

The Albanian Revisionism of João Amazonas and His ‘Demolishing’ Critique of Maoism*

Albenzio Dias Carvalho

July 2006

*<https://serviraopovo.com.br/2023/03/25/livro-o-revisionismo-albanes-de-joao-amazonas-e-sua-critica-demolidora-do-maoismo-albenzio-dias-carvalho/>

Contents

Presentation by the Editors of <i>Servir al Pueblo</i> (Serve the People)	4
The Albanian Revisionism of Amazonas and His ‘Demolishing’ Critique of Maoism	6
Presentation	6
Introduction	9
“The Chinese Revisionism of Mao Zedong”	11
“Bourgeois in Socialism” and “Lasting Coexistence”	18
Amazonas and the “Theory of the Three Worlds”	25
Two-Line Struggle in the Communist Party	28
Still on Dialectics: “Mao Prioritizes the Unity of Opposites Over the Struggle of Opposites”	35
“Mao Defends the Existence of the Principal Contradiction”	41
Revisionist “Critique” of Capitalist Restoration	48
The Superiority, Validity and Invincibility of Maoism	68
The Finished Work of Callous Revisionists	74
Conclusion	75

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Presentation by the Editors of *Servir al Pueblo* (*Serve the People*)

It is with great satisfaction that we, from the blog *Serve the People*, are pleased to make available to the public the work *The Albanian Revisionism of Amazonas and His ‘Demolishing’ Critique of Maoism* by the distinguished communist militant Albenzio Dias Carvalho.

Published in 2006, at the height of what the ideologues of the reaction presented as the “left turn in Latin America” (that is, the succession of opportunistic governments led by traitors to the workers’ movement, such as Lula’s), the work opens a relentless war against the revision of Marxism by the same “leaders” eager to hitch themselves to the old order’s wagon. Its immediate target is João Amazonas, the main culprit behind the revisionist turn of the PCdoB¹ after the “Lapa massacre” in 1976, which liquidated it as a Marxist-Leninist party formed through the 1962 reorganization. In the name of rejecting Mao Zedong’s “Chinese revisionism,” the turncoat Amazonas buried the Araguaia Guerrilla Balance, the subject of the fateful Central Committee meeting, and the revolutionary line of People’s War. With this, a dramatic period began in which the revolutionary and communist movement in the country would almost completely disappear, in the words of the author:

“In the context of the debate and historical review, we consider the issue focused on in this publication—the location and role played by João Amazonas’ leadership in the ideological struggle within the process of the workers’ and people’s movement in the country—to be of utmost importance. No matter how belated it may seem, revolutionaries cannot refrain from providing a scientific explanation for the gravity of errors that followed the dramatic outcome of the Araguaia Guerrilla to understand the opportunistic and reactionary role that Amazonas’ organization has been playing in the current management of the old Brazilian state. This includes the shameful collaboration between the social-liberalism with a radical trajectory (PT) and the Amazonas organization, both at the helm of presiding over the reaction in the country and in the South American subcontinent.”

¹RedLibrary: PCdoB stands for Communist Party of Brazil.

Therefore, this publication is a true settling of accounts between Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (the Marxism of today) and revisionism. Since it came to light, under the contributions of universal validity of Chairman Gonzalo, it has advanced not only the revolutionary movement in Brazil but also worldwide, calling new generations of proletarian fighters to the battles, as attested by the great news of the foundation of the International Communist League, which we salute from this platform. This only makes the following words more relevant, and it is not without reason that we can assert that “Albanian revisionism” is a classic of the communist movement in Brazil.

Brazil, March 25, 2023.

The Albanian Revisionism of Amazonas and His ‘Demolishing’ Critique of Maoism

“Heresy is essential to verify the health of dogma.”

José Carlos Mariátegui.

Presentation

THE publication of *The Albanian Revisionism of Amazonas and His ‘Demolishing’ Critique of Maoism* is of great importance for the debate among all those interested in the transformation of our society and the achievement of a new world.

The situation that the revolutionary movement in our country has reached in recent decades, namely, its almost complete disappearance, is mainly caused by the hegemony that revisionism² has achieved throughout the entire workers’ and people’s movement. This hegemony deepened within an international situation of a growing general offensive of counter-revolution, whose leading force was initially modern revisionism with Gorbachev and his perestroika at the forefront, and which soon after converged with imperialism under the leadership of the Yankees.

All this scenario of counter-revolutionary reaction served as the backdrop for the most shameful capitulations and betrayals on the left throughout the

²Revisionism: Opportunist current in the revolutionary workers’ movement, it is hostile to Marxism but presents itself under its banner. It got its name because it subjected Marxist theory, its revolutionary program, and its strategy and tactics to “revision.” Revisionism appeared at the end of the 19th century when Marxism had won a complete victory over all varieties of socialism within the proletariat and was spreading more and more among the working masses. The main representatives of the old revisionism (late 19th-early 20th century) were the Germans Bernstein and Kautsky, the Austrians Victor Adler and Otto Bauer, the right-wing socialists of France and others. In Russia there were the “economicists,” Mensheviks (a minority), and after the October Revolution (1917) Trotskyism and Bukarinism. The essence of revisionism is to introduce bourgeois ideology into the workers’ movement, to adapt Marxism to the interests of the bourgeois, to eradicate the revolutionary spirit from it. Revisionists, as Lenin said, dedicate themselves to the “bourgeois castration” of Marxism in all its component parts: philosophy, political economy and scientific communism.

world, in Latin America and in the country. In today's context, when it becomes evident what all of this led to, particularly here, there is a demand to return to a rigorous assessment of the entire international, Latin American, and Brazilian revolutionary process. It is necessary to more precisely examine the reasons for such a disastrous outcome for the worker's and people's struggle, as well as for every socialist and democratic struggle in general.

Are the protagonists of the current scenario not the fervent critics "on the left" of the historical path of the communist movement in Brazil? Of course, the disaster they led to had the contribution of those previously criticized, in the shaping of the opportunistic electoral popular front of "all the left." Incidentally, criticized not only for their revisionism but also accused of their alleged Stalinism.

Today, as popular resistance takes the initiative worldwide, driven in part by the aggressive and unrestrained actions of the reaction with Yankee imperialism as the sole superpower, the heroic resistance of the Iraqi people and many other peoples struggling worldwide demands an urgent deepening of the historical analysis to respond, based on Marxism, to the great challenges of today and the future. More than ever, it is necessary to continue relentlessly combating revisionism and all opportunism, as the advice of the great leader of the international proletariat holds true: to truly combat imperialism, one must combat all opportunism. Furthermore, in this struggle, we must wage relentless war against revisionism as the main danger, as warned by the great Helmsman in the late 1950s during the capitalist restoration in the USSR.

In its overall offensive, the key tactic for the reaction has been and continues to be to attack the proletarian mind with massive and systematic campaigns about the "bankruptcy of Marxism," the "end of communism," etc. Revisionism has been its battering ram in this regard. However, it is equally crucial for the struggle against imperialism, the liberation of the proletariat, and human emancipation to continue the relentless and uncompromising fight against revisionism and all opportunism.

Today, 50 years after the XX Congress of the CPSU,³ where the new revisionism played its sinister clarinets, setting in motion the accelerated restoration of capitalism in the USSR, and as we mark 30 years of similar episodes in the People's Republic of China (the restorationist coup of Deng Xiaoping), it is crucial to take advantage of this moment for the deepest

³RedLibrary: Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

reflection by revolutionaries of both old and new generations.

To halt the modern revisionist wave unleashed by Khrushchev, Chairman Mao's People's Republic of China promptly engaged in combat to defend Marxism-Leninism, sparking the most resounding controversy in the world, the most intense two-line struggle in the international communist movement. This struggle culminated in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which for ten years prevented the capitalist restoration in that country. As Chairman Mao himself foresaw, a single cultural revolution would not be sufficient, but successive ones were needed to halt restoration and advance the socialist revolution and construction towards communism. The proletarian left could not prevail, and Thermidor prevailed, as Mao had anticipated.

This time, the international proletariat, severely battered and having lost power in its major strongholds — the USSR and People's China — found itself without a support base and without sufficiently organized forces to confront and counteract the revisionist offensive. The people's war in different countries continued to raise the banner of Marxism-Leninism, now under the guidance of Maoism. Notably, the people's war in Peru, under the leadership of the PCP and its leader, Chairman Gonzalo, solidly sustains the struggle against revisionism and the elevation of Marxism to its third and superior stage of development, Maoism.

In the context of the debate and historical assessment, we consider the issue addressed in this publication — the role and location of João Amazonas in the ideological struggle within the process of the workers' and people's movement in the country — to be of utmost importance. However belated it may seem, revolutionaries cannot refrain from providing a scientific explanation for the gravity of errors that followed the dramatic outcome of the Araguaia Guerrilla in order to understand the opportunistic and reactionary role that Amazonas' organization has been playing in the current management of the old Brazilian State. The question arises as to why there is a shameful collaboration between the current administration of the country, the social-liberalism with a radical trajectory (PT), and Amazonas' organization, all of which are at the center presiding over the reaction in the country and in the South American continent.

Furthermore, this text is part of a series of publications by the Nucleus of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Studies, aimed at combating revisionism, revealing its presence and role in the social, political and cultural movement in our country. We believe that, although this is an appendix to another, larger document on the problems regarding the history of the Communist Party of

Brazil, its separate presentation is not harmful.

Nucleus of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Studies
Rio de Janeiro, July 2006

Introduction

Starting from the dramatic episodes of Lapa in December 1976,⁴ João Amazonas shifted to an open and declared attack against Maoism. To do this, he followed in the footsteps of Enver Hoxha, as he had been doing for some time, acting under his leadership. However, it was all a maneuver aimed at immediately justifying his betrayal and capitulation of the revolutionary line of people's war, seeking to cover it up with a revolutionary façade and continue deceiving the unsuspecting. In the years that followed, when the worldwide counter-revolution launched its general offensive in the late 1980s, sweeping away Albanian revisionism and its spokesperson Ramiz Alia, Amazonas quickly distanced himself from Hoxha as well. In practice and in theory, he continued to develop his own variety of revisionism. Similarly, after the death of Chairman Mao in 1976 and the counter-revolutionary coup by the Deng Xiaoping clique, Amazonas launched harsh attacks on Deng, claiming that, with his capitalist restoration, Deng essentially represented Mao Zedong Thought. It didn't take long for him to fall silent on the crimes of the traitors in China and soon start applauding them. Therefore, it is essential to demonstrate that his formulations attacking Maoism are evidence that it was all a pure artifice to justify his shameful capitulation. At the same time, the denial of Maoism served as the ideological and theoretical basis to support the creation of a new revisionist party (under the guise of the continuation of the PCdoB), but one that also continued to differentiate itself from the pro-Soviet group (Brazilian Communist Party) led by Prestes at that time.

The importance here in appreciating and responding to these attacks on Maoism, which essentially is an attack on Marxism, is primarily to unequivocally demonstrate how opportunism was so deeply embedded in the history

⁴Refers to what became known as the "Lapa Massacre," in which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil fell under the siege of the reactionary army. Among the meeting participants, Pedro Pomar and Ângelo Arroyo were brutally assassinated in the house, João Batista Drumond was assassinated under torture, and the remaining participants were arrested.

of the Communist Party in Brazil. How revisionism persisted in different forms, influencing its direction even after the Reconstruction of 1962. At the core of the arguments presented by Amazonas in his critique of Maoism, one finds the traces of the entire legacy of opportunism in the history of the Communist Party, with Amazonas being its main spokesperson in the leadership after its Reconstruction. Stemming from a petit-bourgeois ideological foundation, this opportunism continued to manifest not only in the content of formulations but mainly as a cause in the handling of internal contradictions within the Party, through the administrative and sectarian method of stifling discussions or simply excluding opponents from the ranks. It is important to understand that, on the one hand, starting from the process of Reconstruction in 1962, the significant advances and progress in the Communist Party were due to the embrace of Mao Zedong Thought (as Chairman Mao's contributions to Marxism-Leninism were called at the time), the effort towards its assimilation. On the other hand, the difficulties and delays (intolerance towards divergences, for example, with militants who formed themselves as the Red Wing (Ala Vermelha)⁵) and the mere formal assimilation of Maoism, the denial of it as a third stage, all culminated in the 1970s. These were the results of a persistent resistance to it, in which Amazonas played a central role.

Hence the need to clear this entire terrain, because, in the end, unlike Prestes' Khrushchevist revisionism which caused the first split between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists in 1962 and, therefore, practically led to a significant advance in the formation of the Communist Party of Brazil as a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, the capitulation of Amazonas represented the main and greatest revisionist blow against the Party in its entire history, completely liquidating it as a true Marxist-Leninist communist party. With the collapse of the revisionist USSR in 1990, in which the PCB⁶ disintegrated, giving rise to the PPS,⁷ the PCdoB of Amazonas and Rabelo became, within the spectrum of opportunism of all kinds (PPS, PSB,⁸

⁵Later they were called the Communist Party of Brazil Red Wing.

⁶RedLibrary: Brazilian Communist Party.

⁷RedLibrary: Popular Socialist Party.

⁸RedLibrary: Brazilian Socialist Party.

PSTU,⁹ PSOL,¹⁰ PCO,¹¹ PCB, PCML,¹² etc.), the main revisionist force in the country. It is the one that, in the most dangerous way, uses the banners of Marxism to deny Marxism, and therefore, the one that needs to be unmasked and swept away from the midst of the workers' and people's movement most profoundly, before anything else.

“The Chinese Revisionism of Mao Zedong”

As revealed later, Amazonas took many years to develop his critique of Maoism, which was only fully presented in 1978 with the publication of *The Chinese Revisionism of Mao Zedong*.¹³ In it, Amazonas makes it clear that he had always been in contradiction with Chairman Mao's formulations and that his defense of them at certain times was nothing more than opportunism for his convenience and mere formalism. In fact, he had always, timely but covertly, manifested a special hostility towards him, which served as an obstacle and a tool of sabotage throughout the time of the Communist Party's revolutionary line, notably from 1970 onwards. For the sake of objectivity, we will take this publication as the subject of our controversy. In his “masterpiece,” in a few pages, Amazonas claimed to have exposed Maoism. “*Mao Zedong did not become a Marxist theorist*”¹⁴ (page 7). Thus, he announces in advance the conclusions of a critique that fails to demonstrate its assertion anywhere minimally.

Deprived of any basis of objectivity, Amazonas' supposed criticism of

⁹RedLibrary: United Socialist Workers' Party.

¹⁰RedLibrary: Socialism and Liberty Party.

¹¹RedLibrary: Workers' Cause Party.

¹²RedLibrary: Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

¹³This 1978 publication by the PCdoB's Anita Garibaldi publishing house, signed by João Amazonas, is presented like this:

“The Soviet, Titoist, Eurocommunist revisionism, and their variations have been met with a fitting response. The proletariat already possesses the theoretical arsenal to confront them. It is now a matter of facing Maoism with the same determination and removing it from the workers' movement. It is with this commitment that João Amazonas intervenes in this book.”

¹⁴To make it easier for the reader to distinguish the authorship of the various quotations in this work, those referring to Amazonas and his other supporters will always be in italics. Other quotations and titles of reference works are distinguished only by quotation marks.

Maoism boils down to shooting in all directions in a hateful verbosity that doesn't escape facile adjectives as arguments, in a true jumble of inconsistencies. His subjectivism is evident in the very intention to critique; there is not a single method or direction to follow, revealing a complete lack of understanding of Chairman Mao's comprehensive formulations and the importance he attributes to the various issues he addresses. Despite addressing a very limited number of issues, Amazonas does so in an unruly manner, attacking here and there. Objectively, any minimally serious critique that aims to demonstrate that a certain author is not a Marxist theorist, let alone a Marxist-Leninist militant, as Amazonas proposes in his criticism of Chairman Mao, would have to approach these formulations from the three constitutive parts of Marxism (Marxist political economy, Marxist philosophy, and scientific socialism) and their correspondence with practice in the class struggle; it would need to demonstrate that these three parts, in their unity, are not the essence of the formulation under critique.

In the absence of proper justification for the thunderous sentences condemning Maoism, there is equivocation: *"We do not intend to assess the different aspects of Mao Zedong Thought here. In due course, in other works, we will examine this issue."* (page 8). However, there has been no further news on this, except for its moldy practice of revisionism in which this purulent crust called PCdoB has sunk and arrived at the present day under its leadership. In 1990, already reveling in bourgeois legality, the leadership of PCdoB published a book with the pompous title: *30 Years of Ideological Confrontation — Marxism vs. Revisionism*, a selection of texts by Lenin, Stalin, Hoxha, Amazonas, and Luiz Fernandes (an academic, heir to Amazonas and current theorist of PCdoB). In this publication, where it launches its final gasps against Soviet revisionism, Amazonas not only fails to present any new arguments against Maoism but also does not even mention it. It is not an exaggeration to conclude that Amazonas, by this point, may have considered the matter already settled due to his "demolishing" criticism. As for Fernandes, committed to explaining the capitalist restoration in the USSR and feigning ignorance, he ignores all the criticism of the Communist Party of China (CPC) and reduces himself to polemicizing with Charles Bettel-

heim,¹⁵ ostensibly criticizing Maoism. All this, furthermore, only confirms that opportunists, particularly revisionists, with more or less argumentative ability, are all sworn enemies of Maoism. Or rather, that Maoism is indeed the revealing mirror of revisionists.

By exposing this anti-Marxist verbosity, we will demonstrate the underlying issue of Amazonas' position, as well as that of all supposed critics of Maoism, such as Khrushchev-Brezhnev revisionists, dogmato-Hoxhaists, Castroists, etc. Their eclecticism in the conception of mechanistic and metaphysical dialectics will be revealed. They fail to comprehend the question of unity and identity in contradiction, its conditionality and transitoriness, and antagonism as being not only one but one of the forms that the struggle of opposites takes. Due to this, in certain conditions, a contradictory aspect can transform into its opposite, and likewise, one form of the struggle of opposites can transform into another. They deny the universality of contradiction and its condition as the absolute and sole fundamental law of the incessant transformation of eternal matter. They do not grasp the particularity of contradiction as the possible concrete manifestation of universality. They reject the existence of the principal contradiction and its directing role in a phenomenon of multiple contradictions. In short, they do not understand that for materialist dialectics, **one divides into two**—that is, the unity of opposites—and that everything divides into two while simultaneously being one of the two parts of another. These are crucial issues for the correct understanding and just handling of materialist dialectics in the knowledge and transformation of reality.

For our examination, we will follow the order or disorder with which Amazonas, in his work, expounds his critique, highlighting what we consider most representative of it.

