

Some Comments on the Document “On Maoism Itself” of the RCP of Canada

OCTOBER 5, 2020

STRUGGLESSESSIONS

Some Comments on the Document

*"On Maoism Itself" of
the RCP of Canada*



We have produced the following unofficial translation of this document in the interest of developing two-line struggle internationally. We reserve various disagreements with the following document from the Ecuadorian comrades, particularly the use of “Gonzalo Thought” which in our view is not interchangeable with the contributions of universal validity of Chairman Gonzalo. However, we find general and sweeping agreements with the following document, in which the Ecuadorian Comrades show great skill and precision in responding to the Canadians. The document strikes a brave and unflinching blow at incorrect ideas, and veritable slanders coming from Canada and other places, it defends the red line in the International Communist Movement in a principled and upstanding manner, it appropriately defends the life, health and contributions of the greatest living Marxist-Leninist-Maoist walking the face of the earth, Chairman Gonzalo. We are excited to provide this unofficial translation and hope that our readers find it as illuminating as we do. LONG LIVE THE PCE-SR!

SOME COMMENTS ON THE DOCUMENT “ON MAOISM ITSELF” OF THE RCP OF CANADA

Communist Party of Ecuador-Red Sun (PCE-SR)

Some time ago the comrades of the PCR-RCP [Parti Communiste Revolutionnaire-Revolutionary Communist Party] published a document “On Maoism Itself” launching a severe and subjective criticism of the Communist

Party of Brazil Red Fraction (PCB FV) and other parties that it vaguely calls “satellites.”

In the first instance, we think that the document, due to its content, basis and objective, did not deserve to be refuted because it contributes little or nothing in objective terms to the ideology; however, as to not allow these claims to “remain in the air” and generate confusion, with the excess time we had we issue a response to try to clarify some errors and disagreements with the comrades.

It is important to point out (in a self-critical manner) that we know very little about the comrades of the PCR-RCP; therefore, we do not have the necessary parts and political arsenal to be able to analyze their development, work, struggle; but rather focus on the document and based on it, try to argue, without hasty and adventurous academic pretensions, some responses and observations from a unilateral position of the Communist Party of Ecuador-Red Sun.

The comrades of PCR-RCP published a document entitled: *On Maoism Itself: Against the Idealism of the ‘Principally Maoist’ Movement* and the concern of the virulent attack on the PCB (FV) and other parties that uphold the thesis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, and recognize the universal contributions of Gonzalo Thought.

Something that draws attention to this extensive, scattered, subjective and eclectic document is the forcefulness with which they assert certain information:

“Currently a small group of organizations active in a few countries”; “Some satellite groups in Latin America”; “A handful of organizations constitute a very small, even insignificant fraction, whose actual practice is limited”; “The PCB(FV) and its supporters,” such series of terms that in addition to showing certain contempt for this group, fall into the dangerous error of underestimating us; expressions that are repetitively used throughout the text

and that account for the little or lack of seriousness these comrades be it product of either the serious ignorance they have of these parties in the process of building a Party or reconstitution that make up an important current within the ICM, as well as the strange and equivocal handling of the revolutionary theory of the proletariat.

If the PCR-RCP starts from a quantitative analysis, it would be good to ask the Canadian comrades what the ideological development of the communist parties in Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Mexico, the United States, Germany, Austria, France, Ireland and others who are joining the left line with an important effect in the ICM, represent? Apparently little to nothing, failing to consider that Latin America has become a land of turmoil, struggle, and that in Europe the awakening of the class and the masses is momentous for the ultimate purpose of the international proletariat: communism.

Let's analyze, if to the quantitative aspect we add a qualitative assessment to the work and struggle of the PCB (FV) "orbit" in the ICM, what does the fact that this group strengthens the international proletariat's struggle against revisionism, opportunism and centrism mean to the Canadian comrades? What does it mean to PCR-RCP that this group has centered supporting and defending the people's wars carried out by the international proletariat in various countries of the world; supporting, from the perspective of proletarian internationalism, organizations, parties, whether constituted or in reconstitution processes; sustaining and developing two-line struggle, in addition to applying, developing and defending Gonzalo Thought as a dialectical leap from MLM? It is obvious that nothing, and moreover, they rant at a gallop, do not apply two-line struggle but rather fixate on the Brazilian comrades and to some extent on the rest of the small, precarious and dysfunctional parties that support them.

The comrades are unaware of the struggles inside the ICM that developed the left line. With their hastiness and malicious lies, they threaten a process that has only been able to develop after a strong ideological struggle, as

corresponds to the historical tradition of those who believe that unity in ideology is forged in criticism–self criticism–unity; endorsed in countless meetings held in various countries, even challenging the threat of reaction; historical events in which delegations of parties and organizations have also participated, with which there have been serious disagreements within the framework of the necessary and unavoidable two–line struggle.

The ideological struggle with Colombian comrades of the Communist Worker's Union/Union Obrera Comunista (UOC) or Revolutionary Communist Group (Grupo Comunista Revolucionario) (GCR) (the spearheads of Avakianism in the region) has not been alien to us; at certain times with comrades from Italy, France, Spain, Panama or Afghanistan; in fact, within the collective we have also had many and profound disagreements where unity has prevailed without sidestepping the ideological and political contradictions between us or having ended with eclectic positions or shamelessly come about political and ideological submission.

