Gonzalo Thought

Communist Party of Canada (Red Fraction)

Contents:

1. **Introduction**
2. **The Development of Marxism**
3. **Components of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Gonzalo Thought:**
   a. **Philosophy:**
      i. **Synthesis of Marxism-Leninsim-Maoism, Principally Maoism**
      ii. **Analysis-Synthesis, Principally Synthesis Dialectic**
   b. Scientific Socialism:
      i. World People's War
      ii. Three Moments of the World Proletarian Revolution
      iii. Great Leadership
      iv. Guiding Thought
      v. General Political Line
      vi. Unified People's War
      vii. Six Contradictions of Party Construction
      viii. Forms of Struggle in the People's War
      ix. Militarisation of the Communist Party, Concentric Construction, and the Armed Sea
      x. Generated Organisms
      xi. Proletarian Feminism
      xii. Reconstitution of the Communist Party
      xiii. Analysis of low-intensity conflict
   c. Political Economy:
      i. Generalisation and Expansion of Bureaucrat Capitalism
      ii. Expanded Definition of Fascism
      iii. Indigenous Question
      iv. Neoliberalism
      v. Decay and Collapse of Revisionism
4. Synthesis
5. Appendix: The Development of Gonzalo Though
   a. Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought
   b. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism
   c. Marxism-Leninism, the Thought of Mariategui to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Gonzalo Thought
   d. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Gonzalo Thought
6. Notes

1. Introduction

The following document was first drafted by the red fraction of the Revolutionary Student Movement for distribution in the organisation's internal journal. It was originally developed as a short article that would enumerate a few basic components of Gonzalo Thought with a brief explanation of how they have further developed Maoism.At the first conference of the CWF(OC), the central committee was charged with finishing the document that had been drafted to be used for ideological education. It should by no means be confused with a synthesis or Gonzalo Thought or an attempt at one. We attempt

to draw out synthesis to the degree that is possible and not leave it just at the level of analysis. However, any true synthesis of Gonzalo Thought will only be produced in its application particular in making revolution.

The document has been formatted to include information regarding the development of Marxism both abstractly to outline how ideology develops to new stages as well as concretely mapping out the development of Gonzalo Thought. The document then breaks down several of the contributions of Gonzalo Thought, analysing them according to the three fundamental components of Marxism to best show the overall development of Marxism.

2. Development of Marxism

Marxism is the scientific ideology of the international proletariat. It develops through dialectical leaps made in the synthesis of its experience in both two-line struggle and class struggle, principally through the two-line struggle. This process has produced three stages: Marxism, Leninism, and most recently Maoism. However, it is not enough to see the three stages of Marxism, instead Marxists must be able to grasp the process of development and synthesis that led to the emergence of Leninism from Marxism and Maoism from Leninism. Similarly, it is important to understand the small and medium leaps that have occurred in between the great leaps that mark the synthesis of each stage. Without this understanding it is impossible to understand the role played by Gonzalo Thought within the overall stage of Maoism toward future higher stages. This much has been outlined by Chairman Gonzalo at the first congress of the PCP:

“What lies behind this regarding the titans of thought and action that is linked to ‘three bright beacons stand out: Marx, Lenin, Chairman Mao Tsetung’, comrades, a chain of mountains does not have only three summits, there are also small summits, medium summits, but there are also very high summits… ‘and how does our ideology will develop itself being a dialectical process? Through great leaps; this is why the document says through great leaps and three great ones, of course! Three great qualitative leaps: Marx, Lenin, Chairman Mao Tsetung. However, these three great qualitative leaps could not be understood without other big, medium and even small leaps and with these incessant leaps that, due to their such elementary magnitude, we do not consider.”[1]

It is important to remember here what was explained by Chairman Gonzalo on why we speak of a dialectical process of development and not a simple methodology:

