"Human Rights" and Proletarian Revolution[1]

Tiburcio

April 13, 2020



NOTE BY EDITORIAL BOARD: This is the view of the author and not the Editorial Board or Editors. While we unite with the fact that human rights is the language the imperialist bourgeoisie uses to attack revolutionaries, the Editorial Board engaged in a oversight in publishing this piece, which endorses the Right Opportunist Line (ROL) in many places. We will detail this more in a public response. This came to light after a contributor and reader, Kavga, reached out to the Editor and brought it up, placing criticism on the Board and on Tiburcio for their writing. Tiburcio and an editor wrote up this response as a self-criticism. Tiburcio wants to salvage this piece by uniting with its leftist spirit and repudiating the earlier ROL.

"General talk about freedom, equality and democracy is in fact but a blind repetition of concepts shaped by the relations of commodity production. To attempt to solve the concrete problems of the dictatorship of the proletariat by such generalities is tantamount to accepting the theories and principles of the bourgeoisie in their entirety." (Lenin, Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat) [1]

"The Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, Gonzalo Thought conception provides us with the understanding of the reactionary, counterrevolutionary bourgeois character of so-called Human Rights which are constantly manipulated in today's world, as well as how to grasp People's Rights *[derechos del pueblo]*."(PCP, Sobre Las Dos Colinas) [2]

From the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR to the shining People's War in Peru, the bourgeoisie and its lackeys raise the banner of "human rights" in order to

[1] https://struggle-sessions.com/2020/04/13/human-rights-and-proletarian-revolution/

denounce revolution, positioning themselves as defenders of these so-called rights. However, these "rights" remain abstract notions, totally incapable of being fulfilled by the bourgeoisie and remain in irreconcilable contradiction to the material conditions produced by capitalism, to the masses of people, to People's Rights.

Throughout its history, the promoters of human rights, whether imperialist or semi-feudal semi-colonial nations, have been the same ones who have carried out the most grotesque atrocities under various banners such as the war on drugs, the war on terror, Operation Condor, and the like. From the genocide of Mayans in Guatemala spearheaded by former president Efraín Ríos Montt, a US-backed puppet to the UN backed assassination Congolese nationalist Patrice Lumumba, the notion of "human rights" remain an illusion, but more importantly a mechanism of counter-insurgency to enforce Yankee imperialism.

This is only one tool in the bourgeoisie's arsenal of counterinsurgency to attack and delegitimize revolution. While human rights organizations may criticize the violence of the old state, their primary function is not to tear them down, but to reinforce them, promoting *reconciliation* between the ruling class and the masses of people it oppresses. Special attention must be given to the role of these organizations as well as non-governmental organizations (NGO's) in their assistance in counterinsurgency efforts.

Therefore, our departure in understanding human rights must not be shaped by the bourgeoisie's conception of abstraction and pseudo morality, but a Communist one, grasping its abstract and counterrevolutionary nature, how it is used to enforce imperialism, and how we distinguish them with People's Rights.

A Counter-Revolutionary Notion

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) was declared in 1948 following the Second World War. Eleanor Roosevelt, widow of US president Franklin D. Roosevelt, was one of the main backers of the declaration, playing a fundamental role in its creation. In 1996, Peru People's Movement (MPP) stated, "After the war, to guarantee its expansion, dominance and influence, the imperialists promoted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights at the United Nations (UN), a pro-imperialist organization and enforcer for imperialist powers and super-powers." The UDHR and UN must be understood in this context and not detached nor isolated from it. It was an attack on the continuing influence and growth of Communism, the socialist USSR, the People's War in China, and wars of national liberation.

Some of the "inalienable rights" listed in the UDHR are that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights," "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment," "All are equal before the law

and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law," "Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state," "Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment," and "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control" (UDHR).