It is important to point out that although it is true, the communists of Latin America recognize the achievements that the PCB (FV) has had in the organizational levels in order to assume the responsibility of undertaking the New Democratic revolution in Brazil at the service of the international proletariat; the important impulse that has led to struggle to impose the left line within the ICM, we have never established a relationship with the comrades under the figure of the “parent party”; in fact, throughout this journey it is important to remember that the joint statement between the Revolutionary Front of the Bolivian People, MLM and the Communist Party of Ecuador–Red Sun issued on December 26, 2008, warned of the lack of correct leadership inside the ICM as the RIM fell to bankruptcy; Prachanda's betrayal of the People's War in Nepal or the need to combat the growing misery of the masses, especially in Latin America of the so–called 21st century socialism; the statement established, to some extent, the starting point that coincided with the efforts developed by the PCB (FV) of ideological struggle in the international arena, to generate the ideological and political discussion groups

on the problems that afflict the ICM, the World Proletarian Revolution and the struggle for a new and superior international communist.

Comrades, “there is no worse blindness than the one who does not want to see,” in that sense we cannot refuse to recognize the efforts made by the PCB (FV), its great leadership, guidance, and militancy to sustain ideological struggle and the unity of the international proletariat; the arduous struggle made by the comrades of Peru to reorganize their leadership in the midst of the people’s war, confronting not only an armed enemy, but also the ROL and the messengers of imperialism who permanently deny its development today. The very important leaps that the comrades of Chile have taken in the reconstitution of their Communist Party or those gigantic efforts of the comrades of Colombia that are reconstituting their party in the midst of many difficulties, among others, a society plagued by armed revisionism. Impossible not to greet and approach the struggle that the communists are undertaking in Mexico where proposing revolution is in itself an extremely courageous and stoic fact. Never underestimate the struggle of the comrades of Germany to sow a party where it did not exist in objective terms; similarly in Austria, Ireland, in the bowels of Yankee imperialism, where the US comrades, particularly in Austin, have put their levels of struggle and organization in tension; and thus, others who apparently you do not want to see.

It is impossible not to recognize the constitution and reconstitution of communist parties of a new type that are emerging all over the world in the midst of two-line struggle, which is the only thing that will allow us to strengthen the ICM and create the conditions for a new international that will inexorably be MARXIST-LENINIST-MAOIST.

But not fed up with their myopia and ignorance, Canadian comrades brand us as “insignificant” organizations. For them, our complex process of building the instruments for revolution, which has had to confront and overcome many vicissitudes, represents nothing; in fact, even our errors of interpretation and application of the correct ideological line, a weakness that led us to experience a defeat that without being definitive, cost us a high price in lives and, of

course, political. Construction that also, faithful to our line and conception for applying Marxism–Leninism–Maoism–Gonzalo Thought to the particularity of the country, has been given by mobilizing the masses, and not necessarily in a peaceful way, but rebellious, belligerent, combative, applying and developing revolutionary violence.

In Ecuador we have not undertaken “accumulating forces in cold,” as part of the process of construction of the instruments for revolution as the PCR–RCP suggests; in silence, with its back to the requirements of the class and the people or the international proletariat. We have done it in the course of an active, combative militant practice, mobilizing masses and even carrying out acts of violence not only in the framework of treating the existing contradictions in the country, but also in support of the people’s wars that are being advanced in the world and other struggles of the international proletariat. We have done so not only by militarizing the Party but also by all its organizational instances at the level of the generated organisms, by grasping and decisively approaching the initiation of people’s war. Obviously, the enemy’s response has been correlative to our armed proposal to demarcate all the camps with us and the old State: prisoners, kidnapped, tortured, dead, aspects that are not unrelated to what the comrades of Brazil have also had to live where the blood of Comrade Cleomar Rodríguez and many others has not yet dried; or Mexico, where the morning still awaits the return of Dr. Serna or the void left by the premature death of Luis Armando Fuentes by the enemy; the persecution to which the comrades of Germany or Austin, US are subjected. But no, to the Canadian comrades we are an insignificant aspect and with limited practice like the rest of the parties the PCB (FV) “orbit” with similar histories. In any case, it is important to point out that the Maoists of Ecuador and their Party are not followers of the PCB (FV) or any other organization; but they are followers of the correct ideological line, the one committed to sweeping away opportunism, revisionism and centrism in the ranks of the international proletariat.

Contrary to what the PCR–RCP has shown throughout its lengthy document, the Communist Party of Ecuador–Red Sun’s (PCE–SR) style of work fully

conforms to what Chairman Mao pointed out: “Communists must always go into the why’s and wherefore’s of anything, use their own heads and carefully think over whether or not it corresponds to reality and is really well founded; on no account should they follow blindly and encourage slavishness.” In fact, comrades, carrying out this practice, not only for us but for all those who have propped up this “orbit” have led organizations such as the FRP-MLM of Bolivia (co-managers of the creation of this group) years later to disdain some aspects that were ideologically consolidated (MLM, Gonzalo Thought) and to take a step aside to support theses that varied over time and that, like you, deny Gonzalo Thought and the existence of people’s war in Peru, aspect that reflects the political maturity and seriousness with which the ideological struggle has been handled. By the way, this decision of the comrades of Bolivia does not mean that we put them on the side of the enemy, of those who deny MLM, people’s war, the New Democratic revolution in semi-feudal and semi-colonial countries, since at this moment the basis of ideological unity of the international proletariat is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!!