“Mao’s theoretical work is eclectic,” “Mao is empirical” (???)

Referring in a general way to Chairman Mao, he says:

¹⁵Charles Bettelheim, a French intellectual, in his work *Class Struggles in the USSR*, criticizes the capitalist restoration in the USSR. According to his characterization, which is essentially correct, he makes significant errors in discussing the causes due to his anti-Stalinist stance. Bettelheim belonged to the French tendency of “Maoists,” who insisted on contrasting Chairman Mao with Stalin.

“Undeniably, we find, here and there, correct or approximately correct opinions in some of his works. Generally, when it comes to stating the general principles of Marxism-Leninism. But when these principles are translated into practice, anti-Marxist definitions clearly appear.” (page 10).

This is at least an observation that weakens the purpose of someone aiming for a devastating critique. What's interesting, contrary to the statement above, is that, out of the vast theoretical work of Chairman Mao, Amazonas has only managed to locate a passage or two, taken from a few articles. Specifically, these texts are: *The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China*, *On the Coalition Government*, *On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*, *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, *On the Ten Major Relationships*, and an intervention in a party meeting in 1962, which in reality is the 20th speech by Chairman Mao at an enlarged conference on party work, convened by the Central Committee of the CPC and published under the title *On Democratic Centralism*.¹⁶ From this last work and *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, Amazonas extracts the majority of passages chosen as the object of his criticism.

In essence, they are digressions of the type: “*Mao said that...*,” “*Mao asserted that...*,” “*In a meeting with the delegation from the CP of Brazil, Mao said that...*,” etc. The longest article in his publication is a critique of a text published by Renmin Ribao¹⁷ in 1977, under the guidance of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping, regarding the theory of the three worlds—a theory attributed to Chairman Mao. What Amazonas cannot evade is the existence of the extensive theoretical work of Chairman Mao, resulting from the creative application of Marxism-Leninism to the Chinese and global reality of his time. He then digresses, at times judging phrases taken out of context, at times attempting to make counterpositions, which only reveal the anti-Marxist conception that he, Amazonas, actually professes.

By stating that “*Mao Zedong did not become a Marxist theorist*” (page 7), he intends to demonstrate that his theoretical work is not Marxist-Leninist. To this end, he tries to counter a series of statements by the Chairman with some generic quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, concluding

¹⁶RedLibrary: Also entitled *Talk At An Enlarged Working Conference Convened By The Central Committee Of The Communist Party Of China*.

¹⁷Renmin Ribao - People's Daily - Revolutionary China's main daily newspaper.

that “*The eclecticism and lack of confidence in his works are evident.*” (page 9) and “*Mao Zedong’s work is eclectic and therefore not Marxist-Leninist*” (page 104). Without any coherence in the arguments he lists, perhaps in the throes of his daydreams, he doesn’t even realize what he’s saying, titling the following chapter “*Disregard for theory, empirical practice*” (page 11), in which he characterizes Chairman Mao as essentially empirical. There, among other enormities, he ironically states: “*Mao Zedong ‘integrated’ the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the practice of the Chinese revolution, giving excessive weight to practice and almost none to theory. In fact, he opposed practice to theory*” (page 11). To demonstrate, he quotes Chairman Mao without indicating where he got it from: “A good number of comrades do research work (...) reducing all their interest to the study of empty ‘theories,’ divorced from reality.” Continuing, he says that Chairman Mao “sentences” that “*Those who don’t do research have no right to speak*” (sic), and then makes his comment of pure subjectivism: “*The research, however, which [Mao] advised was to turn entirely to practice.*”

As another proof of the disregard that Chairman Mao would have for theory, he cites the following statement in the aforementioned Enlarged Conference of the CPC in 1962:

“In order to formulate a complete set of concrete general and specific policies and methods **under the guidance of the General Line**, it is necessary to allow ideas to come from the masses and to adopt the method of systematic and thorough investigation and study, and examine historically the successful and unsuccessful experiences” (our emphasis) (page 11).

As we can see, in his foolishness, Amazonas himself attests to the reference and importance that Chairman Mao gave to revolutionary theory. What is the general line if not the living theory of revolution? In this speech to 7,000 delegates at the Enlarged Conference on Party Work, attended by the most prominent leaders and members of the party at all levels, from national to local, Chairman Mao spoke about democratic centralism within and outside the party, the importance of its full understanding, the realization that without full democracy in a class society, one cannot deeply understand reality to transform it, and the need for total freedom of discussion, as well as discipline and proletarian centralism, without which democracy cannot be fully realized and socialism cannot be built.

Make a synthesis of the revolutionary process in China in its different stages and phases, highlighting the successes and errors, victories and defeats. He emphasizes that through the correct systematization and synthesis of these factors, resulting from a constant two-line struggle, the CPC was able to better understand the objective laws of the Chinese revolution. This allowed them to formulate general and specific lines, fight to implement them, and advance the revolution. He emphasizes the issue of understanding the objective world, specifically the application of the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism to concrete and particular practice. He speaks precisely of the concrete analysis of concrete reality, emphasizing that only through practice is it possible to apply universal knowledge to specific circumstances. It is a very clear matter, isn't it? However, it is necessary to expose the alleged criticism of Amazonas to reveal that it is nothing more than a cover-up for its capitulation and to give free rein to revisionism, which led to the decay of the PCdoB.

Let's see, in contrast to the lightness with which Amazonas throws the quote as an "empirical Mao," the rigor and theoretical depth with which the Chairman is addressing in this intervention the relations within the party, between the party and the masses, and, in short, the revolutionary practice of a Marxist-Leninist party and leadership at a specific moment in the Chinese revolution. We will cite a long passage from this intervention, including the passage highlighted by Amazonas. Discussing the Party's and the masses' experience in confronting problems and errors in the construction of socialism, and after the realization of the VIII Congress of the CPC (1956), the central committee formulated the general line of "going all out and aiming high to achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism,"¹⁸ Chairman Mao states that the People's Communes were soon established, and the slogan of the "Great Leap Forward" was promulgated. He says that the party, however, "hadn't had the time nor the possibility to formulate a complete set of concrete general and specific policies and methods which were appropriate to the conditions, since our experience was still not sufficient."

Continuing:

"Under these circumstances the cadres and the masses still did not have a complete set of teaching materials, nor had they received any systematic education on policy and so it wasn't pos-

¹⁸This is the famous Maoist slogan of: "Quantity, quality, speed and economy."

sible to have genuinely unified understanding and action. It only became possible after the passage of time, the experience of setbacks and difficulties, and the gaining of both positive and negative experience. Now it's all right, we already have these things or are now formulating them. Thus we can now more judiciously carry out the socialist revolution and socialist construction. In order to formulate a complete set of concrete general and specific policies and methods under the guidance of the General Line, it is necessary to allow ideas to come from the masses and to adopt the method of systematic and thorough investigation and study, and examine historically the successful and unsuccessful experiences in our work. Only then may we discover the laws inherent in objective things and not created by people's subjective imaginations; and only then may we be able to formulate various regulations which are appropriate to the circumstances. This is a very important matter. Will you comrades please pay attention to this point."

This is the context from which our critic extracted the quote in an attempt to discredit Chairman Mao as a theorist and Marxist-Leninist.

Thus, according to the notable understanding that Amazonas has of Marxism, empiricism should, after all, be elevated to the category of supreme revolutionary theory. This is because, as history attests, of the three major events of the 20th century, namely, the October Revolution of 1917, the Chinese Revolution (1949), and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China (1966), two of them were personally led by the "empirical Mao Zedong" in the most populous country on Earth. Not at all! Let's see how Chairman Mao addressed people of thought like Amazonas in the party struggle: "Where our dogmatists err on this question [knowledge] is that, on the one hand, they do not understand that we have to study the particularity of contradiction and know the particular essence of individual things before we can adequately know the universality of contradiction and the common essence of things, and that, on the other hand, they do not understand that after knowing the common essence of things, we must go further and study the concrete things that have not yet been thoroughly studied or have only just emerged. Our dogmatists are lazy-bones. They refuse to undertake any painstaking study of concrete things, they regard general truths as emerging out of the void, they turn them into purely abstract unfathomable formulas,

and thereby completely deny and reverse the normal sequence by which man comes to know truth. Nor do they understand the interconnection of the two processes in cognition — from the particular to the general and then from the general to the particular. They understand nothing of the Marxist theory of knowledge.”¹⁹ Here we have demonstrated the difference and the gap that separates a pseudo-Marxist, bookish and dogmatic, who prattles on about theory and Marxism-Leninism, from a proven authentic and true Marxist-Leninist. After all, practice is the criterion of truth, even for those for whom Marxism-Leninism consists of repeating phrases learned by heart.

“Bourgeois in Socialism” and “Lasting Coexistence”

However, continuing with his mockery, now seeking to counter the theoretical formulations of the “*empirical Mao*,” Amazonas says that Chairman Mao has a conception “*strange to Marxism-Leninism*” regarding socialism and ideological and political struggle. Let’s delve into a long series of quotes to illustrate Amazonas’ “attentive” observations. “*Mao’s error on this issue is not limited to stating that the bourgeois was an allied force in the first stage but in pretending that, in the second stage, it would continue as an ally, interested in socialism*” (page 18). Quoting passages from *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, he highlights: “our socialist system has only just been set up; it is not yet fully established or fully consolidated.” and goes on to say that the document states that in state-private enterprises in industry and commerce, capitalists receive dividends, fixed profits, “exploitation still exists,” and soon comments that the document erroneously states that “contradictions in socialist society (under the conditions of the existence of the bourgeois) do not become antagonistic”; “they are not antagonistic and can be ceaselessly resolved by the socialist system itself.” Amazonas makes the following observation: “*And Mao recommends it is imperative to ‘differentiate contradictions within the people from those existing between us and our enemies (the contradiction with the bourgeois he [Mao] considers as being within the people) and to treat them correctly. . . .*” “*Well, the contradiction between the bourgeois and the proletariat, in any system, is an antagonistic, irreconcilable contradiction.*” (...)

¹⁹Mao Zedong — *On Contradiction*.

“The contradiction with the bourgeois is resolved through class struggle. Mao Zedong, however, recommends resolving it using the method of study, the peaceful transformation of the bourgeois.”

Continuing, he soon quotes Chairman Mao again, making comments with a tone of astonishment and irony: “On one hand, the bourgeois elements have become members of the administrative staff (*administrative!*) [exclaims Amazonas] of joint ventures and (*heaven forbid!*) [indignantly declares Amazonas] are turning from exploiters into workers who live off their own labor. On the other hand (...), they continue to receive profits from the companies.” And then Amazonas comments: *“This would be a manifestation of their dual character, on one hand, as workers and, on the other, as exploiters.”* (All quotes are from page 20). Later on, Amazonas concludes: *“Mao Zedong, in this work, not only praises the bourgeois elements—who are supposedly becoming workers and transforming through study. He defends and proclaims the need for the **long-term** coexistence between the party of the proletariat and the bourgeois parties.”* (our emphasis). And he presents another quote from Chairman Mao: “The idea of long-term coexistence had been there for a long time. When the socialist system was in the main established last year, the slogan was formulated in explicit terms. Why should the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democratic parties be allowed to exist side by side with the party of the working class over a long period of time? Because we have no reason for not adopting the policy of long-term coexistence with all those political parties which are truly devoted to the task of uniting the people for the cause of socialism and which enjoy the trust of the people.” Finally, an exasperated Amazonas concludes: *“Strange theory! Under socialism, the bourgeois would have long-term existence, and its political parties would co-exist for a long time with the party of the proletariat! It would be interested in strengthening the cause of socialism... Oh, bourgeois, to whom we throw so many stones!...”* (page 21).

Amazonas simply does not accept the fact that the Chinese experience resolves contradictions in the conditions of socialism, with the petite bourgeois and the national or middle bourgeois — which Amazonas cunningly mentions only in a generic sense as “bourgeois” — through ideological and political struggle. Chairman Mao, when talking about class contradictions in socialism, focuses on two problems. First, in a general sense, the class struggle in socialist society unfolds differently from how it occurs in old societies like capitalism. He emphasizes that due to the nature of socialism, where the system of exploitation has been abolished, class struggle does not unfold with

the antagonism that occurs in different class-based societies built on exploitation. Due to this new and superior condition of non-exploitative relations of production in socialism, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeois are non-antagonistic. Why? Because in a class-based society founded on exploitation, these contradictions cannot be resolved within the framework of that society and only through violent revolution. In socialist society, where classes and class struggle still exist, these contradictions can and will be resolved within the framework of socialism itself, leading to the extinction of classes. Second, he is very clear in differentiating, in the concrete reality of China, the bourgeois in general from the national or middle bourgeois that is part of the people in the stage of new democracy. This bourgeois continues, in part, as the owner of certain means of production or receiving profits from its capital, while also cooperating with the revolutionary power of the proletariat. He shows that in such a condition, the contradiction with this bourgeois has, alongside its antagonistic character, a non-antagonistic character. This allows the contradiction between this bourgeois and the proletariat to transform from antagonistic to non-antagonistic, depending precisely on the method employed in resolving the contradiction by both conflicting parties. Such a contradiction can be overcome through the method of persuasion.

In light of this, Amazonas concludes: "All that argumentation is nothing but bourgeois liberalism, entirely alien to Marxism-Leninism" (page 23). Our eminent Marxist is primarily referring to the masterful work of Chairman Mao, *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, from 1957, with which the author makes an invaluable contribution to Marxism-Leninism. This contribution addresses the issue that in socialism, classes and class struggle continue to exist and discusses how the proletarian party must manage dictatorship to resolve antagonistic contradictions with the enemy and democracy to address contradictions within the people (non-antagonistic). By examining the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat (in the USSR and China), the author systematizes the process of class struggle in the conditions of socialist construction. Pointing out that there are differences in nature between contradictions that occur between the people and their enemies and those that arise within the people, the author asserts the need for them to be addressed with different methods. The first, of an antagonistic nature, is resolved through violent struggle to subdue the enemy, while the second, of a non-antagonistic nature, is addressed through ideological-political struggle, criticism, and self-criticism. Under certain con-

crete historical conditions, it happens that in the construction of socialism, the national bourgeois or the middle bourgeois is not immediately expropriated and submits to the revolutionary power of the proletariat and collaborates with socialist construction. In these conditions, the existing contradiction between it and the proletariat—which under normal capitalist conditions is an antagonistic contradiction—may evolve into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved through peaceful struggle and persuasion. If the different types of contradiction are not correctly distinguished, and an incorrect method of resolution is applied, the contradiction that is non-antagonistic within the people can transform into an antagonistic contradiction, exploited by the enemies of the people in their restorationist endeavors. The contradiction between the people and their enemies can lead to reconciliation with the enemies, resulting in defeats and suffering for the people and, in the long run, to the potential restoration of capitalism.

Regarding the concrete reality of China, we are talking about the case of countries then dominated by imperialism, colonial and semi-colonial countries, whose socialist revolution is preceded by a stage of democratic revolution, and the state takes the form of a joint dictatorship of revolutionary classes. These classes, in general, sectors of the small and middle bourgeois (national bourgeois), are integral parts of the people, the revolutionary field, and therefore, the new state, which is under the hegemony of the proletariat, with the fundamental basis being the worker-peasant alliance. As the socialist revolution and construction progress, these layers of the national bourgeois or part of it tend to cooperate with the socialist power. Through ideological struggle and reeducation, they may peacefully and voluntarily hand over to the socialist state the means of production and other capital they still possess, relinquishing the profits they were previously obtaining. Chairman Mao argues that in these cases, coercion is not justified or correct. Instead, democracy should be employed, and, of course, as long as these layers and individuals that compose them do not act hostilely towards the power of the proletariat.

The coercive method, in this case, would only sharpen the antagonistic aspect in this contradiction, pushing these forces into the field of imperialism, the big bourgeois, and the landlords. This is a problem of utmost importance and difficult understanding for revisionists and dogmatists, who make a seemingly leftist discourse but with a rightist essence. For them, either the antagonistic social classes disappear and class struggle ceases with the proletariat seizing power and socializing the means of production, or in

socialism, class struggle proceeds in the same way as in class-based societies built on exploitation. Here, once again, Amazonas' one-sided understanding of dialectics is evident. He fails to comprehend the connection of phenomena and even less their external conditioning relationship. While class struggle remains acute in socialism, it initially manifests itself in the ideological terrain and develops into other terrains according to the dynamics, on the one hand, of the action of the masses, which must be continuously mobilized by the party of the proletariat, and on the other hand, of the action of the enemies.

However, contradictions will be addressed and resolved according to their concrete manifestation. Hence, the contradictions between the people and their enemies, characterized by antagonism, will be addressed through coercion using the instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and those within the people through democracy. In the concrete conditions of China and under the wise leadership of Chairman Mao, an opponent of "bookish Marxism" and a faithful observer of concrete reality, the CPC and the People's Power and its legal system presupposed and allowed the bourgeoisie or those bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements willing to collaborate with socialism to organize themselves into democratic parties and have a "long-term coexistence" with them. But how "long-term"? Well, as long as these parties last, obviously! The existence of other democratic parties in socialism depends on the evolution of their positions in the process of socialist construction, so they may disappear before classes are completely extinguished or, otherwise, with the extinction of classes that will result in the disappearance of all parties, including that of the proletariat and the state itself and its institutions. And "long-term" not in the sense of eternity and hindrance to the construction of socialism, as Amazonas cynically wants to imply with Chairman Mao's words!

Here it is, the dynamics of class struggle in socialism, according to the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as particularly

taught by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR).²⁰ In the experience of the Russian Revolution, there was only the Bolshevik Party in socialist legality. Clandestinely and illegally, various parties of the enemies existed. The Trotskyists, Bukharinists, and others who betrayed and conspired against Soviet Power also organized themselves as political parties in secret. The existence of a single party in socialism is not a principle of Marxism, as the bourgeoisie and reactionaries proclaim, relying precisely on the “brilliant contributions” of pseudo-Marxists like Amazonas. We ask: with the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, what should individuals or groups of bourgeois individuals who declare themselves in collaboration with socialism do politically? Just like all declared reactionaries, these individuals will not enjoy any political freedom? Well, unlike counter-revolutionaries who should be systematically repressed, these bourgeois elements should have political freedom. Should they organize into their own parties or join the revolutionary party of the proletariat? The party of the proletariat is the communist party, of communists, and there is no place for any other type of ideology in it. So, can bourgeois elements collaborating with socialism organize politically? Yes and no! Yes, as long as they are in words and deeds actually supporting People’s Power and the construction of socialism through democratic parties. And no, when they cease to support it in practice. Therefore, regarding the agonizing exclamation of *“Holy bourgeoisie, how many stones we throw at you!...”* (page 103), our Amazonas can rest in peace because, with his revisionist practice, he did not throw very many stones. Unless, like fools, who, according to a popular Chinese saying, lift stones to drop them on their own feet.

