Chairman Gonzalo's Intervention Regarding Program and Statutes

First Congress of the Communist Party of Peru

1988 or 1989[1]

Regarding the program, we must think that the program must be a document that establishes principles in a concrete way, and that at the same time serves to highlight the basic principles that we need to enumerate in an exhaustive way in order to manage them better, this is our need. Thus, neither the statutes of 1945 in China nor 1969 are written in this way. We have to think of making the documents according to what our party needs at present; we must always keep in mind that we have a new militancy that has a little formation, that we must deliver a document in consequence that allows them to have clearer, more concrete things, and at the same time are easier to study and understand. That is why we list in this way, with asterisks, the problems of principles. This program and statutes are adjusted not only to what is read in the Seventh and Ninth congresses of the CPC, but also to what Chairman Mao Tse tung presents us as a program in *On Coalition Government*, volume III. Those are our bases, apart from having seen those programs we have just read, the programs established by Lenin, and also the programs analyzed by Marx and Engels. *The Gotha Program*, for example, is very interesting, of great transcendence. We must think that this was drafted by Marx himself, of course, as prior knowledge and acceptance of Engels, because they always acted like that.

PROGRAM

"The Communist Party of Peru is based on and guided by Marxism–Leninism–Maoism, principally Maoism and, specifically, by Gonzalo Thought as the creative application of the universal truth to the concrete conditions of the Peruvian Revolution, made by Chairman Gonzalo, leader of our Party." This is very concrete. Here we would have nothing to substantiate, as we have already done so; it would be useless, especially in the absence of time, to reiterate what we have already seen at length.

"The Communist Party of Peru, organized vanguard of the Peruvian proletariat, which is an integral part of the international proletariat, very especially takes up the following basic principles." Here we must emphasize that although the Communist Party of Peru is defined as the organized vanguard of the Peruvian proletariat, which is always a matter of course, as it is said, in every statute, except in a party already very developed like the CPC, which says "the Communist Party of China is a proletarian party", it was not enough to do that, we need to emphasize the problem of organized

[1] https://vnd-peru.blogspot.com/2017/09/movimiento-popular-peru-cr-viva-el-xxv.html

vanguard, but we must emphasize that the Peruvian proletariat is an integral part of the international proletariat. I think the reason is understandable. And to emphasize that the party assumes very especially the following basic principles, that is, to emphasize basic principles, but it does not say that those are all but that those are the ones we assume very especially. That must be taken into account. I think there are 11, if I remember correctly. There are 11, and in order not to number them, but to emphasize them well, we have put an asterisk because it would not be good to put 1, 2, 3, 4. It would not be right. But then, why don't we put them in a row? Because that way it is clearer, sharper, that is the reason.

"Contradiction as the only fundamental law of the incessant transformation of eternal matter." We are affiliated with the conception, from there we must start, it is very clear, it is the conception. Here we express our condition of materialists when we say eternal matter and dialectic when we emphasize contradiction. Here then is the conception in condensed form.

"The masses make history and 'it is right to rebel.'" Here we pass to the social world, to society, which is a product of the masses. Why do we put "it is right to rebel", because this is a great principle established by Chairman Mao Tse tung; he says that until Marx taught servitude, the subjugation of the masses, but it is Marx who calls upon the masses to rebel, establishing a turn in history. Here what we have put is that in the chairman's quote "it is right to rebel", which is part of a more extensive quote where he expresses what I have just said, that is what is expressed there. The turn that Marxism implies of the role of the mass in society, the problem of rebelling, the negation of the submission of the mass; never before had it been raised in this way, it had always been called to submission, capitalism is a clear expression of that.

"Class struggle, dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian internationalism". To what does this part enter, to the motor, to the contradiction in the social world, it enters because that contradiction expresses itself in class struggle. It establishes a connection between class struggle, dictatorship of the proletariat, and proletarian internationalism. Marx told us that he had not discovered the class struggle, as the discovery was made by French historians, that is true. What Marx did was to give a foundation of the basis that supported the classes and the class struggle, and he drew the transcendental conclusion that the class struggle led to the dictatorship of the proletariat. But being the class, being the proletariat, a single class at international level that unfolds in the various countries of the earth, we then have to uphold proletarian internationalism because the classes have the same interest, the same common goal, no matter how Peruvian, Bolivian, Japanese, North American, French, or whatever, it is the same class, the same goal, the same interest, that is why we have to raise proletarian internationalism.

"The need for a Marxist–Leninist–Maoist Communist Party that firmly applies independence, self-decision, and self-sustenance." Chairman Mao Tse tung in 1948, reiterating Lenin and Marx, speaks to us of the need for the communist party, because