“Because it is a process of knowledge, a reflection in the mind, a reflection of matter in the mind and matter in movement, dialectical, knowledge is so and not by simple method as some say, but by essence, that is another mania. Methodologism is another concession to bourgeois philosophy. Is it used sometimes? Yes, but never do Marxists oppose and even less do they reduce our conception to a simple methodology. It is a crass error to get entangled in the theory of bourgeois knowledge. None of them, neither Marx, nor Lenin, nor the Chairman did it; if they talk about methods they never refer to reducing all Marxism to a simple methodological question, it would lose its quality of conception: being conception has the method as a component, as a derivation; in the end method is procedure, nothing else. That is why it is important to have a dialectical process, because in reality itself and its laws correctly grasped through practice, because it is impossible to have knowledge without practice, it

could not be; precisely separating theory from practice is another concession to the bourgeoisie, it is a strictly bourgeois thought, in our case of narrow empiricism of the XVIII century. These are the things that are at the basis of our criteria as communists."[2]

That is, Marxism cannot be reduced to method alone as it is not a formula to resolve questions it is more fundamentally a worldview. This understanding of Marxism criticised by Chairman Gonzalo is seen most clearly in our context with the book Continuity and Rupture by Joshua Moufawad-Paul. At its root, the many errors of this book stem from understanding Marxism not as a scientific ideology and instead as a ideological science. That is the primacy of ideology – philosophy – is denied. This manifests in other ways such as presenting Marxism not as a doctrine but as a system, not as a dialectical process but as a method, not as the result of practice but as a thought experiment.

There are a number of contradictions at the heart of the development of Marxism, but the most basic of these is the abstract-concrete dialectic. It is composed of two aspects. The abstract aspect is generally the secondary aspect and can only become primary if dealing with issues of abstract ideology such as generalisations and universality. The abstract is applicable everywhere, but on its own it is not capable of transforming reality.

In order for the abstract to become operational, it must be concretised. This is where the other aspect of the dialectic comes in, the concrete. The concrete is generally the primary aspect of this contradiction, because it is the only way for the abstract to effect reality. The concrete is the abstract applied to a specific set of conditions, meaning it is not applicable everywhere but only to that set of conditions. Even in the rare circumstances when the abstract is primary, it can only function through concrete application.

The abstract acts as base for the emergence of the concrete and the concrete realises the base as its leading force. In this way they form a dialectic. With every concretisation of the abstract, it is further developed quantitatively leading to qualitative leaps, syntheses.

The above discussion of the abstract-concrete dialectic is quite dense, this is because it is an abstract discussion that must be made concrete. To illustrate the importance of this dialectic we will discuss its concrete application in the development of Marxism. A roughly analogous dialectic to the abstract-concrete dialect in Marxism can be seen in the stage-guiding thought dialectic. The distinction between these two aspects is discussed as follows by Chairman Gonzalo:

"The 'ism' [that is, the present stage of Marxism, note from the CC] has a clear meaning; 'thought' is nothing but a set of ideas, nothing else, while 'ism' is a doctrine that interprets all the matter in its different ways of expression, which are the three above mentioned: nature, society, knowledge and stop counting, there is nothing else."[3]

The stage of Marxism acts as the base. It is the abstract ideology of the proletariat applicable everywhere in the world. The guiding thought is the leading force in each country. It is the applicationof the abstract ideology of the proletariat to the concrete conditions of specific country. With every application of the abstract ideology as concrete ideology (guiding thought) the abstract ideology is further enriched. At a given point this quantitative enrichment will give way to a qualitative leap that must be synthesised as new stage of Marxism. This synthesis of a new stage of Marxism can only occur

with application. For example, Stalin synthesised Marxism-Leninism through its application to the concrete conditions of the socialist revolution in the Soviet Union. Similarly, Gonzalo synthesised MLM through its application to the concrete conditions of the new democratic revolution in Peru. In synthesis, the Guiding Thought of Stalin produced Marxism-Leninism and Gonzalo Thought produced Maoism. This further development and synthesis of Marxism in the abstract must be further concretised by revolutionaries around the world. Here we see another dialectic that is fundamental to the development of Marxism: synthesis-application.