Amazonas, as he claims himself, supported the Cultural Revolution at the beginning and later condemned it, identifying it as a manifestation of petty-bourgeois extremism in Maoism. And what was the Great Proletarian

²⁰The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was the great ideological-political movement that began in China in 1966, led by Chairman Mao Zedong, through which hundreds of millions of the popular masses mobilized to combat bourgeois ideology within the Communist Party, in the state and institutions, in public administration, in education, in the sciences, arts and literature, in production, in short, in all spheres of human activity in favour of a new culture freed from any remnants of the exploitation of man by man. The GPCR reached its peak in 1969, when the IX Congress of the Communist Party of China systematized its experiences and results. In the early 1970s, the GPCR began to decline with the right-wing offensive in the CPC (Deng Xiaoping) and division within the leadership of the proletarian left, ending in 1976, after the death of Chairman Mao, through the coup d’etat promoted by Deng’s revisionist clique.

Cultural Revolution if not the most fierce struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for power under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat? Moreover, in essence, what was at the center and in conflict in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was the resolution of relations between power and the masses, between leaders and the led. Chairman Mao's definitions were not clear enough that after the completion of the new democratic revolution — which in summary concludes with the seizure of power throughout the country — the main contradiction in the construction of socialism is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist road and the capitalist road, where it is not decided who will prevail over whom? Wasn't it Amazonas, leading his PCdoB, who under the leadership of Hoxhaism asserted that there had never been a trace of socialism in China, that "Mao's new democracy" was nothing more than a vulgar bourgeois reformist dictatorship? He says: *"If Mao theoretically defended the dictatorship of the proletariat, in practice, he did not understand this necessity, nor the leading role of the working class. His conception of the state does not fully correspond to the essential features of the dictatorship of the proletariat conceived by the classics of Marxism. People's Democracy, or the New Democracy, as he founded it, is, in reality, a bourgeois-reformist type of state, formally led by the working class. As he himself said: 'an original form of the State.' "* (page 104).

Was it not under the revisionist leadership of Amazonas that the PCdoB — with mere sophisms, but in reality because it never understood the new democratic revolution — abandoned the concept of revolution in two stages in Brazil, and by defining it as already socialist, included in its "Socialist Program" the existence of the non-monopolistic bourgeoisie? Was it not, then, Amazonas and his decrepit PCdoB that pointed to the traitor Deng Xiaoping as a follower and continuator of Chairman Mao with the supposed "Theory of Three Worlds," but when counter-revolution unleashed in the world in the 1990s, were the first, with shameless faces, to flatter the bandit Deng with melted praises about the Chinese model of socialism? Was it not Amazonas, in his pamphlet "The Chinese Revisionism of Mao Zedong," who wrote *"The theory of the three worlds, opportunist version of the proletariat's class struggle"* in the vain pretense of combating the revisionists of Deng's clique, launching all sorts of adjectives against the "third-worldists" used to classify a contagious revisionist and, ten years later, becoming his greatest worshiper? Well, revisionist gentlemen, since when is Chairman Mao a defender of the bourgeoisie in socialism and your excellencies irreconcilable

enemies of it? But let's address the issue of the famous "Theory of Three Worlds" and who its author is.

Amazonas and the "Theory of the Three Worlds"

Unable to present any evidence of Chairman Mao's relationship with the so-called revisionist theory, Amazonas, in his thin and hollow critique, merely states that it is the latest development in Chinese revisionism. However, in other articles from the same publication, he insinuates: *"Mao Zedong Thought provided the basis and directives that would ultimately lead to the current situation, the audacity with which Hua, Xiaoping²¹ (sic), and other followers of the capitalist road act. Mao not only substantially contributed to the elaboration of the theory of the three worlds but is the advocate of an alliance with the United States, with the imperialist countries of Europe and Asia, with the reactionary forces worldwide."* (page 07); and furthermore, *"Since the Chinese began talking about the theory of the three worlds attributed to Mao Zedong, the CP of Brazil took a clear stand against this opportunist trend which, later, still in Mao's lifetime, turned into the global strategy of the CPC and China."* (page 92). Chairman Mao has nothing to do with such an exotic "theory." This is exclusively the work of the revisionist clique of Deng, which undermined the Cultural Revolution throughout and, after Chairman Mao's death in 1976, staged a coup to seize the leadership of the CPC and the Socialist State. They cowardly arrested and assassinated thousands of Maoist revolutionary cadre to finally restore capitalism. To cover up their counter-revolutionary actions, thrive, and trade on Chairman Mao's authority, confusing revolutionaries worldwide and the Chinese popular masses, they asserted about their rotten theory that *"Chairman Mao's theory of the differentiation of the three worlds is a major contribution to Marxism-Leninism."*²² Furthermore, they fabricated and spread it everywhere to justify promoting all kinds of filthy deeds that, infiltrated into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and under Zhou Enlai's centrist position, they had been practicing for years, supporting reactionary governments and political forces under the pretext of isolating the USA and the social-imperialist

²¹Referring to Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping.

²²This is the title of the Renmin Ribao publication of November 1977. Hua Guofeng was formally the main leader of the CPC, but he was nothing more than Deng Xiaoping's puppet.

USSR.

Chairman Mao, regarding that period, analyzing it as an advanced crisis of capitalism and speaking about the exacerbation of all fundamental contradictions in the world, in which the distinction between imperialist countries as superpowers and powers was taking shape, showed that the inter-imperialist contradictions created a complex polarization. This was between the two **superpowers** (the USA and the social-imperialist USSR) on one hand, and at the same time, between these superpowers and the capitalist **powers** (Europe, Canada, Japan) on the other. He denounced that this was a relationship of struggle and collusion between the two superpowers for the division and control of zones of influence over all other nations in the world, to combat socialism and revolution and perpetuate their domination over oppressed nations. In this, he only stated that "**three worlds are taking shape.**" The revisionists of Deng, through their puppet Hua Guofeng, were the ones who spread this sham "Theory of Three Worlds" in 1977, in whose exposition and foundation, there is no evidence that Chairman Mao formulated it. They only present their own arguments intertwined with citations from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Chairman Mao in a true theoretical mishmash, attempting to legitimize their revisionist creation and justify their capitulation to imperialism and social-imperialism while covering up the capitalist restoration they set in motion. Of the ninety quotations from the classics used in the November 1977 issue of Renmin Ribao, more than twenty of which are from Chairman Mao, only one refers to three worlds. "**In my opinion, the United States and the Soviet Union constitute the first world; intermediate forces such as Japan, Europe, and Canada make up the second world, and we are part of the third.**" "**The third world comprises a large population. The entire Asia, except Japan, belongs to the third world; the entire Africa also belongs to it, and likewise, Latin America.**" Still, this alleged quotation is preceded in the text by the following: "In February 1974, in a conversation with a leader of a third-world country, Chairman Mao said."

With his perceptive and astute attention to contradictions when analyzing the international situation, Chairman Mao applied what Lenin and Stalin had taught about paying attention to contradictions among our enemies. He said, "**We must consider the struggles between imperialist countries as important events. Lenin and Stalin considered such struggles as such. They qualified these struggles as forces reserve for the**

revolution.”²³ Already in 1946, responding to Anna Louise Strong’s inquiry about the possibility of a U.S. attack on the USSR, he said, “The United States and the Soviet Union are separated by a vast zone which includes many capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Before the U.S. reactionaries have subjugated these countries, an attack on the Soviet Union is out of the question.” In 1957, speaking at the National Secretaries Conference, he stated: “In the Middle East, there was that Suez Canal incident. A man called Nasser nationalized the canal, another called Eden sent in an invading army, and close on his heels came a third called Eisenhower who decided to drive the British out and have the place all to himself. (...) From this incident we can pin-point the focus of struggle in the world today. The contradiction between the imperialist countries and the socialist countries is certainly most acute. But the imperialist countries are now contending with each other for the control of different areas in the name of opposing communism. (...) At present their contention converges on the Middle East, an area of great strategic significance, and particularly on Egypt’s Suez Canal Zone. In the Middle East, two kinds of contradictions and three kinds of forces are in conflict. The two kinds of contradictions are: first, those between different imperialist powers, that is, between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France and, second, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations. The three kinds of forces are: one, the United States, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second-rate imperialist powers, and three, the oppressed nations. Asia and Africa are today the main areas of imperialist contention. National independence movements have emerged in these regions. The methods the United States employs are now violent, now non-violent, and this is the game it is playing in the Middle East.” This is how Chairman Mao, in 1974, presented his thesis that “three worlds are taking shape.”

But, in their evasions, the revisionists could not hide everything and deceive everyone. When talking about those who opposed such a “theory,” they had to attack and combat the Maoists who opposed their restorationist plans in China, the same ones who, with the revisionist coup, were arrested and sentenced to death. In the mentioned publication of Renmin Ribao, the clique of Deng asserts that “In our own country, there are persons who frantically oppose Chairman Mao’s theory of the three worlds. They are none other than Wang Hongwen, Zhang Chunqiao, Jiang Qing and Yao Wenyuan,

²³ Annex to Notes on *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, by Stalin - 1959

or the ‘gang of four.’ Hoisting a most ‘revolutionary’ banner, they opposed China’s support to the third world, opposed China’s effort to unite with all forces that can be united, and opposed our dealing blows at the most dangerous enemy. They vainly tried to sabotage the building of an international united front against hegemonism and disrupt China’s anti-hegemonist struggle, doing Soviet social-imperialism a good turn. To a certain extent, their disruptive activities had a deleterious effect, but our Party and government have unswervingly adhered to the revolutionary line in foreign affairs formulated by Chairman Mao. The ‘gang of four’ in no way represent the Chinese people. They are traitors disowned by the Chinese people.” Obviously, on this part of the text defending the “theory of the three worlds,” Amazonas didn’t even bother to mention. Of course, unlike Amazonas, who became a fierce enemy of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the “Gang of Four,” notably the great comrade Jiang Qing, was along with Chairman Mao, its main standard-bearer. Finally, Amazonas took advantage of this revisionist theory to accuse it of sustaining the “principal enemy” thesis, which in turn derives from Chairman Mao’s dialectical conception of the principal contradiction. Specifically on the issue of the principal contradiction, we will address it later.

Two-Line Struggle in the Communist Party

In the continuation of his attempt to demonstrate that “*Mao Zedong is a petty-bourgeois revolutionary*” and therefore liberal, in addressing the question of the relationship with the bourgeoisie in the construction of socialism, he states: “*And this rotten liberalism he manifests in relation to the internal life of the Party of the working class. In 1963, in an interview with the delegation of the CP of Brazil, he proclaims the existence of three currents within communist parties: one right-wing, another center, and another left-wing, as if the party were an organization of a united front. Mao admitted the permanent existence of two lines within the Party and two leading centers (two HQs), which, in essence, is the recognition of the right to fraction within the Party.*” (page 23). As a systematic way of making his criticism, Amazonas continues to twist the words of Chairman Mao. In addition to finding complete political stupidity in his assessment regarding the issue of line struggle in the communist party, we can see all his opportunism in deducing the developments of the struggle, during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolu-

tion, in which at a certain moment the Maoists raised the slogan “bombard the headquarters of the bourgeoisie” in the CPC, referring to the revisionist leaders at the top of the party, particularly Liu Shaoqi.

Regarding the question of the **two-line struggle**, here we will only clarify how he twists the concept by stating that “*Mao admitted the permanent existence of two lines in the Party...*” (page 23). As we have discussed in the work *Two-Line Struggle: Problems in the History of the Communist Party of Brazil*, in its analysis and synthesis of the process of the Communist Party of Brazil, it starts precisely from the understanding that class contradictions in society are reflected within the party, manifesting themselves through line struggle, which intensify at certain moments. How could a true communist party establish a correct proletarian revolutionary line and its just practice without this struggle? How could it establish, maintain, and persist in the correct line and ward off the danger of falling into another non-proletarian line without this struggle? Contrary to what the revisionists claim in their political stupidity, the understanding and handling of the two-line struggle do not contradict the principles of Democratic Centralism; they truly practice and strengthen them. In reality, the revisionists talk about Democratic Centralism as a cliché to cover up and legitimize their practice of bourgeois bureaucratic centralism. Only with the correct understanding of the Party as a contradiction is it possible to understand that the struggle of divergent and opposing opinions within the Party reflects the contradictions in society, and its correct recognition and handling as the two-line struggle is the essence of the exercise of proletarian democracy in the party. Only in this way can the principles of Democratic Centralism truly be practiced, and not under the sophistry of the same, typical of revisionist parties. While internal struggle is ongoing, all Party members are obliged to apply, in their daily practice, the ideology, program, and general political line already defined, without any detriment to the fulfillment of their tasks and goals.

The defense claim of fractionism, of anti-Leninism, is simply absurd. The dogmatists and sectarians with their bookish “Marxism,” like our Amazonas and his followers, cannot comprehend this crucial problem of the communist party, as the dialectic they profess, besides being mechanistic and vulgar, only applies to certain phenomena and not to the totality of matter, the universe, nature, human society, and human thought. When he refers, indignantly, to the mentioned statements of Chairman Mao about the “existence of three currents within communist parties: one right-wing, another center, and another left-wing,” he reveals his entire anti-Marxist conception that does not

take reality as a basis but rather dogmas and abstract and absolute truths as a reference. Subjectivism, characteristic of petty-bourgeois ideology, is accompanied by sectarianism and administrative and coercive methods in dealing with contradictions within the party. Still referring to Chairman Mao's statements about contradictions within the communist party, the inevitable existence of right, center, and left currents, he adds more: Mao affirms that *“not everything is pure within the Party”* (page 24). And as a champion of such ideological asepsis in the party, he asserts: *“No reference there lies about the need to expel them from the communist ranks”* (page 24).

It is very important to precisely understand this issue. The Amazon offers us the opportunity to examine it. Let's see how Chairman Mao locates the core of the problem of contradictions within the party and how he addresses it: **“At first, with regard to certain issues, such contradictions may not manifest themselves as antagonistic. But with the development of the class struggle, they may grow and become antagonistic. The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union shows us that the contradictions between the correct thinking of Lenin and Stalin and the fallacious thinking of Trotsky, Bukharin and others did not at first manifest themselves in an antagonistic form, but that later they did develop into antagonism.”**²⁴ The correct method for handling contradictions within the party must be based on a correct handling of the two-line struggle, even to the extent of transforming certain non-antagonistic contradictions into antagonistic ones. This is a criterion that requires, in the treatment of contradictions within the party, not only allowing but organizing and elevating internal struggle to a higher level, aiming to clearly characterize the nature of each line in conflict through the method of ideological-political struggle, criticism and self-criticism, unity-criticism-unity, leading to its resolution. Even regarding those contradictions in which antagonisms are immediately revealed, it is necessary for a certain development of the struggle to occur for a correct and just solution.

In the debate between RIM²⁵ and El Diario Internacional²⁶ regarding the issues that arose in the Peruvian revolution, starting with the publication of

²⁴Mao Zedong — The role of antagonism in contradiction, in *On Contradiction*.

²⁵RIM — Revolutionary Internationalist Movement. Conference of Maoist parties and organizations founded in the 1980s. Its coordinating committee, the CoRIM, publishes the magazine “A World to Win.”

²⁶El Diario Internacional — Foreign publication analyzing Peruvian and Latin American reality, based in Brussels-Belgium.

the so-called “Peace Letters,”²⁷ the question of whether these characterized a problem of a two-line struggle in the Communist Party of Peru (PCP) is precisely raised. In its argument that the position in favor of the “peace agreement” did not constitute a line within the PCP but rather a police conspiracy, *El Diario*, citing Chairman Mao, asserts that, due to the difference in the nature of contradictions, their treatment should be different. It states that, being the defense of the “peace agreement” in the conditions of Peru a police maneuver, an action of the enemy, it was characterized as an antagonistic contradiction and as such should be treated, with its defenders as enemies of class and the PCP. Concluding that in this case, the treatment would not be ideological-political struggle, a two-line struggle, but, being a case of betrayal, treated with expulsion from the party. However, this is a different assessment from that of Chairman Mao on these issues, as expressed in his assessment of the “Ten major two-line struggles in the history of the CPC.” It shows struggles of various types, but all followed a certain path and relatively long time until their resolution. Such as the struggles in the Bolshevik Party, of Lenin and Stalin, against Bukharin and Trotsky and others.

The error of *El Diario* in dealing with this issue is of two types: first, in characterizing the emergence of the position through the “peace agreement” as a mere police conspiracy rather than fundamentally an opportunist right-wing line. Second, by characterizing it as an antagonistic contradiction, it should not be addressed through ideological-political struggle for a correct resolution. What? If the proponents of the right-wing opportunist line persisted in it, refusing to engage in self-criticism and rectify errors, it became impossible to coexist with them in the party. Meanwhile, even though the RIM identified the nature of the problem as the emergence of another right-wing line within the PCP, its conception of managing the two line struggle, in practice, proved to be misguided. This is because, in its incorrect assessment of the stage of the international communist movement, it turned the internationalist communist slogan of ideological struggle among all communists worldwide into an intrusion and improper interference in the internal affairs of the PCP at an extremely delicate moment. Of course, this is a very complex problem and not easily managed or solved.

²⁷Peace Letters - Documents presented by Fujimori in 1993 (when he was presiding over the bloodiest regime in Peru) as letters requesting peace negotiations from the top leader of the Peruvian revolution, Abimael Guzmán, Chairman Gonzalo, who had been imprisoned and kept in complete isolation since 1992.

In any case, Amazonas prefers to argue, twisting the facts, and, as Lenin advocated at the X Congress of the Bolshevik Party, the end of the right of fractions. With this, the era of organized fractions within the Communist Party would have ended. This is another issue. In his childhood, the Party of a New Type, conceived by Lenin, had to inevitably go through this phase of fractions. If it was terrible for the opportunists of the time (early 1900s) to accept Lenin's proposed Article 1 regarding the party's constitution, which defined the conditions for party membership, causing the most hysterical outcry, imagine what it would mean to raise the issue of the right or not of fractions at that time. Moreover, this was not entirely clear at the time; it was through the concrete experience of building the Party of a New Type that Lenin and other revolutionaries of the time could better understand it.

