

Speech on the Document “Concerning Gonzalo Thought”^{*†‡}

Chairman Gonzalo

1988

Concerning Gonzalo Thought has an introductory part, although it is not expressed, it is an introduction and then there are five problems.

Let’s look at this introductory part. It says: “All revolutions, in their process of development, through the struggle of the proletariat as the leading class and, above all, the struggle of the Communist Party that raises their unrenounceable class interests, give rise to a group of great leaders and mainly one who represents and leads it, a Great Leader with acknowledged authority and influence. In our reality this has taken shape, on account of historical necessity and coincidence, in Chairman Gonzalo, Great Leader of the Party and the revolution.”

It refers to great leaders and if we take into account what Lenin established in *‘Left-Wing’ Communism: An Infantile Disorder* in relation to masses, Party and great leaders; but it is not as the Comrades say that this is the thesis of Lenin, it is not so Comrades, they have not read Lenin well, it is necessary to read Lenin well, to know him well. If you think carefully, here is specified the problem of revolution, ruling class (proletariat) and Party, the three things he is specifying; that is what must be taken into account. We recommend Comrades, we must read well, study and think, striving for the greatest objectivity in order to understand what the document says, not what one has in one’s head; that what one has in one’s head disturbs, understandable, but we have the need, the obligation to be objective, we must

*English Translation from: <https://germinalbooks.wordpress.com/2021/12/28/278/>, *Selected Readings from the Works of Gonzalo*.

†Concerning Gonzalo Thought: <https://redlibrary.xyz/works/pcp/fundamental-documents.pdf>

‡Speech by Chairman Gonzalo at the I Congress of the Communist Party of Peru.

combat subjectivism, it is very important, therefore, pay attention to that, Comrades. There are three questions that are invoked: revolution, proletarian ruling class and Party, the action of the three, that is what it says; these three questions generate great leaders.

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

In our Party we have established many years ago a relationship between masses, cadres and leaders with a proportion; that proportion given the great growth of the Party, of fighters and masses that work more closely with us has unbalanced that proportion and from there derives the need to worry a lot about increasing militancy but without forgetting a good selection, which is possible because having more access to the masses, there will be more candidates on which 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, of about 75 leaders to make the Party march, but the Party today is many times bigger 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, I do not believe that you have a great memory; Comrades, some here believe that what is said is for nothing, then they do not know what to broadcast or they broadcast nonsense and they do it late and badly; we are in Congress and the attention must be very high, we are all tired, understandable, but it does not count, the obligation counts; well, excuse this intermission but it is necessary, Comrades if you compare that in 1976 we needed 75 leaders, how many will we need today, do you understand? And mainly what, we need a Central Committee with an adequate number, and a good Central Committee, well versed in Party politics; that has to make an effort to study the theory in the books or texts that the Party indicates, not in others, Comrades, because in that way we break the unitary formation that we must have; these are questions that we must think seriously. Any revolution that is seen shows that only in decades a number of great leaders are 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 great leaders and

we have a Stalin, we have a Sverdlov, a Dzerzhinsky, a (...) to highlight real great leaders, few; the Chinese Revolution is similar.

But the main thing is that a Great 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 by the will of anyone, *it is the very reality of the revolution, of the class and of the Party*, which demand and promote this conformation. If we speak of a Great Leader, we have for example Marx, a notoriously outstanding Great Leader, a summit. If we speak of the great Lenin, *there is another Great Leader of recognized authority and 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 the specific position of General Secretary because there was no such thing, it was – I repeat – that the General Secretariat in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) arose precisely by Lenin’s own proposal, and in him is also expressed a glorious summit. Or in the case of China, Chairman Mao Zedong; obviously none of the great leaders generated by the Chinese Revolution can equal Chairman Mao Zedong, none of them, and in him we also have a glorious summit.

