World Revolution — Strategy and Tactics

Chairman Gonzalo

First Congress of the Communist Party of Peru

1988-1989[1]

"Chairman Mao emphasizes the importance of the world revolution as a unity…"[2]

"Weight of the masses, oppressed nations, decomposition of imperialism, where does all this lead? Three worlds are differentiated. Yes, Chairman Mao Tsetung's thesis; it has nothing to do with the rotten, revisionist theory of Teng's three worlds…"

Why? Marx has already told us this problem, that the world revolution must be conceived as unity; more, he insisted that communism is entered together, implying that we must all carry out revolution — by this I do not mean to imply that he said in unison. I think there are many things about this that we can imagine, but they are situations, those related to communism, that we are not able to specify. Why? We must always keep in mind what Engels said, he tells us, when he spoke in *Anti-Dühring*, "we can think many things about how communism is going to be and say such a thing is going to be 'a', such a thing is going to be 'b', such a thing is going to be 'c', but rest assured that when communism arrives it will shape its realities and it will not give a damn about everything we have thought", this is how he told us. On this we must seriously reflect on what Engels says. Why? Because it's a world without classes and we move in a world of classes, do you understand what that implies? Our mind is organized according to classes and thinks within the framework of class society, it does not fit, we do not understand, we cannot point to, we cannot concretely specify what a world without classes will be like. Our great flags have told us signs, elements, situations, they are just and correct, but concrete things, very difficult.

Lenin had to act at a juncture in which the revolution could only be made in one country and in only one, the USSR. It is a greatness in him, to have established that thesis, to have laid the foundations for the moment to be fulfilled, and it is the merit of Comrade Stalin for having materialized it. There's no need to be narrow minded comrades, we must recognize. Once again, much is said about Comrade Stalin but little is understood what he has accomplished, can't you see?

---

[1] https://vnd-peru.blogspot.com/2020/09/presidente-gonzalo-sobre-la-tesis-del.html

[2] RedLibrary: *On Marxism-Leninism-Maoism*, Communist Party of Peru, 1988.

Was Lenin not willing to go and command the revolution in Germany, knowing that there was no head capable of leading it? Of course he knew perfectly well. But he came to understand that the revolution could only take place in the USSR and that it was only possible to do that. But he never abandoned world revolution, rather he conceived the Bolshevik, Soviet revolution as part of the world revolution and that it should serve world revolution, and he saw it as a nexus, therefore, to raise up the oppressed nations and unite the two great movements, this is how he thought.

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

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

So the Chairman had already foresaw all those things, therefore I believe he thought about the revolution as a unity. Hence, he comes to propose China as the base to serve world revolution, hence his grand effort to train cadres to wage people's war, mainly in backward countries. And he reiterates that "Either we all reach Communism or nobody does". It's a quote from the Chairman, he reaffirms it himself. But within the reaffirmation, within him it is already a reality that is palpitating, it is a concrete perspective that is given, that is opened, that is what the Chairman has.

Revolution Is the Main Trend as the Decomposition of Imperialism Is Greater Every Day

For this, where does Chairman Mao start?: "revolution is the main trend while the decomposition of imperialism is greater each day, and the role played by the masses grows more immense each year, masses that make and shall make their transforming and unstoppable strength be felt, and reiterates the great truth: Either we all reach Communism or nobody does". That is why he focuses again on seeing the world revolution as a unity, but I insist, already feasible, as a concrete perspective.

In Marx it is as a principle and in Lenin as a necessity to promote it: for the Chairman, the problem is that this situation has already opened up and within that we are going to develop it.

The revolution, the main trend in history, yes. It is the main trend in the world, historically and politically. This is what we must emphasize, that it's not simply that

it is the historical perspective but that it is political, it is already the order of the day, that is, and that is why we have to struggle. This is combined with the period of 50 to 100 years, if not then why did the Chairman ask us? A masterful calculation: 50 to 100 years, because in that period imperialism and reaction must be wiped from the face of the earth and that is then the world revolution.