Today, we say that the scientific ideology of the proletariat has taken the form of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Gonzalo Thought, principally Gonzalo Thought in the abstract and that in the concrete conditions of Canada it takes the form of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Gonzalo Thought, principally the Guiding Thought of the Canadian Revolution. How does this relate to the above-description? The stage of Marxism today is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism. This has been generated over long years of class struggle and principally through the two-line struggle inside the international communist movement as will be discussed below. In Peru the application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism gave rise to Gonzalo Thought. Gonzalo Thought has enriched Maoism with a number of universally applicable elements that stand head and shoulders above other contributions from where Maoism has been applied. These developments which we refer to as Marxism-Leninism- Maoism-Gonzalo Thought (as opposed to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, Gonzalo Thought which refers to the the guiding thought for Peru) represents the leading force in the international communist movement generated from the base that is MLM and a leap within Maoism though not to a new stage. For this reason we refer to MLM-GT as the abstract ideology of the proletariat today.

For MLM-GT to be operational it must be made concrete in Canada it means developing the Guiding Thought of the Canadian Revolution as the leading force from this base. For this reason, we refer to MLM-GT, the Guiding Thought of the Canadian Revolution as the ideological basis of communists in Canada.

The emergence of new stages of Marxism is tied to historical necessity (as well as the necessity-chance dialectic discussed below in the section on great leadership). This is related to the process of all things through negation-affirmation. This can be clearly seen in the 1950s where capitalism had been restored in the USSR. This restoration posed before the proletariat the question of how to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent restoration. It is a historical necessity for the class to discover the answer to these questions. Further, in order to develop the answer, Marxism must struggle against opportunism in both “left” and principally right forms in order to develop and synthesise the revolutionary approach to these questions. From this comes the principality of two-line struggle in the development of Marxism.

Finally, we wish to discuss the dialectic of practice and theory. The materialist theory of knowledge presented in major documents such as Materialism and Empirio-criticism[4] by Lenin and On Practice by Chairman Mao[5] state that practice is the base of all knowledge. With practice knowledge of the world is produced, synthesised in theory, and returned to practice only for the process to continue each time raising both practice and theory to ever higher levels. This process is clearly seen in the development of Marxism where the class and two-line struggle of the proletariat has been analysed andsynthesised as a part of the theory of the proletariat, Marxism. With every application it has enriched the theory

elevating through a series of small, medium, and great leaps into Marxism-Leninism- Maoism-Gonzalo Thought.

In synthesis we note the following dialectics as playing fundamental roles within the development of Marxism and our understanding of it:

1. abstract-concrete;
2. stage-guiding thought;
3. quantitative development-qualitative synthesis;
4. synthesis-application;
5. practice-theory.

A. Philosophy

I. Synthesis of Marxism-Leninsim-Maoism[1]

The principal contribution of Chairman Gonzalo is the synthesis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism from Chairman Mao's universally valid contributions to Marxism-Leninism. Even since before 1949, elements of Mao Zedong Thought had been increasingly applied by revolutionary movements around the world. Each of these movements existed within the general stage of Marxism-Leninism and incorporated the contributions of Chairman Mao to varying degrees. Some like the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA) for example would broadly adhere to the leadership of the Communist Party of China internationally once it had openly come out against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union though they would never officially adopt it. The PLA would also apply several contributions such as people's war, cultural revolution, and the developments made to the line of the socialist revolution within Albania. Some of the contributions taken up by the PLA failed to grasp the essence and fell into replication of its form as is the case with the Ideological and Cultural Revolution which largely failed to mobilise the masses against the development of the bourgeois headquarters in the party, army, and state.[2]

Another major example is that of Democratic Kampuchea where many of Chairman Mao's contributions were applied and unlike in Albania were done so with explicit recognition of Mao Zedong Thought. However, the Communist Party of Kampuchea failed to understand Chairman Mao's contributions as constituting a new stage of Marxism and with the eminent threat of invasion from Vietnam their focus was placed firmly on preparation to defend their new state. It would not be until the Communist Party of Peru (PCP) undertook the task of reconstituting the party, and launching the people's war that Maoism would be grasped as a new, third, and higher stage of Marxism. The red fraction of the PCP would first take up Marxism-Leninism, then Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought following the return of Chairman Gonzalo from his second trip to China. Under Chairman Gonzalo's leadership ML-MZT was used as a base to develop the Thought of Mariategui as the ideological line of the PCP.