These are the three greatest leaders of the World Revolution, because that is their dimension; that they were also Great Leaders of their Parties and of their concrete revolution is subsidiary because *the main thing is that they have been Great Leaders of the World Revolution* and have established for us, then, the great process of the development of Marxism, shaping Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. On another level, without pretending in any way to compare, there would be no reason, but to show that *every revolution needs a head*, think for example of Albania itself – I do not intend to relieve those figures but even in those revolutions there must be a head – Hoxha in Albania; Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam; Kim Il-Sung with all his rotten idea of reign, was the head, that is the problem. So it always happens, there is nothing strange about it, but *it is a necessity; Engels already insisted on this and told us that even a literary movement has a head that represents it*.

The problem lies in the definition of a Great Leadership with “acknowledged authority and influence.” *Are they unquestionable authorities? Yes, for the red line, but that they are questioned and denied, bread and butter.*

Was not the leadership of Marx denied, questioned, and even vilified by a miserable creeping servant of the Tsar like Bakunin or by an “academic scholar,” full of ideas that he could not even manage to understand, like Dühring, who said that our glorious founder Marx, said that he was a Prus-

sian soul and of a Chinese knowledge, so did not say that individual whose name is only remembered because it is in a work by Engels? Was Lenin questioned or not? Of course; how many times did Trotsky's gymnastics fight against Lenin, how many times did he deny him? One should not be fooled by that gross misrepresentation which proclaims that Trotsky was a Leninist, Lenin himself described him as a Menshevik gymnast, a late Bolshevik, who jumped on the bandwagon; one of the things for which Trotsky fell silent at the death of the great Lenin, when it was necessary to select the General Secretary and, obviously, with all the limitations that Lenin himself pointed out, it was up to Stalin, who was a real and authentic Bolshevik, to exercise it, one of the things that led Trotsky to keep silent and to be mute at the Congress where the Great Leadership and the recognition as Secretary of Comrade Stalin was agreed upon was the fear that Trotsky had that the letters in which he attacked and denigrated Stalin would be taken out, we must not forget that, Comrades; and I bring this up because the Trotskyists are very much like fools and want to pull the wool over our eyes, and today they continue to do so, 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. Did not Zinoviev also attack Lenin? Did not Kamenev and several others even say that Lenin was mad when he proposed to prepare the October Revolution and even went so far as to denounce it? These are realities Comrades.

And in the case of the Great Leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong, the struggle was even more fierce; that struggle, as it is said in the history of the Communist Party of China (CPCh), the struggle against the 28 and a half Bolsheviks, those who had learned in Moscow and wanted simply to apply Marxism-Leninism to China strictly, mechanically; was not Chang Kuo-tao himself a student who became a Communist and believed himself called to great destinies and even dared to pressure the Central Committee to recognize him as General Secretary, thus denying Chairman Mao Zedong whose leadership had been recognized in the year 1935 in Tsunyi? These are facts, Comrades; Liu Shaoqi himself, who for a time supported Chairman Mao Zedong, did he not become a denier of the Chairman? Or Deng Xiaoping, has he not even developed a personal hatred against Chairman Mao Zedong? And even Zhou Enlai himself, in the first part, up to the year 1935, did he not fight the ideas of the Chairman and deny Chairman Mao Zedong, did he not label him as a peasant and even, in an absurd criterion, did he not call him a rightist? These are things to remember. Great Leadership is recognized in

the midst of intense struggles.

(...)

It can therefore never draw attention to the fact that there are problems around Great Leadership. And it is in every Party where such a problem is aired; but *notwithstanding this, the objective reality itself generates great leaders and a Great Leader, mainly a Great Leader who becomes even a symbol of a revolution*, or a world one in the case of a Marx, a Lenin, a Chairman Mao Zedong. An example can show this condition in which sometimes we do not think and do not see: the prisoners of war in the Spanish civil revolution, did they not reanimate their optimism and reanimate it by simply seeing a Lenin's insignia, as Marcos Aria himself says, even he says so, and he is a revisionist.

These are things that we must understand and it is time that, mainly the great leaders, we understand things because, Comrades, it is in the great leaders where especially these problems occur because there are those who believe they are called to great destinies and do not even know how to measure their capacities nor know their limitations and are not capable of seeing the objective, what they have rubbing their own noses in it; I am speaking of historical facts, Comrades, I am not speaking of eagerness, I am speaking of historical facts. The problem is not simply to have read or repeated, the problem will always be to apply and therefore to understand. *We believe that this is important.*

Also in this first paragraph, we must emphasize how Chairman Gonzalo has become the Great Leader of the Party and of the revolution... Here it is good to emphasize this point of historical necessity and coincidence, a point that is misunderstood and misrepresented; for example, the Comrades prisoners of war have made a ruckus, a jumble about this problem, when it is clear and simple, I am referring to what is called necessity and coincidence in Marxism.

