

## Marxism-Leninism-Maoism against Gonzaloism

### RSF Editorial Board

As we all know, we Marxist-Leninist-Maoists and Gonzaloists have a long history of contention. In the past, our exchanges were mainly on domestic public platforms. Last year, a "theory master" named Gong Gesheng on Zhihu published an article entitled "Refuting the Attacks of Some People in China on Marxist-Leninist-Maoists in Various Countries"<sup>1</sup>. At the time, Comrade Wuyi Zuanjian, who was attacked by this article on Zhihu, did not respond to this "masterpiece" for various reasons. Later on, the debate did not lead to any further discussion, and thus did not have a greater impact. Originally, the matter had almost come to an end here, but unexpectedly, this article has been brought up again by the Gonzaloists faction on the secret platform outside the wall to make a big fuss about it.<sup>2</sup> Considering that this article covers an extremely wide range of topics (though its actual content is pitifully small) and basically covers all those slogans and tactics favoured by the Gonzaloists, and that it is indeed confusing to a certain extent in terms of theories, I think this article deserves to be attacked by us in retaliation. In addition, some comrades and friends who have long been observing and studying the Gonzaloists also noticed this article a long time ago; in order to save newcomers from being bewitched, and even more so to enhance our mastery of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, these comrades would like to see us respond to this article, and I have no reason to refuse them.

Although this article is mainly polemical, it does not mean that I am going to give up the initiative and be completely led by the logic of the other side. On the contrary, I will try to start from the general laws of proletarian revolution and analyse and logically deduce specific issues in order to comprehensively criticise this "theoretical masterpiece" of the domestic Gonzaloist school. Considering that Mr Gong's article was written in 2021, and that many circumstances have changed from today, and that we are not the original target of Mr Gong's polemics, we will limit ourselves in this article to a discussion of general theoretical issues, without going into detail about the specific contradictions and events of that time.

### **The proletarian revolutionary party and the masses**

Our era is one of capitalist domination (similar to the pre-October Revolution, but very different in many ways, as we will see later), and today's China is a fascist imperialist country under the total dictatorship of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie. In this century, the whole world is going to undergo a stormy revolutionary frenzy; and China, as the industrial heart of mankind, will have to undergo, and is bound to undergo, the most violent and thoroughgoing proletarian revolution of all. Anyone who claims to be a revolutionary Marxist, whether true or false, agrees with this, at least verbally (and we don't need to argue for the necessity of revolution here). Now that we have made it clear that the world is in need of a revolution, and that China in particular is in need of a great revolution, the discussion that follows will inevitably revolve around how to turn this revolution into reality.

The forthcoming socialist revolution, as a thoroughgoing revolution to completely destroy all the established bourgeois political, economic and ideological orders, will naturally be led by the modern working class, the most progressive class born of modern big industry. If the workers want to achieve

---

<sup>1</sup> The article can be found here: [\[substitute supplement\] refute the attacks of some people in the country against Marxist-Leninist-Maoists in various countries - Zhihu](#)

<sup>2</sup> I believe this refers to the Gonzaloists' creation of an underground Party in China which operates on encrypted platforms beyond the reach of the Chinese cyber police – Trans.

the above objectives, they must confront the modern bourgeois state apparatus which is armed to the teeth. If the working class is unable to mobilise and organise itself, or even all the workers of the whole society, to the fullest extent possible, then such a struggle is naturally hopeless. And a revolution that can only be carried out with such a huge social mobilisation and organisation effort must be a conscious revolution. In layman's terms, the coming revolution is a large-scale social movement with a clear division of labour, well organised, and with a smooth attack and defence. This means that we need a group of people who are able to grasp the dynamics of the various classes in class society, and who are able to propagate, educate and organise the workers to promote the cause of the working class. ◦ The group of such people we call the Proletarian Revolutionary Party. Due to the systematic oppression and alienation of the masses in all aspects of the capitalist system, the kind of enlightened people mentioned above, the communists (who today can also be called Marxist-Leninist-Maoists), are bound to be a small minority throughout the capitalist era, and even for quite some time after the dictatorship of the proletariat; but it is this crucial organised minority that will help the working class to move forward towards socialism. (Some quacks accuse us of oligarchy on this basis, but I wonder how they intend to organise and mobilise the whole of society's working people under the present conditions? Or are they actually attacking the organisation of the proletariat itself?) In this connection, Lenin said: "In the age of capitalism, when the masses of workers are constantly exploited and are unable to develop their various talents, the greatest characteristic of a workers' party lies in the fact that it can only include a minority of the class. The party can absorb only a minority of the class, just as in any capitalist society the genuinely conscious workers are only a minority of all workers. So we must recognise that it is only this enlightened minority that can lead the masses of workers and guide them forward. If Comrade Tanner says that he is against political parties, but at the same time advocates that the entire proletariat should be guided by a minority of the most organised and revolutionary workers, then I think that there is really no difference between us. What is an organised minority? If this minority is genuinely conscious, if it can lead the masses forward, if it is capable of solving every problem on the agenda, then it is essentially a political party." Up to this point, that is, that the proletarian revolution needs to be driven by the leadership of a proletarian revolutionary party, we were in agreement, at least verbally, with the Gonzaloists. But once we turn our attention to the specific question of how to build a competent workers' party and how it can lead the masses forward, we find that this apparent unanimity is like the face of a giant beauty in the eyes of a villain, full of holes and tatters, unappealing to the eye.

In the view of the Gonzaloists, the ideal picture of the revolutionary organisation should be as follows: first, a great leader at the centre of everything (the centre), then three concentric circles, from the inside to the outside of which were the "Communist Party", the "People's Guerrilla Army" and the "United Front". What a genius design! It is a pity that this beautiful design leaves a small problem behind - where should we start to build up these three perfect concentric circles? Let's assume that the proposition "the theory of concentric circles is correct" is true. Since the Great Leader is at the centre of everything and everything revolves around him/her, it is only natural that we should first figure out how this person came into being, and then we can solve all the other problems. Our Grandmaster Gong was so sure of himself in solving this problem that he quoted directly from the Secret Communist Party's "General Political Line" the following brilliant statement: "In the course of all revolutions, through struggles led by the proletariat, and especially by the Communist Party, which enlarges the undeniable class interests of the proletariat, a group of leaders and major representatives and leaders of recognised authority and influence are produced. The main representatives and leaders. Historical necessity and causality have given rise in reality to President Gonzalo, the leader of the Party and the Revolution." "Historical necessity and causality!" A perfect

logical argument! It is as impeccable as Master Guo Jiji's<sup>3</sup> statement that the origin of all dharmas in the universe is "Ru Ru"!<sup>4</sup>

It is important to understand that we are discussing the very real, very concrete question of how to build a proletarian revolutionary party and its peripheral organisations, and that according to the logic of the Gonzaloists and the Peruvian party we should naturally think first and foremost about where the great leader at the centre of it all will come from, and here the Peruvian party jumps directly from the concrete organisational question to the abstract laws of history. According to this logic, what else do we need to do? According to the abstract "historical necessity and causality", capitalism is bound to die and socialism is bound to triumph, so why don't we just go home and sleep? Why risk torture and loss of life by engaging in revolutionary activities when all we need to do is to wait for "historical necessity and causality" to defeat capitalism and produce socialism in reality? (But considering that, at least in China, the vast majority of Gonzaloists are really just talking without doing any real work, they are really self-consistent in theory and practice.) Escaping to abstract laws of history in solving concrete problems does not in any way advance the process of solving them, on the contrary, it is only self-paralysing and escaping from reality (the same can be achieved by alcohol, even better); and the superstitious belief in the salvation of abstract laws of history is precisely the spiritual opium that petty-bourgeois intellectuals, who are powerless in the face of the reality, often consume.

In the opinion of us Chinese revolutionary socialists, as well as true Marxist-Leninist-Maoists all over the world, how should we build up a qualified workers' vanguard? This is a sharp and realistic question which we must answer seriously, but for the time being we have to put it aside in favour of the question of the leaders, which we have just begun to discuss.

Mr Gong writes: "The attackers claim that the 'Gonzaloists' have paid unrealistic tribute to President Gonzalo - calling him 'the guarantee of the victory of communism', 'the guarantor of world communism', 'the leader of the world's workers' vanguard', and so on. The attackers accused these glorifications of going against the principles of Marxism and leading to historical idealism that exaggerated the historical role of the individual. The attacker's accusations against the 'Gonzaloists' show that they themselves are the ones who does not understand historical materialism."