Although forty-eight countries initially adopted this declaration, the old reactionary states proved to be in irreconcilable contradiction to its own guidelines and propositions. As Marxists, we understand that something merely written on paper is meaningless and that actions and practice speak louder than words. The PCP lays out the Maoist conception of human rights succinctly:

> "For us, human rights are contradictory to People's Rights because we base ourselves on man as a social product, not as an abstract man with innate rights. 'Human rights' are but the rights of bourgeois man, a position that was revolutionary in the face of feudalism; thus, liberty, equality and fraternity were advanced bourgeois criteria in the past. But today, since the appearance of the proletariat, and as a more organized class through the Communist Party, with the experiences of triumphant revolutions, the construction of socialism, New Democracy and dictatorship of the proletariat, it has historically proven that human rights serve the oppressive classes and exploiters who run the imperialist and landed-bureaucratic [terrateniente-burocráticos] states, bourgeois states in general."

What the PCP demonstrates here is what the three great teachers have always taught, that man and concepts like rights and freedom do not magically appear within our minds, detached from the economic base, but rather correspond to it. Under capitalism where the main contradiction, as Chairman Mao highlights, is "between the social character of production and the private character of ownership," the highest degree of rights and freedom are granted to the bourgeoisie, but remain an illusion for the working and toiling masses who face the brunt of exploitation and poverty. For this reason, rights which truly fulfill the needs of the proletariat and broad masses of people will always be unattainable under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Operating without a Marxist conception, well intended but naïve human rights activists are left scratching their heads, failing to grasp the root of why "rights" are even violated. Instead, they see violence in abstraction, regardless of who is wielding it,

and promote reconciliation between classes through reforms and peace processes. It is crucial to keep in mind that violations of "human rights" by the old state should not merely be seen as the reactionary violence it unleashes on the masses of people, but rather stem from the economic conditions that it creates; the repression then follows suit. Indeed, if violence was the principal aspect, we would fall in line with the erroneous conception that imperialism and fascism are merely interventions and terror/repression, respectively.

This is why today, human rights are not only outdated and abstract, but more importantly a reactionary mechanism of counterinsurgency to enforce imperialism. The PCP detail how under the Fujimori regime, ties with the United States were strengthened. The US did not want to appear as if they were aiding a reactionary regime and pressured the old Peruvian state to set up Human Rights offices and launched PR campaigns in the 1990s to direct attention away from the reactionary violence of the old state and instead attack the People's War. Former assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs and, later, Goldman Sachs advisor on Latin America Bernard Aronson plead to Congress, stating, "Make no mistake, if Sendero were to take power, we would see this century's third genocide." (CSRP, The Revolution in Peru is Profoundly Liberating). Through these maneuvers, the Peruvian Old State was able to receive "aid" from Washington in their attempts to annihilate the People's War. (PCP, Sobre Las Dos Colinas).

As People's Wars continue to be waged and developed, it is crucial to seek truth from facts and move passed the lies and slander used against revolutionaries. As the PCP states, "Among the advantages at its disposal the reaction has many means of information. Its highly developed mass media system includes newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations, etc. We don't have all that but we can count on an unbeatable resource – the fact that the masses are the makers of history." Losing sight of this, one can easily succumb to the bourgeois propaganda machine which claims that the Peruvian comrades were murdering peasants or that the Filipino comrades are annihilating the Lumad people.

The Supreme Right of Our Class

How then must we understand People's Rights in contrast to the counter-revolutionary notion of "human rights?" The PCP provide us with a sober analysis on these so-called "rights" and how any Maoist should grasp this question. We will quote at length from their important 1991 document, *Sobre Las Dos Colinas*:

> "[..] People's Rights are the rights that the *proletariat and immense masses of people conquer with their own struggle and blood*, and study them as guiding principles of the New State based on the interests of the classes that make up the people: People's Rights are obligations and class rights, superior to the so-called human rights, in service of the masses, primarily the poor, of the New State, of socialism and of future communism; People's Rights which only the People's Republic of Peru, in our case, will be able to guarantee, recognizing and above all protecting the right to life and health, the right to education, culture and development, the right to work and to welfare, social and political rights and, principally, the supreme right to seize Power and exercise it, to transform the old, oppressive and exploitative order, and to build a New State and a New Society for the people and the proletariat… Finally, we reiterate, only under a New State that represents the interests of the workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie can People's Rights be applied, the only rights that can really benefit the four classes of the people. These are our positions and no one has been able to nor can refute them. Thus, we differentiate human rights from People's Rights."

