

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

In Commemoration of the 96th Anniversary of the Communist Party of Peru

Peru People's Movement

October 2024

On the Strategy and Tactics of the World Revolution

We greet the international proletariat and the peoples of the world full of revolutionary optimism and with great joy on the occasion of the 96th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of Peru (CPP). On this new anniversary of the founding of the Party, the Peru People's Movement, the organization generated by the Party for international work, pays homage to its great founder José Carlos Mariátegui.

Chairman Gonzalo in long years of intense, tenacious, and never-ending struggle to uphold, defend, and apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and to retake and develop Mariátegui's road, has generated Gonzalo Thought, reconstituted the Party, and has initiated and developed the people's war in Peru, serving the world revolution and making Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, its sole command and guide in theory and practice.

Therefore, as a necessary introduction to the subject we will deal with, on this new anniversary of the founding of the Party, it is appropriate to clarify some questions about our founder:

Mariátegui lived at a time when imperialism, according to his words, was experiencing the "capitalism of the monopolies, of finance capital, of the imperialist wars to control markets and sources of raw materials." He lived, then, and fought, when capitalism was agonizing and the class struggle was empowering the proletariat to seize power through revolutionary violence.

From 1914 to 1918 the world was shaken by World War I, the "war of imperialist pillage" which, supported by the treacherous old revisionism, launched the working class and the peoples of some powers against those of others, so as to re-divide the world for the imperialist powers and their monopolist bourgeoisie.

However as Lenin foresaw, the war hatched the revolution and in 1917 the Bolshevik Party, through armed insurrection, overthrew the power of tsarism in old Russia. With the October Revolution a new world era opened up, for socialist construction under the dictatorship of the proletariat led by the Communist Party. Fulfilling the scientific projections of Marx and Engels, the October Road set the

general norms for the emancipation of the working class: **the need for a Communist Party leading the revolution**, the **need for revolutionary violence** to overthrow the old established order and the **need to install the dictatorship of the proletariat** to build socialism and march towards the classless society of the future. What Marx and Engels taught, in a word Marxism, materialized into an undeniable reality.

The October Revolution had impacts throughout the world. Europe was shaken to its core and **the proletariat launched itself to seize power**; the struggles in **Germany, Italy, and Hungary** are examples which Mariátegui himself popularized in his *History of the World Crisis*, **but while the masses were ripe for revolution there was a lack of the necessary communist parties** to lead them, and **fascism was generated**. The October Revolution not only changed the face of Europe, **the colonial anti-imperialist movement was also inspired by it**; the East was convulsed by **the Chinese Revolution**, “the most extensive and profound sign of the **awakening of Asia**,” and our own **America developed its anti-imperialist maturity**. The working class **generated its own communist parties** and acquired political weight.

Ideologically, the crisis of bourgeois thought became more critical while within the global working class movement, revisionist opportunism was swept away, revolutionary syndicalism was improved and Marxism progressed to a new stage, that of Marxism-Leninism.

Mariátegui lived through this process directly as a working class fighter, he followed and analyzed the world class struggle to understand the revolution in our country. His accurate foresight is in the following words: “The class struggle fills the first plane of the world crisis”; “the most relevant events of the last quarter of a century surpassed all limits. Its stage has been the five continents”; “the dictatorship of the proletariat, by definition is not a dictatorship of a party but a dictatorship of the working class”; “Marxism-Leninism is the revolutionary method of the imperialist stage.”

Modern industry was developed in Peru from 1895 and completed in the 1920s, a decade demarcating the impetus of bureaucrat-capitalism under Yankee domination. This industrialization took place in a semi-feudal society whose economy developed increasingly subjected to North American imperialism, which displaced English domination. That way bureaucrat-capitalism implies development of our semi-colonial condition and underscores the entire development of Peruvian society. This understanding is vital to interpret the Peruvian class struggle in the 20th century.

The Peruvian proletariat grew not just in numbers; the development of mining, textiles, and other branches of industry gave it a progressively more important place. In synthesis, it implied the appearance of a new class and a precise goal.

Our proletariat fought from the onset for salary increases, to reduce the work day and for other better living conditions, and generated a workers' movement which under a trade unionist line created unions in struggle against anarcho-syndicalism until the creation of the General Confederation of Workers of Peru, a task precisely carried out under the leadership of Mariátegui. Even more, the struggle of the working class determined the founding of its Party, along with the acts and works of Mariátegui; in that way the Peruvian proletariat matured, conforming itself as an independent political party and having as its goal the "economic emancipation of the working class," initiating a new stage in the country, that of the democratic national revolution led by the proletariat through its Party.