"Calling President Gonzalo 'the guarantor of the victory of communism', 'the leader of the world proletarian revolution', 'the greatest Marxist-Leninist-Maoist of the world', etc., is in accordance with the basic principles of Marxism and with historical materialism."

In order to prove that this is a true proposition, Master Gong first quoted a passage from Stalin just to emphasise that "Marxism does not deny in the least the role of outstanding personalities" (which we do not deny at all), and then got a passage from the Little Dictionary of Philosophy to tell us that "only a great leader can see the whole picture". Then he quotes from the Little Dictionary of Philosophy, telling us that "only a great leader can understand the whole situation, and if we follow the great leader, we will be invincible", and then he quotes from the Secret Communist Party's marvellous "Historical Necessity and Causality", to prove that Gonzalo is just such a great leader. (Here, the premise of the proposition, that "Gonzalo is a great leader", is just stated.) Then it is claimed that "comrades of the Communist Party of India (Maoist), like Gonzalo", and call him "the leader of the Peruvian people's war and of the world proletarian revolution". Finally, by citing the

---

<sup>3</sup> Guo Jiji, male, Shandong, members of the Communist Party of China, Beijing Normal University Doctor of Philosophy, Northwestern University Postdoctoral Fellow in History (History of Chinese Thought)

<sup>4</sup> As I understand it, an esoteric concept in Zen Buddhism that holds that all laws are equal and that the various phenomena of the world are harmonious and happy in themselves – trans.

example of the restoration of the Soviet Union, which had little to do with the so-called "excessive personal authority", and the fact that "Mao Zedong, in his letter to Comrade Jiang Qing at the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, emphasised that it was not possible to throw cold water on the masses by 'opposing the worship of the individual'", he also said that "Mao Zedong, in his letter to Comrade Jiang Qing at the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, emphasised that it was not necessary to 'oppose the cult of the individual'", thus completing his entire argument. What a perfect chain of logic! But we are going to take a closer look at what Master Gong is selling.

First of all, let us look at the passage from Stalin quoted by the master. That quote is from an exchange between Stalin and a German writer called Emil Ludwig. At that time Ludwig asked, "Marxism denies the pre-eminent role of the individual in history. And you, after all, recognise the pre-eminent role of historical figures. Don't you think there is a contradiction between the materialist view of history and your opinion?" Stalin then replied, "No, there is no contradiction here. Marxism does not deny in the least the role of exceptional people, or that people make history. In Marx's *The Poverty of Philosophy* and other writings, you can find the very words that people make history. But, of course, people don't make history out of some fantasy, not at will. Every new generation encounters certain ready-made conditions that were already present at the time of its birth. Great men have some value only if they recognise these conditions correctly and know how to change them. If they do not recognise these conditions and try to change them by their own fantasies, then they are in the position of Don Quixote. Therefore, it is precisely according to Marx that people and conditions should never be pitted against each other. It is people who make history, but they can only make history if they correctly recognise the existing conditions they encounter, if they know how to change them. At least that's how we Russian Bolsheviks understand Marx. And we have been studying Marx for more than ten years."

Now it seems that our "master of logic", Mr Gong, was in fact an "expert tailor", who immediately caught the middle of Stalin's long passage, which concludes that "Marxism does not deny the role of outstanding people" (in Mr Gong's quotation, he puts this passage directly at the beginning). Unfortunately, when he switched his status to that of a royal tailor, he actually forgot all his attainments in logic, and now he was only concentrating on cutting out the materials and conclusions that he, as a logician, needed, while completely ignoring the necessary premises and specific conditions for the establishment of the conclusions.

Please note, Mr Tailor<sup>5</sup>, that it is in the passage you quoted that Stalin makes it clear that our Marxist recognition of the role of outstanding historical figures presupposes that "great figures are of some value only if they are good at correctly recognising these conditions and knowing how to change them." By "conditions", we obviously mean the complex contradictory relations between classes and strata that are dynamic in society as a whole (what else could it mean?). Naturally, a person can only become a leader of the masses if he clearly recognises this series of contradictions in the reality of the class struggle and grasps all the opportunities that are conducive to the fundamental interests of the working class, so that the workers can see that he is the one who represents their interests. As to how to gain authority and become a leader of the masses, the article "Some Problems in the Work of the White Zones"<sup>6</sup> sums it up very well: "As soon as the masses really begin to take part in the struggle for their own vital interests, they will move in the struggle along the path indicated by the Communist Party. Although I am leading the masses, I am still a member of the masses, and I will never put forward ideas that the masses cannot now understand or accept. If I can do so, even though the ruling class may use the Communist Party's accusations to arrest me, the masses will

---

<sup>5</sup> That is, Mr Gong.

<sup>6</sup> A lecture by Zhang Wentian, one of the leaders of the CCP in the Yan'an period, on October 18, 1936.

certainly rise up and fight against the enemy's arrest of me because I am the leader of the masses. They support me, not because I am a 'communist', but because I am their 'chief'." Indeed, Stalin's own view was the same; and in the very next paragraph of the material intercepted by Mr Taylor, Stalin spoke of how "Marxism has never denied the role of the hero. On the contrary, Marxism believes that this role is considerable, but with the provisos I have just described." Whether or not the Gonzaloists were concerned with these necessary provisos is unclear. All I know is that Stalin then added, "You asked me a moment ago whether in our case one man decides everything. Our workers will never now, and under no circumstances will they tolerate individual arbitrariness. As soon as the most powerful man in our country ceases to enjoy the confidence of the workers, as soon as he loses contact with them, he falls completely and is worthless. Plekhanov used to enjoy very high prestige. What happened? As soon as he became politically lame, the workers forgot about him, left him and forgot about him. Another example is Trotsky. Trotsky also enjoyed great prestige, though not as much as Plekhanov. What happened? Once he left the workers, the workers forgot him." Obviously, according to Stalin, if an important person fails to continue to implement the mass line of coming from the masses and going to the masses, that person will automatically lose most of his/her influence among the masses, not to mention continuing to be a leader of the class. However, although Comrade Stalin himself was very clear about the relationship between the leader and the masses in theory, he still made mistakes in practice. Chairman Mao said on this point that "any leader of the Party and the state will lose a comprehensive insight into the affairs of the state and will lose his or her power to influence the masses when he or she does not put himself or herself above the Party and the masses but, on the contrary, puts himself or herself above the Party branches and the masses, and when he or she is divorced from the masses. As long as this is the case, even a man of Stalin's eminence will inevitably make unrealistic and erroneous decisions on certain important matters. Stalin was not able to draw lessons from individual, local, temporary mistakes on certain issues, and to use them in such a way that they did not become serious mistakes on a national scale and over a long period of time. In the latter part of his life, Stalin's deepening appreciation of the cult of the individual, his violation of democratic centralism in the Party, and his violation of the combination of collective leadership and individual responsibility led to major mistakes, such as the following: the widening of the purges, the lack of the necessary vigilance on the eve of the anti-fascist war, the lack of the necessary attention to the further development of agriculture and the material well-being of the peasants, and the mistakes in the international communist movement, such as the failure to take any action to protect the interests of the people. The international communist movement had some wrong ideas, especially the wrong decisions on the Yugoslav question."

In short, it seems to us that the leader of the revolution should first and foremost be a leader of the masses, and that there are certain specific conditions for becoming a leader of the masses and for maintaining this status. (How can it be said that a particular leader is "the guarantee of the victory of communism" when he has demonstrated to the masses over a long period of time his outstanding organisational skills and his firm class position, his adherence to the line of the masses, his ability to improvise and to seize the moment, etc.?) How can it be said that "by historical necessity and causality, the leader of the Party and the Revolution, President Gonzalo, had already emerged in reality"? If Comrade Gonzalo and the other Peruvian revolutionaries had not resolutely broken with the old revisionist Communist Party of Peru in the 1960s and 1970s, and had not seized on the perfect revolutionary crisis to wage a protracted people's war, who would be paying attention today to the party of a backward country in South America, and to one of its former presidents?

