INTRO NOTE:

I'm bringing here, in 5 parts, a posting which I sent to the then existing Marxism mailing list managed by the Spoon Collective, Jefferson Village Virginia, USA, on 14.07.96, under the heading: "Do c. Adolfo & PCP need lessons from individuals?". This debate in my opinion might be of general interest, not least in connection with the question of the WMC - World Mobilisation Commission to defend the revolution in Peru - whose creation we both supported, comrade Adolfo Oleachea being one of the initiators of the call for it and I being one of its individual endorsers, but which was later formed in a manner which I found to be quite impermissible and protested against.

Only some of the endorsers of the call for the WMC were consulted in its creation (in August 1996); by no means all those organizations and individuals who had stated their agreement with that call were allowed to have their say in this. It wasn't even made public who were members of that "WMC". And some clearly incorrect information was disseminated concerning the whole manner and basis of the formation of this organization. Against this I had to protest, and did so, with a declaration on 17.09.96.

Behind this unacceptable method of creating the WMC there obviously lay a reluctance, on the part of the comrades concerned, to realize that their political line on important questions was erroneous. By their acting on their own, they avoided that the necessary criticism against those errors might be included in the discussion on the formation of the WMC. In essence, their errors consist in their not having made a break with the ideology of the phoney "Marxist" so-called "RIM", although they since a long time back quite rightly have been repudiating the stabbing in the back of the Peruvian revolution on the part of the "RIM" leaders.

This theme is what was debated last June-July between me and comrade Adolfo, as will be seen below. In my 5-part posting, I quoted from some of his. Adolfo Oleachea made no reply to this posting, which I regret. I hold that this discussion, among us who support the people's war in Peru and at least are stating as our intention to follow the line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong, should continue.

Do c. Adolfo & PCP need lessons from individuals?

Hello Comrade Adolfo,

I'd like to take up again the brief debate, or the debate on whether we should have a debate, which we had in mid-late June. Once again, I'm making a rather long posting on the subjects concerned. This is because I think they're quite important. In order to make this posting more surveyable, I'll divide it into numbered chapters.

I'm viewing this debate in the context of the call for the WMC, which I, now as before, consider to be a very important initiative by you and some
other comrades. This World Mobilisation Commission, as intended, is to do essentially two things: Support the revolution in Peru and defend the ideology of and the proletarian revolutionary line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong.

I support the call for the WMC because of both these things.

I hold the second of them to be, at least potentially, even more important than the first. This is because, at present, the international proletariat as good as completely lacks correct leadership and because it's absolutely necessary that it should have such leadership. There is a possibility that the WMC may provide something in that direction. In the present situation, the representatives of the political line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong, who are quite few in the world, should struggle for this possibility's being realized.

Such leadership of course is essential also for the best possible support of the revolution in Peru, as well as for the support of the revolution, at whatever stage that revolution today may be, in all other countries.

To provide such leadership is what, implicitly, is stated as the intention in the call for the WMC, in Point 4 on its intended tasks:

"To defend Maoism as the new, third, and superior stage of Marxism, within the context of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism taken as a unity in development."

By "Maoism" here is meant, I presume, the same thing as the Chinese communists and other Marxist-Leninists have referred to as "Mao Zedong Thought". I hold the latter designation to be better, for reasons I'll explain some other time. But I also think the matter of the name here is not all that important.

The political line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong, that's what must be advocated. That's what the proletariat needs in the international class struggle today.

And I intend on my part, as an individual who has endorsed the call for the WMC precisely as an individual (whose political background at least to some extent is known to you and to the other people on this list) and not as a representative of any party or other organization, to contribute, as well as I can, towards the WMC's really representing that line too, as promised in that call.

I also intend to continue combating the opponents of the call for the WMC, whether they most likely are cops, hard-core reactionaries or "merely" opportunists, and to continue arguing the case for this call towards those who should really support it but haven't realized this yet.

It's above all against this background that I view our debate, respectively, our debate on whether we should have one.

Now on 27.06, you wrote some things which I'd like to comment on, and to put into the context I've mentioned. (In the meantime, as you've probably seen, I've reproduced some documents from Germany, respectively from China, which IMO among other things further support what I've been saying in our earlier debate.)
1. A QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE: SHOULD ONE HOLD LINE OR ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE TO BE KEY?

You wrote on 27.06, among other things (in reply to me):

> We are not blind to these problems, but we are not going to be railroaded either by those who are Maoist in words and not in deeds of any kind.

(I'll make a comment later on those people too.) And then you continued:

> Nor are we going to take lessons from individuals.

This, on principle, is a quite anti-Marxist, indeed, an opportunist, thing to say. It's one which in itself clearly shows that in fact you *need* some lessons, from whichever direction such today can be procured, including of course also lessons from individuals in the case that they can be of any help. That is, if you intend to strive to represent the interests of the proletariat, which I hope you do.

This and some other statements in your posting, in which you once more very mistakenly defended that ultra-reactionary 4-Gang in China which was a main theme of our discussion, in my judgement also are a reflection of that quite pronounced petty-bourgeois streak which unfortunately there exists in the whole ideology of the party which you're representing, the PCP in Peru. From the standpoint of the proletariat, those petty-bourgeois ideological elements of course must be criticized.