(...)

José Carlos Mariátegui was a fighter of the working class, a main actor of the Peruvian proletariat who in theory and in practice, with words and actions, grew and developed in the heat of the class struggle, mainly in our country; a proletarian militant who firmly adhered to Marxism and fused it with the concrete conditions of our revolutionary process, becoming the crowning point and synthesis of the Peruvian class struggle, in the political expression of our country's proletariat, who summarized more than 30 years of class struggle by our working class and our people.

By referring to the founder of the Party and the founding of the CPP on October 7, 1928, we have already laid down some solid questions about the process of the world revolution, now we proceed to expound the subject, as always, taking Chairman Gonzalo's words as faithfully as possible.

Chairman Gonzalo emphasizes that **"Chairman Mao emphasizes the importance of the world revolution as a unity."** Why? Marx has already told us this problem, that the world revolution must be conceived as unity; more, he insisted that communism is entered together, implying that we must all carry out revolution- by this I do not mean to imply that he said in unison.

In the document *UNITE AROUND THE CONGRESS AND DEVELOP THE METROPOLITAN COMMITTEE!* (CPP, 1988), the Chairman masterfully summarizes the development of Marxism up to Chairman Mao regarding the strategy and tactics of world revolution, as follows:

Lenin after World War I proposes a triple division of the countries of the earth... Lenin saw himself faced with a concrete problem, with that foresight he foresaw that the revolution in Europe was not in the immediate future, but that it was taking place in the oppressed nations of the East and thus he began to make an outline of the strategy and tactics for the world revolution.

(...)

Lenin pointed out that an era of wars would accompany the emergence of socialist society:

‘We see immediately that the civil war has made many things difficult in Russia, and that the civil war is interwoven with a whole series of wars. Marxists have never forgotten that violence must inevitably accompany the collapse of capitalism in its entirety and the birth of socialist society. That violence will constitute a period of world history, a whole era of various kinds of wars, imperialist wars, civil wars inside countries the intermingling of the two, national wars liberating the nationalities oppressed by the imperialists and by various combinations of imperialist powers that will inevitably enter into various alliances in the epoch of tremendous state-capitalist and military trusts and syndicates. This epoch, an epoch of gigantic cataclysms, of mass decisions forcibly imposed by war, of crises, has begun—that we can see clearly—and it is only the beginning.’

‘Socialists must take advantage of the struggle between the robbers to overthrow them all.’ ‘War is politics by other (i.e., violent) means’

Within this perspective he reiterated: **‘division of nations into oppressor and oppressed which forms the essence of imperialism,’** and stated that: ‘Hence, the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie, no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism. Characterising the approach of the world social revolution in the Party Programme we adopted last March, we said that the civil war of the working people against the imperialists and exploiters in all the advanced countries is beginning to be combined with national wars against international imperialism... that the civil war of the working people against the imperialists and exploiters in all the advanced countries is beginning to be combined with national wars against international imperialism. That is confirmed by the course of the revolution, and will be more and more confirmed as time goes on.’

Thus, Lenin specified the two great contemporary forces: the international proletarian movement and the movement of the oppressed nations, setting as an obligation of the Communist International ‘support bourgeois-democratic national movements in colonial and backward countries only on condition that, in these countries, the elements of future proletarian parties, which will be communist not only in name, are brought together and trained to understand their special tasks, i.e., those of the struggle against the bourgeois-democratic movements within their own nations. The Communist International must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in the colonial and backward countries, but should not merge with it, and should under all circumstances uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if it is in its most embryonic

form;’ and that, as communists we will only support these movements ‘when their exponents do not hinder our work of educating and organising in a revolutionary spirit the peasantry and the masses of the exploited.’