As for the claim that the CPI(M) "refers to Gonzalo, as it does, as 'the leader of the Peruvian People's War and of the world proletarian revolution'", it is really the Master who is asking for a laugh. Firstly, the quote intercepted by Mr Tailor comes from an obscure Gonzalez website, which does not give a credible source for the quote other than a reference to it, and I have not been able to find such a statement from the Indian party. Secondly, our Mr Tailor<sup>7</sup> has completely ignored the consistent views of Indian comrades on such references to Gonzaloist ideology. For example, back in 2006, the CPI(M) made the following excellent statement: "The International Communist Movement has given birth to many fine personalities, but not one of them has even thought of suffixing their work to Marxism-Leninism as a universal truth. They creatively applied the principles of Marxism to the revolutionary practice of their countries. If new laws are discovered in the process and are proved correct after applying them to revolutionary practice, only then will they acquire universal significance and can be regarded as a development of the theory (Marxism-Leninism-Maoism). Successful application is not development. All development (including the development of ideas) goes through a process from quantitative evolution to qualitative leap. Therefore, it is not necessary to label this process of development as an "idea" or a "path". Moreover, as the Peruvian experience has shown, despite the great contribution of Comrade Gonzalo, his ideas were immature when the movement suffered a major setback and even his current role was controversial. Therefore, that could happen in any other country as well. Therefore, there is no need to be unduly hasty in praising certain individuals by adding suffixes or other evaluations to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism just because some initial successes have been achieved in their countries. It is even more problematic for the Maoist parties to assert that the ideas and path of their leaders have universal significance. This means making their own judgements about the development of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in relation to other sister parties and the international communist movement. This will increase divisions and may lead to disunity." ([Report at the International Symposium on Imperialism and Proletarian Revolution in the 21st Century - Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Library \(home.blog\)](#)) Once again, there is nothing inherently problematic about calling Gonzalo "the leader of the Peruvian people's war and of the world proletarian revolution", just as we can say that "Sir Augustus Bebel was the leader of the German socialist workers' movement and of the world proletariat". Unless there is one and only one "leader". Even if the Communist Party of India (Maoist) does agree with the masters, should we take their words as the Bible?

Next, Tailor Gong listed all those beautiful slogans from the Little Dictionary of Philosophy and the Guangming Daily, but I think they are really not worth analysing. The reason is that the "Master" has already achieved "total victory" directly through the Law this time. Since he has already directly established the slogans in a textbook and a newspaper as the truth universally agreed upon by all Chinese revolutionaries (the reactionaries like us have naturally been expelled), we have no choice but to obediently follow them. I am still curious, however, since the Chinese revolutionaries have always followed the line described by the newspaper Guangming Daily, that is, "Do it according to the established guidelines (Mao Zedong's will - note by the author of this article), that is, according to the proletarian revolutionary line and all policies of Chairman Mao Zedong. The proletarian revolutionary line and policies, adherence to the class struggle as the platform, adherence to the Party's basic line, adherence to continued revolution under the proletariat, adherence to proletarian internationalism, and always following the path guided by Chairman Mao to the very end, are the strategic measures to ensure that our Party will never change its course, and that our country will never change its colours ... ..As long as we follow Chairman Mao's path, we will be invincible." So why did we lose in the end? Now there are only two possibilities, either the line of the proletarian revolution is wrong, Maoism is actually absurd. Either this statement is in fact more propaganda than

---

<sup>7</sup> Mr Gong

theory, more slogan than actual propaganda organisation; and therefore the implementation of its ideas, or even the ideas themselves, cannot be guaranteed, and cannot be equated with the general principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, or with the objective reality. I leave it to the reader to judge for himself whether that possibility is more in line with objective reality.

It is worth noting that I have actually "secretly replaced" the terms "great leader" and "leader of the party" with "leader of the masses" just now. We almost never hear such terms from the Gonzaloists. I mention this only because any comrade who knows a little bit about the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism knows very well that our movement is a product of the mass movement resulting from the socialised mass production of capitalism and the increasingly acute class conflicts. When we look at the proletarian revolutionary party from a macro-historical frame of reference, we see that it is in fact the product of a conscious proletarian struggle, what Luxembourg calls "the expression of the modern proletarian class struggle conscious of the historical consequences of the struggle." This means that, in reality, its true leaders are the masses themselves. Therefore, in the proletarian revolutionary movement, any concrete leader, great or not, must first and foremost be the leader of the masses, the "head" of the workers. Anyone who becomes a leader of the people, in general terms, does not gain the trust of the masses by means of abstract historical laws (in a sense, such abstract concepts are in fact summed up "ex post facto"), but gradually acquires his authority in the practice of concrete, long-term revolutionary struggle; in other words, he gains his authority in the process of putting into practice the principle of the mass line, which is the line of "from the masses, to the masses". In other words, it is in applying the general principle of the mass line of coming from the masses and going to the masses to specific circumstances that one gradually becomes a leader. After all, one must interact with the objective material world through practice in order to produce correct subjective understanding. It is natural that an individual should go through such a process in order to acquire a large amount of correct knowledge about the movement and to grow up to be a leader of the class. (Otherwise, why don't we believe in the Juche idea?) On the question of where do people's correct ideas come from, Chairman Mao said. Chairman Mao talked about this question:

Where do correct ideas come from? Do they drop from the skies? No. Are they innate in the mind? No. They come from social practice, and from it alone; they come from three kinds of social practice, the struggle for production, the class struggle and scientific experiment. It is man's social being that determines his thinking. Once the 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. In their social practice, men engage in various kinds of struggle and gain rich experience, both from their successes and from their failures. Countless phenomena of the objective external world are reflected in a man's brain through his five sense organs — the organs of sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch. At first, knowledge is perceptual. The leap to conceptual knowledge, i.e., to ideas, occurs when sufficient perceptual knowledge is accumulated. This is one process in cognition. It is the first stage in the whole process of cognition, the stage leading from objective matter to subjective consciousness from existence to ideas. Whether or not one's consciousness or ideas (including theories, policies, plans or measures) do correctly reflect the laws of the objective external world is not yet proved at this stage, in which it is not yet possible to ascertain whether they are correct or not. Then comes the second stage in the process of cognition, the stage leading from consciousness back to matter, from ideas back to existence, in which the knowledge gained in the first stage is applied in social practice to ascertain whether the theories, policies, plans or measures meet with the anticipated success. Generally speaking, those that succeed are correct and those that fail are incorrect, and this is especially true of

man's struggle with nature. In social struggle, the forces representing the advanced class sometimes suffer defeat not because their ideas are incorrect ! but because, in the balance of forces engaged in struggle, they are not as powerful for the time being as the forces of reaction; they are therefore temporarily defeated, but they are bound to triumph sooner or later. Man's knowledge makes another leap through the test of practice. This leap is more important than the previous one. For it is this leap alone that can prove the correctness or incorrectness of the first leap in cognition, i.e., of the ideas, theories, policies, plans or measures formulated in the course of reflecting the objective external world. There is no other way of testing truth. Furthermore, the one and only purpose of the proletariat in knowing the world is to change it. Often, correct knowledge can be arrived at only after many repetitions of the process leading from matter to consciousness and then back to matter, that is, leading from practice to knowledge and then back to practice. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge, the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge. Among our comrades there are many who do not yet understand this theory of knowledge. When asked the sources of their ideas, opinions, policies, methods, plans and conclusions, eloquent speeches and long articles they consider the questions strange and cannot answer it. Nor do they comprehend that matter, can be transformed into consciousness and consciousness into matter, although such leaps are phenomena of everyday life. It is therefore necessary to educate our comrades in the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge, so that they can orientate their thinking correctly, become good at investigation and study and at summing up experience, overcome difficulties, commit fewer mistakes, do their work better, and struggle hard so as to build China into a great and powerful socialist country and help the broad masses of the oppressed and exploited throughout the world in fulfillment of our great internationalist duty.

Regarding Gonzalo himself and the Communist Party of Peru specifically, we have never denied their great contribution to the Peruvian revolution and the international communist movement. But this is very different in degree from the kind of contribution and status that Master Gong mentioned. In the opinion of the master, it is reasonable to call Gonzalo the 'guarantee of the victory of communism', 'the leader of the world proletarian revolution', 'the greatest Marxist-Leninist-Maoist in the world', etc., and is in line with the basics of Marxism and historical materialism. In our view, Gonzalo is just one of the leaders of the Peruvian revolution and party at the end of the last century and the outstanding figures of the international communist movement (it is okay to use the word "leader" here). We will deal with this issue in detail below.