"Atomic War", What to Oppose Atomic War With? Oppose It with People's War

It is "the opening period of struggle against Yankee imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, paper tigers that contend for world hegemony", of course, another key question from the Chairman.

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

"Atomic war" What to oppose atomic war with?: "we must prepare ourselves beforehand in order to oppose it with people's war." Everything that the Chairman has proposed is established.

The Oppressed Nations

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

The Economic and Political Relations That Are Unfolding as a Result of the Process of Imperialism's Decomposition

"Both in the economic and political relationships that are evolving on account of the process of decomposition of imperialism…" Very important. One of the problems we have had is how to define this moment, this period in which we are developing. Where have we found the question? In the Chairman himself — decomposition of imperialism is greater every day — within his own positions, he raises this. Who can deny the greater decomposition of imperialism every day, is it not sinking more and more? It is decomposing, it is rotting. If some can claim that they produce more, what the hell does it matter, is that the problem? On the contrary, if they produce more, what they are showing is that there are all the means to satisfy basic needs.

Already in the Second War,[3] what was said at the end of it? It would be enough to work four hours and all the fundamental needs of humanity could be satisfied. Well, the jump that has been made from 50 to 75 has doubled production from 900 to 50, and production from 900 to 50 is equal to all of humanity since its inception, can you imagine? That is showing us that the times of the expropriation of the exploiters is approaching and they are going to be destroyed, that is why they are decomposing.

Some say Lenin was wrong because we see that they have more rockets, more weapons, but is that not an expression of weakness throughout the world? Throughout history it has always been an expression of weakness. What Marxism says is that imperialism slows down all the capacity of the existing means of production, it does not say that they do not produce. That's what Hoxha never understood in his miserable life. They have confused and some repeat, they don't understand the problem, I think that's it. It is the decomposition of imperialism and its increasing artillery, a sign of weakness and not of strength. Review any history or look at history thoroughly and it will be understood, any military history proves it.

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

Why does (revisionist China) want to arm itself to the teeth, why does it want to be a military power? It can already be seen, the same road! Not being able to develop and strengthen the economic force because they are restoring capitalism more and more, now they want to use the immense masses, of billions of men, as cannon fodder, they want to use it by enhancing military power to become a power and fight for world domination, also scheming like others like Germany, like Japan, that from the clash of

[3] RedLibrary: Second World War.

the two superpowers must emerge another power or another dominant superpower. Wasn't that Japan's nefarious bastard dream of the 1930s, isn't it Germany's black dream, isn't it Teng's black dream?

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

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

Chairman Mao Lays Foundations for Developing the Strategy and Tactics of the World Revolution

It seems to us that the Chairman is thus laying the foundations for developing the strategy and tactics of World Revolution and this is obviously necessary. But there we have a problem, do we know everything that the Chairman has said, all his writings, could the Chairman's debates on how to conceive and make revolution be aired and published, could he proclaim it, do you think he could? How is he going to propose? What he could propose are the political criteria of orientation, other debates had to be reserved for a while, it seems to me that this is elementary to understand.

For the rest, are there witnesses? I believe that there are and they exist because there is a meeting of the Chairman with Japanese where he tells them: "In my view, the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong to the second world. We are the third world."[4] These men exist, they have not died, they are witnesses to what the Chairman has said. Why come

[4]RedLibrary: "Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation Of the Three Worlds Is a Major Contribution To Marxism-Leninism", *Peking Review* No. 45, 1977.

then to say that it is not a thesis of the Chairman and that it is an erroneous thesis, have they been able to demonstrate such?

The RCP[5] dared years ago to throw itself against the three worlds, and what did it have to do? First, throw themselves against Chairman Mao based on the supposed Avakianite criteria — of Avakian. He had to throw himself against what? Against the thesis of the Chairman that in the year 1946 between the USSR and the United States there is an intermediate band, an intermediate strip in which there were capitalist countries, even imperialist countries could occur, and oppressed nations, he had to go against that. Could it be denied that there was in 1946, at the end of the war with the hegemony of the United States, that there was an intermediate strip?

