryside in Colombia would have meant the progress of capitalist production, it had to be reflected in the growth of agricultural GDP.

But how can the displacement in Colombia mean the introduction of capitalist relations, without development of the productive forces, without significant growth of production, without constant capital investments, without capital reproduction? The most important contradiction of the 5,701. 996 displaced peasants is capital-labor or is it the struggle for the land? Have the pre-capitalist production relations in the countryside "disappear" or have they stabilized with displacement? The answers are obvious: forced displacement in Colombia has strengthened pre-capitalist relations in the countryside.

6. As a way of conclusion: relation between capitalism and territorial ownership

In economic terms, what means that livestock is developed in these conditions: it occupies 38 million hectares of our country, with low productive efficiency, with a very precarious technological level, generating few employment, with improper use of the soil. To this we must add that unproductive lands

with agricultural vocation up to 16 million hectares. In other words, extensive livestock is developed with little variable capital, practically without constant capital (the one destined for tools), without the efficiencies required to all capitalist companies; that is, they are not under the rationality of capital.

If this is capitalism in the countryside, it would be necessary to rewrite a good part of the capital. However, the reality is that monopoly integrates capitalist production with pre-capitalist production.

Engels said in the ANTI- DUHRING:

*“The anarchy of social production became apparent and grew to greater and greater height. But the chief means by aid of which the capitalist mode of production intensified this anarchy of socialised production was the exact opposite of anarchy. It was the increasing organisation of production, upon a social basis, in every individual productive establishment. By this, the old, peaceful, stable condition of things was ended. Wherever this organisation of production was introduced into a branch of industry, it **brook no other method of production by its side.** Where it laid hold of a handicraft, that old handicraft was wiped out.”* [The highlighted is ours].

The CLT-UOC comrades resume Engels without taking into account that we are in the imperialist phase of capitalism, are convinced that, in the imperialist phase, capitalism does not tolerate any other method or form of exploitation. But they are wrong. And they are wrong because the "method of analysis" of the comrades, in this regard, is anchored to the free trade stage of capitalism. Consequently, things do not happen as they claim that they should happen. Pre-capitalist relations survive no matter how much they say that: **any way of land tenure is an insuperable obstacle** to the development of capitalism in agriculture. The CLT-UOC comrades forget that Lenin said long before unraveling in "Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism", how monopoly worked, financial capital. Pre-capitalism in the countryside survives despite all the death certificates issued.

What a communist should do is investigate under what logic not only extensive livestock is sustained, but also the 16 million unproductive hectares. And not go out with pejorative phrases about semi - feudality. We must explain what happens in Colombian agriculture and many oppressed countries.

There is a full capitalist development in the countryside that only affects the production of 35% of the agricultural area. The rest of the countryside is subjected to the imperialist exploitation regime, where production relations have an undeniable patriarchal character. This merits that the proletariat take into account to resolve class contradictions, friends and enemies, the tasks of the revolution, and not assume that this problem does not exist and that everything is "industrial" capitalism.

If it is not under bourgeois rationality, then those 38 million hectares in extensive livestock and 16 million unproductive hectares under what rationality do they work? How are lucrative?

Statistical evidence shows that the trend in Colombia is not to convert the latifundium into a productive company, or to develop productive forces, but to increase unproductive land, or with very low productive efficiency. And this is because in Colombia the great big landlords continue to accumulate the best lands, as a constituent part of pre-capitalist relations where latifundiums are in **unproductive fertile lands** or with very low levels of productivity, since they are **essentially used as a means of political power**, and where big landlords oppress and exploit the masses of the countryside and the city maintaining an almost absolute influence on the executive, legislative and judicial powers, to enrich

themselves by capturing rent mainly from the State and the masses. The owners of the latifundiums do not represent the figure of the capitalist entrepreneur, but they retain a gamonal and caciquist character more related to social formations typical from the colony.

If there is no constant capital, or if the constant capital is marginal, negligible, that means that the objectives are very rudimentary, that the means of production are very backward and at this level of delay of the productive forces, necessarily, they must correspond pre-capitalist relationships among men. **In the development of productive forces is where the material form of social relations lies.** Lenin said at the X Conference of the CP (b) of Russia: “*the state of productive forces is the fundamental criteria of all social development.*” To deny this dialectical relationship between productive forces and production relations is to deny materialism, it is to deny Marxism.

On the basis of the old exploitation regime, where the monopoly of the land was (and is) a very important means to possess political power, with an undeniable patriarchal character, is that imperialism, and in particular the imperialist nations (the financial oligarchy), the relations of domination of the Colombian nation, generating a bureaucratic bourgeoisie that accumulates fundamentally through the management of the State and a comprador bourgeoisie that accumulates through business with imperialist capital, **giving as a result, the peculiarity of having the capitalist exploitation regime without the whole mode of production being, necessarily.**

The imperialist domination in Colombia articulates big landlords, bureaucratic bourgeoisie and comprador bourgeoisie, which develop bureaucratic capitalism with the reproduction of serfdom regime features; guaranteeing accumulation of wealth and dominance over the masses, through repression, some privileges, the distribution of jobs in the State’s bureaucracy, influence peddling, bribes, corruption, murders, displacements, constriction of voters, personal favors, in order that gamonal and caciques remain in the key positions of the State in a symbiosis, between bureaucrats and voters.

The “analysis” that ignores the peculiarities of capitalism in oppressed nations lead to hide the classes, capitals and wealth that are based on imperialist accumulation. They fail to reveal the causes of the prevalence of pre-capitalist relations, they ignore the agrarian problem, they dismiss the stagnation of productive forces, they avoid imperialist domination and ignore the main force to solve the contradictions of these societies. They make invisible the peasants, and of course, they ignore their claims, they twist the tasks of the revolution making impossible to sweep away pre-capitalist production relations in oppressed nations and to solve the agrarian problem. This makes impossible to lead and to bring forward the democratic revolutions led by the proletariat and its Party; making the socialist revolution impossible.

A communist hug

Proletarian Power