Revolutionary violence is a fundamental principle and necessity for carrying out revolution, for People's War. Of course, the bourgeoisie condemns the use of violence when taken up by the proletariat and oppressed masses of the world. The old state's reactionary violence of mass graves, rape, drone strikes, torture, and prisons are downplayed, framed as "collateral damage," seen as a necessity to protect "freedom" and "democracy," or are acknowledged once information has been leaked. When the masses, led by the Party, rebel and carry out revolution, they are scrutinized to the highest degree and denounced by the ruling classes for violating "human rights" which the bourgeoisie themselves claim to adhere to. Yet revolutionary violence, must be understood as inseparable from the supreme right to seize power. This is the only manner in which the new can be constructed.

Taking from the historical lessons of the Soviets in Russia, Base Areas in China, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the PCP implemented People's Rights in their base areas and People's Committees, constructing the New Power. Contrary to the myths that the PCP, as well as other Maoists, solely use terror to gain influence, the former Committee to Support the Revolution in Peru mentions how even some counterinsurgency experts refute this claim. The CSRP goes on to state,

> "Those who think that revolution has built up this kind of organization [referring to the power exercised by Open People's Committees] by terrorizing the masses should consider that the revolution started with almost no arms at all, and has

> gotten the overwhelming majority of what arms it has by taking them from the Peruvian army and police. It has received no foreign military aid. No genuine revolutionary movement in history has advanced by terrorizing the masses, though this is always the charge of the counterrevolution."

In the case of Peru's countryside, the People's Committees were "made up of Communists, ordinary peasants, and other local progressive forces" and consisted of five Commissioners: Secretary, commissioner of security, commissioner of production, commissioner of community affairs, and a commissioner which convenes and plans the meetings of Party-led mass organizations (MPP, Our Red Flag Flying). The People's Committees were responsible for administering production, people's trials, organizing militias in conjunction with the local guerilla forces and principal forces of the EGP [People's Guerilla Army], and even marriages.

The notion that revolutionaries solely use "terror" is a bourgeois lie which attempts to negate and delegitimize the embryonic revolutionary power being conquered and developed into the New State during People's War. The old state clearly understands this threat, but uses its outlets to distort reality and frame revolutionaries as bloodthirsty savages cut off from the masses in attempts to delegitimize them. Unlike the old state which plunders the masses into poverty, the New State/Front and the dictatorship of the proletariat uplifts the masses, elevates their class consciousness, trains them to take command and exercise power, and crushes the enemies of the people who have exploited them.

People's Rights, therefore, are not detached from the economic base. Under the periods of New Democracy for semi-feudal, semi-colonial nations and socialism in the USSR and People's Republic of China, great strides had been made in the realm of production through collectivization and communes. Resources were distributed accordingly, rather than being extracted and exported as they are especially in semi-feudal, semi-colonial nations under the brunt of imperialism. In China, especially during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, education became a tool for the construction of socialist society rather than being a storehouse of ideas and formulas for exams and strictly intellectuals, cut off from the needs of the masses and society overall. The rights of women were far more emancipatory than in any bourgeois state, with their integration into production as well as ability to leave marriages and not be forced into them either.

These great strides must not be seen solely as socialist states making things easier for the masses of people, but must be seen as the result of fierce class struggle, through the exercising of dictatorship over enemies. None of these gains were made without war nor were they held onto by peaceful coexistence with reactionary and capitalist lines. The red has always imposed itself on the white line, and under base areas and

the dictatorship of the proletariat, rights are not merely handed over to the masses of people, but conquered through revolutionary violence.