The conception of the Party of a New Type, put forth by Lenin, represented a significant leap in the question of the revolutionary party of the proletariat, a gigantic contribution to the Marxist doctrine on the party. Similarly, although Lenin never expressed any doubt about the necessity and importance of internal struggle within the party, he made this very clear in theory and practice. It was Chairman Mao, with the experience of leading a communist party for many years, before and after the seizure of power, who deepened Lenin's contributions, bringing a new leap to the Marxist doctrine of the party with the thesis of the "**two-line struggle**."²⁸ Therefore, fraction and fractionalism are one thing, and the line struggle is another. A fraction is an organically expressed position and not simply a line in conflict. The struggle of proletarian revolutionaries in countries where the communist party has been submerged in opportunism and liquidated as such has gone through long periods to achieve its reconstitution. In these cases, a specific fraction, the truly proletarian one, took on the task of reconstituting the party as the revolutionary party of the proletariat. Lenin taught this when,

²⁸Starting from dialectical materialism, in which everything is contradiction, the communist party is also such. Within the party, the class contradictions of society, the class struggle, and the struggle between the new and the old are reflected. Contradictions within the party manifest themselves in lines. The proletarian vanguard cannot evade this issue by adopting bureaucratic and administrative measures in its treatment. Recognizing this reality and assuming it, the struggle of the proletarian line against other non-proletarian bourgeois and various types of lines must be organized. The party is a unity of opposites, and if unity is vital for the party, struggle is the means to achieve it. Contradiction is the fundamental law of dialectics, it is absolute. Contradiction and struggle are permanent, while unity is transient. Therefore, the struggle within the party is to achieve a new unity at higher levels.

after many years of line struggle in the RSDLP (Russian Social Democratic Labor Party), where two lines emerged that became two major fractions, the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, and with the defeat of the 1905 revolution, gave rise to others such as the Ultimatists, Otzovism, Veperiod, the Vienna Club, and its Pravda²⁹ led by Trotsky, all already with their own organic and independent lives. In 1912, Lenin, against Trotsky's preaching of unity for all, argued that there comes a certain moment when one of the fractions must take on the task of reconstituting the party. The same was applied by other communists in different countries, as prominently seen in the revolutionary process in Peru, with the Red Fraction led by Abimael Guzmán.

What Amazonas refuses to accept is that in any communist party or organic communist process, there will be a tendency for the existence of three currents: right-wing, center, and left-wing, as a reflection of societal contradictions. This is one thing; another is the fraction. For this reason, in our country, given the prevalence of petty-bourgeois ideology in the leadership of the Party until the end of the 1950s, and that its legacy was not completely overcome with the 1962 Reconstruction, the contradictions within it were never properly addressed, to its constant and unchanging detriment. This is ultimately the underlying problem we identify and formulate and present with the work ***Two-Line Struggle: Problems in the History of the Communist Party of Brazil***. It is the opportunist legacy that Amazonas subsequently and unequivocally revealed to be its main carrier throughout the history of the Communist Party. It is indeed true that the three currents exist, as Chairman Mao asserted, despite Amazonas' rightist current in 1966 expelling the left — Red Wing and the group of Manoel Lisboa, the Communist Party continued to have and develop three currents. Although weakened, the left-wing current was responsible for defending Maoism within the party, leading to decisions such as prolonged people's war as a strategy, among other definitions. However, Maoism was defeated in the party in a few years, even before and because its understanding was not developed, particularly concerning the issue of the **two-line struggle**, which required insight, patience, and persistence.

As experience has shown, resistance to Maoism — even through its formal and caricatured defense by the right, as it seems to have been the role played by Amazonas and his followers — developed into its complete denial

²⁹This is the Vienna Pravda, not the Bolshevik Pravda, which appeared on April 22nd, 1912, published in St. Petersburg.

in the early 1970s. One of the texts that makes up the mentioned book by Amazonas, *Brief history of disagreements with the CPC*, gives us ample evidence of this. In it, Amazonas triumphantly highlights that: “*In 1967, the Chinese widely propagated the idea that Mao Zedong Thought was a new stage of Marxism-Leninism. (...) The Central Committee of the CP of Brasil considered it necessary to define the matter. And it reached the conclusion that Mao Zedong Thought, although considered by us at that time as Marxist-Leninist, was not a new stage of the doctrine of the working class. Therefore, the Central Committee reaffirmed, in a resolution approved with only one vote against, that the CP of Brasil was guided solely and exclusively by Marxism-Leninism. In this fact, a serious restriction to Maoism is already evident, presented as a creative development of the most advanced social science.*” (page 88). He refers to the restriction, indicating with this his sectarian, dogmatic, and intolerant spirit towards disagreements.

What is important for him — Amazonas — is not the struggle as a method of reaching the truth, but rather the formal vote formalizing his rejection and prohibiting the continuity or even the resumption of this struggle. It is characteristic of opportunistic conceptions, such as revisionists, to deny the universality of contradiction, to deny it in relation to the Communist Party, or to admit it in it only for the purpose of justifying their bureaucratic party methods and administrative solutions. Unlike bureaucratic revisionists and divisive Trotskyists, communists, Marxist-Leninist-Maoists understand that the struggle within the party is necessary to achieve a strong and proletarian unity at a higher, superior level. Only in this way is the communist party forged, developed, and makes qualitative leaps. Otherwise, as has almost invariably happened in the history of the Communist Party of Brazil, it could never transform itself, break with reformism, opportunism, and revisionism, and leap to the complete condition of a true communist party. However, since these are real and concrete contradictions, the two contradictory lines are also real and concrete. Only opportunists and revisionists like Amazonas admit them in the bureaucratic sense of sabotaging or practicing them with coercive methods to stifle and crush the revolutionary line. Understanding the question of the two-line struggle and handling it correctly, with perception, is the key to constituting, developing, and forging a true communist party.

The revisionist conception of Amazonas, as the backdrop for its positions, completely disregards the importance of applying the laws of dialectics to all things and phenomena. His mechanistic and conditional conception of dialec-

tics makes it the owner of incredible stupidity. In fact, it considers dialectics to be relative and conditional, that is, it only applies to certain things and phenomena and not to all things and all phenomena, stating that “*certain contradictions are only apparent and are actually mere differences and oppositions of extremes*” (page 27). He does not understand the universality of contradiction. Engels, speaking about the universality of contradiction in his *Anti-Dühring*, stated: “**life consists precisely and primarily in this — that a being is at each moment itself and yet something else.**”³⁰ He does not understand that everything is contradiction, that the Communist Party is a contradiction. Even less does he understand that contradiction and antagonism, as Lenin stated, are different things. He does not understand that while the contradiction and the struggle of opposites are unconditional and absolute, antagonism or non-antagonism as the form of this contradiction and struggle of opposites only manifest themselves in a second stage of the development of the phenomenon, that of the solution of the contradiction, whose unity is relative, transient, and conditional. In each thing or phenomenon, in its first stage, what exists is a transformation or quantitative accumulation, and only in the second stage will the qualitative leap occur, in the form of antagonism or not, destroying that old unity, concluding the old phenomenon, and initiating another new one, or a new unity of opposites. In this regard, we will discuss further Amazonas’ “dialectical” criticism against Chairman Mao’s Marxist dialectics.

Still on Dialectics: “Mao Prioritizes the Unity of Opposites Over the Struggle of Opposites”

“*However, Mao Zedong did not bring anything new to the sphere of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. On the contrary, he attempted to introduce erroneous, mechanistic, metaphysical, and eclectic concepts into it. This is demonstrated, for example, by his approach to the question of contradictions.*” (page 27). In this way, Amazonas delves into his criticism of Maoism in the realm of dialectics. He is unaware, for example, that it was Chairman Mao who concretized the solution to a problem of paramount importance posed by Marx: that of bringing philosophy to the masses. As if this were not enough, incapable of providing evidence for his claims, he attempts by decree to con-

³⁰RedLibrary: *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Press - Peking, 1976, page 153.

ceal that it was the same Chairman Mao who, for the first time in Marxism, established that contradiction is the fundamental law governing eternal matter in its incessant process of transformation; who established the two leaps in the process of knowledge—the leap from practice to theory and from theory to practice—defining the latter as principal. In addition, he extensively applied dialectics to politics. Amazonas even went so far as to say that the studies *On Contradiction* “...at most, could be considered didactic popularization of the ideas of the classics of Marxism, and not an original, well-founded work on philosophical problems.” (page 88).

Let's take a long look at Amazonas, with his dialectical gems, in his “demolishing” critique of Maoism:

“*The text discusses Mao's mechanistic understanding of dialectics.*” To demonstrate this, Amazonas unfolds his general conception of dialectics: “*The Marxist dialectic places fundamental importance on the problem of the struggle of opposites, which is the source and internal content of development. If one analyzes the development of any phenomenon, at its foundation are opposing tendencies that are connected and excluded, negating each other in a constant struggle. This struggle leads, at a certain stage of the process, to a leap that creates a new quality.*” (page 27). It is necessary to highlight that this assertion by Amazonas is correct as it is practically a transcription taken from the classics. However, it is imprecise because it seeks to conceal and camouflage part of the truth. He emphasizes, to the detriment of his accusation against Chairman Mao, that he “*prioritizes the unity of opposites,*” that “*Marxist dialectics attach fundamental importance to the struggle of opposites.*” Note the precision with which Lenin poses the question, exposed and meticulously dissected by Chairman Mao in *On Contradiction*: “**The unity (coincidence, identity, equal action) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute.**”³¹ It is clear here that, conditional and relative on one hand, and unconditional and absolute on the other, unity and the struggle of opposites cannot exist separately and independently. In other words, the universe in its entirety, nature, society, and human thought are a complex of units of opposites in multiple, permanent, integral, and infinite connections. “One divides into two” and is simultaneously one of the parts of another.

Therefore, it is nothing more than the crudest fabrication that Chairman

³¹Lenin — *On the Question of Dialectics.*

Mao prioritizes unity at the expense of the struggle of opposites. This is an old and worn-out revisionist diatribe used by all enemies of Maoism. Chairman Mao treats unity exactly as it is: transient, conditional, and relative, and struggle as unconditional and absolute, inseparably one from the other. In other words, “**The combination of conditional, relative identity and unconditional, absolute struggle constitutes the movement of opposites in all things.**”³² It is Amazonas that is one-sided, only considering the struggle of opposites, and therefore, he says that “*not all opposite extremes form the unity of opposites.*” First, contradiction is universal, unimodal, and absolute, that is, it is present in everything; second, what is the form of existence of contradiction if not the unity of opposites? When Amazonas and other opportunists say that “*Marxist dialectics fundamentally emphasizes the struggle of opposites*” (page 27), it is to emphasize once again that dialectical materialism only applies to certain phenomena and not to all, or that, in some cases, it does not apply, such as in the communist party. As we have already seen regarding the struggle of two lines, for them, the struggle of opposites in the Party cannot be unconditional, permanent, and absolute. Unlike dialectical materialism, for them, in some things and phenomena like the communist party, for example, it is unity that must be unconditional, permanent, and absolute, and struggle conditional, transient, and relative. Well, well!

In his own statement of dialectics, Amazonas, as a bookish and trivial memorizer, does not realize what he is copying. Look, he writes: “*If one analyzes the development of any phenomenon...,*” here is exactly affirmed the universal and absolute validity of dialectics (the law of the unity and struggle of opposites) that he denies when appraising certain phenomena; “*...at its base are opposing tendencies that are linked and exclude each other...,*” here it is affirmed that unity and identity of opposites are inseparable from the struggle, but for him, unity is not important (except in some cases like that of the Party) and not everything exists in the form of unity of opposites; and “*...at a certain stage of the process, there is a leap that creates a new quality,*” here it is affirmed that only from a certain stage of the struggle process does the overcoming of that contradiction and therefore of that process, that phenomenon, that unity, take place, giving rise to a new unity of opposites or a new phenomenon, which will relentlessly continue in this process of struggle and unity. However, for him, this **certain stage** is actually

³²Chairman Mao Zedong — *On Contradiction.*

the emergence of contradiction and not the form it takes and manifests (antagonism or non-antagonism) for its solution. We will return to this later. Nevertheless, what is the new quality he speaks of, if not a new unity of opposites? (our emphases).

Here is the confirmation of the dialectical feats of Amazonas that we have previously denounced, he says: *“He [Mao Zedong] often sees contradictions where there are only momentary oppositions of dissociable aspects that do not actually form a unity of opposites. Happiness and misfortune, joy and sorrow, good and bad, right and wrong (presented by him as units of opposites) constitute opposite extremes but are not opposing tendencies that are constantly and reciprocally linked to each other, excluding and negating each other, developing in a process capable of producing a new quality or the victory of one opposite over the other in a higher form, which in philosophical language is called the negation of negation. In fact, joy and sorrow, misfortune and happiness, good and bad are not inseparable opposites. One can exist without the other. What new quality arises from the two extremes of happiness and misfortune, joy and sorrow, good and bad? Here, a phenomenon of simple repetition occurs, one extreme takes the place of the other, there is no dialectical leap. However, development is not a simple repetitive process but a movement that occurs in the direction of a spiral, always advancing and never staying in the same place.”* (page 27).

Here we have a true “ready-made dish” of mechanistic dialectics and metaphysics. Let’s take it step by step. First, he confirms that, for him, not everything that appears contradictory actually is. Chairman Mao says in *On Contradiction* that **“We must consider every difference in our concepts as a reflection of objective contradictions.”** This means that the concepts that people form correspond to what exists in the objective world. So, concepts that oppose each other deal with real contradictions, and therefore, there is no such thing as “*momentary oppositions*” that are not contradictions. Take, for example, the contradiction of “happiness and misfortune,” which he says “*constitute opposite extremes but not opposing tendencies that are constantly and reciprocally connected and that exclude and negate each other.*” (pg. 27), and that only “*one extreme takes the place of the other, there is no dialectical leap.*” (pg. 28). For Amazonas, this constitutes an exception to the rule and therefore does not apply to dialectics, thus denying its universality and absolute character. How so? Where can happiness arise if not from the absence of happiness, which is misfortune, and vice versa? Someone who, due to certain conditions, can move from a state

of misfortune to happiness or vice versa, and if this happens numerous times, as it does in real and concrete life, is it just a repetition? Is each of these events not a new person? If not, is a person who is in “total” misfortune the same as when they are in total happiness?

Secondly, the only thing that repeats here is the revisionism of Amazonas. He echoes the idealistic prattle of the Deborin school (Soviet philosopher), which Chairman Mao criticizes in *On Contradiction*. According to this perspective, the contradiction or struggle of opposites does not appear right from the beginning of the process but only at a certain stage of its development. For Amazonas, the relationship between happiness and misfortune is a phenomenon of simple repetition, just as it is for metaphysicians where the development of the process occurs not under the influence of internal causes, but under the influence of external causes, that is, as mere repetition. While on the one hand, Amazonas states that the movement in each phenomenon is determined by internal contradictions, by asserting that in certain phenomena what appears to be contradiction is merely “*momentary opposition*,” he acknowledges external action as a determinant in these cases. This is pure metaphysics; external phenomena are conditioning factors and act on others through internal contradictory aspects. At best, this is eclecticism of mechanistic dialectics with metaphysics.

And thirdly, he states that “*development is not a simple repetitive process, but a movement that occurs in the direction of a spiral*” (page 28). Although he claims that “*it is always advancing*,” he reveals, by not characterizing this movement as **ascending**, that he admits that phenomena repeat themselves and that ultimately, the wheel of history may turn backward. This is indeed his revisionist understanding of capitalist restoration, which he calls the “*crisis of socialism*.³³

He further asserts: “*He [Chairman Mao] says that a bad thing can turn into a good one, and the good can turn into bad, as if in the **transmutation** he indicated, the law of the unity and struggle of opposites is at work*” (page 28) (our emphasis). Ironically, Amazonas uses the word transmutation in an attempt to ridicule the statement; transmutation is the change of quality, and alchemists transmuted various metals into gold. Chairman Mao speaks of an

³³A concept used by Amazonas in his text *Social transformations in the epoch of revolution and imperialism - Critical examination of the crisis of socialism* (*As transformações sociais na época da revolução e do imperialismo — Exame crítico da crise do socialismo*) in the collection published in 1990 under the title *30 Years of Ideological Confrontation — Marxism vs. Revisionism* (*30 anos de confronto ideológico — marxismo x revisionismo*).

analysis of the totality of a phenomenon, of its various aspects, including the analysis of a phenomenon as an instrument for analyzing other phenomena (the master through the negative). However, for Amazonas, just as happiness and misfortune, joy and sadness, good and bad, right and wrong do not constitute units of opposites, it is even more absurd than life and death. As Chairman Mao inquires, where can peace arise if not from war and war if not from peace? Life and death form a unity of opposites. It is clear to anyone that death arises from life, and life does not arise from death, or would it be from a divine force? Yes, it arises from death, for how can life exist if before in the universe there was only inert matter?

In his work *Conспектus of Hegel's "Science of Logic,"* Lenin says: "Dialectics is the teaching which shows how opposites can be and how they happen to be (how they become) identical — under what conditions they are identical, transforming themselves into one another, — why the human mind should take these opposites not as dead, rigid, but as living, conditional, mobile, transforming themselves into one another." Chairman Mao highlights this passage in *On Contradiction* and comments: "What does this passage mean? The contradictory aspects in every process exclude each other, struggle with each other and are in opposition to each other. Without exception, they are contained in the process of development of all things and in all human thought. A simple process contains only a single pair of opposites, while a complex process contains more. And in turn, the pairs of opposites are in contradiction to one another. (...) This being so, there is an utter lack of identity or unity. How then can one speak of identity or unity? The fact is that no contradictory aspect can exist in isolation. Without its opposite aspect, each loses the condition for its existence. (...) In given conditions, all contradictory aspects possess the character of non-identity and hence are described as being in contradiction. But they also possess the character of identity and hence are interconnected."

Chairman Mao shows that **interdependence** is only one aspect of the identity of opposites. More important than this is the **transformation of one into the other**, also under certain conditions. It also shows that identity exists, on the condition that contradictory aspects are not dead, petrified opposites, but rather living, conditional, and mobile. "The fact is that the unity or identity of opposites in objective things is not dead or rigid, but is living, conditional, mobile, temporary and relative; in given conditions, every contradictory aspect transforms itself into its opposite. Reflected in man's thinking, this becomes the Marxist world outlook of materialist dialectics."

By asserting that, under certain conditions, the identity of opposites exists, one is referring to real and concrete opposites and considering the transformation of one into the other as also real and concrete. Exactly the opposite, for example, of the fantastic transformations of mythology, the miracles of the Bible, and fairy tales, with their artificial, imaginary, naive, and absurd contradictions. Quoting Marx, he emphasizes: “All mythology subdues, controls and fashions the forces of nature in the imagination and through imagination; it disappears therefore when real control over these forces is established.”³⁴ Myths are not created based on specific situations arising from concrete conditions, and therefore, they do not reflect the objective world. The examples cited by Amazonas in his critique, such as “*mere opposite extremes*” that would not form a unity of opposites, like “*happiness and misfortune*,” are objective, real, and concrete opposites that under certain conditions transform into each other, turning an old process into a new one. And this is not a mythological metamorphosis or the tale of Beauty and the Beast, who married and lived happily ever after.