Likewise, **Lenin** teaches us that since the beginning of this century great changes have taken place as ‘millions and hundreds of millions, in fact **the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe**, are now coming forward as independent, active and revolutionary factors. It is perfectly clear that in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, **the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect...** Of course, there are many more difficulties in this enormous sphere than in any other, but at all events the movement is advancing. And in spite of the fact that **the masses of toilers—the peasants in the colonial countries—are still backward, they will play a very important revolutionary part in the coming phases of the world revolution.**’

And pointing out the revolutionary perspective he said, at **the Second Congress of the Communist International**: ‘World imperialism shall fall when the revolutionary onslaught of the exploited and oppressed workers in each country, overcoming resistance from petty-bourgeois elements and the influence of the small upper crust of labour aristocrats, merges with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of people who have hitherto stood beyond the pale of history, and have been regarded merely as the object of history.’

The great Lenin led the October Revolution, opening a new stage of humanity, however he never thought that capitalist restoration was impossible; he said:

‘We do not know whether or not our victory will be followed by temporary periods of reaction and the victory of the counter-revolution—there is nothing impossible in that—and therefore, after our victory, we shall build a ‘triple line of trenches’ against such a contingency.’

(...)

Lenin warned: ‘We have defeated the bourgeoisie, but it is not yet destroyed and not even completely conquered. We must therefore resort to a new and higher form of the struggle with the bourgeoisie; we must turn from the very simple problem of continuing the expropriation of the capitalists to the more complex and difficult problem—the problem of creating conditions under which the bourgeoisie could neither exist nor come anew into existence. It is clear that this problem is infinitely more complicated and that we can have no Socialism until it is solved.’ And he concluded: ‘The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of class struggle but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat is class struggle waged by a proletariat that is victorious and has taken

political power into its hands against a bourgeoisie that has been defeated but not destroyed, a bourgeoisie that has not vanished, not ceased to offer resistance, but that has intensified its resistance.’

These are all substantive theses of Lenin regarding the era that we live in and the period of wars we will continue to develop in, regarding the two forces of the contemporary world, particularly regarding the national movement and regarding socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat; theses that today we must very much take into account in order to analyze the class struggle that is developing in the world.

Chairman Mao Zedong, based in Marxism-Leninism, has systematized the development of the world revolution and established fundamental theses that develop Marxism. We must keep them in mind to guide us in understanding the current international situation. In his great work *On New Democracy*, he stressed that with World War I and the October Revolution, history had entered a new era of world revolution: ‘the world proletarian-socialist revolution’ and that, consequently, **‘any revolution in a colony or semi-colony that is directed against imperialism, i.e., against the international bourgeoisie or international capitalism, no longer comes within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, but within the new category.’**

In this way, he conceived that the powerful revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies was part of the revolution that the international proletariat directs worldwide; emphasizing, after the Second World War, that the Latin American people ‘are not slaves obedient to U.S. imperialism,’ that in entire Asia ‘a great national liberation movement’ had emerged, and calling on the countries of the East to combat imperialism and internal reactionaries with the goal of the emancipation of the oppressed in the East, he said: ‘We certainly should grasp our own destiny in our own hands. We should rid our ranks of all impotent thinking. All views that overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people are wrong... This is the historic epoch in which world capitalism and imperialism are going down to their doom and world socialism and people’s democracy are marching to victory.’ Summarizing the subsequent struggle, he specified the current era:

‘The next 50 to 100 years or so, beginning from now, will be a great era of radical change in the social system throughout the world, an earth-shaking era without equal in any previous historical period. Living in such an era, we must be prepared to engage in great struggles which will have many features different in form from those of the past.’

Analyzing this epoch of the proletarian revolution, Chairman Mao Zedong established his great thesis on reactionaries: ‘All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful.’

In *TALK WITH THE AMERICAN CORRESPONDENT ANNA LOUISE STRONG*, where the above quote is from, analyzing the contradictions and distribution of forces, he also stated:

‘The United States and the Soviet Union are separated by a vast zone which includes many capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Before the U.S. reactionaries have subjugated these countries, an attack on the Soviet Union is out of the question.’

To this approach of 1946 should be added the following analyses of Chairman Mao himself on inter-imperialist contradictions and between imperialists and oppressed nations and contending forces:

‘It stands out above all the contradictions involved in the struggle between countries, the imperialists and their dispute over the colonies. What they are doing is taking the contradictions they have with us as a pretext to cover up their own contradictions.’

‘...Egypt’s Suez Canal Zone. In the Middle East, **two kinds of contradictions and three kinds of forces are in conflict.** The two kinds of contradictions are: first, **those between different imperialist powers,** that is, between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France and, second, **those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations.** The **three kinds of forces are:** one, the United States, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second-rate imperialist powers, and three, the oppressed nations.’

