Proletarians of all countries, unite!

FIRST CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF PERU: CHAIRMAN GONZALO'S INTERVENTION

CONCERNING GONZALO THOUGHT[1]

The first thing is to pay close attention to the title, it says "concerning," it means propositions for treating a problem, it is not the study of something developed, still less a complete study of it; even if you pay attention to the title of the first thing we have seen, it says "on," that also implies that there are still many things, because from what we have debated in the leadership, it has been concluded that in any case *Long Live Maoism!* must be disseminated. It should be a broader document than what we treated yesterday; we will have to look for when to publish it. But comrades, if one thinks about the Congress the tasks are going to multiply tremendously, it is enough to think that we must air the question of the United Left[2] which now more than ever is interesting and necessary; the problem of revisionism is another question because revisionism must be seen as it is expressing itself at present and many other things derive from what we are treating; there in point six of other documents, for example, the people's war necessarily needs a document that studies it as thoroughly as possible; bureaucrat-capitalism, in short, that is indispensable. Before the Congress many tasks arise, all this apart from the main one that we cannot evade: the People's War because, I reiterate. From it derives the Congress.

Well, having seen the problem of the title, which already implies that there are, I reiterate, only bases for studying the problem, and it must be understood well in this way, because this document is going to be strongly attacked and that is as certain as two and two are four, we already knew it, comrades; we knew that in the basis of discussion the problem was Gonzalo Thought and there the question is to comprehend the leap and the leap is key in contradiction, there is where one slips very easily and errs consequently. In this document *Concerning Gonzalo Thought* there is an introductory

[1]Red Library: https://vnd-peru.blogspot.com/2023/04/bandera-roja-org-i-congreso-del-pcp.html. *Concerning Gonzalo Thought*: https://redlibrary.info/works/pcp/concerning-gonzalo-thought.pdf, or buy in paperback form at: https://prairiefirepublishing.com/products/general-political-line.

[2]Red Library: United Left (*Izquierda Unida*, IU) was a revisionist electoral front in Peru. "Such a front is the negation of a Party that leads, and if there is no Party of the proletariat to lead, there is no transformation, no revolution."—Chairman Gonzalo in Central Committee of the Communist Party of Peru, *Interview with Chairman Gonzalo* (July 1988), interview by El Diario (Red Library), 53.

part, although such a thing is not expressed, it is an introduction and then it has five problems.

Let us see this introductory part. It says: "In its process of development, every revolution, through the struggle of the proletariat as the leading class and, above all, of the Communist Party that upholds its unrenounceable class interests, generates a group of leaders and mainly one who represents and leads it, a leader of acknowledged authority and influence. In our reality this has been concretized, by historic necessity and chance, in Chairman Gonzalo, leader of the Party and of the revolution."

What concerns leaders and that if what **Lenin** established in *"Left-Wing" Communism* in relation to masses, Party, and leaders is taken into account; but it is not as the comrades say that this is **Lenin**'s thesis, it is not so, comrades, you have not read **Lenin** well, **Lenin** must be read well, known well. If you think carefully, here the problem of revolution, leading class (proletariat), and Party is specified, it is specifying the three things; that is what must be taken into account. We recommend to you, comrades, one must read well, study, and think, striving for the greatest objectivity in order to comprehend what the document says, not what one has in one's head; that what one has in one's head disturbs, comprehensible, but we have the need, the obligation to be objective, we have to combat subjectivism, it is very important, pay attention to that then, comrades. Three questions are invoked: revolution, leading class proletariat, and Party, the action of the three, that is what it says; these three questions generate leaders.

Every process of whatever type, also a literary type, has leaders, has heads, and these leaders do not arise in great quantities and a time is required for their forging; **Lenin** insisted on this, but this already comes from **Marx** and the Chairman develops it further. It is a handful of leaders that a revolution generates in decades, what is generated in a greater quantity are leaders, in an even greater quantity cadres and a whole mass of militants.

In our Party we established already many years ago a relation between masses, cadres, and leaders with a proportion; that proportion given the great growth of the Party, of combatants, and of masses who work more closely with us has unbalanced that proportion for us and from there derives the need to concern ourselves greatly with increasing militancy but without forgetting a good selection, which is possible because having more access to the masses, there will be more candidates from whom to select militants; we need to form cadres, these documents contribute to that formation and also to increase the number of leaders.

Comrades, think about the following: in 1976 we calculated more or less the need, then, for some seventy-five leaders to make the Party march, but the Party today is many

times larger than it was in 1976; and then think that we have an army and think that we have New Power—

Please copy what I am saying, do not believe that you have a very great memory. Comrades, some here believe that what is said is in vain, and then they do not know what to retransmit, or retransmit nonsense, and do it late and badly. We are in Congress and attention must be extremely high. We are all tired, comprehensible, but it does not count, the obligation counts. Well, excuse this interlude, but it is necessary.

Comrades, if you compare 1976 when we needed seventy-five leaders, how many will we need today? Do you comprehend this? And mainly what? We need a Central Committee with an adequate number, and a good Central Committee! A Central Committee well immersed in Party politics; which has to strive to study theory in the books or texts that the Party indicates, not in others, comrades, because in that way we break the unitary formation we must have; they are questions we must think about seriously. Any revolution one sees shows that only in decades are a number of leaders forged. If we think of the glorious Bolshevik Party, that of **Lenin** and **Stalin**, but mainly of **Lenin** who was its creator, its forger, think, we speak of leaders and we have a **Stalin**, we have a **Sverdlov**, a **Dzerzhinsky**, a———to highlight true leaders, few; the Chinese Revolution is similar.

But the main thing is that a leader is generated, a single head that stands out clearly, far above the others, and that is what we have to understand and it is not through anyone's will, it is the very reality of the revolution, of the class, and of the Party, which demand and promote that conformation. If we speak of a leader, we have for example **Marx**, there is a notably outstanding head, a summit. If we speak of the great **Lenin**, there is another leader of recognized authority and of an immense ascendancy nobody could compare **Stalin** with all his merits and greatness, with the immensity of **Lenin**, nobody, and I reiterate, once again, **Lenin** did not have a specific position of General Secretary for there was no such thing, it was—I reiterate—that the post of General Secretary in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union arose precisely through the proposal of **Lenin** himself, and in him a glorious summit is also expressed. Or in the case of China, Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Obviously none of the leaders that that Chinese Revolution has generated can equal Chairman Mao Tse-tung, none, and in him we also have a glorious summit. There are the three grandest leaders of the world revolution, because that is their dimension; that they were also of their parties and of their concrete revolution is subsidiary because the main thing is that they have been leaders of the world revolution and they have established for us, then, the great process of the development of Marxism giving shape to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

On another plane, without pretending in any way to compare, there would be no reason, but so that it may be seen that every revolution needs a head, think for example of Albania itself—I do not pretend to elevate those figures but even in those revolutions there has to be a head—Hoxha in Albania; Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam; Kim Il Sung with all his rotten idea of kingship, was the head, that is the problem. Thus it always occurs, there is nothing strange about it, moreover, it is a necessity; **Engels** already insisted on this and told us that even a literary movement has a head who represents it.

The problem lies in the definition of a leadership with "recognized authority and ascendancy [moral force or influence]." That they be unquestionable authorities? Yes, for the red line, but that they be questioned and denied, an everyday occurrence.[3]

Was the leadership of **Marx** not denied, questioned, and even vilified by a miserable crawler, crawling servant, servant of the tsar like Bakunin or by a "learned academic," stuffed with ideas that he did not even manage to comprehend, like Dühring, who said that our glorious founder **Marx** was a Prussian soul and of Chinese-like knowledge, did that man whose name is only remembered because it is in a work of **Engels** not say so? **Lenin**, was he questioned or not? Of course; the acrobat Trotsky, how many times did he combat **Lenin**, how many times did he deny him? One must not allow oneself to be deceived by that crude distortion which proclaims that Trotsky was a Leninist, but **Lenin** himself called him a Menshevik acrobat, a late Bolshevik, who climbed onto the wagon; one of the things for which Trotsky kept silent at the death of the great **Lenin**, when a General Secretary had to be selected and, obviously, with all the limitations that **Lenin** himself pointed out, it fell to **Stalin** to exercise it who was a real and authentic Bolshevik, one of the things that led Trotsky to keep silent and make his exit at the Congress where the leadership and the recognition as Secretary of Comrade **Stalin** were agreed upon was the fear Trotsky had that they would bring out the letters in which he attacked and reviled **Stalin**, one must not forget it, comrades; and I bring this up because the Trotskyists very much raise their tails like fools and want to pass off a cat as a hare to us and today they continue pompous, infecting the proletarian movement, and some believe them and repeat them. Many things that are being aired today about **Stalin** are nothing but crude repetitions of what Trotsky said. Zinoviev, did he not also attack **Lenin**? Kamenev and several others, did they not even say that **Lenin** was crazy when he proposed preparing the October Revolution and even go so far as to denounce it? They are realities, comrades.

And in the case of the leadership of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the struggle was still much fiercer. That struggle, as is said in the history of the Communist Party of

[3]Red Library: "Everyday bread" is the literal translation of "*pan de todos los días*." For readability, it has been changed to "an everyday occurrence."

China, the struggle against the twenty-eight and a half Bolsheviks, those who had learned in Moscow and wanted simply to apply Marxism-Leninism to China strictly, mechanically; was Chang Kuo-tao himself not a student who became a communist and believed himself called to great destinies and even dared to want to pressure the Central Committee so that they would recognize him as General Secretary, thus denying Chairman Mao Tse-tung whose leadership had been recognized in 1935 in Tsunyi? They are facts, comrades; Liu Shao-chi himself who for a time supported Chairman Mao Tse-tung, did he not become a denier of the Chairman? Or Teng Hsiao-ping, has he not developed even a personal hatred against Chairman Mao Tse-tung? And even Chou En-lai himself, in the first part, up to 1935, did he not combat the Chairman's ideas and deny Chairman Mao Tse-tung, did he not label him peasantist and even with an absurd criterion, did he not call him rightist? They are things that must be remembered. Leaderships are recognized amid intense struggles.

It can never attract attention, then, that there are problems around leadership. And in every Party is where such a problem is aired; but despite that, objective reality itself generates leaders and a leader, mainly a leader who becomes even the symbol of a revolution, or a world one in the case of a **Marx**, of a **Lenin**, of a Chairman Mao Tse-tung. An example can make visible this condition which sometimes is not thought about and not seen: the prisoners of war in the Spanish civil revolution, did they not reanimate their optimism and give it renewed impetus simply seeing a **Lenin** insignia, as Marcos Aria himself says? Even he says it and he is a revisionist. They are things we must understand it is already time that, mainly the leaders, we comprehend things because, comrades, it is among the leaders that these problems especially occur because there are those who believe themselves called to great destinies and do not know how to measure even their capacities nor know their limitations and are not capable of seeing the objective, what they have rubbing against their very noses; I speak of historical facts, comrades, I do not speak of ambitions, I speak of historical facts. The problem is not simply having read or repeated, the problem will always be to apply and therefore to comprehend. We believe that this is important.

Also in this first paragraph, we must highlight how it is that Chairman Gonzalo has become leader of the Party and of the revolution. Some burdened with bourgeoisie and with false and Christian humility may think that one cannot speak when precisely a situation that involves him is being treated; that is stupid, that is pure bourgeoisie and false Christian humility and we, as communists, are neither the one nor the other and what is being aired is not the person—in this case, mine—what is being aired is a historical, concrete, material fact. Here it is good to dwell on this of historical necessity and chance, a point which is badly comprehended and distorted; for example,

the comrades prisoners of war have made a *champús*,[4] a mishmash about this problem, when it is clear and simple, I refer to what is called necessity and chance in Marxism.

Engels treated this point and said that the social order is governed by necessary laws. The word necessity has a clear and precise meaning, it means that it is fulfilled, that it governs, that is what it means, independently of the individual will of persons; necessity, philosophically speaking, is what has to be fulfilled, the law that has to govern, that is what necessity means. In social processes, literary ones for example, the necessity governs that someone head a movement, be a head of a school; if one sees, for example, the formation of the Castilian language which is what we speak, it was concretized in a Cervantes, or can that be denied? It had to have then someone who would give shape to it, who would establish its norms, who would head the handling of the language, as in Italy it is Dante—not the Dante, as is said, it is Dante alone—there you have an example even in the literary world. In the scientific one, contemporary physics is conformed by a group of notable theoreticians and nevertheless someone was needed to head it in the comprehension of the macrocosm: Einstein, it is undeniable, it was necessary that someone head that, it is a whole different manner, it takes a great step in the physical comprehension of the world; or in the comprehension of the microcosm a Planck who opens a new world in physical science; it was necessary, the law demanded by necessity that someone head the movement. Or in a revolutionary struggle as in the examples aired in Marxism; the French Revolution necessarily had to have a head, for example Robespierre, it is so. **Engels** said, then, every movement at whatever level has to have a head, but it is a general law and as such it is necessarily fulfilled.

Whereas chance—which is the most precise name because sometimes I tend to use randomness which is too imprecise, nevertheless it can occur, comrades, but the term is chance—chance, **Engels** said, is nothing but how necessity sets in determined circumstances specifying a personage, being concretized in a person. The example of physics returns, there it is verified, once again, how the men society needs to develop a field of its unfolding are always generated opportunely (do not concern yourselves with putting the names because they are sometimes complicated and difficult), if one sees physics in the twentieth century, we have an **Eddington**, a **Sommerfeld**, a **Planck**, we have a **Schwinger**, a **Heisenberg**, a **Schrödinger**, a **de Broglie**, a multitude of most notable physicists; any of them, had it not been **Einstein**, would have arrived at establishing relativity, thus it is said in physics for example, if one reviews any history of physics one finds that, but chance, the circumstances specified that it be **Einstein**.

[4]Red Library: A thick South American drink made with grains, fruit, and spices.

Thus is necessity understood, as law and chance as concretion of that law and thus is how the heads establish it, thus is how leaders and a leadership are established.

The problem is simple and clear; the confusion derives on one side, from the lack of knowledge or from the imprecision of knowledge, from the confusion one has, apart from the struggles in which such a situation is defined. I give you a historical example, from science, and I appeal to science because in it there are some very special conditions, nevertheless there too it occurs amid disputes for example, who created or discovered infinitesimal calculus, **Newton** or **Leibniz**? A dispute during centuries and it continues to be discussed, a conclusion has already been reached; in that case, for example, both discovered independently; nevertheless the followers have struggled tooth and nail to say it was **Newton**! Others it was **Leibniz**! And that one stole from the other, what is clear is that the better notation was **Newton**'s, for that reason it is that what he established is used. There you have it, even in science where apparently there should not be those disputes but everything is contradiction.

In any human activity, consequently, wherever the axes are placed, every school, every unfolding needs a head and a leadership and around that leadership there is contention, but a leadership is specified through historical necessity and chance. And in our case, in our Party it has been specified in Chairman Gonzalo; we may like or dislike it, comrades, I dislike summer but it pays no attention to me, it continues unfolding, do you comprehend what I mean? You will say, "but social laws are not like physics." Oh, yes? Read then what **Marx** says, that they are different does not mean that they are not laws, they have a specific field, but the social ones are as much laws as the physical ones.

Well, how is the leadership specified here?: "Leader of the Party and of the revolution." It is not an ambiguity. Why? What are we speaking about, what are we treating? The fundamental documents of the Party, consequently of the Peruvian revolution, thus is how what it says here must be understood; we well know that outside they will say other things, it will be their problem, not ours. The leadership was established, recognizing it—because that is what fits with a leadership, to recognize it—in the Enlarged National Conference of 1979, in struggle, where two factions contended; one, that the leadership was of Chairman Gonzalo and that it had to be recognized; the counterpart, how did it try to oppose it? Invoking Mariátegui, I underline, invoking! It is that one of the "defenders of Mariátegui," as he himself said and expressed his thought, Lima of the balconies and the colonies, what a manner of seeing Lima! For a communist position, it is good for a poem by don José Gálvez but not for a communist. After all, those who invoked Mariátegui did not even know him and were lagging behind by fifty years; these are facts, comrades, that is what we speak about. Perhaps one might ask oneself, and did Mariátegui acquire or was he recognized as leadership, have you ever heard that? No.

Why? Have you asked yourselves that? He did not have time! One must never forget that the founder of the Party died less than two years after the Party was founded; for that reason you will never find any document that says leadership of Mariátegui, whose fault was it? They are then the concrete situations that were expressed in the reality of the country.

The second paragraph tells us: "But, moreover, and this is what is fundamental of every leadership, revolutions generate a thought that guides them, the result of the application of the universal truth of the ideology of the international proletariat to the concrete conditions of each revolution." What must be emphasized here to comprehend well and not err? A leadership is underpinned by a guiding thought, by an application, time being required for a leadership to be recognized. It is not then as is said that leadership sustains Gonzalo Thought, it is absurd, comrades; the reverse, that is what the document says very clearly, because it could not be understood otherwise; the comrades, how do they opine? They believe that thought is a washbasin, that leadership sustains it, how absurd! It is underpinned, it is based on a thought, otherwise there is no leadership; that is what we must see and what is here clearly.

Then it tells us: "A guiding thought indispensable to attain victory and conquer Power and, still more, to continue the revolution and always maintain the course toward the sole grand goal, Communism." What function does a guiding thought fulfill? That is what is clarified here, what it serves for and it says: "indispensable to attain victory and conquer Power," without that, do not even dream of conquering Power, otherwise, bring out a single case, there is none, comrades; but still more, what does it serve? "To continue the revolution and always maintain the course." The problem of maintaining the course is fundamental! Because if it is not maintained, we deviate and if we deviate, the revolution is obstructed, hindered, unnecessarily prolonged, and can lead even to great defeats, which will demand a new and more incessant and redoubled effort to continue striving and struggling for the revolution, for the conquest of Power, and for the goal, why? The revolution is uncontainable! But then guiding thought fulfills a function, a necessity.

It says next: "A guiding thought that, having reached a qualitative leap of decisive importance for the revolutionary process it leads, identifies itself with the name of the one who gave it shape theoretically and practically." Let it be understood well! We cannot continue with the absurdity of bourgeois empiricism of the eighteenth century, anti-Marxist, of separating theory from practice, it is to deny that practice is the source of knowledge. Do we perhaps not know that without practice there is no knowledge, do we not understand that, what do we understand then? Nothing! Is it perhaps not the starting point of differentiation between Marxism and the bourgeois

position, is it not perhaps the first of the theses established by **Marx** on Feuerbach? Foolishly they hurl themselves against principles and historical realities which deny the class, deny the ideology, that is the "A" of Marxism. Here what is to be emphasized is that a moment of "a qualitative leap of decisive importance for a revolution" arrives. What is our situation, why is Gonzalo Thought now being proposed? Because we are then in a qualitative, decisive leap, or what is a Congress, is this Congress not implying the summing-up of what has been done, is it not implying the establishment of the basis of Party unity, is it not implying laying solid bases for the conquest of Power in the entire country, within and in function of the world revolution, is the leap not seen, are we so blind, so shortsighted, so stupid, politically speaking? Comrades, we can no longer permit in the Party such immaturity of a mature Party and the maturity of a Party is the consequence of a long historical process, it is not that of individuals; for that reason they do not understand, they are confusing the maturity of the Party with their own and individual immaturity, that is the concrete root those who do not understand this problem have, it has a personal root in that aspect, it is its concretion, its own reality which it never manages to see, why? One does not seek, one does not think thoroughly, that is it, comrades. That is the reason why we are making this leap in the problem of thought.

