

CHAIRMAN MAO ZEDONG LAID THE FOUNDATIONS FOR THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION*

Peru People's Movement

December 2023

We greet the international proletariat and the peoples of the world with exultant joy and revolutionary optimism on the occasion of the 130th anniversary of the birth of Chairman Mao Zedong, celebrated on December 26 of this year. Serving the successful campaign of its celebration by the International Communist League, on this solemn occasion, based on party documentation, we address the foundations of the strategy and tactics of the world revolution established by Chairman Mao:

Chairman Gonzalo, in his Report on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism at the First Congress of the Party (1988), emphasizes: “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.

I think there are many things about this that we can imagine, but they are situations, those related to communism, that we are not able to specify. Why? We must always keep in mind what Engels said, he tells us, when he spoke in *Anti-Dürhing*, “we can think many things about how communism is going to be and say such a thing is going to be ‘a,’ such a thing is going to be ‘b,’ such a thing is going to be ‘c,’ but rest assured that when communism

*<https://vnd-peru.blogspot.com/2023/12/el-pcp-y-el-maoismo-el-presidente-mao.html>

arrives it will shape its realities and it will not give a damn about everything we have thought,” this is how he told us. On this we must seriously reflect on what Engels says. Why? Because it [communism] is a world without classes and we move in a world of classes, do you understand what that implies? Our mind is organized according to classes and thinks within the framework of class society, it does not fit, we do not understand, we cannot point to, we cannot concretely specify what a world without classes will be like. Our great flags have told us signs, elements, situations, they are just and correct, but concrete things, very difficult.

In the document *UNITE AROUND THE CONGRESS AND DEVELOP THE METROPOLITAN COMMITTEE!* (PCP, 1988), Chairman Gonzalo 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 threefold division of the countries of the world, hence Avakian of the RCP-USA argues that Lenin has paved the way for the opportunistic theory of the three worlds. Lenin faced a concrete problem; with his foresight, he anticipated that the revolution in Europe was not imminent but rather unfolding in the oppressed nations of the East. Thus, he begins to outline the strategy and tactics for world revolution. We saw this in 1977, in *Bandera Roja* No. 47-48, in point V of the agreements of the VI and VII plenums of the central committee, where the international problem is addressed, including the perspectives of Lenin and Chairman Mao.

The following is an extensive quotation of point V, referred to by the Chairman:

“V. TO BE A MARXIST IS TO ADHERE TO MARXISM-LENINISM-MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT

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.’

‘What the socialists must do is to take advantage of the war waged by the bandits to overthrow them all.’ ‘War is politics by other means’ (namely: by violence).

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.' And analyzing the construction of the new society, in *The State and Revolution* he wrote:

'In its first phase, or first stage, communism cannot as yet be fully mature economically and entirely free from traditions or vestiges of capitalism. Hence the interesting phenomenon that communism in its first phase retains 'the narrow horizon of bourgeois law.' Of course, bourgeois law in regard to the distribution of consumer goods inevitably presupposes the existence of the bourgeois state, for law is nothing without an apparatus capable of enforcing the observance of the rules of law.'

'It follows that under communism there remains for a time not only bourgeois law, but even the bourgeois state, without the bourgeoisie!' This is why 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 the First World War and with 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.’

In January 1964, Chairman Mao issued a **declaration in support of the Panamanian people.** In it, he highlighted that U.S. imperialism ‘has continuously been plundering and oppressing the people of the Latin American countries and suppressing the national-democratic revolutionary struggles there.’ He denounced that imperialism ‘turned the southern part of Korea and the southern part of Vietnam into its colonies, kept Japan under its control and semi-military occupation... committed interven-

tion and aggression against other Asian countries.’ Mao pointed out that in Africa, ‘U.S. imperialism is feverishly pursuing its neocolonialist policies, seeking vigorously to take the place of the old colonialists, to plunder and enslave the peoples of Africa, and to undermine and stamp out the national liberation movements.’ He warned that the Yankee policy of aggression and war ‘vigorously seeking to push its policy of ‘peaceful evolution’ in the socialist countries’ and that ‘Even toward its allies in Western Europe, North America and Oceania, U.S. imperialism is pursuing a policy of the law of the jungle, trying hard to trample them underfoot.’ He concludes by calling for unity: ‘The people of the countries in the socialist camp should unite, the people of all the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America should unite, the people of all the continents of the world should unite, all peace-loving countries and all countries that are subject to U.S. aggression, control, interference and bullying should unite, and so form the broadest united front to oppose the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war and to safeguard world peace.’