It is no wonder why imperialist nations, principally Yankee imperialism, have vigorously attacked the dictatorship of the proletariat. As the PCP states, "On the other hand, the US and other imperialist superpowers have always attacked the socialist states of the USSR under Lenin and Stalin and China under Chairman Mao as violators of human rights." (Sobre Las Dos Colinas).

Indeed, the dictatorship over class enemies under socialism is blown out of proportion and cut off from any concrete conditions. The threats of Nazi invasion and Trotsky's wrecking activities are largely ignored when understanding the purges. The historical track record of reemerging famines under the old societies of Russia and China are negated, with bourgeois authors building their careers on their "exposing" of so-called crimes under socialism. As Maoists, we unwaveringly defend, uphold and apply the PCP's position, "As for us violating human rights. We do not ascribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, nor to that of Costa Rica." Instead, we wield the supreme right to seize and exercise power!

It Is Right to Rebel!

"There are innumerable principles of Marxism, but in the final analysis they can all be summed up in one sentence: 'To rebel is justified.' For thousands of years everyone said, 'Oppression is justified, exploitation is justified, rebellion is not justified.' From the time that Marxism appeared on the scene, this old judgment was turned upside down, and this is a great contribution. This principle was derived by the proletariat from its struggles, but Marx drew the conclusion." (Mao, Speech at a Meeting of All Circles in Yan'an to Commemorate Stalin's Sixtieth Birthday)

The ruling class and its lapdogs (Senderologists, NGO's, etc., as addressed in "Enemies of the PCP") have portrayed the PCP as a ruthless and blood thirsty "terrorist" organization. Yet in bourgeois films like the Dancer Upstairs and La Hora Final, as well as in news outlets and literature, the economic conditions of Peru and the reactionary violence employed by the old state are largely ignored. One example is that in Peru by 1991, the inadequate employment rate of Lima, which contained a significant portion of Peru's population, was at 94 percent, the highest in Latin America at the time (McClintock, Revolutionary Movements in Latin America). This was clearly evident in Peru's *barriadas* (shantytowns). Indeed, through its extensive means and mechanisms, the ruling class reinforces the idea that revolutionaries merely utilized indiscriminate violence and killed any person who disagreed with them, disregarding the immense poverty and class stand of enemies who were killed.

This is evident when claims are made that the Communists murder "civilians" and other "leftists." This requires a closer examination given the ambiguity of the term "civilians" as well as the class interests that these people serve. Unless we grasp an individual's class stand, any talk of "civilians" will remain sheer idealism and abstraction. Members of a development company and politicians who devise plans to displace working class people can fall under the category of an "unarmed civilians." Snitches who aid the old state and who are responsible for the repression of revolutionaries, such as William O'Neal who led to Fred Hampton and Mark Clark's assassination, are "unarmed civilians." Bourgeois newspaper editors and administrators who receive funding and "favors" from politicians and corporations and proceed to disseminate lies are "unarmed civilians." The list goes on, but the point is quite simple. The bourgeoisie can drone strike hospitals, massacring masses of people and label the atrocity as "collateral damage," but when enemies of the people are threatened or killed for their actions, the ruling class highlight these examples and strip them away of any context and class interest. From here we understand that for revolutionaries to ascribe to "human rights" would mean to liquidate struggle and revolutionary violence, it would mean to fear imposing dictatorship over the bourgeoisie and permit a conciliatory approach to enemies whose function is to defend and uphold the ruling class.

On a similar note, revisionist leaders are framed merely as "leftists," with their ideology and actions put aside. Communists are then responsible for murdering all opposition, a fantasy which the bourgeoisie loves paying lip service to in order to prop up the toothless "left" which does not threaten, but reinforce their existence and leading the masses astray from the path of revolution.

In 2018, the social-democrat magazine Jacobin released an article condemning the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) for having assassinated other "leftists." However, as Marxists we do not merely accept vague notions of what a "leftist" is. Chairman Gonzalo held revisionism as the principal danger and this was not stated lightly. Revisionism diverts the working-class movement from the path of People's War, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the road towards Communism.