Now the PCP comrades in Peru itself naturally are not directly responsible for everything that you're saying, and vice versa. Because of the massive interference by the imperialists and their large-scale attempts at cutting off the communications of the different revolutionary forces with each other, obviously it must be quite difficult, also for you and the other genuine representatives of the PCP here in Europe, to communicate with that party in Peru.

In that situation, you and the other comrades, notably Luis Arce Borja, whose El Diario Internacional I'm disseminating here in Sweden and with whom I've had some brief discussions too, obviously are doing your best, (largely) independently, to try to represent the interests of the PCP. And such a line of action on your part IMO is quite correct too.

Nevertheless, I think that everyone, except the "Quispe"-Chris-B gang and such people, agrees in holding that your actions and statements, whichever opinion one may have of them, to a certain degree do reflect the standpoint of the PCP.

And in that statement of yours which I quoted above, you seem to have intended to speak on behalf of the PCP, too, since you wrote that "we" are "not going to take lessons from individuals". By some English, German, Swedish etc writers, particularly in earlier decades, the word "we" has sometimes been used as meaning "I", and it seems that it's still quite often used in this manner today by writers with Spanish mother-tongue, such as yourself, for instance. But here, you cannot have meant to say that you personally weren't going to take any lessons from individuals. And you could hardly have been referring (only) to the Sol Peru Committee in London either.

You must have meant to say: "We, the PCP, are not going to take lessons from individuals".

But the ideology which is inherent in this statement is unacceptable. *The international proletariat absolutely must defend itself against such an
ideology.* We must prevent this kind of thinking from being represented by the WMG.

I hope that others will agree with me on this. If certain individuals, or even certain parties, persist in advocating it, then the proletariat must also, to the extent necessary, defend itself against such individuals and/or against such parties.

In my earlier long reply to you, on 17.06, I among other things tried to make you realize the very erroneous character of your argument (on 10.06) that if I continued to insist on the truth, and not a falsehood, being told on one point (namely, that of the character of the 4-Gang in China and on the entire history in connection with the overthrow of socialism in that country), then I would "bring myself into isolation".

That "argument" of yours on 10.06 contained the same basic idea as the one I'm discussing here, that of "not intending to take lessons from individuals".

And in my reply I did try, as one individual to another, to give you a lesson on why this "argument" was quite erroneous. This took up a large portion of part 4/4 of that posting. I among other things made several quotes from the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of China, in 1973.

Since then, I've also posted an important part of the documents from that congress, as #13en of my "UNITE! Info" series, and also, as a reply to something else you wrote in our debate, a document from another formerly very important Marxist-Leninist party, the 1979 article "Why Our Party Had to Reject the Interference by the International Liaison Department and Other Chinese Organs" by the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany, as #12en.

In both of these documents, there are extensive explanations of the fact that to the proletariat, for the international proletarian revolution, *the ideological and political line* is the key, *not* organizational size or some other factor. You could consider those explanations, comrade Adolfo, as lessons to you (and to others who might likewise be thinking that they shouldn't "take lessons from individuals") from Marxist-Leninist parties which at least existed in the rather recent past, although they were both later subverted by the bourgeoisie and today are no longer with us as such.

2. LESSONS FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF MARXIST-LENINIST PARTIES CONCERNING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION OF LINE

Perhaps it's not superfluous once more to repeat some things on this IMO crucial point which by no means have been thought out by me, for instance, but which were the results of the experience of the abovementioned parties:

"The correctness or the incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything." (Mao Zedong)

"To go against the tide is a Marxist-Leninist principle.* During the discussions on the revision of the Party Constitution, many comrades, reviewing the [Chinese Communist] Party's history and their own experiences, held that this was the most important in the two-line struggle within the Party."

"There were many instances in the past when one tendency covered another and when a tide came, the majority went along with it, while only a few withstood it."
"And when a wrong tendency surges towards us like a rising tide, we must not fear isolation and must dare to go against the tide and brave it through."

"If one's line is incorrect, one's downfall is inevitable, even with the control of the central, local and army leadership. If one's line is correct, even if one has not a single soldier at first, there will be soldiers, and even if there is no political power, political power will be gained. This is borne out by the historical experience of our Party and by that of the international communist movement since the time of Marx."

"When confronted with issues that concern the line and the overall situation, a true Communist must act without any selfish considerations and dare to go against the tide, fearing neither removal from his post, expulsion from the Party, imprisonment, divorce nor guillotine."

These things were said by the CPC, and the following two by the likewise formerly revolutionary KPD/ML (NEUE EINHEIT):

"Even if the small Marxist party would be one of, say, ten people, and the party such as the 'KPD' a party of, let us suppose, three hundred thousand people, even in such a case the party of ten people would be the party of the Marxists, while the other one would be the opportunist party."

"It can in history not be overlooked, for instance, that Marx and Engels, as a comparatively small circle of persons, were basically right in their criticism of the Gotha programme, while all those who, a hundred years ago, defended the Gotha programme were taking up an erroneous position..."

