

The Manifesto of National Maoism



By:

A Nationalist Proletarian

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Foreword	3
Contents	6
Preamble for Maoists	7
Preamble for Third-Positionists/Fascists	13
Introduction	24
The Way of a Revolutionary	26
The National Maoist Conception of Dialectics and the State	34
The National Maoist Method for the Revolution	45
The Principles of National Maoism	49
The Cultural Revolution	50
Mass line	53
Anti-Marxism	56
Nationalism	62
Anti-Liberalism	66
Collectivism	72
The Jewish Question and Religion	76
Declaration of Friendship	84
Defining a Friend from Foe	85
In Conclusion	91
Other Matters	99

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Foreword

National Maoism is a general set of principles appropriated from Mao Zedong thought (henceforth referred to as 'Maoism') and Third Position ideologies. Within each national movement that adopts it, it is bound to gain the characteristics of that nation. Italian National Maoist movement will be considerably different to that of Japanese but the common threads that bind them, the basis, will nevertheless be shared in common.

Therefore, this manifesto is **not** an all encompassing call to action and dogma like the communist manifesto, rather, it is a set of guidelines on what National Maoism is.

It would be a mistake to hold the ideas within this manifesto (especially as they relate to early 21st century conditions) as truth eternal; this is merely a document pertaining to its time and many of its aspects are to be put under scrutiny now and in the future. As such this manifesto cannot and should not provide a 'one size fits all' answer to all the struggles of all time, present and future.

However, this doesn't mean that within this document there isn't a universal core which seeks to establish a new revolutionary order and this core itself is what distinguishes the heart of a revolutionary from that of a reformer or a passive spectator.

We therefore prompt the reader to take this into consideration and try to extract this essence, as it is important no matter if it's 2022 or 2222, while treating contemporary analysis as a suggestion for current (early 21st century) circumstances. For a proper analysis, whatever your relative time period, we suggest you investigate!

As Mao Zedong said, "NO INVESTIGATION, NO RIGHT TO SPEAK", these words despite being uttered over 91 years ago are universal and apply to any future or current revolutionary movements. Just like Mao Zedong's words are universal, one ought to read this manifesto in a similar manner, trying to extract the revolutionary essence while appreciating the context it was put in.

Any movement which upholds the 7 values outlined and explained in the section: 'Principles of National Maoism', is effectively a National Maoist movement.

The national manifestos of various National Maoist branches will build on the 7 values and will address specific issues relating to the individual nations, this is also why we don't call for any concrete demands.

The social and political situation will be inherently different depending on the nation, and it would not be suitable to name any demands which may not apply to national particularities. In this way we also avoid any claims of regional chauvinism, of only taking into account the conditions of specific nations over others.

We admit to a certain bias being present, that of primarily considering western circumstances over those in the proverbial 'Third World'. This is due to Third Positionism

The Manifesto of National Maoism

having mostly a strong European (and South American via Peronism) base. Therefore, in the initial stages, these ideas may find direct application in the First and the Second World over the Third. This is not to say that the struggle in the Third World is in any way less significant, we reject First World chauvinism.

To avoid the pitfall of appealing to intellectuals exclusively and alienating others, we wrote this manifesto in a simple language. We tried to limit ourselves to using jargon only where no other term could be used to effectively give the correct meaning.

The sections of the manifesto are designed so that it is not necessary to read the manifesto from the beginning to the end in order to grasp the meaning. We encourage the reader to start from anywhere he feels like, a lot of information and basic concepts are repeated between sections to give proper context.

It is recommended though to read the Introduction before venturing further, the subsection 'The Way of a Revolutionary' contains within itself the 'heart' of National Maoism. If this manifesto was to be broken down to just one section, it would be that one, so we encourage reading it first.

The ideas present in the manifesto were written in such a way to be understood by anyone with even a basic background in either Maoist or Third Positionist philosophies. We don't want to obscure our work to be understood by only a handful of readers and therefore be seldom criticised, we would like this work to be put under utmost scrutiny.

Though we pay attention to who is criticising us, a criticism from a factory worker is worth more to us than that of a middle class Marxist 'intellectual'.

There's a certain bias in the kind of audience that this manifesto may intrigue the most, that being Eastern Marxist-Leninists (including Maoists) and Third Positionists. It is our intention to spark a dialogue between these two revolutionary anti-capitalist camps, to lead them to reflect on their own ideologies and their application.

Only via criticism, addressing the present circumstances and developing a method of addressing the issues of today can we hope for an effective abolition of capitalism and the associated Neo-Liberal order.

It is important to mention that we see National Maoism as National Bolshevism of Karl Otto Paetel of the 21st century. Paetel's work is a brilliant analysis of revolutionary socialism and a synthesis of the correct proletarian, anti-capitalist position for German Nationalists of that time. A read through the National Bolshevik Manifesto of 1933 is highly advised.

We however don't believe in simply repurposing old ideologies, we aren't blind followers of Paetel, rather, we see ourselves as the successors to the revolutionary tradition inspired by him. Our thought patterns, promotion of revolutionary national socialism however are inline with Paetel's vision back in the day.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

He synthesised the nationalistic currents present then in Germany with Stalinist anti-liberal Marxism Leninism, he even promoted a common bloc with KPD and an alliance with the USSR of the time.

Since those times, Stalin died, Mao picked up the burden of further development of the anti-liberal, principled, Marxism-Leninism. Mao Zedong expanded the ideology with new important concepts which furthered the development of the revolutionary class war against the bourgeois.

It would be a great mistake to simply ignore Mao and pretend like we can carry on with the unaltered Paetel's vision, with there being no KPD, no USSR and no strong German Nationalist currents in modern Germany (except for the areas of former DDR). We would just be larpers, living in the past like many western communists.

Our attempt at a synthesis between Third Position and Mao Zedong thought is the adaptation of revolutionary nationalism with revolutionary socialism in the spirit Paetel's National Bolshevism.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Contents

The beginning consists of two preambles, one targeting Maoists, second Third Positionists, we highlight the weaknesses of these ideologies individually. We explain why we cannot rely on these ideologies on their own and why we deem this synthesis necessary.

Following that is the introduction where we lay out the situation of anti-capitalist movements in the present day, our rationale behind National Maoism and 'The Way of a Revolutionary' in the 21st century.

Afterwards, we describe the dialectical model on which the logic of our movement bases on. This section effectively summarises and counters at its foundations the dialectical and historical materialist models originating in Marxism.

Next, we highlight two strategies for struggle, one for third world and second for the first world. We believe that revolution is possible in the first world and has already happened twice in the 20th century, in Italy and Germany. This section ought to be read as a suggestion for mobilisation and seizing power. It will without a doubt have to be adapted specifically to the national conditions of each nation and by no means serves as a universal guideline.

The most important section which contains the soul and heart of National Maoism that warrants the ideology's existence is present next, where we summarise the '6 points'.

The '7 points' contain 7 concepts, Cultural Revolution & Massline come from Maoism, Anti-Marxism & Nationalism from the Third Position, Anti-Liberalism, Collectivism are shared by both. The Jewish question and the religious question are tackled in a general manner though the solutions are inspired by National-Socialism and the concept of positive Christianity hence Third-Positionism.

We describe and explain why they form a foundational basis for National Maoism, we synthesise them and if needs be, supplement them with the strengths of Third Positionist and Maoist principles.

Finally, we reach the declaration of friendship between us and other Third-Positionist & Maoist movements with a subsection on how we define who our friends and foes even are. Followed by the conclusion section where we summarise everything discussed up to this point and give reasons and justifications for National Maoism. We also address any remaining queries that one may have which may not have been addressed elsewhere.

The 'Other Matters' section is where we discuss miscellaneous things and answer 'Frequently Asked Questions'.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Preamble for Maoists

Marxism is dead, it has long died as a revolutionary dogma, it has proven its incapability at achieving its own premises when the first world war dawned upon the world.

It has failed in the reformist path to achieve socialism as the western nations fulfilled the basic foundations on which Marxian socialism was to be built, on universal suffrage and democracy. These promises were instead co-opted by the liberal ideology.

Reformist Marxism failed, dogmatic orthodox Marxism failed, leaving only the revolutionary path which delivered any success. The revolutionaries split from the Marxist canon and took the instruments of the state under their dictatorial control.

The Bolsheviks in Russia triumphed while the Marxists in Germany seethed and spit on the revolutionary gains of the Bolsheviks. Their revolution was most unorthodox, most bizarre, happening in a feudal land, supported by peasants. Yet despite this, even among the revolutionaries, two camps formed. One which wanted to preserve the Marxist canon (the Trotskyist) and one which dared to split again; dared to further themselves even more from the original intentions and dogma of Marxism. They started to build socialism in one country, going against internationalism, going against dialectical materialism, the 'Stalinists' as they were pejoratively nicknamed by Orthodox Marxists, reformists and Trotskyists, did the unthinkable.

They democratised the nation, they brought the machinery of production into the democratic control of the people, they made the party reducible and accountable to the soviet masses. It were the revolutionaries who dared and actively purged those who went against this revolutionary line. They dared to not hold themselves to Marxism as it was set out by its old German-Jewish founder.

Stalin created the Marxist-Leninist line by quote-mining and picking from Lenin and Marx. In this way he made the theory conform to the reality of the state he was building, he took what was useful, discarded what was not. This is the reality of Marxism-Leninism. It is neither Marxism nor Leninism, but it conforms to reality and not to theory split from reality.

At the same time, Mao Zedong split himself from the Chen Duxiu line and his 'proto-Trotskyist' ideas. Mao Zedong embraced the peasants not as work-horses to be subordinated to the 'supreme discipline of the proletariat' as the Trotskyists so brutishly and disgustingly profess, but as the harbingers of the great Chinese revolution. The peasantry was instrumental in the fight for the liberation of China from various cliques and the corrupt Kuomintang.

Mao dared to go further, not only was socialism in one country a realistic and necessary goal, the class struggle did not stop after seizing power as was erroneously believed. Even

The Manifesto of National Maoism

the Soviets held this wrong idea. The people were always at war, if not from the Imperialist element abroad or the national bourgeoisie element at home, then from the internal capitalist roaders in the party. Infesting each level in the national hierarchy, infesting places of work, the military, factories and farms with their decadent corruption. The capitalist roaders aimed to bring back China back to the age of foreign exploitation.

The heathen of Marxism, Mao Zedong dared to wage a Cultural Revolution, to go directly against the Marxist dogma of economic supremacy. He stated that the people not only need economic liberation, they also need political, cultural and spiritual revolution. To collectively develop the new Chinese worker, the new man, free from bondage of capitalism and liberalism. Able to walk hand in hand with his and her comrades without fear and without a thought of liberalism. Able to mobilise and kill the enemy of the collective without remorse.

Mao theorised and developed a new stage, this caused him to be perceived as a heathen in the west and among the eastern Marxist orthodoxy. When the capitalist roaders under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping came to power, they revived the Marxist orthodoxy and the Leninist line. These long forgotten and outdated theories served well for their seed of corruption to plague China, to destroy her newly developed revolutionary traditions, to 'Westernise' her culture. Leninism gave them the authority which they needed to split from Mao Zedong thought.

Marxism is liberalism, only via splits from the original doctrine, the revolutionary gains could've been achieved. Marxism on its own is liberalism, the most hideous type which impersonates a revolutionary doctrine but is simply a repainted version of liberalism.

Liberals of the 1800s believed that the state should wither away, Marx was not unique in his belief of communism, this was the socially accepted doctrine among liberal academics of the time. The commonly held belief among the liberal thinkers then was that the state ought to be small and within itself find means to become smaller, to wither away as much as possible. Their final goal was to produce a stateless society as its productive potential expands which liberates the individual.

Marxism from its onset was liberalism. When Lenin waged a revolution with the Bolsheviks, this was a shock, a break from Marxist orthodoxy. Why would Russia have a revolution led by socialists? Marx' description was that the struggle would be led by the revolutionary bourgeoisie which would industrialise the productive forces and create conditions necessary for proletarian struggle.

This was a shock, one which Lenin, being a sly lawyer and a loyal Marxist tried to explain with Marxist jargon and concepts, but it was too late, the split happened. Orthodox Marxists, who took either the social democratic, reformist line or the staunchly dogmatic Marxist line, already declared him to be a brutal beast. They declared the Bolsheviks to be murderers and certainly (in their minds) unable to build socialism.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Due to the dire circumstances resulting from the peasant rebellions, Kronstadt rebel demands regarding the disposition of one's own produce of labour etc. Lenin gave the power back to the national bourgeois in what was called the 'New Economic Policy' (NEP). This was seen as a 'Strategic defeat' and a setback. However, this was done under the strict control and supervision of the Bolshevik party.

Lenin did that while at the same time adopting an elitist attitude, implementing one-man management in the factories. His policies let one man have the power to ultimately decide the norms in the factories. NEP obligated the workers to be quiet and obey lest they be chastised, fired or even imprisoned. Concurrently, Lenin implemented a system of 'democratic centralism' and 'vanguardism' in the party which means that the party members could not be recalled by the masses. The masses were to obey and subordinate themselves to the 'omniscient' party.

Luckily he died before he could cause any further harm by trying to bring his ideas in line with orthodox Marxism.

He was succeeded by Stalin who painstakingly tried to unify Lenin's words with the new brave path, the post-NEP world, to bring about the foundation for building socialism. Stalin ended the NEP, not without its troubles, as the Kulaks (rich landowners) destroyed their livestock and burned their grain. They did that to force Moscow to bring back a system that favoured them. To their dismay, Stalin with an iron hand annihilated the biggest Kulaks and collectivised the agriculture. This meant that the Soviet Union would never again rely on private actors to supply food to the biggest nation on the planet. The state took control of major industries and agriculture.

The remaining Kulaks didn't reform though, they found jobs and tried to get privileges over others there. The corrupt mentality of former land-owners doesn't erode easily and festers anywhere they go.

Stalin democratised the government and made it so that the masses could recall their representatives. The 1936 constitution reformed the government and its structure and changed how elections were conducted. Stalin's purges in 1936 destroyed the fifth column elements, this move guaranteed complete national loyalty to the state during the upcoming World War while making sure that only his revolutionary line was to be upheld. The line which millions trusted and benefited from.

His theoretical engagements were trying to synthesise a new ideology, Marxism-Leninism, he cherry-picked quotes from Lenin, Marx, whatever fitted to describe his ideological shifts, but this is where his mistake lied. Declaring oneself a Marxist and a Leninist gives credence to both these men. It gives credence to all the smaller movements which hold themselves to be the true successors to Marx and Lenin. It limits yourself and the people since they have to now respect these figures even if their ideas contained many poison pills which ultimately could be used to harm the nation.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Mao committed the same mistake, the Maoist line then was called Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong thought. When Deng Xiaoping came to power, he called himself a Marxist-Leninist after all, but in his mind he was not referring to Stalin's contribution and synthesis of the ideology. Deng's 'Marxism-Leninism' was upholding whatever Lenin and Marx said, not previously filtered by Mao or Stalin.

Deng justified his shift from autarchy to integration with the international capitalist system by referring to low level of productive forces' development. He borrowed Lenin's theorising from the NEP, for example the concept of 'one man management' to undermine democracy to raise the productive forces. This provided him with a theoretical basis to abolish the Cultural Revolution era criticisms via dazibaos (big character posters put up by the Chinese workers in visible places criticising the leadership of high ranking figures).

Hua Guofeng abolished the worker revolutionary committees some years before, this let Deng then subordinate the workers to one factory manager. The factory managers were of course chosen from the party elites and could be controlled and privileged with high salaries. He justified bringing in foreign capital by referring to Marx and how the bourgeoisie is needed to develop productive forces. Their explanation being that socialism and market economy do not contradict, that they are in the primary stage of socialism and need to develop productive forces. Otherwise, it would be impossible to claim that you're building socialism.

This absurd situation leads us to today where China has a record amount of billionaires while poverty is sky-rocketing. The poor people are getting poorer while the rich get richer, a phenomenon well known in the US. However, it is China, not the US which calls itself Marxist-Leninist as they sing the Internationale and in word (but never in action) declare themselves to be socialist and for the working people.

A major problem with Marxism is that it gives high credence to its dogma which it considers 'scientific' and therefore 'true', not to be questioned. Its bulk was written by Marx and later expanded by Engels and Lenin. This means that it cannot consider Fascism and learn from it. It cannot even effectively learn from its own experiments and will always have elements which declare themselves to be Marxist and anti-revolutionary. The same happening in Fascism is inconceivable to a Fascist whose adherence is to the national state that represents his nation, not to the theory and dogma.

The Marxist adherence to dogma is the best argument for why this ideology is a revolutionary dead end. Take for instance an example of Marx saying that a state needs to do 'X' but Stalin and Third Positionists did 'Y' which was necessary for survival. There was still pressure on Stalin to somehow adhere to the 'X' from the Marxist circles. Stalin had to explain away how 'Y' is just temporary compared to the 'X'. The dogma of the 'X' was not to be questioned even when reality proved it to be wrong. Stalin could not do what Il Duce

The Manifesto of National Maoism

did and set a new course, admit to the mistakes and follow the new, rupturing from the past.

The adherence to 'X' was upheld by 'true Marxists' while the realistic 'Y' followers were considered 'red Fascists'. In this way Marxism sabotaged its revolution by adhering to the dogma.

In the end, we are found in the situation whereby various Marxist groupings still adhere to 'X'. This happened even when the Marxist state, the manifestation of ideological success followed 'Y'. Marxists simply refused to adapt to the reality as is, effectively proving that their philosophy is stuck and unable to go beyond itself.

All what Deng did was consistent with Lenin and Marx but not Stalin or Mao, he did the 'X' while dismissing the 'Y' as 'un-Marxist' which he was right about. It were Stalin and Mao who, wanting to add credence to their political lines, kept the references and grounding in these two former figures. Instead of having their line named after them, they should've criticised and given a much lower priority of consideration to them!

It is for this reason why we are writing this manifesto. Marx, Lenin and even Stalin to some degree are no longer enough as revolutionary inspirations or models for present day socialism.

Marx said: *'History repeats itself, first as tragedy, second as farce'*. He was right in that respect, the ideologies bearing his own name are nothing but a farce, delusions upheld by liberals with a tinge of red pretending that they aren't liberals. Infested with middle class children role-playing as revolutionaries while spewing hatred and denouncing the working class which doesn't fit their profile of 'progressivism'.

Their hallmark is to be elitist and rejecting the working class while hiding in their burrows. Spending their time in their irrelevant and pathetic book clubs, reading the same old dry theory without a shred of creativity in their brains. Book worming for the sake of book worming, the equivalent of driving a car just to drive without using it to reach your destination. In both comparisons one is aimless, just wandering around for no purpose.

It is therefore necessary to reject Marxism and Leninism in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

As a true modern day ideology, Maoism can stand on its own legs without being tied down to the shackles of the old. Maoist dialectics differ from those of Orthodox Marxist ones, Mao's political philosophy differs from Lenin. There's an element of continuity coming from Marx, but the same can be said of Confucius, Laozi and their influence on Mao, the same could be said of Hegel through Marx. Yet one doesn't call themselves a follower of Hegelianism-Marxism-Leninism-Taoism-Confucianism-Mao Zedong Thought, because one

The Manifesto of National Maoism

knows that the leap from Confucius and Hegel was significant enough to not warrant credence to these ideologies. Credence means power to those who follow other lines, power given from actually successful socialist currents to otherwise obscure political fringes. Right Hegelians, Confucians are largely irrelevant now for this reason, whereas Trotskyists, Left-Communists aren't for the same reason.

As a true revolutionary doctrine encompassing the Cultural Revolution, Chinese dialectics, Protracted People's war, Peasant-Proletarian continuum, Maoism warrants to be its own ideology, **not MLM but M!**

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Preamble for Third-Positionists/Fascists

Fascism as a political ideology arose due to failures of Marxism. It was a development which addressed the issues springing from both socialism and liberalism, addressing the problems of both and trying to create a new course.

It rejects the materialist supremacy of the Marxist and Liberal world-view, which by its own admission broke down the man to the level of a machine. The machine which cares only for what it can obtain, isolated from any spiritual concerns. Marxists claim that what man is and how man thinks has its origins in his material realities exclusively, these realities then build up culture, not the other way round. The base of society are material relations which build up the superstructure above.

Fascism rejects that with its spiritual primacy, the individual is not a special unit but rather, it exists within the state. Fascism allows limited freedoms so that the individual can serve the state best. Life does not evolve around a single unit, rather, the unit is a part of a whole structure, the state. The Fascist state builds a common destiny based on the culture, language and history of the entire people. This common destiny is the spiritual aspect of fascism which was frequently emphasised by Mussolini.

Restoring essential values and principles to a great national society, Fascism is working with a soul of iron to strengthen in the people those virtues of devotion and discipline from which it drew its strength.

— 'Fascism is spiritual Revolt' - Mussolini

One can die for the spiritual aspect, death being the cessation of life, there's no material interest in dying, nothing to gain. The materialistic viewpoint cannot reconcile itself with death and this is why it focuses on the 'sanctity of human life'. This is why the liberal propaganda puts life as so important, why it nags various non-liberal ideologies for rejecting the principle and having blood on their hands.

Fascism (And Stalinism + Maoism) utterly reject this belief. One lives to serve the state. The right to life can be revoked when one engages in counter-revolution against the state, when one aims to undermine the cultural and civilizational values on which the national collective hinges.

Fascism rejects the liberal notion that the state ought to play a minimal role in public life. The state is the instrument which leads to the realisation of the nation and its culture. It is the foundation of truth within civilisation without which chaos and blunder are the only alternatives. To prove that this is the case, ask yourself, how does one determine truth now?

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The answer is that one goes to academia and the oracles of science make up truth. They practice their wizardry with their book of magic called the 'scientific method'. An inherently elitist organisation selects these labcoat wizards, they are trained for the role and taught magic. Like every true magicians, they possess various magical instruments from which they gather numbers, and having processed them they then present this as the truth from the universe.

The liberal state then filters out the numbers and picks those which enforce its own capitalist rule for propaganda the best and declares that this is the truth. Their findings, their promulgations become what is 'real' while any folk beliefs contradicting that become superstitions, academia as an element provides 'truth' in a liberal society.

Within Fascism, it is the collective state which forms what truth is, the institutions become accountable to the nation and truth becomes whatever the state determines to be. The state being made up by individuals within it from the whole society. This means that there can be no other truth than what is collectively determined by the state for the benefit of the nation!

The Fascist state is an all-encompassing, totalitarian entity, it seeks to tackle any arising problems in a way that benefits the nation. It seeks to eliminate any internal struggles coming from class, religion, ethnicity, its key is to break down individual identity, individual allegiances and supplant them with collective group identity. All members belonging to the nation share this group identity alongside unconditional allegiance to the state so that it can fulfil the historical mission and destiny of the nation.

Initially erroneous, Fascism claimed that the political structure of the state is trifling and that it 'outgrew' the dilemma of the monarchy vs republic, in 'Doctrine of Fascism' (1932), it is written:

Fascism has outgrown the dilemma: monarchy vs. republic, over which democratic regimes too long dallied, attributing all insufficiencies to the former and praising the latter as a regime of perfection, whereas experience teaches that some republics are inherently reactionary and absolutist while some monarchies accept the most daring political and social experiments.

Yet having experienced the direct betrayal by the monarch and the Industrial capitalists, Fascism entered a new stage in its development. Fascists realised that the state cannot exist with duality of power, it cannot share power, it has to be an end in and of itself. The state cannot allow the monarchs or any other group to exist. In his Munich Radio Speech (1943) after liberation, Mussolini said this:

Given these conditions, it is not the Regime that has betrayed the Monarchy, but the Monarchy that has betrayed the Regime. So low has it fallen in the minds and hearts of the people today that it is simply absurd to suppose that all this can in any way compromise

The Manifesto of National Maoism

the unitary structure of the Italian people. When a Monarchy fails in its tasks, it loses every reason for existence. As for traditions, Italy has more republican traditions than it has monarchical ones. The unity and independence of Italy from all foreign monarchies was willed more by the republican current and by its purest and greatest apostle, Giuseppe Mazzini, than by the monarchists.

{...}

The State that we wish to establish will be national and social in the broadest sense of the word: that is, it will be Fascist in the sense of our origins. While the movement is developing into an irresistible force our intentions are as follows:

{...}

4. We will destroy the parasitical plutocracies and at last will make work the object of the economy and the unbreakable basis of the State.

The parasitical plutocracies being the monarchy as well as the bourgeois which from the very beginning plotted against Mussolini. Their preferred state was that of unrestricted liberalism, where they, as private individuals could gain and profit the most at the expense of the nation and its workers, peasants and soldiers. Fascism forced them to work for the common benefit, something which they never wanted nor were prepared to do.

The working people, the peasants and the army were groups which have not abandoned Fascism, they honoured and stayed loyal to the revolutionary Fascist doctrine. They became the life-force of the Italian Social Republic, republic free from the parasitic influence of Confindustria and the King.