(...)

Thus, he denounced U.S. imperialism, calling to fight it. **But revisionism usurped power in the USSR, restoring capitalism and turning it into a social-imperialist country** which as such extended its penetration, undermining, control and domination, contending for world domination with US imperialism, influencing the aforementioned intermediate zone. Chairman Mao denounced: ‘The Soviet Union today is a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the grand bourgeoisie, a fascist German dictatorship, and a Hitlerite dictatorship.’ And calling for the struggle against the two superpowers he laid down the following important theses:

‘The United States is a paper tiger. Don’t believe in it. It can be hollowed out with just a single blow. The revisionist Soviet Union is also a paper tiger.’

‘Working hand in glove, Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism have done so many foul and evil things that the revolutionary people the world over will not let them go unpunished. The people of all countries are rising. A new historical period of struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism has begun.’

‘People of the world, let us unite and oppose the war of aggression unleashed by any imperialism or social-imperialism, let us especially oppose the war of ag-

gression in which atomic bombs are used as a weapon! If such a war breaks out, the peoples of the whole world must eliminate it with revolutionary war, and we must make preparations right now!

Thus **the period of struggle that has opened up against the two super-powers**, the United States and the Soviet Union, was defined; and in this perspective, reiterating the role of the peoples of the world, in May 1970 he made his famous statement: **'The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, dare to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history.'**

Chairman Mao Zedong always paid close attention to tactical principles. His work ON POLICY is of utmost importance in this regard. In it, he established the basic policy: 'With regard to the alignment of the various classes within the country, our basic policy is to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the anti-Communist die-hard forces.' In dealing with the defiant forces, he advocated a revolutionary dual policy: 'In the struggle against the anti-Communist die-hards, our policy is to make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and crush our enemies one by one, and to wage struggles on just grounds, to our advantage, and with restraint.' These criteria, initially established for the struggle in China, are applicable to combating imperialists.

In 1957, **Chairman Mao synthesized the strategic and tactical concepts for fighting the enemy:**

'We have developed a concept over a long period for the struggle against the enemy, namely, strategically we should despise all our enemies, but tactically we should take them all seriously. In other words, with regard to the whole we must despise the enemy, but with regard to each specific problem we must take him seriously. If we do not despise him with regard to the whole, we shall commit opportunist errors. Marx and Engels were but two individuals, and yet in those early days they already declared that capitalism would be overthrown throughout the world. But with regard to specific problems and specific enemies, if we do not take them seriously, we shall commit adventurist errors. In war, battles can only be fought one by one and the enemy forces can only be destroyed one part at a time. Factories can only be built one by one. Peasants can only plough the land plot by plot. The same is even true of eating a meal. Strategically, we take the eating of a meal lightly, we are sure we can manage it. But when it comes to the actual eating, it must be done mouthful by mouthful, you cannot swallow an entire banquet at one gulp. This is called the piecemeal solution and is known in military writings as destroying the enemy forces one by one.'

So far we have fundamental questions about the historical period we are living in, the contradictions and the developing forces and tactics; but, in addition,

Chairman Mao Zedong was devoted to synthesizing the experience of the socialist revolution by laying down his great theory and practice of the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat by finding the appropriate way to develop it through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Chairman Gonzalo tells us that the Chairman raised the need for strategy and tactics of the world revolution, but there are things that are not known, let's see:

In 1946 Chairman Mao was asked if the war between the USA and the USSR (in Stalin's time) was something immediate and he said no because between the two there is an intermediate zone of capitalist countries, colonies and semi-colonies; that Yankee imperialism would seek to cover that intermediate zone and as long as it does not cover it there could not be a world war. Forty years have passed and what Chairman Mao said has been proven.

In the year 1956, when the issue of the Suez Canal arose, Chairman Mao commented on the situation. He said that when the British and French forces landed at the canal to retain control of it, the USA opposed, and Egypt (an oppressed nation) even more so. Chairman Mao pointed out that there were contradictions evident in the situation. Firstly, there were inter-imperialist contradictions, and secondly, there was a contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nation, along with other forces involved: 1) England, France, 2) the more powerful U.S., and 3) the Egyptian nation (Nasser being a representative). Each party wanted the canal for themselves, and this highlighted the difference in interests between the weakened imperialist powers of England and France.