Engels dealt with 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 means, independently of the individual will of people; necessity, philosophically speaking, is what has to be fulfilled, the law that has to govern, that means necessity. In social and literary processes, for example, there is a need for someone to lead a movement, to be the head of a school; if one sees, for example, the formation of the Spanish language, which is the one we speak, was concretized in a Cervantes, or can that be denied, it had to have someone to shape it, to

establish its rules, to lead the management of the language, as in Italy it is Dante – not the Dante, as they say, it is just Dante – there you have an example even in the literary world. In the scientific world, contemporary physics is made up of a group of notable theoreticians, and yet it needed someone to lead it in the understanding of the macrocosm: Einstein, it is undeniable, it was necessary for someone to lead that, it is a whole different way, he takes a great step in the physical understanding of the world; or in the understanding of the microcosm a Planck who opens a new world in physical science; it was necessary, the law demanded by necessity that someone lead the movement. Or in a revolutionary struggle as they are in the examples ventilated in Marxism; the French Revolution necessarily had to have a head, for example Robespierre, so it is. Engels said, then, every movement at whatever level must have a head, but it is a general law and as such it is necessarily fulfilled.

Whereas coincidence – which is the most precise name because sometimes I use chance, which is too imprecise, however it can occur, Comrades, but the term is coincidence – *coincidence*, Engels said, *is nothing more than how necessity comes into being in certain circumstances, specifying a character, taking shape in a person*. The example of physics comes back, there it is proved, once again, how it always generates opportunely the men that the society needs to develop a field of its development (do not worry to put the names because they are sometimes complicated and difficult), if one looks at physics in the 20th Century, we have an Edington, a Sommerfeld, a Planck, we have a Schwinger, a Heisenberg, a Schrödinger, a De Broglia, a multitude of very remarkable physicists; any of them, if it had not been Einstein, would have come to establish relativity, so it is said in physics for example, if one reviews any history of physics one finds that, but chance, circumstances specified that it was Einstein.

That is how necessity is understood, as a law and chance as a concretion of that law and that is how the heads establish it, that is how the great leaders and a Great Leadership are established. The problem is simple and clear; the confusion derives on the one hand, from the lack of knowledge or from the imprecision of knowledge, from the confusion that one has, apart from the struggles in which such a situation is defined. I give you a historical example, of science, and I appeal to science because in science there are some very special conditions, however, there is also in the midst of disputes, for example, who created or discovered the infinitesimal calculus, Newton or Leibniz, a dispute for centuries and it is still being discussed, a conclusion

has already been reached; in that case, for example, both discovered independently; however, the followers have fought 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 best notation was that of Newton, that is why the one he established is used. There you have it, even in science, where apparently there should not be such contentions, but everything is contradiction.

In any human activity, consequently, wherever the axes are placed, every school, every development needs a head and a Great Leadership and around that Great Leadership there is contention, but a Great Leadership is specified by historical necessity and coincidence. And in our case, in our Party it has been specified in Chairman Gonzalo; we can like or dislike him, Comrades, I dislike the summer but it does not pay attention to me, it continues to develop, do you understand 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 social laws are as much laws as physical laws.