To no surprise then, why Mussolini in his testament (1945) said this:

The worker who fulfills his social duty with no other hope than a piece of bread and the health of his family repeats, on a daily basis, an act of heroism. Labourers are infinitely superior to all false prophets who pretend to represent them. These false prophets have an easy time of it due to the insensitivity of those who have the sacrosanct duty of taking care of labourers. It is for this reason that I was, and am, a socialist.

Mussolini rejected socialism in his previous writings, in 'Turn to the Right' (1922) he wrote:

We realized this shift before anyone else, which caused us to revise the historical and theoretical positions of Fascism from top to bottom. This is why Fascism has been gradually stripped of those primitive trappings which could make it seem like a left or semi-left movement.

{...}

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Now is the time for Italy to move towards the right. Now is the time to eliminate the political left. Experience is a teacher. ... Regardless of what people may say, the fact is that all the fresh, raging and most current forces of national society lean towards the right. It is the voice of a Europe which does not want to perish. Needless to say, the right does not necessarily mean stagnation or perpetual conservation, but means wisdom of reality and historical possibility. Thus measured, therefore, critical faculty and equilibrium and inexorable opposition will completely vanish.

He characterised the 'right' as:

"The world is moving toward the right". When I say 'right', I mean anti-socialist and anti-democracy.

Yet despite the sweet words of loyalty coming from the marble chambers of Confindustria and the promises of the King to not involve himself in Mussolini's affairs. They betrayed Italy to consolidate power for their own selfish interests. Ultimately, it didn't work out for the king as post-war Italy became a bourgeois republic. This was the decisive turning point in the development of Fascism.

The Italian Social Republic in its Manifesto of Verona recalled the 1919 'Il manifesto dei fasci di combattimento' and exceeded its demands. The Republican Fascists socialised their industry further with the aim to get rid of the traitorous and parasitic capitalist class (This manifesto is similar to the 1975 Maoist constitution). This does not mean though that Fascism turned to the left or that it stayed with the right. While Fascism used to so proudly used to proclaim in 1922 that the 20th century is the century of the right and therefore Fascism. Republican Fascism as an ideology exceeded and broke through the left-right axis spanning from the French Revolution.

It was at the same time anti-capitalist and anti-communist, it was anti-liberal and socialist, nationalist and anti-internationalist, it was the third position. In the 'Doctrine of Fascism' Mussolini/Gentile write:

Equally foreign to the spirit of Fascism, even if accepted as useful in meeting special political situations—are all internationalistic or League superstructures which, as history shows, crumble to the ground whenever the heart of nations is deeply stirred by sentimental, idealistic or practical considerations. Fascism carries this anti-pacifistic attitude into the life of the individual. "I do not care" (me ne frego)—the proud motto of the fighting squads scrawled by a wounded man on his bandages, is not only an act of philosophic stoicism, it sums up a doctrine which is not merely political: it is evidence of a fighting spirit which accepts all risks. It signifies new style of Italian life. The Fascist accepts and loves life; he rejects and despises suicide as cowardly. Life as he understands it means duty, elevation, conquest; life must be lofty and full, it must be lived for oneself but above all for others, both near by and far off, present and future.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Such a conception of life makes Fascism the resolute negation of the doctrine underlying so-called scientific and Marxian socialism, the doctrine of historic materialism which would explain the history of mankind in terms of the class struggle and by changes in the processes and instruments of production, to the exclusion of all else.

The Fascist conception of life and one's devotion to the state and therefore to the nation was a breakthrough. It went against the deluded belief that somehow the people as a class will internationally unite to abolish capitalism to bring about some magical classless, stateless and individualist utopia.

Fascists opted instead for national unification and destruction of capitalism via the national collective of workers and peasants. This same process happened in the USSR and in Maoist China to the dismay of orthodox Marxists. The Chinese identity in particular hinged on the nation because China cannot be broken down based on culture because there are many cultures within its borders. It cannot be broken down in terms of language because there are many languages spoken in the country. It can't be broken down in terms of ethnicities because there are 56 different ethnicities within it. The only way for China to exist was as a collective nation with the people of all languages, cultures and ethnicities declaring themselves as Chinese and upholding their shared devotion to China.

Orthodox Marxism utterly failed in its own predictions and had to undergo a revision. Reality forced a rupture in the ideology, it had to adopt Third-Positionist logic to realise itself, to come into being. Stalin and Mao still grasped onto Marx while they reached the same conclusions (albeit organically) as the third Positionists.

Evolution selects species based on the environmental pressure that they are exposed to. When the environment is similar in two places of the world, 2 different species, even when separated thousands of miles from each other, may evolve similar features. This is called 'Parallel Evolution' in biology, this explains why hedgehogs and echidnas have spikes and look similar despite having no close common ancestor.

The same law persists with ideologies and revolutions. The only way for the Marxist revolutions to prosper and to survive was to effectively adopt the same solutions and concepts that Third Positionism did. This would've happened even without the existence of Fascism, like an echidna would still look like it does even without hedgehogs. This will happen again and again, and is a mark of any successful revolution so far.

Even the concept of public criticism which was so profound during the Chinese Cultural Revolution, was theorised within Fascism 23 years prior in the Manifesto of Verona. The workers were free to criticise the state bureaucracy when it didn't further the interests of the national collective.

3. That this republican Constituent grant to citizens, be they soldiers, workers, or taxpayers, the right to audit and criticize the public administration's actions, so long as this right is exercised in a responsible manner.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Fascists realised their mistakes in their early years and adopted a programme which paralleled what later was drawn up by Mao Zedong independently. This was effectively convergent evolution as similar circumstances forced Mao (and Stalin before) into doing something similar to what the Italian Social Republic did. We can even analyse features of Fascism that were more advanced than Mao Zedong thought, and those were the concepts of the state and the nation.

Within the tradition of revolutionary nationalism, there's also a phenomenon of anti-fascism, particularly springing from Paetel's group — National-Bolsheviks and their modern descendants.

Often revolutionary nationalists pride themselves in how their ideological tenets didn't spring from Fascism but as opposition to it, and they refuse to be grouped in with Fascists. We believe that this is a mistake given modern conditions, but nevertheless it was the correct approach back in the 1920s and 30s.

Fascism under Mussolini underwent 4 stages, the pseudo-socialist phase, liberal phase, capitalist corporatist phase and finally a socialist phase.

When Paetel was writing his manifesto, Fascism was firmly in its corporatist phase. Mussolini played a 'centrist' within Italian Fascism. He rejected the revolutionary syndicalism and corporatism (syndicalismo/corporatismo integrale) which sought to eliminate the capitalist class, conceived by Edmondo Rossoni, while also eliminating the liberal wing from the Fascist party and general society. He did that as he subordinated the Fascist party to himself via the state which he was in charge of.

His policies benefited the Confindustria (Italian Industrialists) out of his own initiative, not theirs, and he allowed the King to remain untouched, pledging allegiance to him.

He accomplished many great things during that stage such as elimination of the Mafia and stabilisation of the economy via mass-socialisation of industry, second only to the USSR.

Special labour courts were established to guarantee the protections and fairness in rulings for the working class (although most of its membership was filled by capitalists). However, despite all this, the corrupt plutocracies of the monarchy and capitalism remained as they were and effectively plotted against the state since their default preferred mode of production is liberalism, not Fascism.

They sought to be free from the shackles imposed by the Fascist system and Mussolini was too blind to acknowledge it, instead flaunting about how his class-collaborationist model has effectively solved the issues springing from class struggle.

To this type of Fascism, did the Revolutionary Nationalists rally against. They rallied against the Confindustria, against monarchy and having the nation who is composed of working class heroes, be subordinated to these parasitical plutocracies. Their

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Anti-Fascism was anti-capitalist and perhaps this would've been the appropriate stance to take to this day if it was not for the final development of Fascism.

In 1943, as could've been predicted by revolutionary nationalists, Mussolini was betrayed by Confindustria and the King, he was arrested and jailed. He was then promptly rescued by German paratroopers and returned to Italy. His whole world-view of class collaboration between the capitalist oligarchs and the monarchy with the proletarian and peasant masses has shattered.

We bring again Mussolini's words in his first radio address post-liberation (18th of September 1943, Munich), he stated:

"4. We will destroy the parasitical plutocracies and at last will make work the object of the economy and the unbreakable basis of the State.

[...]

Fascist women, resume your work of moral and material support, so necessary to our people. Farmers, workers, and employees: the State that will emerge from this immense toil will be yours, and as such it will defend against whoever might dream to return to the past. Our will, courage and faith will give back to Italy its character, its future, its potential and its position in the world. More than just a hope, this must be an absolute certainty for you all."

It was clear that it were not the peasant and proletarian masses which abandoned Fascism. As such Mussolini had to abandon the corporatist project, of trying to balance power between various plutocracies, he went onto embrace a new socialist project. The Italian Social Republic was born in 1943 whose policies were that of vast socialisation of the means of production and land, the re-orientation of Italy along peasant-proletarian line in a national alliance.

The state that was emerging from this 'immense toil' was to be that of the 'farmers, workers, and employees', not capitalists or the king.

On the behest of the allies, a series of strikes were planned by the communists in 1944 to weaken the Italian Social Republic internally. Only a fraction of the total workers participated which although had an impact, it was nevertheless under-whelming. The workers weren't suppressed and stood united under the banner of the Italian Social Republic, this goes to show the genuine support for Fascism from the working class.

The ISR was also Fascism, yet has the Italian Social Republic done anything that a genuine Revolutionary Nationalist would disagree with?

Is it then justified for Revolutionary Nationalists to see Fascism in such a negative light, through the eyes of 1933's Karl Otto Paetel?

The Manifesto of National Maoism

No, this mistake here is common among Marxists too, stuck ideologically and situationally in the year 1950, refusing to reconsider their ingrained notions. They instead authoritatively proclaim that they are right, nothing changed, fascism is bad because Dimitrov wrote a terrible book about it in the 1930s.

This is laughable and unrealistic, it refuses to consider the obvious change within Fascism, its development as a doctrine and system. The most 'modern' variation of Fascism, based on the experiences of the Italian Social Republic is Socialism. It is a doctrine that is compatible within the canon of Revolutionary Nationalists, including Nazbols.

Given this view, we cannot stick to the criticisms of Paetel. Although his criticisms of the Fascist system of his time are correct, they hold no more water given the existence of the Italian Social Republic and its development.

Fascism turned to the workers and abandoned the 'parasitical plutocracies'. When talking with modern European Fascists, it is seldom found that such a Fascist would dismiss the goals and achievements of the Italian Social Republic.

It is this Italian Social Republic which reformed the ideology and as such we warmly embrace the label 'Fascist' within our own movement.

A note must be made concerning US Third-Positionists. Just like US Marxists, being filled to the brim with liberal notions and mentality, so do US Fascists often share this sentiment. As Socialism or Fascism never existed within the United States, the liberal mentality is the de-facto state.

It is a common trend among US Fascists to declare themselves as 'classical Fascists' since they refuse to consider the important developments of 1943-45 in Fascism and prefer instead to cling *uncritically* to Doctrine of Fascism and any considerations prior to the ISR. This is a mistake, arising from the fact that in America, there was no Fascism or socialism.

America is mentally filled to the brim with liberalism. Fascists there want to have Fascism but also idolise the markets and capitalism. They see corporatism of 1926-1943 as their ideal solution. Socialist, anti-capitalist notions are watered down in a Hitlerian fashion, rather than strict anti-capitalism, the notion is turned into building a common 'social' community, the Volksgemeinschaft.

Capitalists are allowed to be and control the economic system while the workers are subjugated to their whims but not without first receiving substantial governmental support and protections.

US Fascists tend to declare their adherence behind corporate Fascism, seeing it as their ideal while also dismissing or pretending the experiences of the Italian Social Republic didn't exist. Effectively these Fascists are stuck fetishising a Fascism which is outdated, refusing to acknowledge its development which is so vital and informative.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

They proclaim that capitalists need to exist and flourish while the workers need to be subjugated under the corporate will. The workers are to be given some stake within the company they work in but never sufficiently high for self-determination which is instead given to the 'advanced, smartest, most-capable' elites, (aka: the parasitical plutocracies in words of Mussolini.)

Their advocacy breaks down to simply transplanting Fascism of 1933 Italy into the US. Against them, the Paetel's critique stands firm and strong. They are anti-masses, elitists and have no place within any revolutionary movement. They are filled with liberal notions and refuse to advocate for the interests of the national masses, the majority of which are composed by the workers struggling due to these 'most-capable' elites deciding their fate.

Not to mention that this stance is ignoring history and is elitist and anti the working class masses (hence anti-nation), not to mention that even if implemented, the American capitalists **WILL** without a doubt betray the Fascist project sooner or later, there can be no Fascism, no Nationalism without socialism!

We oppose that decisively, Fascism can only realise itself as a true Socialist doctrine. These US fools have no right to claim the mantle of Fascism, and it is our aim as conscious, nationalistic and socialistic proletariat to struggle against such outdated and anti-worker entities. Indeed, it is the duty of Fascists themselves to defend the Italian Social Republic against such attempts of 'returning to the past'.

"...and as such it will defend against whoever might dream to return to the past"

Mussolini was clear, the new Fascist state will defend the workers against Fascists stuck to and in the past, trying to go back to earlier forms of Fascism. He didn't consider the previous Fascism as some alternative but acceptable route, he himself considered the return to the past, the 'Fascisms' of the past as states that we need to avoid and agents trying to bring back the past as enemies to be liquidated.

It is the duty of every modern Fascist, enlightened with the experiences of the Italian Social Republic, the most modern development of Fascism, to see to it that he is an enemy of any so called 'Fascists' who seek a return and inspiration from the Fascism of earlier years. Fascism is tough and unbroken, it seeks not to replicate the past but to further the interests of the national community for its brighter future, socialism is an obvious key to the national revival.

We embrace Fascism but strongly oppose any elitist, plutocratic anti-mass variations of it, stuck to a period which ultimately was a mistake for the movement.

Nationalism without socialism can never be a path to 'full liberation'. When Poland became 'independent' in 1918, the right of PPS (Polish Socialist Party) declared that they can reach independence without fulfilling its commitment to socialism, simply by having its own

The Manifesto of National Maoism

nation and its own 'patriots' from among the working and capitalist classes. In reality this meant foreign interests could buy out the nation bit by bit. French, American capital flowed within the country meanwhile the condition of the working class (the lifeblood of the nation) didn't improve.

After the war, when a new socialist ideology was implemented and was beginning to be built by Bolesław Bierut (the president of Poland from 1947-1952 and later party's general secretary until 1956), he analysed these contradictions and promulgated that the fight for independence is an area which is dependent on class struggle between the workers and capitalists and cannot be independent from that.

He was correct and under his reign, Polish production and culture prospered in significant ways, achieving better results in 10 years than the entire 20 year pre-war Republic.

The working masses make up the nation, they cannot sell it out unlike the corrupt plutocracies of monarchy and capitalism.

Socialism is the only solid ideology which can guarantee legitimate independence for the nation. If one professes love for the nation and declares himself to be a nationalist then socialism is a natural and logical step, to guarantee the welfare for the nationalist masses so that the nation can develop and grow.

There are of course so called 'right wing patriots' who profess love for the nation but advocate for a policy of ruthless individualism and social Darwinism, reducing the nation to shallow patriotic slogans and signifiers, making it a matter of personal, rather than collective identity.

They seek to make capital become synonymous with being patriotic, they seek to make consumption of commodities the highest expression of patriotism. This buries a genuine love to one's nation behind cheap plastic flags and consumption rituals. It sells out the national assets to the foreign bidder without reserve.

We reject that resolutely. As much as we are anti-left, so are we also decisively anti-right, the two wings of the same liberal bird can only be smashed by the doctrines of revolutionary nationalism.

We therefore believe that a unification of Maoism and Third-Positionism is a step towards the total consolidation of power in the hands of the working masses. This synthesis allows us to go beyond adherence to dogma and build a common adherence to the national state as being above any 'theory'.

We are for the masses, the workers are the ones who constitute the largest group within the nationalist masses. Therefore, The workers' interests are national interests. Otto Von Bismarck said:

"Crowned heads, wealth and privilege may well tremble should ever again the Black and Red unite!"

The Manifesto of National Maoism

This is no longer true for anarchists and Marxists as they turned to be ineffective and philosophically liberal, without the ability to challenge the liberal state. This is true for Third-Positionists and Maoists though, and it ought to be the motto of our unification!

We stand for national internationalism, this internationalism doesn't seek to turn us into individuals without an adherence to the nation. National internationalism allows us to seize the state and begin our national destiny. We stand against anti-national internationalism, against the parasitical plutocracies, against Communism and Liberalism, let the revolutionary Brown and Red unite!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Introduction

With the fall of the USSR and the liberalisation of China, revolutionary Marxism seems to have returned back ideologically and practically to where it was in the 19th century. Except the revolutionary spirit and the support from the working class isn't growing but falling for this ideology.

The 21st century therefore offers a new non-Marxist revolutionary potential. In the new age, it is no longer the case that non-Marxist, anti-capitalism is destined to fall into irrelevance. It is no longer the case that two global hegemony effectively control the entire world.

This opportunity allows us to diverge from Marxism itself. There's no authority to keep us grounded to it. If the 1990s to 2020s can be categorised as a period of capitalist realism. A period where all alternatives to this system became 'unrealistic' and neoliberalism grounded itself as the only possible road ahead, then the Cold War could've been categorised as capitalist/Marxist realism. Only these two doctrines were seen as realistic within popular consciousness, any ideas of a third alternative were effectively squashed by this global duopoly.

It made sense therefore that the majority of anti-capitalist revolutionary groups declared themselves Marxist and sought help from the Soviet Union or Maoist China, this was effectively the only acceptable and realistic form of struggle.

We live in an age however, where the red imperium is no longer here. Therefore, there's no need to grant authority to the Marxist doctrines as effective theory for revolutionary struggle. Marxism gains adherents purely due to recalling its legacy or if it is Maoism, recalling the current ongoing struggle in the Philippines. This struggle is of course important, and we ought to support it fully, but the question nevertheless remains, why stay Marxist?

Marxism is anti-Fascist, yet it finds itself in the same position as Fascism. Unlike Marxism though, Fascism is gaining following among the national working class, while new Marxist adherents tend to come from the middle class or universities.

In part, this is what prompted us to take Marxism and Third Positionist ideologies. We seek a possible synthesis to develop an organic theory able to build enough impetus to break out of capitalist realism.

The issues with Marxism all spring from liberalism, which results in pessimism and dogmatism. Too often do Marxists surrender to the status quo and support imperialism of 'red capitalist' nations. We cannot consider Marxism as an alternative to capitalism any longer, it is capitalism. Red capitalism.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Marxists act as if the year is 1950, their arrogance and dislike of the working class as it is, is a symptom of that. They see themselves as superior, the 'enlightened', 'Marxism is a revolutionary science after all' and therefore is the most correct. If they don't do anything to approach the working class, the great USSR will do revolution for them. Therefore, they can afford to stay arrogant and study the same books in their study rooms, high in their marble towers decorated with hammers and sickles.

Third Positionism offers an alternative and is connected to the working class. However, it is economically immature. Many third Positionist parties profess various economic theories and ideas springing from early 20th century corporatism to 19th century Distributism. This economic adventurism isn't grounded on reality and doesn't bring confidence to the movement.

Yet, it was Maoist China which managed to industrialise the fastest in history. It was Maoist China which reached a highly developed state of autarchy and ability to defend its socialist state from foreign invasion. As an economic model, the Chinese example offers the most stable economic system.

The picture is not as pretty when considering the political and social dynamics of Maoist China. The political system founded in China under Mao did fail, the capitalist-roaders within the party reversed the course and from austere autarchy, China opened its doors to foreign capital. The big evils of capitalism came once again to plague the Chinese lands. The Cultural Revolution era defences did not manage to establish a politically safe and stable nation that could survive Mao Zedong himself.

In what China failed though, DPRK managed to secure with success. The Korean nation rejected the Cultural Revolution, but it nevertheless managed to secure its political and social line. This was despite the collapse of the USSR and the following period of famine. It did so via hyper-nationalism and economic restructuring, but not surrender to the foreign capital like was the case with China. The Taean work system still keeps strong in Korea, guaranteeing her socialist present and future.

It were precisely the organically grown nationalist and cultural elements which kept the DPRK regime alive to this day. Ironically, these elements, if advocated for in the west, would be shunned by the left as 'Fascist'. This is the crux of the problem. The social and political policies advocated by the DPRK resemble closely the Third Positionist doctrines in the west. These policies appear to be the key to keeping states alive in the age of capitalist turmoil and counter-revolution.

Yet due to their negation of individualism, of human rights and 'freedom', they are considered backwards and 'Fascist' by the western left and therefore portrayed as the greatest evil.

The high degree of resistance from the western left against any form of Third Positionism is astounding. Leftist prefer much rather to revive various anarchist currents and long forgotten ideologies whose test for relevancy has long passed than consider analysing the

The Manifesto of National Maoism

present day situation. They would rather be 'Anarcho-Primitivist-Stirnerites' than decide on plotting a new course based on what the working class desires.

By the way, it was not the left which created the Third Position, the socialist theories of the Third Position came organically. Their conception was a result of reaction to the Marxist hegemony. This goes to show that the masses need and sympathise with socialism as an expression of their collective interests. If Marxism doesn't appeal to them as the model, something else will arise which will represent these tendencies.

We therefore write this manifesto trying to give our collective vision on the development of society. We would like to offer a bridge where the far left and far right can cross and work towards a new revolutionary ideology, National Maoism. This ideology is uncompromising on the political adherence to the nation associated with Third Positionism and economic principles of Maoism.

The Way of a Revolutionary

Any revolution is done by revolutionaries, but what does it mean to be a revolutionary?

We live in an age of cowards whose existence was normalised so that being a coward is justified and considered 'normal' meanwhile being a revolutionary is terroristic and hence bad.

This cowardice has its roots in capitalism and its infamous creation, the 'consumer', the lazy man who plays video games, listens to music, has few worries, that is the new normal.

Just demand of a man to give his life away to the revolutionary attempt, when the odds are low. Demand for him to fight, he'll come up with a hundred excuses e.g: I have a family, I have a dog, I need to take care of them, I'm not ready, I'm too young/old, I'm a student, I will join when I get my life on track (doesn't join when he did, but comes up with more excuses), I am too busy being in a relationship etc. we could list 100 other excuses, but this should suffice.

It seems that in the contemporary world, such a request appears inhuman. That we as anti-capitalist revolutionaries, demand a person to be ready to fight and potentially die even though he has a family to feed.

Consider this though, we all have families, whether defined by blood or friendship, but there's also one more type of family which is neglected by liberalism, the national family. Is it then not your duty as a member of the national family to fight for it?

If you saw your child on fire, would you just stare as it burns, and make up excuses for not saving it or would you find within yourself the ability to try to rescue it with all your power even at a great cost of personal injury and death to yourself? The answer is too obvious,

The Manifesto of National Maoism

yet when it comes to saving the nation, the default preference is to let it burn. This is in fact the situation that we find ourselves in nationally. Our nations are on fire. We see the fire, we smell the smoke but we choose to ignore it, we let the man in the TV and on the internet tell us that everything is fine, we just need to relax and binge on a new movie or video game.

We as nationalists simply decided to say no more to distractions, no more to mindless wandering and hedonism, this is our national family, this family which brought us up through its teachers, its symbols, and just like with a nuclear family, our impulse to save this collective is no lesser than if it concerns saving our closest relatives.

This is what it means to be a nationalist, it means to love your fatherland, your national family with all your heart and in your struggle, you make it greater. When it is threatened you fight the danger, when it is at peace, you help it prosper, there is no escape from this holy duty, this duty bestowed upon us with birth in a nation.

Yes, there are those who despite being born within one soil, are beholden to the interests of a different national community, yet their obligations to that other national community are still the same. They still have a nation in their heart for which they struggle.

The heart of a Nationalist revolutionary is one which is honest and holds within itself the best interests of the nation. One who like a solid bloc stands firm, refuses any bribes to soften his revolutionary nationalist tone, refuses laziness and relaxes only to serve his country better, his dear national family.

How does one become a fearless and organised revolutionary?

As Nikolai Ostrovski wrote in 'How the Steel Was Tempered'(1936):

The dearest possession of any person is life. It is given only once, and it must be lived so as to feel no torturing regrets for wasted years, never know the burning shame of a mean and petty past; so live that, dying you had a right to say: all my life, all my strength were given to the finest cause in all the world—the fight for the Liberation of Humankind.

So what makes one give his dearest possession to the revolutionary fight?

It is the core, what is in their hearts. A man regardless of his past, develops revolutionary tendencies depending on the circumstances he is thrown in. Within all of us workers and peasants, there's a commitment that we inherit, the commitment to the national collective.

We serve our national family and as such, when we see our nation being enslaved by foreign powers, we fight for its national liberation. The individual could theoretically forego this attachment and live in greater material abundance and personal security but then he'll just be hiding away from his responsibilities. This longing for a liberated fatherland is what motivates the revolutionary to fight. It is what motivated thousands of heroes of ages gone past to work and fight for the glory of their nations.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

It is this commitment and love for the collective that creates the revolutionary who seeks revolution to help his collective.