without a communist party there is no way to lead the revolution by the proletariat nor to serve the people. What we must emphasize is our Marxist-Leninist-Maoist condition, in accordance with what it says in the paragraph, it is not simply a Marxist-Leninist party. The declaration of the RIM[2] speaks of Marxist-Leninist parties, we cannot speak like that, we are a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party. It is not possible to be in the case as the RIM states Marxist-Leninist-Mao Tse tung Thought, and have a Marxist-Leninist party. We should at least put: Marxist-Leninist-Mao Tse tung Thought party, there they always have the problem of remaining in Marxism-Leninism, that is why we must affirm this. Regarding the firm application of independence: since Marx it has been established that the communist party is a party distinct and opposed to all others, because it has its own class interest, opposed and distinct from that of the other classes, because while the other classes seek property, the proletariat does not. From there derives its condition of last class in history and derives a goal, communism. Only the proletariat has that historic task, and for that reason it is necessary to emphasize its independence from the parties of other classes. Self-decision: a party must decide for itself because the Communist Party of Peru — in our case — responds to the Peruvian revolution, within and in service of the world revolution, in agreement, but for the Peruvian revolution. We must have self-decision, we cannot follow any baton of command; the Chairman many times reiterated: "there is no father Party, there is no son party, the parties are equal, and each party must decide for itself", for that reason what fits between parties are the conversations to arrive at common points, in common agreement; this is very important, no baton of command, that is revisionism! Self-sustenance: the party must rely on its own forces; the main thing is, from this, to rely on one's own forces to establish the policy, that is the main thing of self-sustenance, it is necessary to think well because sometimes it is reduced to a simply economic question, it is also part but it is not the main thing, comrades. Also, of course, it means that a party should not live on what another gives it, that is not to rely on its own efforts, but obviously this does not deny, in any way, proletarian internationalism and the fraternal help that some parties owe to others, that is already a problem of proletarian internationalism.

"Combat imperialism, revisionism, and reaction inseparably and implacably." We consider that although it is said to combat imperialism and to combat revisionism, it is an inseparable and implacable struggle, it is also necessary to combat reaction because these three: imperialism, revisionism and reaction are inseparably united and all three must be combated implacably. Where does this point to? To emphasize that there is also an obligation to combat reaction implacably. For example, the reactionary ideology of the Catholic Church, are we going to accept it? The semi-feudal conception, are we going to accept it? The feudals, the reactionary ideas in the world or reactionary systems in the world, are we going to accept them? No. Are they linked to revisionism? Yes, it is enough to see that foul alliance between communists and Catholics upheld by

[2]RedLibrary: Revolutionary Internationalist Movement. Their 1984 Declaration can be read here: https://bannedthought.net/International/RIM/Docs/DeclarationOfTheRIM-1984-OCR-sm.pdf.

the Italian party, a clear revisionist position. That is what we put forward. Imperialism and revisionism are not enough, also reaction, because, I repeat, is imperialism linked to revisionism? Yes. And reaction? That too.

"To conquer and defend power with the people's war". It is a reaffirmation that power can only be conquered with the people's war and only through it can it be defended. I believe it needs no further substantiation.

"Militarization of the Party and concentric construction of the three instruments of the revolution." Here it is only fitting to put it that way, because it is the program and statutes of the Communist Party of Peru: here we could not put "of the Communist Parties", in any way. We are not naming other parties, we are regulating ourselves. I think we also understand that.

"Two-line struggle as the driving force of Party development". This is the problem, that the contradiction energizes the life of the party, and this is concretized in the two-line struggle, between the proletarian line and all the other lines, especially the bourgeois, which is ultimately concretized in revisionism.

"Constant ideological transformation and to always put politics in command". The ideological transformation is fundamental for all of us, for all the militants, for the whole party, it cannot stop, it cannot end, because it is necessary to change the spirit precisely and completely.

(…)

It is taking place by progressive leaps in step with the development of the revolution according to its stages and periods. Because the definitive change, the change of spirit, the new spirit, will only be expressed in communism. In the meantime, we are proclaimers of that new spirit, but we are elements of a transition period between the old society and the future new society, that is, communism. This should be of great importance to us. To always put politics in command, we already know, we have seen it when speaking of Maoism. If we do not put politics in command, it is not that we do not put politics anywhere, or avoid it, but rather we are putting another politics in command, that of the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, or whatever it may be.

"Serve the people and the world proletarian revolution". This is what the Chairman has taught us; every militant has to be guided by serving the people and the world proletarian revolution by proletarian internationalism.

"An absolute selflessness and a just and correct style of work". Absolute selflessness was taught by Chairman Mao Tse tung, and why is absolute selflessness demanded of us? because we correspond to a class that has no property, that aims to sweep away private property over the means of production, and has no other interest than to arrive at communism, to reach the final goal; as we will not see that goal, we are expressing absolute selflessness — because we will not see that goal, comrades — it is an expression of the destruction of particular interests as part of the class whose

essence is to be extinguished as such, it is part of being communists, that is to say, to assume the interests of the proletariat. As for the style of work, the Chairman masterfully synthesized it, telling us: "connection of theory and practice, connection with the masses, and criticism and self-criticism"; the three questions of the style of work, is masterful.

These are what we understand by basic principles. If the comrades analyze this, they see that it goes from the most universal which is our conception to the condition of communist, of militant. Why? They are threaded. From the conception expressed in contradiction and eternal matter, we pass to the social world in which we move, the party; from there we establish the principle of masses and rebellion; having posed the problem of masses, we pass to the problem of class struggle, which is the contradiction of society because the masses are grouped in classes and these struggles, and they do it for the dictatorship of the proletariat as a consequence of the whole process of class struggle. It is the inevitable consequence, and that poses us the dictatorship of the proletariat. With this established, from what guides the proletariat as an international class, we pass to the party which is its highest organization, the first social organization. From the party we pass to what the party combats: imperialism, revisionism, and reaction; then it goes on to how the party conquers power because it is the center or the central task of the revolution; from there it goes on to how the party organizes itself to fulfill the task that corresponds to it: militarization and concentric construction; then how the party develops: two-line struggle; and from there already, seen conception, seen the question of society, seen the question of the proletariat, seen the problem of the party, seen that it fights, seen its tasks, seen how it is organized, how it develops, we pass to the problem of the constant ideological transformation and put politics in command as a guide of the party and of the militancy. Here already enters the problem of militancy. The problem of the party too? Obviously. To end with serving the people, the world proletarian revolution, absolute selflessness, and style of work. In that way they are ordered. I think it is good to point out because they could ask them why they are placed like that. That is the reason comrades: it goes from conception to militancy. Some things you could ask them: but why do you put conception? It seems to us that it is fundamental, but in other places it is not put, but we see that the current needs demand to put it, that is our condition because it is unusual, there is none. It is convenient for us because we insist that the statute of the program is in accordance with what the party needs, this party. The established examples serve us as an example to solve our problem: It always remains the application to our reality.