Well, how is the Great Leadership specified here: “Great Leader of the Party and of the revolution.” It is not an ambiguity, why, what are we talking about, what are we dealing with, of the Fundamental Documents of the Party, consequently of the Peruvian Revolution, that is how we have to understand what it says here; we know well that outside they will say other things, it will be their problem, not ours. The Great Leadership was established, recognized – because that is what is appropriate with a Great Leadership, to recognize it – in the Enlarged National Conference of 1979, in struggle, where two factions contended; one, that the Great Leadership was that of Chairman Gonzalo and that this had to be recognized; another, invoking Mariátegui, I stress, invoking, is that one of the “defenders of Mariátegui,” as he himself said and expressed his thought, the Lima of the balconies and the colonies, what a way of seeing Lima! For a Communist position, it is good for a poem by Don José Gálvez but not for a Communist, and after all, those who invoked Mariátegui did not even know him and were 50 years behind; they are facts, Comrades, that is what we are talking about. Perhaps we should ask ourselves, did Mariátegui usurp or was he recognized as a Great Leader, have you ever heard that? No, and why, have you asked yourselves, he did not have time, we must never forget that the founder of the Party died less than two years after the Party was founded; that is why you will never find any document that says Mariátegui’s Great Leadership, who was to blame? It is therefore the concrete situations that were expressed in the reality of

the country.

The second paragraph tells us: “Moreover, and this is the basis upon which all leadership is formed, revolutions give rise to a Thought that guides them, which is 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 in order to understand well and not to make mistakes is that a Great Leadership is based on a Guiding Thought, on an application, requiring time for a Great Leadership to be recognized. It is not as it is said that the Great Leadership sustains Gonzalo Thought, it is absurd, Comrades; on the contrary, that is what the document says very clearly, because it could not be understood in any other way; the Comrades, how do they think, believe that Thought is a washroom, that the Great Leadership sustains it, how absurd, it is sustained, it is based on a Thought, otherwise there is no Great Leadership; that is what we must see and that is clearly stated here.

Then it tells us: “(...) a Guiding Thought indispensable to reach victory and to conquer political power and, moreover, to continue the revolution and to maintain the course always towards the only, great goal: Communism.” What function does a Guiding Thought fulfill, that is what is clarified here, what is it for and it says: “indispensable to reach victory and conquer political power,” without it, do not even dream of conquering power, otherwise, take a single case, there is none, Comrades; but moreover, what is it for, “to continue the revolution and to 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 slowed down, hindered, unnecessarily dilated and can lead to great defeats, which will demand new and more incessant and redoubled efforts to continue struggling and fighting for the revolution, for the conquest of power and for the goal, why, the revolution is uncontrollable, but the Guiding Thought fulfills a function, a necessity.

It goes on to say: “(...) a Guiding Thought that, arriving at a qualitative leap of decisive importance for the revolutionary process which it leads, identifies itself with the name of the one who shaped it theoretically and practically.” Let us understand well, we cannot continue with the absurdity of bourgeois empiricism of the 18th Century, anti-Marxist, of separating theory from practice, it is to deny that practice is the source of knowledge. Do we not know that without practice there is no knowledge, we do not understand that, what do we understand then, nothing, is it not the starting point of differentiation between Marxism and bourgeois position, is it not perhaps

the first of the theses established by Marx on Feuerbach?

(...)

They foolishly throw themselves against principles and historical realities that deny class, deny ideology, that is the ABC of Marxism. Here the remarkable thing is that a moment of “qualitative leap of decisive importance for a revolution” is coming. What is our situation, because now Gonzalo Thought is being raised? Because we are in a qualitative, decisive leap, or a Congress, is this Congress not implying the balance of what has been done, is it not implying the establishment of the Base of Party Unity, is it not implying the laying of solid foundations for the conquest of power in the whole country, as a part of and serving of the World Revolution, do we not see the leap, are we so blind, so short-sighted, so stupid, politically speaking? Comrades, we can no longer allow in the Party such immaturity. A mature Party and the maturity of a Party is the consequence of a long historical process, it is not that of individuals; that is why they do not understand, they are confusing the maturity of the Party with their own individual immaturity, that is the concrete root that those who do not understand this problem have, it has personal roots in that aspect, it is their concreteness, their own reality that they never manage to see, why, they do not search, they do not think in depth, that is it Comrades. That is the reason why we are making this leap in the problem of Thought.