The Guiding Thought of the Peruvian Revolution would develop through successive leaps and finally be systematised as Gonzalo Thought by the 1988 Congress. In doing so, the red fraction led the struggle to reconstitute the Communist Party of Peru and initiate and wage the people's war, proving the universal validity of MLM as the third and higher stage of Marxism. The dialectic of synthesis-

application is crucial to an understanding of the development of Maoism. It was the creative application of Maoism as what would develop into Gonzalo Thought that generated its synthesis and it was the synthesis of Maoism that required it to be applied as a guiding thought. The most important point to consider in comparing the PCP and other contemporary revolutions is that it was the PCP alone that grasped MZT not only as a quantitative development of Marxism, but as a qualitative leap.

Chairman Gonzalo reaffirms that Maoism is not pure science, nor is it an ideological science, but a scientific ideology. Both are errors that are repeated by many liquidators today linked principally to either Avakianism or Althusser and his students. They deny the primary aspect of Marxism which is that it is a philosophy – ideology. They do this in order to substitute dialectical materialism with some other philosophy, often Kantianism, and present it as the philosophy of Marxism. Of the three components of Marxism, it is dialectical materialism that is principal. Chairman Gonzalo basing himself on what is established by Engels states that:

"In this way, every non-proletarian ideology twists reality, deforms it and therefore cannot understand the essence of reality, cannot understand the truth as it is, cannot grasp the contradiction as it is. Therefore, non-proletarian ideologies are deformations, they are not scientific and the root is one, very concrete: they are based on exploitation."[3]

The proletariat are the only class that have no property of their own. Their class-interests are tied to the abolition of property while the bourgeoisie's class interests are tied to the preservation of property. While other classes have produced dialectical and materialist philosophies historically they have always fallen short of dialectical materialism into mechanical materialism or dialectical idealism. The reason for this is that the interests are in the way of them developing a truly dialectical materialism.

Such a philosophy clashes with the ideology that they themselves produce as a reflection of their economic and political power. These ideologies present the mode of production of these ruling classes as historical, natural, and eternal. Dialectical materialism on the other hand shows that all modes of production based on private property are temporary and society moves in the direction of the abolition of property. For the ruling class to produce dialectical materialism would be to come to terms with their own transience. That they are historically revolutionary, but presently reactionary. This is why it is only the class and two-line struggles of the proletariat that have produced dialectical materialism and not some other class.

Finally, the reason that it is specified that Maoism is principal is due to the fact that it is the the highest stage of Marxism reached so far. This does not negate the two previous stages but recognises that they have been developed and synthesised into a further stage. The law of contradiction requires the designation of a primary aspect or principal contradiction, to not recognise Maoism as the principal component of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is in essence 1) to deny Maoism as a qualitative leap in Marxism; and 2) to deny the heart of Marxism, dialectical materialism. As Chairman Mao states:

"As we have said, one must not treat all the contradictions in a process as being equal but must distinguish between the principal and the secondary contradictions, and pay special attention to grasping the principal one. But, in any given contradiction, whether principal or secondary, should the two contradictory aspects be treated as equal? Again, no. In any contradiction the development of the contradictory aspects is uneven. Sometimes they seem to be in equilibrium, which is however only

temporary and relative, while unevenness is basic. Of the two contradictory aspects, one must be principal and the other secondary. The principal aspect is the one playing the leading role in the contradiction. The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principal aspect of a contradiction, the aspect which has gained the dominant position."[4] This law applies to Marxism as much as anything else.

II. Analysis-Synthesis, Principally Synthesis Dialectic[1]

The understanding of the relationship between analysis and synthesis was not first introduced to Marxism with Gonzalo Thought. An understanding of the contradiction can be seen in the writings of Marx[2] as well as Lenin[3], what has been contributed by Chairman Gonzalo is a deeper understanding of this contradiction as well as its relation to dialectics and metaphysics.

In addition to the writings of Marx and Lenin on the analysis-synthesis dialectic, Chairman Gonzalo further bases himself on Chairman Mao's presentation of the materialist theory of knowledge with the recognition that rational knowledge is secondary to practical application which is the root and target of all knowledge.[4] In relation to the theory-practice dialectic, the analysis-synthesis dialectic can be understood.