It is necessary to see that none of these elements listed by Amazonas, as with any other phenomenon, only exists and can only be understood as something concrete and not imaginary. Therefore, happiness and misfortune, joy and sadness, good and bad can only be appreciated in a concrete reality, that is, as a phenomenon in manifestation. Therefore, they can only exist as opposing aspects that mutually exclude and at the same time are interdependent in the form of the unity of opposites. Under certain conditions, these aspects in conflict tend to transform into each other, with one changing from a primary or dominant aspect to a secondary or dominated condition and vice versa, thus marking the end of an old phenomenon and the emergence of a new one.

“Mao Defends the Existence of the Principal Contradiction”

As we have already announced when addressing the issue of the “theory of the three worlds,” which Amazonas, along with his close friends (the Deng clique from 1990 onwards), attributes to Chairman Mao as a justification for the thesis of the “main enemy,” derived from his “main contradiction,”

³⁴Karl Marx — *Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.

we will discuss it here based on the following mention: “*This idea is present in the formulation made by [Mao Zedong] about the so-called main enemy and the main contradiction. He says that, just as in the set of contradictions there is always one that is the main, in the set of enemies, there is also one that is the main. However, this does not always occur. In Brazil, there are two fundamental contradictions in the current stage of the revolution: the contradiction between the plundered and oppressed nation and imperialism, and the contradiction between the large popular masses and the latifundium system. Which of these two would be the main one? In reality, both are intertwined and connected with the contradiction between the working people and the monopolistic groups of the big bourgeoisie, generally associated with imperialism. If we were to accept Mao Zedong’s conclusion, we would have to give priority to one of them. But this would be falling into opportunism.*” (page 29).

This is one of the problems of the dialectics of Amazonas; here, once again, he says, “*However, this does not always occur,*” denying the universality and absolute nature of contradiction in phenomena. Also, concerning the problem of the principal contradiction, we take this quote from him not only to confirm what we had said before but also to discuss the application of materialist dialectics in the analysis of Brazilian reality, in understanding the general laws of our revolution, once again to demonstrate why these problems have never been properly resolved. We will focus on the example he cited to illustrate the issue of the principal contradiction in phenomena. With the assertion he makes above, persisting in the denial of the principal contradiction in phenomena, Amazonas departs from the erroneous position of “Union of Brazilians to rid the country of the crisis, dictatorship, and neo-colonialist threat” (thesis of the CC³⁵ of the PCdoB at the VI National Conference in 1966, very well criticized by the Red Wing³⁶), to fall into another. In this thesis, it was claimed that in Brazil at that time, there were two principal contradictions, but now there are none. The problem of understanding the issue of the principal contradiction arises from dealing with

³⁵RedLibrary: Central Committee.

³⁶Red Wing — The Communist Party of Brazil Red Wing originated from a group of militants of the PCdoB who, upon returning from China in 1966, diverged from the positions of the Central Committee. They were expelled and soon after formed their own party. Their main document of criticism was titled *Critique of the Opportunism and Subjectivism of the Union of Brazilians to Free the Country from the Crisis, Dictatorship, and Neo-Colonialist threat.*

the particularities in contradiction and is as crucial as that of its universality.

In *On Contradiction*, Chairman Mao states that: "...if in any process there are a number of contradictions, one of them must be the principal contradiction playing the leading and decisive role, while the rest occupy a secondary and subordinate position." Regarding the issue of the thesis of the VI Conference (1966) asserting that there were **two principal contradictions**, this was well addressed at the time by the Red Wing. There is no exception to the rule: "But whatever happens, there is no doubt at all that at every stage in the development of a process, there is only one principal contradiction which plays the leading role." insists Chairman Mao. He concretely demonstrated the determination of a principal contradiction in three different cases in revolutionary processes: The first example, "...in capitalist society the two forces in contradiction, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, form the principal contradiction. The other contradictions, such as those between the remnant feudal class and the bourgeoisie, between the peasant petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie, between the proletariat and the peasant petty bourgeoisie, between the non-monopoly capitalists and the monopoly capitalists, between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism, among the capitalist countries and between imperialism and the colonies, are all determined or influenced by this principal contradiction."

In the second example, in semicolonial countries; "When imperialism carries on its oppression not by war, but by milder means — political, economic and cultural — the ruling classes in semi-colonial countries capitulate to imperialism, and the two form an alliance for the joint oppression of the masses of the people. At such a time, the masses often resort to civil war against the alliance of imperialism and the feudal classes, while imperialism often employs indirect methods rather than direct action in helping the reactionaries in the semi-colonial countries to oppress the people, and thus the internal contradictions become particularly sharp." This is the case of the democratic, agrarian, anti-feudal, and anti-imperialist revolution in its first phase. A third example is, "When a revolutionary civil war develops to the point of threatening the very existence of imperialism and its running dogs, the domestic reactionaries, imperialism often adopts other methods in order to maintain its rule; it either tries to split the revolutionary front from within or sends armed forces to help the domestic reactionaries directly. At such a time, foreign imperialism and domestic reaction stand quite openly at one pole while the masses of the people stand at the other pole, thus forming the principal contradiction which determines or influences the development

of the other contradictions.” This is the case of the democratic, agrarian, anti-feudal, and anti-imperialist revolution in its second phase, or simply the revolution of national liberation.

When we talk about principal and secondary contradictions, we are discussing subordination and conditionality. This subordination is expressed in relation to a phenomenon that contains various contradictions. As we understand well, in Brazil, there are many class contradictions, but the fundamental ones are three: between the vast majority of the nation and imperialism; between the poor peasantry, especially and the latifundium system; and between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. These are the three because the different and fundamental dominant and dominated social classes of the country, in their semi-colonial condition, oppressed by imperialism, especially Yankee imperialism, constitute an incomplete national process. According to the general laws of the country’s economic and social development, the revolution is characterized as national-democratic, anti-feudal agrarian, and anti-imperialist, uninterrupted towards socialism. It has two stages that proceed uninterruptedly, with the first demanding the resolution of contradictions between the peasantry and the latifundium system, and between the nation and imperialism, where confiscating bureaucratic capitalism is key to ensuring its uninterrupted transition to the second stage. In the second stage, a complete solution to the contradiction between the proletariat and the monopolistic bourgeoisie is sought. Contrary to what Amazonas says, choosing one as principal leads to opportunism; indeed, one of these is indeed the principal contradiction, and not being able to determine it correctly does lead to opportunism, which has always undermined the Communist Party throughout its history. In this case, what is the principal contradiction and why is it? To resolve this issue, it is necessary to carefully analyze all the contradictions of the phenomenon, examine their differences and particularities. To do this, it is necessary to examine the two aspects of each contradiction, seeking to understand what is general and specific, identity, and opposition in them, observed in their development. Without examining and understanding the particularities of the contradictions and their two aspects in their stages of development, one cannot accurately determine which contradiction in a process is principal.

In a certain phenomenon, a contradiction is principal when, for a specified period or stage, its resolution subordinates or conditions the resolution of the others. In the case of the Brazilian Revolution, among the dominant classes that constitute the principal aspect in each of the three contradictions, the

most decadent, archaic, and rotten is that of the latifundium. In turn, among the dominated and oppressed classes that constitute the secondary aspect of each of the three fundamental contradictions, the most oppressed and in a state of greater unrest is the poor peasantry, mainly. These are just some of the factors to be carefully observed; there are many others. After examining both aspects of each contradiction and the differences between them, we can briefly conclude from a set of factors that the most acute contradiction of all is that between the poor peasantry and the latifundium, which is expressed even more broadly as the contradiction between the popular masses and the old bureaucratic-latifundium State. The large mass of tens of millions of landless peasants, with little land or subjected to the exploitation of large landowners in our country, constitutes the most numerous force interested in the destruction of the latifundium system and, therefore, has been the target of constant and systematic massacres by the dominant classes and their State throughout the centuries. Of all the contradictions in the country, the one that the peasantry lives, perceives, and reveals the greatest interest in and demands urgency to resolve—and therefore has greater awareness of—is the conquest of land and the end of latifundium exploitation and oppression. In this struggle, the peasantry, under the leadership of the revolutionary proletarian communist party, will attain a new and higher level of consciousness, carrying out agrarian revolution and becoming the main force of the entire democratic revolution. This is always the case when it remains under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat through its revolutionary party, the communist party.

In order for the contradiction between the majority of the nation and imperialism to be resolved in favor of the popular masses, to transition from a situation of secondary or dominated aspect to the principal or dominant one in the contradiction, their forces must accumulate and be constituted at a higher level to defeat imperialist oppression in the political and military arena. This can only happen if the popular masses manage to accumulate strength and establish their armed forces. This problem, in turn, can only be resolved through agrarian revolution and the entirety of the revolutionary democratic movement. As the most revolutionary class, the proletariat, through its vanguard party, launches the revolutionary agrarian program as the basis for its alliance with the primarily poor peasantry. In the struggle to take over the lands of the latifundium and hand them over to landless or small-landed peasants, the forces in the struggle – under the leadership of the Communist Party, through revolutionary armed struggle – gradually consti-

tute the people's army and the revolutionary united front as a new Power in construction, defending the interests of the classes in the revolutionary countryside, grouping all possible forces of this field by phases and stages until they triumph. Even before complete triumph, and to the extent that imperialism and its lackeys in the country are threatened to be swept away, there is a tendency towards direct armed intervention by imperialism. At this moment, the main contradiction shifts to that between the vast majority of the nation and imperialism. It is then evident that the solution to the contradiction between the vast majority of the nation and imperialism was subordinate to the solution of the contradiction between the poor peasants and the latifundium.

The advancement in resolving the contradiction between the poor peasantry and landlords, although not completely resolved, has led to the strengthening of the secondary aspect of another contradiction. Consequently, this secondary contradiction becomes the principal one, creating conditions for its resolution in favor of the popular masses. The people's war then transitions from the phase of liberation war, expanding the scope of the revolutionary united front until its triumph across the entire country. This involves seizing the assets of the large bourgeoisie (monopolistic bourgeoisie in its bureaucratic and comprador fractions) and completing all tasks of agrarian revolution. By accumulating forces in this way, there is a continuous progression towards the tasks of socialist revolution and construction, corresponding to the resolution of the contradiction between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, socialism and capitalism, which has now become the principal contradiction. Successively, in phases and stages determined by the principal contradiction, the revolutionary struggle of the popular masses for the conquest of power advances. This transition shifts our society from bureaucratic capitalism to socialism, transforming the Brazilian nation from a senile colonial country to an independent one. The proletariat and other popular masses evolve from being dominated to becoming the dominant class. It can also be observed that during the process of resolving the principal contradiction, other secondary but fundamental contradictions progressively intensify and sharpen. Each of these, in turn, assumes the status of the principal contradiction. This occurs within the complexity of contradictions in a revolutionary process that is not uniform, gradual, and linear. On the contrary, it is contradictory, full of twists and turns, characterized by quantitative accumulations, qualitative leaps, and even zigzagging.

Here we can clearly observe that, in addition to the crude pseudo-dialectical

statements of Amazonas, other formulations in the history of the Party also made significant errors. Even with its essentially accurate criticism of the “Union of Brazilians to defeat the crisis, dictatorship, and neo-colonial threat,” the Red Wing pointed out as the main contradiction the one that opposed the “immense majority of the nation and imperialism and its internal social support,” arguing that this was the contradiction that corresponded to the entire current stage of the revolution, and that, with the coup d’etat, the national armed forces became a force of internal occupation. It is true that the main contradiction of a revolutionary process, at a certain moment, corresponds to the stage in which the revolution develops. However, the complexity of reality, phenomena, and contradictions in their stages of development requires greater efforts from revolutionaries in their investigations and analyses. It should be noted that stages have sub-stages or distinct phases, each with its peculiarities in the development of the process. In the case of the uninterrupted agrarian and anti-feudal and anti-imperialist democratic revolution towards socialism, among its three fundamental contradictions, the main one will not always be the one that concludes the entire stage of liberation from imperialism. To resolve it and move on to the next one, the socialist revolution, often requires starting with the agrarian revolution to enhance the strength of the popular masses, which constitute the secondary and dominated aspect of the process.

In the case of our country, after the military coup of 1964, it was not an easy situation to comprehend, as the military coup sponsored by imperialism, as a new fact in the country’s situation, appeared as a sharp contradiction with the Brazilian people. If popular reactions to the coup grew, and the Yankees intervened with troops, as was planned, the contradiction between the majority of the nation and imperialism and its internal social support would become the main one and could only be resolved by a national liberation war. Without such internal reaction, what actually happened was just a change in the management form of the State’s power system from the big bourgeoisie and servile landowners to imperialism. Thus, a revolutionary overthrow of the military from power would only be possible in a prolonged armed struggle that required the political and military organization of the popular masses, especially the poor peasants. As this process did not effectively take place, we can see that, with the role of the military management exhausted in defeating revolutionary forces, restructuring the old State, and driving economic, social, political, and cultural changes according to the Yankee imperialist post-war pattern and order, the local ruling classes

were able to recycle their dominance through what was called redemocratization or a return to the “Rule of Law.” Once the revolutionary resistance was defeated, the revolutionary forces capitulated, and the opportunistic reformist line prevailed, popular mobilizations for democratic freedoms and a constituent assembly, in the end, only served to endorse and legitimize the continuation of the old and corrupt State in the service of imperialism, now again under the guise of “democracy.” This “democracy,” exploited by all opportunists, including Amazonas with its peculiar “dialectic” and its revisionist association PCdoB, served them well to “prosper” (?!).

Revisionist “Critique” of Capitalist Restoration

To continue exposing the Marxist pseudo-critique from Amazonas at Maoism, we will address some of his other works and those of his followers. In 1990, the Anita Garibaldi publisher released *30 Years of Ideological Confrontation — Marxism vs. Revisionism*. It is a collection of articles by Lenin, Hoxha, Ramiz Alia, Amazonas, Luiz Fernandes, and other leaders of the PLA (Party of Labor of Albania). The articles are aimed at attacking “contemporary revisionism,” often using the qualifiers “Khrushchevist,” “Brezhnevist,” or “Gorbachevist.” Except for Hoxha’s articles, which occasionally release arbitrary remarks against “Mao,” and Luiz Fernandes’ article criticizing the capitalist restoration in the USSR, where he accuses Bettelheim of following the theses of “Mao Zedong,” what is called *30 Years of Ideological Confrontation — Marxism vs. Revisionism* boils down to criticizing Gorbachev’s “perestroika” as a continuation of Khrushchev and Brezhnev’s revisionism. The long-promised combat and continued exposure of the “dangerous Chinese revisionism of Mao Zedong” are conspicuously absent in this relentless compendium of 30 years of combating revisionism (from 1960 to 1990). Curious!

We would like to emphasize, before addressing the position of Amazonas and its epigone Fernandes, that in one of the articles signed by Ramiz Alia in 1990, speaking at a meeting of the CC of the PTA about the counter-revolutionary typhoon sweeping through the social-imperialist USSR and Eastern European states, he stated: “*We say that in Albania, the phenomena known in the East will not appear. Not because the actions and pressures*

from abroad on our country are weaker, but because there is a solid internal situation here, because in our country, the Party of Labor always takes the initiative, and its policies are in unity with the will of the masses.” Some time later, what was called the “beacon of socialism in the world” completely collapsed like a house of cards. More than that. Under the leadership of the same Ramiz Alia. What we want to emphasize here is not the fact that “socialist Albania” collapsed, given that the siege, pressure, and the entire international situation of counter-revolution raised by Gorbachev’s revisionism were an objectively powerful and undeniable destructive factor. And certainly, amid the great confusion that took hold of the minds of the masses throughout the East, many brave communists continued to fight for socialism. But what we want to emphasize is the shameful role played by Ramiz Alia and his revisionist clique.

The article *Social Transformations in the Epoch of Revolution and Imperialism — Critical Examination of the Crisis of Socialism* by Amazonas can be summarized as a set of “speculations” in the face of the counter-revolutionary typhoon of perestroika and the **velvet revolution**.³⁷ It reflects on what actually led to the “tragedy of socialism,” as Amazonas classified the restorationist processes. It is necessary to quote several passages from this article to respond more clearly to one of the essential questions of Marxism—the question of the State, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the existence of classes and class struggle in socialism throughout the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a crucial problem in Marxism and the struggle against revisionism and other bourgeois theories that seek to mystify the State. He asks: “*As a speculation — was there too much concentration of powers in the hands of certain individuals or certain directing bodies? Did the party/masses relationship function correctly? Was the Party, to some extent, a foreman of a large construction site rather than the driving force behind the organization, the decisive supporter of the initiative, and the creative work of the masses? Has the concept that the Party controls everything been exaggerated and opposed to the freedom of creation, expression, and manifestation of thought?*” and so on. At first glance, it seems unusual—an Amazonas being reflective and inquisitive, not the dogmatic one but a flexible investigator. Not at all! This is how Amazonas introduced his disguised march to then attack Stalin and also dismiss Hoxha, taking advantage of the counter-revolutionary offen-

³⁷Velvet Revolution - the name given by the reactionary press to the events in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

sive unfolding in the world. He argued that “It is not possible to scientifically explain the dominance of revisionism and the setback in the USSR simply by alleging the treacherous and Machiavellian activity of a Khrushchev or a Brezhnev.” He says nothing about China, not even repeating his thunderous assertions about “Mao Zedong’s Chinese revisionism.” It is evident that with the notorious simplicity of those who refused to study the conclusions and teachings, formulated more than 30 years ago³⁸ by Chairman Mao on the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it could only lead to this kind of pathetic questioning so many years later.