It must be remembered that at a certain moment we signed joint declarations with other organizations that have nothing to do with the “idealistic orbit” of the PCB (FV). Without having tried to endorse positions that by conception the UOC, from Colombia, a sector of comrades from France, Panama and others have; perhaps sinning as pragmatists, we adhered to the statement that called for THE INTERNATIONAL UNITY OF COMMUNISTS DEMANDS THE DEFEAT OF REVISIONISM AND CENTRISM!; and that by the way brought us serious contradictions with some organizations and parties in Europe, especially with the comrades of Italy and Spain, demonstrating our sovereign decision-making capacity. And we did it because we considered it appropriate, correct; because the document proposed by the comrades of Colombia expressed the need for the international proletariat to struggle against revisionism, opportunism, but also against the other enemy of the international proletariat, centrism, which remains alive in the shadow of the contradictions existing in Nepal. Suffice it to say that under no circumstances could we submit to any document that comes loaded with the ink and content of any expression that approaches Prachandism, even less, Avakianism or that

denies MLM and/or the people's wars in Peru, Turkey, India and the Philippines.

(...) The Canadian comrades also refer to an alleged "shameless attack" carried out by the "followers" of the PCB (FV) against the most active and advanced Maoist organizations in the world: the Communist Party of India (Maoist) and the (Communist Party of the Philippines).

In this regard and for the exercise, in the very specific case of the Filipino comrades, we are going to present some arguments from our experience.

A few decades ago, the Maoists of Ecuador were ready to develop people's war, and we did so in difficult conditions where an opportunist left line prevailed. It's the truth, and those mistakes cost us a lot. We were weak, we were not well equipped with MLM, nor with Gonzalo Thought, and therefore we gave the initiative to reaction in very difficult circumstances.

Through synthesis, we better understood how much the New Democratic revolution (or socialist revolution where it applies) is set back in a country and in the world when we communists give the enemy any space to establish negotiations, conversations, agreements, truces, etc.; and based on our meager experience we hold with vehemence and determination; there is no reason or condition whatsoever to establish agreements, pacts or negotiations with the enemy except to define its final defeat or its capitulation.

If we offer a truce (bilateral or unilateral) to the enemy, the class and the people lose. In Colombia, armed revisionism is champion in this type of behavior. Truce for Christmas, for Easter, for winter, for the national day of Colombia or because they are surrounded by the enemy troops. In fact, comrades, by the way, the Filipino comrades made a unilateral truce over the Covid-19 pandemic. The enemy took advantage of the truce to inflict heavy blows on the comrades.

It is in this context in which we have particularly dared to criticize the Filipino comrades and their recurrent calls to “negotiate” truces/ceasefires with the enemy, because even, saving the distances in favor of the Filipino comrades in the development of the war, we understood that this is atrocious for the interests of the class and the revolution, and not only that, but also for the international proletariat, therefore it is worth noting the danger they are incurring.

At this point it is difficult to know, but if the comrades of Nepal had considered and assumed the timely alert and criticism in this regard, Prachanda would probably be where he should be: 6 feet under, and the people’s war: close to victory.

But without going beyond that, there is another aspect that is important to highlight. The tremendous impact that certain erroneous behaviors of Filipino comrades have in their international line of work, especially in Ecuador.

One of the most recalcitrantly revisionist, opportunist and harmful parties that exists in the country is the Marxist–Leninist Communist Party of Ecuador (PCMLE)(Popular Unity); from Hoxhaist, they have become Bolivarian; perhaps one of the main obstacles to be destroyed in order for the people’s war to develop in Ecuador.

Some years ago, in a joint action between armed elements of this Party (PCMLE) and the national police, they captured party militants who, basically armed with brushes and paint, were carrying out a campaign of paint in support of the people’s war in Peru, India, Turkey and the Philippines in a public university in the capital (Central University); in addition to the detained comrades, their torture and their subsequent imprisonment, we had to confront the loss of a very important arsenal and the repressive escalation of all the armed apparatuses of the state against the Party that had its climax with the siege of a populous neighborhood from Guayaquil (48 and K) where 1500 soldiers, tanks, boats and helicopters concentrated the population, they raided house by house until they shot 4 people in front of their relatives

(literally), 3 of them members of the Party. Of course, our response against revisionism was bloody to make them understand that under no circumstances were we going to tolerate or allow this and other types of attacks.

This same organization participates in all electoral processes, including in alliance with the most recalcitrant sectors of national politics (they called to vote for the banker Guillermo Lasso, comprador bourgeoisie, and today, facing the 2021 elections, they support indigenous reformism) and they repeatedly traffic in the struggle and pain of our people. Staunch enemies of Maoism.

Every year the PCMLE organizes the International Seminar on the Problems of the Revolution in Latin America, which on some occasions has been attended, in a curious and inexplicable way, by the Filipino comrades who, after that conciliation, end up defining “strategies” for the revolution in Latin America with organizations such as: Círculo Jaques Roumcin de Montreal – Canada, an organization that you surely know; the PCR of Argentina, of Bolivia; Popular Unity for Socialism of Brazil, Revolutionary Communist Party of Brazil; American Labor Party, George Grunental, Red Star Editions – United States; Revolutionary Socialist Party of Peru and obviously the National Democratic Front of the Filipinos and others.

Those are the alliances of the Filipino comrades in Ecuador. Even more questionable, is the fact that we have issued letters to comrades warning of their error through different channels.