In one example, Jacobin glosses over the class interests of the so-called "victims" of the New People's Army (NPA). It is stated that some peasant activists, who were associated with the social-fascist Akbayan party, which later would literally promote the presidential candidacy of Senator Benigno Simeon Aquino III, were killed and "had been told to cease his attempts to have the government's bill on land reform implemented in his area." While framing this scenario as an attempt to have a government bill implemented, it looks past two aspects: that this "attempt" in essence is collaboration with the old state and that this person was warned and not killed indiscriminately or

randomly. Indeed, Jacobin goes on to mention the killing of members of the so-called Marxist-Leninist Party of the Philippines which it refers to as Maoist, but is really a Trostkyite organization.

The bulk of this article is based on Trotskyite sources, most notably, French Trotskyite Pierre Rousset whose orientation is that:

> "The intricacies of the Filipino Left are for sure difficult to understand from abroad. But the question here is not to discuss the merits and demerits of each party (or each individual). One can be very critical of the political line or the political evolution of a given organisation or individual. We are not asked to involve ourselves in the debates over politics, strategy and programme in the Philippines" and "If our responsibility is engaged, and if we have to express solidarity, it is because we are faced with an overall policy of threats, death sentences and killings deployed by the CPP-NPA-NDF on a national scale, something that no other group is doing."

Quite a remark. The revolution in the Philippines is not difficult to understand if one studies Marxism and the country's material conditions. But if we exclude the political lines of organizations and remove ourselves from "debates," from two-line struggle, then what would we even be supporting and defending? A vague notion of what the "left" is, devoid of political line, strategy, and their material actions. In fact, Rousset's conclusion on "death sentences," seen in abstraction, boils down to the bourgeoisie's conception of violence when wielded by the proletariat, that rebellion is never justified and that all violence should be condemned. That the proletariat and broad masses of people should not seize power nor exercise it over enemies. That peaceful coexistence with the revisionist left will not deviate the revolutionary movement.

The same disdain for the Peruvian People's War was used by its opponents as well. They claimed that the PCP simply killed any "leftist" who disagreed with them. One of the most oversaturated examples in the media is the case of Maria Elena Moyano. Being part of the old state in 1989 and a representative of the revisionist Izquierda Unida (United Left or IU) party, stating that urban rondas had to be formed against the "senderista threat" and in essence reinforces the old state, pedaling the "vasos de leche" program which was merely a charity to quell the rebellion of the masses and disregard the root issue of their poverty and starvation, and calling for a rally against the PCP during an armed shutdown (strike). The latter was her final action, carrying on a measly rally of no more than 30 people. What is important to remember though, is what this rally was against.

On February 14 of 1992, the PCP held an armed shutdown "against hunger, unemployment, and crisis; land for poor campesinos, higher wages, national production for the oppressed masses, free medical attention. Against repression and crimes [of the state], for the Rights of the People, and a call to stop the repression and genocide." (El Diario Internacional 1992). Indeed, with the means employed by the old state, it is no wonder that she is framed as a progressive activist in the fight against "terror." Whether in Peru, Philippines, India or Turkey, one must examine the concrete actions of the "left" such as Moyano or Akbayan which attempt to divert the masses from People's War, legitimizing the bankruptcy of the old state and opposing the growing people's rebellion.

In a PCP document published by El Diario, they stated,

> "The [PCP] is not against the organizations of the Vaso de Leche (Glass of Milk), Club de Madres (Group of Mothers), Comedores Populares (Communal Kitchens), etc, because there are masses within them. We are against their leaders who manipulate, rob, and cheat the masses and they collude with the with the government, not demanding that the government comply with its obligations: to provide food, health, housing, education, etc… we are against the snitches, informants, and collaborators of the Armed Forces and the police; to these the Party and the masses apply just penalties. We will continue to do so."

Indeed, accusations hurled at Maoists are that they are against food programs. One should understand that these charities themselves are not revolutionary in any way, but that the most sinister is role is played by its leaders who divert the just rage and fury of the masses into charity drives, insisting to the masses that the path is not the transformation of society, but that instead they should be complacent with the old state-funded crumbs and handouts.