The document clearly states: “In our situation, this phenomenon specified itself first as Guiding Thought, then as Chairman Gonzalo’s Guiding Thought, and later as Gonzalo Thought.” Well, let us look for the Party, revolutionary, historical correlation of why these specifications were produced. Guiding Thought, 2nd National Conference when we prepared ourselves to generate a vacuum in the countryside and create New Power, that was the concrete historical foundation. The reference to Guiding Thought of Chairman Gonzalo, 1st Plenum of the Central Committee of the 3rd Conference, what was agreed there, “Great Leap,” within what plan, to conquer bases, important or not in the People’s War? Obviously, Comrades. There you have the correlation. Gonzalo Thought, I have already said why, it is not free elucubration. Please, Comrades, always think, meditate and refer the things that are raised to the Party circumstances, to the circumstances of the People’s War that is being carried out, to those of the Peruvian Revolution, to the needs of the class, of our people, or is it that they separate the Party from the class and the people, without this meaning that this vanguard – as some say – of the proletariat and the people, no, Comrades, the Party is the

vanguard of the proletariat, it is not of the people. Here is something else more remarkable.

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 which is guarantee of victory.” Is there or is there not the creative application, a little word that some do not like, is it mechanical, then, when it is simply said “application,” in some mouths! Not to say “creative” is to propose, because of what they think, mechanical, well, prove it, prove it, it is not a problem of regurgitation, confusion, that is not the problem, it is to see the history of our Party, the problems that it is solving. 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 that it is a personal problem and thus they subjectivize the revolution and turn it into a subjective reality, not an objective one. Comrades, it is fine for a Frondizi, for an idealist but not for a Marxist; to reduce a social problem to subjective questions may be fine for a Feuerbach, before Marx. That is what must be seen at the bottom of these things that are there; everything has its foundation, it is not a word written by chance, nor is it a word said unthinkingly, which does not express its errors because it is unthoughtful.

Well, the following paragraph says: “Gonzalo Thought has been forged through long years of intense, tenacious, and incessant struggle to uphold, defend and apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, to retake Mariátegui’s path and to develop it, to reconstitute the Party and, mainly, to initiate, maintain and develop the People’s War in Peru serving the World Revolution, and that Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism be, in theory and practice, its sole command and guide.” Here there are things that jump out that must be seriously reflected; in short, we have until August because now we only need to take a position and what we do is to give foundations because the comrades need it to be able to explain because it is understandable that there must be questions. First thing to emphasize here: It “has been forged through long years,” yes, through long years, it is not forged in one day or in two years or in three years, in long years! We will give you an example: when we had a meeting with the Comrades from Spain, when we saw the problem of Guiding Thought, of the Thought that we call Gonzalo Thought, Comrade Roberto who heads the Communist Party of Spain, he already believed that he was “Roberto Thought,” they had just been founded not even six months

ago and he already believed that he was “Roberto Thought”; it cannot be so, Comrades, how easy it would be, no, that way no Thought is generated anywhere on Earth, why? Everything has a process, absolutely everything, there is nothing that does not have a process, reason: because everything is contradiction and contradiction has a path, a process. Has it been intense, well, the struggles we have had, I think that proves it; tenacious, well, I think I have been persistent, otherwise we would not be talking today about Gonzalo Thought; incessant, of course, we must not falter, we must persist, continue, continue, continue, we must not get tired!

But about what things? The first thing it puts forward is to “Uphold, defend and apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism” and it is understandable, because if we do not start from the universal ideology, what application are we going to talk about, or are we going to create – by originality – another world outlook of the proletariat? In this we are consistent with the practice taught to us by Marx, Lenin and Mao and the great Marxists that have been on Earth and that the founder himself taught us, “the only way to be free and to create, is to take the conception of the proletariat as a dogma, understanding it as such” (...) Some people find it hard when they hear the word dogma in Marxism and I tell them that they have not read Lenin well; “our old dogma” and the specific, “our old inapplied principles,” I think we all understand that, it is confused, because the mind repeats “Lenin has said that it is not a dogma,” but there he refers to that there is no mechanical application, we must try to understand what Lenin says in each case and in each moment, we must not be content with repeating and with superficial appreciations; we have already seen how Chairman Mao Zedong can only be understood if we see as a unity all that he has done, Lenin the same and Marx, the same. That was then, Comrades. Without having done that, what application would there be, it would be a ridiculous joke, I think.