From the above mentioned, it is obvious that this type of political decisions by the Filipino comrades does nothing to contribute to ideological unity of the international proletariat and the need to reconstitute the Communist International; however, there are countless campaigns of support that our party has developed in favor of the people’s war in the Philippines, the historical value that we have given to its martyrs, including Comrade Ka Parago, because we do not let this correct criticism make us lose perspective and ignore the fundamental aspect of the Filipino comrades. So, for the

Canadian comrades, is it better to keep silent? In honor of proletarian unity glued with slobber and not in ideology, is it better to turn sideways every time the comrades make truces with class enemies of the poor peasantry and other exploited masses of the Philippines putting at risk the vital effort for the revolution in their country? Should we, the communists of Ecuador, look complacently as the Filipino comrades sit at the table to draw up “revolutionary” strategies with the most revisionist sector of Ecuador and that on many occasions, have openly and destructively criticized the people’s war in Peru, ridiculed Chairman Gonzalo, and declared themselves anti-Maoists?

Comrades. As we pointed out initially, years ago we were wrong, we fell into the ravine, we were beaten by the enemy, and many Maoist organizations and parties harshly criticized us, and we accepted it; we do not take it as poisonous darts that seek to annihilate us, nor (in the pure Movadef style) did we changed our strategic course, on the contrary, along the way we have been reconstituting better equipped with ideology. We learned to self criticize, because we use this method as a form of Party catharsis and, given the historical trajectory of struggle that the Filipino comrades have, we believe that they will know how to take our criticism, as a two-line struggle, as “medicine to save to the sick one.”

(...) In truth, comrades, you have lost all objectivity to assert that we “oppose the people’s wars” that are taking place in the world. The comrades go astray, launching an infamy of rants. Without detracting from the important campaigns carried out by the communists of the world in support of the people’s wars that are unleashed in the Philippines, India, Turkey and Peru, it has been precisely the organizations that wield MLM, principally Maoism and we recognize the universal contribution of Gonzalo Thought, who have carried out the strongest and most decisive campaigns in favor of these wars. Just look at the fabulous and internationalist work carried out by Dem Volke Dienen’s comrades; the Committee Red Flag and Tjen Folket in Norway, New Peru (VND-Peru.blogspot.com) from Germany; the rest of the organizations and parties of which it is enough to see that from the forms, the slogans, and the practical activity, they have deployed thousands of internationalist actions in support of

these people's wars, indeed, at certain times using sabotage actions such as those carried out Ecuador in favor of the People's War in Peru.

Comrades read, investigate, absolutely all the pronouncements, statements and publications of these Parties, whether individually or collectively, we revive the people's wars, the same ones that even in the framework of setbacks, twists and others have had the militant and internationalist support of our parties; quite the contrary to you, who at the first blow of wind come out to deny the People's War in Peru. Apparently their accusations are nothing more than a projection of what they feel, what they think about this and other issues addressed in their document and surely in their practice.

(...) Continuing with the document, the Canadian comrades return to what has become a true tirade: that we support an "imaginary war" in Peru. The comrades, like other organizations that proclaim the same fallacy, end up being subservient and functional for the counterrevolutionary strategy of the CIA. Likewise, they join the chorus of the Peruvian reaction; grabbing onto and tailing Movadef, while shouting the lie: there is no people's war in Peru because it has already been defeated!

In this regard we must say, denying the existence of the People's War in Peru has become a counterrevolutionary act. The Canadian comrades do not want to understand how just wars are played out today as opposed to unjust wars; how the reaction in Peru hand in hand with the imperialist strategy considered, according to its plans to neutralize and defeat the people's war, that it was not enough to murder the prisoners of war, unleash the "white terror" massacring entire communities, base areas in the countryside; they were clear that they should attack Chairman Gonzalo directly, cut off his line of command; isolating leadership, but it was also peremptory to go for the ideology, and there they used Movadef to distort the basic foundations of Gonzalo Thought and New Democracy; that is, to come to terms with the fact that the war was defeated, and not only that, but that semi-feudalism no longer exists, that the war resolved that contradiction; that in that journey or phase, Peru went from semi-feudal to dependent capitalist, consequently the

revolution must be socialist. Of course, what is sought is to remove in the course of the New Democracy from the proletariat its strategic ally: the poor peasantry, and in that way dismantle the people's war. But no comrades, you, imperialism, reaction and the ROL have skinny dog dreams if you believe that the people's war was defeated; obviously, it lives in a corner that is already being overcome; it is not easy in the course of war to reorganize the Party, but in the same way, the People's Liberation Army, despite combat difficulties, generates New Power; it recovers strategic spaces, keeps the enemy at bay, demonstrating the strength of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Gonzalo Thought.

Lacking in knowledge, the Canadian comrades fire their shots into the air with wet gunpowder, they want to make waves by throwing a handful of lentils into the river. That is what they want, it cannot be otherwise, they get angry and from their most abject ignorance, or worse, from their demobilizing role they want to deny everything. In truth, the comrades should get closer to Latin America, get to know its people, the communist parties, above all try to better understand what is happening in Peru and under what conditions the people's war is taking place.

(...) In their document the Canadian comrades also point out that we have no respect for the people's war in Nepal.