The key is collectivism, the key is putting the needs of the whole above the needs of the individual person. In the past, even some of the Marxist tendencies understood this requirement and therefore they advocated for the liberation of the proletariat and peasantry which made up the 'masses' and therefore the collective.

Although, mistaken in their view that this collective is not bound to a national entity, nevertheless this is what defined a genuine revolutionary, this ability to work for the whole and give up your life for the needs of the whole.

This is the foundation on which a revolutionary is built. A person who has within himself the love for the fatherland and the willingness to struggle for its greatness, even at the cost of his life. This is the basis, the core. However, such a person if not given an ideology, a direction for this internal energy, will at best end up being a trying patriot or a rebel.

Ideology serves to inform such a person on how to effectively help the collective, what to do and how to act to realise this grand ambition. If the core is the basis, the fuel and motivation for the person, then ideology is a compass pointing into a direction where this energy will transform the world in a specific way as theorised, with the ultimate aim to help the collective.

Individualism cannot be the core, anyone who considers and puts himself first will never give up their life for the revolution, because if the dearest thing that you hold above everything is your own individuum, then naturally, any actions which will threaten your self-satisfaction or life, will have to be avoided. This is the basis for liberalism and what plagues our collective communities these days.

When a person has within himself the revolutionary core, there are various ideologies which claim to help the collective. An honest man will sooner or later gravitate away from any treacherous ideologies or those ineffective, an ideology does not have the aim of motivating someone to do something, it has the goal of putting the collective energy into changing reality in some way that benefits the collective.

An ideology which doesn't put this energy into good use fails. The revolutionary masses are still there, but the ideology is no longer useful for them. We find ourselves in a situation where many revolutionary currents are either capitulating to the neo-liberal order to gain some scraps from this horrid system or offer no way for the masses to realise their interests, either due to fear that this may result in the individual leaders getting arrested (liberal core, selfish self-interests) or being stuck in 20th (for some even 19th) century, advocating for methods that no-longer work.

Historically, this core defined and is defining truly revolutionary movements, from the French revolutionaries under the guide of Robespierre to the Russian and Chinese revolutionaries, followed by the brave West German RAF (Rote Armee Fraktion) and modern Phillipino Maoists.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

There's a characteristic way of thought that defines one who is willing to give their life away for the idea to those who are too afraid and use a plethora of excuses just to not engage and fight against the system or try to excuse their reformist tendencies.

There's no cure to depression, to lack of meaning, to be found in reformism, as much as you want to fool yourself that signing petitions, volunteering for your local politician's campaign, advertising etc. is action.

This universal core is what unites a Nationalist Revolutionary (National Maoist, Strasserist, National-Bolshevik) with a genuinely revolutionary Marxist (Eastern-Marxist Leninists, Maoists). In fact the successful implementation of every anti-liberal ideology hinged on this collective core, putting the collective interest as the highest interest. Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong thought, Fascism in Italy, Juche in Korea, all are examples of the primacy of the masses and anti-individualism.

Paetel noticed (although not blatantly) that internal characteristic which allowed him to correctly identify the KPD as a revolutionary proletarian base in Weimar Republic and promote what he termed 'National Communism'. This genuine desire for a revolution is what allowed him to be strategic in advocating an alliance between communists and revolutionary nationalists while rejecting Hitlerian NSDAP, no matter the (on the surface) closer ideological affinities between himself and what NSDAP advocated.

It is this core which allows you to tell apart scum declaring to be on your side from a genuine ally and friend to the working masses. If you're a revolutionary, then mere declarations of being a nationalist or a socialist cannot suffice. Mere words or labels are just words and labels but it is what is in one's heart which truly makes the difference.

A revolutionary can identify other revolutionaries, seeing in them comrades and compatriots not caring about the labels that they use. It is a sign of liberalism when someone screeches and howls when they hear others describe themselves as 'Fascists' or 'communists' without asking them and investigating further whether they are revolutionaries or not, whether there's a genuine and unconditional love for the working masses in their hearts.

A Fascist loves his country and the working people within it. A Nationalist must also be a socialist as it is socialism which can eliminate the liberal mode of production - capitalism. A communist may also love the working class masses, although mistaken in his view on communism, if within their heart there's a revolutionary spirit and devotion to the collective, then each of these revolutionaries is a brother to the other.

We can see many examples in history of principled nationalists uniting with the communists and vice versa for the good of the nation, take for instance the Xi'an incident as a result of which Chiang Kai-Shek was imprisoned by Chang Hsueh-liang (who became a national hero of China) and forced to sign a declaration for a united front with the communists against the Japanese invasion.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

It is a shame that in the western world, such a concept among the left is foreign, how there are practically no 'good' revolutionary communists, they are only strong in mouth but weak in will, whose devotion to the label sets them on a quasi-religious path to conform to the holy doctrines.

Even western Maoists are often anti-workers, arrogant and dismissive because their path is the 'most correct', 'most modern'. Dismissing for instance the ideological promulgations of DPRK which via Juche, idealised its own system and nationalised Marxism. They will deny Juche in the name of sacred Marxist orthodoxy which preaches unconditional materialist primacy, even if reality shows them that currently DPRK is the only socialist nation standing, a nation with ideology which dares to be 'idealistic'.

A sensible man would use this as an opportunity for self-reflection, to change his own line. To investigate and find the reasons for why such a tiny country could resist liberalism and revisionism of its Nationalist Socialist line. A tiny nation which despite endless sanctions put upon it by world imperialists, is still standing strong, showing no signs of national decay. Meanwhile the 'great' socialist Marxist experiments like the USSR are lying dead, and gone for 30 years now.

This manifesto, itself proves that the idea of 'classical Maoism being perfect' is a complete lie and utter nonsense. There are drawbacks to classical Maoism when they are adapted to non-Chinese conditions. Only in China could we talk about re-implementing Maoism, elsewhere, Mao is exotic and unappealing.

It is through trying to merge the organic collectivist thinking of Third-Position that we can develop our own organic Maoism and apply the teachings of Mao-Zedong for the creation of a Nationalist Socialist revolution. The best that the current Maoists amounted to in the present western world is a few book clubs and newspapers, with no power under their hands granted to them by the proletariat or peasantry!

Mao Zedong himself wrote in "Methods of Work of Party Committees" (March 13, 1949), Selected Works, Vol. IV:

Pay attention to uniting and working with comrades who differ with you. This should be borne in mind both in the localities and in the army. It also applies to relations with people outside the Party. We have come together from every corner of the country and should be good at uniting in our work not only with comrades who hold the same views as we but also with those who hold different views.

Guard against arrogance. For anyone in a leading position, this is a matter of principle and an important condition for maintaining unity. Even those who have made no serious mistakes and have achieved very great success in their work should not be arrogant.

Yet it appears that *our* western 'Maoists' chose to not apply themselves to these important suggestions from Mao. When approached in good faith by well meaning revolutionary nationalists, all that is heard from their marble thrones is that we are nothing but Fascists,

The Manifesto of National Maoism

tools for the financial capitalists to squash socialism. Lies, arrogance and falsehoods, borne out of fear, this is the mark of western Maoists.

A revolutionary isn't a pathetic maggot like western Marxists. Arrogant because of correct remembrance of the sacred texts. Pretending like he knows more about Fascism than a Fascist because he read slanted pieces about Fascism without anything from the actual advocates of Fascism itself.

The exact problem with western Marxists MLs and MLMs is the issue of them having a liberal basis - individualism - as described above but with ideology which is historically collective, presumably they do that out of self-satisfaction, that Mao and Stalin were 'their' men who were also liberal and therefore USSR and Maoist China are examples of successful 'liberal - Marxism'. It is a bitter irony that clearly collective ideologies who disregard the interests of the individual are being re-envisioned as successes of that rotten red liberalism, 'but it was liberalism without worker oppression!'

Mao Zedong speaking at the World Communist Representative Meeting in Moscow in November 1957 so aptly said:

China has a population of 600 million; even if half of them are killed, there are still 300 million people left so what, this is war. Years later, we nurture new, and the population will be restored

Can anyone reading this seriously think that the life of a single Chinese individual mattered to Mao? You think that he would've taken their single life over the interests of the collective Chinese nation? Of course not! Half the population of China could've died, but as long as the line of the revolutionary socialist struggle was upheld and strong, this is a sacrifice that is tolerable.

This is tolerable and makes sense for anyone whose collective interest is at the heart and it supersedes the individual. In this scenario, China was bordered by the hostile USSR and threatened by US imperialism, in the event of a war, a great deal of Chinese would die, but the ones surviving would see the survival and flourishing of their socialist homeland.

If one asks a nationalist whether they would opt for the destruction of half of the populace but in return get socialism and opportunities for the surviving half to replenish the nation and develop itself, or say no and let the nation fade away in the misery of Neo-Liberalism, they would naturally prefer the former option. It's a matter of survival, of life and death, a fight for an idea greater than any single individual, it's about the further existence of the nation to last for generations. Great wounds and costs are to be earned and paid in exchange for this idea to persist. Any true revolutionary is willing to pay this price.

These liberal Marxists clearly misunderstand and even deny the collective ambitions and Stalin's and Mao's lack of concern for the individual, instead preferring to ignore them for the sake of individualism and fantasies about making life better for the single person. These Marxists were born in the west as individualists and want to keep that basis while

The Manifesto of National Maoism

seeing some issues with capitalism and therefore declaring themselves MLs but without the backbone. Just tell them that Stalin killed millions, and they will deny that, so afraid of this admission that in fact people had to die to enforce the collective Marxist Leninist line.

When a nationalist gets told that he killed millions, he asks millions of what? We only killed parasites, the enemies of the national masses, we killed bankers, usurers, cowards, traitors etc. all for the sake of the national collective! There's no retreat to liberal apologetics, to trying to lower the given estimates because 'many dead=bad', in fact, the higher the number, the bigger the sacrifice, ergo the stronger the national mythos, we as revolutionary collectivists are not afraid of numbers! We are not afraid of oppressing the individual for the realisation of the goals of the whole.

These Marxist cowards run to Marx and the liberalism of that old fool, of his ambitions for personal individualistic realisation while later quoting Mao and Stalin as if the goals of these two leaders was not the collective interest but they did what they had to because internally they were just like the western Marxists, individuals forced to do what was necessary for individual liberation.

The way western Marxists interpret Stalin and Mao is in itself a reflection of themselves. It is a reflection of having a liberal core and therefore seeing the ideology as conforming to that core. They adopt 'ML' and 'MLM' despite not understanding that their own understanding is perverse and liberalises, 'humanises' ML and MLM. The situation is so absurd that a Fascist is closer to a Maoist of the 1970's purely because a Fascist has within himself the revolutionary core whose key feature is collectivism whereas western 'maoists' don't.

It matters not then that one is supposedly ideologically different, if the core is the same, then they can find themselves becoming close allies. This is why western Marxists tend to have liberal, social-democratic friends while both despising the 'scary, evil' Fascists; while Fascists and eastern MLs (including Maoists) tend to be at the very least tolerant if not outright sympathetic and friendly to each other, hence the phenomenon of Nazbols.

A revolutionary therefore has to have the revolutionary collective core, powered by the love for his people in his heart, fueling his creative energies. This revolutionary heart is the key, on its basis an ideology is built, which informs one of the roads that he needs to walk on for the benefit of the masses.

A clean collective heart rectifies the ideology, it makes one a warm and trustworthy comrade and compatriot. When the ideology is ineffective, then he will no longer follow it. He is the voice of the collective masses, grasping and wanting to seize the day collectively.

If the core is the heart then the ideology is the brain. The heart gives the reason why, the brain shows a way how.

This is the way of a revolutionary.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Anyone serious about the revolution needs to focus on what is in his heart. Once you have it, you will know it, the way you will perceive others will change and you will naturally drift away from the squabbling pseudo-liberals who claimed to be for the working class.

You will find within yourself revolutionary optimism and power to do things you never thought you could do, your focus will increase and there will only be one goal: Revolution.

For the people, for the nation, for the collective. Long live the Socialist Nationalist revolution!

The National Maoist Conception of Dialectics and the State

Marxism relies on a method, it holds the pretences to be scientific because of the so-called 'Dialectical Materialism'.

The method is rather simple when you strip away the Marxist jargon around it, it states that the world is inherently materialistic. That there exists a material world outside human perception. According to this, humans are subject to the operations of the material world and its laws.

Natural laws of physics and biology affect people without their conception of it. In the same way Marx postulated that what guides the development of society, and therefore the development of history, are laws which decide how civilisations unravel. This is the crux of Marxism, trying to find out these laws and how they function.

As the basis for his theories, Marx used the dialectics originating from another German philosopher, George Wilhem Friedrich Hegel who had a great influence on 19th century German philosophy.

Dialectics on their own are contradictions, originating in ancient Greek philosophy, they describe how matter interacts with other matter and the abstract laws which dominate this interaction. Hegel formed his own dialectics basing on the thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Basically, what made a 'change' is the contradiction between the present state and the 'other' which changed the nature of the original object into something else.

Hegel then theorised that history itself could be explained by this simple principle. He was an idealist though and for him history was led by the world spirit (Weltgeist) whose development through time manifested itself within the minds of great people unconscious of it. These great personas were nevertheless instruments of this spirit.

Through these dialectics, history leads to an 'ideal' state whereby the questions of human freedom, reality, governance etc. would be resolved.

Marx took this as his philosophical basis but flipped it upside down, he rejected idealism and embraced materialism. He posed that history is a product of relations in the fields of production and exchange. He theorised that conflict between classes of those who hold different relations to production is what makes history and not ideas of great men.

Materialist dialectics can be broken down ranging from the physical phenomena to social changes. When you heat water, what happens is you give water (the thesis), the element of heat (the anti-thesis) which upon interaction with water produces vapour (the synthesis); how is monarchy replaced and a republic is born? The monarchy (Thesis) conflicts with the masses (antithesis) and if the power of the masses is strong enough then eventually a

The Manifesto of National Maoism

republic is born (synthesis). This causes a change of state where the masses inherit the position previously occupied by the king within the republic. The synthesis is neither the 'thesis' nor the 'antithesis' but it inherits characteristics of both.

The world was categorised like this and all interactions were broken down to this simple principle.

Marx categorised history by class struggle, in the feudal age, the serfs worked on the fields of the lords, the lords and the Serfs were two conflicting classes. Nowadays we have the conflict between the working class (proletariat) and the capitalists (bourgeoisie), the latter exploits and subjugates the former for its own gain. This conflict, as theorised by Marx, would eventually lead the proletariat to abolish the capitalists as a class and complete a synthesis. The state which in the present day is in the hands of an oligarchic elite, is overturned and the workers can establish their own dictatorship against the capitalist class.

Eventually, this movement of history would (in a similar conclusion to Hegel) establish an 'ideal' state. This ideal is classless and stateless, the individual can be born and prosper on an equal basis to everyone else. Production is based on human need and not for profit.

All of this is being controlled by the laws of dialectics, the material world is effectively controlling the development of history.

Marx saw the nation state as an outgrowth of the bourgeoisie interests, nations as expressions of national bourgeois rule. The capitalists modernise the means of production while subjugating the working class to their rule. He therefore preached internationalism, the idea that the working class, the proletariat of various nations realise their shared interests and abolish the bourgeois order. It will do that via a violent revolution, and the revolution will happen in the 'most advanced' sections of world capitalism. This is because of dialectical development going the furthest there as opposed to 'less developed' areas.

For all these reasons, you see Marxists now reject the nation state, reject nationalism and embrace the concept of internationalism.

Mao too believed in that, however, reaching from the Chinese tradition of philosophy, he conceptualised things differently. For instance, the revolution could not be done by the working class in a country where they are a minority. In China, for every proletarian there was a sea of peasants who lived the same way for thousands of years. Mao broke from the orthodoxy of Chen Duxiu (who advocated that only the proletariat can lead the revolution) and lead the Chinese revolution to victory.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

His understanding of dialectics broke down to the simple rule of 1 goes into 2. A concept produces a plurality. This fundamentally shifted the perception of how class came about in the first place. In Marxist conception of history, which is the theory of how dialectical materialism caused history to unravel in the way it did, humanity is said to have lived in a state of 'primitive communism'.

From primitive communism, humanity eventually divided their labour, different specimens were selected to perform different tasks from the rest; this eventually resulted in class divisions. However, a state of communism, even if primitive, implies no classes and no state, so how can class originate from nothing?

It can't. There were means of production and therefore there was a class, since class is defined by the relations that one has to the means of production. Class is an intrinsic quality of every society because every society has a certain characteristic of it, namely, production.

This changes the nature of this primitive communism as not being a classless state, but to the contrary, it was a uni-class state. The contradictions within the one class eventually lead to the formation of two separate classes! The approach of class materialising out of nowhere is mistaken, because reality is treated as a scientific tool to be cast aside in the future.

The separation was a result of division of labour, spanning from the requirement to have a king to make decisions on the division of land and justice as well as religion. Early on the king was not much different from the rest, he still performed physical labour like everyone else, except he also had extra administrative and judicial responsibilities. Eventually the figure of the king distanced itself further and further from the work of the common people and became exclusively engaged in administration.

As a result, the interests of the king were gradually more and more removed from the interests of the common folk, until these interests became antagonistic and exploitative in some ways, this was the birth of the royalty, a separate class. But even then his interests were never the complete opposite of those of the commoners.

The king had the responsibility to keep the borders safe and therefore keep the people safe from foreign invaders. This created a contradiction between the people and the king and gave room for the contradiction to become antagonistic. Despite that, even now the interests of the bourgeoisie in some small amounts, correlate with the interests of the proletariat even if the relation is overall antagonistic.

Early Fascism saw national bourgeoisie and their interests as being aligned with the interests of the nation. Fascism perceived Domestic bourgeoisie as opposition to the foreign bourgeoisie which sought to exploit the people of the nation without care. It sought to unite the workers and the national bourgeoisie in a model of class collaboration for the common good.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Marxists reject Fascism and call it capitalism because they think with Marxian dialectics, something like Fascism cannot possibly, logically, rationally or materially exist, it has to simply be capitalism. In their minds Fascism is simply fooling the people by pretending to be something else.

However, with Mao, the situation is different. Fascism can exist as a collaboration between classes and in fact it does so because Mao saw the correct handling of contradictions as important. Fascism could exist because it attempts to handle the contradictions between different classes, so they don't turn antagonistic. This is what Peronism was doing.

~~The Chinese already practiced dialectical thinking for hundreds of years before Hegel came up with his model. There's a fundamental difference between the Chinese dialectics and Hegelian. The Hegelian dialectical model presupposes that there's a simple whole split into two opposites. The Chinese dialectics instead posit that a concept has its anti-concept, which is not simply another concept, it is literally an anti-concept.~~

The human mind cannot imagine what an anti-concept even is because our minds operate exclusively on concepts. The anti-concept is therefore a theoretical entity existing on the same basis as negative numbers. One can imagine 2 apples but not -2 apples, the negative is inferred logically but cannot be imagined to exist within the realm constructed from our senses (empiricism). It's in a sense spiritual, based on faith and logical deductions.

There's also the 'non-concept' which contains within itself everything that a concept is not. The colour red for example is a concept, its anti-concept is anti-red. Red however contains everything that is not itself, so 'not-blue', 'not-yellow', 'not-black' etc. are all categories that exist within 'red'.

To demonstrate how this is true, consider white and black. Marxist dialecticians may tell you that these are opposites, and when black interacts with white, a synthesis forms which produces grey. We would disagree with this view and would instead pose that white has its anti-concept of anti-white, black has its concept of anti-black.

When white and black interact, this is an interaction between two concepts and one did not annihilate the other, because only anti black and anti-white could annihilate their respective concepts.

What happened is that a separate concept simply came into being, the same way the proletariat came into being with the advent of capitalism. Rather than coming to be as a result of some synthesis of opposites, it came about via interactions between various concepts which caused the serf to wither away and the proletariat to be born. These two concepts transformed into a new concept that is grey, grey now contains within itself 'not-white' and 'not-black', but only anti-grey is its anti-concept that can annihilate it. The proletariat contains within itself 'not-serf' but also 'not-lord', and under the conditions of class struggle, a new class the 'worker' comes. The 'worker' has its opposite with anti-worker and within itself it has the categories of 'not proletarian' and 'not bourgeois'.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

In a sense, one can imagine the universe as being full of concepts united with their anti-concepts, distinguished by everything that they are not. A 'thing' can therefore exist in three states only, Concept, anti-concept and potential existence. A concept initially isn't, this means that it is not a concept, rather it exists in a state of being and not being. It is united with its anti-concept effectively.

Whenever a concept comes into 'being', this concept becomes 'real' as it becomes separated from its anti-concept. It also gains all the characteristics of what it is not.

If we are to visualise a futuristic engine that hasn't been invented yet, it currently only potentially as a concept with its anti-concept. Of course, our imagined engine already exists in our minds, so this cannot be it. We have to suppose that there will be an engine in the future which we cannot imagine now. So don't try to imagine it. This engine now is in a state of potential existence until we discover it and therefore make it 'real'. We know however that even this potentially-existent 'thing' is not a cat, we can describe all the things that it is not and all the attributes of what it is not without even it being 'real'. It is in a state of potential existence, once humans invent it, only then does it become 'real'.

Due to this dynamic, we can perceive the concept and the anti-concept but not 'not concept'. The concept consists of the objects that we can perceive, while anti-concept equal but opposite to the concept, We can perceive anti-matter for example. However, the 'not concept' cannot be perceived even if every item has it. We cannot perceive the attribute 'not dog' when looking at a cat even though we know that this is contained within it.

A concept cannot be created nor destroyed though, everything that is, was and is going to be, already potentially exists. It either hinges on interactions with what already is a concept to come into existence or is a result of quantum effects (virtual waves/particles arise and annihilate but due to 'Hawking radiation' affecting black holes, a photon can simply 'escape' and become 'real' as it enters the universe whereas its other pair enters the event horizon of the black hole) but nevertheless, in either case nothing 'novel' exists as that would imply forces 'outside' of the universe. However, the universe is all encompassing therefore it is a logical impossibility for there to be an 'outside' to the universe. So in the same vein, there cannot be anything 'novel'. First law of thermodynamics states that matter cannot be created nor destroyed, concepts likewise operate on the same principle.

Therefore, after some time, as the concept is collectively forgotten and no longer has any physical manifestations in the 'real world', it returns to its former state of 'potentially existing'. It could come into existence again under certain circumstances therefore proving that it can never be truly destroyed. Like matter, which you may transform into something else and even annihilate it with its anti-matter, the result of this interaction produces something else.

This matter, if it ever is 'split' from its anti-matter, it could come into being again, it was not created nor destroyed, it simply changed form. A great Chinese scholar Ai Siqi teaches us

The Manifesto of National Maoism

that all concepts or categories are reflections of real things or events. Once the thing or event no longer is present in the 'real' world, its concept does persist after some time but eventually becomes forgotten or transformed into something else.

Consider for instance the extinct Hawaiian bird species Hawai'i 'ō'ō, the last bird died in 1987. Those who saw the bird live and heard its song are still alive. However, for them, seeing the live specimen will be different to what we, who never heard or saw the bird see it as. We may listen to a recording, see pictures and sketches of the bird but never witness it.

The concept of the bird that we are exposed to is different to what the bird was alive. Eventually even the pictures and recordings will be forgotten. This doesn't mean that the bird is non-existent though, it is now in a state of potential existence. If cloning technologies gain the ability to bring this bird species back to life, this would be the concept coming back into existence.

Life can be categorised in the same exact manner, we live, and we categorise what 'is' not what 'is not'. Our lives are effectively a concept in themselves, but in due time as we die, the concept of life doesn't stop existing, it merges with anti-life. Our apparatus, the brain which differentiates concepts, no longer functions, it returns to its primordial state from which it initially came, before conception. We are in a state of potential-existence, and just like with Hawai'i 'ō'ō, cloning could potentially bring us back to life.

In theory, if we master this technology and apply it, Mao Zedong could himself 're-live' again, be called when needed to use his great intellect and prowess to bring China to order. However, this is speculating on par with science-fiction which goes beyond the scope of those considerations. It is important to realise that death is not a cessation of life, it is a return to the state of potential existence.

Using this model, we realise that life was split from its anti-concept (not life) and therefore became realised. This then, via the differentiation abilities of the brain, invoked into existence other concepts from their anti-concepts. When a baby sees objects for the first time, it sees concepts, they come into existence, there's now a boundary between 'things' whereas before there was just an unrealised potential.

Within each concept there are contradictions, relations which upon exposure produce different concepts. Within water, upon being given high enough temperature, it evaporates, however if the temperature is even higher, it turns into plasma (as it breaks down into H⁺ and OH⁻ ions). Within each concept there are directions, pathways which the concept follows in given conditions.