"The Communist Party of Peru has Communism as its final goal; therefore, given that present Peruvian society is oppressed and exploited by imperialism, bureaucrat-capitalism, and semi-feudalism, the revolution has a first democratic stage and a second socialist one in order, subsequently, to unfold successive cultural revolutions. At present, with the People's War, the Party develops the democratic revolution, having as its immediate goal to culminate it by conquering Power in the entire country". In

this paragraph, we had to necessarily include communism as the ultimate goal, and this must be emphasized because if we did not include it, we would not be a communist party. If, with that goal in mind, we have to look at the current reality, this also needs to be emphasized: Peruvian society today is oppressed and exploited; oppressed refers to the political domination that is exercised, that is what the word oppressed and oppression, which is its noun, expresses, and exploited refers to exploitation, to how surplus value is generated, how profits are generated that are devoured by the exploiting classes, it is an economic expression; oppression refers to politics and exploitation, to the economic base, that is what it refers to. And who oppresses and exploits us? It says oppressed and exploited — by whom? — by imperialism, bureaucrat-capitalism, and its semi-feudalism. That is the current situation of the country, of Peruvian society. We already know: imperialism, bureaucrat-capitalism, and semi-feudalism. That is why the Peruvian revolution has stages, which is another thing we must highlight: a democratic stage, a second socialist stage, and subsequently successive cultural revolutions, which in our view is a third stage, but I think that requires another explanation, and is how to see the revolution. The night before last, we were discussing with some comrades how we saw the dynamic process of this. At a certain point, the cultural revolution will become a stage; that is what we think, but we do not need to put that here in the program. We must also emphasize that we are in a people's war, with which the party is developing the democratic revolution, and that the immediate goal is to complete it by conquering power country-wide. These things must be analyzed, highlighted, and viewed part by part. Think, comrades, that this is a program, that it is synthetic, condensed, because that is how it should be, but when explaining, we must explain this problem.

Next comes the GENERAL PROGRAM OF THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION; because that is what the previous paragraph says in its final part: "Therefore, we uphold the following objectives:" Why? Because we are currently in the stage of the democratic revolution, which, no matter how armed it may be, remains democratic, and if we wage war, it is because it is the only way to carry it forward. It does not change; it has nothing to do with the program, but it must be emphasized. From there, we move on to:

GENERAL PROGRAM OF THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

With 14 points.

1. Demolition of the Peruvian State, dictatorship of the exploiters led by the big bourgeoisie, of the repressive armed forces[3] that underpin it, and of all its democratic apparatus.[4]

What are we talking about here? The demolition of the Peruvian State — that's the issue, that's the key, that's what it's all about: "demolition of the Peruvian State." We have taken the words of Marx, remember when he talks about the Paris Commune? He says that he showed that it had to be demolished, very expressive with words, that's where we took it from, it's a very precise and expressive concept. It can be read like this: demolition of the Peruvian State, the dictatorship of the exploiters led by the big bourgeoisie, and of the armed forces and forces of repression that sustain it and of all its bureaucratic apparatus. Of course, otherwise there would be no demolition because to demolish the State you have to demolish two fundamental things: one, the armed forces, which are the backbone of the State, and the repressive apparatus linked to this system, and the bureaucratic apparatus. These are the two fundamental parts of the state, the main one being the demolition of the armed and repressive forces because they are the backbone, here it says: "that sustain it." That is the thesis established from Marx to Chairman Mao Tse tung.

The phrase "dictatorship of the exploiters led by the big bourgeoisie" aims to highlight that the Peruvian State is a dictatorship. Is it a class dictatorship? That is obvious, otherwise it would not be a dictatorship. Or, could there be a dictatorship without classes? No, there could not be, which is why it is enough to say dictatorship. We must emphasize that. But also, "of the exploiters", yes, because the dictatorship, which is a political problem, is based on an economic foundation that it defends, and that base is the Peruvian State of exploitation. That is what we must understand: that it is a dictatorship, but one that defends a system of exploitation that is its base, and defends it with blood and fire. That dictatorship is led by the big bourgeoisie, that makes the problem clear, because who else leads the dictatorship in Peru? The big bourgeoisie. That is why they are put that way.

We were asked whether there would be a problem here in including exploiters, whether this would clash with the ERFURT program, which is the 1891 program of the Social Democratic Party of Germany analyzed by Engels. We have reread the program and Engels' critique of the ERFURT program, and there is no contradiction with that term. Why? Because what Engels criticizes in that program is the statement "domination of the capitalists and large landowners", saying that an economic problem cannot be explained from a political point of view. To understand this, what does it mean? If one recalls what is in *Anti-Dühring* about the problem of violence, Engels himself, reviewed by Marx: "There are those who say that property is domination, that is, violence, and therefore property is nothing more than dispossession, seizure by force." Engels, in *Anti-Dühring*, explained to us that exploitation is an economic phenomenon, that is,

[3]Red Library: "of the repressive armed forces" reads as "of the armed and repressive forces," in the General Program of the Democratic Revolution. "Of the repressive armed forces" may be a transcription error.