### **On the Evaluation of Comrade Gonzalo**

Here is the passage where the logician evaluates Gonzalo:

Gonzalo's thought was a guiding philosophy that emerged from the application of Maoism to Peru, and it served to guide the Peruvian revolution. With the development of the People's War, Gonzalo also developed theories of general applicability based on Peru's revolutionary experience, such as the theory of the militarisation of the party, the theory of bureaucratic capitalism, etc. However, this does not mean that the concept of 'Gonzalo's Thought' itself has a universal application. The Communist Party of Peru uses the term 'Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Gonzalo's thought, mainly Gonzalo's thought', whereas comrades in other countries currently only use the term 'Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, mainly Maoism, and Gonzalo's universally applicable contributions' and generally do not use the term 'Gonzalo's contribution'. The term 'Gonzalo's thought' is generally not used. Some articles refer to



'Gonzalo's thought' as a theory of universal application in its own right, a usage that is not strictly correct.

Second, Maoism cannot be separated from Gonzalo's contribution. As stated earlier, the Chinese Communist Party failed to effectively summarise the concept of Maoism (or "Mao Zedong Thought"), whereas the Peruvian Communist Party first summarised Maoism and systematically explained its universal applicability as the third stage of Marxism. Gonzalo reiterated some of the important and previously neglected theories of Maoism, including protracted people's war, the three instruments of revolution, the three worlds, and bureaucratic capitalism, and refuted revisionist distortions of Maoist theory. Gonzalo's role in Maoism was similar to Engels' role in Marxism and Stalin's role in Leninism. It is no accident that those who deny Gonzalo's contribution to Maoism often fail to recognise some of its basic elements. Today, advanced revolutionaries in various countries (including Peru, Turkey, Brazil, and other countries in the Americas and Europe) have generally recognised Gonzalo's contribution as being of universal application, with the exception of a few countries where revolutionaries have hesitated to do so.

I know that the long and tedious paragraph quoted above will more or less bore the readers, and if we take into account the fact that the actual information density of such a long paragraph is so low, even if I were myself, I would probably not go and read it in detail in normal times. However, since this paragraph touches upon such key issues as why Gonzalo is called the Sixth Guru by the Gonzaloists, what Gonzalo has summarised and Gonzalo's association with Maoism, which are often mentioned by the Gonzaloists, I have no alternative but to savour this sour fruit. I can only express my regret about this.

On the question of what to say about Comrade Gonzalo, we were "pleasantly surprised" to discover that, in addition to being a master of logic and tailoring, Master Gong also had a remarkable talent for writing novels and in the field of linguistics. He began by suggesting that we were "equating 'mainly Maoist' with 'mainly Gonzaloist'", but in fact, none of us had ever made such a reference, and we didn't pay much attention to the name at all; On the contrary, it is the lovely 'Marxist-Leninist-Maoists, mainly Maoists' themselves, who are obviously talking about Gonzalo and his so-called 'universal contribution' every day, but in the end, they still have a strong aversion to the term 'Gonzaloist'; in this case, the term 'Gonzaloist' is used to refer to a person who is not a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, but a Maoist. "In this respect they are not as honest as the Trotskyists, who at least openly admit that they are Trotskyists and do not go around asking people to call them "Marxist-Leninists, mainly Leninists".

The Master later gives two reasons why they think so highly of Gonzalo. The first reason is that Gonzalo's creative application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to his country's revolution gradually gave rise to "Gonzalo Thought".

It is true that Gonzalo applied Marxism-Leninism-Maoism creatively to the Peruvian revolution, but it is important to know that in the history of the international communist movement over the last 170 years, the working class has had many outstanding leaders, and if, on this basis, we call Gonzalo the Sixth Mentor and the Great Leader, or even the "Guarantor of the Victory of Communism", or the "leader of the world proletarian revolution", why not give the same honour to comrades Bebel, Katayama, Luxembourg, Gramsci, Forster or Thielmann? Which one of them was not a leader of his country's movement? Which of them, like Gonzalo, was not a person of great talent, who applied Marxism creatively to his or her country's revolutionary movement, who gave everything to the workers' cause, and who in the end left with regret? If we could just add the name of a person to the

list of guiding ideologies, we would soon have something like "Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought, Deng Xiaoping Theory, the Important Thought of the Three Represents, the Scientific Outlook on Development, Xi Jinping's Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era,"<sup>8</sup> and Frankenstein's "The New Era of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics".

Secondly, if, according to the logic of the Communist Party of Peru and the Gonzaloists, we can gradually produce new ideas by creatively applying a theory (a universal truth) to each specific condition, then I think if Master Gong can "creatively" apply  $F=ma$  (Newton's first law)<sup>9</sup> to calculate the acceleration of a car on the street today ( $a$ ), and then "creatively" apply it to calculate the mass of a raindrop tomorrow ( $m$ ), and then calculate the combined force on his own body when he walks the day after tomorrow ( $F$ ), then it won't take long for him to become a great scientist on a par with Isaac Newton, or at the very least, Newton's First Law must be rewritten as "Newton's First Law, Gong Geshengism", or else Master Gong would not be going in the opposite direction, turning into a "modern revisionist" who opposes the Secret Communist Party line.

The Master's second argument is that Gonzalo summed up and systematised Maoism and that without his contribution there would be no Maoism, and therefore Gonzalo deserves to be called "the guarantor of the victory of communism" and "the leader of the world proletarian revolution" because of his great merits.

The Master writes that "as stated earlier, the Chinese Communist Party has failed to effectively summarise the concept of Maoism (or 'Mao Zedong Thought')."

As the Master said in the previous article, "Maoism remained undefined and unsummarised until 1976, when the Communist Party of China (CPC) abandoned Mao Zedong Thought as the third stage of Marxism-Leninism. .... In 1976, the Communist Party of Peru (CPP) denounced the revisionist coup d'état in China and adopted Maoism as the basis of its doctrine. In 1982, the Communist Party of Peru was the first to introduce the concept of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and thus became the only political party in the world to be guided by Maoism. .... Under the influence of the Communist Party of Peru, revolutionaries in various countries generally accepted the concept of Maoism".

The question of what a theory should be called is of no interest to us, just as renaming a file does not change its contents. (Unless the reference itself is of great relevance, as when the Bolsheviks dropped the name of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party mainly because the Mensheviks and the parties of Western Europe, which also called themselves "social democrats", had become notorious among the revolutionary masses) we are mainly interested in the specifics of the theory. If it is true what the master says, that the CCP and Chairman Mao have failed to "accurately define and summarise Maoism", then what theory has guided the Chinese revolution? An imperfect, half-baked version of Maoism? It is true that any scientific theory spirals upward in an infinite cycle of practice-theory-practice. But does that mean that Maoism was half-baked until 1976? And then it was only in 1982 that it was completed by the descent of the gods from Gonzalo in faraway Peru? Does it mean that it was only thanks to Gonzalo that revolutionaries in all countries accepted Maoism in general? I can tell you in advance that the answer is no.

Now we also have a consensus with the Gonzalists that Maoism is a new development of Marxism-Leninism, a higher third stage, but the difference is that the Gonzalists refer to it in this way because they believe that "Gonzalo reiterated some important and previously ignored theories of Maoism,

<sup>8</sup> With the exception of Mao Zedong Thought, these are all phases in the development of Chinese "Marxism" (revisionism) associated with party leaders Deng Xiaoping, Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao and Xi Jinping respectively.

<sup>9</sup> Actually, Newton's Second Law of Motion which states, "The force acting on an object is equal to the mass of that object times its acceleration."

including the protracted people's war, the three instruments of revolution, the three worlds, and bureaucratic capitalism, and refuted the revisionists' distortions of Mao's theories. Gonzalo's role for Maoism is similar to that of Engels for Marxism and Stalin for Leninism." The guru throws two more reasons at us, but this time, for the sake of brevity, we will begin with his second reason.