3. WHERE DO YOU RISK LANDING IF YOU ACT ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLE: "WE ARE NOT GOING TO TAKE LESSONS FROM INDIVIDUALS"?

The underlying idea behind such a "principle" is of course, that you'll consider something as important only if it's stated by or supported by some organised forces or other, which thus at least on the surface may appear to carry more weight with them, and if something at a given point in time is stated by only one individual or perhaps a few individuals, then you don't think this is anything that should be taken much into account.

I suspect that it was such thinking that landed the PCP together with Avakian and his "RCP" of the USA and the other organizations which supported this "RCP", in its signing of the phoney "Marxist", in reality reactionary, "Declaration of the RIM" in 1984, a declaration which, most unfortunately, the PCP still today is supporting.

I don't know whether the PCP really reasoned like this. At any rate, whether it did or not, such thinking, such a "principle" as "we're not going to listen to such things as are said by merely a few individuals; we'll support them if they have some larger organized forces behind them but only then", that's a typically petty-bourgeois line of thinking.

The petty-bourgeoisie wavers between supporting the proletariat and supporting the bourgeoisie. As a class, it seeks support for its interests and asks itself: Which one is the stronger of the two? In fact the proletariat is the stronger. But petty-bourgeois forces, or such forces which haven't left petty-bourgeois thinking behind them entirely, don't always see this.
In the early '80s, the PCP - which I hold to be a revolutionary party and whose armed struggle against the reactionary regime in Peru absolutely is favouring the international proletariat - was seeking international support for its struggle. The Avakianists offered such support. They had several - rotten - organizations behind themselves. The only thing the PCP had to do in return for their support, they said, was to sign their rotten declaration and thus in this respect help them oppose the international proletariat.

The "RIM Declaration", that's a kind of "Gotha programme", only even much worse.

I know that you and other comrades in London from the start expressed grave doubts about the Avakianists. That IMO is to your credit. But the error was committed anyway. The PCP signed. And your 27.06 posting seems to confirm that you still haven't seen that it *was* and *is* a serious error, although you also did write (as I quoted above): "We are not blind to these problems".

To have gone together with the Avakianists into a united front, for instance for support of the people's war in Peru, while not coalescing with them, while not selling out on principle, that would have been quite another matter and would, as far as I can judge today, have been correct.

And you, comrade Adolfo, in some documents on the struggle within the "RIM" which you have earlier posted to this list have quoted Lenin as saying that of course it's OK to enter into alliances with non-proletarian forces, as long as you don't sell out on principle. Only, in this case, that was precisely what the PCP did.

For the "RIM" of course has never presented itself as a "united front" of some kind but has always pretended to be an entity for ideological and political leadership of the international proletariat, as its 1984 "Declaration" states.

Those two different things, an international united front, on the one hand, and an organization for international leadership of the proletariat, on the other, of course one mustn't mix up with each other. In your 27.06 posting you at one point seem to me to be doing precisely this as well. I'll return to this question below.

Nine years after 1984, in late 1993, the PCP (and others) did receive an important lesson, not from any individual but from a "movement", as the "RIM" calls itself. That was the lesson of the support by the "RIM" for the CIA/SIN "peace letters" hoax. It wasn't "just" the "CoRIM" that supported that hoax. It was the "entire RIM".

In my 12.08.1994 article, later posted as "UNITE! Info #3en", which was a kind of "Critique of the Gotha Programme", you could say, directed against the "RIM Declaration", I also pointed to and attacked that statement (No. 2) of 26.12. 1993 signed by "the RIM" which was "In Support of the People's War in Peru" etc, etc, but which pointedly omitted all mention of that hoax and of the Oct '93 PCP CC declaration against it, and thus quite openly stabbed that CC and that entire people's war in the back.

That lesson IMO absolutely should be taken into account now when we're preparing for the WMC. This was the "thanks" that, eventually, the PCP itself got for signing the "RIM Declaration". And so far, there still haven't been any sign (visible here) of a reaction by the PCP itself to those "thanks". I find this a little disquieting. But
it may simply be due to the reactionaries' very fanatical cutting-off of the communications.

At any rate, it's absolutely wrong to think and say that you should not take any lessons from individuals, just because they're only individuals and don't have any organization behind them. The question of whether one should take lessons from other forces or not of course should depend on whether the ideas of those forces are seen to be correct or not, *not* on how organizationally big they are.

The PCP "took lessons from" Avakian's "big" forces, and what were the results? Firstly, considerable damage to the international proletariat by the dissemination, during a long time and eventually in more than 20 languages, of the reactionary platform and the entire reactionary ideology of the "RIM", which thus were given the "all clear" by the PCP, a party which deservedly had and has a certain prestige. Secondly, the lesson to the PCP itself from late 1993 on, the stab in the back, which one might say that the PCP "deserved", too, but which the Peruvian people and other peoples have had to pay for.

I do hope that you, comrade Adolfo, will realize the completely erroneous character of that "argument" about "not taking lessons from individuals", respectively, on "becoming isolated" (if one insists on the truth) which you repeatedly (on 10.06 and again on 27.06) have brought against me in our debate, and start representing instead the opposite standpoint on this, which is the only standpoint the proletariat can use.