Plasma may not be formed if the temperature is low enough, the water will instead freeze and become ice, it went in a different direction. The reason we say 'may' instead of 'will' is because one cannot ever be 100% certain, maybe in the future, water will turn into plasma given low temperature.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Socially we also have concepts and it is of our interest to investigate their 'directions'. There's the class of proletarians, this concept itself is capable of transforming into something new, just like it came about. Investigating the possible set of directions on which a class becomes revolutionary, is revolutionary research.

The fundamental effect that these dialectical considerations have on perceiving social relations is that if bourgeoisie and the proletariat are no longer opposites of each other. It follows that when the proletariat seizes power and destroys the bourgeoisie by physically killing and eliminating the capitalist class; the proletariat as a class doesn't wither away. It instead becomes a class of the 'worker', no longer tied to any ruling class. The 'worker class' remains as itself because only its anti-concept could eliminate it, therefore classlessness is impossible, there can however be a world of just one class. Of just the working class without the monarchy or the bourgeoisie.

If there's a class though, then the state as the instrument of mass power persists. We can therefore conclude that having supplanted Marxist dialectics with those outlined here, history can at best reach a point where class divisions withered away. The people are now one class.

This single-class state doesn't mean that it'll be permanent though, just like in the Stone Age where human tribes effectively constituted a single class. Within this class, following the advent of agriculture, intra-class divisions appeared which then led to the formation of separate classes. The same phenomenon can happen under the workers' state. Intra-class divisions could create new classes, ones which we have yet to theorise. Interestingly, this creates a bridge with Fascism, within the 'Doctrine of Fascism' Mussolini/Gentile write:

"The Fascist State is not a night watchman, solicitous only of the personal safety of the citizens; nor is it organized exclusively for the purpose of guarantying a certain degree of material prosperity and relatively peaceful conditions of life, a board of directors would do as much. Neither is it exclusively political, divorced from practical realities and holding itself aloof from the multifarious activities of the citizens and the nation. The State, as conceived and realized by Fascism, is a spiritual and ethical entity for securing the political, juridical, and economic organization of the nation, an organization which in its origin and growth is a manifestation of the spirit. The State guarantees the internal and external safety of the country, but it also safeguards and transmits the spirit of the people, elaborated down the ages in its language, its customs, its faith. The State is not only the present; it is also the past and above all the future. Transcending the individual's brief spell of life, the State stands for the immanent conscience of the nation. The forms in which it finds expression change, but the need for it remains. The State educates the citizens to civism, makes them aware of their mission, urges them to unity; its justice harmonizes their divergent interests; it transmits to future generations the conquests of the mind in the fields of science, art, law, human solidarity; it leads men up from primitive life of the tribe to that highest manifestation of human power, Empire. The State hands down to future

The Manifesto of National Maoism

generations the memory of those who laid down their lives to ensure its safety or to obey its laws; it sets up as examples and records for future ages the names of the captains who enlarged its territory and of the men of genius who have made it famous. Whenever respect for the State declines and the disintegrating and centrifugal tendencies of individuals and groups prevail, nations are headed for decay.”

Fascism wants man to be active and to engage in action with all his energies; it wants him to be manfully aware of the difficulties besetting him and ready to face them. It conceives of life as a struggle in which it behooves a man to win for himself a really worthy place, first of all by fitting himself (physically, morally, intellectually) to become the implement required for winning it. As for the individual, so for the nation, and so for mankind. Hence the high value of culture in all its forms (artistic, religious, scientific) and the outstanding importance of education. Hence also the essential value of work, by which man subjugates nature and creates the human world (economic, political, ethical, and intellectual).

The Fascist conception of the state is an end of itself, it isn't a means to an end, the state instrument creates and owns the past, the present and the future. There's no specified age of glory where the human civilisation will reach its end in harmony. Life is a struggle for which one ought to sacrifice oneself.

We can understand this dialectically too. A single proletarian state will contain within itself intra-class divisions and struggles, those born will be required to fight to keep the state and not give way to decay.

Maoists understand this well. Mao made the claim that class-struggle persists even after the proletariat seized power, this was his great theoretical contribution. He called out those within the party, the capitalist roaders, as the enemies who will effectively bring back the bourgeoisie and therefore class divisions, even though they were within the proletarian strata themselves.

Yet many western Maoists still grasp onto Marxism with the false belief that despite this struggle within socialism, at some objective point, classes and the state will be able to wither away. They believe that the struggle could end and refuse to grasp that the struggle is a natural consequence of life as understood correctly by Fascists.

We would like to underline that a single proletarian state is radically different from communism, a single class doesn't mean that there won't be a hierarchy within this class. Some members will be charged with performing roles that others cannot. Others will be selected as leaders by the masses to make quick, spontaneous decisions, while the bulk of the population will be subjugated under their command. This is consistent with the Fascist doctrine. This hierarchy can be established via mass-democracy though rather than rigid elitism present in for example 'Prussian Socialism' or early Fascism. In this way the masses will select their leaders based on the natural capabilities of these leaders. This is yet another example of similarity between the Italian Social Republic and Maoism.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The Manifesto of Verona states:

Every fifth year citizens will be called upon to nominate the Head of the Republic.

These citizens were proletarians and peasants exclusively, two classes which stayed loyal to Fascism. Similar situation happened in Maoist China, the peasants and the workers created a continuum, they built the infrastructure, universities, schools and hospitals in the countryside. The hope was that this will lead in the future to the merger of cities and villages and will cement the existence of the new peasant-proletarian continuum. The masses criticised the positions of those in authority and questioned the competence of whether they can lead them to socialism. The masses judged the corrupt officials and even death was on the table if they were proven to act in self-interest against the nation.

Within this model of dialectical materialism the proletarian state remains as it was. It doesn't wither away in a utopian manner, no matter if world socialism was achieved or not. It makes no sense for it to do so as it is the instrument of national power.

The national divisions remain as they were due to the cultural, historical, language and ethnic composition of the nation. However, the state forces the individual into conformity for the collective good, so these divisions can never be an obstacle to the national interests.

In this way we see how Maoism and Third-Position philosophies effectively become one. Leading to the same state, Fascism having realised that power cannot be shared with parasitical plutocracies, gained a socialist character while retaining anti-communism and anti-internationalism. Purging the Marxist dogma from Maoism, in turn turned it anti-communist and even more nationalistic while retaining its commitments to the working and peasant masses via socialism and Mass-Line!

The National Maoist conception of the state is all encompassing like under Fascism, there's the state and nothing may exist outside the state. This state is an instrument of the masses under which they can fulfil their unique national destiny. The masses consist of a worker-peasant continuum.

Compare this to the Leninist definition of the state which compared to the Fascist conception of the state is vulgar and immature. The state according to Lenin is just vehicle for oppression of the other classes. This definition doesn't call the state what is associated with the state, its actual administrative apparatus.

Every nation holds within itself a mission passed down from generations, this becomes the national destiny. The national destiny of China was to unite within itself various peoples, Chinese culture was never static and always dominated any cultures of its invaders who themselves became Chinese sooner or later.

The destiny of Italy as an empire was to provide a Spazio Vitale for the Italians. They sought to restore the glory of the Roman Empire, to raise Italy from its ruins and let its

The Manifesto of National Maoism

culture and way of life become dominant. Just like in the days of the old 'Imperium Romanum', Italy was to be a great power. This 'imperialisation' of Italy was never to be accomplished by brutal conquests and domination of its neighbours, that would be characteristic of Neo-Liberal imperialism. They didn't characterise themselves by greed and profit seeking in favour of the capitalist oligarchs, but by reviving the internal cultural glory of the Roman Empire. In 'Doctrine of Fascism', it is stated:

The Fascist State expresses the will to exercise power and to command. Here the Roman tradition is embodied in a conception of strength. Imperial power, as understood by the Fascist doctrine, is not only territorial, or military, or commercial; it is also spiritual and ethical. An imperial nation, that is to say a nation which directly or indirectly is a leader of others, can exist without the need of conquering a single square mile of territory. Fascism sees in the imperialistic spirit -- i.e. in the tendency of nations to expand - a manifestation of their vitality. In the opposite tendency, which would limit their interests to the home country, it sees a symptom of decadence. Peoples who rise or rearise are imperialistic; renunciation is characteristic of dying peoples. The Fascist doctrine is that best suited to the tendencies and feelings of a people which, like the Italian, after lying fallow during centuries of foreign servitude, are now reasserting itself in the world.

But imperialism implies discipline, the coordination of efforts, a deep sense of duty and a spirit of self-sacrifice. This explains many aspects of the practical activity of the regime, and the direction taken by many of the forces of the State, as also the severity which has to be exercised towards those who would oppose this spontaneous and inevitable movement of XXth century Italy by agitating outgrown ideologies of the XIXth century, ideologies rejected wherever great experiments in political and social transformations are being dared.

We won't prescribe any universal notions concerning the national destiny and its realisation in this manifesto. The national mission will differ from nation to nation. As a nation adopts National Maoism as its leading ideology, it will have to evoke the cultural and historical sentiment in its people. It will have to realise what its unique destiny is and lead the masses to its realisation.

We will however affirm Mussolini and Giovanni Gentile and repeat their words, albeit updating them for the 21st century:

**Granted that the 20th century was the century of Marxism, neoliberalism, Capitalist Fascism, this does not mean that the 21st century must also be the century of Marxism, liberalism, Capitalist Fascism. Political doctrines pass; nations remain. We are free to believe that this is the century of collectivism, a century tending to the "Third Position", a Maoist-Fascist century. If the 20th century was the century of the great anti-liberal ideological experiments (Fascism, Stalinism and Maoism) we are free to believe that this is the mass-based century, and therefore the century of the great radical left-right syntheses.*

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Original Quote:

**Granted that the 19th century was the century of socialism, liberalism, democracy, this does not mean that the 20th century must also be the century of socialism, liberalism, democracy. Political doctrines pass; nations remain. We are free to believe that this is the century of authority, a century tending to the "right", a Fascist century. If the 19th century was the century of the individual (liberalism means individualism) we are free to believe that this is the "collective" century, and therefore the century of the State.*

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The National Maoist Method for the Revolution

Our conception of the revolution hinges on Protracted People's War in less developed nations and mobilisation of the masses in the proverbial 'first world'.

Third World Struggle:

In the Third World we aim to influence the revolutionary ideologies already present there and change their character to be susceptible to National Maoism.

It is a fact that the only revolutionary struggle of present day in the Third World is fought under the banner of Marxist-Maoism. Whether in the Philippines or Peru, our interference is not negative nor invasive from our side. We don't want to condition our support for these revolutions on the need for them to follow our line. We grant strategic support to all movements which genuinely struggle against the ravages of global Neo-Liberalism and aren't openly hostile to National Maoism.

Our analysis leads us to believe that the path pursued by adherence to Marxism is flawed and will sooner or later lead to paralysis and failure of the revolutions which adhere to the Marxist line. We therefore feel obliged to spread our perspective, to let revolutionary movements tackle problems which would otherwise be left unaddressed and lead to revolutionary failure.

Our interference is strictly ideological, we offer a perspective on the struggle which allows these revolutionaries to avoid the pit-falls of communism spanning from Marxism. We don't want to be speaking in hindsight when these revolutions fail, that we knew beforehand why that happened. We feel like it is our duty and obligation to spread the message now so that these revolutions can succeed! It is no pleasure when a socialist struggle fails even if it pursues a line that is not 100% compatible with us.

We will send volunteers to help other nations in their anti-capitalist struggle. Our national organisations will determine via mass-line the degree of help to be given to anti-Neo-Liberal struggles. We believe that this is beneficial for both sides. It gives us experience and new perspective while also granting material aid to these revolutions to continue.

As for the eventuality of Third World struggle under National Maoism, we support the method of protracted people's war and all that is entailed with it as the modern method of struggle. We pledge material support and are willing to send international volunteers to fight as well as spread propaganda within our own nations that is favourable of the revolution. We will encourage new recruits to go and struggle for the revolution directly and

The Manifesto of National Maoism

indirectly. National Maoist organisations are happy to mobilise via protests to stop any individual actions of our Neo-Liberal governments aiming to harm the socialist revolutions.

First World Struggle:

We are not afraid to use any means necessary to secure power, within the first world we aim to mobilise the masses by appealing to them. We will go to the working class and lumpen communities and will recruit via food drives, community programmes. In that way we take a lesson from the black panthers and their attempts to mobilise the poor in their communities.

We adopt the principle that only when a man's stomach is full, will he listen to what we have to say.

National Maoism rejects the Marxist anti-Lumpen line as disgraceful and written by upper class men who were far isolated from the daily realities of those suffering the most under this liberal capitalist system. We aim to give the lumpen a hand, they will then decide whether to take it and help themselves within our organisation.

Within our local communities, once we gain enough numbers, we will try to operate our own internal community governance where we strengthen the regional collective and solve problems of the working folk. To the greatest extent, we want to minimise the executive reach of the Neo-Liberal state. The working class people need to know that it is **us** who helps them, and it is **us** who they can call to get problems solved. The Neo-Liberal state has abandoned them, and it deserves no legitimacy.

We run an electoral platform which is uncompromising and unashamed of our principles, seizure of power is possible via electoralism. Fascists in Italy and National Socialists in Germany seized power this way. However, their revolutions only went halfway. Likewise, the National Maoist revolution can only go half-way electorally. It has to be completed via a forcible mobilisation of the masses to overturn the remnants of the liberal system and initiate a National Cultural Revolution.

Outside the electoral wing, our party brigades will try to obstruct, via protests and agitation, the functioning of the Neo-Liberal imperialist system wherever possible. We will join Pro-Palestine protests and try to obstruct the Israeli foreign policy interests present within our nations.

We shall have a military trained wing of the party, and we shall run programmes among the youth to train them physically and mentally for the eventuality of combat of any type.

Furthermore, we will block the liberal state from throwing desperate people from their houses because they couldn't pay their rent. Likewise, we will not be merciful to landlords and will seek to eliminate this subclass of parasites from the society whenever and wherever possible, let Mao be our guide on this.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

National Maoists will run an active propaganda campaign online and on the streets, targeting the youth, the middle-aged and the old. We represent ourselves in nationalist and socialist events. We make sure that we are everywhere to be found, making sure that everyone, even the most ardent denier will know that we are the coming of a new age.

We will agitate against communists, running counter-propaganda within communities susceptible to their influence. We shall critique them thoroughly but be always willing to debate them and challenge their views, whenever a platform gives us a voice, we will use it to spread our ideas. As a union of Mao Zedong thought and Third Positionism we are confident that we can cover all bases.

As an ideology with origins in the 21st century, we accept the internet and consider struggle through the web as the key for spreading our message, propagandising and effectively doing revolutionary praxis. We consider this a necessary supplement to 'off-line' struggle, it allows us to recruit volunteers sympathetic to our cause from the entire world and spread the ideas of National Maoism worldwide.

We will not be a place for those who have no faith in the cause, for those who frequently mellow and are depressed, who see setbacks and lose hope. For every betrayal, every setback, there will be those in our movement who nevertheless proceed, these will get to witness the dawn, while the traitors will die in darkness of this age.

This does not mean we do not sympathise with the shattered and broken mess that the modern individual is under the liberal system. However, we will not let that negativity and pessimism influence our movement. National Maoism reaches out to you but it is your choice to accept the help and adhere to our discipline and organisation. You're free to choose not to and stay in the dark with no obligations to the collective.

Within our collective methods, we aim to radicalise the workers and hold strikes to improve their living conditions. We denounce corrupt trade unions that represent the interests of their bosses and not the workers, and we will launch our own syndicate networks in the style of Edmondo Rossoni.

Our party will build a state within a state, a shadow state effectively, undermining the Neo-Liberal government in every possible way, ready to replace it during a revolutionary period!

The party structure will be that of democratic centralism as this structure has proved itself to be enough to seize power effectively. The vanguard structure always organically appears in states where revolutionary conditions are prevalent, we aim to use this to our advantage.

At some point though, this structure will be challenged by the National Cultural Revolution and cannot persist. Like a ship which gets us to our destination overseas, the same ship, if it is not dismantled, could get us back to where we departed from. Once we seize power,

The Manifesto of National Maoism

we may not allow instruments which lead to the revolution become tools for the counter-revolution!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The Principles of National Maoism

These are important concepts which we take and cherish from Maoism:

1. The Cultural Revolution

2. Mass-Line

These are important concepts which we take and cherish from the Third Position:

3. Anti-Marxism

4. Nationalism

From both we inherit strong traditions of:

5. Anti-Liberalism

6. Collectivism

A general consideration:

7. The Jewish Question and Religion

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The Cultural Revolution

As National Maoists we see the Cultural Revolution, initiated in 1966 as a decisive development in trying to uphold the proletarian-peasant state of China against the currents of capitalism and reaction. As Third Positionists we treat this revolution, whose focus was not economic but cultural and therefore belonging to spiritual affairs as being compatible with our doctrines.

We adopt its tenets and aims that are compatible with Fascism. In the Decision of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (Adopted on August 8, 1966) we read:

Concentrate all forces to strike at the handful of ultra-reactionary bourgeois Rightists and counter-revolutionary revisionists, and expose and criticize to the full their crimes against the Party, against socialism and against Mao Tse-tung's thought so as to isolate them to the maximum. The main target of the present movement is those within the Party who are in authority and are taking the capitalist road.

The masses are entitled at any time to criticize members of the Cultural Revolutionary groups and committees and delegates elected to the Cultural Revolutionary congresses. If these members or delegates prove incompetent, they can be replaced through election or recalled by the masses after discussion.

The precepts of the Cultural Revolution are important but its ideas and basis cannot simply be copied and pasted into National Maoism. We therefore propose expanding and criticising the elements which ultimately caused the Cultural Revolution in China to fail. We call our synthesis 'National Cultural Revolution'!

Il Duce's revolution did not go far enough and could not prevent the resurgence of the anti-Fascist liberal and monarchical camps within Italian society. This corruption eventually led to their betrayal of the Fascist state and Mussolini.

The National Cultural Revolution and its precepts guarantee a permanent state of people's cultural war. The spirit of Fascism, the spirit of struggle can rise high and express itself among the masses within the nation. As we destroy the anti-Third Positionist elements and question their remaining structural elements, we seek to replace them by the peoples' revolutionary committees.

We also believe that the Italian Fascist experience can serve to add an extra precept to the National Cultural Revolution, that of dissolution of the party. Mussolini as a leader of the Fascist movement did not intend to keep the Fascist party independent of the state, so he subordinated it to the state. By 1931 the PNF had been depoliticised and effectively reduced to being a subservient state organ.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

This was done to the dismay of National-Syndicalists like Edmondo Rossoni, who even then had the correct economic line of '*Corporatismo Integrale*' more in line with proletarian interests. This step nevertheless ensured fascist unity in action and faith. Mussolini was not couped by Fascist masses (though there were individual traitors) once the King's betrayal became public. There were also no attempts from within Fascist circles to create a 'fascism' compatible with the invading allies and the monarchy against Mussolini.

For an example of why the party structure can fail, we need not look further than the USSR, where power was centralised, and it was effectively a dictatorship of the party state. Party became the dominant organ of power, democracy was limited to the politburo, this effectively turned the USSR and its satellites into modern aristocratic republics.

The authoritative members of the Central Committee and the politburo took the ministerial offices and used them the same way that medieval lords used their lands. The politics of the USSR were the politics full of drama, ministerial struggle was the order of the day.

For example of this, consider the struggle between the KGB head Yuri Andropov and the militia head Nikolai Shchelokov. Under Shchelokov the militia became a respectable organisation, being granted extra funding for extra training, better pay, tougher discipline at the expense to Andropov's KGB. Therefore, Andropov viewed Shchelokov with envy and hatred.

This drama left the militia dysfunctional after Shchelokov was stripped from all his ranks when Andropov became the general secretary. This dysfunction carried on until after the fall of the USSR.

Such petty disputes over different personas who held power over state organisations is exactly why the party should not control state organs. This omnipresent drama in the USSR was a disservice to the masses, it undermined national unity and turned state departments against state departments.

For all these reasons, we oppose the party rule and as much as possible we want to see it limited to being a subservient state organ. Its role is to be limited to spreading the National Maoist ideology to the masses with no extra power beyond that. The party ought to be a symbol, the state is the state.

The National Cultural Revolution therefore not only needs to target the party members within, it must also target the party itself. It is necessary to bring the party under the heed of the national National Maoist state. We build upon the mistakes of Mao and address the faults so that we can create a new line which will not allow a Dengist-like restoration.

Another precept that is added from the Italian experience is that the National Cultural Revolution needs to be a permanent state of society. It has no determined end, it is in itself constant, just like water in a river, it is always in motion. Even when it changes to steam or freezes over, the river is in a constant state of change and flux, its only constant is the

The Manifesto of National Maoism

principle of change. The same applies to the nationalist Cultural Revolution. It may contain within itself different stages of different character but the revolution never ceases.

Just like Fascism presupposes that life is that of struggle, so should this presupposition impact the ideological tenets of National Maoism. The National Cultural Revolution is constant, it begins upon the seizure of state power with no declared or supposed end. The socialist Peasant-Proletarian single-class state is a stage in history as indicated by Chinese dialectical materialism. There's no communism to be reached, and we must not fool ourselves of that. Therefore, the revolution in its own nature is permanent. It gives people an ambition and a destiny that each generation must outdo the last to reach what is commonly desired by the nation.

The aim of the great proletarian Cultural Revolution is to revolutionize people's ideology and as a consequence to achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in all fields of work.

The National Cultural Revolution impacts all fields of work and life, of spirituality and governance. Nothing is left without question. In due time new models of society and organisation will supplant the old, addressing the initial concerns of the masses. The new generations of masses will begin to criticise the new models, so that they can be replaced by even newer models as a response to the criticism. The National Cultural Revolution is a never ending-iterative process whereby the power of the nationalist masses becomes realised.

In the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, it is imperative to hold aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought and put proletarian politics in command. The movement for the creative study and application of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's works should be carried forward among the masses of the workers, peasants and soldiers, the cadres and the intellectuals, and Mao Tse-tung's thought should be taken as the guide to action in the Cultural Revolution.

No group within society shall be left unturned and unquestioned, force will be used where necessary and where it is desirable to root out the counter-revolutionary elements. The Nationalist Cultural Revolution will unite the people under one banner of Maoism — Third Positionism. The national destiny of our nations will be realised generation through generation, without an end in sight, for the revolution itself is a never ending process!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Mass line

Concerning the Mass-line, National Maoism regards it as the correct approach. It addresses the issues and problems that affect those who are members of the national collective, from mere individuals to entire organs of the state.

The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history.

We agree with Mao that people are the motive force in the making of world history, the people constitute the nation, without the people, there's no nation. Without consensus of the people, there's no national unity and without national unity, the state cannot work towards its national destiny.

The masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant, and without this understanding it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge.

Once again, Mussolini and Mao are in agreement:

The worker who fulfills his social duty with no other hope than a piece of bread and the health of his family repeats, on a daily basis, an act of heroism. Labourers are infinitely superior to all false prophets who pretend to represent them. These false prophets have an easy time of it due to the insensitivity of those who have the sacrosanct duty of taking care of labourers.

We advocate the destruction of these false prophets and the empowerment of the people. They are the real heroes and the national state has no better source of power and legitimacy than that derived from these heroic men and women present within the working and peasant classes.

We reject elitism and embrace natural hierarchies, constituents of which are to be the heroic workers and peasants and not the elites educated to shepherd the people for their own benefit.

A national state which cannot realise its destiny without oppressing the people who form the foundation of the nation and instead turns them instead into slaves for the 'western educated' elite minority is not a state which a National Maoist can support or should support. It is a state which warrants burning to the ground to give way for a process of reconstruction in accordance to the National Maoist line.

We don't want to throw out the word 'oppression' lightly as the word, so frequently shouted out by Marxist currents has gained a self-victimising dimension. Marxists cry about how they are oppressed by the 'unfair' bourgeois, how life is horrible and how nothing can be

The Manifesto of National Maoism

changed. This 'oppression-mongering' effectively became a sport, where one doctrine seeks to outdo the other in its frequency and intensity of complaints.

Marxists don't empower the masses, they just tell them that they are 'oppressed' without a plan, without a goal to achieve. We reject that whole-heartedly, when we talk of oppression we don't talk of it in the Marxist sense. The invoked feeling is not one of surrender and depression at how the world is 'unfair'. Oppression in our lingo is a simple pointer to the elements of society which we ought to analyse and get rid of.

Within the National State under the ideology of National Maoism, identifying that one group oppresses the other is a conversation starter and not an emotional tear-jerker. A National Maoist immediately follows up with 'how?' He isn't concerned with any questions of fairness or justice. He asks 'how' so that he can develop a method for halting or minimising this oppression for the benefit of the collective whole.

However, the oppression of the counter-revolutionary elements is absolutely in order, it is an oppression that is ultimately unfair because we are the collective masters of the state. We hold power, and we use this power to squash and suppress, kill any counter-revolutionary potentials who are in the minority, effectively out-powered by our collective might. We don't accept the liberal doctrine of fairness and human-rights, we are only concerned with the masses and not the interests of the individuals.