Let us first talk about Engels and Marxism. It is well known that Marxism was originally co-founded by Marx and Engels. Theoretically, Marx himself made three main contributions to the founding of Marxism: First, Marx discovered and put forward the theory of surplus value and the analytical method of historical materialism; second, Marx devoted his life to composing *Capital*, which comprehensively studied and analysed the entire capitalist economic system, starting from the simplest circulation of commodities. It was his work that first turned socialism into a science and laid a solid scientific foundation for the struggle of the working class. Thirdly, Marx put forward the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat through his study of a series of revolutions and counter-revolutions from the 1848 Revolution to the Paris Commune. Engels' contribution to Marxism was mainly in the field of philosophy. In his *Anti-Dühring*, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, *Dialectics of Nature* and some of his later correspondence, he made a significant contribution to the philosophy of Marxism, including his theories on the relationship between thought and existence, the three major rules of material dialectics, and the theory of the synergy of historical development, all of which are of great importance to all philosophies. We do not know which of Gonzalo's books made the seminal theoretical contribution comparable to that of Engels. Moreover, Marx and Engels were already very close friends. (Let's not talk about their early friendships, at least when Engels withdrew from the company and moved to London, in which case the two of them openly mentioned Kautsky, so let's write another article to criticise him!) and others collaborated on the publication of a large number of Marx's surviving manuscripts. It is all this (and I am only talking about the theoretical aspects, in fact Engels also made a great contribution to the 1848 revolution, to the practical work of the international workers' movement, and especially to the organisation of the Socialist International in its early days, but it is not convenient to go into this here). As for Comrade Gonzalo, although he has been to China, according to what he said in the interview, he has neither met Chairman Mao nor studied the practice of the Chinese revolution. Not to mention that he doesn't even speak Chinese, and he himself admits that there is too little information about China circulating in Latin America (if my impression is correct, it was in the context of the rationale behind the question of "50-100 years"), which, I'm afraid, is very different from Engels' situation. Teachers can often exchange opinions. Works like "*Anti-Dühring*" were written with Marx's full support. After Marx's death, Engels stopped his scientific research work and worked with Marx's daughter and Kautsky (comrades from the tribute faction<sup>10</sup>, please pay attention to this name! You see, the "counterrevolutionary countercurrent"<sup>11</sup> has publicly mentioned Kautsky, Hurry up and write another article to criticize!) and others collaborated to compile and publish a large number of Marx's posthumous manuscripts.

Moreover, although Engels was himself a gifted theorist, he was very modest, as he said in his *Anti-Dühring*, which is a comprehensive discussion of socialist theory, that "the world-view expounded in this book has been established and elaborated in the vast majority by Marx, while only a very small part of it belongs to me, and that therefore it is impossible for me to make such an elaboration without his knowledge. This is self-evident in our mutual understanding. I read the whole original manuscript to him before it went to press, and the tenth chapter of the section on Economics ('Discourse on the Critical History') was written by Marx." Engels, even after Marx's death, more than

---

<sup>10</sup> That is, the 'Gonzaloists' who 'have paid unrealistic tribute to President Gonzalo'.

<sup>11</sup> Presumably the Revolutionary Socialist Front as targets of the Gonzaloists criticisms.

once expressed the view that "Marx is the genius of mankind, and we are at best only capable". He also said, "I am glad that I have such a brilliant first violinist as Marx," while always humbly calling himself a "second violinist". He would never call himself "the guarantor of the victory of communism" or "the leader of the world proletarian revolution", let alone allow the German Social Democratic Party to promote itself to such a high level.

Next we find ourselves unfortunately taken by Master Gong to the Stalin question, a place where there are so many different opinions that it is difficult to generalise. I do not have the will, much less the ability, to do a comprehensive evaluation of Comrade Stalin in the space of my few scraps of paper, but it is possible to draw on the work of others to talk about Stalin's significance for Leninism. Again, in the paragraph which Mr Tailor has just cut out, we find in the "waste" these words of Stalin: "As for me, I am a pupil of Lenin, and the aim of my life is to be worthy of being a pupil of Lenin." Did Stalin say that because he was ashamed of being unworthy of his position? No, obviously not. As a matter of fact, he was a rare and outstanding Marxist and a gifted leader. The Communist Party of China has spoken highly of Stalin's lifetime achievements:

Stalin, when Lenin was still alive, fought against the tsarist system and for the spread of Marxism; after joining the leadership of the Bolshevik Party Central Committee headed by Lenin, he fought for the preparation of the 1917 Revolution; and after the October Revolution, he fought for the defence of the fruits of the proletarian revolution. Stalin, after the death of Lenin, led the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the people of the Soviet Union in a resolute struggle against all enemies at home and abroad, and defended and consolidated the first socialist state in the world. Stalin, under the leadership of the Communist Party of the USSR and the people of the USSR, adhered to the line of socialist industrialisation and collectivisation of agriculture at home, and made great achievements in socialist transformation and socialist construction. Stalin, who led the Communist Party of the USSR, the Soviet people and the Soviet army, fought hard and won a great victory in the war against Fascism. Stalin, who defended and developed Marxism-Leninism in the struggle against all kinds of opportunism, and against the enemies of Leninism, the Trotskyists, the Zinovievs, the Bukharinists and other bourgeois agents. Stalin, with his series of theoretical works, a monumental document of Marxism-Leninism, made an indelible contribution to the international communist movement. Stalin, the Party and Government of the USSR under his leadership, generally speaking, pursued a foreign policy in line with proletarian internationalism, and gave tremendous assistance to the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of all countries in the world, including those of the Chinese people. Stalin, who guided the struggle at the forefront of the tide of history, was an irreconcilable enemy of imperialism and all reactionaries. Stalin's activities were closely bound up with the struggle of the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the great Soviet people, and were inseparable from the revolutionary struggle of the people of the whole world. Stalin's life was that of a great Marxist-Leninist and a great proletarian revolutionary.

We fully accept that Stalin deserved to be called "the great leader of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the international communist movement in an epoch of history". In terms of the creative application of the basic principles of Marxism to the realities of his own country, we believe that his achievements, measured by the harshest and most extreme standards, are not inferior to those of Comrade Gonzalo in Peru. But like Engels, he never wanted to call himself "the guarantor of the victory of communism" or "the leader of the world proletarian revolution". Nor did Stalin ever put forward anything like "Gonzalo's ideas, Gonzalo's universal contribution". On the contrary, the

Trotskyists often used the term "Stalinism" to attack the principles of Marxism-Leninism, which comrade Stalin had always observed and promoted.

Now looking back at the Master's statement that "Gonzalo's role in Maoism is similar to Engels' role in Marxism and Stalin's role in Leninism." I just find it inexplicably funny. Both Engels and Stalin (and even Marx, Lenin and Mao himself) made far greater contributions than Gonzalo, yet they never accepted, and even explicitly rejected, such self-indulgences as "the guarantee of the victory of communism", "the leader of the world proletarian revolution". It was the fault of the Peruvian party and Gonzalo for making such references in the first place. I don't know what good this promotion of Gonzalo does for the international communist movement, or even just for the Peruvian revolution itself. It did the revolution no good at all. The ultimate failure of the Peruvian revolution is the best proof of this! As I finish this paragraph, I feel a sudden shock in my body, as if I were seeing my "friends" from the Gonzos standing in front of me, pointing at my nose and shouting hysterically, "Slander! The Peruvian Revolution has not failed! The Peruvian Revolution has suffered a major setback mainly because of fortuitous events like the arrest of President Gonzalo and the Central Committee! If President Gonzalo had still been at the helm, the revolution would have succeeded!" The thought of such a scenario scared the hell out of me, and I could not wait to find a place to hide, so I thought I would hide behind Montesquieu. Montesquieu said in "The Causes of the Rise and Fall of Rome": "If an accidental factor such as a specific war can cause the destruction of a country, then there must be an inevitable factor that will cause the country to perish in a war." I think that the above statement is completely suitable to describe the connection between the contingency and inevitability of a revolution's failure, with a slight change of nouns. (In fact, "revolution" itself is a special kind of war, but I do not mean that "protracted people's war applies to all revolutions", but I want to say that "revolution" is essentially the same as "war", both of which are class struggles. In its most fully developed form, it is a highly abstracted confrontation between the economic base and the superstructure) Now we only need to point out why the over-exaggeration of Comrade Gonzalo's contribution and historical status, and the ensuing personality cult, are just one of the inevitable factors (note the word "one") that caused the "major setback" in the 1990s.