4. DID THE BIG BLOW AGAINST THE 4-GANG IN CHINA IN OCT '76 MEAN THAT "A BALANCE WAS BROKEN"?

On the question of the 4-Gang in China, which is a question closely connected to that of the whole ideology of the present-day Avakianists and to the subversion against the international communist movement since several decades back and still today, you wrote in your 27.06 posting:

>So you admit already that with the overthrow of the "gang of four" a balance was broken and the Right benefitted from the word go! There is of course another explanation too Rolf, which you may have overlooked. That the group of "perfect Maoists" was not taken seriously at all!. That the way to settle issues within the International Communist Movement was not by printing instant letters of support from leaderships of Communist parties which were proven idiots just a few weeks later, and, like in the case of PCP, were therein criticised and thrown out.

This is erroneous on several not unimportant counts. It's erroneous concerning recent history and it's erroneous on a matter of principle which is as least as important. In the above which you wrote there's even a rather silly suggestion on one matter, namely, the "German connection", about which I obviously know something and you just as obviously knew nothing, but this didn't stop you from coming up with a "possible explanation" which I "might have overlooked" - a bit superfluous, don't you think? But more on that below. The really serious thing about the above IMO is that you still seem to be unable to distinguish phoney "left" from genuine left.

In my 17.06 reply to you I at some length pointed out how in your 10.06 you had confused those two. And here you're talking about a "balance" which, according to you, was "broken". It's not only that you've got your facts wrong; your whole reasoning on this point is muddled. I'll once more try to explain this whole matter to you.
First of all: Is the matter of the 4-Gang of the 1970s really still of importance today? It is, and there are several reasons for this. I'll give you one quite practical such reason.

Suppose I were a boss within the CIA (and not merely a small-time operator and "provocateur" of that agency, as "Quispe" wrote I was, when he really started getting stuck in that quicksand) charged with the mission of preventing the genuine communists in the world today from ever gaining any influence in China, a country which has over a fifth of the entire population of the world and the country where the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, for instance, took place not too long ago. What would I try to influence those communists to do, by means of my infiltrated agents etc, in order to get them to discredit themselves completely to the Chinese people?

The best thing obviously would be having them applaud the revisionist and fascist Deng Xiaoping regime in China. But this nobody in our pro-WMC camp, for instance, does - well, except for the PTB, the Partie du Travaille Belgium, whose chairman happens to be a namesake of mine, Ludo Martens, and whose entire leadership in fact are relatively close to the Soviet revisionists, too, which doesn't speak too well for them. But the PTB is a rather large party and it's a good thing that, obviously, comrade Luis A.B. and others, probably with some help from you London comrades too, have managed to influence its "ordinary" members and light some fire under the asses of those PTB leaders so that they've even agreed to support the WMC. Preventing the WMC from squarely condemning the Deng Xiaoping regime they quite certainly will not be able to do.

But a very effective "second-best" thing the communists could do in order to discredit themselves with the Chinese people, that would be, precisely, to support those other infamous and hated counter-revolutionary forces there of the quite recent past, the 4-Gang. Certainly the Chinese people have not forgotten the enormous crimes which *they* perpetrated. Any forces coming to them today and saying "We uphold the line of Mao Zedong and the 4-Gang!" would be quickly, completely and justly rejected by the Chinese.

Just because many comrades today, among those who support the WMC, are so extremely badly informed about the elementary facts of recent history, those on China in the mid-'70s for instance, because of the decades-long disinformation and brainwashing campaigns by the Avakianists and others, this doesn't mean that "ordinary people" are equally ignorant of all these facts. The crimes of the 4-Gang, and the great joy with which the Chinese people greeted their downfall in Oct '76, still are quite well known to many people not only in China but here in Sweden, for instance, too, as well as in Britain and in many other countries.

You, comrade Adolfo, also wrote that you lived, as a grown-up person, during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and thus you also remember the events in China in 1976 or at least that which was reported on them. Can you have failed to realize the fact of the massive, enthusiastic support by the Chinese masses for the big blow against the 4-Gang in October '76? The evidence for this fact is overwhelming. I've quoted only part of it in my series on the 4-Gang, but even that part should be sufficient - everyone can check on it and will find that it's the truth.

Another 1976 event in China is quite important too, for that correct evaluation of things which I'm trying to show you once more here. That is the suppression by the 4-Gang - who at that point even managed to carry the
leading CPC organs with them, under the circumstances, that Chairman Mao was in bad health - of the massive demonstration by the people, in reality precisely against the 4-Gang, at the Tiananmen Square in Beijing on 05.04.1976.

It's important because this suppression and the ensuing "official" vilification of that event as a "counter-revolutionary incident" is one big crime which we, even from afar and even today, unequivocally can ascertain was committed and undoubtedly was caused by the 4-Gang. And it's a crime about which it's easy to realize, even today, how much it must have helped the *other* reactionary grouping, the openly-Rightist Deng Xiaoping revisionists, in *their* subversive plans, since Deng Xiaoping, who had already been subjected to a *just* public criticism, now in a certain respect became a "victim" of an *unjust* accusation, which could not but have helped decrease the people's opposition to him.