[4]Red Library: "Democratic apparatus" reads as "bureaucratic apparatus" in the General Program of the Democratic Revolution. "Democratic apparatus" may be a transcription error.

social relations of exploitation, and that in order to defend and maintain it, there is the state, which is organized violence, as Engels himself taught. So, when he criticizes what they proposed as the Erfurt program and they say "domination by capitalists and large landowners", this way of thinking leaves room for deriving property from violence, which is incorrect. That is the essence of Engels' justified criticism. But the problem is that it also says "individual capitalists", that's what it says; so Engels says that this is another mistake because society — he's talking about Germany — increasingly has trusts, monopolies, corporations, and there it is not individual property, and furthermore, he says, individual property is also that of the small producer, which consequently leads to a second mistake. Another situation that could be linked to what we are discussing is what Engels says in that critique, almost at the end, when he talks about production and says: "Needless to say, it is individual", and then goes on to say that it should not be called individual, because the production system increasingly undermines the middle classes, small producers, etc. Consequently, what Engels is criticizing is giving property a root based on violence, which is Dühring's idea, which is what Dühring is criticized for.

It is true that the national bourgeoisie are also exploiters, but no one can say that the national bourgeoisie exercises dictatorship here in Peru today. Or do they? Obviously not.

Consequently, point 1 of the program proposed in the problem of the demolition of the old state, that is, the Peruvian state, which is specified as a dictatorship, is worth highlighting, but that dictatorship is one of exploiters, to emphasize the basis it defends, which is what motivates us. And there should be no confusion with the national bourgeoisie because it is not part of the dictatorship and because, furthermore, the problem of specifying the economic overthrow that we are destroying comes in the subsequent parts and was clarified in point 5; no one could argue that the national bourgeoisie is part of the dictatorship led by the big bourgeoisie, that is the crux of the matter. We do not intend to explain an economic problem.

(…)

There is no individual property here, except when we talk about the peasantry and the land, which is another matter, so there is no room for confusion.

2. To sweep away all imperialist oppression, mainly Yankee, and that of Soviet social-imperialism and of any imperialist power or country. In general to confiscate their monopolies, companies, banks and all forms of their property including the external debt.

It is the problem of the first mountain, of imperialism, and it is clearly separate from oppression because it exercises it, it oppresses us; Lenin tells us that nations are

oppressed by imperialism, these are Lenin's own words. Here we must see very clearly that imperialist oppression is mainly Yankee, but not only that, it is also Soviet social imperialism, which, I repeat, is penetrating our country more and more dangerously; and any imperialist power or country, China for example. China is going to invest in mines; they have also discovered that they need raw materials. That's fine; they are already showing their true colors. If this is understood, it answers the question of what China is. If this is understood, it is understood that it is China, today's China, I mean. "Any power or imperialist country": Jalón, England, France, Spain; why do I say Spain? Think about it, Spain is going to invest nearly three billion dollars in Argentina, and it also has investments here: Canto Grande, for example, is an investment in high-security prisons for Peru. The problem with these markets that the President is opening up is that they are Jewish capital that could not be used because there was a difference, a dispute over their value. In other words, we do not accept any domination, any oppression, but we highlight two: Yankee and Soviet, mainly Yankee imperialism because that is the country that mainly dominates and exploits here, that imperialism.

The other part refers to the economic issue. How did they propose to "confiscate their monopolies, companies, banks, and all forms of property in general", because there can be many forms, such as patents, royalties, and so on; international economic relations will go on generating many more forms. This remains open here because it is a very clear and broad term, a legal term that has been well defined since Roman times, and nothing escapes that term. Why are we including foreign debt here? Because of its importance; the debt of oppressed nations is enormous, and this foreign debt is a drain or a death sentence, but the problem of foreign debt can only be solved by confiscating it, denying that right. There is no other way, because it is a form of property, in this case based on credit, which is why we are highlighting this point. Our debt is growing every day and must be around $17 billion. That is the reason.

Point 3 refers to the second mountain, in order of importance; here they are listed in order of importance, in terms of power: economic, political, military, or whatever. Here is the problem:

3. To destroy bureaucrat-capitalism, private as well as State owned; to confiscate all their properties, goods and economic rights to benefit of New State, as well as those belonging to imperialism.

This is the second mountain: bureaucrat-capitalism. It must be destroyed — destroyed is a broad term — demolished economically, politically, ideologically, in every way possible. Ideologically, for example————————————, we already know from the Chairman that a class can lose its economic and political power but retain its ideological power, which is obviously a serious problem. Why do we say "private as state"? Here, too, there is not much confusion because it refers to bureaucratic capitalism; we agree and we fight against the distinction between private property and state property because

both are forms of private property: individual property is a form of private property, state property is that which is managed by the state as a whole, but both are private. The old state operates in this way, and to call it private would be a mistake. "Non-state" is not very expressive for us, but there is no room for confusion because here it says to destroy bureaucratic capitalism and nothing escapes it; and after all, a society, a monopoly has individual owners, of course it does, so we have no problems either, because — I repeat — it has been specified as "bureaucrat-capitalism."

"to confiscate all their properties, goods and economic rights to benefit of New State…" Why this? It is key to passing to the second revolution without interruption. But here we have added "as well as those belonging to imperialism" so as not to repeat ourselves, because both pass to the new state; they are the economic means for the new economy.