The document well says: "In our situation, this phenomenon specified itself first as Guiding Thought, then as Chairman Gonzalo's Guiding Thought, and subsequently as Gonzalo Thought." Well, let us seek the Party, revolutionary, historical correlation of why these specifications were produced. Guiding thought, Second National Conference when we prepared ourselves to generate a vacuum in the countryside and create New Power, that was the concrete historical fundamental. What refers to Chairman Gonzalo's guiding thought, First Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Third Conference, what was agreed upon there? Great leap, within what plan? Conquering bases, important or not in the People's War? Obviously, comrades. There you have the correlate. Gonzalo Thought, I have already said why, it is not free speculation. Please then, comrades, always think, meditate, and refer the things that are proposed to the Party circumstances, to the circumstances of the People's War being carried forward, to those of the Peruvian revolution, to the needs of the class, of our people, or is it that you disconnect Party from class and people? Without this meaning that that vanguard—as some say—of the proletariat and of the people, no, comrades, the Party is the vanguard of the proletariat, it is not of the people. Here is another thing to be emphasized.

Let us continue, it says: "Because it is the Chairman who, creatively applying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to the concrete conditions of Peruvian reality, has generated it, thus endowing the Party and the revolution with an indispensable weapon that is a guarantee

of triumph." Is there or is there not creative application? A little word which some do not like, is it mechanical, then? When simply "application" is said, in some mouths! not to say "creative" is to propose, from what they think, mechanical, then prove it, prove it! It is not a problem of regurgitating, confusion, that is not the problem, it is to see the history of our Party, the problems it is resolving. Because defining guiding thought, Chairman Gonzalo's guiding thought, and Gonzalo Thought are problems of the Party, as they see everything through the person, through their individualism, they believe it is a personal problem and thus they subjectivize the revolution and convert it into a subjective reality, not an objective one. Comrades, it is good then for a Frondizi, for an idealist but not for a Marxist; reducing a social problem to subjective questions may be good for a Feuerbach, before Marx. There is what must be seen behind these things that are there; everything has its basis, it is not a word written at random nor is it a word said unthinkingly, which not for being unthought expresses their errors.

Well, the following paragraph says: "Gonzalo Thought has been forged throughout years of intense, tenacious, and incessant struggle to uphold, defend, and apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, to retake the road of Mariátegui and develop it, for the reconstitution of the Party and, principally, to initiate, maintain, and develop People's War in Peru, serving the World Revolution and serving so that Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, may be, in theory and practice, its sole command and guide." Here there are salient things which must be seriously reflected upon; in short, we have until August because now we only need a taking of position and what we do is to give fundamentals because the comrades need them to be able to explain for it is comprehensible that there will be questions. First thing to emphasize here: "It has been forged throughout years," yes, years, it is not forged in one day nor in two years nor in three years, in long years! We will give you an example: when we had a meeting with the comrades of Spain, on seeing the problem of guiding thought, of the thought we call Gonzalo Thought, Comrade Roberto who heads the Communist Party of Spain, already believed that he was "Roberto Thought," they had just been founded not even six months before and he already believed that he was "Roberto Thought"; it cannot be so then, comrades, how easy it would be that way, no? Thus no thought is generated anywhere on earth, why? Everything has a process, absolutely everything, there is nothing that does not have one, reason: because everything is contradiction and contradiction has a direction, a process. Has it been intense? Well, the struggles we have had I believe prove it; tenacious? Well, I believe that I have been persistent, otherwise we would not be speaking today of Gonzalo Thought; incessant? Of course, one must not falter, one must persist, continue, proceed, one must not tire!

But of what things? The first thing it puts forward is "uphold, defend, and apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism" and it is comprehensible, because if we do not start from

the universal ideology, of what application are we going to speak, or are we going to create for ourselves—for originality—another conception of the proletariat? Let the original ones do that then; in this we are consistent with the practice that Marx, Lenin, and Chairman Mao and the great Marxists there have been on earth have taught us and which the founder himself has also taught us, what did the founder of the Party tell us? "The sole manner of being free and of creating, is taking the conception of the proletariat as a dogma, understanding by such……." Some have difficulty when they hear the word dogma in Marxism and I tell them that they have not read **Lenin** well; "our old dogma" and he specifies it, "our old unapplied principles," I believe we all understand that, it is confused, because the mind repeats to itself "**Lenin** has said that it is not a dogma," but there he refers to there being no mechanical application, one must try to understand then what **Lenin** says in each case and at each moment, one must not be content with repeating and with superficial appreciations; we have already seen how Chairman Mao Tse-tung can only be understood if we see as a unity everything he has done, **Lenin** likewise and **Marx**, the same. That was it then, comrades. Without having done that what application would there be? It would be a ridiculous joke, I believe.

It says "to retake the road of Mariátegui and develop it," key: develop it! On this we have contended, comrades, long years in the Party; it fell to me to draft the document of the Nineteenth Plenum of the Central Committee, of the year 1966, and there it is written, no. 18 of *Red Flag*[5]—for the comparers—there it is written that the road of Mariátegui must never have been abandoned, that it must be continued and developed; please recall how we have been combated. Of the Party, what have the "Mariáteguists" of the PUM, those earlier vanguardists, said? That we took Mariátegui without seeing that Mariátegui died in 1930 and that Peru had advanced greatly because we were already in the 1960s, did they not say so? Well then, comrades, for that reason the problem was to develop it; there are reasons for this—if there is time we will see when treating the question of Mariátegui—not to propose not developing it is not to understand that time passes and that new problems arise, it is to want to remain in 1930 and attention! Mariátegui is not a universal thought, attention! "For the reconstitution of the Party and, principally—of what?—to initiate, maintain, and develop People's War." This is extremely important, this is the main thing in this of reconstituting the Party, retaking Mariátegui, why? Because in the process of Gonzalo Thought it is the People's War which has propelled it, has led it to be concretized as Gonzalo Thought, I believe it is so, comrades; any analysis however lightly we might make it of the history of the Party proves this that I have just said: the People's War has made us comprehend profoundly things already known and has made us understand many new things, resolve new problems, and see

[5]Red Library: "*Red Flag* (*Bandera Roja*): Organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Peru."

new problems still pending solution and makes us comprehend also that there are many more things that will have to be treated. Thus, in that process, one cannot fail to see that there is then the retaking of the road of Mariátegui and developing it, it is not to ignore the founder. I believe that of the founder, of Mariátegui, many speak but few know of him, too few, and if they have studied him, not thoroughly, I say……., how badly things can be dragged in by the hair, comrades.

Then it already tells us that "It is a substantive Party necessity to study Gonzalo Thought." "Substantive Party necessity," of the Party, what does this imply? Of the leaders, of the cadres, of the militants, and mainly of the leaders! I underline, mainly of the leaders! Because here is where the tangle is expressed and that is no randomness, it has always been so in every Party; let us recall then what we have said many times: Central Committee is the vortex of the storm, that is, the center of the storm, one must never forget. But what do we need this study for? "For a more just and correct comprehension of the General Political Line and principally of the Military Line," for that, because if Gonzalo Thought is not seen, how are we going to handle the General Political Line and the Military Line which is its center if they are derived from that thought? It is like taking from the river its source, the lake from which it begins to flow, or do you see a river without a beginning? Perhaps you imagine that rivers have no beginning—as some have seen only the Rímac, a little piece, no? They believe it has no beginning—nonsense, comrades, any material fact on which the eyes rest always shows a road, a process, an origin of something. Consequently, it is necessary to handle the line and the military one especially; if we begin by denying it, if we begin by putting Mariátegui, I ask: very well, tell me now the General Political Line of Mariátegui? And you are not going to repeat the five elements to me, reason: because I made them, comrades, tell me now the Military Line of Mariátegui, what is it? Now tell me whether with that line we are waging the People's War. We do not meditate or think; the Chairman has told us that we must use the head, he has told us that the head is for thinking, that is what the head is for, thus said the Chairman, and the work of the leaders is to move the head, mainly to move the head. The Chinese comrades said, "The leaders have to move the head but some leaders believe that they have to move the feet," very expressive, very expressive what the Chinese comrades said!

Well, when Gonzalo Thought is treated, where to aim? There it says: "at deepening the particularities of the Peruvian Revolution, what is specific and proper to it," because if we do not grasp the specific, we would handle badly this revolution which the Party leads; but as the Party is an entity composed of a system of organizations, it does so through its leaders, through its cadres, through its militants who move all the rest of the organizations. Only in this manner "we will serve the "Great Plan of Developing Bases," the development of the People's War, and the perspective of conquering Power

in the entire country. They are eminently practical reasons, reasons of requirement, of peremptory demands, needs of the Peruvian revolution; as there are many narrow empiricists here, then I believe they understand well if we tell them practice! They are practical reasons! Although I comprehend, comrades, already speaking of practice demands leaving narrow empiricism, of course, because with narrow empiricism you will never handle practice from the Marxist position, never, you will do bastard, narrow empiricism, crawling, you will do Sancho Panzaism, yes, comrades, things must be understood well.

The other paragraph says: "We must study Gonzalo Thought, starting from the historical context that generated it." Reason: it is the class struggle that forms us all, it is the Party that nourishes us with Marxism (…)

A profound leap, a notable advance. I believe it is enough, comrades, to look ten years back, please think how we were and where each one was ten years back, are we what we are today? I do not believe so, for however many limitations we may have we are not those we were ten years ago and I do not refer to the mere passage of the days.

"See the ideological basis that underpins it." Of course then, comrades, because without an ideological basis there is nothing, because a thought also contains construction, of course it contains construction, and without an ideological basis what construction can there be, is a thought not constructed like a building, brick by brick? Of course it is. Can there be a house without foundations? Or are we going to construct on sand? Without an ideological basis, one constructs on sand; and even the Bible says what the result is.[6]

"Make precise its content, more substantially expressed in the General Political Line and the Military Line that is its center." It is the problem of the specifications, particularly of the General Political Line and the military one.

"Aim at what is fundamental in it, the problem of Power." Power here in Peru, because it is the Peruvian revolution, although being a Thought which unfolds within Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, it necessarily has to be "inextricably linked to the conquest of Power by the proletariat throughout the world," otherwise it would not be communist, it would not be inscribed—geometrically speaking, so that it may be comprehended well—within Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

"And pay utmost attention to its forging in the two-line struggle." Why do some comrades not develop as they should and can, and therefore must! They have that

[6]Red Library: "But everyone who hears these words of mine and does not put them into practice is like a foolish man who built his house on sand. The rain came down, the streams rose, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell with a great crash." Matthew 7:26-27 (New International Version).

obligation, why do they not develop the two-line struggle? Because they fear it; but the Chinese verse well says, "The tree does not want the wind to blow but the latter does not know it," it is comprehended, no? So it is in vain that the two-line struggle is ignored, it continues intensifying and becomes a storm every certain time, whether we want it or not, it is so; or are we going to say I do not want two-line struggle and the two-line struggle stopped, even if we take an agreement will it stop? We believe that that is the introductory question.

Then it passes to see synthetically and this of doing it synthetically has to do at these moments with two questions: (1) being the first time we officially propose a document on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, it would have been totally incorrect for Gonzalo Thought to have more extent, in treatment, than Maoism, it would have been totally incorrect; we must know how to treat things. (2) and in second place, because we are only beginning to speak of Gonzalo Thought—some comrades began first, thus it always is in life, it was not the one speaking just as it was not the one speaking who proposed the leadership, no, comrades, to each his own—the Congress is only now treating it and consequently it is a problem that must be studied. They are two reasons but I believe that the first weighs more or would you have liked to have forty pages of Gonzalo Thought and zero of Maoism? Comrades, I believe that the Congress would not have accepted it and with just reason, it would have said this cannot be.

As for the five problems, five questions that have been proposed, we will try, comrades, to expand on some points because we consider that some comrades may not know.

I. HISTORICAL CONTEXT.

INTERNATIONAL. "As for the facts," as you will have seen very well, it is very succinct, it is a set of affirmations; after all, the documents of a Congress do that, affirmations which explain a condensation that each one has, a basis; it is one of the problems our document on the bases of discussion has, very large, but it was needed so to put the multiple things that must then be aired because we must handle the line very well, because politics is the center, because politics has the problem of Power as its axis.

Well, it says: "As for the facts: 1) The development from the Second World War and onward." World War II is a fact of transcendence in the history of the world, strictly it began in 1939 and ended in 1945—excuse me if I enter into these expressions, I believe it is necessary at least to recall them, because sometimes I believe some comrades may not know; if I am mistaken, it is preferable to run the risk to its not being known. It is a world war in which on one side there is imperialist rapine, the dispute for world hegemony which Germany under Hitler demanded for itself; but on the other side

it is the defense of socialism and development of the revolution, yes, it is very clear and it is correct that the war waged then by the USSR was a great patriotic war. I insist, sometimes, comrades, we combat revisionism implacably and we already want to forget certain things; it was a just war of defense, a great patriotic war, thus it was defined with complete correctness, for that reason; and of development of the world revolution because besides that glorious heroic defense which cost the USSR twenty million men, we have an anti-imperialist struggle which is going to unfold in oppressed nations mainly in China. And why do we say mainly in China? It is good to recall that in China 60 percent of the Japanese army was held for a long time; for that reason we do not agree when one simply speaks of the western front, of the eastern front but taking everything as what was waged in Europe, and seeing the problem of the East which is a great front of struggle and a great revolutionary front, it is erroneous, in our judgment, when one pretends to reduce it to the action of the imperialist westerners and mainly of the United States, it has not been so. It is the great war of resistance of oppressed nations, like China, like Korea, like Burma, like Indonesia, Philippines, etc., where precisely the imperialists fled like rats and it was the peoples of those nations who took up arms; those who had the luck to count on a Communist Party triumphed and advanced and those who did not, at least rid themselves through compromise of being colonies, for example Indonesia which ceased to be, as a consequence of that war, a colony of Holland.

In that war there was a sinister plan: the crusade against the USSR, and I underline the word crusade for its medieval roots which clearly express its reactionary entrails and because thus it was proposed by Hitler himself, as an anti-Bolshevik crusade, because the black dream they had was to sweep the USSR from the face of the earth; futile, a dream of glass, it crashed against the Power of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the leadership of the Party and of Comrade **Stalin**, of the Russian proletariat, of the Russian people. Comrades, heroic pages!: Stalingrad, the greatest struggle of war in the cities, of war in the streets, which generates the most mortality. There, one fought not only house by house but room by room. They are chapters which have shaken the world. There too the dirty, cunning game of the imperialist allies has been seen very clearly: United States, England.

I do not speak of France because it was occupied—and it was in eighteen days—cunning ones who delayed the opening of the invasion of Europe through the north to strike the heart of Germany, seeking that fascist Germany defeat the USSR. We all know, and it must be recalled, comrades, that fascist offensive headed by the Nazis to which the Italian fascists, Franco's Spanish fascists contributed and they utilized all the economic might of subjugated Europe, launched 1.5 million men, the cream of the German army, 75 percent of its air force, they penetrated. But wisely

Comrade **Stalin** had handled diplomacy on a grand scale and with subtlety—they are things which————be forgotten the German-Soviet pact was necessary————some say, "but that did not spare the USSR from the invasion." They do not know what they speak of, one thing was to gain time and another thing was that Germany would necessarily strike the USSR. The reason: it could not continue advancing in the west with a powerful enemy at its back and with a fierce and most rich land of fabulous potential. Yes, comrades, that must be recognized, reality must be understood as it is because we therefore even understand what those social-imperialists base themselves on today and a people above 200 million, that was inevitable. There one must emphasize the sagacity and penetration of the Soviet intelligence service, that was an intelligence service! Which came to know the day of the invasion; they say it served for nothing—I believe they are stupid belches—

What could Russia do before such an onslaught? Apply then a strategic defensive, and that is what was done—we as communists and already handling people's war understand what a strategic defensive is—and that was what was done, united to scorched earth, to leaving them nothing, bare earth; and they had the audacity, the high decision to blow up monumental works like that famous dam which joins the Volga with the Don which cost so many years of effort, it was blown up!; the Germans never dreamed, they thought that that work would not be blown up because it was too important and had cost much effort. Comrades, the dictatorship of the proletariat was at stake, the revolution was at stake, we cannot stop to ponder nor can we simply let ourselves be hindered, as Chairman Mao says, by defense of inches of ground not of pots. That is how we communists are. They crashed at the gates of Leningrad, at the gates of Moscow, and at Stalingrad; but not only was scorched earth made but guerrillas were left and even men individually with a good rifle and a good quantity of ammunition and their vodka for the cold and to annihilate one of those, the Germans had to lose forty men, that is the average, comrades.

It has not been easy, as the Germans believed. Think, comrades, that that offensive is a military plan of high quality, thus, the highest and most enlightened German military leaders elaborated that plan, and the German school has a tradition of war proven many times: in three months they were going to conquer the USSR. In three months. Comrade **Stalin**'s foresight, he had already taken measures since the 1930s when there is the great transformation of the countryside and of industry. They had already transferred factories beyond the Urals foreseeing even the possibility of abandoning even Moscow, for it is true, everything was already ready in case they could not ultimately defend Moscow, although that was the decision taken, displacing the leadership and the center to the Urals was already foreseen; thus, the first thing that

was done was to take measures for the transfer of **Lenin**[7] because he could not fall into the dirty hands of miserable sons of the abyss, he could not fall. But the order, what was it then, comrades? After they penetrated to the aforesaid gates, the order was retreat no more!; you will say and how were there those plans to go as far as the Urals? Comrades, there is always a plan in case it fails, a single plan is never made, that is for the untutored, there are plans for various circumstances and even the extreme ones. It is very memorable and one must always highlight how on one November 7—the anniversary of the revolution—they had nowhere to celebrate it and fulfilling it was already considered impossible; Comrade **Stalin** said: "To the station!"—"But there is no platform there, there are no seats there." Comrade **Stalin** put up a crate, stood on it, and celebrated the revolution: "How many were we when we conquered Power? What forces did we have when we repelled the imperialist aggression immediately after the October Revolution? Few and weak compared to what we are today. Therefore, they shall not defeat us. We will crush them! And we will annihilate the beast in its own lair, in Berlin." Did he not say that? Comrades, they are things one must recall, Comrade **Stalin** cannot be judged just like that. For that reason, the Party says that World War II must be seen.

It is known by all how after that came the great resistance, the breaking of the German lines, the encirclement of Stalingrad from the commands (…)

But here, he told them, "the Aryans do not retreat, the Aryans cannot be defeated by barbarians, by Mongols, by inferiors," yes then, but those inferiors, barbarians, Mongols, hunted them like rats and they had to surrender. It is good always to reiterate this: **Stalin**, handler of the war with skill and wisdom, always took into account the moral element. He made all the defeated, surrendered Nazis parade and throw their flags, their eagles, their swastikas at the foot of **Lenin**'s mausoleum. It was not only a great military defeat, but a great moral defeat! Nazi arrogance and pride had been sunk in the mud and trampled, it was the greatest moral blow it received! There began the breaking of the Nazi army. The other resistance of the three hundred thousand of the heroic race who would prevent the Russians' access to Germany, the Soviet offensive of the Red Army blew it into a thousand pieces and blew away three hundred thousand more men. Germany was undone, of course then, comrades. It is there when the imperialist westerners hurry to land in Normandy. Why? Because the Red Army, the communists, and communism were advancing threateningly over all of Europe, that was it. But we well know that at the beginning of May, the Red Army took Berlin, and in the Reichstag the corporative parliament they had planted the red flag with the

[7]Red Library: Referring to Lenin's preserved body on public display in Moscow since his death in 1924.

hammer and sickle, the photographs remain for eternal memory.[8] Hitler committed suicide, as we well know, he was even cremated for he knew what would come if he remained, they were not going to pardon him. The westerners, maybe them perhaps, but the USSR was not going to pardon him.