You probably read about that event at the time, comrade Adolfo, both in the Peking Review (English or Spanish edition) and in bourgeois newspapers. I on my part did so. My German comrades at that time had left their exile here in Malmoe and gone back to Germany. And not yet knowing anything about the problem with the 4-Gang, which had of course at the time not been mentioned at all in the Chinese press, I then accepted the official, *mendacious*, version about a "counter-revolutionary incident", although I did feel a vague unease on account of the "reporting", in the Peking Review No. 15/76, for instance, on how those 100 000 people or even more "simply" were "passers-by who had come over too see what was happening" (!!) while "a small group of bad elements" were "engaging in a counter-revolutionary provocation" - presumably "staged by pro-Deng Xiaoping forces", then, although this was not directly stated.

At the time, I had read only about the criticism campaign against Deng Xiaoping's "Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts", which had then been going on for months.

If I had studied better the documents of the CPC 10th Congress, of August 1973, which my then German comrades had pointed to as extremely important and in which comrade Zhou Enlai had pointed out: "It is imperative to note that one tendency covers another", then I might have realized, even at that time, the existence in China of *another* reactionary tendency than that of Deng Xiaoping.

In retrospect, after the existence of that phoney "left" reactionary group the 4-Gang had been revealed and after I had also gotten the main facts about the whole struggle in China (and internationally) explained to me, I could see of course how these two deviations had covered each other, and eventually could ascertain the facts about what took place on the Tiananmen on 05.04.1976.

And these facts today are easy to ascertain for all other comrades, too, who have followed those events. I've written about them in my 4-Gang posting series, where one informative eyewitness account was also reproduced.

In your erroneous and indeed quite strange arguing, comrade Adolfo, about a "balance" being "broken" by the Oct '76 big blow against the 4-Gang and "the Right benefitting"(!)"from the word go" by it, you obviously mean to say, once again, that the 4-Gang was *not* a reactionary, phoney "leftist" group but a *genuinely* leftist one.

But the suppression, and later vilification, of the people's demonstration on 05.04.76, something for which the 4-Gang was clearly responsible, is one clear fact which I can point to which shows the really Rightist character of that Gang.
There are many others as well.

The 4-Gang, under the circumstances that people's attention was directed at criticizing Deng's openly-Rightist deviation and that Chairman Mao's health was failing, banned the people's grieving the death of that opponent of the Gang and important ally of Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai, and caused the people's just protest against this to be suppressed and later to be vilified as "counter-revolutionary" even by the Politbureau of the CPC (although the two main decisions of the PB meeting I'm referring to, on 07.04.76, firstly, dismissing Deng Xiaoping and secondly, appointing Hua Guofeng, and no 4-Gang member, First Vice-Chairman, of course were correct).

This by no means was the work of any genuine Leftists!

When saying that a "balance" was "broken" by the 4-Gang's being defeated, you firstly are misplacing that group into a "left scale" in a "left-right balance", when in reality it above all belonged, together with the Deng group, in the "bourgeois scale" of a "bourgeois-proletariat balance", and in this "scale" again, there was another, smaller, "balance", the "Deng - 4-Gang" one, since those two reactionary groups, who both opposed the proletariat and, indirectly, were helping each other doing this, also were contending with each other.

In my 17.06 posting, I described it in the form of a triangle.

Secondly, with your description, you're once again advancing that strange theory of a "balance" between the Left, the genuine Left, and the Right, which "shouldn't" have been "broken". But of course there should *never* be any such "balance" at all.

The Marxists-Leninists and the great majority of people, who are the real Left, *want* to "break" *all* such "balances" and defeat the Right at all times.

5. WERE THE SUPPORTERS OF THE BIG BLOW AGAINST THE 4-GANG IN OCT '76 LATER "PROVEN IDIOTS"?

Those who supported the big blow against the 4-Gang, were they "proven idiots" a few weeks later, as you say - referring then to the fact, that, as early in November 1976, reactionary things could be observed as being done by the Hua Guofeng group? No.

I've already described how the Hua group, after it had gained the massive support of the people in Oct '76 by then declaring it would continue to uphold Mao Zedong's line completely and continue the criticism of Deng Xiaoping, later started to commit treason and, on the sly, teamed up with the Deng group in its utilization of the people's great hatred for the 4-Gang - whose crimes were liable to make all opponents of the 4-Gang "look good" - in order, step by step, to edge out those real Leftist forces which there were, *defame* them as "4-Gang supporters" and, in the period from late 1976 to 1978 approximately, overthrow socialism in China and install their own revisionist regime.

In the 1979 German article I reproduced as "UNITE! Info #12en", this is correctly analysed in detail and in some of its international connections too.