4. Liquidation of semi-feudal property and every subsisting modality of it, confiscating it in order to deliver the lands to the peasantry, mainly the poor peasantry, applying the principle of "land to the tiller."

It refers to the third mountain. It is in third place because that mountain is weaker. Why do we say "all remaining forms thereof"? Because Lenin taught us that there are a thousand and one ways in which feudalism can manifest itself, and others may appear or be specified: the question remains open, and we are not tying our hands. That this land be confiscated is understandable; to give it to the peasantry is what he says. ————-; what we highlight is "mainly poor," as it is very understandable and necessary, because when the peasantry reads this, the poor will easily identify with it and say, "mainly for me", which is what we are aiming for; we could have simply said peasantry, but no, the Chairman tells us: "after all, if we talk about peasantry, we are talking about the poor", he tells us, remember "a single spark…", by—-, —— was in Junín, the investigation.

The principle of "land to the tiller" is an old principle, one that remains fully valid. Chairman Mao reiterated this point in the program when he addressed the issue of land, and it is worth highlighting because here in Peru there is a lot of nonsense being talked about, such as "land and liberation". but that is not the problem. It is simply "land for those who work it". You may have seen the program from Vietnam, remember? In other words, both the 1930 program and the 1967 program — the one from the south — say the same thing. It is an old situation that every democratic revolution raises; if one thinks about it carefully, one cannot say that "the demand of the democratic revolution is the land problem". No, comrades, how could we say that, when there is also the problem of imperialism and the problem of bureaucrat-capitalism? In other words, in dealing with what we are seeing, I think we are answering multiple questions.

5. Respect of the property and rights of the national bourgeoisie, or middle bourgeoisie, both in the countryside and in the city.

This brings us to another issue: the problem that characterizes classes in terms of destroying the democratic revolution. A democratic revolution that does not respect the property and rights of the national bourgeoisie ceases to be democratic and becomes socialist. National or middle bourgeoisie, to make it clearer, because national is sometimes confused with native, many confuse national with native and that is a mistake; in Marxist language, in Maoism, the national bourgeoisie is the middle and that occurs both in the countryside and in the city, in the countryside it is the rural bourgeoisie — that once again solves the problem of the rich peasant and the confusion we have seen here. This clarifies and further defines the democratic character of the revolution and, in turn, reiterates what we have always maintained; there are those who say that we have changed our line, that we now respect the rights of the national bourgeoisie, and I ask myself, what party document says otherwise? ———which one? None. So the "wise" Senderologist is a poor ignorant devil who only repeats what he is paid to say.

Thus, points 2, 3, 4, and 5 precisely define the democratic nature of the mountains that must be torn down and respect for the property and rights of the bourgeoisie. The word is also broad — respect — it does not say that we guarantee them, it says nothing more than respect, and that is how it should remain. Why? Because out of necessity we can restrict those rights, even today, particularly in the countryside where there is a shortage of land, but there is no need to say that here. How can we say, "I respect you, but I'm taking it away from you", as comrades? We know this because Chairman Mao himself says so.

6. Fight for the institution of the People's Republic of Peru, as a front of classes based on the worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat headed by its Communist Party; as New Democracy given shape, carrying forward a new economy, a new politics, and a new culture.

Point 6 raises the issue of the new state, a new state that we are already forging, but there is no need here to specify "people's committees, base areas, a new democratic republic in formation." There is no need; we are setting the goal, the perspective. We know the rest; we don't need to write it into the program. Here, the class front is highlighted, but its foundation — the "worker-peasant alliance" — and the leadership of the new state we are building, "led by the proletariat", are emphasized. But that is not enough; we must be clear: "led by its communist party." The programs that have been written do not say this, but it is in our interest to say it. Moreover, I believe that a long time has passed since the CPC program of 1928, and things are now more defined, especially if we are the "most authentic revolution". "It is clear that the Shining Path is

the movement with the strongest revolutionary support in the world", Aguirre, get it! That's what comrades say, and that's what Don Francisco Morales Bermúdez, former president of Peru, major general, and other bigwigs say. That's right, That's what he says, "It is clear that the Shining Path is the movement with the strongest revolutionary support in the world." All right, very well, you are beginning to understand, you are beginning to understand. There is no other, comrades. Which one? Get out of here! The M-16, the FARC, the Nicaraguan revolution? Please, man! Please! I just read their program, it's very clear, isn't it? Which one? The great revolution of Haiti by the RIM? Please! That's a bad joke. Or the revolution in South Africa? Please! Another bad joke, because that's how it is, the RIM puts us on the same level and even puts us at the back of the line. First is the revolution in South Africa; yes, I say, yes, for the imbeciles. They are clumsy and are undermining the international communist movement, that much is clear, comrades: call a spade a spade, as they say. So it is worth specifying this: it is the Communist Party. Let them know, then! And we have no qualms about saying it, of course, it is necessary.

Then this idea of "as New Democracy given shape" with its threefold content, I think it clearly and precisely expresses the connection that Chairman Mao has established with Maoism; that is its content, there is nothing more to explain in terms of content. As a new state, everything is there, so what is missing? It is these three questions.

7. Develop the People's War that, through a revolutionary army of a new type under the absolute leadership of the Party, destroys the old order[5] part by part, mainly its armed and repressive forces, and serves to construct the New Power for the proletariat and the people.