The other grand front, in the East, has China as its center where the Japanese army became mired in a sea of masses, undermined, sapped by guerrilla warfare. Various oppressed nations took up arms against them. The westerners "supported" the fight against the Japanese army to then return, it is good to recall MacArthur, the best cadet West Point has ever had—that is the military school of the United States—one of the highest strategists the US has produced. He had his headquarters in the Philippines. What did he do? He withdrew pronouncing what his famous phrase says "I shall return!" Yes, when they defeat the Japanese, that is the part he did not say. Of course then, comrades, because he said "we shall return," yes they returned, but when did they return? When the Japanese were undermined, sapped by the struggle in China and in the various oppressed nations of the East. It is then the oppressed peoples who have resisted the Japanese beast which once again returns to its old ways.

Think about this simply so that you see what it has cost the US, a hundred thousand soldiers, it is all World War II has cost it, the majority of them dead in the East. Do you see now? And before the fear that the war having concluded on the European western front, and as the agreements said, the USSR must turn its front against Japan, before the fear that the Red Army would expand, then they had to use the atomic bomb. Yes, there one sees clearly how politics leads war,[9] the Japanese were going to be crushed, they could not resist, justifications they want to give us today are that, justifications.

All that grand fact of World War II shook the world and has marked men and gave good fruits; not everywhere, yes, but it even gave subordinated fruits, example, France and Italy, reason: revisionists, they let triumph be snatched from them, the fruits of victory having guerrillas of five hundred thousand men, of three hundred thousand

---

[8]Red Library: Referring to *Raising a Flag over the Reichstag*, taken by Yevgeny Khaldei on May 2, 1945.

[9]Red Library: "'War is the continuation of politics.' In this sense, war is politics and war itself is a political action; since ancient times there has never been a war that did not have a political character. . . . However, war has its own particular characteristics and in this sense, it cannot be equated with politics in general. 'War is the continuation of politics by other . . . means.' When politics develops to a certain stage beyond which it cannot proceed by the usual means, war breaks out to sweep the obstacles from the way. . . . When the obstacle is removed and our political aim attained the war will stop. Nevertheless, if the obstacle is not completely swept away, the war will have to continue until the aim is fully accomplished. . . . It can therefore be said that politics is war without bloodshed while war is politics with bloodshed."—Mao Tse-tung, "On Protracted War" (May 1938), in *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tsetung*, 2nd ed., 3rd printing (Foreign Languages Press, 1976), 58–59.

men, forged in that heroic resistance of the class and the European peoples who must also be taken into account. Thus then, World War II is a fact of great transcendence. The prestige of the USSR rose high over the earth, it is enough to see the newspapers of the epoch, you of course had not yet been born, that is the advantage of having more years; I recall, comrades, when victory came, yes, I was in Callao, the port you know, just here, no? How the sirens of factories and ships sounded when Germany surrendered! Because there the war was already won, the other was already to finish it, it was a worldwide clamor, as I also recall, as if I saw it today, how the pages of the newspapers already raised the atomic bomb as a club to frighten the fearful asking us is there a risk of disintegration, will the earth disintegrate? A foolishness because if there had been so much risk would the scientists have dropped the atomic bomb? It makes no sense, that is not to see the political essence which leads war, weapons are used in service of political objectives. A little bomb killed the whopping figure of 80,000 persons in Hiroshima. Nagasaki were 145,000 and nevertheless Hiroshima is more celebrated or recalled because it was the first time, but in Nagasaki they were 145,000, more, they are facts, then, of transcendence which go on forming the minds of persons in those clamorous times.

2) "The powerful national liberation movement and, within it, the process and triumph of the Chinese Revolution." Already before the beginning of the second war and after it, mainly after, the struggle for national liberation intensified: the oppressed nations resisted the return of the imperialists as oppressors and exploiters. It is obvious that the Chinese Revolution, which the Chairman led, marked a great milestone with its triumph in 1949, we have already said, it changes the correlation of forces in the world; one must reiterate that in the final part of the Chinese Revolution, the three final years, it is a national liberation war carried forward by the people's liberation army under the absolute leadership of the Communist Party of China, under the command of Chairman Mao Tse-tung. I believe one need not insist on the Chinese Revolution because we know it.

The national liberation movement continued unfolding. An important milestone is the Vietnamese revolution which had begun also at the beginning of the 1930s; in 1945, when the Japanese surrender, the August uprising is produced and the north is emancipated, the north of Vietnam, but the south remained under imperialist domination, French first, Yankee afterward. Great lesson: do not divide nor permit the country to be divided because afterward emancipating the part of the country that remains demands much more blood, much more effort; a lesson must be drawn. South Vietnam, a small people with fourteen million inhabitants then, defeated—because it dared to take up arms—defeated the gendarme of world reaction, the US, Yankee imperialism; it was its second great defeat, because the first was inflicted on it in Korea in the year 1953

with direct participation of China. There too one must recall MacArthur, the great MacArthur, a brilliant strategist, he made a "marvelous plan" to encircle the Chinese and ended up encircled by them, who would have the better plan? I saw a film about MacArthur and there they celebrated the strategic genius of the village of Incheon, what is the village of Incheon, which is a port of Korea? It is the humiliating defeat of the US which has to escape taking its troops out by sea, fleeing like rats, so it is not a stroke of genius, it is no stroke of genius. It cannot be compared with Rommel's withdrawal which indeed is a fact of great importance in the handling of war as to withdrawal, Incheon is not equal. It is the Yankees who want to elevate MacArthur, they create a figure for him and supposed triumphs. In 1973, the US had to accept its defeat; as the Yankees, Nixon, said then, "allow us to save face," it is the whole problem they had, an honorable withdrawal.[10] "That they not humiliate us," that was all they asked, the all-powerful Yankee imperialists. The Chairman is right: "Not everything large is powerful nor must it be feared"[11] because Marxism is large and that indeed is all-powerful and before that all the reactionaries have to tremble because they will be swept away.

3) "The Cuban revolution and its repercussion on Latin America." The triumph of the Cuban revolution in the war which lasted two years more or less, not any longer, where they only came to have an armed force of five hundred men before an enemy of twenty thousand which had not been defeated. But whose leaders, beginning with Batista, fled, for there it was simply proposed to reestablish the constitution of 1945, nothing more, and defeat Batista's tyranny. That was what permitted the circumstances of that triumph in a short time. Yankee imperialism did not intervene directly, it did not do so, Guevara himself recognizes it. He says in his initial writings that it was an exceptional case, for that reason he himself said it. Another thing is already what they said afterward, that it was an example for all, not only for America but for the world. But did the Cuban revolution have repercussions in America? Yes, comrades, it had repercussions in America; when we speak of America we speak of Mexico downward, do you understand? The rest are those who call themselves Americans who encompass the whole continent as their own, as we are their backyard. It had repercussions. Why did it have repercussions? Because breaking decades it showed that taking up arms one could triumph, that is what had repercussions, and ninety miles from the US, under its

[10]Red Library: Referring to Nixon's emphasis of "peace with honor," most notably seen in his January 23, 1973 announcement of the defeat of US imperialism in Vietnam.

[11]Red Library: When Chairman Mao crossed the Yangtze River in 1957, he pointed out that "People say that the Yangtse is a very big river, actually there is nothing to be afraid of about its size. Isn't U.S. imperialism very big? It turned out to be nothing when we rebuffed it once. So, there are actually some big things in the world that are not to be feared."—Paraphrased statement from Chairman Mao in *Peking Review* no. 31 (July 29, 1966), 4-5.

very nose; it was a renewing air in all America, it had great repercussions among youth. Facts are facts, comrades, another thing is to interpret afterward what lay behind it, the end. They were epochs or moments in which Fidel Castro said: "From the Andes we will make a Sierra Maestra and with Venezuela's oil we will set America ablaze," yes, past times, because in 1970 he said: "Armed struggle has failed in Latin America" and the Venezuelan Douglas Bravo told him: "Strategy has not failed, tactics have failed, that form in which you tell us and teach us to wage war, that is what has failed."[12]

4) "The great struggle between Marxism and revisionism." Since 1956 the international communist movement, without being organized as it was in the International, existed and had relations, but at the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the clown Khrushchev, because thus he was labeled by the Russian people themselves, held his famous "secret session" of the Central Committee where he bellowed and vomited all the opportunist revisionist poison against **Stalin** calling him "murderer," "tyrant," "Ivan the Terrible," in short, everything; the next day, all the newspapers of the earth announce the content of the secret session, an infamous fraud of that pig, ignorant pig, because he was then, and foolish, a man of bravado, the bravado is seen very clearly: the rockets in Cuba, an adventurist action, and their withdrawal through conversations in New York behind Cuba's own back, a shameful withdrawal on the sly, thus are then the adventurists, thus are then the revisionists. But what was behind it? The attack on the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the Communist Party of China well said in its documents on the dictatorship of the proletariat and once again on the dictatorship of the proletariat, unveiling the essence of the problem; there is when one begins to speak of the cult of personality, know then the origin.

Years 1957[13] and 1960[14], the international communist movement meets in Moscow, Communist and Workers' Parties because not all call themselves Communist Parties. Vietnam's is the Workers' Party, and Albania's is the Party of Labour, which initially was a Communist Party; Hoxha has never explained to us why he changed its name,

---

[12]Red Library: Douglas Bravo stated: "What had failed was a tactic, not the strategy." See Humberto Solioni, "Reportaje a Douglas Bravo," *Marcha*, no. 1493 (May 15, 1970): 17.

[13]Red Library: The Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries, held in Moscow on November 14-16, 1957, was attended by twelve parties. See *Complete Text of the Declaration of the Twelve Communist and Workers Parties: Meeting in Moscow, USSR, Nov. 14–16, 1957, on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution* (New Century Publishers, 1957). This English translation was supplied by the Hsinhua News Agency of Peking.

[14]Red Library: The Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties was held in Moscow in November 1960, with eighty-one parties participating. See "Documents of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties", *Peking Review*, nos. 49–50 (December 13, 1960): 6–24.

what reasons there were.[15] Being so Marxist, he did not abide by what **Lenin** said, by the mandate and the agreement of the Communist International.[16] What happened in 1957 and 1960? In those two meetings one must think that they were the first the communists had after many years for the Communist International was dissolved in 1943, it was a sharp struggle between Marxists and revisionists; the Marxists headed by the Chairman, who was present at the meeting, made the revisionists retreat to the point of making them withdraw the proposal for the event's agreement; there was a circumstance—chances also have importance, they do not define everything but they have repercussions, comrades—Khrushchev was absent and returned bellowed and cried, laughed, moaned, shouted, rolled about, struck with his shoe as he used to do, threatened. At the end, he said: "Allow me to save face, how does the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stand, how does the movement stand, how do we stand, how does the Twentieth Congress stand?" He had to beg, he had to implore. But I believe one thing was what happened: 1957 was the first meeting after many years (…)

It could not be divided, it would have been a triumph for imperialism; one must understand well the circumstances in which it was celebrated, both that of 1957 and that of 1960. Hence the documents have ambiguities, but there the Marxist-Leninist principles are defended and the Chinese comrades themselves, as appears in documents of the collection of the great international polemic, the Chinese comrades proposed their observations in repeated internal documents and in 1960 they came to propose that for the last time they would sign a document where the principles of Marxism did not

---

[15]Red Library: The Party of Labour of Albania was founded in 1941 as the Communist Party of Albania. It was renamed to the Party of Labour of Albania at its First Congress in 1948.
First Secretary Enver Hoxha explained the name change in his 1979 account of a 1947 meeting with Comrade Stalin. Hoxha wrote: "Apart from other things, he expressed the opinion that since the biggest percentage of its members were peasants, our Communist Party should call itself 'The Party of Labour of Albania.' 'However,' he stressed, 'this is only an idea of mine, because it is you, your Party, that must decide.'" Enver Hoxha, *With Stalin: Memoirs from My Meetings with Stalin* (8 Nentori Publishing House, 1981; repr., Red Star Publishers, n.d.), 35.

However, Hoxha, in his 1948 report at the First Congress of the Communist Party of Albania, did not mention Comrade Stalin's alleged idea, attributing it to "a detailed Marxist-Leninist study" conducted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Albania. Likewise, the 1982 *History of the Party of Labour of Albania*, authorized by the Party's Central Committee, does not mention that it was Comrade Stalin's alleged idea. Nonetheless, in 1970 the Party of Labour found that workers had become the largest proportion of members, but did not attempt to rename the Party back to the Communist Party of Albania. For the 1970 membership figures, see Institute of Marxist-Leninist Studies at the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, *History of the Party of Labour of Albania*, 2nd ed. (8 Nentori Publishing House, 1982; repr., Red Star Publishers, 2020), 414.

[16]Red Library: "Any party seeking affiliation must call itself the *Communist* Party of the country in question (Section of the Third, Communist International)." V. I. Lenin, "The Terms of Admission into the Communist International" (July 1920), in *Collected Works*, vol. 31 (Progress Publishers, 1966), 211.

remain sharply clear, that they would not do so again; that was in 1960, comrades, there had been only four years of the struggle, a struggle which had to be carried internally.

Something which must always be very carefully guarded is the development of the internal struggle; this struggle we have had here, for example, what must come out is main danger revisionism; nothing will come out nor will anything be reported about the debate or who sustained such or such positions, that remains at the level of the Congress participants, that is what we propose; we do not want knowledge about the internal struggle to reach reaction because they always twist it and utilize it to sow against us. A lesson must be drawn and one must know how to carry the struggle, the struggle has levels of development; here even written self-criticisms could be requested, very well, I say "could be." We are not proposing. I have not yet proposed anything, comrades. Even measures could or could be taken, "could" I underline, I reiterate we have proposed nothing nor are we proposing, but that will remain at the Congress level, is that clear, comrades? The Chinese comrades have taught us how an internal struggle is carried and how it is carried by levels and how it is and at what moment it comes out to the masses, following what **Lenin** himself established; internal struggle is not gossip for political circles nor little cafe chats, internal struggle is two-line struggle organically, it means in the Party organisms, at the corresponding levels, that is what it means.

In that form is how one can see why the documents of 1957 and 1960 were stamped thus. Why do we say this? Because there are those who say that it was not defended firmly, that one must have gone further. We have an example in miniature, comrades, here a set of situations have been presented, there is a turn, a leap in the struggle as to the main danger, criteria, positions, ideas of revisionist root have been expressed, it is beginning, could we already sanction and separate at once, would it be correct, could we already expel at once? No, comrades, the struggle has to develop, we have a long stretch even for the Congress; a struggle which is not resolved with two club blows, internal struggle is not so, it is a struggle of ideas, we have to see then the persistence or not in the ideas expressed, the real correction in practice or not of attitudes, ideas, criteria, positions, in short. I believe only thus can this be judged.

The struggle between Marxism and revisionism is going to be waged utilizing parties of lesser importance, that is what Soviet revisionism did, it used the French, Italian Party—I am not speaking badly, they call themselves so, let them who have changed their name—; then the Communist Party of China had to respond to them. The Soviets aimed to break Albania, even its very location, its dependence before food needs on the USSR placed Albania in difficulties, that was so. That does not mean Albania was the center of the struggle nor that Hoxha was the conductor of the struggle against

revisionism. I refer to the speeches given at the congresses, because they exist. Read Hoxha's speech and read the position of the Communist Party of China expressed there at the Congress and it was not by the Chairman because he was not there for that—the Chairman has been little given to leaving China, very little given, he has only gone to the USSR when it was indispensable to do so and for the shortest possible time—; compare the documents, the positions, and see the content: the content of the documents of the Communist Party of China, its position is clear, forceful, accurate. We could not say the same of Mr. Hoxha's speech but one cannot deny that he combated, of course he combated and historically he had a hard confrontation, personal and direct with the bellowing Khrushchev himself, a miserable one who when the request is made to him for the tons of wheat that Russia or the USSR must deliver to Albania, plays deaf and asks, "how many tons?" They respond, "so many tons," and he responds, "ah, the rats already ate those." That was Khrushchev, that was his form of carrying out the two-line struggle, overbearing! Baton of command! That was Khrushchev. The miserable one who in the struggles of the 1930s said, "Woe to whoever raises his hand against little father **Stalin**, we will cut it off!" Did he not say so? Little father **Stalin** up, little father **Stalin** down, was Khrushchev not so? That was Khrushchev, an inconsistent one. His action in Ukraine, his own land where he was sent for the reorganization after the fascist defeat, he behaved with ferocity, Comrade **Stalin** himself had to call him to order; that is Khrushchev, that pink sty pig, is the one who afterward says of **Stalin** "Ivan the terrible."

The year 1963 marks a milestone of much transcendence, on June 14 the Communist Party of China sends a letter to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the famous Chinese letter, The *Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, twenty-five points. It asks to debate those twenty-five points, asks that it be published in the USSR, China committing itself to publishing the Soviet documents so that they would be known and aired, that the struggle develop. How did it respond? With the famous letter of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union written by Suslov, the Soviet gray eminence, the "theoretician"; read the letter, comrades, if that is a theoretician we are Martians, there is that revisionism will always be orphaned of ideas, orphaned of reasons because it will never be able to prevail against the principles of Marxism, rats cannot gnaw steel columns. That letter has much transcendence in the whole world, we have reiterated many times what it implies for our Party.

Thus that great international polemic between Marxism and revisionism was another fact which shook the world and take into account that in this Party, even when we were members of the old Party, because the division comes only since 1964 when revisionism is expelled, in 1956 many communists rejected Khrushchev's position; because comrades, one must recall, in those times what were we all formed in? In *Questions of*

Leninism, in the works and writings of Comrade **Stalin** which had more dissemination than those of **Lenin** himself—all know, I believe, *Questions of Leninism*—of course, we had been forged in that, in respect for **Stalin**, in recognition of him as leader of the world revolution, in Moscow as the center, we all knew that poem of Neruda: "While Moscow and the world sleep, **Stalin** watches,"[17] we all knew that. This great polemic between Marxism and revisionism has also had repercussions in our country, has served to give clarity, sharpness, certainty of the course to struggling against revisionism, here headed by that del Prado, the "hero of 1928," the hero fabricated by reaction, by the newspapers of the American Popular Revolutionary Alliance,[18] because that is true.

5) "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." Comrades, we have already treated this many times; I would only like to say that one thing is to study it today in texts and recall it and another thing is to have seen it in China itself and have lived it in its glorious moments; they are two different things and that marks profoundly.

Well, the document tells us to take these facts into account. But what is important is in the final part where it says: "But the key is to see how, in that grand class struggle at the world level, Gonzalo Thought considers that a third stage of the ideology of the proletariat arises: first as Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought; then Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought; and, subsequently, to define it as Maoism, comprehending its universal validity; and in that way to arrive at Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, as the present expression of Marxism." This is the question which must be grasped and in what part is it? In international historical context, where could it be after all? I insist, see how Gonzalo Thought considers, that is the question, what does it consider? That a third stage arises, that is, it says, the key, from there one must start; how this comprehension has been, on one side, to adhere, comprehend, and assimilate, because the first is not enough, simply to adhere is not enough, one must comprehend and assimilate, what we say incarnate what the Communist Party of China taught us all in the world and ask oneself why some took those teachings firmly and others did not, that must be asked, because the light illuminated all but through class blindness it was not seen and some continue without seeing it. What would the core of this be? Of this key question, define it, attention! Define it as Maoism, that

[17]Red Library: This is a paraphrase, likely referring to these lines: "In three rooms of the old Kremlin / lives a man named Joseph Stalin. / His bedroom light is turned off late. / The world and his country allow him no rest."—Pablo Neruda, "Let the Woodcutter Awaken" (1948), in *Canto General*, trans. Jack Schmitt (University of California Press, 1991), 264.