The Chinese people, who in October '76 massively and most enthusiastically supported the big blow against the 4-Gang, were not "proven idiots" in this by the later treason of the Hua Guofeng group. The dozens of foreign parties and other organizations which likewise supported this big blow [see items (11) and (12) of my 4-Gang series] were not "proven idiots" by this
either. It should be noted of course that some of these parties etc., actually most of those which there were in Europe at the time, were of a rather doubtful character, so that their support wasn't worth all that much. But the epithet "idiots", if it's to be used in this context, would only be fitting for some quite other people.

"Not" supporting the big blow against the 4-Gang at that time but, on the contrary, openly taking the side of the 4-Gang, were some other forces outside China, and do you remember who they were, comrade Adolfo?

They were, firstly, the Albanian Party of Labour led by Hodxa. It's well known how it in 1978 started quite openly vilifying Mao Zedong. It's well known what tragedy that party, which had earlier done some things to its merit and had supported the struggle against Krushchev’s revisionism, later brought on the Albanian people.

They were, secondly, in Germany, as I have recounted, the "Roter Morgen" (which unjustifiably called itself the "KPD/ML"). In 1978, it cut off Mao Zedong's head from the image of "the five classics" on the front page of its paper and went with Hodxa.

(Here in Sweden, the "Roter Morgen"-friend the "KFML(r)" back in 1974 had gotten such a pasting, above all by me with the help of my then German comrades, that it threw off its cover and started its open attacks on Mao as early as in 1975. That's the group that Mr. T.P. and "Quispe"-Chris-B "accused" me of "splitting".)

They were, thirdly, a party whose international subversive activities are even more infamous than any of the other mentioned, namely, the "RCP" of the USA, the "uncle party" of the "RIM", that long-time prison and trap for some people whom I on my part shall refrain from calling "idiots" only because it's not always easy to see through the cover of such phoney-"Marxist" reactionaries, and in my own case, as a comparatively inexperienced person then, I saw through the "KFML(r)" (from 1978 on called the "KFML(r)" and still in existence) only after I had received some lessons, not from individuals, you could say, but from the then revolutionary party the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany, together also with the CPC of that time in China.

I was inexperienced in 1974, and in the then struggle made many mistakes, both of the "Left" sectarian type and of the Right opportunist one, and, not least, at first had difficulties in seeing how I, as only one individual, could successfully combat the then "KFML(r)" which, after all, in the 1973 parliamentary elections in Sweden (voters: 5 million), had received some 16 000 votes. But I didn't land with the Right opportunists either (e.g. a "fraternal party" to the CPC called the "SKP" which later went with Deng and then disappeared in the early '80s) and I at least managed to see which forces on the international level I should "copy-cat" or take lessons from.

By my pointing at that, of course local and small, comparative success in Sweden at that time - the exposure of the "KFML(r)" and the then ensuing possibility for me in the years that followed to conduct such struggles which really constituted a certain support for the interests of the masses - as largely a result of the help received and lessons learned from forces on the international level, I've intended to give one concrete example of that fact which is at least as important today as it was more than 20 years ago, as I think all must agree:

The adherents in the different countries of the political line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong, whose vision in each case of course to some extent or
other must be limited, who must realize that they, if armed with the experience only of the struggle within the country where they happen to live, cannot "know it all", should learn from the - possibly existing - strong points of their comrades in other countries. Of course they, on such issues where this is appropriate, should "take lessons" from each other.

Such people or even parties who persist in maintaining that they under no circumstances whatever will "take lessons from individuals" in other countries, for instance, will eventually indeed be "proven idiots", if not worse. On that you can rely.

Of course it's not only the question of the different revolutionary forces' learning from each other. It's also a question of their supporting each other. For instance, the people's war in Peru led by the PCP should absolutely be supported by the Marxist-Leninists in other countries, who by no means should team up with the opponents of that people's war.

Conversely, the PCP - which is a relatively very large party, even if it's active in a comparatively backward country, far away from those countries in the world where there are large concentrations of workers and where the working-class movement has a century or even two centuries of experience in struggle behind it, while at the same time it has also been subjected to that massive corruption caused by imperialism - naturally should support the struggles of the proletariat and of all genuine Marxist-Leninists in the other countries and absolutely should avoid getting fooled into teaming up with *their* opponents. The same goes for PCP representatives in other countries, as I'm certain you will agree.

To see to it that all these things are done as well as possible, this of course is an important task for the WMC.

How have the different forces so far managed in these respects? This is a question which you also touched on in your 27.06 posting. On what you wrote concerning this, and on the question of whether the PCP today does need to learn some important things or not, I'll make some comments in my next chapter.

6. ON THE EARLIER SEPARATE STRUGGLES OF THE DIFFERENT FORCES, ON THEIR HAVING BEEN CUT OFF FROM EACH OTHER, ON WHO HAS BEEN MAKING THINGS DIFFICULT FOR WHOM AND HOW, AND ON WHAT BASIS THE REVOLUTIONARIES TODAY MUST AND CAN UNITE

Touching on several questions, you wrote:

> We have tasks at hand. You have your ideas, and we have >ours about what RIM is. We certainly do not share your view in full. Yes RIM can be a prison. But it can also, and in the past has been a trench of combat too! When centering on the relative unity achieved in RIM as the ONLY cause of the present troubles, you are forgetting a simple fact: Where were the legitimate "Maoists" then back in 1983? Some, of course were in Peru with Chairman Gonzalo, developing the new wave of revolution. Others were in various parts fighting revisionism. >Some came together into a United Front which meant a relative basis of unity and found themselves in the same trenches with some Maoist in words and not in deeds whose real revisionist content took many years for ALL and sundry to see.