Analysis is the secondary aspect of this dialectic and involves the breaking apart of the object of study in order to analyse it in all of its parts. Synthesis is the primary aspect of this contradiction which involves grasping the essence of the object of study. While analysis can produce a quantitative development in knowledge, it is only with synthesis that a qualitative leap in knowledge can be produced. In this way, analysis on its own requires only metaphysics, it sees things in isolation only measuring things in terms of quantity not quality. It is only with the introduction of synthesis that dialectics are introduced, seeing things not only in isolated quantitative terms but also in a qualitative interconnected way. That is, the process of knowledge begins with practice then moves to the stage of theory in which the practice is analysed quantitatively developing the theory then the theory is returned to practice. These quantitative developments achieved with every application must eventually give way to a qualitative leap – a synthesis – allowing practice to rise to higher levels and in turn also elevating theory.

Chairman Gonzalo gives the example of this process in the development of Marxism from the development of science and philosophy in Western Europe from the 15th to 18th centuries when the peak of developments in bourgeois society: 1) German philosophy; 2) English Economics; and 3) French socialism gave way to synthesis as Marxism.

Note

2. The Development of Marxism

1. https://ci-ic.org/blog/2022/01/04/communist-party-of-brazil-uphold-the-red-flag-of-the-communist-international-and-of-its-7th-congress/
2. https://ci-ic.org/blog/2020/12/03/some-basic-knowledge-of-marxism/
3. https://ci-ic.org/blog/2020/12/03/some-basic-knowledge-of-marxism/

4. https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/mec/
5. https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_16.htm

3. Components of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Gonzalo Thought

A. Philosophy

I. Synthesis of Marxism-Leninsim-Maoism, Principally Maoism

1. We recommend readers to read On Marxism-Leninism-Maoism from the PCP https://pggtpublishers.wordpress.com/on-marxism-leninism-maoism/, Some Basic Knowledge of Marxism by Chairman Gonzalo https://ci-ic.org/blog/2020/12/03/some-basic-knowledge-of-marxism/, and Some Fundamental Questions on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism from the Communist International Online Newspaper https://ci-ic.org/blog/2020/11/17/some-fundamental-questions-on-marxism-leninism-maoism/. These three documents should help the reader grasp the importance of this synthesis.
2. The understanding and criticism of the Cultural Revolution by the PLA can be found in this polemic against Dengist China. https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-5/paa.htm
3. https://ci-ic.org/blog/2020/12/03/some-basic-knowledge-of-marxism/
4. https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm

II. Analysis-Synthesis, Principally Synthesis Dialectic

1. The most detailed analysis of this is presented in the document On the Rectification Campaign Based on the Study of the Document “Elections, No! People’s War, Yes”https://the-red-flag.org/uncategorized/central-committee-of-the-communist-party-of-peru-on-the-rectification-campaign-with-elections-no-peoples-war-yes/
2. An example of Marx’s writing on this topic is found in the afterword to the second German Edition of Capital Volume 1 in which he states “Of course the method of presentation must differ in form from that of inquiry. The latter has to appropriate the material in detail, to analyse its different forms of development, to trace out their inner connexion. Only after this work is done, can the actual movement be adequately described. If this is done successfully, if the life of the subject-matter is ideally reflected as in a mirror, then it may appear as if we had before us a mere a priori construction.” https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/p3.htm
3. An example of Lenin addressing this dialectic is found in One Step Forward, Two Steps Back part N, in which he states that “Having finished our analysis of the Congress debates and voting, we must now sum up, so that we may, on the basis of the entire Congress material, answer the question: what elements, groups, and shades went to make up the final majority and minority which we saw in the elections and which were destined for a time to become the main division in our Party? A summary must be made of all the material relating to shades of principle, theoretical and tactical, which the minutes of the Congress provide in such abundance. Without a general “resumé” without a general picture of the Congress as a whole, and of all the principal groupings during the voting, this material is too disjointed, too disconnected, so that at first sight the individual groupings seem accidental, especially to one who does not take the trouble to make an independent and comprehensive study of the Congress Minutes (and how many readers have taken that trouble?).” https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1904/onestep/n.htm
4. https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_16.htm