That is stupid, it is not seeing reality, that is not knowing history, you cannot judge 1946 by 1988. And you cannot see that this happened? Of course, it happened that way, there was a strip. If he talks so much that the war is approaching, the world war, precisely why is it? Because that strip is covered, it is already taken over, and there is the risk they have to face.

But comrades, for years you have been telling (using) the RIM,[6] we must stop the war, well where the hell is the war? The world war, where is it? Why don't they propose instead to develop the democratic revolution, socialist revolution, to define Maoism, because they don't propose that, why do they not propose opposing it with the people's war and waging world people's war against the world war that they cackle about so much, or is it that they hope that the world war will lead to the revolution? No comrades, the only thing the world war will be able to do is stir the revolution, but the triumph does not come from the third world war, it comes from the People's War in which we free ourselves, which liberates the communists and peoples of the earth, from there it will come, in great periods of decades and waves. Those who do not understand this have not read history, nor have had the pleasure of passing high school.

We consider that all this has been said by Chairman Mao Tsetung, of course he had to see it, even for the third world. Mr. Snow in an interview from 1970 asked the Chairman: "What do you think of the third world, Chairman?" And he responded that way he had, smiling, "it concerns your chairman so much", he did not say more, there it was, of course there it was, it did not go any further. But at the United Nations, Ch'iao Kuan-hua reported that the Chairman proposed "three worlds are differentiated", those are the words verbatim, in quotation marks, those are the Chairman's words.

---

[5]RedLibrary: Revolutionary Communist Party.

[6]RedLibrary: Revolutionary Internationalist Movement.

[7]RedLibrary: Likely "In the Middle East, two kinds of contradictions and three kinds of forces are in conflict. The two kinds of contradictions are: first, those between different imperialist powers, that is, between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France and, second, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations. The three kinds of forces are: one, the United States, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second-rate

And there are quotes, the quote from 1957 on Suez[7] also demonstrates that the Chairman was raising and that there was this situation that the United States was different from France and England, that there were three interests and two contradictions, that was evident: Egypt, oppressed. The United States wanted to control the Suez Canal. England and France wanted to defend their interests there. That is evident: could the power of the United States be compared with that of France and England? Obviously, England is at the tail end of the United States, France is the one that later, today, is developing as a power with its own atomic weapon, but 1957 was not like that, and was the problem of De Gaulle.

Well, the Chairman then has given us a whole vision of world revolution, he has raised key questions, milestones and he has raised strategy and tactics of the world revolution that unfortunately is not known. It can be said, then how it is affirmed, comrades, it is enough to grasp such and such elements for one to see that he speaks of revolution as a unity, why does he speak of communism, why does he speak of 50 to 100 years, why is a new period proposed? Why does it arise that war must be fought with people's war, why do we talk about it, why does the weight of the third world, the oppressed nations, be proposed, why does it propose "three worlds are differentiated"?[8] I think one cannot be so foolish to simply say: glass, ashtray, glasses and it's over, one must say objects, admitting; so you have to generalize, think what are they then, where does that lead, instruments for the use of a human being, you have to draw the conclusion; and why don't they want to draw them? Because it collides and they want to propose a strategy totally out of square from Marxism-Leninism, principally Maoism, that is.

Prepared for the internet based on Chairman Gonzalo's intervention at the First Congress of the PCP[9] by the Peru People's Movement to serve the reorganization of the PCP in Peru and abroad.

September 2020

imperialist powers, and three, the oppressed nations.", *Talks at a Conference of Secretaries of Provincial, Municipal and Autonomous Region Party Committees*, January 1957, *Selected Works* Volume V.

[8]Peru People's Movement: Here is the Maoist synthesis on World Revolution.

[9]RedLibrary: Communist Party of Peru.