It's like carrying out that revolution. Of course, and he says things openly. How to do it? With people's war, there's no other way. With what instrument? The revolutionary army of a new type, but under the absolute leadership of the party. The party again? Of course, because that's how it is, so don't even dream that other classes will have leadership in the army, don't even dream it. It's fine that we are at the forefront of the classes, but that doesn't mean they will command the army. If the party did not have absolute leadership, we would not be able to carry out the first revolution, complete it as it should be, or move on to the second.

What are the objectives of this people's war with that army? To destroy the old power part by part, mainly what? Its armed and repressive forces. No, we are not like Vietnam or Nicaragua, comrades. We are going to demolish the army, we are not going to turn it into a "new national army". That is not what we are here for. It is not the case of the USSR under Lenin. It was a different circumstance, a different necessity.

[5]Red Library: "Old order" reads as "old power" in the General Program of the Democratic Revolution. "Old order" may be a transcription error.

8. To culminate the formation of the Peruvian nation, unifying the country truly to defend it from all imperialist and reactionary aggression, safeguarding the rights of the minorities.

Point 8 is about the Peruvian nation — we must pay close attention to this point. The union of struggle of Spain, which does not even know what it is fighting for, says that we do not understand the national problem and cannot understand it — it says — because Mariátegui never understood it; that is how shameless that imbecile is to speak, a group of lazy revisionists whom the RIM indulges and calls on to unite with others to form the Communist Party of Spain in an organization that is not part of the RIM, whose criticisms of the party it accepts, accommodates, and uses. Why is it put that way? Because the Peruvian nation is a nation in formation and this national formation is being developed over long years, centuries, and it cannot be broken down into a Quechua nation, an Aymara nation, or nations by dozens of silvicultures.

(…)

In formation, what corresponds is to culminate the formation of the Peruvian nation, that is either we disintegrate, or there is no Peruvian nation in concrete. He says in turn, really unifying the country, because it is not unified, only we will be able to do it, both to complete the formation of the nation and to really unify the country. He also says to defend it from all imperialist and reactionary aggression, very important; therein lies our "anti-patriotism". Who raises like this, who speaks of the Peruvian nation, takes it as already consecrated, as established, and in that way they are following a fascist like Víctor Andrés Belaúnde because he began with that chant that the Peruvian nation already exists, in his "famous refutation" of the *7 Essays*, refutation in dreams, an empty shell that could never refute anything, comrades. It has a deep content and has reality. I reiterate: we are a nation in formation, the country is not unified, we have to unify it, why? To defend it, we have to defend it, why? It is going to be attacked or is exposed to aggressions at different times, imperialist or reactionary. (…)

And the final part says "safeguarding the rights of the minorities", of course, because in this way unifying the nation, unifying the country, there are minority differences that must be safeguarded; they demand that it is necessary to satisfy. For example, are we going to prohibit the Quechua language? How are we going to do it, comrades, are we going to prohibit the Aymara language or the multitude of languages of the jungle dwellers? We could not comrades, we could not: that is what is being referring to.

This is the way in which we can see the national problem, the problem of the Peruvian nation.

Point 9 is the problem of the proletariat, yes, because it is the class whose interests we uphold and serve to the end, until its historic goal is achieved. That is what it refers to, the proletariat.

9. To serve the development of the Peruvian proletariat as part of the international working-class, the formation and strengthening of true Communist Parties guided by Marxism–Leninism–Maoism, and their unification in a revived international communist movement; all in service of the proletariat fulfilling its great historic mission as the final class.

We believe that this is how we should approach the problem of the proletariat. There is no place here for eight-hour workdays or unemployment; that is a problem for a specific program, because here we are addressing the supreme interests of the class. Specifically, "to serve the development of the Peruvian proletariat" means developing its class consciousness, its political capacity, its leadership capacity, that is what it refers to, that it give shape to its class interests, that it leads, that it assumes power, whether by leading the democratic revolution or the dictatorship of the proletariat or cultural revolutions. We conceive of the Peruvian proletariat as part of the international working class because it cannot be separated from the class that is one in the world, I repeat.

It also says, to the formation and strengthening of true communist parties, of course, that's what we're here for, so let them jump, then! We haven't seen it that way in the programs, but we have to put it that way because that's why we're here. "Unifying a revived international communist movement", of course, that's what we're here for because it's a necessity for the international proletariat, but guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; that's why what Morales Bermúdez says is interesting, there it is, check it out, what party proposes this, ours, and it's an obligation to do so, can they label us nationalists? No; I can already see the frowns on some people's faces when they read point 8. "Ah, nationalism has come out!" they will say, and when they read point 9, "Internationalism has come out!" That's what they'll say: head-butting on one side, head-butting on the other, I can already see it, and we're going to send a lot of Hepabionta, by the ton, good for the liver, of course, comrades, everyone knows how to scrub, the other thing is principles: "all as a function of the proletariat fulfilling its great historical mission as the final class", of course, what better way to serve the proletariat, could we replace it — I repeat — with eight hours? Obviously not, comrades, it is a demand but not the supreme demand of the class.

10. To defend the freedoms, rights, benefits, and conquests that the working-class and the masses have achieved at the cost of their own blood, recognizing them and guaranteeing their authentic validity in a *Declaration of the Rights of the People*. To respect, particularly, the freedom of religious conscience, but in its full breadth, both to believe and not to believe. Likewise, to combat every provision harmful to the popular interests, especially any form of unpaid work or personal burden and the overwhelming taxes that fall upon the masses.