It seems to us that if the existence of a single individual is enough to guarantee the victory of the revolution, or even the realisation of communism, then that individual has become God. Because he cannot make mistakes, he cannot have any flaws. According to this logic, if someone opposes, or even just does not fully agree with, one of his views, it is tantamount to opposing the revolution and communism itself. It is precisely because of this fallacy that the democratic centralism of the Peruvian party was severely restricted and the organisation's mechanisms for correcting mistakes were seriously undermined, making the party slow to react to changes in the enemy's tactics, which ultimately led to a great deal of mischief.

### **On the Strategies of the October Revolution**

The Gonzaloists believe that Maoism is the third stage of Marxism, and that without Gonzalo there would be no Maoism, and that without the influence of the Peruvian Party, no one else would accept Maoism. Having just argued at length that one of Master Gong's sub-arguments to prove the above point, namely that "Gonzalo's role in Maoism is similar to Engels' role in Marxism and Stalin's role in Leninism", is wrong, we now turn back to deal with the remaining argument, that is, the Master's assertion that Gonzalo reiterated some important and previously neglected theories of Maoism, including protracted people's war, the three instruments of revolution, the three worlds, and bureaucratic capitalism." But because of these four issues, Gonzalo's thesis is that Maoism is the most important of all. "But since each of these four issues is large and not yet logically more strongly

connected, we will return to the logic of our own text and focus on the issue of revolutionary strategy.

In general, there are only two revolutionary strategies that we know of and have been tested in practice. They are the protracted people's war strategy suitable for new democratic revolutions in backward countries, and the October Revolution strategy suitable for major social revolutions in industrialized countries. This is a huge difference between the Gonzaloist faction and us. In their eyes, the strategy of protracted people's war is applicable to all countries and all situations. They even shamelessly accused us and said, "Maoists in various countries have systematically analyzed why the path of protracted people's war is in line with the path of revolution in imperialist countries, and the attackers have not made any serious criticism of the core arguments of Maoists in various countries." It seems that Tailor Gong has been able to automatically ignore the opinions of so many critics at home and abroad. The literature is available, but it's embarrassing to say that we avoid their core arguments. Let us now drag out his so-called "core arguments" and take a look.

The following is the so-called core argument:

1. The accumulation of power-legitimism strategy has not produced any revolution in (at least) eighty years, and has not even come close to overthrowing a bourgeois regime during this period.
2. The people's war strategy produced many revolutions and became a major threat to many reactionary countries on several continents.
3. The strategy of legal accumulation of power over a long period of time is the same in practice as that of the reformist rightist opportunists. It does not prepare revolutionary leaders, cadres, activists or the masses to take power through revolutionary violence.
4. This strategy paves the way for the capitalist methods of NGOism, the bureaucratic methods of the social-democratic workers' movement and the reformist methods of ministerial socialism.
5. The strategy and tactics of people's war can be applied to the revolutionary wars of the imperialist countries, as we can partly (not wholly!) observe in the wars of liberation in Ireland and the Basque Country.
6. In the light of Mao's interpretation of people's war, we can better understand the experience of anti-fascist resistance in Europe during the Second World War - for example, in countries such as France and Norway, where there were protracted armed struggles during the period of Nazi occupation and pseudo-government. This shows that revolutionary war is possible in industrialised countries where there is a high level of control and surveillance.
7. The existence of armed groups such as the communist contingents, the Red Army Faction, the Red Brigades, etc. proved that it was possible to carry out an armed struggle in an imperialist country, even for decades, without being defeated militarily.
8. The experience of working legally for a long time and accumulating power did not lead to any revolution. It led countless parties and organisations to revisionism, reformism or outright dissolution. Their cadres and sympathisers were more and more closely integrated into the old society and even into the reactionary state apparatus.
9. We are moving towards a militarised society. The imperialist countries are becoming more and more militarised and the reactionaries are becoming more militarised.

10. The imperialist governments are moving towards fascism, the weakening of parliamentary democracy through integrationism, the growth of racism, more police surveillance and state violence.

11. Elections were seen as farcical by the largest majority of the people. The majority of the people had no confidence in the elections.

12. The old social-democratic trade unions have lost a very large number of their members and the masses do not trust the trade union leadership.

13. We have entered the era of world proletarian revolution, sweeping away imperialism in the next fifty to one hundred years, as Mao said.

14. What is big and complex develops from what is small and simple, and it is through war that war can be learnt. Therefore, revolutionary war must grow from the small to the large, and revolutionary fighters must learn war through war in a sustained process.

15. As Clausewitz says in *On War*: "The stronger the motive for war (.....), the closer it approaches its abstract form, the more it is directed towards the destruction of the enemy, the more the military and political aims coincide, and the more the war will seem to be purely military and less political. " Is there any stronger motive for war than the seizure of power by the proletariat? This produces more wars, more protracted wars, rather than quick and limited wars."

It is extremely unfortunate for our readers to have to join me in analysing fifteen pieces of Norwegian Gonzaloist nonsense.<sup>12</sup>

The first one is a game of logic. Does the fact that no one has used a certain strategy to gain state power for a long time mean that the strategy itself is unreliable? There is no logical necessity here, just as the fact that man has not landed on the moon for a long time does not mean that the theories that guided the Apollo landings in the past are wrong, let alone that man is incapable of landing on the moon. According to general logic, the fact that one has succeeded even once in applying a certain strategy is in itself enough to prove that success in applying such a strategy is possible, and behind any possibility or contingency there must be a certain degree of necessity; and in the case of the application of the strategy of the October Revolution, the necessity in this case refers first and foremost to the need to build a proletarian revolutionary party with a deep connection with the masses. And isn't the problem of the failure of the revolution to win in the industrialised countries in the last half century or so precisely that the movements in these countries (from Korea to the United States) hardly even have a general revolutionary strategy, let alone a qualified proletarian revolutionary party? Under these circumstances, the revolution lacks the inevitability of victory. It is ridiculous that the revolutionaries in these countries, instead of reflecting on why they failed to make good use of the strategy of the October revolution, are now blaming the strategy itself for being unreliable.

I don't even know how to judge the second point. The "strategy of protracted people's war" is a strategy in itself, a macro-guideline for the revolutionary movement; and a macro-guideline by itself cannot produce any revolution, just as the theory of architectural design by itself cannot build a building. And, frankly speaking, I can count on one hand the countries in history that have actually seized national power by means of the strategy of protracted people's war. (I don't mean to attack the strategy of protracted people's war in the slightest.)

---

<sup>12</sup> In his article on the Zhihu platform, Mr Gong aligned with the Norwegian Gonzaloist group Tjen-Folket which had attacked Comrade Jose Maria Sison's criticisms of the "universality of people's war".

From the third point, we can see that the strategy of the October Revolution as understood by the Norwegian tributes and Master Gong was "the strategy of long-term legal accumulation of power". It seems that things have come to such a pass that in the shrunken brains of the Gonzaloists, the strategy of the revolution was either protracted people's war (violence) or long-term legal accumulation of power (peace). The Gonzaloist clowns could not understand that the real strategy of the October Revolution required the revolutionaries to organise, propagandise and educate the masses (especially the industrial workers) for ten years in order to raise the class consciousness of the masses and the cadres, to build up the organisation of the masses and the party, and then to take over the country by means of a highly organised and co-ordinated general insurrection at the outbreak of a revolutionary crisis. In this connection, the CPC says, "We have always believed that in order to lead the working class and the masses in the revolution, the proletarian party must be adept at mastering all forms of struggle, at combining all forms of struggle, and at rapidly replacing one form of struggle with another in accordance with changes in the situation of struggle. Only by mastering all forms of struggle, peaceful and armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary and mass, national and international, and so on, can the proletarian parties be invincible in any situation."

This process, in which legal and illegal, violent and peaceful, clandestine and open, domestic and internal, etc., alternated according to the specifics of the time and place and the people, can never be summed up in a simple "accumulation of power-legalist strategy", and the very term itself is a slur on the tactics of the October Revolution and the revolutionaries and conscious workers of all industrialised countries.