Mao describes the method of mass-line as follows:

In all the practical work of our Party all correct leadership is necessarily "from the masses, to the masses". This means: take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas), then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them and translate them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again concentrate ideas from the masses and once again go to the masses so that the ideas are persevered in and carried through. And so on, over and over again in an endless spiral, with the ideas becoming more correct, more vital and richer each time.

We agree with the method as it is consistent with the theory of permanent National Cultural Revolution. Rather than through party though, it is the state which seeks to enforce mass-line. With every iteration and every new model of government, these ideas become richer and richer, more optimised to serve the national whole, more vital in awakening the spirit of the Volk.

We should go to the masses and learn from them, synthesize their experience into better, articulated principles and methods, then do propaganda among the masses, and call upon them to put these principles and methods into practice so as to solve their problems and help them achieve liberation and happiness.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

'Happiness' does not concern us, people may be 'happy' under the bourgeois system, where their basic needs are provided, and they have commodities made to be consumed. The sweetest drinks, the most 'exciting — brain numbing' films, the most addicting video games. All these commodities made by the capitalist class to satisfy the 'consumer', a horrid identity against which we rally and discard.

The National Maoist state will not produce such commodities, from the viewpoint of an addicted 'consumer' in the present day, our state will be a dystopia. We seek to realise a revival of the folkish spirit among the national masses, to give the masses a sense of belonging and unity, a sense of duty and obligations. The modern consumer hates obligations, hates duties, only cares for himself, we see the consumer therefore as our enemy.

Our struggle will be hard and will bring more hardships for the average person, in fact, the capitalist order will react and try to squash us via sanctions, military action and propaganda. All because we represent its anti-thesis, the socialist, nationalist collective. We don't promise an easy life or fulfilment for the individual. We promise struggle between life and death and every National Maoist will be sworn to uphold the collective nationalist ideology throughout their life. National Maoists do not fear death but let it invigorate them to fulfil their obligations to the collective whole.

Mussolini in his 1943 address to the new directorate of the Fascist party said:

I have a conviction which I would call mathematical. But this conviction is not enough. There are different categories in a people, just from the standpoint of what I call nervous resistance. We are not all born equal; we are not all strong, all tall, with a solid nervous system. There are quite a few individuals who have a delicate nervous system. They are not dangerous, but they can cause unpleasant wavering. And then there are a minority of true defeatists who love to predict catastrophes, they broadcast. Those must be energetically dealt with.

Our Mass-line concept will aim at identifying the true defeatists and dealing with them. Simultaneously are creating an archetype of the strong, the powerful, those with an iron will, those who in the face of betrayal and struggle will not waiver!

With that in mind, the mass-line will open a door for us to grow as a revolutionary ideology, addressing the needs of the revolutionary masses. We will make no excuses to the masses for not enforcing it, and we will make no apologies to the enemy for utilising it!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Anti-Marxism

We explained how one can reach a position of anti-communism organically via substituting the Hegelian model of dialectics with dialectics inspired by Chinese philosophy and therefore create a new model of dialectics. In this section we would like to focus on 'anti-communism' which we proudly appropriate from the experiences of the Third-Position movements.

That the vicissitudes of economic life — discoveries of raw materials, new technical processes, and scientific inventions — have their importance, no one denies; but that they suffice to explain human history to the exclusion of other factors is absurd. Fascism believes now and always in sanctity and heroism, that is to say in acts in which no economic motive — remote or immediate — is at work.

-Benito Mussolini, 'Doctrine of Fascism'

Communists so often talk like they are above the working class, like they are a vanguard high on the mountain tops commandeering the working class. They promise them nice material provisions and 'human rights', this is exactly the same as what bourgeois politicians do.

Communists put themselves rhetorically as something separate from the masses, promising the people nice materialistic rewards if they unite behind the communist vanguard.

This is something we are categorically opposed to, our rhetoric is one from among the working class. When we say 'we', 'us', it refers to the working class itself, we don't thrust our will on the masses from the ivory tower, we gain power from within the masses. Our interests are one and the same with the masses, and what do the masses want? What do we want?

We want power!

We want to seize power and eliminate the capitalist class and create our own system, our National collective, socialist state. Even if we are under capitalist onslaught, we still want power that we will not exchange for any material concerns.

We refuse to delude ourselves that things won't get worse under socialism. Communists however cannot plan for that contingency with their ideology! When they promise people

The Manifesto of National Maoism

nice material things and simply can't deliver because of international capitalist blockades, they are seen as hypocrites by the masses. The people then proceed to destroy and make irrelevant the communist party, crushing the communist ambitions.

This happened already in the past. When the US instituted sanctions and blockades blocking the influx of material goods to Chile under Allende, Augusto Pinochet could then coup the government.

Whereas we as National Maoists, in the Sorelian spirit don't promise the masses any material niceties. Our programme is clear, if we collectivise and fight, then we will gain socialism. Socialism being an expression of our National working class power. Things may get worse, or they may get better for the individual. That isn't our main concern because we are building socialism, and we will sacrifice every last drop of our blood for the nation without a second thought.

There's no contradiction here like with materialist conceptions coming from Marxism, we are not setting roadblocks for ourselves, we hold no expectations beyond holding mass-power.

We adopt the mindset that culture and the national spirit dream within the people of a nation, that spirit becomes realised under appropriate political circumstances and is the primacy of action.

In the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) during the 1990s famine, the people suffered great material deprivation of the basic materials necessary to live. The United States regime engineered the famine in the hopes that this will prompt the Korean masses to overturn the system and seek reconciliation with the Republic of Korea. This didn't happen though and the system based on the Juche idea still exists and keeps going strong to this day.

Individual DPRK citizens know that their standard of living and their materialistic demands would actually go up if they got assimilated into the South. All those sanctions would get lifted, and yet, despite that, they are devoutly nationalistic, undoubtedly patriotic and exceptionally socialistic about their motherland.

Why do they not hate the government? Why did they refuse assimilation by the South which had food and would've fed them, why? With Marxist materialist lenses there's no way to make sense of it, this question is illogical if we consider material primacy, if we look at it with Marxist lenses.

Why are they willing to literally starve and die and nevertheless still believe in Juche, still hold strong even if their loved ones die?

There's something much deeper here, going beyond brutish materialism. We as National Maoists refuse the notion that the world revolves around the primacy of materialism. DPRK proves our thesis correct and proves our correctness in rejecting the materialist Marxist conception.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

There's a state of general confusion among Marxist circles which opened up a possibility of revision and counter-revolutionary currents within. Currents and counter-revolution which do not exist or at least could not manifest themselves in DPRK and Juche to rot the nation from the inside.

This confusion is a result of the collectivist variations such as Marxism-Leninism and Maoism claiming to represent true Marx. These ideologies nevertheless tell its followers to read Marx, to read Engels and learn from them genuinely. So when their followers read Marx and Engels and came up with the conclusions that they should liberalise their homeland because Marx had liberal tendencies, this is in conflict with the collectivist approach, however, it's not dishonest. It's not a perfidious revision and misinterpretation of the works of Marx or Engels, if anything, it's the right and more honest conclusion.

True revolutionary Marxists basically have to put up a mental filtration mechanism between themselves and the words that they read from Marx, Lenin, Engels. This is so they can uphold and keep upholding the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist pretences while also disregarding any liberal, anti-collectivist line from the original thought leaders.

However, how can one expect everyone to be aware of this and develop the same exact intuitive anti-liberal, collectivist mechanism? Especially as Mao Zedong and Stalin called for thorough study of Marx and Lenin, obviously, there will be those who will read Marx and Lenin and take their words literally in a good faith interpretation.

They are not dishonest, nor are they trying to twist words, it's just that if you're bound to Marx, Engels and Lenin, as you're told, then you will simply adopt a more liberal mindset, inline with Karl Marx.

The development of revision and liberalisation from within this environment is quite expected and logical given this analysis. Of course, the two-line struggle within the party between bureaucracy and the masses will happen under any system, Mao wrote about this principle quite clearly. However, why isn't the DPRK's bureaucratic line dominant or even close to taking power like it was in the USSR in 1956 and China in 1978; because their ideological correctness was denied!

Could one hide behind quoting Marx, Engels and Lenin and propose a path of liberalisation going against the national interests in the DPRK? No, they couldn't. Their legitimacy is not granted and they are treated as enemies of the state, it's collectivism and pro-mass line or exclusion. But someone like Khrushchev or Deng could hide within the party comfortably and even gain followers, after all, they were told to follow Marx, Engels and Lenin and so they did, what more can be expected of them?

There's a clear contradiction here which was not addressed by Stalin or Mao. This was and is a mistake, it is the reason why Marxism as a revolutionary doctrine is insufficient and corrupt. One cannot reconcile obvious liberalisms from Marx, with mass-line. It cannot be expected from everyone to read Marx and Lenin with Mao's or Stalin's 'vision.' Filtering what you need for legitimacy and dismissing what you don't. When you advocate that your

The Manifesto of National Maoism

line is consistent with Marx, Lenin and Engels then you grant legitimacy to the movements which in their orthodoxy keep to Marx, Lenin and Engels over Stalin or Mao.

The party then has to by its very nature, by this glaring contradiction, accommodate the more liberal humanist minded Marxists. It arms them by granting them the weapon of 'true Marxism.' This weapon is not granted in the DPRK and the results are obvious.

As National Maoists we don't claim legitimacy of some past gone figures, we have within ourselves principles which define us and make us into a characteristic movement but the words of men are to be put under collective scrutiny. What drives us is the collective core and from this core our hostility to the figures of Marx, Engels and Lenin arise. National masses over everything, anti-liberalism to the core!

Our movement is the movement of the revival of the national spirit, our socialist dedication remains a strong part of this movement. Socialism for National Maoism is the model under which the people can be collectively supplied with all the materials necessary to grow and develop. Socialism lets the people develop without having to rely on a parasitic, counter-revolutionary bourgeois class. This class has betrayed us and will betray us again if it is left alive in any form, whether internally via the managerial elite class or externally as bourgeois experts.

Capitalism and models based on profit will lead to civilizational degeneration as 'commodities' get produced whose purpose is to be sold. This is done without any considerations whether the commodity furthers our goals or whether it degrades our nationalistic values.

We therefore view socialism as the superior model to other economic models, control over the economy allows us to focus production on the necessities and materials designed to fulfil our national destiny.

Mao Zedong said:

Commandism is wrong in any type of work, because in overstepping the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of voluntary mass action it reflects the disease of impetuosity. Our comrades must not assume that everything they themselves understand is understood by the masses. Whether the masses understand it and are ready to take action can be discovered only by going into their midst and making investigations. If we do so, we can avoid commandism

Yet 'commandism' is what Marxists do. Refusing to become acquainted with the material conditions, refusing to drop their dogma and criticise their own doctrines. The masses must conform to the vanguard, say the Marxists, the peasants need to be subordinated, said the Trotskyists, we say **no!** As we stand with Mao Zedong thought on this matter!

Fascism conceptualised its differences between Marxism as rejection of class struggle and adoption of class-collaboration, if we read an extract from 'A Diary of the Will' by Mussolini:

The Manifesto of National Maoism

With regard to class struggle, what is the difference between Marxism and Fascism?

This: that for socialists class struggle is the rule, while for Fascism class struggle is the exception; class collaboration for them is the exception, while for Fascism it is the rule.

This view is mistaken but it being mistaken doesn't mean that it proves the Marxist doctrine correct. That class-struggle and the materialist conception of life is correct, we would be relegating ourselves if we said so to being yet another Marxist strand.

Rather, different classes and their interests may align and misalign depending on their nature and composition. Class collaborationism and class struggle may both occur and may both be exercised within a civilisation.

Marxism mistrusted the peasantry, considered them a primitive, uncivilised class which ought to be subjugated to the 'supreme discipline of the proletariat'. However, it were the peasants who supported the socialist revolutions materially and sent their sons to fight and die for the promises of socialism. Marxism was wrong to develop class-suspicion if not directly wage class-struggle against the peasantry.

However, Fascism was also wrong to preach class-collaboration with the bourgeoisie, to consider the idea of class struggle as a Marxist doctrine and therefore set to be automatically rejected. It is incorrect to treat class struggle as an 'exception' to the rule of class collaboration.

This led to the betrayal of Mussolini by the king and the industrial bourgeoisie in 1943. The Fascist scholars of the time did not undertake a serious analysis of the monarchy and bourgeois class interests and their tendencies. In fact any class-analysis was outright rejected as 'Marxism'; this was an error.

What one ought to take from this is that class collaboration can exist between the working class and the peasantry. This is the core of the peasant-proletarian continuum, while at the same time class struggle can be waged against the bourgeoisie.

The peasant-proletarian continuum is the basis of socialism. The great insight of Mao Zedong was that the revolution in China can only be achieved by using the 500 million peasant masses. He did not stick to the orthodox conception of class struggle passed down by Marxists and upheld by Chen Duxiu.

It is a vast socialist revolutionary movement involving a rural population of more than 500 million, and it has extremely great and world-wide significance. We should give this movement active, enthusiastic and systematic leadership, and not drag it back by one means or another

We therefore reject Marxist conception of class struggle and the Fascist conception of class-collaboration. Instead, we adopt our own model of class collaboration and struggle

The Manifesto of National Maoism

that hinges on collaboration between the working class masses and the peasantry and struggle against the capitalist oligarchy and monarchy.

With whom we collaborate and with whom we struggle is to be determined by the wisdom of the Nationalist masses.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Nationalism

The greatest contribution arising from the phenomenon of Fascism was extensive study and consideration of the state and the nation, these considerations we adopt for our own ideology.

In the Fascist conception as theorised by Mussolini in 'A Diary of the Will', the state is *the supreme Authority which subordinates the activity and the interests of the individual citizens to the general interests of the Nation.*'

The nation is a collection of individuals whose *moral, political and economic unity is integrally realized in the State.*

This is further clarified in the "The Guidelines of the Fascist Party' (1921):

The Italian Fascist Party considers that society is composed of the National State, not as the mere sum of individuals living in a given territory, in a given period of time, but as a body comprising an indefinite series of generations of which individuals are but transient elements.

On the basis of this concept of national society, the Italian Fascist Party believes that individuals and groups (categories and classes) must categorically subordinate their interests to the higher interests of the Nation and believes that this can only be achieved by recognizing the authority of hierarchies and the differentiation between organs and functions.

Consequently, the Italian Fascist Party affirms that currently the dominant form of social organization in the world is national society and that the essential law in the life of the world is not the unification of various societies into a single, vague and indefinable global society, i.e. "humanity" in the parlance of the internationalists, but rather fruitful and peaceful competition among the various national societies.

The State. Having defined the Fascist concept of "national society", the Italian Fascist Party assigns to the Nation-State the specific task of dedicating the sum of its activities to the reinvigoration, development and expansion of the Italian Nation for the purpose of achieving its great historical and world goals; the fortunes of individuals and individual classes are dependent and legitimized by the achievement of such goals; therefore the Nation-State has the duty to enforce the principles of national solidarity and fight uncompromisingly against all the causes of internal disintegration.

As National Maoists we believe and hold dear the conception of the state as an instrument which subordinates the individual for service to the nation. We see Maoist China and the Italian Social Republic as successful states which managed to achieve this goal. The core

The Manifesto of National Maoism

idea, the core components of national revival were present throughout both these societies.

We believe in a powerful and strong state. A state which oppresses the individual element and subjects it to the service of the collective socialist nation so that the nation can realise its unique national destiny.

Furthermore, we reject any anarchist or communist notions of statelessness in favour of what Fascists call a '*fruitful and peaceful competition among the various national societies*'. We believe that China has its national identity, a nation which survived for millennia and is right now the oldest surviving, continuous civilisation.

Despite many invaders, these invaders eventually adopted the Chinese culture rather than impose their vision and their destiny upon the peoples of China.

Internationalism makes no sense to us, and we wholeheartedly reject the premise that China and for example, Norway could exist as '*a single, vague and indefinable global society*'. Norway and its culture survived hundreds of years of subjugation by the Kalmar union and then by the Danish empire, its national destiny cannot be reconciled with that of other nations. Even if a Nordic Union is to come into existence, the unique character that is Norway would still prevail within.

Each nation holds within itself a unique destiny. We could theorise and sum up the destinies of various national communities, be it Serbia, Poland, Germany, Brazil, Japan etc. but suffice to say we thoroughly reject the doctrine of internationalism on all levels. We believe in hyper-nationalism, in bringing to consciousness, the spirit which subconsciously lays dormant among the nations of the world. Likewise, we aim to wake these nations from the nightmare-hypnosis of Neo-Liberal individualism.

For an example of a modern society that is 'awake' and which brings the national spirit to the forth and is actively present and conscious among the masses, we consider the Democratic People's Republic of Korea!

We also adopt a notion of imperialism, but which has nothing to do with Neo-Liberal imperialism,

Any nation whose main factor of economic growth is profit, any nation that is subjugated by the imperialist Neo-Liberal order, is effectively 'asleep' and the national spirit lies dormant. Citizens take drugs and commodities to suppress this subconscious desire, all done to make themselves obedient workers to the capitalist hegemony. This, we believe, is the source of the international depression and despair among the people, we live in a society of dreamers, and it is time to wake up!

We reject Neo-Liberal imperialism as a force which suppresses the process of national revival, of national awakening. We lend our support to nations and peoples who are suppressed the hardest by this omnipresent demon of international capital!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Likewise, we don't reject that a nation though may become imperial, but we adopt the Fascist conception of it present in the 'Doctrine of Fascism':

The Fascist State expresses the will to exercise power and to command. Here the Roman tradition is embodied in a conception of strength. Imperial power, as understood by the Fascist doctrine, is not only territorial, or military, or mercantile; it is also spiritual and ethical. An imperial nation, that is to say a nation which directly or indirectly is a leader of others, can exist without the need of conquering a single square mile of territory. Fascism sees in the imperialistic spirit—i.e. in the tendency of nations to expand—a manifestation of their vitality. In the opposite tendency, which would limit their interests to the home country, it sees a symptom of decadence. Peoples who rise or re-arise are imperialistic; renunciation is characteristic of dying peoples. The Fascist doctrine is that best suited to the tendencies and feelings of a people which, like the Italian, after lying fallow during centuries of foreign servitude, are now reasserting itself in the world.

But imperialism implies discipline, the coordination of efforts, a deep sense of duty and a spirit of self-sacrifice. This explains many aspects of the practical activity of the regime, and the direction taken by many of the forces of the State, as also the severity which has to be exercised towards those who would oppose this spontaneous and inevitable movement of 20th century Italy by agitating outgrown ideologies of the 19th century, ideologies rejected wherever great experiments in political and social transformations are being dared.

For us, a nation which realises itself but doesn't grow, is a degenerating nation. When a nation achieves a state of national awakening and revival, its natural tendency is to grow. This doesn't mean subjugating other nations to its will by direct invasion or unfair trade practices which hinder the growth of others for the benefit of its own elite.

We reject what nations like the USSR in the past and modern day Dengist China do by forcing non-repayable loans onto African nations. China does this to steal their natural resources for itself when these nations fail to pay. Such practices only generate resentment and hatred towards the big bullying superpower and will eventually lead to the denunciation of the superstate and struggle against it. This will harm China and the Chinese masses in the long-term.

For us imperialism means continuous growth of the culture and its influence over the world. A healthy nation cannot stop growing, it will influence others and eventually become a leader of other nations organically and with their consent. It will effectively become an empire '*without the need of conquering a single square mile of territory*'.

Various cultures with jealousy admire the shining diamond of France that was and to some degree still is, the city of Paris. Various nations can admire European civilisations without

The Manifesto of National Maoism

ever having been conquered by them. Indeed, the Asiatic and European civilisations absorbed a lot, good and bad from each other over the span of millennia.

We once again would like to reject the idea that 'internationalism' was somehow the cause of this, what happened was that cultures of various nations thrived and exchanged ideas, even supplanted the native ideas and concepts, this is normal and is a result of the prospering of nations rather than some abstract notion of internationalism.

For us, as National Maoists our own ideology is a result of this phenomenon. We take what the Italian Social Republic gave to us through experience and uniting it with what China under Mao gave us through theory and practice. This allows us to produce a superior synthesis than what is proposed by Marxist-Maoism or Third Positionism as their own separate ideologies.

We rectify the mistakes of both and synthesise a new revolutionary outlook. This could not have been done without the philosophical contributions of the great Italian and Chinese civilisations, it is precisely through nationalism and not internationalism that these conceptions formed!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Anti-Liberalism

From both, the Maoist and Third Positionist traditions, a strong critique of liberalism has developed. We summarise both as follows:

Mao doesn't characterise liberalism as a coherent ideology in a way that a European would. This is because liberalism as a concept and ideology was something foreign to the Chinese as a nation. Rather, for him, liberalism was the essence of decay. Decay that leads people away from revolution and the masses and instead it is a self-serving tendency where the individual is put above the masses.

In his work 'Combat Liberalism', he presents the major types of liberalism and gives examples for its corruption, we present here the most relevant to our considerations:

liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent, Philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organizations.

[Liberalism means] To be among the masses and fail to conduct propaganda and agitation or speak at meetings or conduct investigations and inquiries among them, and instead to be indifferent to them and show no concern for their well-being

To see someone harming the interests of the masses and yet not feel indignant, or dissuade or stop him or reason with him, but to allow him to continue.

To regard oneself as having rendered great service to the revolution, to pride oneself on being a veteran, to disdain minor assignments while being quite unequal to major tasks, to be slipshod in work and slack in study.

Liberalism is extremely harmful in a revolutionary collective. It is a corrosive which eats away unity, undermines cohesion, causes apathy and creates dissension. It robs the revolutionary ranks of compact organization and strict discipline, prevents policies from being carried through and alienates the Party organizations from the masses which the Party leads. It is an extremely bad tendency.

Liberalism stems from petty-bourgeois selfishness, it places personal interests first and the interests of the revolution second, and this gives rise to ideological, political and organizational liberalism.

Maoism provides specific and clear points addressing the corrupting influences of liberalism and a liberal mindset. It is anti-national and anti-revolutionary. Mao correctly identified the root source of this mindset as being present within the '*petty bourgeois selfishness*'.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

A National Maoist state cannot go without applying itself to these guidelines, for every individual to rely on these lessons. Within these lessons a clear message can be read, that is 'serve the people'.

We don't disagree, we promise to apply ourselves to these points and expand them based on our modern experiences, the only issue that perplexes us is the allegiance to the party. As explained in our section discussing the Nationalist Cultural Revolution, the party itself requires critique and dismantling when it no longer serves its purpose.

An institution of power that persists, but no longer has any use will be infected with corruption and elitism, this is the nature of such structures. Rather than strive to make the party 'clean' and filled with 'good people', we realise that it is impossible to keep this state forever. We therefore support the dismantling of such structures and subordinating their remnants as organs of the state.

The Fascist perception of liberalism seeks to analyse the roots of what liberalism philosophically consists of and it rejects that swiftly, building the antithesis of liberalism.

The liberal doctrine presents the conception of a negative state, this means that the state bases itself on negative perception of liberty. It seeks to grant individuals the greatest freedom and exert minimal pressure, only perform a role that it must without any interference which goes beyond that.

Liberals believe that the state therefore ought to be minimal and the rights of the individuals are to be respected to the highest extent possible. This is the ideal state on which liberalism built its perception of the state. It is inherently negative as opposed to a positive conception of the state whereby the state exerts its power in every domain of life. The latter would naturally be to the detriment of 'individual freedom' and maybe even 'human rights', this is the Fascist conception. Fascism rejects the liberal state as explained in 'The Transformation of the State' by Alfredo Rocco:

The Fascist State has vast tasks, in fact, which the liberal doctrine held to be foreign to the State. The Fascist doctrine rejects the conception of the negative State, which has no substance and no ends of its own, and is alien to the life of the individuals. Unlike the liberal-democratic State, the Fascist State can never consent that social forces should be left to themselves. Fascism has understood that the masses, which have remained for so long alien and hostile to the State, must be brought near, and incorporated in the State, which performs its own function and its own mission in every field of social life, directing, encouraging and harmonizing all the forces of the nation. This coordination raises the national energies to their highest potentiality, directing them effectively to secure their own ends, in the interests of national prosperity.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Fascism rejects wholeheartedly the concept of the negative state, it conceives society as being controlled by the state on every level, economic, political, spiritual. The Fascist state is the force which harmonises society and incorporates the masses into the state, orients them to work towards a common national destiny.

It ends regional conflicts because they only destroy national unity, it seeks to end the individual 'positive freedom', because of the destructive consequences that this has upon the nation and the world.

We live in the age where oligarchic elites control the state and their destructive ideology of liberalism and individualism poisons every area of life. The upcoming environmental holocaust cannot effectively be stopped because the steps required to stop it will require violating the rights of the 'individual'. It will require violating individual rights to profit and to private property, it would require a strong and powerful national discipline. The state would need to appropriate the oil and gas industries and replace them with alternative sources of energy that are less-polluting on the environment.