Point 10 refers to the rights of the people, that's what it refers to, I think it's quite understandable. Let's take the fundamental point: "rights of the people". There is much talk and dissemination in the world about human rights, imperialist countries raise it, the bourgeoisie in particular raises it, it is a bourgeois position, as Marx said, it is in *The Holy Family*, that's where I raise this problem; He said: "What does it mean to uphold human rights? It means upholding bourgeois rights; it is the position of the bourgeoisie." That is why Engels speaks of "democratic rights and obligations" and in this way, he says, the bourgeois character is removed, there is no trace of the bourgeoisie, he says. Why do we raise the rights of the people? Because that is what Lenin taught us; he taught us that. Therein lies a fundamental document that the revolution, the party in particular, will have to produce.

Okay. Defending the freedoms, rights, benefits, and achievements of the class and the masses: freedoms, we understand; rights, we understand; benefits, we also understand (social benefits, for example); and achievements, of course, we must end the achievements, let's say, daylight saving time that the state employocracy has here — because its name is not state bureaucracy, it is state employocracy; bureaucracy is the upper layer, it is the one that commands, that's it; the others are workers but not laborers, obviously — that's what it refers to. How to respect them, how to recognize them? Through the *Declaration of the Rights of the People*; that's why we say this is the problem of the rights of the people, of the big bourgeoisie? No, just of the people. What are the people? It is a concept that is historically defined according to the stage and period of the revolution. It is enough to say "the people." The Chairman has taught us what the people are. That concept comes from Marx. The problem of the people comes from Marx.

Respecting religious freedom of conscience in particular, but in its fullest sense, both to believe and not to believe, seems to us to be very relevant, especially if they want to pit us against the church. Here we are not respecting or safeguarding the rights of the sacrosanct Roman and Japanese apostolic churches. No, that is not our problem. here we are not respecting the rights of the hierarchy that is part of oppression, as Lenin said: army, police, judges, prisons, and priests, the same old story, part of the same thing, of oppression. What we are here for, and what we have an obligation to do, is to guarantee freedom of religious conscience, and we have restricted it because it is not freedom of conscience but religious freedom, because that must be emphasized. There are those who want to believe in a flowerpot or whatever, so that's how it is. The opium of the people — Marx said it — would be swept away as the relations of exploitation changed, and the new relations of production require a long way to go for that. But in its full breadth, it implies both believing and not believing; just as some have the right not to believe, we have the right to atheism; in other words, that is the complete way of approaching freedom of religious conscience.

Likewise, combat any provision that is harmful to the interests of the people, because many laws and many actions are harmful to the interests and rights of the people, and they must be combated, especially — what? — any form of unpaid labor or personal

burden; unpaid labor cannot be tolerated, and why do we impose personal burdens? Because it is very broad. Personal burdens are strictly feudal in origin. The bourgeoisie itself only accepts two personal burdens: 1) taxes and 2) compulsory military service. It accepts nothing else. How many personal burdens can they invent? Many, so it is enough to put personal burdens, broad. And the oppressive taxes that fall on the masses, yes; we have not yet wanted to raise the issue of progressive taxation, which is Marx's thesis, Engels' thesis, Lenin's thesis, the Chairman's thesis. That is a matter to be specified, because without taxes, the state cannot be financed economically, but it has to be progressive and specified in many ways. we must remember that in Russia Lenin showed several ways according to the needs of the revolution, so it is better to leave it open.

Then we move on to point 11, which deals with the protection of special groups of the population due to their special circumstances. Hence, we state:

11. Real equality for women…

Only the revolution will bring it about, understood? So we are in favor of women's emancipation, but that is part of the whole revolution and part of the emancipation of the proletariat. therefore, comrades, wait until communism, it will undoubtedly come, so says the thesis, it is not nonsense, according to Marxism, the emancipation of women is part of the emancipation of the proletariat, that is when there will be full equality in life, there will be leaps forward; That's how it is. Desire is one thing, reality is another. The other thing is not seeing reality. That's what Marxism says. A decree is not enough. We could issue a decree, couldn't we? Full legal equality, equality in life, but it's not going to be true, comrades. That's the fact. Lenin distinguished this well when he said, "It is one thing to have equality before the law, to guarantee equality between men and women, and another thing to have equality in life." Of course, and that is why he said that the problem is that women fight for their own emancipation and can only do so within the emancipation of the proletariat. There is no other way to do it.

a better future for the youth…

Obviously. What future does youth have in this rotten society?

protection for the mothers and the children…

Understandable, comrades, I don't see what you're going to refute here.

respect and support for the elderly.

Also, don't we see how even retirees are treated, even by the police themselves? What role do the elderly play here? They also deserve respect and support.

> A new culture as a weapon of combat to concretize nationality, that serves the popular masses and is guided by the scientific ideology of the proletariat. Give special importance to education.

Point 12 refers to the new culture. Yes, it is how we are putting into practice what the president says about the new culture; that is what we are aiming for. What do we emphasize? Its role as a weapon to achieve nationality, yes, it is indispensable. The culture of nationality that we must give shape to is not the corruption of popular music as is done in the huaynos, it is not that corruption, destroying precisely the deep cultural roots that will shape our nationality. We do not agree with that corruption; it is not those pantomime functions of political tasks that the IU does, that is not promoting popular culture; having huacos in your house is not being nationalist, it is not having national spirit because of that, it is not true, being an antique collector does not necessarily express national spirit. Why do you think Mujica Gallo has national spirit? And he has, I believe, a very valuable historical collection, doesn't he? Or do you think the Osmas have national spirit because they have a huge collection of art from the viceroyalty? No, comrades, that's not it, comrades. We must generate a new culture to make nationality a reality. It is necessary because we are a nation in formation.