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 aggression 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 superpowers, 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 En-

gels 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 (...)**

The death of Chairman Mao Zedong, like the death of all of the great leaders of the proletariat, has generated deep unrest and wide repercussions in China as well as the world; and, in the conditions that the struggle was developing in China, it provided the opportunity for the right wing to usurp the power of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to undermine the conquests of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and to open the doors to capitalist restoration, to capitulation and to revisionism by means of a coup of the State. The class struggle in China between revolution and counter-revolution, between Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and revisionism, between the proletarian line of Chairman Mao and the revisionist, counter-revolutionary and capitulationist bourgeois line headed by Deng Xiaoping has entered crucial, complex and difficult moments; strange and surprising

methods are resorted to in the treatment of the problems and the struggle, important and broad changes are produced in the leadership and in the organizations, mainly of the Party, at the same time that the criticism against the revisionist revocatory wind of Deng Xiaoping is suspended, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is openly questioned, the especially national capitulation is developed and Deng's counter-revolutionary program is upheld as a flag. All this is nothing but a right-wing blow in the sharp two-line struggle in the period of the continuation of the revolution, taking advantage of the juncture and repercussions of the death of Chairman Mao Zedong.

The situation that has arisen in China is not a trivial matter. On the contrary, it is a matter of great significance for revolutionaries and communists worldwide, and we all must pay very close attention to it. The usurpation of Power leads to a general change in both the development of socialism and international politics. The key issue in Marxism is the dictatorship of the proletariat; this is its essence. A right-wing coup and its usurpation are matters of utmost seriousness and importance. It is not only a matter concerning China; it is a matter for all communists because its repercussions are related to the global revolution. The experiences of restoration and usurpation of Power in the USSR are fresh lessons that we cannot forget.

Mariátegui taught us: 'It is impossible to be disinterested in the destiny of a nation that occupies such an important place in time and space. China weighs too much in human history for us not to be attracted by its deeds and men.' This great truth remains valid today more than ever for all communists and revolutionaries in the country. But if the events in China, after the death of Chairman Mao Zedong in particular, move us to just concern and the obligation to defend the flags of Marxism, precisely to defend them let us be guided by their own forecasts:

'If the Rightists were to stage an anti-Communist coup d'état in China, I am sure they would have no peace either and their rule would most probably be short-lived, because it would never be tolerated by the revolutionaries who represent the interests of the people constituting more than 90 per cent of the population.'

‘No matter whether in China or in other countries of the world, over ninety per cent of the people will support Marxism-Leninism in the long run. In this world at present there are still many people being deceived by social-democratic parties, by the revisionists, the imperialists, or by the reactionary elements of various countries, who have not yet awakened. But eventually little by little they will awaken, they will support Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is truth; it cannot be resisted. The masses want revolution; the world revolution will finally be victorious.’

We have upheld **fundamental theses of Lenin and Chairman Mao on the class struggle at the international level** because the understanding of such a complex problem, especially its strategy and tactics, can only be approached from Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. **The international question, the position before it, is part of the general political line of the Party since its constitution**, and its substantive points are in the same program: it starts from the international character of the economy and the revolutionary movement of the proletariat that is guided by the slogan of ‘Proletarians of all countries, unite!’; it upholds the situation of the backward, semi-feudal and semi-colonial countries, which under imperialist pressure cannot have an independent national economy nor be at the service of their people; and concludes by affirming that in the epoch of imperialism, epoch of monopolies and wars of plunder for the division of the world, Marxism has become Marxism-Leninism to which we adhere as a guide for our action.