Giving way to his “speculations,” our bewildered Amazonas continues to grasp for explanations that will console him. *“We know that neither the State nor the Party are eternal. They fulfill tasks that lead to their own negation. In what manner and within what timeframe this dialectical process takes place is something to consider. Surely, they will not remain static. Everything indicates that it depends on the degree of intensification of the class struggle on a global scale and, especially, on the education of the masses, the dissemination and assimilation of socialist ideology, and the increasing integration of the people into public activities.”* Here, Amazonas vulgarizes the Marxist conception of the transition from capitalism to socialism in general, and from the lower phase of communism (socialism) to the higher phase in particular. Continuing, *“Stalin debated the problem of the disappearance of the State in the evolutionary march of society. A great theorist, a distinguished revolutionary leader, he justified the strengthening of the State in the USSR in the face of the aggression of capitalism. And he said, ‘The norms of our socialist state change and will continue to change, according to the development of our country and the changes in the external situation.’ In principle, the theses are correct.”* He then questions, *“But what really consisted, in the Soviet Union, especially after the Second World War, of the changes in the functions of the State? To what extent were steps taken to reduce the intervention of the power of the State in social relations, an intervention that should become superfluous in one field after another, as Engels foresaw?”* Amazonas takes the words of the classics (Engels in *Anti-Dühring*) [23] about such a transition, as the State cannot be abolished and as it withers away, to counterpose Stalin. *“Stalin, it seems, did not approach the question from this perspective.*

³⁸Refers to the time between 1956/57, when the CPC published *On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, On the Correct Handling of Contradictions within the People*, among others, and 1990, the date of the Amazonas PCdoB publications.

He considered the changes in the State not as a reduction of state intervention in one domain after another but as new responsibilities of the organs of Power. He [Stalin] says, for example, taking into account the disappearance of antagonistic classes, that 'In place of this function of suppression the state acquired the function of protecting Socialist property from thieves and pilferers of the people's property.' ” citing Stalin's report to the XVIII Congress of the CPSU(b) in March 1939.

Here it becomes quite clear that, although Amazonas, in his speculations about the “tragedy of socialism,” emphasizes the need to investigate the entire process of building socialism, he has already defined Stalin's direction as the central target of criticism. The old and worn-out cliché of all renegades and reactionaries, that Stalin is to blame for all evils. In fact, at the XVIII Congress of the CPSU in March 1939, in his report, Stalin, referring to misunderstandings in the Party that questioned why the old state machinery should not be thrown into the trash of history, replied that the question of the State in socialism as posed by the classics of Marxism was not understood correctly. He argued that the State could not be abolished, that it would gradually extinguish itself. These inquiries within the CPSU, in turn, were based on Stalin's own statements in his report indicating the “complete liquidation of the remnants of the exploiting classes.” In other words, they questioned if there was no longer anything to suppress, should not the State then disappear? Since it continued to exist, they proposed its abolition. In his response to these inquiries, Stalin provides a very precise exposition of the Marxist conception of the transition to communism and how the State gradually extinguishes itself. On this, Amazonas seems to agree with Stalin when he says, “In principle, the theses are correct,” but then, comparing it to the cited passage from Engels in *Anti-Dühring*, he states that “*Stalin, it seems, did not approach the question from this perspective.*” Let's see what and how Stalin clarifies in the controversy.

Referring to Engels' quotation that if it were fair, he responded: “Yes, it is correct, but only on one of two conditions: (1) if we study the Socialist state only from the angle of the internal development of the country, abstracting ourselves in advance from the international factor, isolating, for the convenience of investigation, the country and the state from the international situation; or (2) if we assume that Socialism is already victorious in all countries, or in the majority of countries, that a Socialist encirclement exists in stead of a capitalist encirclement, that there is no more danger of foreign at-

tack, and that there is no more need to strengthen the army and the state.”³⁹ Considering the concrete situation of the USSR, where socialism triumphed in one country, it asserts that under these conditions, “Two basic functions characterize the activity of the state: at home (the main function), to keep in restraint the exploited majority; abroad (not the main function), to extend the territory of its class, the ruling class, at the expense of the territory of other states, or to defend the territory of its own state from attack by other states. Such was the case in slave society and under feudalism. Such is the case under capitalism.”⁴⁰

And furthermore, in the case of the socialist state, which can only arise from the overthrow and destruction of the old bourgeois and landlord state, it is stated that: “But it does not follow that the new proletarian state may not preserve certain functions of the old state, changed to suit the requirements of the proletarian state. Still less does it follow that the forms of our Socialist state must remain unchanged, that all the original functions of our state must be fully preserved in future. As a matter of fact, the forms of our state are changing and will continue to change in line with the development of our country and with the changes in the international situation.”⁴¹ Stalin then quotes Lenin, who, after stating that bourgeois state forms are very varied but their essence is the same, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, says, “The transition from capitalism to Communism will certainly create a great variety and abundance of political forms, but their essence will inevitably be the same: the dictatorship of the proletariat.”⁴² Here, Stalin demonstrates perfect harmony with what Engels proposed, rejecting Amazonas’ speculations. However, this means that as long as classes or remnants of classes exist, the dictatorship of the proletariat must exist, and only when they completely disappear will the state (dictatorship of the proletariat) begin to wither away, ceasing to interfere in society in one field, activity, or matter after another until it extinguishes, never before that. Nevertheless, as long as it exists, it must strengthen and improve itself and not weaken as Amazonas desires with his vulgar interpretation of Marxism and his petty-bourgeois liberal conclusions of “more freedom.”

So what is right and wrong in all this controversy? In our view, Stalin’s

³⁹Stalin — *Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, 1939.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*

⁴¹*Ibid.*

⁴²*Ibid.*, quoting Lenin in his work *The State and Revolution*.

exposition is essentially correct regarding the interpretation of Marxist classics as a general concept. And in its application in concrete reality (the USSR)? Yes and no. Yes, regarding the inquiries at the time in the CPSU about the general conceptualization, which were wrong, as are the conclusions that Amazonas draws in the form of speculations. And no, regarding Stalin's understanding when he classifies the functions of the State as being of two types, designating them as principal and non-principal. We will clarify this issue further. In Amazonas' case, this was initially the case, later his PCdoB went on babbling that Stalin's mistake was that, instead of weakening the socialist State, he strengthened it more and more. And with this chant, they openly joined the reactionary chorus of anti-Stalinism and, once again, played into the hands of Khrushchev revisionism. But if Stalin is essentially correct in his assessments, where then is the problem of restoration? There is something wrong with Stalin's position on the issue. Stalin's mistake in this matter lies in the application of the general concept of Marxist-Leninist classics to concrete reality, and there are two: one, whether it is possible to transition to communism in one or some countries alone, and two, about the existence of classes and class struggle in socialism, about its form and where the antagonism lies in this struggle throughout the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Specifically: 1) considering that one or some countries can transition to communism independently. This leads to attributing functions to the State that are not essentially that of a "special repressive force"⁴³ in the class struggle. Stalin in his formulation highlights the two fundamental types of State function, the internal "special repressive force" which he characterizes as principal, and the external action (attack and/or defense of the given country), which he characterizes as non-principal. The problem is that the function of a special repressive force is not simply a principal type of State function; it is its essence, others are consequences. In other words, if the essence disappears, the State phenomenon disappears, leaving the administration of things.

Stalin performs this exercise when systematizing the Soviet experience into two phases, the first being from the establishment of Soviet power in 1917 until the "suppression of the exploiting minority" and the second "from the elimination of the capitalist elements in town and country to the complete victory of the Socialist economic system and the adoption of the new

⁴³Engels — *Anti-Dühring*

Constitution.”⁴⁴ He asserts that in the first phase, the socialist state carried out its “principal” function of suppressing the resistance of defeated exploitative classes, organizing the defense of the country against external aggression, restoring the economy, developing the socialist economy, and eliminating capitalist elements. In the second phase, the “principal task in this period was to establish the Socialist economic system all over the country and to eliminate the last remnants of the capitalist elements, to bring about a cultural revolution, and to form a thoroughly modern army for the defense of the country.”⁴⁵ He characterizes this by stating that “The function of military suppression inside the country ceased, died away; for exploitation had been abolished, there were no more exploiters left, and so there was no one to suppress. In place of this function of suppression the state acquired the function of protecting Socialist property from thieves and pilferers of the people’s property.”⁴⁶ His understanding of the concrete situation in the USSR stems from his conception of the existence of classes and class struggle, as well as their forms throughout the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is another aspect we highlight in his error on the issue. Chairman Mao, in his systematizations of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, correctly concluded that **“We all enter communism, or no one enters.”** He thus posed that communism in one or a few countries was not possible. For this reason, the issue of transitioning to communism poses a great challenge for the world proletarian revolution. Confirming what Lenin had stated and what Stalin himself cites in his explanation but interprets differently, that in the various forms that the socialist state takes in the transition process, it will always be the **dictatorship of the proletariat**, and thus its essence as a special force of repression does not change. And why? Because classes continue to exist in their gradual process of disappearance. In other words, although Comrade Stalin affirms and observes, in the reality of the USSR, an end to the repressive function of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it continued to be a special force of repression because classes persisted, and its management was incorrect, understood exclusively as the repression of the “thieves and pilferers of the people’s property,” in reality one of the concrete forms of class struggle of the defeated bourgeoisie against the proletariat and its domination. By not understanding the problem in this

⁴⁴Stalin — *Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, 1939.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*

⁴⁶*Ibid.*

way, over time, the bourgeoisie won the struggle with the capitalist restoration led by the revisionist clique of Khrushchev.

And 2) to consider the existence of classes, class struggle and its form in socialism, in every period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Stalin's misunderstanding of the problem of the disappearance of classes in socialism led him to state as early as 1939 that they had completely disappeared in the USSR.⁴⁷ For this very reason, he understood that the socialist state would change its functions and would only have to continue to promote the economy and culture, as well as defending the USSR from possible external aggression. This was an important error on Stalin's part regarding the existence of classes and the class struggle throughout the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In *On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World*,⁴⁸ the CPC demonstrated that: "Following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat was established in the Soviet Union, capitalist private ownership was destroyed and socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership were established through the nationalization of industry and the collectivization of agriculture, and great achievements in socialist construction were scored during several decades. All this constituted an indelible victory of tremendous historic significance won by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. However, the old bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes which had been overthrown in the Soviet Union were not eradicated and survived after industry was nationalized and agriculture collectivized. The political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie remained. Spontaneous capitalist tendencies continued to exist both in the city and in the countryside. New bourgeois elements and kulaks were still incessantly generated. Throughout the long intervening period, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads have continued in the political, economic and ideological spheres."

Continuing, "As the Soviet Union was the first, and at the time the only, country to build socialism and had no foreign experience to go by, and as

⁴⁷Stalin — *Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, 1939. — "...the remnants of the exploiting classes have been completely eliminated." And "...no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes..."

⁴⁸Ninth commentary of the CPC on the Letter from the CC of the CPSU to the CC of the CPC in response to the Chinese publication of the 1963 *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*.

Stalin departed from Marxist-Leninist dialectics in his understanding of the laws of class struggle in socialist society, he prematurely declared after agriculture was basically collectivized that there were ‘no longer antagonistic classes’ in the Soviet Union and that it was ‘free of class conflicts,’ one-sidedly stressed the internal homogeneity of socialist society and overlooked its contradictions, failed to rely upon the working class and the masses in the struggle against the forces of capitalism and regarded the possibility of restoration of capitalism as associated only with armed attack by international imperialism. This was wrong both in theory and in practice. Nevertheless, Stalin remained a great Marxist-Leninist. As long as he led the Soviet Party and state, he held fast to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist course, pursued a Marxist-Leninist line and ensured the Soviet Union’s victorious advance along the road of socialism.” Here, therefore, is an explanation regarding the existence of classes and class struggle in socialism, in the Soviet experience, and where comrade Stalin erred on this crucial issue. We will delve deeper into the matter ahead when refuting Fernandes’ criticisms.

Resuming the question of the possibility or impossibility of communism in one or more countries. It becomes evident that there were (and still are) many confusions regarding this matter. Let’s see, if socialism is a transitional phase that requires the dictatorship of the proletariat, and this is (the State,) in other words, the instrument of one class to repress another, it is because there are classes and class struggle. Therefore, the State will only disappear when classes disappear, as a direct consequence of this. Furthermore, imperialism is a global system, and the bourgeoisie is an international class within it, so it continues to influence within the socialist country through the old defeated and expropriated classes, but not eliminated. Hence, their new representatives will inevitably be present, whether covert or not, in the communist party, in the organs of the socialist State, and in all economic and cultural spheres of society. Therefore, classes will only truly and completely disappear as a global phenomenon, more or less simultaneously in all countries, or at least in the vast majority, in what is fundamental to these countries.

The Khrushchevist opportunism sought to rely on formulations about the State in communism, with its “State of the whole people,” as if Soviet society were entering communism, when in fact it was to cover up its bourgeois restorationist policy. In its cunning polemic with the CPC in 1963, it even cited a passage from Marx’s *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, where he says:

“the future nature of the state (Staatswesen in German) of communist society...” However, in *On Khrushchev’s Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World*, it completely exposed him by stating that “They gleefully announced that the Chinese would not dare to quote this from Marx. Apparently the revisionist Khrushchev clique think this is very helpful to them. As it happens Lenin seems to have foreseen that revisionists would make use of this phrase to distort Marxism. In his Marxism on the State, Lenin gave an excellent explanation of it. He said, ‘...the dictatorship of the proletariat is a ‘political transition period..’ But Marx goes on to speak of ‘the future nature of the state (gosudarstvennost in Russian, Staatswesen in German) of communist society!!’ Thus, there will be a state even in ‘communist society’!! Is there not a contradiction in this?’ Lenin answered, ‘No.’ He then tabulated the three stages in the process of development from the bourgeois state to the withering away of the state: The first stage – in bourgeois society, the state is needed by the bourgeoisie – the bourgeois state. The second stage – in the period of transition from capitalism to communism, the state is needed by the proletariat – the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The third stage – in communist society, the state is not necessary, it withers away. He concluded: ‘Complete consistency and clarity!!’ In Lenin’s tabulation, only the bourgeois state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the withering away of the state are to be found. By precisely this tabulation Lenin made it clear that when communism is reached the state withers away and becomes non-existent.”

The underlying question of all this controversy lies in the conception of the existence or non-existence of classes and class struggle in socialism, the lower phase of communism that requires the dictatorship of the proletariat to lead to the complete abolition of classes and their transition to the higher phase. In Amazonas’ criticisms of Chairman Mao, regarding the existence of the bourgeoisie in socialism and his assertion that in socialism the antagonistic contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie could become non-antagonistic, it was argued that such statements constituted absurd distortions of Marxist-Leninist theory. Indeed, his disciple Fernandes, with the aim of attacking Maoism in the aforementioned publication,⁴⁹ in “Marxism and the discussion about the nature of Soviet society,” (“O marxismo e a discussão sobre a natureza da sociedade soviética”) states that the Chinese

⁴⁹ 30 Years of Ideological Confrontation — Marxism vs. Revisionism (30 anos de confronto ideológico — marxismo x revisionismo)

critique of the USSR's situation was erroneous, non-Marxist, and highlights a quote from Hoxha affirming this transformation of contradictions in socialism. First, Fernandes says, *“The texts elaborated by the Chinese Communist Party on this issue are not very successful either. Starting with the fact that there is no major work that seeks to deepen the discussion on the current nature of the Soviet Union, but only scattered publications. In general, especially during the dominance of the so-called ‘Gang of Four,’ Chinese analyses tend to slip into the field of idealism.”* Fernandes asserts that classes do not exist in socialism and that class struggle in it is only the manifestation of the struggle between the capitalist road and the socialist road.

To support his claims that there are no classes in socialism in an attempt to refute Maoist formulations that assert the existence of classes and class struggle in socialism, and that the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist and capitalist paths, becomes more intense in socialism, he transcribes the following quotes from Lenin: “Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it.” “What are classes in general? Classes are that which permits one section of society to appropriate the labor of another section. If one section of society appropriates all the land, we have a landowner class and a peasant class. If one section of society owns the factories, shares and capital, while another section works in these factories, we have a capitalist class and a proletarian class.” These are quotes of a general conceptual nature, taken respectively from *A Great Beginning* and *The Tasks of the Youth Leagues*. With this, Fernandes asserts that it is not supported by Marxism to affirm the existence of classes in socialism. He says that Maoists confuse the political regime (dictatorship of the proletariat) with the mode of production (socialism). He, who denies Marxism, contends that in one way or another, the superstructure of society is a projection or reflection of its material base. In the case of the socialist revolution, the proletariat destroys the bourgeois state (bourgeois dictatorship) and establishes the socialist state (dictatorship of the proletariat) to transform the relations of production, putting an end to exploitation. In socialism, the proletariat is the dominant class, and the bourgeoisie, defeated and expropriated but not annihilated, is the dominated class. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the concentrated

expression in the superstructure of its class domination and the existing social relations in the material base of society **in transition**. And as such, it must exist until the complete disappearance of classes and to ensure their disappearance.

Let's then take here, from the same text by Lenin, *A Great Beginning*, the continuation of the quote extracted by Fernandes, which he did not dare to cite and deliberately omitted: "Clearly, in order to abolish classes completely, it is not enough to overthrow the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, not enough to abolish **their** rights of ownership; it is necessary also to abolish **all** private ownership of the means of production, it is necessary to abolish the distinction between town and country, as well as the distinction between manual workers and brain workers." (emphasis in bold by Lenin, underlining is ours). But let's look at other quotes from Lenin on the issue, not general concepts, but on socialism and the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And we will take them abundantly because this is a question that all communists must understand well and master to avoid falling into revisionism. In *Economics And Politics In The Era Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat*, a text published in the same volume as *A Great Beginning*, both from his complete works in 1919, he assesses: "Theoretically, there can be no doubt that between capitalism and communism there lies a definite transition period which must combine the features and properties of both these forms of social economy. This transition period has to be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism—or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble. The necessity for a whole historical era distinguished by these transitional features should be obvious not only to Marxists, but to any educated person who is in any degree acquainted with the theory of development." Here he characterized socialism as a transitional period.

He goes on to highlight the peculiarities of Russia to assert that, essentially, the transitional period is common to all countries, whether advanced or backward capitalists: "In Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in certain particulars from what it would be in the advanced countries, owing to the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country. But the basic forces—and the basic forms of social economy—are the same in Russia as in any capitalist country, so that the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance. The basic forms of social economy are capitalism, petty commodity production, and com-

munism. The basic forces are the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie (the peasantry in particular) and the proletariat." It is evident that Fernandes could not present Lenin's entire argumentation, so he only took the general concept of classes that he presents.