In the year 1957, Chairman Mao attended a meeting of communists in Moscow where he stated: "the east wind prevails over the west wind." At that moment, he was suggesting that revolution is the main trend and he made a fourfold division of the world. This was during a time when the socialist bloc existed, and no one contradicted him or pointed out that his proposal was incorrect, not even the foolish revisionist HOXHA (taking into account that Lenin had said that Albania, upon defeat, would become a semi-colony).

In another meeting with the Japanese, Chairman Mao said: China and the vast majority of oppressed nations constitute the third world—the poor and backwards of the earth. England, France, and Japan make up the second world, while the United States is the first world. Years later, when China's representative at the UN spoke and mentioned that Chairman Mao proposed the concept of "three worlds are delineated," what was the purpose? By analyzing the world, Mao sought to emphasize the role of the oppressed nations, the vast majority of the earth, and for communists, the masses make history. Earlier, Lenin had stated that the weight of the masses defines, and envisioning the revolution in the East after World War

II, an ultra-reactionary advisor said, “The masses and the oppressed nations have politically stood up.” Taking all this into account, Chairman Mao said, “In the world, there are villages and there are metropolises. The path is not against the revolution in Europe but in understanding the world’s trend, and by raising the oppressed nations, imperialism sinks.” Mao argued that Yankee imperialism was defeated by Korea and Vietnam, suggesting the beginning of a period of 50 to 100 years during which imperialism and all reactionaries are mere paper tigers.

If we gather all these ideas of Chairman Mao, to which he dedicated the final part of his life, what he is doing is laying the groundwork for the strategy and tactics of world revolution. In the Chinese Letter, the Chairman raised the need for strategy and tactics, but there are things that are not known. For example, Volume V is cut, however, one must connect the dots. This is to define the strategy and tactics of world revolution. But there are still unknowns. From the congress of the Communist International until today, strategy and tactics have not been defined. In the 1959-1960 meeting of the communists, neither did the Chinese 25-Point Letter define it, nor did Stalin’s Central Committee, because the Seventh Congress sanctioned the anti-fascist front. Subsequently, after Chairman Mao’s death, Deng emerges with his revisionist theory of the three worlds, which implies aligning with the superpowers, specifically Yankee imperialism, and enslaving the situation of oppressed nations to the outcome of conflicts between the great powers.

The Soviets were the first to oppose the “three worlds delineated” when Chairman Mao died in the seventies. Hoxha, on the anniversary of Lenin’s birth, stated, “After Lenin, no one.” And who was the first to support this theory? Khrushchev. In this way, the revisionists have attributed Deng’s revisionist theory to Chairman Mao to combat it and claim victory over it. Furthermore, Hoxha never fought against Chairman Mao. After his death, Hoxha accused him of nationalist revisionism and called him the Chinese Khrushchev. In Peru, some insignificant individuals have echoed Hoxha. Later, Avakian came out against it, criticizing what Chairman Mao said in 1946... Avakian has also criticized Chairman Mao’s three worlds, but not Mao’s himself, only Deng’s version, knowing that Mao’s version is different.

The Chairman says:

We, the CPP, are Maoists and must unite the communists. To do so, we have advances; it is admirable to have taken steps and I repeat, we do not know all that is Maoism. What should be said is: Where is the error in what Lenin defined? Where in what Maoism says? Where in what we say? And not to cover up with “process of ideas.” We have defined the principal contradiction and the three fundamental ones, it is in the document signed by the CPP, where is the principal contradiction

wrong? Are the fundamental contradictions wrong? Is it wrong to raise world people's war against world imperialist war?

On war, RCP-USA says that the problem is the world war. Why do they artfully twist the fundamental contradiction of capitalism? They claim that the world war will eliminate the northern hemisphere. They are repeating what scientists say and have not analyzed what the military is saying, but the problem is deeper: has war lost its class character? It suggests that classes are committing suicide, similar to Khrushchev, and today Gorbachev acknowledges and attacks Stalin, just like Avakian. Coincidence? Avakian supports the theory of productive forces; it either needs correction or it will sink. We focus on revolution, on the masses, while the RCP focuses on the imperialist world war. We advocate for world people's war because the issue is to see the revolution, not the enemy.