> The real question then to answer is where were the "pure Maoists" then in relation to support of the Peruvian revolution?
>Quite a few ended up as dones at the service of revisionists, isn't that true? Others were supinely ignorant or did not consider it their duty to uphold the living revolution, and it's taken them some years, and the undeniable reality of the people's war to get themselves "busy" supporting it.

On these different matters, I'd like to comment:

A) *On the PCP and its armed struggle since 1980*

Yes, the PCP did create a certain new wave of revolution, emerging from a Third World country, from 1980 on. It has advocated and upheld in practice some correct and important things which has earned it a not inconsiderable support, above all in other Third World countries, namely,

Down with US imperialism!
Down with Soviet social-imperialism (Russian new tsarism)!
Down with the Deng Xiaoping revisionist regime in China!
Imperialism is a paper tiger; it can and must be combated with revolutionary war, as a general principle!

This has been the important positive side of the PCP's actions. By its armed struggle and by its representing these four things, it has helped the struggle of the proletariat also in other countries and that of the oppressed peoples and nations.

At first, the PCP had practically no contact (as far as I understand) with the revolutionary forces in other countries and knew very little about them. And the revolutionary forces in other countries knew very little about the PCP.

B) *What were the genuine Marxist-Leninists in Europe (for instance) doing in 1983 - and long before that?*

A wave of revolution came into being in Europe (and elsewhere too) with that youth and student movement which in history has been connected with the year 1968. In France, practically all of which was on strike during the entire month of May of that year, and also in West Germany, many young workers participated in that movement, which also gave rise to several new parties in the West European countries, (only) one of which developed into a consistently proletarian revolutionary one, the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany.

I've written about that party in several postings already. One important document from it, from which you can also get a little information about its early struggles, was reproduced in my recent "UNITE! Info #12en" (08.07.96).

The "1968" wave of revolution was a very important one, in several countries. In e.g. the "RIM Declaration" however, characteristically, it's being passed over completely, as if it never existed.

When that movement waned, the proletarian essence of it still, for a long time, continued to be represented by the KPD/ML (NEUE EINHEIT). You obviously knew nothing about this party, comrade Adolfo, yet you wrote (as I've already quoted before), suggesting an "explanation" for the suppression of its telegram of support for the big blow against the 4-Gang in China:
There is of course another explanation too Rolf, which you may have overlooked. That the group of "perfect Maoists" was not taken seriously at all!

This is bad, not because of your ignorance in itself, which may be explained by the fact that, earlier, the different revolutionary forces were cut off from each other. It's bad because you don't even seem to realize that there *are* things which you're ignorant of. This is also a tendency which I've noted in discussions with other Peruvian-origin comrades too, and on several points in documents of the PCP itself.

It's further bad because, once more, it seems to indicate you're not realizing that the line is the key. And concerning this, I'll also quote again another thing you wrote, concerning the messages of support to the CPC in Oct-Nov '76 (see also items (9), (11), (12) and (13) of my 4-Gang series):

>That the way to settle issues within the International Communist Movement was not by printing instant letters of support from leaderships of Communist parties [...] 

The reproducing by the *Peking Review* of such messages actually was a good thing, since it (except for the suppression mentioned) clearly showed which forces, on the international level, supported what, on such an important occasion, and (with that exception again) showed which forces understood what, concerning the struggle in China itself. And when, in addition to this, the comrades read the message from this revolutionary party in Germany at that time [in item (9) and again in (13) of my series], they can clearly see that this party was very much one that should be reckoned with.

In Europe (for instance) at the time, as today, there were and are no immediate possibilities of an armed revolutionary struggle by the proletariat. This doesn't mean that the struggle of that proletariat, which in part has taken place and is taking place under the surface, so to speak, is not a very important one.

We need the linking up of that struggle with the struggles of the oppressed peoples, which in part, but only in part, may be said to be represented by the actions and the propaganda of the PCP.

What were we here in Europe doing in 1983, and long before that? There are a very large number of documents on that, on the struggles of the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) since the late '60s and on those of course very small-scale ones which I on my part have conducted since 1974, and on the connection of these struggles with the masses.

And if you compare the standpoints and the explanations of comrade Gonzalo in the "big interview" of 1988, for instance, and those of his in the mid-late '70s, to the writings of Klaus Sender of the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) from the early '70s and to approximately the mid-'80s, you can see that it was the latter who had the considerably better understanding of the facts of international class struggle and whose line in *all* respects was parallel to that of the CPC led by Chairman Mao.