Marxists have made numerous analyses of the strategies and specific tactics of how to carry out revolutions in the capitalist countries, and such analyses have continued from Marx's time to the present day. Lenin himself analysed the revolutionary tactics of Britain, the undoubtedly advanced imperialist country, and said:

In Britain, communists must make persistent and consistent use of parliamentary elections, of the ups and downs of the British Government's Irish, colonial and global imperialist policies, and of all other spheres, sectors and aspects of social life, and in all of these, work in a new way, in a communist way, in the same way as the Third International, not the Second International. I do not have the time and I do not have the time. I do not have the time or space here to describe the "Russian", "Bolshevik" method of participating in parliamentary elections and parliamentary struggles, but I can tell foreign Communists with certainty that it is quite different from the usual Western European parliamentary activity. People often conclude from this that: "Yes, that was in your Russia, here we have a different kind of parliamentary activity." This conclusion is incorrect. The reason why there should be communists in the world, and why there should be adherents of the Third International in all countries, is precisely to transform the old socialist, trade unionist and trade-unionist parliamentary work into the new communist parliamentary work in all systems and in all spheres of life. In the past, too, in our elections, opportunist and purely bourgeois, utilitarian, capitalist manoeuvres were not uncommon. The communists of Western Europe and the United States must learn to create a new, unusual, non-opportunistic, non-libertarian parliamentary activity in which the Communist Party can put forward its own slogans, in which the real proletarians, with the help of the unorganised and repressed poor, can transmit and distribute leaflets, visit the workers' houses, the rural proletarians and the poorer villages (which, fortunately, are much fewer in the continent than in Russia, and even fewer in England), the peasantry, and the proletariat, and in which the Communist Party will



be able to make its own slogans. He visits the cottages of the rural proletarians and the peasants in the backwoods (much less on the European continent than in Russia, and even less in England), goes into the lowest commoner's pubs, enters the real commoner's associations and societies, takes part in their impromptu assemblies, speaks to the people without a scholarly (and not too parliamentary) tone, and doesn't in the least seek a parliamentary "fat seat". Rather, it inspires ideas everywhere, mobilizes the masses, seizes what the bourgeoisie has said, uses the institutions established by the bourgeoisie, uses the elections it prescribes and its appeals to the entire people, and makes the people understand Bolshevism, and in the bourgeoisie Under class rule, there is never such an opportunity except during elections (with the exception, of course, of general strikes, during which such institutions of popular agitation worked even more intensely in our country). In Western Europe and in the United States it is difficult, very difficult, but it can and should be done, because all the tasks of the communist movement cannot be accomplished without effort, and that effort must be spent on the practical task of taking over from the bourgeoisie, sector by sector, area by area, in an ever more diversified manner, increasingly involving all sectors of social life.

In Britain, propaganda, agitation and organisation should also be carried out in the armed forces and among the oppressed, unequal peoples of "this" country (e.g. Ireland and the colonies) in a new way (not socialist, but communist, not reformist, but revolutionary). It is important to realise that throughout the imperialist era, and especially today, in the post-war period, when the peoples of the countries, suffering from the war, are quickly opening their eyes to the truth (the truth that tens of millions of people are dying and being maimed in order to solve the problem of whether it is for the British or the German robbers to loot more of the country), all of these spheres of social life are full of flammable substances that can trigger conflicts and crises, The opportunities for triggering conflicts and crises and for catalysing class struggles are also particularly great. At a time when, under the influence of the world economic and political crisis, countless sparks are breaking out from all sides in all countries, and we do not know and cannot know which of these sparks will be able to ignite the flame, that is to say, to awaken the masses once and for all, it is necessary to "plough" all the fields, even the most stale, stinking, and seemingly hopeless fields, in the light of our new, communist principles, otherwise we will not be able to shoulder our tasks, take care of all aspects, master all kinds of weapons, cannot be prepared to defeat the bourgeoisie (the bourgeoisie has arranged all aspects of social life in its own way in the past and now in its own way destroy them), nor be prepared to transform all life according to communist methods after defeating the bourgeoisie.

Lenin could not have made it clearer that the key to the work of revolutionaries in the imperialist countries lies in the constant "propaganda, agitation and organisation" to help the masses to "realise the truth" and finally to "awaken them completely" so as to win the victory. It is true that in a fascist country like China, there is no legitimate parliament as a platform for us to use. But the basic principle of the strategy of the October Revolution is still applicable to all industrialised countries. That is that the communists have been organising, propagandising and educating the masses (including the army) for a long time, using all kinds of means (which, in a big country like China, can never be covered by the simple words "lawful" or "violent"), and that they have been like a virus incubating in the bourgeoisie. It is like a virus that lurks in every corner of bourgeois society (and I am talking about society as a whole, not just the bourgeois state apparatus), and finally, when society as a whole is faced with a revolutionary crisis, it seizes power in the main industrial areas through a

highly organised and coordinated general national uprising, and then extends the workers' regime throughout the country by means of a war.

The next four to fifteen articles are almost all based on the first three, so I do not have any interest in analysing them one by one, so I will skip them here. First of all, it is useless to have any superstitious belief in the power of history in the abstract, or even to believe in the promise of "eliminating imperialism in the next 50 to 100 years". Chairman MAO made this statement at the end of the 1960s, and according to the development of the situation at that time, there was no problem with this judgement, but what has happened since then, and is it not obvious to the blind whether the world revolution has reached the stage of a strategic offensive in high gear or not? As for the armed groups in the imperialist countries, history has proved that none of them has ever possessed the power to shake the capitalist regime, and that they are often very small and isolated, as has been the case from Spain to Germany. At the time of the Irish Revolution, Ireland itself was not industrialised and was a colonial country in every sense of the word, and there is absolutely no comparison with modern Ireland. The situation in France and Norway in the Second World War, which were completely under foreign occupation, was naturally not comparable to a general bourgeois dictatorship, and there were a lot of political gaps. These few examples only show that the Norwegians and Master Gong were equally accomplished in history. Finally, if the Norwegians want to carry out a protracted people's war in Norway, or an armed regime of the workers and peasants, then let them go ahead and do it themselves, as long as they don't remain in the "preparatory stage of a protracted people's war" as the Communist Party of Brazil (Red Faction) has been doing for more than 40 years. Mr Gong can also rebuild revolutionary bases in China. On this issue, I suggest you have a good exchange with Mr Li Minqi from the "Red China Network" next door. If I remember correctly, at least he has planned the "Western Sichuan Revolutionary Base Area" in earnest. On the other hand, the Chinese tributists, until now, have not put forward anything on the specific issues of the Chinese revolution, not to mention any practice. On these two points, the Chinese tributists are even worse than the semi-peripheralist clowns who have long since rotted away.

Here we address in passing the confusion of the Gonzaloists in the history of military theory.

The Gonzaloists' reliance on abstract violence has made them so devoted to the "military" that they even go so far as to distort the facts, saying that "Chairman Mao applied Marxism to solve the concrete problems of the Chinese revolution, developed the theory of people's war, and defeated imperialism and its lackeys by means of people's war. This was the first thing that gave the world communists their own military doctrine - the highest knowledge in the history of the world". First of all, we need to clarify what the military doctrine of the proletariat is. We are not military experts and naturally we cannot give a precise definition from the point of view of military specialisation, but we can make it politically clear that the military doctrine of the proletariat is definitely the doctrine which guides the military armed forces of the proletariat in their operations. As far as we know, as early as the nineteenth century, Marx and Engels, and especially Engels, had already formulated a part of the military theory of the proletariat in their examination of the 1848 revolution, the Paris Commune and the various bourgeois wars and revolutions of the same period. Even if all this does not count, what was the theory on which the Russian Civil War and the Patriotic War were fought and won? Could it be that Lenin, Frunze, Stalin and Zhukov actually won the Civil War and the Second World War by sheer luck in the face of near-desperation under the bourgeois military theories or immature military theories? Is it possible that the Soviet military theory studied by Chairman Mao was not actually a proletarian military theory? These questions are not even mentioned by the foreign and domestic tributes. What are historical facts? You know that the Great Leader Chairman Gonzalo himself instructed that "(Maoism) for scientific socialism (development) it is enough to point

out the people's war, because with Chairman Mao the proletarians of the whole world have gained a fully developed military theory." Yes, it is enough to point this out to the lazy thinkers to be worshipped forever.

### **On the Strategy of Protracted People's War**

The Gonzaloists claimed that the strategy of protracted people's war was a globally applicable strategy and the only feasible strategy. As mentioned above, they not only stigmatised the strategy of the October Revolution as the so-called "strategy of peaceful accumulation", but even went so far as to deny the essential difference between the strategy of the October Revolution and the strategy of the protracted people's war, saying that "the road of the protracted people's war is in line with the road of the revolution of the imperialist countries", and even directly described the October Revolution itself as a revolution guided by the strategy of protracted people's war. Just now I thought that on the question of leaders and the Party, Mr Gong had won for himself a total ignorance of logic and theory, but I never thought that I had underestimated the master's power. However, we are not interested in honestly starting with analysing the logic of the master's argument and examining each sub-argument one by one, as we did in the previous question. Instead, we are going to critique it mainly in its positive aspects.