In the sequence, Lenin shows how classes continue in socialism after the socialization of the means of production in essence, stating: "Socialism means the abolition of classes. In order to abolish classes it is necessary, first, to overthrow the landowners and capitalists. This part of our task has been accomplished, but it is only a part, and moreover, not the most difficult part. In order to abolish classes it is necessary, secondly, to abolish the difference between factory worker and peasant, to make workers of all of them. This cannot be done all at once. This task is incomparably more difficult and will of necessity take a long time." (emphasis in bold by Lenin, underlining is ours). He emphasizes that "It is not a problem that can be solved by overthrowing a class. It can be solved only by the organisational reconstruction of the whole social economy, by a transition from individual, disunited, petty commodity production to large-scale social production. This transition must of necessity be extremely protracted. It may only be delayed and complicated by hasty and incautious administrative and legislative measures. It can be accelerated only by affording such assistance to the peasant as will enable him to effect an immense improvement in his whole farming technique to reform it radically. In order to solve the second and most difficult part of the problem, the proletariat, after having defeated the bourgeoisie, must unswervingly conduct its policy towards the peasantry along the following fundamental lines. The proletariat must separate, demarcate the working peasant from the peasant owner, the peasant worker from the peasant huckster, the peasant who labors from the peasant who profiteers. In this demarcation lies the **whole essence** of socialism." (emphasis by Lenin).

Regarding this issue about the differences between workers and peasants, we take this opportunity to clarify its meaning and importance for the complete abolition of classes. In the reality of building socialism, with the socialization of the means of production and the collectivization of agriculture, two types of socialist property emerged: the property of the entire people and co-operative property (called kolkhoz in the case of the USSR). The latter gave rise to commodity production and, therefore, continued to be a source and basis for capitalist restoration. This situation clearly indicated a significant difference between workers and peasants. Stalin saw this clearly. In his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, he addresses this in detail and

even points out the need to transform cooperative kolkhoz property into the property of the entire people to eliminate such differences. He indicates the need to increase production under the system of the property of the entire people as a way to balance production between the two property systems and eliminate commodity relations. However, in his critique of the management of the Soviet economy and Stalin's work, Chairman Mao points out that Stalin does not explain how to carry out this process. This relates precisely to the forms of conducting the class struggle by the proletariat, which is the **proletarian cultural revolution**. That is, both to increase production under the system of the property of the entire people and to transform kolkhoz property into the property of the entire people, a great ideological transformation in society was necessary. This transformation could only be achieved under the leadership of the proletariat, through its dictatorship in all domains. This aligns with what Lenin had emphasized: **the omnipotent dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie**. Therefore, Chairman Mao highlights the complete absence, evident in Stalin's theoretical work, regarding the permanent mobilization of the masses, the central role of ideological struggle, and the struggle of proletarian ideology against all manifestations of bourgeois ideology.

Still reaffirming the existence of classes, Lenin says: "Socialism means the abolition of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has done all it could to abolish classes. But classes cannot be abolished at one stroke. And classes **still remain and will remain** in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship will become unnecessary when classes disappear. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat they will not disappear. Classes have remained, but in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat every class has undergone a change, and the relations between the classes have also changed. The class struggle does not disappear under the dictatorship of the proletariat; it merely assumes different forms. Under capitalism the proletariat was an oppressed class, a class which had been deprived of the means of production, the only class which stood directly and completely opposed to the bourgeoisie, and therefore the only one capable of being revolutionary to the very end. Having overthrown the bourgeoisie and conquered political power, the proletariat has become the **ruling class**; it wields state power, it exercises control over means of production already socialised; it guides the wavering and intermediary elements and classes; it crushes the increasingly stubborn resistance of the exploiters. All these are **specific** tasks of the class struggle, tasks which the proletariat formerly did not and could

not have set itself. The class of exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, has not disappeared and cannot disappear all at once under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The exploiters have been smashed, but not destroyed. They still have an international base in the form of international capital, of which they are a branch. They still retain certain means of production in part, they still have money, they still have vast social connections. Because they have been defeated, the energy of their resistance has increased a hundred and a thousandfold. The 'art' of state, military and economic administration gives them a superiority, and a very great superiority, so that their importance is incomparably greater than their numerical proportion of the population. The class struggle waged by the overthrown exploiters against the victorious vanguard of the exploited, i.e., the proletariat, has become incomparably more bitter." (emphasis in bold by Lenin, underlining is ours).

Here we have, therefore, the foundations of Lenin in the midst of the whirlwind of the proletarian revolution facing the initial steps of socialist construction. These issues were revisited and developed by Chairman Mao as early as 1957 and extensively addressed in *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*. They were further elaborated in 1959 in the *Reading Notes On The Soviet Text "Political Economy"* and on *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* by Stalin. Later, in 1963, during the sharp struggle against Khrushchev's modern revisionism, in the *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement* and the *Nine Commentaries*, Mao reaffirmed them. In *On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism....*: "socialist society covers a very long historical period. Classes and class struggle continue to exist in this society, and the struggle still goes on between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism. The socialist revolution on the economic front (in the ownership of the means of production) is insufficient by itself and cannot be consolidated. There must also be a thorough socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts. Here a very long period of time is needed to decide 'who will win' in the struggle between socialism and capitalism. Several decades won't do it; success requires anywhere from one to several centuries. On the question of duration, it is better to prepare for a longer rather than a shorter period of time. On the question of effort, it is better to regard the task as difficult rather than easy. It will be more advantageous and less harmful to think and act in this way. Anyone who fails to see this or to appreciate it fully will make

tremendous mistakes. During the historical period of socialism it is necessary to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution through to the end if the restoration of capitalism is to be prevented, socialist construction carried forward and the conditions created for the transition to communism.”

In this period, he earnestly warned, “Never forget the classes and the class struggle,” and soon, in a masterful systematization, made the prediction: “Class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment are the three great revolutionary movements for building a mighty socialist country. These movements are a sure guarantee that communists will be free from bureaucracy and immune against revisionism and dogmatism, and will forever remain invincible. They are a reliable guarantee that the proletariat will be able to unite with the broad working masses and realize a democratic dictatorship. If in the absence of these movements, the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and monsters of all kinds were allowed to crawl out, while our cadres were to shut their eyes to all this and in many cases fail even to differentiate between the enemy and ourselves but were to collaborate with the enemy and were corrupted, divided and demoralized by him, if our cadres were thus pulled out or the enemy were able to sneak in, and if many of our workers, peasants and intellectuals were left defenseless against both the soft and the hard tactics of the enemy, then it would not take long, perhaps only several years or a decade, or several decades at most, before a counter-revolutionary restoration on a national scale inevitably occurred, the Marxist-Leninist party would undoubtedly become a revisionist party or fascist party, and the whole of China would change its color.”

This question has been at the center of the ideological-political struggle the entire time and was the contention of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that, for ten years, prevented the restoration of capitalism in China. Chairman Mao declared, “The great proletarian Cultural Revolution is in essence a great political revolution under socialist conditions by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. It is the continuation of the long struggle against the Kuomintang reactionaries waged by the CPC and the broad revolutionary masses under its leadership. It is continuation of the struggle between the proletariat [and the] bourgeoisie.” Emphasizing its role in the economic sphere, he stated, “The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a powerful driving force for the development of

the social productive forces in our country.” In the ideological realm, its basic problem is guided by the principle of “fighting against the concept of private ownership and criticizing and repudiating revisionism.” “Therefore the great proletarian Cultural Revolution is a great revolution that touches the souls of the people and solves the problem of a world view for the people.” Thus, in 1967, Chairman Mao reaffirmed to a military delegation from Albania: “Now I would like to ask you a question: What would you say is the goal of the Great Cultural Revolution? (Someone answered on the spot: It is to struggle against power holders within the party who take the capitalist road.) To struggle against power holders who take the capitalist road is the main task, but it is by no means the goal. The goal is to solve the problem of world outlook: it is the question of eradicating the roots of revisionism. The Central Committee has emphasized time and again that the masses must educate themselves and liberate themselves. This is because world outlook cannot be imposed on them. In order to transform ideology, it is necessary for the external causes to function through inner causes, though the latter are principal. If the world outlook is not transformed, how can the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution be called a victory? If the world outlook is not transformed, then although there are 2,000 power holders taking the capitalist road in this Great Cultural Revolution, there may be 4,000 next time.”

In the end, Fernandes’ aspirations to attack Maoism and emphasize Hoxha’s positions, asserting that his is the only Marxist stance critical of the capitalist restoration in the USSR, which the PCdoB shares, are nothing more than musty and shameful maneuvers. Let’s examine the absurdity to which he stoops. He highlights the following quote from Hoxha in 1977, in *Some Fundamental Questions of the Revolutionary Policy of the Party of Labor of Albania for the Development of the Class Struggle*: “*The class struggle is the main motive force, not only in society with antagonistic classes, but in every society divided into classes, including socialist society... The Party has always made it clear that antagonistic contradictions have not disappeared in our country with the elimination of the exploiting classes as such; they exist along with the non-antagonistic contradictions. The fundamental antagonistic contradiction is always the contradiction between socialism and capitalism, between the socialist road and the capitalist road... The bitter experience of the Soviet Union has shown that as long as the fundamental contradiction has not been resolved, in the ideological field, too, the fundamental contradiction in the political and economic fields cannot be considered as solved*

completely and finally, that is, the triumph of the socialist revolution cannot be considered complete and final. Thus, neither with the seizure of power, nor with the construction of the economic base of socialism is the question, ‘who will win,’ resolved finally, in other words, the fundamental contradiction between socialism and capitalism, between the socialist and capitalist road is not resolved finally. This fundamental contradiction remains during the whole period of the transition to communism. If the class struggle is not waged correctly and ceaselessly, not only in the ideological field, but also in the political and economic fields, the possibility exists of the transformation of non-antagonistic contradictions into antagonistic ones.” Fernandes, full of jubilation, displays this quote to affirm that this is the correct conception. He just doesn’t mention where Hoxha copied the part that is correct more than twenty years late,⁵⁰ and that he did it only to chatter and, in practice, sabotage its implementation. Let’s look at Fernandes’ inconsistencies.

In this quote, Hoxha asserts that classes exist in socialism, but emphasizes that the antagonistic contradiction is only between capitalism and socialism, not between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. So, where does the bourgeoisie come from in the capitalist restoration? Does it come from outside the country or like a rabbit pulled out of the hat of the revisionist magician? Where did the bourgeoisie in capitalist restoration in Albania come from if not from Hoxha’s own ranks? As for plagiarism, Hoxha was a master; he went so far as to claim that the famous formulations **Two Whatevers and Three Represents**⁵¹ were his own creations!

The question that has always been and is at the foundation of all this theoretical and ideological struggle is the question of freedom and democracy. Whether in *A Great Beginning, Economics And Politics In The Era Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat*, and others by Lenin, as well as all the material mentioned here, it is about the struggle that Lenina, Stalin, and Chairman Mao waged against the opportunists and revisionists and their petty-bourgeois liberal conceptions of freedom and democracy. In Stalin’s case, what happened was that due to his insufficient handling of dialectics and contradictions, by disregarding certain manifestations of these, he concluded that the struggle of police apparatuses could lead to their overcoming when it came to ideological issues that could only be addressed through a great

⁵⁰See page 69 of this publication, under the second item.

⁵¹Two Whatevers and Three Represents — As Chairman Mao summed up Khrushchev’s modern revisionism: Two Whatevers: All-People’s Party and All-People’s State. Three Represents: Peaceful Transition, Peaceful Coexistence and Peaceful Competition.

proletarian cultural revolution. For this reason, the innocent speculations of Amazonas—soon transformed into hostile positions towards Stalin—and the positions publicly exposed today by the leaders of the PCdoB (see debates on the challenge of socialism in the 21st century - Rabelo and Fernandes - vermelho.org.br),⁵² are nothing more than the same liberal refrains and whining about freedom and democracy from the petty bourgeoisie. In *A Great Beginning*, Lenin accused: “**Those who try to solve the problems involved in the transition from capitalism to socialism on the basis of general talk about liberty, equality, democracy in general equality of labor democracy, etc. (as Kautsky, Martov and other heroes of the Berne yellow International do), thereby only reveal their petty-bourgeois, philistine nature and ideologically slavishly follow in the wake of the bourgeoisie.**”

In summary, these are precisely the problems that are at the center of the controversy arising from the decisions of the XX Congress of the CPSU in 1956. The essence of the struggle between Marxism and modern revi-

⁵²Let's look at this contemporary gem, one of the comments from the lecture given by Fernandes in Brasília (March 2005), as part of the PCdoB debate on the “challenges of socialism in the 21st century.” When concluding about the “failed” experiences of socialism, he presents the following conclusions, according to comments from the website vermelho.org.br: “Luis Fernandes emphasized that *‘in societies where alienated and inherited values from the previous society still predominate, they end up generating various manifestations of departure and corporatism in practice. In other words, they cannot build a collective project for society because they shun the mechanism of mediation. Political mediation. All the socialist experiences of the 20th century dealt with this problem.’* ‘The solution found was for the leading party of the revolution to assert itself as the representative of the collective interest. However, in practice, this generated a process of merging the party with the state, in which the logic of real power within the state was not those mechanisms of direct and participatory democracy constitutionally envisaged based on Marx’s reading, but rather the hierarchical structure of the party’s own organization and deliberation. This situation, in which the party assumes state functions and begins to defend its own interests, stifled the full democratic development of socialist experiences.’ This is a great lesson from the socialist experience in the 20th century. For him [Fernandes], ‘this implies preserving mechanisms of representative democracy. Luis Fernandes emphasizes that there is indeed a practical problem, which is the need to structure political mediation in the socialist state. It means preserving, for much of the socialist transition, mechanisms of representation and political mediation to constitute the collective interest.’ ‘To the extent that this was not done, in the socialist experiences of the 20th century, there was a crisis generated by the party merged as the state, which transformed and distanced itself from the society that had generated it, consolidated privileges, and became increasingly unsympathetic to the rest of society,’ he explained.” (our emphasis).

sionism, in addition to the problem of revolutionary violence in the process of world revolution and the struggle against imperialism, is the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the existence of classes and class struggle in socialism, and the forms it takes, as well as the correct approach that the party of the proletariat must take to carry out the class struggle in the construction of socialism, against the danger of restoration, for the abolition of classes and the suppression of the validity of **bourgeois law** in society, for the complete elimination of differences between workers, peasants, and intellectuals, between the countryside and the city, between manual and intellectual labor, for the complete elimination of any vestiges of the oppression of women, and the gradual extinction of all forms of the state in the transition to communist society. These are problems that Amazonas and his followers have shown over time that they never read, understood, and resolved their contradictions with them according to old and worn-out revisionist formulas. And this is the basis on which their revisionist party led to rejecting and attacking Maoism, Comrade Stalin, and sweeping any traces of scientific socialism from their midst beyond empty rhetoric, renouncing the proletariat's experience in the revolution and socialist construction, and with which the PCdoB, with its fallacious "socialist program," attempts to cover up its current practice as an auxiliary force of reaction.

The Superiority, Validity and Invincibility of Maoism

In the Ninth Commentary, *On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World*,⁵³ the CPC, under the strict leadership of Chairman Mao, systematizes the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat and establishes the general line for the entire period of socialist construction and transition to communism. The approach to the problems of the relationship between power and society, and ideological-political leadership with the masses, is completely different from the point of view of the modern revisionists of the PCdoB. Although the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, as the living embodiment of this understanding and radical application of its advanced general line, mobilizing hundreds of millions of masses in the struggle for the power of the proletariat, has produced extraordinary advances, both theoretical and practical, the systematization presented in this document remains relevant. We will reproduce here this systematization, long but of utmost importance and necessity for the scientific ideology of the proletariat. "The main contents of the theories and policies advanced by Comrade Mao Zedong in this connection are as follows:

FIRST, it is necessary to apply the Marxist-Leninist law of the unity of opposites to the study of socialist society. The law of contradiction in all things, i.e., the law of the unity of opposites, is the fundamental law of

⁵³This is the ninth comment made by the CPC on the response letter from the Soviet revisionists to their letter dated June 14, 1963, titled *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, a document globally known as the *Chinese Letter*. The response from the Soviet revisionists to this letter from the CPC led the Chinese communists to make nine additional comments known as the *Nine Commentaries*. They are: *I – The Origins and Development of Differences Between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves*, *II – On the Question of Stalin*, *III – Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?*, *IV – Apologists of Neo-Colonialism*, *V – Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace*, *VI – Peaceful Coexistence - Two Diametrically Opposed Policies*, *VII – The Leaders of the CPSU Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Time*, *VIII – The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchev's Revisionism*, and *IX – On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World*. This collection of letters and documents is known as the "great debate of the communist world." Previously unpublished in Brazil, at least as a whole, they were published in 2003, including the two letters from the Soviet revisionists and another document from the Chinese communists titled *Why Khrushchev Fell*, under the title of *The Chinese Letter* by the Nucleus of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Studies.

materialist dialectics. It operates everywhere, whether in the natural world, in human society, or in human thought. The opposites in a contradiction both unite and struggle with each other, and it is this that forces things to move and change. Socialist society is no exception. In socialist society there are two kinds of social contradictions, namely, the contradictions among the people and those between ourselves and the enemy. These two kinds of social contradictions are entirely different in their essence, and the methods for handling them should be different, too. Their correct handling will result in the increasing consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the further strengthening and development of socialist society. Many people acknowledge the law of the unity of opposites but are unable to apply it in studying and handling questions in socialist society. They refuse to admit that there are contradictions in socialist society — that there are not only contradictions between ourselves and the enemy but also contradictions among the people — and they do not know how to distinguish between these two kinds of social contradictions and how to handle them correctly, and are therefore unable to deal correctly with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

SECOND, socialist society covers a very long historical period. Classes and class struggle continue to exist in this society, and the struggle still goes on between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism. The socialist revolution on the economic front (in the ownership of the means of production) is insufficient by itself and cannot be consolidated. There must also be a thorough socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts. Here a very long period of time is needed to decide 'who will win' in the struggle between socialism and capitalism. Several decades won't do it; success requires anywhere from one to several centuries. On the question of duration, it is better to prepare for a longer rather than a shorter period of time. On the question of effort, it is better to regard the task as difficult rather than easy. It will be more advantageous and less harmful to think and act in this way. Anyone who fails to see this or to appreciate it fully will make tremendous mistakes. During the historical period of socialism it is necessary to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution through to the end if the restoration of capitalism is to be prevented, socialist construction carried forward and the conditions created for the transition to communism.

THIRD, the dictatorship of the proletariat is led by the working class, with the worker-peasant alliance as its basis. This means the exercise of

dictatorship by the working class and by the people under its leadership over the reactionary classes and individuals and those elements who oppose socialist transformation and socialist construction. Within the ranks of the people democratic centralism is practised. Ours is the broadest democracy beyond the bounds of possibility for any bourgeois state.

FOURTH, in both socialist revolution and socialist construction it is necessary to adhere to the mass line, boldly to arouse the masses and to unfold mass movements on a large scale. The mass line of 'from the masses, to the masses' is the basic line in all the work of our Party. It is necessary to have firm confidence in the majority of the people and, above all, in the majority of the worker-peasant masses. We must be good at consulting the masses in our work and under no circumstances alienate ourselves from them. Both commandism and the attitude of one dispensing favours have to be fought. The full and frank expression of views and great debates are important forms of revolutionary struggle which have been created by the people of our country in the course of their long revolutionary fight, forms of struggle which rely on the masses for resolving contradictions among the people and contradictions between ourselves and the enemy.