Then he will tell us:

On revolutionary violence, it is the core of Marxism. It is a universal law without any exception. In Marx and Lenin there is an exception, although the latter corrected himself and prepared the insurrection that led him, to clash against revolutionary violence is bourgeois pacifism, the RCP-USA proclaim peace, one is Maoist or one is not Maoist. So first you are firing at the congress, second at Maoism, and you must define yourselves as for or against it. These ideas have no basis whatsoever.

Democratic revolution (DR), it is the height to collide with democratic revolution. Why do some doubt semi-feudalism? Because they have no qualitative idea of what class is, but rather rely on bourgeois statistics falsified about what the city is and what the countryside is to deny that the peasantry is the main force, to abandon the countryside and focus on cities? And focus on what class? On the petite bourgeoisie? Or do they advocate for a socialist revolution? Others have proposed an intermediate revolution, an intermediate revolution, following the criteria of Liu Shaoqi. Before the uprising of 1927, he said, "there are no conditions"; continue the revolution. When Japan is defeated, he proposes to unite with the Kuomintang, surrender weapons, and exchange them for parliamentary seats. When he takes power across the country, he says to continue with the democratic revolution, let the productive forces develop, the bourgeoisie is good, and let the democratic revolution be consolidated. In 1957, in the midst of the socialist revolution, he stated that there is no class struggle, this was expressed in the 8th Congress where he again put forward the theory of "the productive forces."

Chairman Mao in 1930 stated that the revolution has two uninterrupted stages: the democratic revolution, when the revolution triumphs and power is seized in

the whole country immediately, without intermission, the socialist revolution begins.

Chairman Mao has resolved the problem of the democratic revolution. Marx spoke to us about the permanent revolution in the 1850s, stating that the revolution in Germany could be realized if the peasant wars were rekindled, channeling the democratic energy of the peasantry. In 1891 in Germany, the choice was between socialist revolution or democratic revolution. In the past, when there was no imperialism, given the conditions, the transition from feudalism to capitalism was specific to Germany and England, an evolutionary process through collusion between the bourgeoisie and the landlords.

Lenin faced problems of democratic revolution because Russia had a semi-feudal system on which a late capitalist process developed. There was the Duma, not a parliament, and there was tsarism, a monarchy that had lasted for 400 years under the Romanovs. The Mensheviks argued that the proletariat was too small to carry out the revolution; this was opportunism because Marx had already said that the proletariat had to lead the democratic revolution. We must consider the nature of the 1905 revolution in Russia, its democratic revolution. In *Two Tactics*, Lenin states that the proletariat must lead the democratic revolution with a government of workers and peasants. In February 1917, bourgeois revolution led by Kerensky and Lenin said: “that the party could and should have done it, but did not do it because the party was not ready” and so Lenin makes the first socialist revolution in October 1917 and opens up a new era. Thus Lenin said: “that the proletariat leads the democratic revolution.”

Chairman Mao made the democratic revolution from 1927 to 1949, because he is the one who solved the democratic revolution. Some will say: what about Vietnam? It was before 1945, yes, but Ho Chi Minh himself said: “we have learned from Chairman Mao Zedong.” So he has solved it and he has established his laws, we have to apply them.

This problem of bureaucrat-capitalism... In *On Coalition Government*, from 1945, Chairman Mao speaks of bureaucrat-capitalism, which is the capitalism of the big bourgeoisie, big landowners, financiers, who have a government represented by the Kuomintang, which exploits four classes: the proletariat, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and which restricts the national bourgeoisie. In 1947, Volume IV, page 170, he speaks of bureaucrat-capitalism, but he continues calling it bureaucrat-capital and that this monopoly capitalism that existed in China had increased in those twenty years and had merged with the state, becoming state bureaucratic and comprador capitalism; it merges then with the economic power of the state; afterwards, they say that in China bureaucrat-capitalism must be confiscated. What did Sergio of left liquidationism think? That it was only the state bureaucrat-capitalism, not the other part of big capital. Thus, they let this part

loose. In the following pages, Chairman Mao speaks of bureaucrat-capitalism, that is why he already says “three mountains.”

In unpublished writings he speaks of bureaucrat-capitalism as well as of the Russian and Chinese revolutions, he says that the October Revolution was a socialist revolution and that by confiscating bureaucrat-capital we are laying the economic foundations that allow us to control the entire economy and the passage from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution. In our country we have applied this thesis and in our understanding bureaucrat-capitalism is the capitalism that the imperialists belatedly promote in the oppressed nations and it is stubborn not to understand it this way.