Mariátegui also, in his work for the construction of the Party, paid very special attention to the international class struggle. For him, with the First World War, the capitalist system entered into a great crisis and with the October Revolution; a new era for humanity began; bourgeois democracy accentuated its crisis and engendered fascism; the socialism of the Second International, follower of ‘parliamentary cretinism,’ aggravated its decomposition; and the revolution swept through Europe with repercussions throughout the backwards world, especially in Asia whose awakening, he tells us, is worthy of the times. The emergence of the Communist International, for Mariátegui, implied a great devel-

opment, because, for the first time, the International truly embraced the exploited and oppressed of the world and, with great vision, understanding the perspective of the movement of the oppressed nations and its importance for the world revolution, he was in opposition to those who stood against Lenin and wanted to maintain a narrow International circumscribed and centered in Europe, blind to the strategic necessity to uphold the oppressed nations as a powerful movement of national liberation.

As it is seen, from our constitution as a Party, the position in front of the international class struggle is an important part of the general political line and concrete expression of proletarian internationalism. And if this was the case at the foundation, today we are in pursuit of completing the Reconstitution, it is also important and necessary to pay attention to this part of the general line: for this reason it is appropriate to raise some problems.

With the October Revolution a new epoch began: the World Proletarian Revolution, that of the passage to socialism and communist construction. Historically the world bourgeois revolution that, for centuries, had unfolded and expired. If in this the bourgeoisie was the leading class, in the new epoch the revolution is led by the proletariat through its communist parties. In this epoch there are fundamental contradictions: between capitalism and socialism, between bourgeoisie and proletariat, between imperialists, and between imperialists and oppressed nations. Of them, the contradiction between capitalism and socialism will continue its development throughout this epoch and the other fundamental contradictions serve its development, since on it depends, ultimately, the construction of the new society; however, in each period each of the four takes shape as principal, as evidenced by the history of the 20th century.

The class struggle of this century also proves that two powerful movements are developing: the movement of the international proletariat, the movement of national liberation and, although the former is an expression of the ruling class which is concretized in the Communist Parties and the International Communist Movement, the National Liberation Move-

ment, as a consequence of imperialism itself, has acquired great strength and fulfills, as foreseen, an important strategic role. We must consider that, as long as imperialism and bourgeoisie exist, revisionism will continue to exist, thus generating the split within the international proletariat; hence the need and importance of fighting its counter-revolutionary activity inseparably from the anti-imperialist and revolutionary struggle.

This epoch, on the other hand, is one of the great wars for the hegemony and repartition of the world, for the domination of the colonies and semi-colonies, to maintain the exploitation of the proletariat and to prevent the development of socialism; all of these **are reactionary wars that imperialism carries out with the support of the reactionaries. Against them rise the revolutionary wars:** the wars of national liberation, the civil wars against the exploiters themselves and those in defense of socialism and the continuation of the revolution; if the former are unjust and reactionary wars, these are just wars that serve the revolution and whose direction depends on the course that the proletariat gives them through its parties.

In short, we live in the great epoch of the World Proletarian Revolution in which the construction of the new society opens its way through the universal law of revolutionary violence concretized in democratic revolutions, socialist revolutions and continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. An epoch in which the oppressed peoples are more and more incorporated into the revolution, mobilizing the masses as never before seen in history, particularly of the oppressed nations; in which the proletariat increasingly expresses its character as the leading class of the new epoch; in which Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought manifests its growing power proven in more than 100 years of struggle; and, in which the communist parties that adhere to it fulfill and will continue to fulfill their role as organized vanguards, fighters for the emancipation of the proletariat and the world revolution.

The post-World War II development with the vigorous growth of the National Liberation Movement, the transformation of the socialist Soviet Union into a social-imperialist country, with the

inter-imperialist struggles especially of the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, for world hegemony, and the development of the proletariat, socialism and Marxism have led Chairman Mao Zedong to the greatest precision of the present epoch: **The next 50 to 100 years** will shake the Earth by changing its face like no previous epoch and in it many new things are to emerge, us revolutionaries must be vigilant to know how to grasp them firmly and develop them for the sake of the revolution. The counter-revolutionary activities of the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as the struggle of the peoples of the world against the two superpowers have initiated a new period, that of the struggle against American imperialism and Soviet revisionism; this precision is of extraordinary importance for the development of the world proletarian revolution.