El Diario Internacional writes,

> "[An NGO's] principal objective is to enter the lives of the oppressed masses, and from here manipulate them, to take them down the path in opposition to the revolution. The tasks of NGOs is to aim to halt social explosion, to delay any attempt of the oppressed to rebel […] For NGOs to complete its political objectives must maintain close ties with the state and governments of the day, from there, they officially receive support and the ability to 'operate politically,' even in major conflict regions in Peru, where, as admitted by the right-wing press, they play a 'role of containment before the advance of the senderistas.'"

NGO's and the like are not neutral organizations nor are they merely Band-Aids for the struggles of the masses. The case of the Black Panther Party highlights how as the FBI spearheaded the Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO), the state simultaneously jumped on the wagon of providing food to students to counter the BPP's efforts. Increasingly since the 1990s, in the US there has been an implosion of NGOs and non-profits to subdue the rebellion of the masses. Similar to elections, the banner of human rights and work of NGO's are component inseparable from counter-insurgency efforts. As the PCP highlight, "Finally, we insist that Yankee imperialism in its "low intensity" war aims to "help" "legitimize" governments, hence the juggling of human rights Fujimori and the role of NGOs acting in this field to service of the same master."

A Communist's orientation to NGO's should grasp that their function is to obstruct revolutionary efforts and therefore "should educate the slum masses and particularly the activists about the sinister role of such organizations and the agencies financing them. We should particularly expose them when they stand in the path of the people's struggles." [Urban Perspective]

It is of no surprise that when these organizations had been confronted and "leaders" like Moyano were killed, Senderologists negated their politics and connections to the state and erroneously considered these to be attacks on women. One book review of Americas Watch *Untold Terror*, goes as far to claim "most grassroots organizations are run by poor women; Sendero's systetmatic assault on such groups is tantamount to a war on women." Yet, the PCP was constituted largely by women and supported by them as well.

Again, what is missing here is the role that the leadership of these organizations played, as well as an examination of the material conditions women were entrenched in. A fact that is overlooked in discussion of women in Peru is that prostitution was rampant and state-sponsored, having grown from less than five thousand registered prostitutes in the 1960s to at least fifty thousand by the middle of the 1980s, not accounting for those who were unregistered (Andreas 138). Indeed, Andreas goes on to mention the various cases of women killing their own children, and even themselves, as result of the immense poverty.

Similarly, the 2003 Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) excluded the state sanctioned forced sterilization of women during the 1990s, which can only be understood as a policy of genocide against the Peruvian masses. Although the systematic rape of women by the Armed Forces is acknowledged to a degree, it was not the Armed Forces nor the state who were waging a "war on women," but rather "Sendero." The bourgeoisie and its lackeys point to identity as the rationale of assas-

sinations, which couldn't be farther from the truth. The PCP did not target women or campesinos, but enemies of the People's War. Any Maoist must stand guard against these accusations which only serves to obscure the class position of enemies of the people and erase their anti-people actions.

The defenders of "human rights" have also condemned People's Armies as a result of youth being active participants within them. In a bourgeois documentary, *Returned: Child Soldiers of Nepal's Maoist Army*, an NGO condemned the Nepalese People's War for having allegedly utilized child soldiers. Regardless of whether the revisionist Prachanda denied these accusations, youth are not exempt from the storm of class struggle. Whether in Peru or Nepal, the ruling classes have trembled at the thought of armed children and youth. They will accuse of revolutionaries of violating "human rights," even though it is the reactionary old states which plunders the land and annihilates families. Indeed, children are already thrown into the class struggle regardless if they decide to fight or not. One's village being raided by the state, one's extreme conditions of poverty are ignored by these so-called "human rights" organizations and children are merely seen as passive. The logical conclusion of this is that children should be led to the slaughter and not be equipped, ideologically and physically.