[18]Red Library: *Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana* (APRA); its members and supporters are called Apristas. "Mariátegui proposed the formation of a Communist Party, a Party of the proletariat, while Haya de la Torre proposed the formation of a front similar to the Kuomintang, claiming that the proletariat in Peru was too tiny and immature to be able to give rise to a Communist Party." Chairman Gonzalo, interview by El Diario, July 1988, *Interview with Chairman Gonzalo* (Red Library), 12–13.

is the main thing, define it as Maoism because the Communist Party of China does not say that; we all know the vicissitudes the great proletarian cultural revolution and the counter-revolutionary coup have had. In passing, we never doubted! And the coup having occurred, we comprehended that it was a counter-revolutionary coup, more: that behind Hua the supposed pipsqueak called chairman, was Teng's boil of pus; it was not we, and some must recall then, who vacillated and said that there was no such coup, that Hua was the true Chairman and that Comrade Chiang Ching was mistaken? Because that has been expressed in the Party, Ayacucho Regional Committee, and we have not forgotten, my dear comrades, and why could we comprehend that counter-revolutionary coup? Because provisionally we had studied the great proletarian cultural revolution thoroughly, from there come the three numbers of *People's Voice*[19] dedicated to the cultural revolution. One may say, but Homeland[20] has proposed Maoism, yes, it has also licked Teng and continues doing so; advancedness of traffickers are nothing but labels to act as what they are not, they are stage representations of actors who change personage according to who commands. We have not, we have sustained and recognized that there was already Maoism, we have upheld it, defended it, and applied it. This is the key and in that key there is something of the core and the main thing is Maoism, that is it.

"National: 1) Post-war Peruvian society and, within it, the political struggle, the so-called National Democratic Front, Aprista action, Odría's coup d'état and the struggle against the Eight-Year Rule, the contention between Apristas and Communists; and particularly, the development of bureaucrat-capitalism during the 1960s and part of the 1970s and the sharp class struggle that accompanied it; "Velasquism" and its so-called revolution, the collusion and contest between the comprador bourgeoisie and the bureaucrat bourgeoisie (factions of the big bourgeoisie), and opportunism and principally revisionism as supporters."

Yes, they are problems of Peruvian society, how has this society been? As in the whole country, also in the country democratic desires were expressed, but these democratic desires were of a bourgeois-democratic type, that was what was expressed, that was the main thing expressed; one must recall, for example, what Acosta, then Secretary, said: the problem is no longer to use elections as propaganda and agitation but to use them to win parliamentary seats—Secretary of the Peruvian Communist Party—.[21]

---

[19]Red Library: Issues 6, 7, and 8-9 of *People's Voice* (*Voz Popular*), all published in 1977.

[20]Red Library: Red Homeland (*Patria Roja*), an exponent of revisionism in Peru, "an agent of Chinese revisionism whose party hacks worship Teng."—Central Committee of the Communist Party of Peru, *Interview with Chairman Gonzalo* (July 1988). A faction within the Communist Party of Peru that was expelled for following a right opportunist line.

[21]Red Library: The Peruvian Communist Party is not the same as the Communist Party of Peru. Chairman Gonzalo identified the Peruvian Communist Party as the main exponent of revisionism

There you can see then the class content of those democratic criteria: bourgeois-democratic. Peru then was emerging from Manuel Prado's government, representative of the comprador one, consequently a member of the big bourgeoisie; one must not forget how they utilized the Party to center it on elections and bring to government, to Power, the so-called "champion of democracy," did they not call Prado so? Even infamously, "the Peruvian Stalin"; one can already see then how the Party was. In 1945 there were to be elections; as even bourgeois say, "In Peru—Arciniegas himself, that Colombian, what did he say?: in America, the sole freedom which exists is Libertad Lamarque; ironically he said so and he was right—the Colombian said: "In Peru there is a white-glove dictatorship"; but understand well what a bourgeois says when he speaks of dictatorship, he does not refer to class dictatorship, no? But to the negation of rights, liberties constitutionally consecrated, he refers to that. (…)

What they found then was the conformation of a national democratic front. The APRA could not present itself in the elections, the communists themselves either because the constitution of 1933 had an article—53—which prohibited parties of international affiliation. The bloodthirsty Benavides, marshal—then he was simply a general of the Peruvian army—who had handed the government to Prado and with him conspired since the year 1913, attention, to overthrow Billinghurst, that one came out as a good arranger, but one can suppose who was behind him, comrades, the army then. It was in Arequipa that Bustamante de la Puente, a lawyer, is going to propose and agitate the conformation of a front in dealings with the APRA and with the Party and seek an acceptable candidate. Many names were played, among them that of Rafael Belaunde, father of Fernando Belaunde Terry; the APRA contested for Haya to be the candidate—the eternal candidate: moral president of Peru—but he was vetoed, that is the real thing; they sought a gray personage, yes, comrades, José Luis Bustamante y Rivero, a simple ambassador in Bolivia—nobody is going to say that Peru's embassy in Bolivia is an embassy of great importance, no, comrades—a gray personage who acting as Secretary, when he was young, was the one who drafted Sánchez Cerro's pronouncement when the latter rose against Leguía in 1930—you can already begin identifying the "patriarch of democracy," one must recall then because there are many "patriarchs," sacred cows—that was Bustamante, he had no force of his own, but they arrived at that arrangement. And the APRA and the communists accepted on condition of being able to participate in parliament, that was it, that is what is called the national democratic front. Bustamante y Rivero, the man of "juridicity" as he said, the man of the "rule of law," of what law? Of the constitution, class root? Bourgeois-democratic then, very clear, with whose backing, of the big bourgeoisie in one of its parts; because

---

in Peru and the fifth column of Soviet revisionism. The publisher of *Unity*. Led by the revisionist Jorge del Prado.

the other sustained Marshal Eloy G. Ureta as candidate and with the army's backing, the armed force, I say, which has always been the great elector. Thus what is going to occur? A president who chooses ministers, among them Apristas in a minority, and second-order personages, that is the reality, like Portugal, provincial figures. But he had no control in parliament, it was a regime, a government I will better say, fragile, without underpinning or base of its own which determined a contest between Bustamante and the APRA which wanted to monopolize as always and a contention with representatives of the big bourgeoisie, particularly agrarian ones, grouped by Pedro Beltrán Espantoso—which is his surname, I am not saying it, it is his surname—but Beltrán has never been a representative of anything, he has been one of the handlers of Peruvian politics from behind. Who also operated from the shadows as a renegade servant of reaction? Ravines, who was Secretary of the Party after Mariátegui, Eudocio Ravines, from Cajamarca, fellow countryman of Alfonso Barrantes Lingan, one of the most sinister personages of Peruvian politics, little Barrantes is tiny beside him, tiny beside him, and little del Prado a little cockroach beside him; a personage whom the Party here did not expel, who expelled him was the Communist Party of Chile for his dirty and black behavior there and for the evil deeds he did in the Spanish Civil War where he also was, afterward already the Party has expelled him when it was the one which must have done so first. All this contention, what does it lead to? To a situation of ever greater dispute between Bustamante and parliament, in the chambers, both chambers.

Don Pedro Beltrán formed the national alliance where de la Piedra was, that northern sugar man, a situation is going to occur, those of the national alliance managing to have a majority in the senate, who are also going to count on communist support, of the Party, yes, comrades, facts are facts, so what you are seeing are not simple coincidences, the old ways are very ancient. The senate suspends its functioning—according to the constitution a single chamber cannot function but both simultaneously—and consequently parliament remained paralyzed. You can already see the dealings of these days and what they imply: the blow to the backside and the nape that the mad horse has given himself, he does not know where he has got himself. If you take this into account, where does it lead then? To the paralysis of parliament and that placed the country on the verge of the coup d'état, that was the fact obviously Bustamante began governing through decree law invoking that the constitutional provisions voted in Benavides's epoch were valid, he argued the nonfunctioning of the functional senate which the constitution demanded. It was an extremely grave constitutional dispute: on one side there was no parliament which could function and on the other the president's capacity to be able to govern was questioned or in question, quite a problem. Well, there you have in synthesis the famous national alliance.

Well, so that you recall, that you know: it was in those elections that don Fernando Belaunde Terry came out a deputy, through his father's influence of course, from there he begins. It was in those circumstances where Héctor Cornejo Chávez appears, who afterward would found Christian democracy in Arequipa, there Christian democracy is going to function, he was the president's Secretary. There is where the Polars begin to emerge, the current senator, and from there all that brood comes.

It says: "Aprista action." How did the APRA act? Peru had a constitutional president but there was a moral president, a revel, every day the moral president spoke and, attention! Haya had a demagogic oratory which the current one does not reach, yes, comrades. The influence the APRA had in the masses was immensely greater than what it has today, yes, even schoolchildren were Apristas, you already imagine how a schoolchild can be an Aprista, it is clear, much influence, a constant hammering. The APRA, as always, applied its policy of monopolizing everything; thus it appropriated the CTP, yes, because it was the communists who prepared and convened the CTP congress—the confederation of workers of Peru, which Cruzado presides over today—and they were the majority, but they committed an error, they left registration open and then the Apristas registered unions in torrents and at the final hour had the majority: one prepared the tea and another drank it, there is Jorge del Prado's great skill and ability, one must know them, comrades, from stupidities and betrayals we can learn from them; the APRA gave much importance to monopolizing youth, education. The APRA, as always seeking a general who would give a coup d'état and afterward deliver the presidency to them in elections, conspired repeatedly; there have been many attempts at military coups linked to the APRA, the most important of them, that of the third of October of 1948 in which they involved the navy where they had elements with command in that force, aviation, and the civil guard which was quite penetrated; the PIP[22] did not have the influence it has today, the PIP was only reorganized under Bustamante and in Peru they were always known as the informers, of course, the "scientific" only comes since Bustamante, we already know what it implies. As always, some Aprista leaders tried to make their links with———and prepare a military pronouncement with support of organized buffalo gangs, yes; don Víctor Raúl went to the US so that when the military pronouncement was produced he would be far away and not involved. Always the maneuver, the "wrist" as they say, famous phrase, the "wrist," now they say Alan García's "wrist," Ludovico's "wrist"; yes, comrades, they are terms which have always been used in Peruvian politics and in Party politics, Breña's "wrist," the art of accommodating oneself and defining oneself when things are already defined, that is Breña. Well, but there were Aprista leaders who did not want it because they said "We may lose rope and goat"—as they think today—who? The

[22]Red Library: Investigative Police of Peru (*Policía de Investigaciones del Perú*).

patriarch Luis Alberto Sánchez and the Aprista outside the ranks, Townsend Ezcurra who when their leader traveled, met and brought out an agreement to oppose it; but a part did want it with that customary thing—I repeat—of seeking a military man who delivers Power to them, that is true it has been of the APRA always to lean on the army. Thus the uprising of October 3 in the Callao was produced, but the air force did not participate which in the end before that internal dispute of the APRA backed down; the civil guard was easily monopolized, there were some changes of command and they contained it, because it was a *vox populi*[23] conspiracy which everyone knew, a military coup which everyone was saying was coming and they were also saying then the uprising which was convened and suspended several times, until already fed up, they chose the third; there the sailors with Aprista commands are who are going to fulfill an important role, plus organized buffaloes. The navy withdraws out to sea and threatens to bombard if Bustamante does not resign; the sailors land on the military pier, take Real Felipe, and between the navy and Real Felipe strike violently at the army barracks which then was beside Real Felipe, I do not know whether it is still there, because the army was not within that plan. The army commander then was Noriega, but opposed to the APRA, they had other plans linked to **Beltran**; minister of the interior was **Odria**, army general, Manuel A. Odría. The army displaced itself and with blood and fire crushed the uprising; according to the BBC, five hundred dead, much blood flowed, it was the third of October. Bustamante's government remained captive of the army, that was the question, it was the result.

It is in those conditions that on October 27, 1949 Odría's coup d'état occurs in Arequipa, with an economic fund of 10 million soles collected by don Pedro Beltrán Espantoso. The situation having been produced, Bustamante called the commander of the army, Noriega, don Zenón Noriega—I say this not as an anecdote but so that you see the army's action—and there he swore to the president that while he was commander nobody would touch him and he was the second leader of the conspiracy, of course, that is the "honor" of the Peruvian army, likewise under Belaunde. The following must be said: the great Manuel Apolinario Odría believed that the movement had failed, had failed and abandoned those who had risen in Arequipa and took himself off; by radio they had to communicate to him that they had won and then, "heroic," he assumed Power to "save" the homeland. One must know them, comrades, one more "heroism" which fills the "pages of glory" of the Peruvian army, please, man!

In Bustamante's government there was a strong mass movement and the peasant demands begin to move, but on the legal plane; there is when laws are going to occur on leasing, on ……, on tenancy. There there has been a very important

[23]Red Library: Latin phrase that means "voice of the people."

clash around freedom of the press for the APRA wanted to shackle that constitutional liberty, so what we see is nothing new (…)

Rally in the university park where the communists clashed violently with the Apristas, who was behind it? *El Comercio*. Of course then, the holy family knows very well how to handle its interests, it always comes out winning—only we are going to cut the tradition, nobody else is going to cut it—upstarts, traitors, powerful ones of Peru.

(Why do we call them traitors and stupid? I want to explain this of the Miro Quesada family. First Panamanians, they traded in Peru and took over *El Comercio* which Carranza founded, not they as they say, of course it is so, it is the historical fact. Enemies of Piérola, when the war with Chile they committed the stupidity of publishing that the then president, Mariano Ignacio Prado, had left Peru, who was going abroad to seek ships and arms; the Miro Quesadas' "brilliance," what did it lead to? To Piérola's coup d'état, of their enemy, the family is very intelligent, cunning is what it is, roguish, how to publish that at a moment as grave as a war like that we had with Chile?)

Well, all that then facilitated the coup d'état because the masses began to move strongly demanding demands, dearness began—the shortage and the rise in prices which that implies dearness, dearness implies both things: rise in prices and shortage—queues reigned, little state shops: little state shops for rice, little state shops for sugar, little state shops for oil, the people made immense queues from the night to buy a kilo of rice the next day and the Apristas had everything and to whom did they give it? Easy to comprehend; so we are seeing the lesson for the second time, now more expanded, of course then, they have not learned. The mass then was effervescent, all that under a weak government, the October action having failed the uprising of the 25th comes and the eight-year period begins, that is, Odría's eight years of government. The first thing he did was give a law of internal security of the republic, of expeditious procedure: in forty-eight hours one was sanctioned with strong sentences to condemnations, I will say, of twenty years, expeditiously, a great persecution of Apristas and communists with the objective of making them disappear, thus it has been then, that is real. There have always been these laws of internal security since the famous one given by Sánchez Cerro, by Benavides, there have always been in Peru and they have been extremely drastic, that is no novelty in Peru. Another measure: freedom of exchange, we already know for what, no? Rise of the dollar, foreign exchange, dollars no longer handled by the State but in the hands of the exporters, thus it has been; what we are seeing today, is it novel, do you know what it contains? They are on the tightrope, they are on the edge of a knife. Sánchez knows it very well because if there is a crafty one, it is he, did they not always call him "silver fox"? They have always called Sánchez so; the man who knows very well how to earn money, in every circumstance, in the good and in

the bad; the "sniper" of the APRA, as he himself has called himself, for that reason he believes he is going to stroll through which is a mockery; the man of whom Haya said he was a traitor, who asked him forgiveness on his knees crying like Magdalene and Haya said no! For that reason he did not receive him at his deathbed, of course, comrades, witness: Orrego, the famous philosopher of the APRA, Antenor Orrego, from Trujillo. Thus Odría's government began. Thus the Party burst which had grown greatly like a balloon because it became an apparatus of adherents not of militants; the representatives the Party had, who were they then? As always, lawyers, doctors, learned ones, rogues, sharp ones, has it not been so? That, then, is the reality. The Party burst almost to its disappearance.

In 1950 Odría had formed a party with de la Piedra, that one of the alliance, that sugar man from the north, those of Pomalca: the restorer party, motto: "Deeds and not words," famous motto. In 1950 Arequipa rose. They were three days of struggle: the troops stationed in that city could not contain it, furthermore the troops stationed at a point always establish links, they were not very trustworthy and were insufficient, they had to bring troops from Tacna, troops from Puno and from Cusco, with blood and fire they crushed that uprising. Was del Prado there? Yes, del Prado was there, he believed the revolution had arrived, what his teacher Ravines taught him had always remained with him—that he saw Mariátegui does not mean he learned from Mariátegui, no, comrades one must not confuse, he learned from Ravines, there he learned all the tricks he has, he has perfected himself in Khrushchev's school. Well, it was crushed with blood and fire; that movement is going to contribute to Christian democracy being conformed. Arequipa was anti-Odríist, one must not forget then that Bustamante was from Arequipa, he was of the "republic" and many well-known leaders were from the same part and . . . in particular. Well, the people, as always, have demonstrated their capacity for struggle there; they put the armed forces in check and the skilled military men when repressing have shot one another as always, among themselves—what happens in Ayacucho is no novelty, it has always happened to them—they are "skilled" handling troops, yes then, comrades; the people took the electric light and turned it on by zones and off by zones; they took the main square, had seized arms and with those few arms they needed three days to control the city, three days! There too one sees another glorious page! Of the army; when there are negotiations and a commission goes with a white flag to meet and treat with them, how did the army respond? Shooting!; there was when Villegas died, who was really the head of the Christian democrats, buried alive! He had not died, but those, as always, to conceal what do they do? They open a trench, a grave, throw the corpses and cover them but as that family had influence it demanded return of the corpse and the doctors, what

did they declare? That he had been buried alive, he had not died. There one can see, thus is how they act then, what can they teach us, of what honor can they speak?

The election of 1950 comes. Odría one month before the elections descends to the plain so that they be "democratic," "clean" elections and so that he remain apart from any handling: that is Peruvian democracy. Excuse me for speaking these things to you but I believe you do not know them and they are not simple anecdotes, they are facts which demonstrate how this country is and what they speak to us so much about their democracy and of what honor the army speaks. Well, there were two candidates: Odría and General Montagne, father of who was afterward commander and crony of Velasco, of course, and relative of Mr. Cardinal, they are of the same gang. Montagne was a general of the Peruvian army, the highest rank there is in Peru—the marshalship is not an army rank, it is a recognition alone, it is a distinction; with it they paid, for example, Benavides's services for having arranged Bustamante's government, they paid him elevating him to the rank of marshal, what did he do to do so? Nothing except murder thousands of Peruvians—; Odría had the frying pan by the handle but such was his fear that he did not want a rival candidate and discovers that the general of the Peruvian army was not Peruvian but French, they say he had been born around Paris or I do not know where, a mockery, general of the Peruvian army, only there did they discover it. A fraud to have a single candidate. Then what was foreseeable? A barrage of votes against him; but the electoral law, what is it going to say? All spoiled and blank votes will be for the sole current candidate: complete then, comrades, that is Peruvian democracy, and thus Apolinario became constitutional president of Peru. He had a moment of advantage, the Korean war, the prices of minerals rose and then there was foreign exchange, he had means with which to unfold a little this economy so miserable and so narrow; but the war ended in 1953 and the problems began again to become aggravated, to leap up, that was it.