It says “to retake Mariátegui’s path and to develop it,” key: develop it. On this we have contended, Comrades, for many years in the Party; it fell to me to draft the document of the 19th Plenum of the Central Committee, in 1966, and there it is written, “Red Flag”¹ No. 18 – for the collectors – there it is written that Mariátegui’s path should never be abandoned, that it should be continued and developed; please remember how we have been

¹RedLibrary: “Red Flag” translates to “Bandera Roja,” this issue does not seem to be available online.

fought against. Of the Party, what have the “Mariáteguists” of the PUM² said, those former Vanguardists, that we took Mariátegui not seeing that Mariátegui died on the in 1930 and that Peru had advanced a lot because we were already in the 1960s, is that not what they said? Well, Comrades, that is why the problem was to develop it; there are reasons for this — if there is time we will see when we deal with the question of Mariátegui — not to propose not to develop it is not to understand that time goes by and that new problems arise, it is to want to remain in the 1930s and, beware, Mariátegui is not a universal Thought, beware, of reconstitution of the Party and, mainly — of what? — of initiating, maintaining and developing the People’s War. This is extremely important, this is the main thing in this reconstitution of the Party, to take up Mariátegui again, why? Because in the process of Gonzalo Thought it is the People’s War which has driven it, which has led it to become concrete as Gonzalo Thought, I believe it is so, Comrades; any analysis, however lightly we might make of the history of the Party proves what I have recently said: the People’s War has made us deeply understand things already known and has made us understand many new things, solve new problems and see new problems still pending solution and it also makes us understand that there are many more things that will have to be dealt with. So, in this process, one cannot but see that retaking the path of Mariátegui and developing it is not ignoring the founder. I believe that of the founder, of Mariátegui, many speak but few know about him, too few, and if they have studied him, not in depth, I say (...), how wrong it is to bring things by the hair, Comrades.

Then it tells us that “It is of substantive necessity for the Party to study Gonzalo Thought.” “Substantive necessity” for the Party, what does this imply, of the leaders, of the cadres, of the militants and mainly of the leaders, I stress, mainly of the leaders! Because this is where the mess is expressed and this is not by chance, it has always been like this in every Party; let us remember what we have often said: the Central Committee is the eye of the storm, that is, the center of the storm, we must never forget it. But why do we need this study, “for a more just and correct understanding of the General Political Line, and mainly of the Military Line,” for that, because if we do not see the Gonzalo Thought, how are we going to manage the General Political Line and the Military Line which is its center if they are derived from that Thought? It is like taking away the river’s source, the lagoon from where it

²RedLibrary: PUM is the “Mariáteguist Unified Party.”

begins to flow, or do you see a river with no beginning, maybe you imagine that rivers have no beginning — as some have only seen the Rimac, a little piece, don't they, they think it has no beginning — nonsense, Comrades, any material fact on which your eyes rest, you always see the path, the process, the origin of something. Consequently, it is necessary to handle the line and the Military Line in particular; 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, reason: because I did them, Comrades, tell me now the Military Line of Mariátegui, what is it; now tell me if with that line we are making the People's War. We do not meditate or think and the Chairman has told us that we have to use the head, he has told us that the head is for thinking, that is what the head is for, that is what the Chairman said, 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 think they have to move their feet," very expressive, very expressive what the Chinese Comrades said!

Well, when it comes to Gonzalo Thought, where to aim, there it says: "aiming at deepening the understanding of the particularities of the Peruvian Revolution, what is specific and particular," because if we do not take the specific, we would badly manage this revolution that the Party leads; but as the Party is an entity composed of a system of organizations, it does it through its leaders, its cadres, its militants who move all the rest of the organizations. Only in this way will we "serve the Great Plan to Develop Bases, the development of the People's War and the perspective of conquering political Power countrywide." These are eminently practical reasons, reasons of exigency, of peremptory demands, needs of the Peruvian Revolution; as there are many narrow empiricists here, then I think they understand well if we say "practical," they are practical reasons! Although I understand Comrades, to speak of practice demands leaving narrow empiricism, of course, because with narrow empiricism they will never handle practice from the Marxist position, never, they will do bastard empiricism, narrow, crawling, Sanchopansism they will do, yes Comrades, we must understand things 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.