The revisionism of Khrushchev and Brezhnev is one of the substantive issues of this period; the usurpation of power in the USSR and its conversion from a socialist country into a social-imperialist superpower shows the gravity and transcendence of the restoration of capitalism. And, besides being the superpower that needs a new distribution of the world to enthrone its hegemony, it generates a counter-revolutionary movement, concealed behind the prestige of socialism and the Party that Lenin founded, to develop bourgeois workers' parties at the service of its interests of revisionist social-imperialism. This is a problem of strategic importance, especially for the communists. Therefore, the character of the main danger of revisionism whose center is the social-imperialist Soviet Union cannot go unnoticed.

Within this period, starting precisely from the fundamental contradictions, the contending forces and their distribution according to tactics, is how the **strategic concept that 'three worlds are delineated'** can be defined. The question of the existence of the two superpowers vying for world domination, of the inter-imperialist contradictions with the superpowers in particular and of the National Liberation Movement, will do, starting from relying on the peoples of the world whose axis is the international proletariat, 'our basic policy is to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the

anti-Communist die-hard forces.’ and ‘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’; bearing in mind the following important orientation:

‘We must turn to good account all such fights, rifts and contradictions in the enemy camp and turn them against our present main enemy.’ All that must be kept very much in mind in order to develop the front against the two superpowers, American imperialism and Soviet revisionism, the United States and the Soviet Union.

This period shows very clearly that the problem of ‘who will defeat whom’ is not defined, that the restoration of capitalism can take place in any socialist country, and that the solution is the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, concretized in the proletarian cultural revolution. Not one, but several, since the revolutionary transformation of the old society is a long historical process.

The fundamental contradictions, given the social-imperialist transformation of the USSR, have taken the form of the following: ‘the contradiction between the oppressed nations on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other; the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries; the contradiction between imperialist and social-imperialist countries and among the imperialist countries; and the contradiction between socialist countries on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other,’ as established by the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China. Every day the great thesis that ‘imperialist wars are absolutely inevitable’ as long as their system subsists and the inter-imperialist contradictions are those that lead to world wars, in the face of which the revolutionary position has been clearly defined: ‘Whether the war gives rise to revolution or revolution prevents the war.’ Finally, this period shows more and more the growing role of the peoples of the world, of the millions and millions, especially of the colonies and

semi-colonies, who are drawn into the international class struggle and rise up in revolution.

It is in the light of the epoch of the World Proletarian Revolution and the period of struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionist social-imperialism that we must analyze the present international situation. In it, the two superpowers vie for world domination; one, the United States, to maintain its domination and even extend it over the colonies and semi-colonies of the old displaced powers and to tighten its control over its own countries; the other, the Soviet Union, struggles to extend its domination and consolidate the positions it has achieved. Both superpowers are hit by the crisis that at various levels is shaking the foundations of the imperialist system headed by the United States and the social-imperialist system headed by the Soviet Union; imperialism in particular is struggling in a crisis that has not yet concluded and threatens to worsen. In these conditions the superpowers are the fundamental source of the world problems at present and their containment ignites the warlike conflicts burning in Africa, the Middle East and others that threaten to lead to World War III. While in addition to these enemies there is imperialism and world reaction in general, regarding the two superpowers it is right to affirm: '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'; and against the wars they are leading or against the world war they are preparing to settle their hegemony, the peoples of the world must unite in opposing any aggressive war unleashed by imperialism or social-imperialism, especially the war of aggression using atomic weapons, and if it breaks out: 'the peoples of the whole world must eliminate it with revolutionary war, and we must make preparations right now!'