It would require changing the economic system to not be based on profit but common, collective use!

We as National Maoists sign ourselves under such a fascist perception of the state because only this can minimise the upcoming environmental disaster. Only this lets our people survive as the Neo-Liberal states fall, one by one, in the flames caused by their own destruction and selfishness!

The conception of the individual rights under Fascism is also a doctrine worth studying. Liberalism takes the individual and its 'human rights' as the ideal, as the recipe for a good and harmonious society. The state is limited, and it allows 'freedom of expression', 'assembly', freedom to consume and engage in degenerate acts, Fascism categorically rejects that. Mario Palmieri writes in 'The Philosophy of Fascism':

The importance of this new Charter of human rights and duties oversteps the national boundaries of the Italian State and the limits of time of the Fascist Revolution, to project itself across the whole western world and through the centuries yet to come.

By establishing as fundamental principles of individual and social life that: "Work in all its forms is a social duty;" that, "A Nation is an organism having ends, life, and means superior to the single individuals or groups of individuals composing it." And that, "A Nation is a moral entity," not an aggregate of individual elements, the Labor Charter advances a rightful claim to immortality.

For Fascism, a 'right' is an obligation. One cannot just be granted rights which are inalienable and apply for the entire life of the individual. A right is a duty and the ability to act in the interest of the national collective.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

A Fascist right is one to be able to fly national flags, to celebrate national holidays, the right to work for the benefit of the collective state.

This concept may sound alien to western readers accustomed to rights being 'whatever you want' to do, because this concept is inherently anti-individualistic. It grants the individual rights to work for and contribute to the collective.

This is what Fascists refer to when they talk about freedom within the state. The state is the only organ which can define and set out the range of actions that the individual can do, outside the state, the concept of freedom itself becomes meaningless.

This freedom, while initially counter-intuitive, makes perfect sense when we relate it to reality.

In modern China, the state forbids its citizens from acting in favour of their national-collective. The right of private property is not in the interests of the masses, yet the state forbids any attempt to collectively work towards its abolishment. The police will arrest anyone organising the masses for this aim. Individual freedom conflicts with the collective freedom of the masses.

China moves in the western direction by implementing the right of private property. This means that the state will defend the private property holders over the Chinese masses. This could happen precisely because Deng deprived the masses of their right to fight for socialism.

The assault on the collective rights of the workers is opposite in form to what the 1975 Chinese constitution from the last years of the Cultural Revolution had in mind. Within this constitution the citizens have a collective right to place dazibaos, (big character posters) and have a right to criticise the management of factories and the party. This is an example that conforms perfectly to the Fascist conception of a 'right', criticism was sanctioned by the Manifesto of Verona after all.

This is different to the individualist 'freedom of speech'. Freedom of speech lets anyone, even a capitalist roader lie to the masses, manipulate the public perception and turn people against themselves for his own benefit to the detriment of national unity.

Freedom to criticise comes from within the state, the ability for the masses to critique their representatives serves to increase state cohesiveness. The freedom to struggle and work, lets masses as a collective organism fight against capitalist restoration and work towards collective fulfilment.

As National Maoists we adopt the Fascist conception of 'rights'. We seek to eliminate individual rights and replace them with collective or 'Fascist rights' wherever we can. In a sense, we seek the greatest liberty, the greatest freedom because our liberty and our freedom grants the collective national state maximum ability to do what it needs and wants. It grants the state freedom beyond what is minimally expected of it. It empowers the

The Manifesto of National Maoism

people as a collective and eliminates all restrictions on our power. Furthermore, it allows us to realise our programme of national revival!

Unfortunately, early fascism also had within itself anti-mass sentiments which we reject whole-heartedly, in 'The Transformation of the State' Alfredo Rocco writes:

The Fascist doctrine denies the dogma of popular sovereignty which, on one hand made the Chamber the only seat of sovereign power, and therefore the chief organ of the State, and on the other surrendered the election of the deputies to the caprice of the masses.

The masses cannot themselves have a spontaneous will, still less can they spontaneously proceed to the choice of deputies.

By a fundamental law of social life, which Maine calls the law of "imitation", the mass of men tend to follow the will of some dominating element, some so-called "guiding spirits." The problem of Government will never be solved by trusting in this illusive will of the masses, but must be solved by a careful selection of the "guiding spirits." If a good system of selection is not organized, circumstances often place the least worthy in authority over the masses.

This false belief in trusting the governance to a 'careful selection of the "guiding spirits."' is inherently elitist and produces a class of leeches and individualists. It is by no means better than the liberal doctrine from which this assumption originates, that only the most 'capable' can lead the masses through the state.

This belief is counter-intuitive and inherently harms the Fascist line itself, never mind the Maoist complete opposition to it. It were the 'most capable' men who betrayed Mussolini. It were the combined powers of the House of Savoy, the traitors to Fascism like Pietro Badoglio and the capitalist elites which betrayed Italy in 1943. Ironically, it was also them that early Fascism considered most 'worthy' compared to the workers and the peasants.

Suffice to say, Maoist line of entrusting the masses is what we take as our basis for mass national organisations. The state power ought to be questioned by the conscious masses because it is the masses who form the state on every level. National revival can only come from them, the masses cannot betray themselves, they cannot be bribed. A structure whose basis is the mass initiative is the most stable structure, least prone to corruption and decadence because it is based on the 'ground layer'.

This doesn't mean we reject hierarchy, this would be a false reading of our critique. It does mean that any hierarchy needs to justify itself and undergo heavy critique from the national masses, to be built from among them and not imposed on top of them. We don't accept any 'mandates from the heavens'.

Just like with infrastructure, so is the construction of political structures, the most stable buildings are those thoroughly supported by the ground. If you build taller and taller towers without enforcing the foundation then it is bound to collapse sooner or later. Fascism being

The Manifesto of National Maoism

reliant on the top — down infrastructure rather than bottom — up caused it to collapse. If Fascists don't learn this lesson, then nothing but doom will come from our ideology!

We mentioned our support for the DPRK. The Juche system is mass-based and can even support great leaders who became the heart of the nation. The Kim family are symbols behind which the people rally, they are signs of their collective continuous struggle. A system therefore can be hierarchical and still be based on the mandate of the masses, we reject any unjustified anarchist promulgations that the hierarchy itself is the problem.

On the note of elitism, this isn't a phenomenon just affecting early Fascism that we need to be wary of, it is the default state of Leninism and therefore Trotskyism. They seek to subordinate the workers to one-man management, and the peasants to the proletarian discipline. Everything is to be controlled by the unaccountable vanguard of supposed '*most worthy*', '*guiding spirits*' from within the party.

Only later did Stalin and Mao make the system accountable to the masses and enforced that as the basis of state building. This is what ultimately led to the victory of the USSR over the Axis powers. Reliance on the masses in common struggle. Fascist elitism actually served as useful propaganda against Fascism within the USSR.

National Maoism therefore vows to represent the collective interests of the masses and lead to national revival. It bases itself exclusively on the mandate from the masses!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Collectivism

Within the minds of modern Europeans whose ancestors underwent the French Revolution and were impacted by the values springing from this upheaval, liberalism is the order of the day.

Modern Europeans often promote ruthless individualism as they declare collective values to be oppressive and 'authoritarian'. Third Positionism is considered evil by the left and the right, both sides of the same liberal coin.

The left espouses individual freedom as the highest ideal, they declare themselves to be communists or anarchists. These ideologies result in the same desire to deliver complete emancipation to the individual from the 'oppressive' institution of the state.

Communists proclaim statist socialism but only temporarily, both anarchists and communists dream of a society where human rights are respected. A civilisation where there's no racial or gender division, where the individual is the master of his own fate without any propaganda or class struggle. There's no state or national division, no obligations or duties, just endless state of pleasure and satisfaction.

Marxists take materialism to be their philosophical outlook, and believe that this stage is ultimately where the human society leads to. They dismiss any notion of national and spiritual revival as idealism at best and 'fascism' at worst, which in their minds is the worst evil imaginable, the power of capitalism in decay.

On the right such individualism is no less profound, national slogans may be espoused, but they are being espoused by the disgusting creature that is known as the 'conservative'. We would like to highlight the difference between a conservative and a nationalist before we go any further.

A nationalist is a person whose adherence is to the National Collective. The state subjugates his individuality to fulfil the national destiny. This nationalist doesn't need to own flags or other various commodities smeared in the sacred colours of the nation to stand behind what these national colours and symbols represent.

He or she wants to give their life for the nation, their personal satisfaction has no bearing on their allegiance. They are the prime and shining examples of heroes for the collective national state!

Their values may embrace traditionalism and futurism, to link the past and create a bright future for their own people, but they are no 'conservatives'. The conservative is a 'consumer' that declares himself in support of 'conservative values' which in his mind means simply an earlier stage of capitalism. A stage where he was free to consume and not be occasionally bothered for 'bad consumption'.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

These conservatives who wave flags, are also the same ones to denounce the people, the nationalist masses who are the lifeblood of the country. They care not about the collective prosperity but about the individual ability to get richer at the expense of others.

What they want is to be 'left alone', being 'free' to consume and not be bothered. They are too busy complaining that a commodity that they liked changed form to conform to the contemporary Neo-Liberal political correctness; their ideal world isn't one where the nation is prosperous. They don't want to reach a state where people collectively decide and are not ruled by parasites. Likewise, they are fine with the exploitation of their fellow countrymen as long as they are profiting.

Their 'rebellion' is based on consumerism. It is done with a fake patriotic tinge rather than being a genuine rebellion of the masses against the parasites which immobilise their collective national spirits and will. Their 'values' are hypocritical and self-serving. 'Personal Responsibility' is their motto, well in that case, let our be 'collective responsibility'! The duty of the conscious people of the nation is to 'destroy all self-serving individuals'!

Individualism thoroughly invaded the European subject. Whether forcibly via US imperialism supplanting the native culture and values with its horrid pursuit of profit or naturally via organic liberalism coming from the native bourgeois class.

We reject individualism because it atomises people and makes them think only of themselves as being responsible for their actions and severs the link that they previously innately had with their communities.

When one considers themselves an individual, they loudly proclaim that they are an atomised unit, not beholden to any collective concerns. They are the masters of their destiny, they can do whatever, take whatever, that it is **their** life!

The collective, unlike the individual, changes the perception of people in that they don't see themselves as single units, but rather as a continuous stream within a collective. Their interests and those of others are mutual. The people share their feelings, mental states, desires as well as duties and responsibilities within the collective.

This vision is a fascist vision of the state, as an instrument of power which subjugates the individual so that the nation can fulfil its national mission. In 'The Transformation of the State' Alfredo Rocco writes:

This [political] conception [of fascism] is the very antithesis of democratic and liberal ideas, which are all derived from the doctrines of an exotic philosophy, individualistic doctrines, which regarded the individual as the ultimate end of society, and society simply as the aggregate of the individuals of a given generation, without any aims of its own but those of the individuals which compose it. Thus the State could have no other essential function save that of coordinating the will of its members so as to prevent the liberty of one from encroaching upon that of another.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The painful period of anarchy was arrested by the coming of Fascism, which, by restoring order and discipline to the country, was obliged to bring about the transformation of the State in accordance with its own fundamental doctrine, which is eminently social and therefore clearly anti-individualistic. Fascism has indeed an organic and historical theory of society, opposed to the traditional conception—atomistic and materialistic as it is—of liberalism. Society must be considered as an imperishable organism where life extends beyond that of the individuals who are its transitory elements. These are born, grow up, die, and are substituted by others, while the social unit always retains its identity and its patrimony of ideas and sentiments, which each generation receives from the past and transmits to the future. According to the Fascist conception, therefore, the individual cannot be considered as the ultimate end of society. Society has its own purposes of preservation, expansion and perfection, and these are distinct from the purposes of the individuals who at any one moment compose it. In the carrying out of its own proper ends, society must make use of individuals. ... The State, however, which is the legal organization of society, is for Fascism an organism distinct from the citizens who at any given time form part of it; it has its own life and its own superior ends, to which the ends of the individual must be subordinated.

This rightly oppresses the 'individual'; the more power you give to the collective, the more you have to repress individual rights! Fascism challenges the concept of the 'self' as atomised units and instead makes the people act as a collective. It takes the existence of the nation and the state as transcending that of any individual. It is the opposite of the liberal doctrine.

The individual under Fascism doesn't warrant any special rights as it is not the subject of history. It is an element which lives and dies, but the state is there forever. It is the destiny of the people, unbroken and permanent. The state forces everyone to be useful to the collective. The worth of an individual is determined by their ability and desire to contribute to the greatness of his nation, not out of some innate, hard to define worth.

We can see now why Fascism fell into the pitfalls of ignoring class struggle. The role of an individual in society was reduced to what someone can do to help the collective. The way the organisation is structured and the role that the class position and rank play within the state bureaucracy were not considered.

This was corrected within the Italian Social Republic. The state asked the individual what can he do for the collective with an extra consideration for the class that the individual occupies. This was so the individual could not work to harm the state in any significant manner.

Such subordination of the individual to the state was also a concept put to practice under Mao. The collective power manifested itself against the individual capitalist roaders. Dazibao (character posters) were put up by the people to shame and target those who cared about their own self interests over the collective. The individual was to serve the

The Manifesto of National Maoism

masses, the masses were not to serve the individual. Nowadays in China the opposite is true as the Chinese workers get exploited by billionaire elites within the Chinese Communist Party.

During the Cultural Revolution, the people felt empowered while the individual was repressed. The people felt like they belong within the national collective and their best well-being is inseparable from the collective well-being. After the fall of Maoist China, the Chinese film-makers made countless films, detailing how horrible the period of Cultural Revolution supposedly was. All of this was a petty revenge from individual artists, film-makers, who, during the Cultural Revolution were forced to conform to the desires of the masses.

For an example of a heroic sacrifice to the collective, we just have to look to the Great Leap Forward in Maoist China. A party representative Wu Changxing refused to eat more than the villagers as he worked with them on the irrigation sites day and night. He later died from a combination of exhaustion and malnutrition, this collective ideology was so powerful that it transcended death itself!

We reject the Marxist focus of brutal materialism in favour of radical and staunch declaration of collectivism. One's existence is to be heavily administered by the state for the benefit of the nation. The demands of the individual will be undermined in favour of the collective so that the collective is able to fulfil its destiny.

We analyse and appropriate the Fascist line on collectivism, for only this line could grant us a strong socialist nationalist state. However, we also implement the ideas of mass-democracy from Maoism. In this way the state is not just all-encompassing, it is also controlled by the masses themselves. National destiny can only be an achievable goal when the masses themselves build it.

We cannot rely on 'benevolent' institutions which are composed of '*worthy*' elites to do it for us, the task of national revival is the task of the masses and masses themselves. National Maoism combines the organic western collectivism present within Fascism and the Eastern Maoist collectivism!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The International Question

Any sort of modern social nationalist thought and struggle appears to be limited in one key aspect and that is underappreciation of international struggle or a lack of framework to justify it.

We live under the age of liberalism, an ideology which via its own axioms justifies its own spread. It becomes synonymous with civilisation and therefore whoever as a liberal spreads it, is deemed to be doing a good deed, civilising others.

Manifest destiny, the conquest of the Americas was led under a notion of civilising the 'savage' natives, the idea was of this land being better in the hands of those who are civilised, modern, and Christian. Liberalism came from the Christian roots, its individualism developed from the idea of the soul in Christianity, its superiority came from the need to spread the gospel.

This age of Neoliberalism also justifies itself and its expansion into foreign territory via its ideology, it is relentless in its efforts to liberalise the globe.

In the opposite ballpark, come the communists and their idea of internationalism, in its essence it breaks to the idea that workers of the world, the oppressed of all corners of the world having a common interest in abolishing the capitalist neoliberal system and implementing a communist system.

Using this framework, one of true faith is able to put the needs of the revolution, of the anti-capitalist struggle above the interests of any regional identity. Dr Bethune after all is a great example of that, he volunteered to help patients in both China and Spain rather than spending his life comfortably in Canada, his nation.

Communist fighters have exactly this advantage in that they will without hesitation travel across the world to weaken the chains of capitalism wherever these chains appear to be weak.

This idea directly counters and gives a justification for communists all over the world to fight for this perceived common interest.

Yet, we as nationalists, lack any general, great idea which could counter liberal internationalism. Often we preach an isolationist line of self-development which only lets liberalism come in and attempt to subvert our movements and political systems. After all, if we can only defend ourselves and never attack, then how can we expect to survive? Sooner or later an international ideological system will be successful in breaking us.

Historically one answer came from the Hitlerian National Socialist ideology and its justifications lying in Aryanism, it was not a universal ideology and yet it justified its spread via conquest and subjugation of non-Aryan nations. It was logical for it to spread like this because in the lack of an obvious international agenda that can appeal to the people of the

The Manifesto of National Maoism

world, the only way for it to survive was to eliminate internationalism via its own show of strength and become the sole hegemon in existence.

It was not exclusive though and in its absurdity it was eventually forced to deem the Japanese as 'honorary Aryans' and even then as World War 2 has shown, the two internationalisms, the communist and liberal did eventually win out anyway. Hitler himself tried to ally Germany with the liberal Britain back then but to no avail, because international ideologies will not submit themselves to exclusive racial dogmas.

Going the Hitlerian way is out of the question in the modern day, with the rise of various competing Asian nations and therefore weakening of the global position of Europe in the world stage, it is impossible to achieve what was conceivable then. So, therefore out of our own framework, we must create a model of sufficient and world spanning international agenda which will justify as a necessity, spilling our blood even thousands of miles away from our dear nations.

The key is to embrace class struggle and realise how that has an impact on the nations we live in. Global capitalism isn't just a system which affects our nations exclusively, it is a system that internationally enslaves billions but by its very nature it is a system which cannot go on forever and it has its weak spots.

No nation can truly be free and develop itself independently when it is under the heel of the capitalist system. Breaking out from the global capitalist system via a revolution itself is a feat unlikely within certain nations but a very real possibility in others.

Having appreciated that key point, it would make sense to fight and possibly die in centres of the most realistic anti-capitalist struggle compared to staying at home and seeing nothing change for possibly the entire life?

One may do more for one's own nation fighting on foreign soil than staying home. If one is for instance a Polish nationalist, would it not make sense to fight for an anti-capitalist revolution sparked in the east, for instance Russia? A successful Social-Nationalist revolution may produce more favourable conditions for Poland compared to struggling at home.

This may apply differently in different nations and nationalities, for instance Indian nationalists can stay in India and have no need to move elsewhere because due to the advanced class struggle existing in India, especially with the global pandemic producing even more revolutionary discontent, the situation in India appears to begin becoming ripe for a revolutionary movement.

It all is a matter of analysis and devotion to the Social National cause. This is something we must learn from the communists but with the important caveat of aiming for the liberation, self-autonomy of our nations. If a Pole is willing to die in China for the freedom of the Chinese and socialism, then a Chinese will be willing to die for the liberation of Poland and its social-nationalist revival.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

We need to develop ties with other social-nationalist movements and realise that the common interest of all is to live neighbourly with self-governing, independent nations. After all, it is in the interest of Poland for Belarus, Ukraine and Russia to themselves also be oriented on social-nationalism and autarchy. It is much better to live with a neighbour that is sane and speaks the same ideological verse as you than to be surrounded by enemies, ideological and otherwise.

Specifically for Slavic nations, this might mean developing Slavic consciousness that is separate from our national affiliations but nevertheless unites us as 'east' against the non-Slavic west. This would allow us to develop closer economic, political, ideological lines and justify expansion and protection of all Slavic peoples.

This could play out differently across different strata of peoples, for instance, this could play out as a great Hispanic idea, of uniting all Latino-American nations as one anti-capitalist, anti-liberal, anti-Anglo sphere bloc.

However, the Inter-Slavic idea as well as that of any other great super-nation, while rooted in nationalism, that nationalism itself is only marginally international, able to counter some liberal internationalism but not all. In contrast, the appeal of communist and liberal internationalisms is border-less, whereas a super-national idea is limited geographically and culturally only to certain folk and not others. It is hard to infect the non-Slavic nations with the idea of inter-Slavic solidarity like it is to infect them with the idea of common international interest and belonging.

So what is a more viable solution?

Before WW2, there was a Polish Inter-Slavic thinker, Jan Stachniuk who developed the idea of [Zadruqa](#), this idea involved an embrace of nationalism, with a planned economy (socialism) while emphasising strongly the ideal described via culture over the bare material. Over time, his idea expanded from Great Polish Nationalism and restoration of the 'original' Slavic faith, to Inter-Slavic unity of all Slavic nations against the west; eventually even this idea generalised further to 'backculture'* (Wspakultura) vs 'overculture'.

The west symbolises backculture which is a degeneration of the human spirit, destruction of culture and the reverse in the cultural development, it is the dialectical opposite to the overculture which is the expression of the superior culture, of anti-liberalism, socialism and cultural unity.

It can be broken down to 6 main elements which make up the human being as a whole:

Those originating in human biology:

Personalism (individualism) - putting the interests of the individual above the community to which he belongs;

The Manifesto of National Maoism

All-Love - solidarity with all that lives, loving all implies, after all, the unimportance of anything;

Those originating in creative will:

Moralism - arid internal self-improvement resulting in indifference to the external world;

Spiritualism - placing man's own purpose in the outworld;

Finally, those originating in instrumental will:

Nihilism - negation of the cultural world;

Hedonism - the pursuit of personal happiness alone.

Thus, one can read the history of various human civilisations as a struggle between culture and backculture, a struggle between each of these 6 aspects and civilisation which is a negation of that.

A backculture devoid of spiritualism and nihilism is referred to as a caducous (kadłubowa) or secular and includes atheism and Freethought, such backculture is what the United States represents these days, although, US as an empire of degeneration is moving into the realm of total backculture, where all 6 of these elements predominate.

It is not difficult already to convince nationalists of the degeneration and liberalisation coming from the United States, however, it is difficult to convince them to unite collectively in our common struggle against the US. Many nationalists much rather prefer to stick with the limited vision of only paying attention to the nearest environment. How many balkaners are too busy fighting with each other because of the slights of the past? Such a state is only useful to global liberalism which pacifies nationalist movements by bringing up what differentiates them rather than what unites. There's a saying in the Polish language, 'where two fight, the third gains' and in this case, the struggles between two bordering nationalists mean the gain of imperialism and therefore liberalism over both of them.

Jan Stachniuk's idea however, lets both nationalists see the global affairs in a more expansive light, to see their struggle for their nations, not as a struggle with their neighbours who are often identical in almost every way to them, but the struggle of keeping culture, civilisation from decay that is blowing from the west over. Croatians and Serbs both lose their national identities, both lose their culture, their sense of traditionalism and national collectivity when liberalism wins.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

There's nothing to be gained by pointless struggle and Jan Stachniuk's thought shows us this, we therefore call upon all socially minded nationalists to research and adopt a similar idea based on Jan Stachniuk's work. Stachniuk offers a compelling view of the west and why we should struggle against western 'backculture' and it allows people of all nations to solidarise with this idea. The creation and building of our own nation states is our attempt to create overculture and destroy backculture, to resist western civilisation and build something that is neither communist and soviet, nor liberal.

In this great act of creation, of resisting the temptations of liberal freedom and mindless statelessness/classlessness of communism, the conscious nations are able to unite and build together an international national front against liberalism, capitalism and all, that plagues our collectives!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

The Jewish Question and Religion

How does National Maoism handle the Jewish question? How do we characterise what a Jew is and isn't?

For us a Jew is one who is beholden to the Jewish faith and/or is of the Jewish ethnicity. One who is a 'convert' may not be accepted into the orthodox Jewish community and isn't ethnically Jewish, but he nevertheless is an agent of the general culture as such he is a Jew. Many Jews are atheistic as well, in which case their belonging is determined by their ethnic group and not their faith, their 'Jewishness' and belonging is no less strong than their religious brethren though.

The Jews are a peculiar group since their expression of 'Jewishness' groups them into a community that doesn't hinge on one particular aspect such as religion or ethnicity but is a combination of various elements. One cannot say that he is a Christian but not believe in the Christian God or faith, but one can perfectly well say that he does not believe in the Jewish God and does not observe the faith and yet still call himself Jewish.

This makes the Jewish question particularly difficult to answer. Zionism is a part of the Jewish community, but it is not obligatory, in fact, many Jews oppose Zionism in all its forms, so one cannot even group Jews into those seeking to establish their own nation. Their identity does not hinge on the Zionist nation, most Zionists aren't even Jews but Christians!

There's no question that Zionism is a cancer which opposes the self-determination of the host nations and tries to make them beholden to the interests of Zion. National-Maoism does not tolerate Zionism and actively swears to fight against the Zionist Jewry in the host nations. Upon seizing power, it will be important to expel all Zionists, regardless whether they are Jews or not, the awakened nation hinges on the national masses and serves its interests not those of Zion! The masses will quickly abandon any group which fails in this promise, which sells them out.