In the capitalist world order, the modernisation process in some parts of the world has been artificially hindered for decades or even centuries. Without going into the rationale behind this phenomenon, it is sufficient to know that even today pre-capitalist relations of production still play an important role in the economies of many oppressed countries. This means that in those societies the majority of workers are not at least modern proletarians, and that pre-modern small farmers and those who live in the cities but are in fact isolated from social production (a situation that is very common in some countries in Latin America and Africa) make up a very large, if not absolute, majority of the workforce.

In terms of the need for a protracted people's war, the key to the proletariat's seizure of power in backward countries lies in how to win over the classes or strata that can be fought for to the path of revolution. To achieve this, it is necessary to instil the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat into the revolutionary ranks. In our view, the waging of a protracted people's war is absolutely necessary for the realisation of this aim. It is only under the protection and with the help of the people's armed forces, organised in the order and ideology of the proletariat, that the revolutionary party and the masses of the people will be able to maintain the necessary economic basis for all kinds of propaganda, education and organisation. It is only under the influence of this revolutionary war, which is constantly in motion and which will eventually spread throughout the country, that millions of small farmers, who have never left their villages in their lives, can be drawn into the great cause of seizing national power and liberating all of mankind.

It is also very counter-intuitive that in a protracted people's war, a considerable part of the people's army is not on the firing line, but in the base areas helping the masses in their production activities and providing the necessary social security and educational services. Without these activities, the people's armies would not be able to maintain the necessary political and economic ties with the masses, build up a deep friendship between the army and the people, or receive steady replenishment and assistance from the masses, and they would easily degenerate into a generalised sectarian army.

In terms of the possibility of a protracted people's war, Chairman Mao originally thought that the strategy of a protracted people's war could be adopted only in the "joint colonies" of the various

imperialist countries like old China. Because in such countries, "the prolonged divisions and wars among the white regimes have given rise to conditions under which a small area or a number of small areas of red areas under the leadership of the Communist Party can take place and persist in the midst of the surrounding white regimes". In other words, in the joint colonies of the imperialist countries, there were enough political gaps to accommodate decentralised, long-term viable red regimes. It was not clear at the time how much political space was needed for a strategy of protracted human warfare, but it was possible in China. Chairman Mao, who was not a "guarantor of the victory of the Chinese revolution", but who had only just formulated the theory of protracted people's war from the practice of the Chinese revolution, naturally had to define the scope of application of his new theory as rigorously as any other scientist (yes, communists are also practical social scientists). Later, however, the national liberation movements in Indochina and Indonesia during and after the Second World War proved that the strategy of protracted people's war could also be applied to victory in colonies under the direct control of a single empire. It was only with the support of objective facts that Chairman Mao revised his conclusions of 1928, which were based only on the Chinese experience. Our Mr Gong, on the other hand, only knows how to talk abstractly about "Mao's understanding of people's war is subject to change, and his overall view of people's war cannot be proved only by his momentary understanding", but he does not say a word about why such a change took place, and finally deduces a conclusion on the basis of this "change of understanding", which is completely abstract in his view. Finally, on the basis of this "change of understanding", which was completely abstract to him, he deduced that "the path of protracted people's war is also in line with the path of revolution in the imperialist countries". This time, Gong Gesheng as a master of logic and Gong Gesheng as a royal tailor successfully became one!

### **On the Relationship of War to the New Democratic and Socialist Revolutions**

The "theorists" of the Gonzaloist school, including Master Gong, were often keen to distort the strategy of the October Revolution into a "protracted people's war". Their main arguments are two, which the masters have summarised for us:

Proposition 1: The revolution of 1905-1907 was a preview of the people's war, the conditions for which were not yet ripe. The period from 1908 to 1916 was a period of preparation for the people's war, and the struggles of this period were not merely "legal" and "bloodless"; on the contrary, a large number of revolutionaries died or were exiled during this period.

Proposition 2: The period 1917-1921 was a period of seizure and consolidation of power through people's war.

Let us begin with the first proposition. The Master said that the 1905 revolution was a preview of the people's war and that "conditions were not ripe for a people's war". What was the period before 1905 and what was the series of general strikes in the 1890s? A preview of a preview? Moreover, I am curious as to what the Master meant by "conditions for the conduct of a people's war". What conditions require 18 years of rehearsal and preparation to be "ripe"? Of course, we understand our friends in the Gonzaloist community very well. After all, the largest Gonzaloist organisation in the world, the Communist Party of Brazil (Red Line), was founded in the 1980s and has been in the phase of preparation for a protracted people's war for more than 40 years, and still nothing has been achieved. On the other hand, the less advanced Indian comrades, from the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) and the Maoist Communist Centre (yes, the term "Maoism" predates Peru by about twenty years, and I think it must have been the influence of the Indians who encountered the Secret Communist Party back in time that "the concept of Maoism was generally accepted") and was itself founded by revolutionaries at the height of the peasant movement, in the actual organisation

of the people's armed forces. Today, their successor, the CPI(M), has been leading India's people's war in the new century for almost 20 years, while none of the Gonzaloist organisations are now engaged in a universally recognised people's war. Thus, the "accumulation of power-legitimism strategy" is probably a self-presentation of the friends of the tributists.

There are also some Gonzaloist kids who are not as smooth as the masters, and they just say that the Russian People's War started in 1905, which is plainly absurd. In any war, there must be armies on both sides and battles that make up the war. So may I ask my friends in the Gonzaloists where the Bolshevik army was during the period 1905-1917? If there was such an army, where and when did it engage in battles with the enemy? And, if we assume that the civil war did break out in Russia in 1905, can we imagine that Comrade Lenin, the leader of the Party, would have gone into seclusion abroad for decades at such a critical time? In that case, how should we judge such a leader who ran away from the battlefield? How should we judge the Bolsheviks and even the Russian Revolution itself, which made such a person its leader?

Let's move on to proposition two, which is actually what we are mainly interested in. The main basis for the Gonzaloists' description of the October Revolution as a protracted people's war was the Russian Civil War of 1917-1923. But if we take a closer look, we can see that the background of the Russian Civil War was very different from that of the Chinese protracted people's war. Lenin said well: "The fundamental question of the revolution is the question of state power; in the hands of which class the power lies, this determines everything." Both the strategy of the October Revolution and the strategy of the protracted people's war are essentially revolutionary strategies of the proletariat, and they are both macroscopic approaches to serve the proletariat (or the class alliance headed by the proletariat) in its attempt to seize power. The section on "On protracted people's war" has already hinted at the fact that, in the new democratic revolution, the war and its accompanying economic and productive activities are the main tools for the propaganda and organisational work carried out on a daily basis under the dictatorship of the reactionaries (as opposed to in times of revolutionary crisis), and at the same time are the main tools for the final showdown, for the seizure of power and for the defence of people's power. In the socialist revolution represented by the October Revolution, the situation was very different. Historically, even before the outbreak of the civil war, the Bolshevik Party had already seized power in at least the major industrial areas centred on Petersburg and Moscow through general uprisings and armed general strikes in all the major cities of the country in co-ordination with each other. By the time the Russian Civil War broke out, there was no single class in power in Russia, and in fact, the war at that time had to solve the problem of which class was going to be the dictator of the country in the context of the chaos of the various classes. Considering the socio-economic characteristics of the industrialised countries, it is difficult to imagine that such a war would last long. Historically, the main phase of the Russian Civil War lasted only three years, and there were hardly any major battles after 1921; the German Civil War after the November Revolution was even shorter, lasting less than a year, but the Spartacists did not win the civil war either by winning the soviets throughout the country at the beginning or at the end.

To use a poor analogy, a protracted people's war is like a weak man trying to take the Holy Grail away from a strong man. The weak man grows in the process of taking the Grail, and eventually the Grail is taken away from the strong man for good. War in the socialist revolution is like the owner of the Holy Grail suddenly bursting into flames, and then the representatives of the various classes that burst out of the body of the Grail fight against each other, with the winners taking the Cup and the losers perishing.