The question should not be based on an abstract conception of children being divorced from their conditions of poverty, abuse, of their families being massacred or exploited, but can *only* be analyzed in this context. The matter is simple: to fight or to be massacred. The ruling class utilizes every method such as films or Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) programs in proletarian and nationally oppressed high schools to mold youth into their cannon fodder for imperialist wars. Maoists have every right to remold youth along proletarian lines and unleash their fighting capacity in the struggle for socialism, and in semi-feudal, semi-colonial nations for New Democracy.

This does not necessarily mean that by default, all youth should be integrated into a People's Army or that PAs should strictly recruit children, but that youth do have a fighting capacity and are not divorced from the class struggle. While the Nepalese revisionists cowardly deny that youth were integrated into their army, we reaffirm that to make revolution is no crime, and that youth fighting against their own annihilation is justified. The Filipino comrades, adhering to "International Humanitarian Law," disallows youth under the age of 18 to be integrated into the NPA. Yet, these standards are not based on dialectical materialism nor are they developed by the proletariat, but are rather founded on sheer idealism and inventions devised by the bourgeoisie. The youth have a fighting capacity and while this does not necessarily mean they

will become combatants, they should learn the basics of combat according to their objective conditions.

Conclusion

Any Communist must understand the function and nature of "human rights," otherwise they will fall into a trap of idealism and abstraction. While this piece only scratches the surface, we can conclude that the bourgeois notion of human rights is anti-Marxist in all three spheres: political economy, dialectical materialism and scientific socialism. They are in irreconcilable contradiction to the conditions produced by capitalism, to man with innate rights, and especially in relation to People's Rights and liberties under base areas and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They remain a tool of counterrevolution, reinforcing the influence and domination of imperialism, especially Yankee imperialism. Violations of these so-called rights should be viewed principally in the realm of the economic base, secondarily in relation to the old state's repressive violence.

We must stand guard against the sham Cold War myths propagated by the bourgeoisie and revisionists. While this can constitute its own paper, Truth and Reconciliation Commissions should never be taken at face value by Communists, especially since these players at hand collaborate with the state and utilize the old state's statistics. Any accusations, slander, and so forth must be thoroughly exposed and repudiated.

The bourgeoisie will never be able to uphold "human rights." Maoists defend and uphold People's Rights which will be implemented far more adequately under the dictatorship of the proletariat, until communism is achieved.

Notes

[1] "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," Lenin. 1919.

[2] "Sobre las dos Colinas," PCP. 1991.

https://web.archive.org/web/20061003135559/http://www.blythe.org/peru-pcp/rights/hhrr-c.htm

https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/

"Sobre las dos Colinas," PCP. 1991

"On Contradiction," Mao.

Committee to Support the Revolution in Peru. *The Revolution in Peru is Profoundly Liberating*. 1992.

"Sobre las dos Colinas," PCP. 1991

http://www.anakbayanusa.org/stop-the-lies/ "Sobre las dos Colinas," PCP. 1991

Committee to Support the Revolution in Peru. *The Revolution in Peru is Profoundly Liberating*. 1992.

Movimiento Popular Peru. *Our Red Flag is Flying in Peru*. 1990.

"Sobre las dos Colinas," PCP. 1991

Ibid.

Mao Tse-tung. Speech at a Meeting of All Circles in Yan'an to Commemorate Stalin's Sixtieth Birthday.

McClintock, Cynthia. Revolutionary Movements in Latin America.

https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/09/community-party-philippines-sison-ndf-murder

http://www.internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article616 El Diario Internacional. *Entre partidos politicos y ONGs: La historia no contada de la "Madre Coraje."* April 1992.

Ibid.

Ibid.

"Sobre las dos Colinas," PCP. 1991

Urban Perspective.

Andreas, Carol. When Women Rebel. 1985.

Getgen, Jocelyn. Untold Truths: The Exclusion of Enforced Sterilization from the Peruvian Truth Commissions Final Report. 2009.

Returned: Child Soldiers of Nepal's Maoist Army.

http://www.bannedthought.net/Philippines/CPP/1999/MinimumAgeForNPA-991015.pdf