There is no question that there can be no race or culture of people within another nation that is hostile to it in the first place. It is a fact that many Jewish communities did not integrate within the nation and often prioritised other Jews over the ethnic residents.

It is also a fact that many Jews gave their lives away for their adopted nation, who served bravely and fought for the national masses. We can see the graves of Jews who fought in anti-Russian uprisings for Polish national liberation. To treat the Jewish question with a universal brush is deeply unfair to the national minorities including Jews who sent their sons to fight for the national cause of their adopted nations.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

In the past there even existed deeply nationalistic organisations which were run by Jews. One cannot forget about the Association of German National Jews which lent its support to the Volkisch revival of the German masses. One cannot forget Jewish nationalists like Walther Rathenau who said:

I am a German of Jewish origin. My people are the German people, my home is Germany, my faith is German faith, which stands above all denominations

The past has shown that Jewishness as a separate identity can be eliminated in favour of the national identity, this is in fact a must. It can in fact be undergone by the segment of national-socialist Jews, those realising the reality and need for this.

One may ask what about the ultra-orthodox Jews who are also anti-Zionist? While we must admit that their stance on Israel is admirable in the world of Zionist domination, it cannot be denied that if Judaism in its unaltered state is allowed to persist and spread, these principled Jews may have children who adopt a Zionist mindset. So from generations of anti-Zionist Judaism, eventually Zionist Judaism will resurface. This is why we oppose ultra-orthodoxy as well.

Many religions in their teachings oppose the idea of national revival oriented around a specific nation and instead try to universalise their message. An example of such a religion is Christianity. Its universal characteristics and ascribing a soul onto every living human being, with equal rights before the lord in heaven, was the origin of individual enlightenment in Europe.

The mystic aspects were washed away and the main ideas were repurposed for liberalism. A lot of what plagues us, what destroys our cultures and poisons our national identity, this liberalism has its origins in Christian thought.

The catholic religion itself is still beholden to Rome as opposed to the Orthodox faith which broke away from Byzantium and became nationalised, and each nation now has its own Orthodox church.

Likewise, the protestant reformations gave each nation which decided to break away from Rome, a specific national religion with its own characteristics, to be exercised by the national community.

What many European nationalist organisations ignore, in their hatred of Islam, that it was Christianity which naturally resisted national ambitions and gave way to liberalism and capitalism, our greatest enemies, not Islam.

One cannot in good faith and good conscience stand up and preach about how they want to strengthen and build up a nation; how they want national revival but then propagate a foreign religion, whose goal is to make us submit before a foreign entity. This is a joke, no

The Manifesto of National Maoism

matter whether in Poland or Spain. The only nation which could be excluded from this critique is Italy, and that is because Italy could absorb the Catholic Church into the nation as it lies within its territory.

We simply cannot rest and ignore the religious question. The current discussion around this topic among nationalists, breaks down to either promoting and making it compulsory to belong to the majority religion or trying to revive some ethnic religion or simply ignoring things as they are, letting anyone with any set of religious beliefs into nationalist groups.

However, this is a mistake. One cannot simply touch the topic of religion without prior investigation. Like everything else, religion too, ought to be subjugated to the state and made to serve the nation. Atheisation is an option, however it may not be ideal in states where religious adherence is strong and a vital part of the culture.

In this case, a programme of positivism and nationalisation of religion is due. There's something that National Socialist Germany did which was important, and is a grand solution to this problem. They pushed forward the idea of 'Positive Christianity' which broke off from the Nicene Christianity and was seen as heretical by virtually most of Christian denominations. It used Christian faith and teachings and reinterpreted them for the needs of the Volk.

Positive Christianity was based on and was completely assimilated into the national Volkisch foundations of the then German state. Such Christianity solved the issue of the denominational split between northern Protestant and southern Catholic Germany and united people based on common adherence to the National Socialist precepts.

The German state was not beholden to the whims and wishes of Rome or any other centre of power like Mussolini's Italy. At the same time, the state did not force a policy of state atheisation that was undergone in the Soviet Union. The people were given a 'purely Aryan' christianity, not universal in its characteristics.

This had the benefit of state recognition of their religious beliefs. It is religious belief from which many people gained their power and determination to serve the people. This development also had the inherent advantage of not exposing the masses to beliefs that are inherently anti-national.

A program of positivisation is in order for any conscious national community. In this way, a version of Judaism, positive Judaism which promotes total assimilation into the National masses, anti-elitism, anti-prioritisation of other Jews over non-Jewish members of the nation, would be conceived and practiced.

The Jewish question could be answered by an assault on the Jewish doctrine and then its conscious, national revision. The Jews could maintain their characteristic faith but know that their doctrine is fulfilled by service to the nation.

Just like positive Christianity makes little sense when it is ripped away from its Germanic context, so would positive Judaism make little sense if it is ripped away from its national

The Manifesto of National Maoism

context. Positivism aims at replacing the universal notions with national ones. One cannot be a positive Christian and a sub saharan African for example. Of course, positive sub saharan Christianity in its form would forbid central Europeans from being members of it as well (unless these members were assimilated prior into the national communities).

Positive Christianity solves issues that the national community may have with its adherence to the doctrines of Christianity. In Poland for example, the Catholic community is often in direct disagreement with the pope in Rome. However, the Catholic doctrines demand adherence to Rome, despite countless kings in the past opposing the Roman primacy, these days it is not so easy and a rift is developing.

As this contradiction grows, eventually Poles will feel alienated from their church but their religious beliefs and adherence won't change. They will feel lost and without purpose. It is no surprise that church attendance grows, the more desperate the people become, but they don't need the Catholic Church which tries to universalise their pains, which refuses to go into the specific national notions. The Catholic Church where countless priests live in luxury while others are involved in violating children.

This tendency to sexual exploitation itself is a result of the desperate situation the country is in, which affects the priests as well who are forced to put a smile on their faces and peddle the Roman line which by no means can effectively help the Poles as a nation.

The Poles need a Positivist Church, one which is spiritually and via its doctrines, connected to the Polish spirit, the Polish land and destiny, whose goals are to strengthen the collective, the nation. A church which cannot exist without Poland, one whose interests are the national interests and are not separated in any level from the whole.

So one may ask now: What about old folk religions and trying to bring them back?

Well, we as National Maoists see no issue with that. Be it Scandinavian folk beliefs or the Slavic Gods. Ultimately, this question links back to the positivisation of religions. Of presenting their active, positive aspects in order to embolden the national spirit.

The revived folk religion will also ultimately be beholden to the nation, its precepts will not just be an empty recreation of the old, (which is the case now, with many 'pagan' groups performing old rituals and playing dress-up in old clothes), it will be something new, based on tradition. A modern set of beliefs on which a nation can hinge on and unite based on. Updated to account for the modern age and the needs of the nation.

It will espouse the collective values of socialism and nationalism and all involved will be deeply involved in its practice and development. The old viking religion gave the vikings the power to not fear death, such a power can be revived in a new revival of the old, the forgotten past in the awakened future.

One must consider for example the question of former Viking territories, namely, what is now Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland and the Faroe islands. A contradiction that exists now (and will surely be amplified in the future) in those areas is between national pride for

The Manifesto of National Maoism

the national entities, of what does it mean to be Swedish, Norwegian Danish, Icelandic, Faroese etc. and what does it mean to be Scandinavian and a descendant of the Norse, the Vikings.

Is a Norwegian able to forgo national affiliation and join a collective 'New Norrland'? If so, the question of a united, restored northern faith based on the beliefs of the vikings is important. It may serve as the tool to unify various Northern folk into one great Norse nation.

It will focus on their ancestral connections rather than their national differences. In effect Sweden, Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Faroe Islands will die, maybe preserved as regional names but the folk living in those territories will be principally Norse and Neo-Viking.

On the other hand, a nationalist revival in Norway will be inherently anti-Norse and very pro-Norwegian. A question of positivising Christianity will come to the forefront, to espouse and unite Norwegians and contrast their differences between themselves and others, including their neighbours. A Norwegian Christianity seems like a logical step for this path.

The same situation may be presented when it comes to various Slavic Nationalist groups, aiming to unify all slavs into one national entity vs national identification and pride of each slavic group. Poles will likely resist any such attempts at unification, and will seek their own national destiny whereas Serbs will likely try to unify, seeking to gain the most from it. The question of slavic faith vs positivist faith will come to the front.

It has to be mentioned though that both positivism and native religion could exist at the same time, each strengthening the nation in its own way, this depends on the unique circumstances of the nation.

Sami folk beliefs may coexist with a national Positivist Christian Church. Currently the Sami people practice the faith of the areas they inhabit, so they are often Lutheran or Orthodox. An awakening of the Sami people could unite them under one Church while also reviving their traditional beliefs.

Both, the positivisation and the return to the tradition can have a compounding role, appealing to each, those bound to their Christian faith and those seeking a return to tradition. In other places the positivisation of Christianity will involve merging of a lot of traditional beliefs into that National Christianity, effectively making it an amalgamation.

This is the answer to the religious and the Jewish question that the National Maoists espouse. A positivisation of beliefs and complete assimilation into the greater national body.

We do realise that for many National-Socialists, a Jew is a metaphysical concept of everything wicked. A Jew is a coward, a traitor, a backstabber, one who seeks profit at all costs.

For us, such an abstract is also useful, to describe the enemy, everything that is hostile to us and our goals, however it makes little sense to use the character of the 'Jew' for this.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Else we arrive at a ridiculous situation where there may be those who happen to be ethnically Jewish but reject the Jewish teachings and are willing to die for their host nations. These types of 'Jews' will not be 'Jews' which is absurd.

The characterisation of a traitor, coward and a backstabber seeking profit is instead assigned to the 'Liberal'. The Liberal is everything wicked, there can be no good liberals, because by their very nature, liberals will not die for the country. Liberals are ready to sell the hard earned national wealth to the highest foreign bidder, we arrive at no contradiction here as we would with 'Jews'.

There may be those who are ethnically of the nation, who generationally lived in the land, but they exhibit behaviours typical of the Liberal. They may sell their own country for profit. For all intents and purposes, these are Liberals even if they don't identify with the Liberal doctrine. Many western communists belong to this category, the so called trend of 'Neo-Marxism' as identified and used in right wing circles is simply a sub branch of a Liberal. This is in opposition to principled eastern Marxist-Leninists, whose support among the folk was great and their doctrines were anti-liberal to their core.

We adopt the same classification of what is a 'Liberal' that Mao Zedong used in his work: 'Combat Liberalism'. Unlike the national-socialists in the 1940s, we don't give great attention to the genetic or ethnic affiliations of the enemy. The liberal is a hostile agent who possesses a cultural hostility to the host nation, it could be a Jew, an ethnic person, a Catholic or a Buddhist, focusing on one relation gives too much leeway for other traitors to hide in plain sight simply because they are 'not Jewish'.

When we then uncover some startling statistics that a lot of traitors are indeed Jewish, we ought to ask further, are they Zionist or not? We uncover that yes, they happen to be.

However, not all Zionists are Jews, the Christian Zionists would be given too much leeway if we only concentrated on the Jewish Zionists. Cancer has many forms, it is not restricted to one type or the other, there are different types of cancers, some more, some less aggressive of course but just because a cancer appears small or benign, it doesn't mean we shouldn't fight it and try to remove it from our collective societal body.

Due to the statements above, a common accusation that may be thrown at us is that we are anti-Semitic, after all, we are open about trying to revise Judaism for our political purposes. But we are not anti-Semitic, we are anti-Judaic. We oppose Judaism as it is now, and its affiliation with Zionism, we seek to produce Judaism that is oriented towards assimilation in the host nation, National-Socialist Judaism effectively.

Not to mention that Semites as an ethnic group constitute multiple nations, including Islamic ones, as such we refuse to link Judaism with Semitism. Hence, this accusation is utterly baseless.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

So what about the ideology of Zionism?

Jews are a nation that is a few thousand years old, a nation which often failed to be integrated into the nations where it settled as a guest, this situation gave rise to Zionism. Zionism was born only relatively recently, in the 18th century. The justifications for it sprang from the Jewish history present in the religious teachings but despite that, Zionism was adopted by non-observing Jews too.

For centuries, the Jews as a collective began infesting the top branches of European and American governments despite only being a tiny percentage of the population. Many of these Jews profess Zionism and allegiance is to a foreign state, Israel. Why should they be allowed to control the banking, governmental and industrial sectors of nations they don't hold allegiances to!

This argument could be put forward for any other minority of course. Why then is it so controversial to say that if you're to occupy a powerful place in the national hierarchy, that you should be beholden to the nation?

This situation is unacceptable and National-Maoists vow to remove all foreign agents operating within the state. The national destiny of a nation cannot be realised when a separate parasitic nation inhibits it! The state (including banks and industry) are to be owned by mass-collectives coming from the people of the nation.

Why do Jews fail to integrate into the nation? This is because of their faith, Judaism is a hostile belief system. It is hostile to the nation, but just because it is hostile now, doesn't mean that it must be. Just because Jews failed to integrate in the past does not mean that they will fail to integrate in the future, Positive Judaism is a National-Socialist project of integration into the national community.

The ideology of Zionism is an utterly disgusting phenomenon, and we stand with Palestinians against Israel.

No matter how loudly a Zionist may cry about the holocaust, what is happening in Palestine is worse. This is because a threat of starvation plagued Germany in 1942, which caused the Holocaust to happen but there's no starvation in Israel. There's no reason for destruction of Palestina as a nation other than the Zionist showing his internal bloodlust and hatred of the other.

This hatred and bloodlust exists in local liberal Zionists too, they will throw the national masses to the pits for personal profit if such an opportunity comes. What is happening in Palestine is not an exception, if we allow Zionism to propagate, then the same will be done to our nations.

There are those who called themselves Jews and yet fought valiantly against Zionism, the Bundists. We don't consider them enemies, though we do encourage modern Bundists to assimilate into the host nations. We cannot let the potential seed of 'Zionism' propagate.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

National Maoism equips the masses with the ability to purge foreign anti-national elements from the national collective. This includes Zionist elements. Complete assimilation is the only acceptable alternative! We uphold the motto of Benito Mussolini: 'All within the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state.'

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Declaration of Friendship

As National Maoists we aim not to violently destroy all other Third Position and Eastern Marxist-Leninist (Maoist) ideologies. We don't believe that our line requires conquest of others to manifest itself among the revolutionary national masses.

We do of course believe that our synthesis is the newest and most advanced development in both Maoism and Third-Positionist philosophy, but we would like to spread our message peacefully. Furthermore, we invite and accept invitations to debates and discussions and via mutual cooperation, achieve common aims and desire for National revival.

Likewise, mirroring the Fascist conception of imperialism, we believe that our ideology can spread in the same way, via continuous growth. Effectively leading to more and more recruits to join our side organically, without predatory force and ruthless competition. In this way, we see National Maoism becoming the beacon of revolution and the leader of the entire Third Positionist-Maoist axis against the Neoliberal and Marxist political order.

We don't delude ourselves though that at times, we will get into conflicts with either Maoists or some Third Positionist elements. There will be those who with jealousy follow our every move as they see their membership fall and ours rise. We refuse to partake in the same jealousy of course, strong Strasserist or National-Bolshevik movements are also expressions of awakening of the national spirit. Therefore, we wish all the best to these ideological strands in their pursuit of a Third Positionist revolution.

Our aim is to try to unite the Maoist currents and organic European Third Positionist ones in order to create a new revolutionary synthesis which will push the revolutionary masses to anti-capitalism and anti-liberalism. Due to this, we stand for the removal of liberal mythos from communism, we want to bridge our ideologies and revolutionise them. We want to awaken the former mass based status of communism, as many communists could be potential allies even if we ourselves aren't communists. We still support former communist regimes (Stalin's USSR, Maoist China etc.).

Our members consist of a wide spectrum of Third-Positionism and Eastern ML and derivative ideologies. It would be foolish of us to alienate many principled Maoists and Eastern Marxist-Leninists whose interests are mass-interests and who are anti-liberal unlike the weak willed, dogmatic and liberal to the core, western Marxists. We do oppose Communism but any movement which puts the interests of the national masses first is a movement we pledge to hold out an olive branch to for a common struggle against liberalism.

Having said that, we will defend ourselves and if needs be, eliminate those who declare themselves to be our enemies and see themselves not as allies or compatriots but as competition. The pride of our movement, like the nation under Fascism will not be left to question, we will not be humiliated or pushed to the side.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Our mutual peace between us and other movements and our cooperation with them is our virtue. It is built on a solid foundation of common strength rather than on weakness and having the need to 'suck up' to others to gain better treatment.

Where we are not allowed proportional voice to our strength, we will not enter. But within our movement, we allow all manners of recruits, be it former Maoists to former National-Socialists as long as these members agree to abide by our principles.

Defining a Friend from Foe

The questions of political differences and how to define an enemy from an ally are of utmost importance. Therefore, they need a solid and clear answer.

An outline of a methodology by which we should approach individuals to determine whether they are foe or ally is necessary and which we shall present here.

First, we would like to describe what a belief system is to get some fundamental ideas out of the way.

A belief system is several ideas interconnected with each other that produce a belief and condition one's devotion to the belief structure.

A belief system however first has to be situated on a basis, this is very important, the basis are the core values, the 'primitive' base desires and notions that one holds, on which any further beliefs are stacked upon. If we give an example of a house of cards, then the first, bottom most layer is the foundation on which further cards are stacked. Without the basis any further decks cannot be built and are just cards without structure.

So is the belief system structured like this, at its core, there's a foundation level on which everything else is built, any decisions and beliefs are situated in their most basic form from which more 'conscious' ideas are built upon.

A human mind is trained to only consciously perceive the ideas that are higher up on this stack, rather than their core. When you ask someone for example what their opinion of taxes or abortion is, he will be able to tell you his stance but will not really delve into his root belief on which this belief is built upon. Only upon further investigation can we get to the basis.

Even if we ask directly why is it that he believes this and why is this his stance, he will go to other stances or give a ready-made answer which may be on a level lower on the stack but nevertheless still not be the basis.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

If someone says that he is against abortion because God mandated it this way, this doesn't really say much. After all, is it the fear of God, love of God, abiding by scripture or just intuition that this is what God wants which caused the person to have this belief?

It is seldom that upon further asking why, the person themselves thought about it in detail, and so he may not even answer beyond 'God' because he himself is not intuitively aware of the basis of the stack, his brain simply referred to the top levels as the default state and never truly explored the basis on which the argument stands.

This is sort of like seeing a house, when you look at a house you see its windows, decor, walls, but it is seldom that you can see its foundation, this foundation is promptly hidden away underground buried by earth. However, no house can stand without a foundation.

The investigation of the basis is a precondition to knowing whether you're dealing with a friend or foe, because higher level stacks can be identical to those of another person even if the basis between the two people is different. For example, going back to the abortion examples, one person opposes abortion because of God but the other person opposes it because he believes that every life is necessary to strengthen the nation and abortion eliminates life.

In the latter example, the reason for opposition of abortion is secular yet both of these persons hold the same stance nevertheless, it is only when looking at lower level stacks do we identify differences.

In this same manner a foe can pretend to be an ally by supposedly holding higher level stances that conform to your own, however his basis and the stack that it is built upon will fundamentally differ to your own and as such, the person can be identified as an enemy.

Even if you do know the lower level stacks of another person, this might not be enough if you don't know the basis.

Consider the same abortion example but now both happen to have the same secular reason of wanting to strengthen the nation and therefore they oppose abortion.

What if the reason for one of the people is that he is a capitalist and more people within a nation means more people in the reserve pool of labour which allows for greater exploitation and lower wages within the active pool of labour? That capitalist is ultimately holding this stance for selfish reasons.

Meanwhile, the other person holds this stance because he is a worker and wants to strengthen a nationalist socialist nation and liberate his people from the scourge of capitalism. He wants his nation to prosper and therefore abortion weakens the nation for no good reason.

These two individuals, despite seemingly holding a lower level stack belief that is identical, nevertheless still differed on an even lower stack. We could go on further and make up even further examples, going down and down the stack of two people with seemingly identical beliefs yet internally being very different.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Suffice to say, this exercise could go for a long time. Instead, what we pose is that within each person there's a fundamental basis, a 'core', which is their fundamental basis for any belief, the basis itself is most resistant to change since it relies on the most fundamental and clear notions about the world and how one as an actor within it should act.

One can shed many beliefs, and it won't affect the core fundamentally, attacking someone based on their stance on abortion is like attacking the leaf of a tree and thinking that this will change the entire tree.

A basis holds fundamental ideas, a fundamental idea could be the difference between 'individualism' vs 'collectivism'. For an individualist, liberalism is their go-to ideology, as it is posited on this belief that one is an individual in the world and everything revolves around this conceptual unit that is the 'individual'.

For a collectivist, it is the collective structure which holds precedence over the individual. It is the nation, the class, the collective which dominates over the interests of the individual. These two conceptualisations of the world are fundamental, from them anything else can be built on top.

A collectivist minded folk will be more willing to be for example nationalist, seeing the national collective as the aggregate of the people. The collectivist minded folk will also be more willing to adopt socialism as a collective ideology which seeks to empower and liberate the nation as a collective even at a great cost to the individual and its rights.

This is the basis on which National Maoism, Eastern Marxism-Leninism (Including Maoism), Revolutionary Nationalism, Juche, Fascism is based and on which its devotees built their further beliefs.

This being clarified, let's return the question of recognising the ally vs foe.

An individual minded person, who holds humanism, the interests of the individuals as primary over the collective, may still declare himself to be a 'Maoist', 'Marxist-Leninist', even a 'Jucheist'. Their basis for this is that 'Marxism' in their orthodox interpretation is an ideology whose aim is the liberation of the individual over those of the masses, the collective.

In fact their focus when it comes to socialist experiments such as the USSR Or Maoist China would be the way the 'individual's' life got improved. How under Stalin the people were finally fed and happy etc. Completely disregarding and not acknowledging that what made the USSR a functional state was anti-liberalism and anti-individualism. It was the collectivism of the working class over the interests of any single individual which allowed the USSR to prosper.

It was the will of the conscious folk, to undermine any individuals and be ready to get rid of those who threatened the masses in the great purges, without concern for their 'individuality' and 'rights' which made USSR a successful and anti-liberal state. All of this is ignored and a liberal revision of history is applied by these 'Marxist-Individualists'.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

It is a big problem among modern western Marxism that modern western Marxists are not collectivists but individualists; this is why we rally against it and seek to purge communism from its liberal mythos. They twist and turn the achievements of men much greater than them into their opposites.

Ridiculous situations come from this when a genuine collectivist engages with such individualistic, liberal Marxists. The latter may declare their 'support' for someone like Pol-Pot but at the same time proclaim that they are 'humanists' and want to further the concept of 'human rights'.

A clear sign of someone being a 'liberal Marxist' is the topic of Stalin's 'victims'. Bourgeoisie historians tend to throw huge numbers of those being supposedly killed and repressed by the 'evil Stalinist regime', so in response what does our liberal Marxist do?

They deny any repressions at any cost and try to whitewash Stalin as a hesitant man whose repressions were forced upon him by the bourgeois.

The reason this response is liberal is because it tries to conform with the liberal ethos of the sanctity of human life. A Fascist being confronted with Mussolini's 'death count' simply retorts:

"Yes, Mussolini killed many enemies of the Italian people, for this reason he is our hero".

Stalin did kill many enemies of the Soviet people too, he killed Kulaks, foreign agents, domestic counter-revolutionaries, Hitlerite invaders etc. and for this precise reason he should be lauded as our hero.

A high count of deaths shouldn't matter, a question should instead be posed to liberal historians of 'WHO' was it that was killed. If the answer is innocent workers and peasants then we deny that as lies, but if the answer is Kulaks, white army soldiers, counter-revolutionaries then the higher the number, the better as it shows Stalin's love and care for the nation and his efficacy in removing the enemies who threatened the socialist, anti-liberal order.

As collectivists, we don't care about the sanctity of the individual life, we care about who the individual is, whether they are harming the collective, and if yes whether they could be re-educated or would their death be preferable.

The questions of death and sanctity of human life, whether the good of a single person can be denied for the good of the collective are key in determining whether someone possesses an individualistic or a collectivist core. This allows us to determine whether one is fundamentally an ally or an enemy.

Those collectively minded even if they use different labels for themselves, Fascist, National-Socialist, Revolutionary Nationalist, National Maoist, Maoist, Marxist-Leninist in their core are the same and are happy to unite and ally over shared commitment to the collective masses over the individual. This is called recognising the allies despite disagreement from the upper stacks. It is fundamentally the core, the basis on which reliable alliances and friendships should be built upon.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

If one was to only consider the top layers of the stack, then they would judge others based on labels and not on their core held beliefs, what is effectively 'in their hearts'. This is actually omnipresent among the western 'left' ridden with individualism. For them mere mention of Fascism is enough to make them scream and panic and prepare to throw at you a pre-prepared speech about how you're supposedly an aid to capitalists, force of revision and anti-socialism.