The comrades recreate shadows. They do not know the support that was given to this process in Latin America; support was not given to those like Kiran and others who were involved in contradictions with Prachanda for the sharing of power, who wanted to be shown to the world as the left line in Nepal and were timely fought not only by those whom the Canadian comrades brand as an "idealistic line," but by other organizations with which they now sign joint statements. In fact, comrades, there are countless propaganda campaigns and mass mobilization that we have undertaken in support of the reorganization of the people's war in Nepal. By the way, in a letter sent to Dazibao Rojo's comrades on September 8, 2012, we pointed out the importance of supporting the reestablishment of the people's war in Nepal and why we openly opposed

the support given to Kiran. And history, unfortunately proved us and other Maoist organizations right; and we say unfortunately because we consider that both you, some comrades from Spain who fell into Kiran's entrapment, we would have wanted the results to be different, for Kiran and the others to have had the ideological valor to correct and resume the people's war until the triumph and maintenance of the New Power in Nepal.

(...) And yes, the Canadian comrades are not only clinging to the tail of the ROL, they are also holding onto the revisionists and other opportunists who in their time criticized and branded the Chinese comrades revisionists and opportunists when they held the VII Congress of the CCP (1945) that the guiding thought of the party is Mao Tse-tung Thought and that it was specifically –by then– the application of Marxism–Leninism to the reality of China. Today they reply, today it is the ICM Khrushchevs who howl and oppose Gonzalo Thought. And like it or not, Mao Tse-tung Thought, despite having several detractors who held the hands of the dog Deng Xiaoping, Khrushchev, Hoxha and others, there were also some parties and organizations that began to value Chairman Mao's contributions of universal validity. In Colombia, the PLA ML Mao Tse-tung Thought; in Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Spain and other parties and organizations in the world were renamed ML Mao Tse-tung Thought and proposed New Democracy and others contributions. Of course, the historical evidence tells us that none of these organizations and/or parties synthesized Mao Tse-tung Thought as Maoism, why? Because that definition had to be subject to certain historical conditions that allowed deepening its study and application.

The comrades of the PCR–RCP, consider that even before the People's War in Peru there was already a universal recognition of Maoism without being Maoism, however, the comrades refuse to recognize that Maoism, as such, was defined, recognized, wielded and defended as such, as the third and superior stage of Marxism–Leninism with the beginning and development of the people's war in Peru.

The comrades, in a clear idealistic manifestation, refuse to understand how and under what conditions Mao Tse-tung Thought was generated and how it came to be defined as Maoism; initially within the framework of the revolution in a country like China with characteristics different from those that existed in Russia before the Bolshevik revolution; on the basis of inter-imperialist contradictions (US and the USSR); world wars, cultural revolution; international proletarian movement, national liberation movements, struggle between Marxism and revisionism and later the development of the people's war in Peru.

The PCR-RCP asks: before the people's war in Peru, did Mao Tse-tung Thought already have the same weight and meaning Maoism has today? No comrades; after the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese Khrushchev, Deng Xiaoping and his clique took great pains to distort it, in addition to attacking it, they always tried to show it as unviable; it was not applied in Vietnam or in any other place on the planet like it was applied in Peru in the process of reconstituting the Party and other instruments for the revolution; where Chairman Gonzalo, Gonzalo Thought and the Party had a deeper understanding of Mao Tse-tung Thought initiating and developing people's war, otherwise it would have been impossible for this to happen and with it the recognition of what today we communists of the world uphold, MARXISM-Leninism-MAOISM.

And no comrades, when the PCP and particularly Chairman Gonzalo synthesized Mao Tse-tung Thought, it did not happen "in a vacuum" regardless of the practice as you point out it certainly occurred by analyzing the experience of the Chinese revolution and furthermore, in the course of preparing, initiating and developing the People's War in Peru, that is, validating the theory in practice, in fact, of course, without underestimating the important two-line struggle that developed in the RIM at the time.

As a means of arguing its presentation, the PCR-RCP points out that Stalin "did not synthesize Leninism. He defended Leninism." Yes, it is true, Stalin defended it, but they omit a fundamental fact, before he defended it he

defined it as Leninism and applied it in a new context, in that of the Cold War, in the counteroffensive of Yankee Imperialism with the support of the imperialist and capitalist powers of Europe and after World War II, and do not forget comrades that it was precisely Stalin in 1924 who affirmed that “you could not be a Marxist if you were not a Marxist-Leninist,” just like us, particularly the communists of Ecuador have said it with loud and clear, with determination and without ambiguity, today you cannot be a Marxist-Leninist without being a Maoist, and to be one in a particular manner, meaning to be a Maoist today is to recognize the contributions of universal validity of Gonzalo Thought, in such a way that we consider Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Gonzalo Thought! We consider this the correct ideological line to develop people’s war in our country and in service of the World Proletarian Revolution.

(...) The comrades from Canada have an inexplicable disagreement with the most elementary Marxist, historical materialist, dialectical analysis; in fact, it easily reminds us of Avakian’s vain pretensions. No comrades, you cannot compare the contributions Lenin made to Marxism, or Chairman Mao to Marxism-Leninism; we are not there for that, it is part of a whole, as you well point out, they are also a dialectical sequence that is developed through synthesis, although it is true that it begins with Marx and Engels, we cannot think that it will end with Chairman Mao and Maoism. That is idealism, comrades, gross mechanism; Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is called by history to develop with the contribution that initially arise within the particularities such as the People’s War in Peru with Chairman Gonzalo and will later be with the contribution of the People’s War in Brazil, Mexico and that other comrades do, parties that manage to develop the theory from the practical exercise, in the work of the revolution and that have universal validity, which will put us in front of a new “ism” as many time as it is necessary until the conquest of communism.