Thus we already approach 1956; that is, the end of Odría's government, of the six years; but Odría despite having offered the presidency to his crony Zenón Noriega, wanted again to be president. You will say, but the constitution? It always enjoys a good start but is never applied because reelections have not been seen in Peru but he wanted to be. A coup or an attempted coup by Noriega came, it was crushed, dissensions began to occur in the restorer party.

In Lima they begin to move in function of the elections, but the key was the south, why? Because the south of the country, more with that action of 1950 and all the repression which was very strong in the south—against communists, because Apristas, the APRA has never been strong in the south, I do not know what sleight of hand is happening in recent times—in the south intense struggles developed, the workers have struggled

strongly, the unions to make marches, to form the federation, thus the federation of Arequipa, the federation of Puno, of Cusco are going to arise. Rosello a front man of Beltrán, is going to form the so-called national coalition, among them Javier Ortiz de Zevallos stood out, Peru's current ambassador in Panama, known as "little boil" for his lack of stature, a man of dealings and various tricks, Pradist: it is the big bourgeoisie which begins to move. Odría had a bloodthirsty jailer, Esparza Zañartu, comparable to Mier y Terán another bloodthirsty jailer of the famous PIP. The national coalition is going to celebrate a meeting in Arequipa and Odríism displaces its thugs from Lima, its assault forces; in Arequipa also, as in other parts of Peru, there was mounted police which attacked with saber, which was abolished but has reappeared again in Garagay, one must not forget, there it has reappeared again, that, comrades, those attacks are very hard, think of the Cossacks' attacks in Russia, similar is the attack of mounted police because it does it with saber, they are very strong charges against the mass; well, they strengthened everything to prevent the meeting which was going to be in a theater: the thugs and the police were there to guard and the thugs to prevent, as always they are "safeguarders of public order," they went to prevent the clash. The mass gave the thugs a beating and passed over them; it was packed—I am a witness because I saw, that theater packed and it was a great repudiation against Odría.

What ideas were expressed there again? The bourgeois-democratic ones, defense of the constitution, its application, and free elections, the same old refrain, those are the ideas and there Christian democracy already participates. To prevent the continuation of a closed rally which was openly—I reiterate—anti-Odríist, the police committed the barbarity of launching a great quantity of tear gas bombs; obviously, a river was generated which contested to get out but they believed that in that manner they would dissolve the meeting, but it was not so, the mass came out inflamed and a violent confrontation was produced. Already in the 1950s or the year 1950 it had shown many things: the year 1950, comrades, the Peruvian people rose took the military club, their famous piano they threw from the second floor, you can already imagine how it ended up, their books, their furniture, everything, they made a pile and if they did not set fire to the premises it was because it was not of the army, that was it; the house of the military leader which was under construction in a zone on the other bank of the river which is far away, the mass went, looted it, set it on fire, dynamited it. Comrades, when the mass combats there one sees might, there one sees the force of the class, the force of the people, thus it was again in 1956. The famous charges the mounted police made, with a single slash they sliced the head, the top of the brains as if it were a watermelon, off a Chicata, the surname of that person was that: Chicata and that inflamed the mass more, the reverse of what is believed. And the mass always contrives, I do not know how it contrives: they found I do not know from where,

barrels, Arequipa's square is a slope, even the city has an inclination, the police charged in one direction then went to the lower part, then the mass reappeared through the upper part, when it began to charge they launched the barrels at it, you can already think what happened, "little captains" through the air, like turtles legs up, frightened horses; the mass fell back toward the arcades which are polished tiles, consequently, the horses, can you imagine on tiles? And on top of that they threw balls at them, the marbles or little balls, I do not know where they take them from but the mass contrives, thus it is then, comrades. It was like three hours of pitched battle throughout the central part of the city, not only in the main square. In Arequipa barricades are always usually made, not Belaunde's barricades, which are another thing, how are his going to be barricades? In Arequipa it is easy to make barricades one stops a tram, takes out the lever, as they are paving stones, one levers, a paving stone comes out and all come out and with that barricades are made; trunks, I do not know how they appear, comrades, but the mass makes them appear, they close streets, cut traffic. What did the army do? Fall back; then the police suffered the onslaught. The army wanted to prevent another bloodbath like that of 1950 from occurring, it did not suit Odría's promotion to be president of Peru again (…)

That they tell him they are going to take his teeth away is grave, that inflamed the mass; I do not know whether that individual said it, but they are phrases which inflame people, and the movement was worse. Odría had to yield and Mr. Esparza Zañartu fell; I ask myself and why did they not ask that Odría fall? No, because what they wanted was elections, that is what they wanted. That is what is called the eight-year period.

<u>The contention between Apristas and communists</u> is important. We communists have always been formed as anti-Apristas, because even Doctor Guardia Mayorga wrote a book called *Reconstructing Aprismo* where he undoes Haya's positions; I do not say that what he says is correct, there are things ……., but what is important is that he undoes, completely unmasks the monstrosities of "historical space-time," of "the peoples-continent," all the Aprista stupidities; and he was a person who although he was not a militant called himself a communist, a man who made …… and influence in the Party itself. Well, comrades, it will not return: there were nonmilitant persons who had much influence in the Party, even decisions; you can already imagine how the Party was then. We have been formed I say and we are anti-Apristas because Aprismo denies Marxism, goes against Marxism; we have even been taught that the Apristas were fascists, thus we have been taught. And Apristas and communists have confronted one another with bullets, not only with sticks, I no longer say with punches nor with kicks because that is common, yes, with bullets; always, at least from what I recall, I have seen an open and violent contention on all planes, comrades, in the ideological, in the problem of control of organizations, and in the problems of political

struggle and in violent confrontations. I do not know how now one speaks of the APRA as advanced and able to make the peaceful revolution, where has revisionism arrived then? Because at that time there was Browderism which is an antecedent of revisionism, nevertheless thus they were formed. This for us is, for that reason I emphasize, it has always been a violent contention between Apristas and communists; nevertheless at one moment there has been union to combat Odría, at a first moment, but it could not last because of the ideological conditions which are opposed, comrades, they are contradictory, antagonistic and that comes out in any case, more with the formation all had or what they were taught then. The clash has always been for that reason and with all the dirty tricks the APRA has always done against the Party, against the communists, it is good to take it into account; because if one looks today what happens then? This is ever more galloping revisionism.

The development of bureaucrat-capitalism. It is evident how bureaucrat-capitalism has developed, has deepened after the second war; the 1960s are key and part of the 1970s. On this I believe we have already spoken many times, it is in the Party documents, I do not need to say more.

On "Velasquism." Precisely the problem of Velasquism, the coup d'état of October 3, 1968—once again I reiterate—was known in the army; one must discredit the army to its depths, the naval force, the air force, the police force, the repressive one, for that reason ……..: Velasco was to go as commander general of the army to the meeting of commanders general of Latin America, but he did not go, he sent Montagne, I understand that giving a pretext and one day before at a hand-kissing ceremony there was in the palace, Belaunde asked Velasco whether it was true as was said that there was a plan to give a coup d'état in the army and what did General Velasco say?: "Not while I am commander general" and the next day he gave the coup d'état; the same as under Bustamante. Those are then the generals the Peruvian army produces! That coup d'état had repercussions in the Party, had repercussions in the struggle we had, already the fraction against Paredes's right liquidationism. Paredes, assuming the name of the political bureau and of the Standing Committee, for there was no such meeting, brought out a document in which he said—I believe it was October 6 or thereabouts—that if the government was nationalist as it said, why did it not take La Brea y Pariñas? And on the 9th they took it; therefore, the government was nationalist and in turn called itself conductor of the masses and revolutionary: tremendous stupidity.

In the preparation of the bureau meeting—at that time it was not bureau, it was political commission and there was no Standing Committee, there was a Secretariat; because there are political bureau and Standing Committee only after the Sixth National

Conference—in the preparation of the Sixth Conference, the problem was the typification of the government; the fraction sustained that it was a fascist government and Paredes said no, that at most it could be fascistizing, at most, but it could not yet be said. The Sixth National Conference did not resolve this problem, but when debating the document of conclusions and resolutions of the Sixth which obviously is approved at the event but which has to be drafted afterward with the contributions of the debate—as the formula says—the struggle sharpened around that; for that reason no official document of the Sixth came to be had because neither the Standing Committee, which was created at that event, nor the bureau arrived at a conclusion, they did not accept the drafting Paredes proposed. Afterward he has disseminated the document as official; of the Sixth National Conference the event's document and the editorial which is in *Red Flag* are official, that is all; the editorial, what does it say? "Reconstitute the Party—I believe—to prepare the People's War" or something so, I drafted that, comrades, I know it, for that reason I say, I speak with knowledge of the matter, that indeed was debated and approved; the conclusions and resolutions were not approved because we did not agree on this problem. The struggle which is going to occur in Peru is around that, how to qualify or typify Velasco's government? The position the Second Plenum of the year 1970 sanctions says that it is a fascist and corporative government and establishes its two functions which we all know—it seems to us—; for us then Velasquism was a fascist and corporative government, it had to deepen bureaucrat-capitalism, it had as its mission to reorganize Peruvian society to corporativize, those were its fundamental objectives; it is verified afterward when the Inca plan was published. We have unmasked Velasco's three fundamental laws: the agrarian law, the general law of industries, and the law of education, in written documents, while others vacillated and reached at most fascistizing after several years. Paredes or "Homeland" itself reached that. But they have indeed supported Velasquism: what did Vanguard say about the agrarian law? That it is good, the bad thing is that it is not socialist; politically it is a stupidity because an agrarian law is a democratic demand.

Also the contest between comprador bourgeoisie and bureaucratic bourgeoisie as factions of the big bourgeoisie was seen clearly, how was the problem comprehended? As a renewal of the big bourgeoisie, I refer to the conference of 1962 in Ayacucho, the documents exist, part of that is published in *Red Flag* no. 45; extremely important to comprehend bureaucrat-capitalism and those two factions which has served so that we comprehend the democratic revolution better and do not fall into the tail of any faction of the big bourgeoisie.

Opportunism and revisionism. Very many intellectuals signed supporting Velasco, in the concrete after the struggles of June of 1969 among them Delia Laura Caller, of course it is so, the document exists. Many intellectuals, what did they do? Climb onto

the wagon opportunistically and they supported it and defended it: Ruiz Caro, that one who leads *The Voice*,[24] one of them; that elite Trotskyist, of "high intellectuality," leap writer, according to him, called José B. Adolph; another great defender, Frías, another Trotskyist; great defender, Béjar, the expert in guerrillas of one month, of course then; that MIRist[25] who attacks us today in Sweden, Elio Portocarrero passed to being Velasquist; Tauro de Lama, who was Secretary of the youth and who was in prison long years for having stupidly killed a policeman on becoming desperate believing he was coming to arrest him because he was transferring a mimeograph and the policeman was coming to tell him they were going in the opposite direction, his fears overcame him, the policeman approaches and he fires a bullet into his forehead and kills him, and the problem was simply a question that they were against the traffic, the great genius who played chess blind—I speak with knowledge of the matter because I knew them in Lurigancho's "vacation place," there I came to know them—. All those opportunists, what did they do, was it not to support "Velasquism" seeking to prosper with it, seeking posts?

Revisionism first opposed Velasco, there are the publications of *Unity*. Why? Because they said that Velasco's coup was to prevent the electoral triumph they were going to obtain, always dreaming! Always the milkmaid; but afterward, great defenders. Who then brought out "Juan without fear," who brought out "Armed force and people united will never be defeated" prostituting an international slogan? It is the people united will never be defeated! What is that of armed force and people united? It is a prostitution of international slogans, revisionism has done that then, see all its congresses. With the establishment of relations with the USSR then they believed that the revolution was even advancing and the baton of command from afar, as always, makes the herd serve its interests; because there begins the social-imperialist penetration in Peru which today intensifies and dangerously—not only of them but of the Chinese revisionists too—.

That is, I believe, on this problem, there you can already have an idea to explain things and

2) <u>"The class struggle in the peasant movement."</u>.

In 1948—I have said—the peasant struggle begins but on the legal plane; at that time the Party, what did it propose? Not agrarian law, not agrarian reform, but it proposed a project of agricultural and livestock promotion, I believe the difference is very clear, or not? 1956 is the beginning of a powerful peasant movement which is going to reach its conclusion in the year 1963; the year 1956 is the struggles in the center, it is the

[24]Red Library: *The Voice* (*La Voz*).

[25]Red Library: Revolutionary Left Movement.

problem of Rancas with invasion of lands which are theirs even with title, of the peasants I say, which the then Cerro de Pasco Corporation—today it is Centromin—has appropriated, on that afterward they have made the SAIS; there was the police repression but what did they find? A militarily organized mass which repelled them and they had to bring more forces to crush them with blood and fire, has it not been so? And the powerful movement from July of 1963 to February of 1964, half a million men have moved—some say three hundred, in short—a trail of powder ran from the center to the south of the Peruvian sierra, it burst intensely in Cusco. It is interesting to see, as a chronicle, Neyra's book, of another Velasquist, there what is said? That the mass surpassed the leaders, that the leaders acted as firefighters—he does not say that, of course, he says: the leaders behaved well, wanted to restrain the mass and always sought the coming to terms with the landlords, when the mass invaded a hacienda they said "But leave him half, only take a part" and the mass said "No, everything"—of course it was so, they have acted then as firefighters, who?: Valer then, the deputy; the famous Huamantica, opportunist trafficker, otherwise why does his employer **Romellin** weep at his death? Comrades, if the employer weeps over the death of a union leader what does it mean? That he has lost a good serf, that is Huamantica. What role did the federation of workers of Cusco fulfill? Of firefighters then, and where did that lead? To the crushing of the mass, again with blood and fire, landlords and policemen riddled them with bullets, so that afterward, the mass struggle having been bridled, all the firefighters ended up in prison, they received their just payment. The greatest peasant movement which has been seen of much importance.

To that we refer when it says: the class struggle in the peasant movement, invasions, because that is the name, afterward they have come to us with the invasion of "taking of lands"; taking of lands is collusion with the government to apply agrarian law, example, year 1974, Toxama and the other of Huancahuacho, the famous acts of Andahuaylas; who promoted that then, is it not Letts Colmenares, was it not Vanguard,[26] was it not Mezich, "great peasant leader," "second leader of the Shining Path,"—I believe he is not here, I have never seen him, communist of three months—they have been invasions and from there we have drawn lessons; in Ayacucho, two cases which permit comprehending things thoroughly: the invasion of Pomacocha and the invasion of Ccaccamarca. There one sees that it is not enough to take the land if there is no armed revolutionary movement which proceeds toward the goal of culminating the democratic revolution, they adapt (…)

A clique of new little gamonales who are the "leaders." Those movements have given us many lessons, comrades, you must study and see in Ayacucho Ccaccamarca,

[26]Red Library: Revolutionary Vanguard (*Vanguardia Revolucionaria*).

Pomacocha and there is a mirror of what must not be done. One must develop the armed revolution, otherwise it is worth nothing to conquer lands however much blood it may cost and prisons, because it has cost them, of course yes.

3) "The process of the working-class movement."

The workers' movement has developed vigorously, has grown, the class increased, its class consciousness increased, its political sense, it developed its organic forms, its forms of struggle. 1967-68 are clear examples of that: taking of factories, taking of mines, blowing up of roads to prevent access to the mines, hostages; it has been shaking, 150,000 men on strike at once, but in active strikes then, not in communion stoppages. It is in those conditions that the General Confederation of Workers of Peru[27] is going to arise, 1968, which was inaugurated, if I do not recall badly, in the colon theater with Belaunde's help and the presence of Mr. Minister of labor; read the statute they approved, for that reason we say that that is not Mariátegui's central, it is foolishness to say so, it is to ignore the process, it is not to know reality, that has been done with the help of Belaundism. One must not forget then, comrades, that we communists voted for Belaunde in 1963, were there not good relations with Belaundism, how are we going to forget?

4) "The intellectual movement."

The struggle of university students, extremely important, there they did combat—they did not paint the university walls so that there would be no slogans—there indeed, epoch of strikes, mass strikes, against Odría of course, there have been many national strikes; many young university students have left studies to go to the struggle, to devote themselves to the Party, is it perhaps like today, was San Marcos perhaps like today?

The intellectuals themselves begin to air new ideas for when the mass moves it has repercussions in the intellectuals, it is an opening to new ideas, they begin to grasp Marxism. Of course in them there is always the problem of the flowering of the latest fashion, the stupid snobbery of always: the Althusserian[28] ideas we spoke of yesterday, do you recall? Which have changed in Peru, as if it were something extraordinary, a great———Marxist; the problem of Godelier, did the famous Aracelis Castillo not

[27]Red Library: *Confederación General de Trabajadores del Perú* (CGTP). Regarding the confederation founded by Mariátegui, Chairman Gonzalo stated: "But the CGTP that he founded in the latter part of the '20s is not the present-day CGTP, which is the complete negation of what Mariátegui had established."—Chairman Gonzalo, interview by El Diario, July 1988, *Interview with Chairman Gonzalo* (Red Library), 13.

[28]Red Library: Refers to Louis Althusser (1918–1990), the forefather of postmodernism and New Revisionism (Bob Avakian and Prachanda). In notes from his 1987 philosophy seminar, Chairman Gonzalo criticized Althusser's theories: "Althusser's theories lead to a new surrealism and what is possible is to fuse Kantian theory and Spinoza's. A bourgeois rationalism and a bourgeois idealism are taken." See Chairman Gonzalo, *Chairman Gonzalo's Philosophy Seminar* (1987; Red Library), 11–12.

say? "The sage Godelier," that Frenchman who what he does is deny unilinear development to establish the multilinear, that aims at denying Marxism, why? Because he proposes that Marxism is exclusive to the west, to Europe, and does not correspond to the backward countries, that if we take it it is because we take the best, that is it does not come out of the entrails of the struggle, sinister thesis, have the intellectuals not repeated that? That famous stupid woman, Marta Harnecker, have professors not had her as a text in Huamanga's own university? Are those not today's PUMists? Yes then, comrades, there is an airing of ideas but with those burdens. But there is also another intellectuality, a revolutionary one and one which advances to Marxism and one which is and is going to be communist which is what we need.

We cannot be opposed to intellectuality, we have to understand its importance and what we have to see is how to win them and how communist intellectuals are formed; one must know things well, otherwise we would simply generate rejection of intellectuals, it is incorrect, Chairman Mao, what does he say? "Without the participation of the intellectuals victory in the revolution is impossible."[29] we must have it very present. The Party has generated communist intellectuals, we must then develop intellectual work among revolutionaries and make them follow communism: that is the problem which is called the Mariátegui Center for Intellectual Work in Ayacucho; in no university has that been generated, they are not going to tell us tales that in San Marcos, San Marcos what? In San Marcos the professor of dialectical materialism did not know about Lenin, of course I know because I dealt with him, comrades, he knew as much about dialectical materialism as I about Japanese, and he was a professor; thus too, has that father Evaristo San Cristóbal and the other curaca who writes about Mariátegui not been dialectical then? In any case, there is an airing of ideas and there is a really communist intellectuality which begins to develop, and that we cannot deny.

But the problem does not remain there, one must see intellectuals and intellectual movements. The teaching profession begins to struggle and develop and has had heroic days; teachers in that interim learn to go into the streets to fight because they already came to understand that that of the ascetic teacher whose vocation was teaching, are cheap words with which they want to prevent their struggle, restrain their demands; even Sofocleto, comrades, when he wrote in *El Comercio*, does he not have an article mocking, speaking of a strike he said: how can a teacher be chubby, has a chubby teacher been seen? He has to be thin, ascetic, therefore they do not need increases, they are going to lose their mystique, mocking then, even he said to them is it not the moment and the time for teachers to fight the police with heel blows? One must recall then. Well, now how is the teaching profession? It is good then, the problem is

[29]Red Library: Mao Tse-tung, "Recruit Large Numbers of Intellectuals" (December 1, 1939), in *Selected Works*, vol. 2 (Foreign Languages Press, 1967), 301.