That serves the masses and is guided by the scientific ideology of the proletariat. Why have we added "scientific" here? To emphasize that it must reject superstition, false ideologies, and idealism. Because we are not proposing a proletarian culture; that corresponds to the second moment. We are talking about a national culture (consequently anti-imperialist), democratic (therefore anti-feudal, expressed in that it serves the popular masses) and that culture cannot but be guided by the ideology of the proletariat, which we have said is scientific, and here it is appropriate to highlight that character because of the above: it goes against superstition, with everything that is rotten in ideology, because without that guidance there can be no new culture. Compare this with Vietnam: "national, democratic", but what ideology guides it? It does not say.

Placing special importance on education, which I think is understandable. We will have to explain, express, and specify what this education is like, because now everyone is involved in the new education and is repeating a set of imperialist theses or Catholic criteria, rotten from the church, such as the famous "consciousnessization," Freyre's stupidity; What was that based on? On Christian imperialism. That thesis is of feudal origin. We are not going to allow that. The new education is well qualified, well defined: education and work. That is the thesis of Marxism, that is Marx's thesis, that is what we will have to forge.

13. Support the struggles of the international proletariat, of the oppressed nations, and of the peoples of the world; fighting against the superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, imperialism in general, international reaction, and revisionism of every type, conceiving the Peruvian revolution as part of the world proletarian revolution.

Here, the connection between proletarian internationalism and serving the world revolution is expressed; we believe it is understandable, it suffices to highlight the parts separated by semicolons. Struggles of the international proletariat, the class, the oppressed nations, and the peoples of the world, that is how it must be. Against the superpowers, because that is the period we are in, the United States and the Soviet Union, that is why it must be emphasized; imperialism in general, of course, any imperialism whatsoever: the Japanese because they consider — The Japanese imperialists — that the Andean Pact area is complementary to their economy, aren't their Japanese companies everywhere? There are Teng's sons, now they are going to invest too; the French, needless to say; the Germans rub and rub all the time; all that research, that investigation, who pays for it? Imperialism, particularly the Europeans, that's where the Senderologists like Gonzales come from. The international reaction — of course — and revisionism of all kinds, superpowers, middle powers, impotent powers, or whatever, of all stripes. Conceiving the Peruvian revolution as part of the world proletarian revolution.

Point 14 is the problem of the revolution as a unity, its stages, and its continuation and culmination. This is very necessary, I think the debate shows that:

14. Fight tenaciously and heroically for the full and complete triumph of the democratic revolution in the entire country and, once this stage is culminated, immediately, without any interval, pass to the socialist revolution in order, together with the international proletariat, the oppressed nations, and the peoples of the world, through cultural revolutions, to continue the march of humanity toward its final goal, Communism.

I believe it is extremely necessary, especially today, to highlight the uninterrupted revolution; secondly, to emphasize the complete and total triumph of the democratic revolution throughout the country, without allowing anyone to take away even a small piece of it, as that would cause serious problems; passing to socialism for and alongside the international proletariat, oppressed nations, and peoples of the world, through cultural revolutions, continuing the march of humanity toward the final goal, communism — why do we say "continuing the march of humanity"? Because we either do it together or no one does it.

Both points 13 and 14 express the link between the Peruvian revolution and the world revolution, an interrelationship that is unavoidable not only in principle, but also

because the triumph of the democratic revolution — as conceived by the Chairman — is linked to the global situation, to global circumstances, and the development of the revolution requires that the revolution take place in other countries, in other nations, and together we must strive for communism and enter into it.

Those are the questions of the program. It then says: "But considering that the democratic revolution in the country passes through a period characterized by:

1. Deepening of the general crisis of Peruvian society, mainly of bureaucrat-capitalism;
2. Greater reactionization of the State, today with an Aprista government, fascist and corporativist, headed by the genocidal García Pérez;
3. Sharpening of the class struggle; the masses increasingly take up the necessity to combat and resist;
4. The People's War develops vigorously and grows; and
5. The people need a People's Republic built according to the principles of New Democracy."

Why bring this up? Chairman Mao tells us: "We must have a general program, but depending on the period of the revolution, we must establish a concrete program"[6] consequently, we must specify the period, and five points are proposed to characterize it. You will recall that we said there is a relationship between characteristics 1) and 3), and between 2) and 4), because they form contradictions, and all these contradictions lead to point 5): "the people's need for a People's Republic built according to the principles of New Democracy". It is essential to specify the period; without it, there is no concrete program. I believe I already dealt with this even in the preparatory report, comrades; we do not need to endorse it.

"We must implement a concrete program" (…) from the outset. What have we told you? It is a concrete program. Based on that period, then, "we must implement a concrete program for the period, with the following specific objectives." We have proposed that this concrete program be established and approved after the debate on the general program and the period in order to obtain contributions that specify the application of the problems according to the conditions of the regions or zones; that is why we are putting a concrete program here, with ellipsis.

We have proposed that the statutes be reviewed later because they will be strictly organizational in nature, although they will obviously also have to be based on statements of principle; that is why we have left them open-ended (…).

---

[6]RedLibrary: This is a paraphrase from Chairman Mao's work *On Coalition Government*, "Our Specific Programme", 1945.

Well, comrades, (…): "we must implement a concrete program" and then, under that heading: "Our Specific Programme" Is that clear, comrades? I think we all understand (…)

Well, that's all we can say about the program and statutes.