Comrades, we also find it vulgar, when you ask, “how is it possible that the Communist Party of China, several decades before the emergence of ‘Gonzalo Thought,’ managed not only to lead a people’s war but also to lead it to victory? How is it that the Vietnamese communists, several years before the

so-called 'synthesis' of Maoism, managed to do the same?" in relation to what was sustained in one of the statements in which we note the impossibility of a people's war without having assimilated the contributions with universal validity of Gonzalo Thought.

They want to compare and oppose the People's War in Peru with other historical processes. They again throw a handful of lentils into the river, this time claiming a tsunami: "even the Vietnamese resistance wars against French and American imperialism (...) had much greater influence than the People's War in Peru in the world and unlike the latter, resulted in victory" What an analysis! What a comparison! Comrades, analyze the context; the characteristics of the war in Vietnam were of national liberation, they did not consider the possibility of developing a New Democratic revolution; furthermore, in 1967 they chose to follow the Soviet social-imperialism led by Khrushchev and implement in Vietnam a bureaucratic dictatorship over its people, alien to the leadership of the proletariat. However, and unperturbed, comrades countless times accuse us comrades of the PCB (FV) and "their satellites" of being idealistic, petty-bourgeois, of being unaware of historical materialism.

(...) People's War until communism

The comrades of Canada also find ways to point their rifles at the slogan: People's War until Communism!

Likewise, they qualify it as wrong; as "lessening what people's war means," they consider that the people's war is a "form of revolutionary action and a strategy to dismantle the military forces of the class enemy and take power [...] that once power is conquered throughout the country and the enemy armed forces have been crushed, the military confrontation ends for the simple reason that there is no longer a militarily organized adversary to face."

Comrades. The seizure of power alone does not represent anything; nor does the destruction of the military apparatus guarantee that the enemy has been

totally liquidated. In fact, to some extent the enemy regains its strength because imperialism is going to support it more and better. Power is expressed not only in the seizure of the means of production; power is no longer only expressed in the military apparatus, it is also shown solidly in the field of consciousness and in another aspect that has now gained great strength: the militarization of societies.

Today's imperialism is obviously not the imperialism of the last century; it deploys new strategies, they have been recreating them for decades in Colombia to combat armed revisionism using alternative apparatus, paramilitary groups, or pitting masses against masses. They have done it in Peru, where imperialism put its greatest effort. Let's see what happens in Syria, they continue with the line of balkanization; they utilize the masses of the same countries to weaken or overthrow governments or states. Comrades, it is not enough to defeat the old military apparatus, it is important to develop people's war to defend the new power. It is fundamental, and that defense has long since ceased to be the responsibility basically of the new apparatus, of the new army, it is up to the armed sea of masses to do so; as Marx and Engels said, without the "armed sea" of masses, there is no possibility of defending power and transitioning to communism. We insist on the need to recognize and rescue the experience of the international proletariat in the Paris Commune, or the USSR where the lack of militarization of the party and of arming the masses contributed to the leadership of the party and the professional army being easily assaulted by restoring revisionism.

Comrades, People's War is much more than an army made up of guerrillas organized into local forces, main forces, and armed militias destroying the enemy's living forces until the seizure of power, and achieving this purpose, going to lock up in the barracks. The war that the proletariat and the poor peasantry raises is a comprehensive, systemic, dialectical war, where every vestige of the Old Power is destroyed, that is, its old armed apparatus, its old productive structure, its old relations of production, its old culture, and the masses under proletarian leadership, have that task, but on the same premise and with the same vehemence, they must defend the New Power that will try

to be undermined and destroyed by the remnants of the bourgeois and landlord classes with the support of imperialism.

Chairman Mao points out the importance of arming the masses even after victory has been achieved: “The imperialists are bullying us in such a way that we will have to deal with them seriously. Not only must we have a powerful regular army; we must also organize contingents of the people’s militia on a big scale. This will make it difficult for the imperialists to move a single inch in our country in case of invasion [...] If imperialism dares to unleash a war of aggression against our country; the people’s militia will operate in coordination with the People’s Liberation Army and will reinforce it at all times to defeat the oppressors.” And not only that, comrades, but Chairman Mao considered the militias and the armed forces as an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Today, in the absence of the socialist camp (since 1976), the Yankee imperialist superpower is much more daring, violent, it feels itself owner of the world despite the counterweight that Chinese and Russian imperialism tries to apply. It shows it in Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen. Precisely in recent times it has not ceased in its threat to invade Venezuela, to position itself more solidly with its armed contingent in Colombia and other countries where it has puppets, lackeys, all armed, just as violent, because imperialism and reaction in general know that Power is defended with violence. Should we communists invent another way to defend Power, which must necessarily be expressed as people’s war, without violence?

It is that surely the comrades of the PCR-RCP think that we communists, with Power in our hands, become humanitarian souls, that we must treat the bourgeois remnants with white gloves, with cowardice. No, we are not going to make that mistake again! The question of Power also lies in how to defend it. We know well that it is accessed by war and is defended by war whose limits can only be established by its ability to decisively and definitively annihilate or neutralize its enemy, that the question is ultimately defined by who “uses force without regard, without economy of blood.”^[1] Clausewitz maintained

this and also warned of what the Canadians conclude regarding how to handle the bourgeois remnants in socialism; “the mistakes that are made out of benignity are precisely the most harmful”; and if to wield the defense of New Power with people’s war is to want to show a radical vision of it, well, we are here for it.