Homeland; but already then, the teaching profession too will combat, they have masses, then as the Party enters there the struggle of the teaching profession will grow green again but now in another course.

All the professionals themselves in Peru, who form part of intellectuality, those who emerge, do they perhaps not find themselves with the degree under the arm and not knowing what to do with that degree, do they not clash with reality? Thousands of teachers without posts, agronomists even; according to what was said in *Expreso* itself, I believe it is 60 percent of agronomists, who do not work as such, then what is that investment for, what is that study for?

All those things burst in Peru and go on making intellectuality advance, one must not underestimate it, comrades, it is not to know its struggles, its needs nor the role they can and must fulfill and they are going to fulfill it, they are already beginning to do so. Here we ourselves, are there not several intellectuals here who have advanced? Or can they deny our condition, that several of us who are here are of the intellectual movement, I believe it is a reality.

5) "The armed struggle in the country."

In Peru there are antecedents before 1965. We have that of Blanco in La Convención, but the essence of Blanco's problem is that he never proposed, as he himself says in his writings, bringing Power down, but simply taking lands and for that creating a military apparatus linked to a guild, dependent on the guild, for no more. The case of Lieutenant Vallejos is the case of an action of uprising in Jauja, linked to Trotskyists and students, and at the hour of the parrots only a few students presented themselves, it lasted hours; but they express a situation then, comrades, lieutenant of the republican. Heraud, the poet; the case of Heraud is a part of the group of those who were formed in Havana, after the Cuban revolution, after the triumph, in the universities especially people were sought to send them to Havana and many Peruvians have gone to Havana, very many—I do not speak of those who went to stroll—I speak of young people who went to be indoctrinated in armed struggle, only that a school of militarist cut where the problem was how to walk well, march well, how to shoot and how to communicate by radio and it ended, and the head? Orphaned of politics, I say with knowledge of the matter: Pelayo ore, of Ccasamarca, there is a cadre formed in Cuba, at present I understand "great leader" of the peasant movement, of his head, because he moves nothing, just as Lizárraga "great peasant leader" who moves the masses signing petitions as a lawyer, Paredes's school, of course. There was a group of young people in which Javier Heraud, Alain Elías, and others were, which was to enter Peru through Bolivia to enter through Madre de Dios and there begin the action, the criterion can already be seen, but they were surprised and several murdered, among them Heraud,

a poet of quality, unfortunately he died very young, the verses he has we have seen in the Party are very beautiful; Elías I understand is mad, there he is isolated. But what is important is who knew this?: it is a dark page, only the Party of Bolivia and don Jorge del Prado knew, miracle of miracles, how did the police guess? That hardened and senile del Prado must give account of that, the one of stammering thought, because he thinks as he speaks, have you not heard how he speaks? He thinks likewise, with stammerings of a porridge which makes little bubbles, that is his head, a rotten opportunist, that one is responsible! And he has to do with Heraud's death; they are historical accounts and balances, some day then, comrades, it will be clarified, because in any case they have been combatants, people who have had another criterion and that is part of the people's struggle and a lesson must be drawn.

The problem of 1965. The MIR guerrillas, we have spoken of this several times, it lasted like six months or something so, perhaps a little more; that struggle has been very important, it showed plainly how a guerrilla kindles hope, yes, comrades, because that is what it did. Problems of conception, of Military Line, rotten bastard ambitions of personal Power also conspired against that struggle, I refer to Lobatón; why then did he begin before when he was to begin only when the situation in Cusco was prepared, the Pachacutec guerrilla which Luis de la Puente Uceda himself commanded, why did he do it? For protagonism, for being he, head; for that reason the comrades must think well and draw a lesson. That it is an important chapter of the struggle to take up arms in Peru and is part of our people's experience, only that it must be interpreted well and the MIR has never done so, never, we indeed have analyzed the MIR struggle thoroughly and have drawn important lessons, for example: on paying attention to the initiation, we have done that. The national liberation army, Bejar's movement, in the department of Ayacucho; Bejar was a member of the Party, director of *Unity*, he proposed to the Ayacucho Regional Committee that he be supported and we rise in arms with him. Yes, his proposition was rejected as inappropriate for a member of a Party cannot rise with another Party without an order from its central leadership, what was the response? Treat this at the level of the Central Committee then, in the Party who has to resolve it, a committee does not. A struggle where focoism has been expressed, once again, focoism with all its rotten burden, a guerrilla apart from the peasantry in application of "distrust the peasants" as Guevara preached; what great action did they do? Taking of Uchaca, what more did they do? That was all their great action, the rest? They shattered them: Bejar sick left because he had Uta,[30] the shoe had reached his ……., farce! And he acts as a guerrilla, of paper, more, of burned paper, that is it, what more does that one know of guerrillas? And

[30]Red Library: A native term for cutaneous leishmaniasis, a skin infection often transmitted from animals to humans.

afterward what did he become? A cheap and foolish anarchism, he too was in fashion in the 1970s derived from the French May 1968, of course then.

6) "The problem of the Party"

I believe here it is enough to read what it says, what is the difference in this?: "How a Party founded on clear Marxist-Leninist bases—attention: understand, it says clear Marxist-Leninist bases, it does not say Maoist bases because it was not—degenerated into a revisionist party, the need to retake Mariátegui's road, developing it, and reconstitute the Party, the Communist Party of Peru that Mariátegui himself founded in 1928—very important, that must be highlighted, we do not deny the foundation, of constitution is a whole first moment the Party, I do not know what that of Mariátegui comes to—and how through this reconstitution a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Party was built" which is what this Party is.

These are the things of the national, but the key is at the end. "Here it is basic how Gonzalo Thought deeply comprehends Peruvian society," yes, comrades, Gonzalo Thought has a comprehension of the history of Peru which it has expressed and explained many times—from there comes our Comrade Roberto telling us we are historians, it is very good then, we are going to ask that he make the history of that history[31]—but no serious movement can base itself on historical ignorance of the society in which it combats. The Chairman said it well, "One must know history, mainly of the last hundred years,"[32] does he not say that? "Centering on the crucial problem of bureaucrat-capitalism," of course, crucial problem, either this is understood or the democratic revolution is not comprehended. "Sees the need to reconstitute the Party and to conquer Power and defend it with People's War," and this is the main thing here, in national context, this is the main thing, this is the core, the problem of the People's War. It is enough to recall that reconstitution has a first strategic policy: the road of encircling the cities from the countryside and that comes since the beginning of the 1960s; it's not from today. This question, this is what must be highlighted here fundamentally: "Conquer Power and defend it with People's War."

II. <u>IDEOLOGICAL BASIS.</u>

"Without Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Gonzalo Thought cannot be conceived, because the latter is the creative application of the former to our reality. The key question of this point lies in the comprehension of the historical process of the development of

[31]Red Library: The source transcript has damaged wording, "*vamos a pedir que el haga la historia de c esa historia.*"

[32]Red Library: Likely a paraphrase based on the document *Reform Our Study* in vol. 3 of Mao Tse-tung's *Selected Works* (Foreign Languages Press, 1967), 17-25.

the ideology of the proletariat, of its three stages given shape in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and of Maoism as principal; and what is essential, principally, is its application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a universal truth to the concrete conditions of the Peruvian revolution; hence Gonzalo Thought is specifically principal for the Communist Party of Peru and the Revolution it leads" (…)

Reason: because it is nothing but the creative application to our reality; but if Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is not taken, what would be applied, Marxism-Leninism? We would be with a slow clock and what is the key?: "the comprehension of the historical process of the development of the ideology of the proletariat," this is key, how it comprehends the process which the ideology of the international proletariat has followed which leads, to what? To Maoism as main; that is the basis which underpins it, for that reason it is the main thing, without that there is nothing, for that reason one must understand. It says thus: "and essential," thus it says: "and essential," and do not get dizzy with what it says "principally," it refers to the essential, because several essential things but there is one essential which is main. Do you understand what I say? It says: "the essential principally," it means that there are several essential things but there is one thing which is main within the essential, "application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a universal truth to the concrete conditions of the Peruvian revolution." That is the essential, it is not enough to say that the main thing is taking Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, if it is not accompanied by that the essential principally is the application to the concrete condition Gonzalo Thought makes no sense, both things must be seen, and this in strict application of what the Chairman has taught us, that the problem of Marxism is its application and that is what Lenin taught and that is what Marx taught; I believe this part must be taken very much into account and it is essential; take that from it and the essence is taken from Gonzalo Thought, it would have no essence.

Then, pay attention to what it says: hence, from taking that basis, Maoism, from that application which is essential, what derives? "Gonzalo Thought is specifically principal for the Communist Party of Peru and the Revolution it leads." Here the word is "specifically," that is what must be grasped here, because if it did not say "specifically principal," then, comrades, we would be denying that the principal thing is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, do you understand what I mean? It would be not to see its universal value and we could not do that, to be communists first we have to be Marxist-Leninist-Maoists and as we are acting in this country called Peru, it is essential to apply it here in Peru, but without the first the second does not fit. From there derives this: Gonzalo Thought is main for the Party, yes, specifically, what does it mean? As application, as necessity of our revolution, in this specific case, for this concrete question; and in that manner one cannot in any way evade Marxism-Leninism-Maoism because it is the universal truth and that is the source from which we will always have to drink.

"The Guiding Thought, having reached a qualitative leap of decisive importance for the Party and the revolution, has become Gonzalo Thought, thus marking a milestone in Party life." I already explained this, I do not need to reiterate, do you recall the introduction? We have already spoken of this, twice the same thing.

III. CONTENT.

Here there are three precise points, three points:

a. The theory.

We must know how to locate Gonzalo Thought well: it is a specification of our revolution, of our proletariat, of our Party, of the class struggle and of war which is its higher form, and it must be seen so; then, if we see it specifically in that manner, our problem is not to put it at the level of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism because that cannot be, it is a gross error, we could never commit it, never, comrades, we cannot confuse things. When treating theory, what we have to see is how the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in its three component parts is handled, how it is applied; if there were a contribution, that today is subsidiary, if tomorrow it were developed, tomorrow is not today. I believe we must be very clear and very concrete, understand well, more when we propose theory, the theory, because there we are speaking—I repeat—of the three component parts, of the universal truth and only there can we then think about how it is applied, how it is handled; if there were contributions, time will tell. For me this is key, comrades, a different thing is the problem on the content—we are going to see this—there is a difference.

As for theory what does it say? For that reason it proposes: "how it comprehends and applies"—for that reason it says so—"How it comprehends and applies the three integral parts of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism," that is what it says, here it does not say how it develops. I believe one must be objective and if there are perspectives, perspectives may be seen, but for me, perspective is perspective, first the perspective has to be treated to say this already is reality. Here a comrade I believe is twenty years old, his perspective is to reach sixty, he may reach it or not, is what I say clear or not? I believe it is understood, a creature is born, is going to become a man, it is its perspective, it may arrive or not. Is that clear? Do not give as reality what is perspective. But in this of theory one must have the utmost care because it is the universal truth that is being treated, one must be extremely cautious and careful, for that reason it says the following: "How it comprehends and applies."

This clarified, it proposes: "Emphasize the importance it gives to Marxist philosophy," very clear: "the importance it gives," it says, nothing more. "The necessity of forming

ourselves in it"—in Marxist philosophy—"and especially its application of the law of contradiction to the study of every problem, always aiming at defining the principal aspect and the process of things." It says nothing more, neither beyond nor before, neither so far that it does not illuminate the saint nor so close that it blackens him, the thing in its place; in this manner is how this problem must be proposed. When treating universal theory, I insist, prudence and much care: dawn does not come earlier for rising very early, it is not convenient, comrades. Here, what must be emphasized? It says "especially its application of the law of contradiction," that is what must be highlighted: Gonzalo Thought always strives to see contradiction because that is what universal truth tells us, because that is what principally Maoism teaches us, more than Lenin, more than Marx, I tell you, it teaches us that. Besides, in philosophy there are other things; in this as in the other there are many things which we do not yet want to propose, yes, comrades, each one is conscious and if one drafts with greater reason, there are other things, but I do not want to propose, sincerely, it does not seem so to me, this is enough; furthermore, this only says "concerning," it says nothing more, it says nothing more.

"In political economy—again the word, what does it say?—the concern for the relations of exploitation, and very especially for bureaucrat-capitalism, orienting itself toward the maturation of the revolution and the repercussion of People's War on the base, as well as its attention to the economic relations of imperialism, seeking their political consequences." What thing is salient here?: bureaucrat-capitalism and the economic relations seeking their political result, that is what is salient here.

"In scientific socialism, how it centers on People's War and its concretion in the country, how it always keeps the problem of Power in mind and, particularly, its shaping and development as a New State." Two things also: a) People's War, it centers on the People's War because without it there would not be the second of this part, b) shaping and development as New State, is it clear? Thus it seems to us that it is better to see.

I know, comrades, that there are other things, each one knows, I believe, what he has of strong and what of weak, each one knows and it is true I drafted this document then, why am I going to say no if I did it, comrades? Each one knows what he puts, or not? It seems to me that there it must be proposed just so, it is better, there is the problem of theory. Why has this been put? Because a thought can never be proposed if the universal truth of which it is a component part is not taken into account, one could not, how would there be a communist thought then without taking the three component parts into account? Here, as you will see, it does not say, for example, generalization of bureaucrat-capitalism, it does not say so, why might it be? Because putting it here does not belong, at least today putting it in General Political Line does not belong.

b. <u>On content.</u>

"The most substantive and most developed part of Gonzalo Thought is found in the Party's General Political Line; this thought, then, directly underpins the line and its five elements, the point of departure of this underpinning being how it comprehends and firmly maintains the course of the Program." Two words about this. Most substantive and most developed part, the General Political Line, that is what we must be very clear about. Attention: on this thought the line and its five elements are underpinned, therefore the Military Line as center. Third question which must be emphasized is what the point of that underpinning is; why, how is it that the line is underpinned on the thought and a General Political Line can be developed? Because of what it says there: because "it firmly maintains the course of the Program." Is it clear? They are three questions which must be emphasized.

Well, having arrived at this point of content—we are speaking of the part which says "most substantive and most developed" is the General Political Line—well then here the problem, where is it? In the specifications of our line, of what we consider typical or peculiar to our revolution with all the perspective it might have or has in some points. For that reason we pass simply to enumerate the specifications of the General Political Line and contributions to the world revolution which we must highlight. I was telling you that one must put it in the line; comrades, the first is universal theory, much care with this; if there are contributions see them in the General Political Line

Which is the substantive or most substantive, most developed part. For that reason here we propose in that manner: specifications of the General Political Line and contributions to the world revolution which we must highlight. Is that all? Well one would have to study more; can this be recast? It is a problem of studying more; must it be ordered better? It is a problem of studying more. It is a first attempt, take it so, what we are going to enumerate, why enumerate? Because the comrades already know what it is about, of course then:

I. <u>International Line.</u>

That is what refers to specifications of International Line.

1. Strives to impose Maoism as the third, new, and higher stage of Marxism.
2. The three moments of the world revolution. Strategic offensive of the world revolution.
3. The fundamental contradictions and their solution. The main contradiction.
4. The world people's war as response to the world imperialist war.
5. Process of Marxism.

6. Develops bases of strategy and tactics of the world revolution.

II. <u>Democratic revolution.</u>

(1) how it conceives the Peruvian revolution: democratic revolution, socialist revolution, and cultural revolutions toward communism, proposing as third type of revolution, because thus it is proposed in the documents, as third type of revolution the cultural revolutions. (2) generalization of bureaucrat-capitalism. Generalization it says here, it does not say in theory, it says in General Political Line. (3) character of Peruvian society, the fundamental contradictions and the main one. (4) on the State: Old State and New State. On this some comrades say why does New State not go first? It depends on how you see it, comrades, put thus it is Old State and its continuation the New State, it depends on how one wants to propose it; proposed thus, that is what it means, no, is it bad? One must understand: the New State is the continuation which will come after the Old State. If we go to things, what exists today as predominant, the Old or the New State, the New State? Obviously the Old State, otherwise it would not be the society it is, nor the class character it has, nor the Power it has, nor the government it has; then, comrades, it depends on how one thinks then, on what one wants to say. Could one put in some case, New State-Old State? What would one mean there? There one could say that the New State is main, in what sense would one mean? In that it is the new, that is what it would mean, but if I put it as continuation does it not imply process? In short. That is the reason why it is put in one or another manner, it is not the same as another thing, everything must be thought well, in this sense is how it is put. Comrades, do you think it must be put in reverse? It depends, that is what it means, the one does not deny the other, it depends on what one wants to express. (5) the essence of the democratic revolution: peasant war led by the Communist Party through people's war.

III. <u>Military Line</u>.

(1) unitary people's war and importance of the initiation. (2) specification of the Base Area. (3) strategic development. What does this refer to, comrades? To the axes, etc. (4) the five parts of a campaign. (5) the five steps of the actions. (6) the strategic-operational plans. (7) mass work through the army.

IV. <u>Construction line.</u>

(1) principle of construction. (2) militarization of the Communist Parties and concentric construction. (3) the construction of the People's Guerrilla Army. Incorporation of the militia. Perhaps this deserves two words: the comrades say incorporation of the militia. (…)

In how the People's Guerrilla Army is conceived, it has to do with Lenin's thesis, it has to do with Chairman Mao's development, it has to do with how we conceive a force in

its construction with three parts incorporated into the People's Guerrilla Army itself one must have this clear and next emphasize the incorporation of the militia; for that reason it says period incorporation of the militia.

(4) front is countryside: New State (People's Committees, Base Areas, New-Democratic People's Republic in formation). Front in city: MRDP.[33] (5) the five forms of New Power. (6) militancy: communist first and mainly combatant and administrator.

V. <u>Mass Line</u>.

(1) reaffirmation in the principle "the masses make history" and "it is right to rebel." (2) specific weight of the masses in the world revolution. It serves to define the main contradiction in the world. (3) mass work in and for the People's War. Countryside guiding in the city. (4) struggle for demands in function of Power. (5) the Generated Organisms. Militarized in the countryside and specification in city. (6) law of incorporation of the masses into the People's War. (7) Marxist-Leninist-Maoist tactics, Gonzalo Thought. (8) scientific organization of poverty. There we have, tentatively, the problem of specifications. "C. In Gonzalo Thought we must highlight the notable fulfillment of the demands stated by Chairman Mao:" Here what must be emphasized are three questions. "Theoretical solidity": without a solid revolutionary theory, new, one cannot lead, that must be understood. As for "comprehension of history," we have already said it: necessity to comprehend the historical process of society, mainly of the last hundred years which in good account in bureaucrat-capitalism. In third place "good practical handling of politics"; Lenin said: "How easy it would be if in politics there were not the damned daily problems," they are his words, yes, comrades; our problem, the Chairman says, is to handle politics well, resolve the concrete political problems well; Engels said: "Without that, there is no politics," thus he proposed.

IV. <u>WHAT IS FUNDAMENTAL</u>.

It says: "What is fundamental in Gonzalo Thought is the problem of Power; in the concrete, the conquest of Power in Peru, thoroughly and completely in the entire country, as a consequent application of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to our revolution." What is what we have to emphasize here?: "conquest of Power in the country," in the entire country, do you recall that we said the experience of Vietnam which was divided, of Korea which was divided? For that reason here it says "in the entire country," that is what must be highlighted here.