In Mariátegui we find: “bourgeoisie tied to imperialism and linked to semi-feudalism.” In 1920 the mercantile bourgeoisie assumes the leadership of the State, an accurate approach and linked to Maoism, that is why we have studied the economic process of Peruvian society, applying this theory. We have analyzed this critical phenomenon because from two sick parents; feudalism and imperialism, what comes out? In Peru bureaucrat-capitalism has three moments: since 1895 and in the third moment is that the revolution has matured, engendering the same class that destroys it. We have entered the destruction. For this destruction of the old state, the destruction of its backbone, the armed and repressive forces in general, is required. We have applied the thesis of bureaucrat-capitalism to differentiate two factions in the big bourgeoisie and not to put ourselves on the tail of any of them.

(...)

The majority in the world are the democratic revolutions, then the socialist revolutions and cultural revolutions towards communism, but today within communism we fulfill what we are responsible for, as a concrete task until we die, why think about how communism is going to be from today? In these problems of militarization we have raised militarized society, aiming at the armed sea of masses, but we have not gone deeper because it is not the main problem today.

Chairman Gonzalo, in his speech at the First Congress, already mentioned at the beginning, summarizing the problem at hand, said:

Lenin says that the revolution is not going to purely and simply take place in the advanced countries, that is foolish. It must be combined with the revolution in the backward countries, because that is how imperialism will sink. He established lines, concrete lines in the long term, masterfully. If one reads Lenin carefully, one can see that he turns his eyes to the backward countries, not because he didn't want revolution within the heart of imperialism, no, that is not the problem, but rather that he sees the reality and the perspective of the world.

Chairman Mao, in another circumstance where the revolution was already developing, it passed in our opinion—what we believe—to the problem equilibrium and the question of the strategy of world revolution has entered, the strategic offensive of world revolution, that's what we believe.

So the Chairman had already foresaw all those things, therefore I believe he thought about the revolution as a unity. Hence, he comes to propose China as the base to serve world revolution, hence his grand effort to train cadres to wage people's war, mainly in backward countries. And he reiterates that 'we all enter communism or no one enters,' it is a quote from the Chairman, he reaffirms it himself. But within the reaffirmation, within him it is already a reality that is palpitating, it is a concrete perspective that is given, that is opened, that is what the Chairman has.

For this, where does Chairman Mao start?: 'revolution is the main trend as the decomposition of imperialism is greater every day, the role of the most immense masses year after year that make and will make felt its irrepressible transforming force and in the great truth, reiterated by him, that we all enter communism or no one enters'; That is why he focuses again on seeing the world revolution as a unity, but I insist, already feasible, as a concrete perspective. In Marx it is as a principle and in Lenin as a necessity to promote it: for the Chairman, the problem is that this situation has already opened up and within that we are going to develop it.

The revolution, the main trend in history, yes. It is the main trend in the world, historically and politically. This is what we must emphasize, that it's not simply that it is the historical perspective but that it is political, it is already the order of the day, that is, and that is why we have to struggle. This is combined with the period of 50 to 100 years, if not then why did the Chairman ask us? A masterful calculation: 50 to 100 years, because in that period imperialism and reaction must be wiped from the face of the earth and that is then the world revolution.

It is 'the period that begins to fight against Yankee imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, paper tigers that contend for world hegemony,' of course, another key question from the Chairman. It is well arranged, the military principle is well arranged: world revolution, trend, weight of the masses, the period of 50 to 100 years. He is specifying and it is masterful. It is unfortunate that he is not seen in that way. Hegemony, of course, two then, there are two who can develop or unravel a world war—Yankee imperialism or Soviet social imperialism—paper tigers says the Chairman! They are not to be feared, they can be pierced through! This is how he taught, a quote from the Chairman.

'Atomic war' What to oppose atomic war with?: 'First it must be condemned and then prepared in advance to be opposed with people's war.' Everything that the Chairman has proposed is balanced.