Thus, the development of the fundamental contradictions increases the danger of world war, which would be a new war of plunder, a new division of the world by the superpowers and a means, even, to 'overcome' their crises and impose, as they pretend and dream, new 'world orders'; let us not forget that, as Chairman Mao Zedong said, 'revolution is the main trend in the world today.' And

that it is a law of history that a people, even a small country, can defeat a powerful country on the condition that it ‘dares to rise in struggle, dares to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country.’ The peoples of the world, the international proletariat and the Communist Parties that remain faithful to Marxism have a great historic task and they will fulfill it.

To have a defined position on **the international class struggle** is of utmost importance given its complexity, the continuation of the ‘great disorder under the skies,’ the important rethinking that is unfolding, the transcendence of the current conjuncture, the grave perspective of the right-wing coup in China, the divergences that are developing in the International Communist Movement and the **repeated need to specify the strategy and tactics of the world revolution at the present time**. Furthermore, let us reiterate that the position, the line on the international class struggle is part of the general political line, hence the need to deal with it more today that we have entered the Culmination of the Reconstitution of the Party. Finally, let us not forget that around World War II, under Browderist conceptions, with an opportunist position before the international struggle, the way was opened to capitulation in our country, before the comprador bourgeoisie and reaction as class capitulation and before U.S. imperialism as capitulation as a nation. This is, therefore, an important problem that we cannot neglect, especially if we adhere to proletarian internationalism.

The treatment of the line on the international class struggle (...) for our Party, in synthesis, the question today is posed as follows: to be a Marxist is to adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Subjecting ourselves to this position we can make our way towards the understanding of the class struggle at the international level in order to fulfill our role accordingly, both in our revolution and with proletarian internationalism” (until here BR (Bandera Roja [Red Flag]) 46-47).

We continue with Chairman Gonzalo’s presentation at the Meeting with the Metropolitan Committee (1988):

“**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 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. Fur-

thermore, 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. He claims that Chairman Mao never opposed the errors of 1935, the 7th Congress of the Communist International. However, he has not investigated the implications of those circumstances as a struggle and content. 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. To make matters worse, Avakian claims it is erroneous (...) (Also opposed were those in RIM who opposed the definition of Maoism as the third, new and higher stage of the ideology of the international proletariat and who spoke only of Chairman Mao's contributions, note from the MPP).

We, the PCP, 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 PCP, 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 advo-**

cate for world people's war because the issue is to see the revolution, not the enemy.

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. 'Today revolutionary violence is people's war' (First Congress).

Democratic revolution, 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 landowners. 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 bureaucratic capitalism** (...). In *On Coalition Government*, from 1945, Chairman Mao speaks of bureaucratic 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 bureaucratic capitalism, but he continues calling it bureaucratic capital and that this monopoly capital-

ism 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 bureaucratic capitalism must be confiscated. What did Sergio of left liquidationism think? That it was only the state bureaucratic capitalism, not the other part of big capital. Thus, they let this part loose. In the following pages, Chairman Mao speaks of bureaucratic capitalism, that is why he already says ‘three mountains.’

In unpublished writings he speaks of bureaucratic capitalism as well as of the Russian and Chinese revolutions, he says that the October Revolution was a socialist revolution and that by confiscating bureaucratic 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 bureaucratic 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 bureaucratic 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 (with the people’s war) 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 bureaucratic capitalism to differentiate two factions in the big bourgeoisie and not to put ourselves on the tail of any (...)

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 (...)

CONCLUSION

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. That 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.

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.

In this celebration, the MPP, as the organization generated for the party work abroad, by placing this document in your hands, a product of the party documentation, we serve the tasks of the Communist Party of Peru, which while in the complex and difficult circumstances of the bend and the inflection, struggles for its general reorganization in a life-and-death struggle against the revisionist and capitulationist ROL in and for the people's war.

On the 130th anniversary of Chairman Mao's birth and its successful celebration by the ICL, the Party, as the red fraction of the international communist movement, upholds, defends, and applies the triumphant red flags of Marx, Lenin, and Chairman Mao in service of the Peruvian revolution and the world revolution.

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

**Long live the 130th Anniversary of the birth of Chairman Mao
Zedong!**

Long live Chairman Gonzalo and his almighty Gonzalo Thought!