No comrades, you can’t, in fact, you don’t have the right and to make mistakes in that manner; in the current circumstances in the world there is a certain tendency towards greater fascism and reaction of the old states; waging war to destroy the old power becomes a much more bloody, harsh, complex strategic exercise that does not necessarily conform to dogmas or formulas that must be mechanically replicated, no comrades, the conditions are different; today it is necessary to militarize the communist parties, militarize the masses to defend the new power with people’s war, understand that people’s war is “a strategic perspective to guarantee the dictatorship of the proletariat” as Chairman Gonzalo points out.

Chairman Mao states, “The proletariat seeks to transform the world according to its own world outlook, and so does the bourgeoisie.” Although it is true that the proletariat and its allies destroy the old bourgeois–landlord power (in the semi–colonial countries), are the old bourgeoisie and the big landowners not going to organize the recovery of power by armed or violent means?; are their military apparatus defeated, will they resort to “democratic” means to destroy the New Power? Both in New Democracy and in socialism the antagonistic classes survive and as long as societies are made up of antagonistic classes, it is war to death!

The maintenance of the people’s war until communism establishes, as a basis, the absolute predominance of Marxism–Leninism–Maoism– principally Maoism until a new thought emerges and is consolidated worldwide as the development of MLM.

One of the brilliant contributions that Chairman Mao made to Marxism and which would establish itself as one of the starting points that would mark the

emergence of Mao Tse-tung Thought was the study of the correct treatment of contradictions among the people. In fact, among the people there will be contradictions that must be resolved through two-line struggle, such as the one we propose will develop among you to the extent that they do not become antagonistic; however, when revisionism is strategically being restored or preventing the revolution from breaking out, it must be struggled against to death; against the bourgeois-feudal remnants it must be driven to death, and not because one wants to show a version of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a new “radical” version, as you point out, but because the history of class struggle has taught us that it must be this way. If the enemy does everything it considers doing to be able to hold Old Power, why shouldn't the proletariat do the same, and more so to hold its dictatorship?

Comrades, those who proclaim the bourgeois military line think in this way, focusing on the idea that the people's army as a vertical, unique, bureaucratic, professional armed structure, divorced from the masses; is to think like Khrushchev, Peng De-juai and Luo Rui-ching who promoted the idea of a professional army, separated from the people, from the masses. Why did they think and act in this way? Because in this way the army leadership could be easily assaulted and turned into an instrument to usurp the party leadership. History has shown us that this line is opportunistic, rabidly anti-dictatorship of the proletariat. In fact, to some extent it also happened in Peru, where Feliciano and Alipio from the command of the army attacked Party leadership to neutralize the development of the people's war.

Lenin warned, “that the bourgeoisie remained stronger than the proletariat even after the latter had seized power, and that it will always try to make a return to power.” Stalin was weak in that regard; here lay one of his mistakes, to not fully recognize and in its true dimension the existence of antagonistic classes in socialism and how to resolve these irreconcilable contradictions.

Comrades, class struggle is a struggle for power and the fundamental aspect of Maoism is that, power, power for the proletariat. The fundamental aspect of Gonzalo Thought is power, and how to sustain power in the framework of new

contradictions where an imperialist superpower like the United States remains; imperialist powers that try to redivide the world, but also, in a scenario where the petty bourgeois reformism provides us new scenarios and where a neorevisionism has clearly emerged to struggle against the correct ideological line of the international proletariat.

(...) The Canadian comrades also consider that those of us who hold the thesis of Marxism–Leninism–Maoism, principally Maoism, give an equivocal assessment of what the Cultural Revolution represented.

No comrades. We start from a fundamental premise that the comrades do not seem to understand correctly. The cultural revolution is above all CLASS STRUGGLE.

In Chairman Mao's China, after the seizure of power, the structural transformation did not occur mechanically and in the midst of a sacrosanct peace. That is, the productive forces were developed, private ownership of the means of production were abolished, and exploitative relations of production were eliminated. No comrades, an ideological revolution was also necessary because it was necessary to root out the conceptions that tied the masses to feudalism, to the old structure, to the bourgeois conceptions that survive and of which the restorers take advantage to undermine the New Power. Those leaps occurred in the midst of confrontations, some antagonistic, to death; others, among the people, the left line of Chairman Mao, the other, of the Chinese Khrushchev, Deng Xiaoping and his clique, which ultimately served social–imperialism and the path of restoration.

The cultural revolution did not respond to operating basically in the field of consciousness, as you suggest; through that revolution, the consolidation of proletarian power had a notable impact. It is important to recreate what Chairman Mao pointed out in this regard: “correct ideas characteristic of the advanced class are grasped by the masses, these ideas turn into a material force which changes society and changes the world.” Without the Cultural Revolution, the teachings of Marx and Engels that the emancipation of the

workers is the work of the workers themselves would not have been evident; consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, strengthen its class consciousness and advance production.

We must not forget comrades that Chairman Mao did not see the revolution isolated from the central problem that arose in the super structure, but rather saw it in a systemic, related way, making the cultural revolution was a problem of the class struggle that was linked to the tasks of also fighting for scientific production and experimentation. In fact, Chairman Mao considered that “nor do they comprehend that matter, can be transformed into consciousness and consciousness into matter, although such leaps are phenomena of everyday life,” therefore you cannot be banal and not consider this dialectical relationship that is expressed as a contradiction.