Now, the problem of the oppressed nations. Are they or are they not the ones that house the immense masses of the Earth? Two-thirds or seventy percent, immense masses more or less in quantity. At the end of the day, I think that is not the problem because some situations can change, yes, because the revolution is not straight, it is in zigzags, but that does not deny that the oppressed nations hold the immense masses of the Earth. Moreover, the growth of the masses is immensely greater than the increase of the oppressors in the oppressing nations, of the oppressive countries, of imperialisms, even considering that they themselves oppress their own peoples. Just look at the growth rates, which is 70% of new children born in the backward world and that will continue to increase more and more. For me, in good time, of course, because the weight of the masses in history has begun to express itself more and more and that is fundamental, if the masses make history and this is a very great truth, then the weight of the masses will decide the revolution in the world. And where is that weight, then? In the oppressed nations. There I don't think there is much to discuss, if these are material realities, facts; do we close our eyes? That would be foolish.

As well as the economic and political relations that are developing due to the decomposition of imperialism. Very important. One of the problems we have had is how to define this moment, this period in which we are developing. Where have we found the question? In the Chairman himself—decomposition of imperialism is greater every day—within his own positions, he raises this. Who can deny the greater decomposition of imperialism every day, is it not sinking more and more? It is decomposing, it is rotting. If some can claim that they produce more, what the hell does it matter, is that the problem? On the contrary, if they produce more, what they are showing is that there are all the means to satisfy basic needs... hat is showing us that the times of the expropriation of the exploiters is approaching and they are going to be destroyed, that is why they are decomposing.

Some say Lenin was wrong because we see that they have more rockets, more weapons, but is that not an expression of weakness throughout the world? Throughout history it has always been an expression of weakness. What Marxism says is that imperialism slows down all the capacity of the existing means of production, it does not say that they do not produce... It is the decomposition of imperialism and its increasing artillery, a sign of weakness and not of strength. Review any history or look at history thoroughly and it will be understood, any military history proves it.

Weight of the masses, oppressed nations, decomposition of imperialism, where does all this lead? Three worlds are delineated. Yes, Chairman Mao Zedong's thesis; it has nothing to do with the rotten, revisionist theory of Deng's three worlds which is something else because it is a front to serve imperialism, to side with the superpowers, or to want to be a power in turn which it is already dreaming of.

Why does (revisionist China) want to arm itself to the teeth, why does it want to be a military power? It can already be seen, the same path! Not being able to develop and strengthen the economic force because they are restoring capitalism more and more, now they want to use the immense masses, of billions of men, as cannon fodder, they want to use it by enhancing military power to become a power and fight for world domination, also scheming like others like Germany, like Japan, that from the clash of the two superpowers must emerge another power or another dominant superpower. Wasn't that Japan's nefarious bastard dream of the 1930s, isn't it Germany's black dream, isn't it Deng's black dream?

And it is not a problem of tactics, which Avakian even goes as far to say 'I think it is a situation of a use of tactics,' that seems stupid to me. It is a strategy, it is a global understanding of where the weight of the masses are on earth, it is the problem of the relations between imperialism and oppressed nations, that is the problem. It is the problem that can only be understood in the current international situation starting from the international economic relations of imperialism, that is Lenin's thesis. But—when he raises and says, what is the essence of my position? It is that there are oppressive nations, or he says: 'oppressive peoples, oppressed peoples,' well some do not like it to be peoples, go and argue with Lenin, he has laid it out that way, he put it that way—but then he specifies it himself and it has already remained as imperialists and oppressed nations.

It also seems to me that it would be a mistake to say Lenin was wrong. Why, do we know what he meant? I believe that many things comrades, in Marx, in Lenin, in the Chairman, we do not understand, I believe. One must be sincere, every time one returns and picks up a text from any of those greats, one finds new things, or is it not so? It seems to me a stupid vanity to believe that we already understand everything. I say to myself, do we understand everything Lenin said? I don't think so. Everything the Chairman has said? It seems to me that it is not necessary to have bastard arrogance, they are arrogant of flying horses, of people who believe that genius comes from heaven. We have to understand many things, there are many things to comprehend.

Finally, Chairman Gonzalo concludes with these words:

It seems to us that the Chairman is thus laying the foundations for developing the strategy and tactics of the World Revolution; this is obviously necessary. But here we have a problem, do we know everything the Chairman has said, all his writings; what he could raise are the political criteria of orientation, other debates had to be reserved for a while, it seems to me that this is elementary to understand.

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Gonzalo Thought!

Long live Chairman Gonzalo!
Long live the 96th Anniversary of the Founding of the Communist Party of
Peru by José Carlos Mariátegui!