FIFTH, whether in socialist revolution or in socialist construction, it is necessary to solve the question of whom to rely on, whom to win over and whom to oppose. The proletariat and its vanguard must make a class analysis of socialist society, rely on the truly dependable forces that firmly take the socialist road, win over all allies that can be won over, and unite with the masses of the people, who constitute more than ninety-five per cent of the population, in a common struggle against the enemies of socialism. In the rural areas, after the collectivization of agriculture it is necessary to rely on the poor and lower middle peasants in order to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance, defeat the spontaneous capitalist tendencies and constantly strengthen and extend the positions of socialism.

SIXTH, it is necessary to conduct extensive socialist education movements repeatedly in the cities and the countryside. In these continuous movements for educating the people we must be good at organizing the revolutionary class forces, enhancing their class consciousness, correctly handling contradictions among the people and uniting all those who can be united. In these movements it is necessary to wage a sharp, tit-for-tat struggle against the anti-socialist, capitalist and feudal forces — the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bourgeois rightists, and the embezzlers, grafters

and degenerates — in order to smash the attacks they unleash against socialism and to remould the majority of them into new men.

SEVENTH, one of the basic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat is actively to expand the socialist economy. It is necessary to achieve the modernization of industry, agriculture, science and technology, and national defense step by step under the guidance of the general policy of developing the national economy with agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor. On the basis of the growth of production, it is necessary to raise the living standards of the people gradually and on a broad scale.

EIGHTH, ownership by the whole people and collective ownership are the two forms of socialist economy. The transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people, from two kinds of ownership to a unitary ownership by the whole people, is a rather long process. Collective ownership itself develops from lower to higher levels and from smaller to larger scale. The people's commune which the Chinese people have created is a suitable form of organization for the solution of the question of this transition.

NINTH, 'Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend' is a policy for stimulating the growth of the arts and the progress of science and for promoting a flourishing socialist culture. Education must serve proletarian politics and must be combined with productive labor. The working people should master knowledge and the intellectuals should be come habituated to manual labor. Among those engaged in science, culture, the arts and education, the struggle to promote proletarian ideology and destroy bourgeois ideology is a protracted and fierce class struggle. It is necessary to build up a large detachment of working-class intellectuals who serve socialism and who are both 'red and expert,' i.e., who are both politically conscious and professionally competent, by means of the cultural revolution, and revolutionary practice in class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment.

TENTH, it is necessary to maintain the system of cadre participation in collective productive labor. The cadres of our Party and state are ordinary workers and not overlords sitting on the backs of the people. By taking part in collective productive labor, the cadres maintain extensive, constant and close ties with the working people. This is a major measure of fundamental importance for a socialist system; it helps to overcome bureaucracy and to prevent revisionism and dogmatism.

ELEVENTH, the system of high salaries for a small number of people should never be applied. The gap between the incomes of the working per-

sonnel of the Party, the government, the enterprises and the people's communes, on the one hand, and the incomes of the mass of the people, on the other, should be rationally and gradually narrowed and not widened. All working personnel must be prevented from abusing their power and enjoying special privileges.

TWELFTH, it is always necessary for the people's armed forces of a socialist country to be under the leadership of the Party of the proletariat and under the supervision of the masses, and they must always maintain the glorious tradition of a people's army, with unity between the army and the people and between officers and men. It is necessary to keep the system under which officers serve as common soldiers at regular intervals. It is necessary to practise military democracy, political democracy and economic democracy. Moreover, militia units should be organized and trained all over the country, so as to make everybody a soldier. The guns must forever be in the hands of the Party and the people and must never be allowed to become the instruments of careerists.

THIRTEENTH, the people's public security organs must always be under the leadership of the Party of the proletariat and under the supervision of the mass of the people. In the struggle to defend the fruits of socialism and the people's interests, the policy must be applied of relying on the combined efforts of the broad masses and the security organs, so that not a single bad person escapes or a single good person is wronged. Counter-revolutionaries must be suppressed whenever found, and mistakes must be corrected whenever discovered.

FOURTEENTH, in foreign policy, it is necessary to uphold proletarian internationalism and oppose great-power chauvinism and national egoism. The socialist camp is the product of the struggle of the international proletariat and working people. It belongs to the proletariat and working people of the whole world as well as to the people of the socialist countries. We must truly put into effect the fighting slogans, 'Workers of all countries, unite!' and 'Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!', resolutely combat the anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of imperialism and reaction and support the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed classes and oppressed nations. Relations among socialist countries should be based on the principles of independence, complete equality and the proletarian internationalist principle of mutual support and mutual assistance. Every socialist country should rely mainly on itself for its construction. If any socialist country practises national egoism in its foreign policy, or, worse yet,

eagerly works in partnership with imperialism for the partition of the world, such conduct is degenerate and a betrayal of proletarian internationalism.

FIFTEENTH, as the vanguard of the proletariat, the Communist Party must exist as long as the dictatorship of the proletariat exists. The Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the proletariat. The leading role of the proletariat is realized through the leadership of the Communist Party. The system of Party committees exercising leadership must be put into effect in all departments. During the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian party must maintain and strengthen its close ties with the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people, maintain and develop its vigorous revolutionary style, uphold the principle of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of its own country, and persist in the struggle against revisionism, dogmatism and opportunism of every kind.

In the light of the historical lessons of the dictatorship of the proletariat Comrade Mao Zedong has stated:

'Class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment are the three great revolutionary movements for building a mighty socialist country. These movements are a sure guarantee that Communists will be free from bureaucracy and immune against revisionism and dogmatism, and will forever remain invincible. They are a reliable guarantee that the proletariat will be able to unite with the broad working masses and realize a democratic dictatorship. If, in the absence of these movements, the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and ogres of all kinds were allowed to crawl out, while our cadres were to shut their eyes to all this and in many cases fail even to differentiate between the enemy and ourselves but were to collaborate with the enemy and become corrupted and demoralized, if our cadres were thus dragged into the enemy camp or the enemy were able to sneak into our ranks, and if many of our workers, peasants, and intellectuals were left defenseless against both the soft and the hard tactics of the enemy, then it would not take long, perhaps only several years or a decade, or several decades at most, before a counter-revolutionary restoration on a national scale inevitably occurred, the Marxist-Leninist party would undoubtedly become a revisionist party or a fascist party, and the

whole of China would change its color.⁵⁴

Comrade Mao Zedong has pointed out that, in order to guarantee that our Party and country do not change their colour, we must not only have a correct line and correct policies but must train and bring up millions of successors who will carry on the cause of proletarian revolution. In the final analysis, the question of training successors for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat is one of whether or not there will be people who can carry on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary cause started by the older generation of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not the leadership of our Party and state will remain in the hands of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not our descendants will continue to march along the correct road laid down by Marxism-Leninism, or, in other words, whether or not we can successfully prevent the emergence of Khrushchevite revisionism in China. In short, it is an extremely important question, a matter of life and death for our Party and our country. It is a question of fundamental importance to the proletarian revolutionary cause for a hundred, a thousand, nay ten thousand years. Basing themselves on the changes in the Soviet Union, the imperialist prophets are pinning their hopes of ‘peaceful evolution’ on the third or fourth generation of the Chinese Party. We must shatter these imperialist prophecies. From our highest organizations down to the grass-roots, we must everywhere give constant attention to the training and upbringing of successors to the revolutionary cause.”

The Finished Work of Callous Revisionists

However, even more interesting and illustrative, especially to see the outcome of all this bluster and theoretical acrobatics against Maoism, is the most recent publication of the revisionist PCdoB, entitled *In Defense of the Workers and the Brazilian People — Documents from the PC do Brasil from 1960 to 2000*. The collection opens with Maurício Grabois’ *Two Concepts, Two Political Orientations* and concludes with *500 Years of Struggle...* Attached is *In Defense of Brazil, Democracy, and Labor*, a manifesto signed by “democratic personalities” of the country, including some leaders of PCdoB, which the publication claims played a “prominent role in its preparation.” It

⁵⁴Mao Zedong, *Note on “The Seven Well-Written Documents of the Chekiang Province Concerning Cadres’ Participation in Physical Labor,”* May 9, 1963.

is a solemn mishmash of anti-neoliberalism of the purest civic-patriotic spirit that unified the opportunist front in opposition to FHC⁵⁵ and now wallows (or wallows in the mud) in the management of the old State. The publication literally censors the best that the Communist Party of Brazil has formulated in its history, namely *People's War, the path of armed struggle in Brazil* of 1969 and *Great Progress in the Cultural Revolution*⁵⁶ of 1967, when the resolutions of the VI Congress (of course, included in the collection) focus their attacks on them. But what seems really interesting to us, and is actually the last document in said collection, published in the form of an "Appendix for reference," is nothing more and nothing less than the famous *Declaration of March 1958*, against which the struggle against opportunism arose, the split of 1962 was prepared, and which is the target of attack in the first document of the same collection. What revisionism was formulating back in 1958, and which remarkably reflects *ipsi litteris, ipsissima verba*⁵⁷ the position of this revisionist crust called PCdoB of Amazonas and Rabelo, serving as historical basis, reference, and current validity for the merger of PCdoB and PCB revisionists today. This is the great historical meeting of seasoned revisionists, twenty years later, under the spirit of the *Declaration of March 1958*. This is, finally, the finished work of Amazonas and his revisionist critique of Maoism.

Conclusion

For a long time and even today, the general opinion, particularly within the leftist circles, regarding Amazonas' trajectory in the Communist Party of Brazil during the period from 1962 (Reconstruction) to the time marked by the end of the Araguaia Guerrilla, is that he and the PCdoB had adopted Mao Zedong Thought as their ideological guide. Some refer to them as Maoists during this phase. This is how the reaction treated them when launching its bloodthirsty hordes against the party, the guerrillas, and the population in the Araguaia region to destroy the "Chinese-line subversive organization." The fact is that, after the Reconstruction of 1962, the party leadership, although it had never accepted Khrushchev's frantic attacks on Stalin, did

⁵⁵RedLibrary: Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the President of Brazil from 1995 to 2002.

⁵⁶This essay is by Pedro Pomar, a prominent communist leader and member of the Central Committee of the PCdoB.

⁵⁷Ipsi litteris: (Latin) - with the same letters, in the same terms, as it is written. Ipsissima verba: (Latin) - with the very same words, exactly.

not have a clear understanding of the problem of Khrushchev's modern revisionism. In fact, as recorded in various testimonies from participants in the Reconstruction process, the PCdoB leadership sought alignment with the revisionist party of the USSR and the Communist Party of Cuba on the international stage. They were rejected by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), which at the time trusted the group led by Luis Carlos Prestes, which had consolidated the revisionist position dictated by Moscow with the party's V Congress (1960), and by the Communist Party of Cuba, which had already allied with the Peasant Leagues of Francisco Julião and later with the ALN⁵⁸ of Carlos Marighela. Only after this attempt failed did the leadership of the PCdoB turn to the Communist Party of China (CPC).

The adoption by the leadership of the PCdoB of the "ideas of Mao Zedong Thought" did not go much beyond the formal and dogmatic aspect, as it never delved into a deep study and ideological struggle within the party around them. Although the party's propaganda materials during that period seemed to strongly indicate this adherence, it was never a unanimous and tranquil matter within the PCdoB. In fact, it faced strong opposition in the form of passive resistance throughout the time. Our investigations into the history of the Communist Party of Brazil led us to conclude that dogmatism, as a form of subjectivism, so clearly and consistently present in Amazonas' positions, was the main factor that undermined the deepening of the ideological struggle in the PCdoB. This struggle is necessary and vital to develop a line corresponding to the concrete reality of the country, guided by the universal truths of Marxism. Moreover, Amazonas' behavior makes him the carrier of the ideological deviations of the old party (before the Reconstruction of 1962), of a subjectivist type in the form of dogmatism, and its main transmitter in the process of Reconstruction and beyond.

And this has enormous significance, as this period (from 1962, Reconstruction, to 1976, "Lapa Massacre") was the period in the entire history of the Communist Party of Brazil (since its founding in 1922) when the party truly constituted itself as a Marxist-Leninist communist party. As at that time Marxism had entered a new and third stage of its development, that of Maoism, a true communist party was required to be Marxist-Leninist-Maoist. Vestiges of old reformism and revisionism remained embedded within the party's leadership, hindering its ideological deepening towards Maoism. Finally, after the events in Lapa (December 1976), completing the physi-

⁵⁸RedLibrary: ALN stands for National Liberation Action.

cal elimination of the majority of the party's revolutionary cadre, under the continuous command of Amazonas, the revolutionary line of people's war was abandoned, completely liquidating the party as a Marxist-Leninist communist party and giving rise to another revisionist organization under the continuity of the acronym PCdoB.

In the articles and essays by Amazonas focused on criticizing Maoism, confirmed by his interviews, he never tired of demonstrating that the resistances to Maoism within the party (that is, mainly within it) were already present in the 1960s. He went so far as to assert that the PCdoB's alignment with China was due to the firm combat that the CPC, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, had waged against Soviet revisionism, generating much sympathy among revolutionaries worldwide, nothing more than that. As we have seen above, this did not happen quite that way. It is true that, following the alignment with the CPC, the leadership of the PCdoB came into contact with the struggle against modern revisionism that was taking place on a global scale at that time and participated in it. The party was publicly attacked by the CPSU in its response letter to the famous *Chinese Letter* from the CPC.⁵⁹

In the debates of the fateful meeting of the Central Committee of the PCdoB in December 1976,⁶⁰ in a general plea to deepen the assessment of the events in the Araguaia, Pedro Pomar presented a consistent evaluation highlighting the value of the experience, the fulfillment of the party's decision to pursue the revolutionary path of people's war, the heroism and spirit of sacrifice of the party leaders and militants who went there, the effort and integration with the peasants, practices and behaviors that earned the guerrillas enduring respect and admiration in the memory of the people throughout the region. This truth, not even the systematic counter-propaganda of the reaction and the capitulation imposed by the Amazonas leadership on the

⁵⁹ *Chinese Letter* - This is *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement* dated June 14, 1963. The Soviet revisionists' letter of reply to the Chinese communists, entitled *OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION TO ALL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS, TO ALL COMMUNISTS OF THE SOVIET UNION*, accuses the CPC of being divisive for having allied with parties that emerged from the internal break-up of parties in various countries. In this document, it even highlights the "Amazonas-Grabois group" in the case of Brazil.

⁶⁰ It was the meeting of the Central Committee of the PCdoB that was surrounded by the organs of repression of the state and the fascist military regime, an episode known as the "Lapa massacre."

party, could obscure.

However, Pomar's evaluation is a strong self-criticism he proposed to the party. In it, he asserts that the cause of the guerrilla's defeat was not solely of a military and temporary nature, as presented in Ângelo Arroyo's report, but rather due to a more general issue—the underlying problems, the misconception regarding people's war. In fact, this brilliant document, which was rejected due to the authoritarian and coup-like conduct imposed by Amazonas on the party after the death of the main revolutionary figures, is a self-critical assessment that goes beyond the dramatic episodes of Araguaia. Pomar clearly formulates that what was applied in Araguaia was not the concept of protracted people's war, as its principles and basic tenets were not observed. It is, therefore, a vigorous defense of the correctness of the concept of people's war as the path to the Brazilian revolution. This objectively points to the theoretical and ideological problem of Maoism within the party, particularly in its leadership. In other words, Maoism had never been truly understood and fully embraced in the PCdoB, but rather adopted in a dogmatic and superficial manner.

The episode related to the VI Conference held in 1966 is not a matter of minor importance as a demonstration of the phenomenon of dogmatism within the party. The central document⁶¹ of the Conference presented by the Central Committee, of which Amazonas was a prominent member, was harshly criticized by intermediate and grassroots party cadres for containing gross errors and revisionist tendencies in the handling of revolutionary theory.⁶² The dogmatism of the leadership of the PCdoB led to the rejection of the debate, expelling these militants from the party. In addition to all the criticism, the party leadership, with its sectarian attitude, revealed its complete lack of understanding of an essential and primary issue of Maoism, which pertains to internal struggle and how it should be managed to forge the communist party, that is, the two-line struggle.

The myth of Maoist PCdoB must therefore be attributed much more to the account of the counter-propaganda of the reaction and the sectarian opinion of adversaries within the left than to any ideological essence in the

⁶¹This is the aforementioned *Union of Brazilians to Free the Country from the Crisis, Dictatorship, and Neo-Colonialist threat*.

⁶²This criticism was systematized in the document *Critique of the Opportunism and Subjectivism of the Union of Brazilians to Free the Country from the Crisis, Dictatorship, and Neo-Colonialist threat*. The supporters of the critique were expelled from the party and later formed the Communist Party of Brazil Red Wing.

party. In fact, many within the party advocated for the concept of protracted people's war, and some party documents from that period support this. However, the speed with which they capitulated after the defeat of the Araguaia experience, the methods of handling internal dissent, and how other procedures were used to rid the party of anything associated with Maoism reveal the formalism and superficiality with which this ideology was approached by the leadership of PCdoB. It also shows the extent of misunderstanding and rejection that had always existed within the party. For this reason, Amazonas' criticism of Maoism, firstly, has no connection with any self-criticism of having once embraced it. Secondly, as an opportunistic criticism made to conceal a capitulationist position regarding the revolutionary line of people's war, through the pseudo-Marxist phraseology of the line of Hoxha, it is a revisionist critique.

Although it didn't cost much for Amazonas to formulate his "demolishing" critique of Maoism, as he simply copied what Hoxha whispered in his ears, he surely thought he had spent a long time considering them original. Such criticism had already been systematized since 1969, commissioned by Brezhnev: O. Vladimirov and V. Riazantsev wrote *Mao Zedong: A Political Portrait*, and F. Konstantinov and M. Sladkovski wrote *Critiques of the Philosophical Conceptions of Mao Zedong*, 1973 (Institute of the Far East of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR). Out of curiosity, it is indeed worth taking a look and verifying the identity. Now that the revisionists are all taking refuge in one den, the followers of Amazonas, Rabelo, and company, as well as other revisionists from PCB, PCML, PCR, etc., have reasons to worry. Tremble, gentlemen revisionists, Maoism is advancing to become the command and guide of the world revolution, and this cannot, inevitably and inexorably, fail to pass through Brazil!

**Down with revisionism, dogmatism, and all opportunism!
Long live Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Chairman Mao!
Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!**