A response such as this is virtually non-existent among Eastern MLs who with curiosity look upon Fascism and other collective ideologies, to learn and potentially unite based on common interests, the collective interests.

Individualists also ultimately unite based on a shared core even if their stacked beliefs are different, whether they call themselves, liberals, Marxists, Maoists, anarchists, social-democrats, conservatives, libertarians etc. If a Marxist advocates for the liberation of the individuals and poses that the reason capitalism doesn't work is because it pits individuals against each other and enslaves one individual in favour of the other, then this sort of rhetoric is aimed at liberals.

The core values of trying to 'free the individuals' is the same, for this reason social-democrats tend to be allied with Marxists sentimentally, and often it is former social-democrats who become Marxists in the west. They change the drapes from pink to red but ultimately their core commitments remain unchanged.

Collectivists are seen as their great shared enemies, whether it is the 'evil Stalinists and Maoists' or Fascists who killed millions, the individual fears any collective movements and views the masses as a 'mob to be ruled' by the 'superior intellectual elite' so that these elites can give everyone human rights and 'freedom'.

Recognising the enemies from the allies and vice versa therefore relies on the core. It does not suffice that someone declares themselves as being a 'socialist' or a 'nationalist', and supposedly is in agreement with our values, it is what is at the core which fundamentally should weigh in on whether someone is an ally or a foe.

When we endorse the red uniting with the brown, we mean Eastern Marxism-Leninism and its collective principles uniting with Fascist collectivism and its collective nationalist principles for the benefit of our revolutionary socialist collectives.

With whom we identify and help, how we go about it depends on the investigation of every revolutionary group to determine whether it's a genuine collectivist endeavour or an individualistic farce cult.

We certainly don't mean uniting with just about anyone blindly or trying to give general cred to any group based on its supposed proposed values. Values matter not if they are not implemented, if they are empty words being advocated by a group of individualists who look upon the nation with suspicion and arrogance.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Even if one agrees to the 7 core values of National Maoism, if they are doing that to be 'edgy' and special rather than see them as values whose aims are to inform genuine collectivist revolutionaries in their praxis and action, then they may be National Maoists by word but certainly not by deed and core.

This method of finding the core also allows us to differentiate between critics who are our enemies and try to undermine our movement and critics who in good faith, possessing the collective core, criticise us as they perceive us to be making mistakes which need to be rectified for the benefit of the whole collective movement. We need to listen to the latter because they speak for the nation and the concerns coming from the people and denounce the former as traitors and counter-revolutionaries seeking to undermine our people.

As National Maoists, we recognise our friends as being those filled with a genuine love for the people and who decisively are willing to put the collective aims and needs over those of the individuals in every capacity, their ideological differences resting on upper stacks matter to us less as we believe that through good will and common criticism we can refine our mutual lines and disagreements.

We denounce those filled with individual notions as our enemies, regardless if they call themselves National Maoists or anything similar. They cannot hide behind and defend themselves by almost religious, dogmatic adherence to the higher level stacks of beliefs, but it is what is in their hearts fundamentally which really matters. On this principle, the struggle against revisionism and dogmatism lies.

We are willing and ready to help any collective group, anti-liberal group regardless of their more distant beliefs. We are a movement which seeks to meld together and unite various people of good will and heart, not split them based on minor differences in ideology, as long as one holds the love of the national collective in their hearts, they can be considered friends to us.

On this basis, we build our declaration of friendship.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

In Conclusion

Our ideology is not trying to bridge the gap between Maoism and Third Position artificially. We simply noticed that Maoism and the bridges that it constructed mirror the ones that late Fascism of the Italian Social Republic also constructed.

The logical and ideological gaps were also much smaller than previously thought, we openly dare to state that Maoism and the Third Position are sister movements. They organically come to the same conclusions from different experiences and traditions. We dare to state that Maoism is closer to Third Position than it is to other currents of Marxism, except for Anti-Revisionist, Hoxhaist Marxism-Leninism.

We don't even prompt the replacement of the Marxian dialectical Materialism with a third Positionist model. Chinese philosophy serves as our guideline to fill the blanks and therefore organically arrive at the Third Positionist conception of the state from Maoist methodology. This method is especially compatible with the Chinese masses who will surely see this as a development through them that is not foreign to them (like the Dengist imposed western Marxism).

Each nation will have its own specific flavour of the ideology, suited to national specifics. If China is to take that mantle we would expect this model to flourish as it takes ground. It provides theoretical and practical conceptions which effectively build up the anti-capitalist resistance there. National Maoism provides a framework to challenge the Neo-Liberal, imperialist, Dengist state which uses Marx and Lenin orthodoxy as justifications for itself. The rejection of Marx and Lenin as pariahs in National Maoism strips the clothes from the emperor. It exposes his naked persona, designed to serve foreign capital, for the Chinese masses to see and revolt against in a mass-fashion.

It also invigorates Mao, as a theoretician and revolutionary belonging not just to the past but rather, setting out the course for the Chinese Proletarian-Peasant future. It is in China that we are most optimistic about the prospects of our model.

We must mention that we won't and cannot impose the model upon the Chinese masses as any development has to be organic. It has to come from the masses to the masses. If we were to impose our vision forcefully then we are no better than the imperialists who robbed China and subjected her to a century of humiliation. China is suffering precisely because Dengism, otherwise known as Socialism with Chinese Characteristics, isn't 'Chinese' despite its claims. At best, Dengism is slightly sinified western Marxism which bases its premises on Marx and Lenin while perverting Mao Zedong thought for its perfidious aims.

Fascism and Maoism give us the correct line about what needs to be done, but Maoism is the ideology which also gives us the answers for 'how' and 'for what reason?'

The Manifesto of National Maoism

As an example of Maoism being able to answer how and for what reason, we can turn to the Cultural Revolution. The 2 lines of educational reform crashed, one, the old line of maintaining a 'professional' elite of teachers being responsible for the education of the people. The other, the proletarian-peasant line that education ought to be mixed in with real-life application of what is being taught. Students themselves ought to learn and put into practice what is being taught, else it's just useless theorising.

The old line of education argued that the one who excels best in learning, ought to be the official based on the old Confucian ideals. The new line practiced a principle of 'from the communes-back to the communes'.

In old China, the agricultural colleges were situated in the urban areas, separated from where the rural peasants were. During the Cultural Revolution agricultural colleges were established in those rural areas. The local peasants were trained and educated not only on agriculture but also on the political line of Mao Zedong thought. The new colleges were attended, managed and transformed by the workers-peasants-soldiers and not by a privileged administrative elite like the old colleges.

This was the correct line to take and uphold. From the masses to the masses. Such thinking is what we aim to replicate to solve problems that arise within our movements. The movement will gain a mass character and become beholden to the communities which adopt the National Maoist line.

In the west, the contributions of Maoism can give us a tool and a way forward. We can adopt new ways of thinking that are alien to liberalism, this allows us to shed any liberal sentimentality and embrace the national collective. Commitment to Socialism can be strengthened and the Maoist socialist models can be adopted with authority as opposed to various other immature conceptions of the economical design of the state. Therefore, we reject many prevalent economical frameworks of many modern Third Positionist groupings and parties such as distributism, the guild system etc.

The National Cultural Revolution as a concept allows us to bring the actions of the anti-national elements to light before they can concentrate their powers in the shadows. If we don't monitor their power, they will later use it to abolish the peasant-proletarian state at a time of national crisis. The National Cultural Revolution mobilises the masses in every domain of life and utterly seeks to annihilate liberalism from our native lands, to guarantee a national revival.

We don't want to speculate on the past, so we'll speculate on the future. A socialist state without the National Cultural Revolution is a state open to takeover of the individual who can exploit the collective. The National Cultural Revolution must be adopted by the Third Positionist movements worldwide for securing their revolutions!

We are not communists, in fact, we aim to further isolate Marxism from its working class pretences. Marxism showed itself to be rotten, elitist and anti-masses. When was the last

The Manifesto of National Maoism

time a Marxist in the west visited a factory or tried to persuade a worker who was not a student? 1980's?

Marxism needs to be exposed as a liberal anti-mass phenomenon, as a force which will offer false pretences and sell out the worker when given power. Syriza is a good example of that, elected on a radical ticket with the masses rejecting the EU austerity doctrine in a referendum. Syriza nevertheless betrayed the masses and went with the EU line anyway, this is by no means an accident or an exception. Wherever electoral/orthodox/Trotskyist Marxism came to power, it defaulted to liberalism.

This betrayal is by no means exclusive to the three mentioned branches, it can also affect Maoism as well. After years of waging revolution, the winning Communists in Nepal changed direction. Rather than abolishing the liberal state and the electoral system, they kept it, and arrogantly proclaimed that their path is a new development. They claimed that Marxism can now be realised within the liberal political system via elections.

This is laughable. Not to mention that this 'new path' was not even that new. Over 100 years ago Bernstein also thought that Marxism could be realised via reforms within the bourgeois states, rather than via a revolution. Maybe Nepalese communists could take a refresher course on Marxist history to realise that their anti-mass betrayal is a century old Marxist tradition.

For these reasons and many more, we are anti-communists but not anti-socialist. We are proudly declaring ourselves to stand behind socialism and aim to realise this state into daily reality for the workers and the peasants. Unlike the false promises of the Marxists, we can, and we will actually fulfil our side of the bargain. Behind us lie the proud traditions of the Italian Social Republic, of the USSR under Stalin and China under Mao. We don't worship dead fools who did nothing to wage a revolution and who embedded their theories with the red-liberal doctrine! We respect those who interacted and led the workers into socialism!

We see leftist/Communist groups as circlejerks aimed at professing and promoting their own agenda separate from that of the most conscious of the workers. They're also known as "reactionary proletariat" in most cases as of today. Their actions amount to what is effectively fake concern (saying 'happy worker's day' on the first of May but considering workers as primitive), virtue signalling - they're ridden with this.

Our hyper nationalistic tendencies shelter us from any accusations of wanting to sell out the nation. Our anti-capitalist line is especially profound, we stand behind our workers against the globalist elites, against internationalism which seeks to dilute the interests of the common worker in favour of some utopian ideal.

We seek national revival, the manifest destiny of our peoples against the greed and ideological obstacles present within the liberal doctrine and philosophy. We reject 'human rights' as a concept because it is a limit imposed by the 'individual' on the national

The Manifesto of National Maoism

collective. Our philosophy takes from Fascism that there can be nothing outside the state, everything is within the state.

We denounce liberal and Marxist internationalism but ourselves build our own International framework. We recognise the rotten nature of Marxist internationalism which conveniently lets Marxists ignore the national struggle, it is simply a matter for them of dismissing the nation and working for some utopian internationalism that will never realise.

The liberal internationalism is more threatening and is the real enemy in the 21st century, it justifies its own imperialist aggression via the need to bestow the notions of 'human rights' and freedom onto everywhere. The aggressors are seen as freedom loving and human rights implementing and therefore in this circular logic, justified in violating their own freedom and human rights postulates in their conquest, because the ends justify the means for liberal imperialism.

Any acts of barbarity and conquest are presented as the means to introduce 'liberalism' and freedom onto the persecuted nations. The uncivilised and barbaric US aggression against Afghanistan was said to be done in order to introduce a 'modern civilised government' which will respect human rights, in the same time representing US interests, the self-declared bastion of liberal freedom.

We cannot compete with either international ideology via sheer xenophobia, we need a platform and we built that platform on the ideas of Jan Stachniuk, his analysis of culture. The highest ideal for us is a civilised collective that puts its own interests above any single individual and is willing to create a new world, a world that dialectically opposes the 6 hallmarks of backculture.

Only via a framework like this, can we even stand a serious chance and offer a legitimate opposition to both, degeneration involved in western Marxist thought and liberalism.

As it regards to building new culture, unlike the 'right' which preaches conservative values and often fetishises 'early' capitalism, we don't want conservatism, we want futurism or an alike trend to go with our revolution (Guillaume Faye's Archeofuturism for instance). Our nations are not designed to be stuck to some arbitrary ideal, we create the ideal, the spirit and realise it collectively! This does not mean that we are anti-traditionalists, but merely anti-conservative, we seek to conserve nothing. Society is to constantly reinvent itself in the revolutionary flames of National Maoism.

Concerning religion, we leave this question to the unique national destiny of the nation. For example the Japanese National Maoist state will not do without a revival of its spiritual doctrines which defined Japanese spirituality for thousands of years.

National Maoism is adaptable and may in some cases promote state atheisation, especially in areas where religious conflict overshadows national revival (See Paetel) but we are not atheists by default. We recognise that mysticism was always a part of every culture, no matter its origin. Whether in the Native American beliefs with their animal

The Manifesto of National Maoism

totems and spirits or the Vikings with their Nordic pantheon and devotion to the Gods of Asgard and other worlds connected by Yggdrasil. Therefore, national revival is likely to involve the resurgence of old Gods and old beliefs.

It needs to be clarified that the futurism that we promote is born from the reinvention of old and new faiths. It is not 'conservatism', it is 'traditionalism', it is inventing the new from the forgotten and subordinating it to the state. The Scandinavians last practised their native faiths 800 years ago. These faiths have been forgotten so bringing them back would not be a true replication of the old but would be a reinvention, in this sense it would be something new.

Even newer faiths like Christianity will undergo the process of reinvention and subordination to the nation. Faith will be something unique to the nation and its conditions. The state will uphold the faith and teach new generations its precepts. This is because the national destiny is rooted in the spirit of the people collectively, religions are a part of that spirit which makes them unique. Positive Christianity under National-Socialism is an example of such reinvention.

Consider for example Scandinavia, the Scandinavians became Lutheran, Catholicism was practically eliminated without any significant wars. It is clear that those countries didn't have any strong affinity with the catholic faith, they were happy to rebel when the opportunity came. This suggests that in Scandinavia, the national spirit lingers deep inside and by reviving old faiths, the destiny of the nation could come forth to the national consciousness.

Concerning race, we orient ourselves primarily towards working for the national destiny of the people of a nation. The character of the nation itself will be different however, the national destiny of a majority racial group in a country may be different to those of the minority.

We agree with Mussolini though and his attempts in trying to unify the South and North of Italy under one imperial banner regardless of race. That being said we realise that this issue may differ from nation to nation. White Boers have a different interest to the coloured South Africans. It is ultimately a case-by-case issue and we will not prescribe any universal notions.

We'll just say this, that the primacy of the state dominates any racial dynamics, we reject the National Socialist approach that the state is the instrument of the race, it is the instrument of the national masses. It may just so happen that the vast majority of the masses are also of one race and want to further the interests of their race, in this case they can only do that via the state.

The state is the foundation on which any racial lines are constructed, not the other way round.

The Manifesto of National Maoism

We must also address the socially conservative left which sticks by the most conservative economic theories of Marxism while adopting a model of hatred for various social minorities. They do so in the claim that this is where the workers are, and since the workers are negatively positioned to these minorities, then so are they.

However, workers are also against Marxism. Yet, if one tries to question the Marxist canon, these 'leftists' are no less willing to also throw this section of the working class under the bus. They retort to the anti-communist workers that anyone who disagrees with them is a 'Fascist'. The idea that Marxism may be wrong doesn't enter their minds, it is all the working class with 'false consciousness'.

However, a worker is only combative to various LGBT movements because these are associated with the west and its model of brutal exploitation and destruction of his culture and nation. This interpretation is correct and National Maoism does not promote the LGBT movement but stands in opposition to it, realising that it is a liberal front which individualises people and isolates them from the masses while brainwashing them into accepting anti-social norms.

Homosexuals however are not automatically LGBT, one ought to distinguish between the perverse movement and the homosexuals as people themselves. For example, homosexuality was an accepted phenomenon in feudal Russia, so Russian homophobia is not an organic phenomenon. It is a reaction to the pride parades seen as western influence and the supplanting of the native culture with the moral and spiritual decay associated with Neo-Liberalism. Workers can't be blamed for that, they are right.

A worker may therefore be homophobic, transphobic etc. but only as an impulse to protect their national culture. This is not something that this socially conservative left understands because they nevertheless preach what amounts to state atheism, destruction of the national identity, Marxist internationalism and communism. All these things also lead to the weakening of the national values which the workers hold dear.

Only the Third Position can offer a satisfying exit out of this paradigm, only under its principles can various minorities live in harmony with the majority of the population. Everyone exists under the umbrella of shared national identity. For example, DPRK tolerates gay people, but pride parades and advertising of the 'LGBT ideology' is forbidden. Gay, straight, whatever, one's adherence is strictly to the national collective.

If you speak to a common worker, this is the stance that they will agree with and for a good reason. The common worker contains within himself magnificent wisdom, the working masses are indeed the wisest and smartest. This shows us that Maoist trust in the masses is well founded, ironically, this being something which is seldom found in modern self-declared western 'Maoists'.

Regardless, within the state everything is to be questioned and challenged by the collective, in this way the state will follow a path of its national destiny. We are superior to the right as we don't limit ourselves to simply re-enacting and 'nostalgising' some vaguely

The Manifesto of National Maoism

defined previous state of capitalism and culture. Our revolutionary doctrine seeks to bring to realisation the hidden desire that is deeply hidden within the national subconscious, the desire to fulfil its historic and generational mission. Our ideology brings this desire to the forefront and doesn't shun in the name of individualism. The nation becomes fully conscious of it, allowing us to serve the nation as an instrument of their power, guiding the masses to their national destiny!

In this way we undercut the right and left and expose them as being the agents of Neo-Liberalism, destroying our industries and selling the working class out to the highest foreign bidder. We are the unity of the doctrines of Third-Position and Maoism, the two most promising and most popular revolutionary political philosophies of the 21st century!

Liberalism, whether right or left tries to shun what we have in common, what we desire to achieve as a nation. As Socialists and Nationalists we reject them both and consider them to be our enemies. This is not to say that we consider misguided working class individuals our enemies, as we will attempt to reach them if possible, due to their nature of being workers, they hold within themselves the wisdom and National Maoism is what empowers the working class. We reject the western Marxist pretentiousness of trying to call those who don't fit our criteria 'falsely conscious' as if it's the workers who are to conform to the movement and not the movement to the workers!

It does mean though that we will have no compassion when our turn comes. Days of terror will dawn on the liberal idea and its proponents, when we raise the gallows, we shall not discriminate whether one is right (social-democrat, conservative) or left (Marxist) liberal!

It is therefore necessary for us as National Maoists to realise the power of our collective ideology. Furthermore, we wish to unite Fascism and Maoism and generate an anti-internationalist, anti-Marxist, Anti-capitalist current, which seeks not to eliminate our cultures and nations. We don't want to build a system which validates a mass of mindless, stateless, classless individuals and sees their selfish pursuit as the goal and not as degeneration.

It is the power uniting the East and the West, it is anti-global, national and socialist. We raise the banner of Mao Zedong and Benito Mussolini, our ideology is fluid and never static. It is revolutionary and always changing in accordance to mass-line. In time, we will get rid of 'Mao's' name from the ideology (this may not apply to China), as this namesake nevertheless leaves us with much baggage coming from him. This results from his endorsement of communism which will, without a doubt, harm us if we don't take appropriate steps. Just like his devotion to 'Marxism-Leninism' harmed China as the revisionist, anti-national, anti-working class Dengist elements gained legitimacy from Marx and Lenin.

We don't seek legitimacy from Marxists, we dismiss any Marxist critique of us as irrelevant, we take critique from the masses of the working folk, and we adapt in accordance to mass-line. This does not mean that if a critique of us arises from the Marxist circles, that

The Manifesto of National Maoism

we will just let it pass, **no**. We will address it and its dishonesty to show to others the decadent and corrupt Marxist ideology.

The future name of this ideology will be conceived from the masses, what they choose to call us is what we'll whole-heartedly embrace. For now, names that we accept with pride, and we won't shy away from being called them, are 'Fascist', 'Socialist', 'Nationalist', 'Third-Positionist' and 'Maoist'.

Names however cannot be a branding™ exercise. The commodification of ideologies under capitalism is a well-known phenomenon via which subcultures are formed, we however don't desire to be a subculture but a genuine revolutionary force.

Names are not important, what is important is the sentiment, the feeling and the ideal. The feelings of nationalism cannot be described in any materialistic ways, yet nevertheless this force, this love for one's own nation exists deep in the hearts of revolutionary masses. This approach allows for collectivity and unification with other nationalists. We are Fascists, Socialists, Nationalists, Third Positionists and Maoists, however for all of us, all these words break down to one idea, the idea of National revival through the purifying flames of socialism. No term is sacred, but the love for one's homeland is.

It is the revolutionary core which is important, as long as we maintain it and solidify that internal drive, then we'll be a successful revolutionary, anti-liberal movement.

We've seen many Fascists from the lower end glorify historical experiences of socialism. There's an instinctive understanding of class struggle which actually is lacking in many western communists who proclaim to be the true successors to the USSR and Maoist Chinese tradition. This is why we need to be class and nation-oriented and not Communist-oriented, Fascist-oriented, gay-oriented, or anything like this.

On this note we agree with Karl Otto Paetel who said in the National Bolshevik Manifesto (1933):

“Revolutionary Marxism is already marching for revolution and socialism today. The new order which emerges from the swell of this upheaval will be, in our opinion, not the universal humanity anticipated by its theorists, but the community of sovereign socialist states.

Not the path, but the signpost is wrong.”

There's a path of revolutionary national liberation and it is very important to make sure that we focus on the path ahead of us and not quarrel over the signpost.

Daring to follow the path set out by our ideology is not going to guarantee you material wealth. It may in fact worsen your material circumstances, but it will awaken the national spirit. It will mean that the nation is no longer exploited, it is no longer a cheap whore to be imperialised by Neo-Liberal elites from across the ocean. Furthermore, it is a path of

The Manifesto of National Maoism

struggle and pain, it is a path of dignity rather than an easy life. All this is particularly Sorelian in nature, the idea of struggle and work as fulfillments for life rather than hoping for an easy life full of material certainties but without work. We reject the idea that work is something to get rid off, work is fulfilling, work is what characterises a conscious man, a man who is willing to use his own power to build a Nation.

We cannot promise you commodities, we cannot promise you luxury, we cannot even promise you that food will be always in constant supply. We can promise you the idea though, the immaterial idea of the national destiny and the revival of your people as proud, strong and resisting humiliation from foreign powers. As you follow National Maoism, the national spirit will awaken within you, the spirit that was alive deep in the souls of disgruntled Chinese who grabbed whatever weapons they had to try to expel the foreign imperialists from their cherished ancestral lands during the Boxer rebellion over a hundred years ago. This rebel dreams within all of us affected by foreign domination.

For now, National Maoism is just words printed on paper or displayed on the screen. When you arm yourself with this revolutionary ideology though, it becomes an active force and a set of principles which you can follow to create conditions necessary for national revival!

We believe that this unification is one which bridges the gap between the far 'left' and the far 'right' by creating an almighty united ideology that transcends the left, the right and death itself! Death to Marxism, Death to Capitalism, Death to Monarchs, long live Il Duce and Chairman Mao!

The Manifesto of National Maoism

Other Matters

Our logo is that of three symbols, one of the bottom symbols representing Mao Zedong thought, and the other, Third Positionist Thought, with the top symbol being a mark of their unity within National Maoism.

It is not an 'official logo', in fact we reject any such concepts as touched briefly upon in the 'In Conclusion' section above, basically:

In order to break out of capitalist realism and maintain a true anti-liberal course, one must not attach himself to mere signifiers, to symbols. Capitalism co-opts what it can visually and informationally, if it exists as information, it can be used to sell shit (be it visuals, sounds, food etc.).

Radical art too can be commercialised and cleared of anti-liberalism to then be sold for profit. This is why attaching to any signifiers or any movements like being 'Nationalist, Third Positionist, Maoist' can only serve as a temporary tool. It's useful in giving an idea to the reader as to the direction we are writing from but what matters are not the words or the slogans.

What's important is the revolutionary core, awakening it and bringing it forth, the pure collective will and desire. If we called ourselves Revolutionary Nationalists, Nationalist-Socialists, fourth positionists, national communists etc. it wouldn't make one bit of difference. This is because one ought to not care about worshipping words and symbols, this is a sure path for being sold a 'fandom' to buy products from; for becoming a liberalised consumer.

It is what is in your heart which truly matters and which truly makes a difference. The revolutionaries of the present (although still in embryonic stage) and the future will not care for labels, they will know with their sharp mind how capitalism operates. They will not let themselves be convinced to go down the consumptionist route and will actively fight against liberalisation.

The only effective means to fight is to forego 'fandom identity' and let the individual signifiers slide like water on oilskin. Without effect, the key is to seek those whose hearts are pure and willing to struggle for the collective, no matter a label that they use.

For this reason the suggested logos here are just that, suggestions.

We are a collective, and can be contacted via our email:

ANationalistProletarian@protonmail.com

The Manifesto of National Maoism

We welcome new members and don't discriminate based on specific ideological adherence as long as one is committed to the collective anti-liberal effort via revolutionary socialism and is enthusiastic and ready to use his or her skills for the collective.

If there are any further questions, requests for interviews, debates and collaborations then use the provided email and we will respond.