Comrades, if somehow we, the communists of Ecuador, the nobodies, the little ones, the tiny satellites of the PCB (FV) could define the cultural revolution, we would do so by arguing that this was, above all, class struggle; weapon for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but above all the way in which the absolute predominance of Mao Tse-tung Thought was established in China.

(...) Comrades; We believe that today to be a communist is to be a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, principally Maoist, because we are experiencing a turning point determined by the conditions in which the inter-imperialist contradictions develop in which there is no longer a socialist camp; where the new division of the world is between the Yankee imperialist superpower and the other imperialist powers that seek to establish a certain counterweight to the Yankee empire; where the development of Chinese imperialism, which, apart from the dictatorship of the proletariat, disputes markets with the United States; where the ICM is dispersed by the presence of neo-revisionism exposed by currents such as Avakian; the crumbs that Prachanda has left scattered in some places; due to the permanent confrontation or ideological struggle and the difficulties that the people's wars go through that pushes us to analyze reality is from another perspective.

We are principally Maoists because we consider that we are entering a stage of inflection and leap, where in countries, particularly in the third world, where the weight of Gonzalo Thought is ceasing to be incidental and becoming decisive in politics and ideology.

Let us remember what happened in China, which became the center of the world proletariat after the October revolution; that Mao-Tse-tung Thought was a touchstone for Khrushchev's revisionism, Deng Xiaoping; against reformism and even against those parties and organizations that hand over the responsibility of undertaking national liberation struggles to the national bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie. It was constituted in the center of Marxism-Leninism before the People's War in Peru and that from there it became Maoism, opened gaps for the deed of a new impulse, a new leap, Gonzalo Thought, today constituted the most effective touchstone to distinguish revolutionaries from counterrevolutionaries.

(...) And yes, comrades, without pretending to be pragmatic and eclectic, we can also agree with you on the need to fight against the communist parties and organizations that have distorted class struggle, that have changed the course to follow in relation to create subjective conditions for people's war and revolution by getting bogged down in "postmodernist" struggles that contribute nothing to the revolution and that on the contrary distract the proletariat from its fundamental struggles. In any case, it must be understood that postmodernism not only results in the subjective handling of the struggles of the masses and the distortion of class struggle, it also reveals itself in the new forms of struggle that they seek to impress within the masses.

In Ecuador, a dynamic group that hiding behind the Maoist truth that "it is right to rebel" and sustaining an eclectic discourse, has developed, and to some extent contaminated the forms of struggle of the class and the masses. Drums, mimes, clowns, whistles, dancers, are the actors and methods of struggle that seek to replace the determined and combative action of the proletariat, peasantry and other exploited masses.

Comrades, with the foregoing we are not referring to the fact that we agree with you in pointing out that this is the line of struggle applied by the comrades of the United States whom we highly respect and value and that you attack with so much vehemence, but because obviously, many communist parties that define themselves as Maoists have fallen into this game of dispersion, becoming real obstacles to the revolution.

Comrades of the PCR-RCP of Canada, this is an internationalist call to get out of that small world to which you are shackled to by a subjective vision of reality, of the contradictions that arise within the international proletariat. It is not up to us, as communists, to lean on a materialism tainted with idealism or to merge dialectics with metaphysics to protest those who, even with errors typical of those who tirelessly try again and again to unleash the people's war for conquest and defense of Power for the class on the inevitable path to communism.

You have to get out of that platonic cave that only lets you see shadows and false realities. With ideology and its correct application, it is necessary to explore, interpret and transform objective reality; it is urgent to accept criticism in a constructive way, as "medicine for the sick" and to avoid or discard those false academic claims that do not contribute to the two-line struggle and that end up being exploited by imperialism and other enemies of the class and the people to prevent the revolution.

Comrades, if we do not fight against revisionism, we will have accomplished nothing.

LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM, PRINCIPALLY MAOISM!

LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM, GONZALO THOUGHT!

IF WE DON'T FIGHT AGAINST REVISIONISM, WE WILL HAVE ACCOMPLISHED NOTHING!

FOR UNITY IN THE IDEOLOGY OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT!

LONG LIVE THE PEOPLE'S WAR IN PERU, INDIA, THE PHILIPPINES AND TURKEY!

LONG LIVE THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRAZIL RED FRACTION AND OTHER
COMMUNIST PARTIES COMMITTED TO THE WORLD PROLETARIAN
REVOLUTION!

EVERYTHING IS ILLUSORY EXCEPT POWER!

TO CONQUER THE RED SUN OF LIBERATION: COMMUNISM!

PREVIOUS POST

Criticism of Six Heads Study Circle

NEXT POST

The Psychology of the Unsettled

Leave a Reply

Enter your comment here...

Search ...

ARCHIVES

December 2021

November 2021

October 2021

September 2021

August 2021

July 2021

June 2021

May 2021

April 2021

March 2021

February 2021

January 2021

November 2020

October 2020

July 2020

June 2020

May 2020

April 2020

March 2020

February 2020

January 2020

December 2019

November 2019

October 2019

August 2019

July 2019

June 2019

May 2019

April 2019

February 2019

January 2019

December 2018

November 2018

October 2018

September 2018

August 2018

July 2018

June 2018

BLOG AT WORDPRESS.COM.