"But, being a Communist thought, it comprehends the conquest of Power in Peru as part of the conquest of Power for the proletariat at the world level; and that the

[33]Red Library: Revolutionary Movement of Defense of the People.

conquest of Power in the country, today being given shape in the People's Committees, Base Areas, and the New-Democratic People's Republic in formation, within the perspective of establishing the People's Republic of Peru, serves to institute the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country, because without it one cannot march toward Communism." What questions must we emphasize?: the conquest of Power in Peru linked to the conquest of Power for the proletariat at the world level, the conquest of Power in Peru cannot be disconnected from the conquest of Power for the proletariat at the world level; if we did not do so, then there would be no communist thought, that is it. One must emphasize, then, that the conquest of Power which is giving shape in the known form aims at instituting the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country, it serves that, it serves to institute the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country; because if we did not have dictatorship of the proletariat, how to develop the revolution? Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, comrades, there is no communism, that is the problem.

Finally it says: "And all this is in service of firmly and decisively serving the establishment of People's Republics and mainly the dictatorship of the proletariat in the whole world, under the conduction of Communist Parties, with revolutionary armies of a new type, through People's War and the development of cultural revolutions, so that Communism may illuminate the whole Earth." All this must be highlighted, all this paragraph. What deserves to be explained here? This that "in service of firmly and decisively serving . . . the establishment of People's Republics" is said, why? Because as the democratic revolution is what the immense majority of nations of the globe need and as some have not yet begun, ours on triumphing has to support the institution of those people's republics, that is the reason: that is understood, is it not true? That is what it means, because we have the grounded hope that we are going to end the first revolution first than others, that is the reason, unless we want to continue, the facts will tell, comrades. That is the grounded perspective. But here it says mainly serve what? The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the whole world, because just as joint dictatorship is not enough for us and we need the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the world people's republics of joint dictatorship are not enough, the dictatorship of the proletariat is needed in the whole world. After all that is main; the other I believe that, everything is a unity because what follows is how, with army under the conduction of Communist Parties, army of a new type, people's war, and cultural revolutions until communism; here the question is clear then, comrades.

V. <u>Forging in the class struggle</u>.

"It is through a persistent, firm, and sagacious two-line struggle, defending the proletarian line and defeating opposing lines, that Gonzalo Thought has been forged." Of

course. No line, no thought can be forged apart from the two-line struggle; only the proletarian position contending with every other type of positions or lines is how a thought can be established and developed, in this case Gonzalo Thought. What counts here? The necessity of the two-line struggle for the forging of Gonzalo Thought, that is the problem: necessity of the two-line struggle.

"Among the most outstanding struggles that deserve to be emphasized are those waged against modern revisionism, especially represented here by del Prado and his henchmen; against the right liquidationism of Paredes and his gang; against left liquidationism headed by the one who was Sergio and his self-proclaimed 'Bolsheviks'; and against the Right Opportunist Line opposed to the initiation of the armed struggle." Well. Gonzalo Thought, first through the fraction, because one would have to seek the roots in this case also as in everything, because it is a process; and then, in the development of reconstitution, in the conformation already of the Party of a new type and in war, some struggles have been waged which must be emphasized. Against modern revisionism, yes, because we have been part or are part of that world struggle against revisionism, that is what it means; we may be a tiny part, it is good then but part, that is what matters, for that reason it says: "Especially represented here by del Prado and his henchmen." Why is "especially" said? Because "Red Homeland" is another expression of revisionism and we have also contended against "Red Homeland" although it does not appear here. The struggle against revisionism has unfolded taking first the positions of the Communist Party of China, and in this the document *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement* has been transcendental; with it, we swept revisionism away in Ayacucho, and with it we have combated revisionism in general; that document is fundamental for us. It is with that and other documents, like for example, the document of the Communist Party of China of the struggle against Togliatti or the documents, they are two the struggle against Togliatti, or the struggle against the French Communist Party, or against the Communist Party of India, in short; with all those documents we have developed the struggle as also with "the nine comments," against revisionism here in Peru, against del Prado. And the historical circumstance led to that before an opportunist, revisionist leadership, the bases of the committee linked ourselves with one another and the Fourth National Conference in 1964 was concretized in which del Prado was expelled, we have been coparticipants in that struggle from its initiation; del Prado is expelled from the Communist Party of Peru and it was the immense majority of committees, he remained isolated, but unfortunately the unmasking of del Prado and his gang was not continued because of the obstructionist work of the revisionists who remained, especially Sotomayor.

"Against the right liquidationism of Paredes and his gang." Paredes is going to carry forward a right liquidationism aiming to blow up the Party on being unable to control it

and for that he arranged a whole plan taking himself off abroad for many months. It is this struggle which is summarized in the Second Plenum of the Central Committee of 1970, there is where we can find. What was the fundamental problem of that struggle?: the peasant problem, in essence the problem of confiscation before expropriation; Paredes sustained that the peasantry did not comprehend confiscation but did understand expropriation, that is, understood paying but did not understand not paying: a monstrosity. Paredes develops a destruction of the Party's influence in the masses seeking to unfold in legalism, that is what he is going to do. He is going to aim to destroy the Party, mainly the Ayacucho Regional Committee which was the sole solid committee and really deserving of the name of regional committee which remained after the divisions with "Homeland" and those blows of police handling which Paredes gave, only that committee remained with solid bases and even that committee was at risk of going after "Red Homeland"; yes, we say it so, comrades, because the committee of Lima, the regional of Lima, the "14th of June," was a paper committee, it was in name but they did not function nor had cells set up, rather communists were combated, of a sectarianism which led also to its near disappearance under artisans who believed themselves great Marxists because they had gone to China. The solid committee which remained was the Ayacucho Regional; the Lima base, what was it then? A fight, a scramble between Paredes and the "Bolsheviks," that was it.

Why, then, do I say this? Comrades, I know this because I was Organization Secretary then. And Paredes used lumpen to impose his positions, of course "the old woman," was a lumpen then, an ex-sailor, if I do not recall badly, and many people of that type; he used habitual drunks like *Amauta*; madmen like the person in leadership of Cajamarca. Comrades, they are realities of the Party. Was he crazy? Of course he was crazy then, really crazy. Paredes aimed against Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, as it was then named; after his long stay abroad he returned with the novelty that in Albania they had taught him that there was a frustrated revolution, an unfinished one, and a perfect one; the Soviet, the Chinese, and the Albanian, obviously the perfect one. In that manner, in Paredes there occurs a splittism—do you recall what splittism is? We saw it three days ago, they are three elements then, comrades: it is to go against the ideology, against the Party, and against the Party's influence in the masses, Paredes has all three—he wanted to liquidate; what is called liquidationism? It is the annihilation of the Party and why is it called right? Because it seeks to dissolve it sinking it in legality, that is it, for that reason it is called right liquidationism. Nevertheless, he, Paredes, accused us of being splittists, Trotskyists before the very leadership of the Communist Party of China, for that reason for a time they said that those of the Ayacucho Regional were Trotskyists, of course. I myself have been denounced as Trotskyist and thus it was heard in Argentina, but I have never been a militant in any Party, in the Communist

Party, I have never been a militant in another Party, yes then, I do not come from any other Party. Trotskyist? Since I learned the first steps of Marxism, I believe in Stalin it is very clear what Trotskyism is, Trotskyism is not Marxism (…)

Well, as the document says, of 1970, the declaration: "Practice, time is going to demonstrate who are splittists." We ask ourselves where is Paredes? He went about parliament for a time, in the Constituent Assembly, afterward in the National People's Assembly. He must be kissing Alan's shoes on Roosevelt Street, because he worked there.

Well, in what refers to left liquidationism headed by Sergio, this gentleman who writes in *Change*,[34] Ramón García writes from Colombia. Left liquidationism is going to be a group which forms in Moscow where they are going to have a dispute with del Prado and with defense of the positions of the Communist Party of China, which leads them to be expelled; they were students of Patricio Lumumba in Moscow. They are in China, they return here, but they have not participated, they came afterward. Their head Sergio is going to work in Arequipa with Zapater, what did he do there? He liquidated the youth because he had a foolish criterion about youth, a biologistic connection of youth; he hated work with young people, work with women, he had a famous saying: "Whoever lies down with children…" and in this manner one must not work with young people, there is no need; according to him, women served to warm seats, his own words. I am not inventing this; they are Sergio's words. On that plane, at most it gave him enough to disseminate a position of "liberation of women" transcribing documents of the MIR of Chile,[35] it is the no. 1 of that women's center which we formed, not they. One of its components went with the MIR, afterward he was arrested and landed in the Party. Another component was the famous Montañés of whom one must have a lesson; a man who never gave his official name to the Party, he had a false name, it is extremely grave, obviously he never said it, it was discovered through the orange blossoms life has, it was discovered.

They acted with entryism as a group within the Party, concealed, surreptitiously. How is this proven? With the letter sent by Sergio in the year 1970 to an addressee who could only be defined when he recognized that it was addressed to him: Arévalo, and afterward he has been in the Party and died in El Frontón, of course. But Arévalo, during years denied that the letter was addressed to him when all indications led to that, all the proofs led to that he was the addressee, what was proposed there? "We have to organize basing ourselves on Mariátegui"—attention!—and much they spoke of studying Mariátegui, of investigating Mariátegui and what did they make of

[34]Red Library: *Change* (*Cambio*), a revisionist newspaper that followed the command baton of the revisionists of the Soviet Union.

[35]Red Library: Revolutionary Left Movement (*Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria*).

Mariátegui?: an icon, invocation, and incense, nothing more; and they have denied clear positions of Mariátegui, for example, that of the national bourgeoisie. They have dared to change point 3 and 5 of the programmatic points which Mariátegui drafted. In point 3 they want to present him as a defender of industrialization, that the problem is how to produce; a revisionist criterion which is in the Fourth Congress of 1964. And in point 5, they changed the term "imperialist" to "capitalist," extremely grave. The reason: because then the revolution would be socialist. Comrades, that can never be done, that is condemnable; there you have a sample of "respect" for Mariátegui. They acted, then, as a concealed group.

In the struggle against Paredes of 1967, when Paredes pretended to revive the problem that a part of Popular Action[36] was the national bourgeoisie, represented by Seoane, that Cornejo Chávez was of the national bourgeoisie, which went openly against the Fifth Conference and is which behind it wanted to lay bases to take them to elections, when that is combated, what was then the attitude of left liquidationism, there represented by Sergio? Wanting to justify Paredes who had invoked that he was bad in the head, that he did not understand, nor comprehend. He comprehended very well and proposed national bourgeoisie in such and such personages confusing once again with big bourgeoisie as national bourgeoisie, that is, putting big bourgeoisie as national bourgeoisie, but "He was crazy, did not understand, his head was overworked to exhaustion to understand that that was a great error": Foolish justifications, even going so far as to propose that he should not present the general report, that he did not have the mental conditions to do so. He had conditions to say nonsense, but he didn't have the mental conditions to recognize his error. Who understands that? That Sergio justified him, who else? Professor Caro. Of course then, things must be said clearly because they have pretended to raise Caro as a standard, trafficking with the fact that Professor Caro knew Mariátegui. For that reason I say that I do not believe knowing a person is enough, comrades, I do not believe it is sufficient to already be followers of Mariátegui. Is Caro not made into a standard? And they have pretended to publish a work by Caro. I was asked to write its prologue. I read it and said, "Yes, this is published but with clarifications because here there are things which go against Marxism," whoever has read it—because afterward they published it with a prologue by Pedro García, Sergio's brother, read it then—and there there are anti-Marxist positions. Professor Caro's position, what was it? That then, also that of justifying.

In the Second Plenum, when we separated from Paredes, they participated, and here there are persons among us who were present at that event, after the political report was presented, what was Sergio's opinion? "The report is good, the problem is to see

[36]Red Library: *Acción Popular*, an electoral party in Peru.

whether it is correct"; how is that, did he argue, argue anything against it? Nothing. It has always been so. Did they understand fascism? They did not understand fascism, they understood fascism-repression. In the Third Plenum, when the struggle for the defense of the Party's life had already ended which was waged against "Paredism" which in essence was the defense of the Party because it is a struggle against liquidationism, they agglutinated themselves to the Generated Organisms; behind it what was there?: not wanting to link themselves to the masses. In the Fourth Plenum, the problem was the debate on fascism and corporativization and the problem of the Generated Organisms again, because despite there being an agreement they did not apply it; I refer to documents published in *Red Flag* no. 45, there they are, comrades. Don Sergio brought a whole pile of books to argue against fascism, corporativization, and the problem of the Generated Organisms. He tried through the simplest, Generated Organisms, reading the pertinent part on the Party in *Foundations of Leninism* by Comrade Stalin; it was enough to tell him "Continue reading further," he read further and there found what Stalin said, because there is the problem of transmission belts and the generation of apparatuses which the Party leads and controls. What did he argue? That a movement has no organic structuring. Is that true? It is complete nonsense, Engels clarified that in the last century when he analyzes the American movement. On fascism and corporativism he said nothing, what did the pile of books he brought serve him for? For nothing, because after all it was enough to tell him three reasons and they retreated more frightened than a flock of pigeons, they have always been so, when have they shown their faces? Never, what method did they have? Underhandedly, seeking persons individually to draw them out, to defame.

His "famous" document strengthen the Party,[37] a document we only came to know in the Fifth Plenum, year 1975, for it never reached the leadership, never reached, there is that we were in stability of capitalism, precisely wanting to base themselves on Mariátegui; but, let us think then, from where did Mariátegui take the problem of relative stability of capitalism? From Stalin's proposition, from the Communist International, from there it comes then, comrades, or do you forget that Mariátegui was in Europe? It could occur in that epoch but the Chairman has taught us that after World War II there is no stability; consequently, there being stability there is no revolutionary situation, therefore making the revolution does not fit. It is a central question in that document which is complemented by another, the "famous" summing-up of June 14 of the year 1972, I believe it was; what do they underpin in that document? Not centering on the peasantry as main force invoking the errors committed by some comrades in peasant work; because of errors committed in peasant work, could we not do it? Because of errors committed in people's war would one have to leave people's war?: an insanity.

[37]Red Library: Likely *Strengthen Our Ranks* (*Fortalecer nuestras filas*).

"Fascism is violence, it sweeps everything away, therefore one must wait for it to pass to be able to organize." Such foolishness. Fascism sweeps away what it can destroy, it is up to us to build apparatuses which it cannot destroy; the Communist International itself in the Seventh Congress puts the example of the Austrian comrades to us and tells us that it is feasible to work and develop and organize the masses under fascism and that it is even feasible to use legality or semi-legality, every opening the law gives. Has Chairman Mao not also taught us the same, to use laws, usages, and customs, every possible opening? It is in *Freely Expand the Anti-Japanese Forces and Resist the Onslaughts of the Anti-Communist Die-Hards*, point 6, volume 2. Clear things, comrades: terror of fascism.

How did they organize Party? In coteries, in seminars, taking militants from seminars is growing potatoes in flowerpots: absurd. Are those not their positions? Their incomprehension of Maoism, they never came to handle nor understand Chairman Mao Tse-tung, they always invoked Lenin, Bolshevism, their nickname "Bolsheviks." It is good for Chairman Mao to speak of Bolshevization, year 1938, but already in our times, in what we were discussing then, in the 1970s, with Mao Tse-tung Thought it no longer fit to propose Bolshevization, why? Marxism has been developed. And our Party in Chairman Mao Tse-tung's position and in a backward country is forged around the rifle; they, what did they want to center on? On newspaper, twisting what Lenin says. Lenin says the newspaper is like scaffolding to the building being constructed, but he does not tell us it is the building; wanting to reduce the Party to bringing out publications of 500 copies every certain months, or leaflets in a number of 250 for the CAO, can the masses be moved thus, can Party be constructed thus? For that reason they loved the Mariátegui Center for Intellectual Work,[38] because there they could meet well sheltered to orate and say nonsense. Of course, I had the occasion to attend once or several times, from time to time, when I was around here, I went to the Mariátegui Center for Intellectual Work meetings. There I have heard then the "great" theoretician Aragón, the one of the National University of Engineering—not Aragón of the Revolutionary Socialist Party-Marxist-Leninist, no, not that one—Aragón the engineer, the man who recommended studying the classics *Anti-Dühring* not comprehending the level of our class and doing it going far away, to there, read it. There they are painted then, that same "great theoretician," when he spoke of the classes in Peru, forgot the national bourgeoisie. We asked him a simple question, "And the national bourgeoisie, Mr. Aragón?" What was his response? "Excuse me, I have forgotten." Can one forget a class? It was not a forgetting because in the exposition on political line which Montañez made in D'Onofrio he also forgot the national bourgeoisie, for

[38]Red Library: Mariátegui Center for Intellectual Work (*Centro de Trabajo Intelectual Mariátegui*), CTIM for short.

although I was not present, it was recorded, I listened to it, because someone always records and he did not say "listen, stupidities and a half were said there." What type of Party, then, did they want? A Party of seminars and postpone mass work to the Greek calends, that is, to never; terror of mass work, plain example, Montañez, the eternal adviser, but who never showed his face. There are then clear situations which they have pretended———; in short, I do not want to tire you with that long situation.

But what happened after February 5, 1975? A meeting to which they convened their adherents, those whom they considered so, and there they laid questions against the Party's agreements; but we also had occasion to know the debate because the notes were delivered to us by Mr. Arroyo. And where did Sergio end up? He became frightened and did not stop until Colombia, there he resides and from time to time comes around here to see how Lima is, the city also then of the lattices, Ricardo Palma's adorer then. Thus, he fled the Party to avoid giving the struggle, to avoid airing his foolish thesis of the polar contradiction which is expressed only in the final part of the democratic revolution when the enemy classes join together and all pass to being main enemies, that is the three mountains are already combated unitedly to crush them because it is the final part, and at the opposite pole the people are grouped with the proletariat at the head under the Party's leadership; that was his thesis and was that not what Comrade Nicolás published in———thinking it a "great contribution" and is that not Paredes's position which is in the documents of refutation of Sotomayor? Yes it is the same, is it perhaps not to propose people's democratic revolution and is that not Paredes's thesis, confusing moments, what afterward "Red Homeland" is going to repeat? So he had problems about ideology, about Mao Tse-tung Thought—as was then said—about Mariátegui; I have never heard them give a conference, an intervention on Mariátegui, I have heard them recite phrases of Mariátegui, we have taught them what Mariátegui is (…)

Mariátegui's Thought, if they were the Mariáteguists why did they not dare to expound it? They had then problems about ideology, about Mariátegui, about Party, about masses, about the revolution; behind it they conceived socialist revolution, that implies denying national bourgeoisie, in vain you ring out democratic if you blow away national bourgeoisie. Even in prison, what happened with Sergio?: first his stupid fall, because it was stupid, through strange and alien problems, being well sheltered a person was followed and they found him, stupid situation; and when he was detained, was pressure on his companion not enough for him to accept everything, what example is that of a person in leadership, a member of the Standing Committee? Thus, he fled the Party. Afterward, the "great clandestine one," who understood clandestinity as saving his hide and his person, like Montañez appearing condemning us when the genocide was produced; that letter which circulated, I believe we all recall very well, is signed with

his name and two surnames, he will not be able to deny it; and has he not repeated the same in *Change*, even in *The Daily*?[39] What means does he have today then? Some cheap, foolish speculations about Peruvian history, he is becoming Incaist; a socialist camp exists, is the USSR socialist? Go see then where he has ended up!

The other, Montañez, another of that gang, of the group called "Bolshevik," did he perhaps not oppose the reconstitution of the Party here in Lima in 1975? Of course, did he perhaps not sabotage the reorderings, did he perhaps not invent a false nonexistent cell and one of the persons unmasked him saying "But I am not a member of any cell, when have you organized me?" They had those tricks then, frauds and cunning ones, liars. The "specialist in mass work" who proposed that the CGTP which Mariátegui founded disappeared through fascism's blows not seeing that it disappeared because it abandoned the General Political Line established by Mariátegui, consistent with his criterion of "Fascism sweeps everything away," because Sánchez Cerro then was fascist. The "specialist in women's work," I do not know where it came to him to defend stupidities of liberation of women when our thesis is the emancipation of women; the first is bourgeois, however much it appears in a *Peking Review*, but recall well that in the next *Peking Review* an article on emancipation of women comes out: the two-line struggle in China was expressed then. Always acting as what he was not: member of the bureau. Fully in agreement with the preparation of the Fifth Plenum of the Central Committee but which he did not attend despite being summoned; rather he sent a letter proposing his withdrawal from the Party and returning documents—there is where that famous document of strengthening the Party by the "great" Sergio arrived—. He fled then.

The other, adorer of Mariátegui also, Rojas, brother of Sergio, Rojas, fled the Second Plenum of the Central Committee because the question of the initiation of armed struggle was going to be approved. What had happened? He led the regional of the south and there, with his Felipillo what did they disseminate? That initiating armed struggle would lead to destruction and he sent a letter—with the turtle mail we have it did not arrive opportunely—and he delivered so that it be reflected upon, the booklet *On Guerrilla Warfare in Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin*, published by the USSR around the 1960s, with underlinings. What did he underline? In Lenin's work, *Guerrilla Warfare*, he underlined: "In those conditions the Party is destroyed," it is what he underlined but he did not read the whole text through being stupid, because Lenin says that he

[39]Red Library: "*The Daily* (*El Diario*): A Historic Necessity in Service of the People," a revolutionary newspaper active in the 1980s; conducted the *Interview with Chairman Gonzalo*. Chairman Gonzalo: "*The Daily* [*El Diario*] is a trench of combat and today the only tribune that really serves the people."—Central Committee of the Communist Party of Peru, *Interview with Chairman Gonzalo* (July 1988).

is for guerrilla warfare and understood as actions of guerrilla warfare those which the Latvian Party, that of Latvia, did, for example, liberation of political prisoners or expropriations from the reactionaries which is what that Party did then; Lenin says, the Party which is prepared carries that forward, but the guerrilla actions carried forward have repercussions, destroy when the Party is not prepared. The problem was not then in Lenin, it was in his head; his positions were beaten and one must recall that he was the gonfalon which hoisted the black flag chosen and supported by the clan, one must recall well then. The struggle developing he was enjoined not to abandon the session, because then we met and the meeting was dissolved at night to continue it the next day, he was enjoined at the meeting, he was a member of the Standing Committee, he committed himself not to abandon but the next day did not arrive; and why did he not arrive? Because the letter he had sent from Puno had arrived and in the letter he said that making armed struggle would be generations—three generations which have to die—what is generations after generations? A generation is thirty years on average, they are several, let us put three: ninety years. He had then terror of armed struggle, that was it, for that reason he fled, because he could never defend positions. One must recall that when on June 7, 1979, in the Ninth Plenum, the banner of initiating armed struggle was proposed, what did that member of the Standing Committee speak of then? He spoke nonsense about Mariátegui, nonsense, why? Because he spoke of "his freedom" to adjust himself to the Party he and his freedom, when the problem in discussion was to initiate armed struggle, and invoked phrases of Mariátegui, nonsensical ones—which had nothing to do with Rojas nonsense—has it not been so? He too fled.

The other clever one, who is making the world revolution in Mexico today, intriguing, careerist, she only repeated, liked display, shine, to stand out and sow discord, specialist in rebosarías, in speaking behind backs, was that not Ondina? She believed herself a queen and did not want to present her letter, as all did, so that her militancy be seen because she pretended to invoke a militancy she never had. She has never been a militant, she falsified, said she was a member of a cell which I just told you one of its members said we have never been assembled as such. What cell do they speak of? Also then, she ended up fleeing.

Left liquidationism, what does it imply? Annihilating the Party, but the reverse of the others who seek to legalize all Party work; left liquidationism seeks to annihilate the Party enclosing it in itself. That is the problem of left liquidationism, an entryist group and entryism was already analyzed and condemned by Marx when he treated the problem of the anarchists.

"The Right Opportunist Line opposed to the initiation of the armed struggle." It is enough to recall, because we have treated this several times, it is the line which

arises in the Sixth Plenum of the Central Committee of the end of 1976, it occurs in countryside and city. In countryside the old Encina sustained—who called herself the old "insignia," she always confused, confused Encina with insignia, errors are not accidental, more if repeated—what was her thesis?: Velasco has delivered land to the peasants, the problem is that now he is concentrating, one must develop armed struggle starting from the problems most felt by the peasantry and the masses,——— bra empty in general, clumsy, because there is a central problem in the countryside and it is land, it is the motor of class struggle in the countryside; she said, armed struggle must be made around the Peasant Confederation of Peru. What can one see? The Peasant Confederation of Peru leading, today she would say Letts's National Unitary Agrarian Council[40] leading armed struggle, absurd then, comrades, complete foolishness, another version of what Ravines said: "Organize around the CGTP." Its brilliant theories that roads bring progress, one must avail oneself of government help, were they not its propositions? In city; a workerism, a guildism, they only wanted to do work in unions, to help unions in their struggles but not for Party and less to support the struggle in the countryside. Its clearest expression: Arroyo, he took himself off from the Party because some peasants were killed—Velásquez student of saint Martín de Porres—he panicked, and what did he say, crying? "I withdraw because now I have to concern myself with milk, I am going to be a father," nonsense. Thus is how the line begins to develop and it is that which is going to unfold up to the Ninth Plenum, passing through the Eighth where the Right Opportunist Line is structured and it is in the Ninth where the battle occurs, first against the Right Opportunist Line, then against a new rightist line and finally contradictions in the left; it is there when there was the expulsion of more than half the members of the Central Committee and the purging of the whole Party. That is what is referred to when "Right Opportunist Line opposed to the initiation of the armed struggle" is said.

Well, the document tells us: "Without struggle, Gonzalo Thought could not have developed; and his remarkable handling of the two-line struggle in the Party is a fundamental question that we must study and learn" this is the main thing. One must learn to handle the two-line struggle and one must study the two-line struggle; it is a gross error, comrades, not to develop it and developing it one must do so in a sagacious, firm, and correct form, one must never despair, first question, never despair in the two-line struggle.

The document continues saying: "Studying and principally applying Gonzalo Thought is decisive in order to serve more and better the Party, the development of the People's War, and the world proletarian revolution; as well as learning from Chairman Gonzalo

[40]Red Library: *Consejo Unitario Nacional Agrario* (CUNA), a Peruvian coordinating body for peasant and agricultural organizations. Ricardo Letts Colmenares was its president.

is decisive in order to serve the people wholeheartedly." In the first one must center on "principally applying Gonzalo Thought" because between studying and applying the main thing is to apply; and "learning from Chairman Gonzalo" is an agreement of the Second National Conference, what is proposed here is that "it is decisive to serve the people wholeheartedly," what Chairman Mao has taught us. That is on the document, comrades.

There are some criteria which have been proposed on Gonzalo Thought. "One more thought" implies that there are others or implies a thing without importance. I believe what has been aired erases this nonsense.

"It will impose itself in the future," an ambiguous phrase, essence: denies that it governs, exists, and commands in the Party and that it is the specific guide of our action.

"The highest fusion." No other fusion of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism with our concrete reality exists. Otherwise, propose it. Which fusion? That of Mariátegui could not be because it is of Marxism-Leninism with concrete reality and it has been Chairman Gonzalo who has established the similarities between some of Mariátegui's theses and the laws established by Chairman Mao Tse-tung. There is a difference between laws and theses because nobody is going to pretend, it would be absurd, to put the founder of the Party at the height of Chairman Mao Tse-tung (which is universal development). That would have neither feet nor head. There is a confusion which what it does is revive situations already aired.

"That it self-values." Who, the one speaking, the Party? The first is not true, the second infamous! Because the Party does not self-value; nobody in these lands nor in our America has begun nor develops a people's war; only the Communist Party of Peru. That the one speaking self-values, I believe it is a bastard personalist vision of bourgeois root of those who see everything through the individual, who center on individual counterposing to mass, who do not understand that it is the mass who makes history and that it is a revisionist theory to propose that individual makes history because it is bourgeoisie of ancient lineage and it is also revisionism to sustain that masses or individuals make history which is Liu Shao-chi's black revisionist vision. A communist never proposes things so, because everything we communists do, small, medium, or large is not for us as individuals, it is for the Party and is its property, nobody else's, it is the Party's.

"That he does not establish line nor is chairman." Well, considering who it comes from, who has loose screws in the head. I believe that has already been crushed, there is no need to insist; and it has also been criticized and the person or the comrade who has proposed that has self-criticized: I have nothing more to say about this. "Cult of personality." Well, rotten Khrushchevist, revisionist position, which is utilized to

combat leaders and heads and principally leadership. In determined circumstances one must speak much of the leadership or of whoever heads a Party because representing it he becomes even a symbol; if that is not understood nothing of what revolution is is understood. I abide by and I am saying applying what Chairman Mao says (…)

But this theory of bourgeois root has as its essence then the individual, that individuals seek their own presence because the thief believes all are of his condition, it is the criterion of undermining head to bring down Party, reason: whoever heads a Party in the just and correct line is a barrier against the appetites and against the usurpation of opportunists and revisionists. For that reason they elaborate those black theories of cult of personality. Well, "that he is a historian" I take it ironically as one more title and thank him without any————obviously; I like it because thus one pretends to evade the fundamental. Don Roberto cannot do that, he has too much time and gray hairs are not combed in vain, one must tell him not to deny his condition and that it be clear he is losing the course.

"Guiding thought." Several comrades reiterate this, "guiding thought," "guiding thought," it slips out of them, it slips out of them, it slips out of them, why does it slip out then? Because they do not understand the process nor understand the leap and because you are not seeing reality, that is the problem. Some endure only up to "guiding thought," why? They think; if Gonzalo Thought is established the leadership was affirmed and then how do I stand? I have no little space, what is my historical role? Strive then! And history will tell.

I already believe I spoke of "Chairman Gonzalo sustains Gonzalo Thought." . . . It will be because thought is elaborated in the head. This is a crude anatomical interpretation on which I believe insistence is not deserved, we have already spoken too much I believe.

"Integrate theory and practice," we have already referred to it.

"Counterpose Chairman Gonzalo with Mariátegui, Chairman Gonzalo with Chairman Mao Tse-tung." Comrades, first: it is absurd to compare historical figures, historical persons; each one of us unfolds in a different and precise historical context. We could never counterpose our glorious founder Marx with Lenin nor with Chairman Mao, nor those two with the first, nor with one another, never, I speak of facts; because counterposing the one speaking with Chairman Mao, please! It seems to me a joke of the worst and stupid taste, how to counterpose a specification to a country with the highest summit of the universal ideology, how? That makes no sense, comrades, that really does not deserve even thinking about. Counterposing Chairman Gonzalo with Mariátegui I believe is the same but on a different plane because it is not universal thought being treated. In the case of the founder, the founder of the Party,

Mariátegui—and once again: not the *amauta* Mariátegui; *amauta* is the title, I believe, they give when they give teaching palms, they want to identify Mariátegui with the magazine *Amauta*, what stupidity! Think well who do that and who say so. Mariátegui is not *Amauta*. The founder has a fulfilled historical role, nobody can erase it, neither today nor tomorrow nor ever! He acted in a determined concrete circumstance, in a span, unfortunately for us, very short, but if he lived, neither was it because his physical frailty was utilized to the extreme to give us a Party, which is the most glorious thing he has done. Such counterposition does not fit then, comrades.

Then, here what must be seen is another question of substance: it is wanting to raise Mariátegui to oppose, today concretely, Gonzalo Thought. It is not to understand that in the world there is Maoism, not to understand that in the world there have been transcendental facts like the Second World War, Chinese Revolution, powerful national liberation movement, great proletarian cultural revolution, struggle between Marxism and revisionism, that this is higher than the previous one—that waged against old revisionism—it is not to see that in the country bureaucrat-capitalism has developed fundamentally and that is not in Mariátegui. I have said that there there is a root; if it is there, I ask why do others not propose it then? It is that only starting from Chairman Mao Tse-tung at least I have comprehended what bureaucrat-capitalism is, more, I am conscious, comrades, I have studied Mariátegui, of course I have studied him, but many times I have said and I reiterate, I have valued Mariátegui more knowing Chairman Mao Tse-tung. When I had the good luck to be in that glorious school of the Communist Party of China, there I comprehended that the question was application and that we found that application in Mariátegui; I have been, comrades, in 1965 in China and in March of 1966 I write that one must retake the road of Mariátegui, that it must never have been abandoned, but that it must be developed. I believe concerning the founder, as far as I am concerned, what his thought is has deserved and deserves serious study from me, because I have sustained that Mariátegui is not a legacy as Paredes said, he is a thought; when in 1967 I propose in *Deepen and Intensify the Internal Struggle in Revolutionary Practice* there is the basis of unity, but my idea and which I have always defended is this, that the basis of unity then was Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, Mariátegui Thought, and General Political Line—not the line of the Fifth Conference and if the official document says something else it is because such was the conference's agreement—. For me, Mariátegui is thought, it is not simply Mariátegui, with that we get nowhere, comrades, put it in your heads then that our founder was a thought on fusing Marxism-Leninism with our specific reality. And understand well that he comprehended things which the Communist International, or at least the South American bureau and the representatives of the Communist International who were there, did not understand the founder's theses, and that there

is an imbecile called Peters[41] who attacks them dogmatically and foolishly, particularly what does he attack in Mariátegui? The problem of nationality proposing that Quechua and Aymara autonomy must be applied,[42] he questions the problem of races proposed by Mariátegui; so senseless was the attack that the representative of the Communist International, a Comrade Luis, says that the debate must be settled, we do not know well how America is, they know better than we, it is better to study that—I refer to the Buenos Aires meeting—.

Much has been spoken of the founder, much has been said, but what his General Political Line is has never been proposed; the Sixth Conference gives to understand—even shamelessly—that Mariátegui was to blame for dying without leaving us a line, complete stupidity; at the Fifth Conference, Mr. Paredes mechanically copies *The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party*[43] and presents that as the General Political Line, but it was only agreed upon as the line of the Fifth Conference, because we well know there was. Although the founder specifically did not draft a General Political Line, from the study of his theoretical-practical work, of writings, of their original versions, not of the distortions which circulate, one can extract and we have extracted Mariátegui's General Political Line in five points which are the five we now propose already more developed, and introducing Military Line; yes then, comrades, or tell me where is Mariátegui's line? Del Prado wrote a work, read it, it is called *Mariátegui and His Work*, it is a crude distortion of Mariátegui, there even what the founder gives to understand is denied, gives to understand because he does not say it expressly—except the problem of race—that the revolution must come from countryside to city; and those ideas which some comrades sustained around the 1940s are labeled Trotskyism by that impenitent revisionist del Prado. We have analyzed and refuted Jorge Núñez Valdivia's positions, a fatuous one who for having made index cards of *Capital*, believed he knew Marxism, who was the one who for the first time denied that Mariátegui was Marxist. We have sustained the reconstitution of the Party, of what Party? The document itself says it, of that which Mariátegui founded in 1928, because this is its

[41]Red Library: "Peters" was the pseudonym of Zacharij Mijailovich Rabinovich (1903-1941), a representative of the Young Communist International to the South American Secretariat of the Communist International.

[42]Red Library: "It is important to avoid some errors in posing the problem of the Indians, such as considering this problem only as a cultural or racial problem, as the petty-bourgeois 'defenders' of the 'Indigenous race' do. The Peruvian comrades, with good reason, have reacted against this idealistic and petty bourgeois conception, specifying the agrarian base, the *class base* of this problem. But in this reaction from this correct point of view, it seems to me that they have fallen into the opposite error: that of *denying the national character* of the Indigenous struggle."—Peters, in *The Latin American Revolutionary Movement: Proceedings of the First Latin American Communist Conference, June 1929* (Koninklijke Brill NV, 2023), edited and translated by Marc Becker, 543.

[43]Red Library: Mao Tse-tung, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party" (December 1939), in *Selected Works*, vol. 2 (Foreign Languages Press, 1967), 305-34.

continuation however much it is a Party of a new type, because it is Maoist, it is, but it is a continuation of that which Mariátegui founded, just as Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is a continuation of Marxism-Leninism; but we have explained several times that through ill-fated luck it fell to us that Mariátegui died less than two years after the Party was founded and in two years a Party does not set as a Party of a new type, it is enough to recall that the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party founded in 1898 sets as a Party with capacity for real, effective action, opening a field to the revolution in 1972, having a giant like Lenin at the head; one must know well that few cells obeyed our founder and that the cell of Cusco, through that cheap Incaist nationalism they have, through that foolish pride they have of outdated regionalism, dared to disown Mariátegui, and affiliated itself, not to the Party founded by him, but to the South American bureau, did you know it? How many times we have treated it! How then to ask that the founder give us a Party already set? He did enough in ten years more or less, from 1918 to 1928, because I sustain, and prove it, that Mariátegui was Marxist before going to Europe, it is not as they say that he became Marxist in Europe, that is not true.

Consequently, comrades, although there are other reasons on which I need not elaborate at these moments, it seems to me that it is absurd. First, wanting to counterpose the one speaking with the founder whose place is already defined forever because he already died; and in second place, it is outdated in the Party, unfounded, rightist, and it has always been, to invoke him, uphold him as an icon, bastardizing him, to oppose the development of the General Political Line, the establishment of a General Political Line of the revolution, which although linked to Mariátegui's, takes into account Maoism, the important world facts and the process of the country from 1930 to the present, which are fifty-six years. It seems to me, as we cannot permit nor continue already with rehashes nor can we…… simply continue launching empty phrases, launch empty barrels without rhyme or reason. Wanting to remain in Mariátegui is an absurdity, it is to deny reality, it is to deny the development of Marxism-Leninism made by Chairman Mao Tse-tung, it is to deny the development of the revolution in the country and it is to deny what has cost the Party so much; we cannot continue with those monomanias, that, comrades, are outdated stirrings of already rotten foods, that is part of the dregs already eliminated, part of the mud we have already swept away. I believe we must understand things very well. Mariátegui is Mariátegui, his role, historically is already defined I reiterate, undeniable, but that cannot lead us to remain in 1930; let us not deny what we are doing, let us not deny the Party, let us not deny the People's War, let us not deny New Power, let us not deny the perspective opened for our class and our people, let us not deny service to the world revolution. I affirm: the Party has never assumed arms as we have done starting from 1980, nor had the prestige it has today nor has it shaken the country so much with its rotten order and its obsolete

State, nor has it sounded so high in the world sowing hope for others. Comrades, we must be conscious, comprehend things well, and not launch muds already finished.

(Well, excuse me, but we have to proceed, comrades. We have to proceed because today this point must be ended. I know attention lowers, we tire but for that we have ideology.)[44]

[44]Red Library: Chairman Gonzalo then delivers his intervention regarding *Program and Statutes*. https://redlibrary.info/works/pcp/chairman-gonzalos-intervention-regarding-program-and-statutes.pdf.