To the PCP, its documents show, Chairman Mao practically "ceased to exist" after, say, 1972. In particular, the PCP has more or less never propagated the very important and correct 10th Congress of the CPC, in 1973. And in various documents (not only by its signing the phoney "Marxist" "RIM Declaration" in 1984 but even earlier) it even has indicated a certain discontent with it.
These are things which IMO absolutely should be corrected today. The PCP, and many of its supporters in other countries too, need to learn from the experience of Mao Zedong's CPC of the mid-'70s and from that of the formerly revolutionary KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany. These are things which I, as an individual, happen to know about and can inform all comrades of - those who care to listen and then to make their own judgement on what I'm saying, that is.

The eventual bourgeois degeneration of that last-mentioned party, in approximately the late '80s, is another and tragic matter, from which we should also draw lessons today.

Of course this degeneration has to do with the elements of parasitism and corruption which long have existed in the (West) European countries due to imperialism, but also, importantly, with the strivings by the bourgeoisie in the last two decades to *diminish* and "chastise" the proletariat in these countries by strangling the development of production in them and even emptying them of production, i.e., the "green" warfare, which here has resulted in whole armies of people having to "beg" the bourgeois governments for their existence.

C) *What was and is the "RIM"?*

On this, I've already written in many postings and also in part 1 above. You wrote that the "RIM" indeed "can be" a prison but that it in the past "has been a trench of combat too", that its "Declaration" was a "relative" "basis of unity", that "the revisionist content" of some "Maoists (only) in words" who also endorsed it "took years for ALL and sundry to see", and even, if I've understood you correctly, that the "RIM" has been a "United Front"(!).

But, to take that last thing first, of course the "RIM", as a purported "International" or at least an "embryo" of one, has *never* presented itself as a "united front", which is something altogether different. One mustn't confuse those two things, as you're doing here!

The proposed WMC, according to the call for it, will not be a "united front" either. The point No. 6 on its tasks states that it is also to call together a broad conference for the support of the people's war in Peru. And *that* conference will then be one of a united front. But the WMC itself, as proposed, is *not* to be a united front but is to be an organization both for support of the revolution in Peru and also for leadership of the international proletariat, as indicated by the other points on its tasks.

And on a declaration such as the 1984 one of the "RIM", which purports to be a "general programme for the entire international struggle of the proletariat", you cannot have "relative" unity either. You either endorse it or you don't.

In the case of the PCP, the documents show that it has endorsed, still is endorsing, the "RIM Declaration", in its entirety, and that all talk of "relative unity" in this respect is really a pretext and something which in itself must be criticized too, since it only serves to confuse the issue.

The question here - I repeat one more time - is this: The line is the key.

Concerning the "RIM", the main question is *not* whether or not the "revisionist content", as you wrote, of some of its "participants", who were "Maoists (only) in words", took years "for ALL and sundry to see". The
question is not about the "contents" of different people or parties. The main question is: What are the contents of the *programme* agreed on, what is the *line*?

D) *Can those who signed the "RIM Declaration" in 1984 and who still are endorsing that document, or are not criticizing it, really in justice call themselves "genuine Maoists" in all respects?*

As all comrades know, this "Declaration" is a document which has purported, and still is purporting, to do nothing less than provide basic guidance for the entire international proletariat in its struggle, and which in recent years has been disseminated in more than 20 languages.

Here is what this document says, on a number of points which were vitally important when it was written and still are so today:

[QUOTES FROM THE "RIM DECLARATION", 1984:]

On the important 1963 CPC document, *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement* (the 25-point letter) and in general on the differentiation by Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong of various forces and their advocacy of uniting with all such forces as can be united against the main reactionaries, p. 22-23 (of the English-edition pamphlet):

"Yet, on a number of questions, the criticism of revisionism was not thorough enough and some erroneous views were incorporated even when criticising others. Exactly because of the important role these polemics and Mao and the Chinese Communist Party played in giving birth to a new Marxist-Leninist movement it is correct and necessary to consider the secondary, negative aspect in the polemics and in the struggle waged by the Communist Party of China in the international communist movement."

"In relation to the imperialist countries, the "Proposal" put forward the view that 'In the capitalist countries which US imperialism controls or is trying to control, the working class and the people should direct their attacks mainly against US imperialism, but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests.'"

"This view, which seriously affected the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement in these types of countries, obscures the fact that in imperialist countries the 'national interests' are imperialist interests and are not betrayed, but on the contrary defended, by the ruling monopoly capitalist class despite whatever alliances it may make with other imperialist powers and despite the inevitably unequal nature of such an alliance."

"The proletariat of these countries is thus encouraged to strive to outbid the imperialist bourgeoisie as the best defenders of its own interests. This view had a long history in the international communist movement and should be broken with."
Generals,

So, here we go again. Those of us who've been in the debates for some time already know the phenomenon quite well: Another writer who wants to send some people to the funny farm. Or to the nut-house, the looney bin. He's "invoking the Sanity Clause". ("There ain't no Sanity Clause" - Chico Marx; a truth we learned about on the old "MI" list.) In Russia and in Europe at least, the disease since long is also known as "the Andropov Syndrome" (isn't that right, Klaus?), after the former KGB boss Yuri Andropov.

This time the writer is one who formerly at least enjoyed a certain prestige: Adolfo Olaechea, of the Sol Peru Committee, London, UK, and long-time (unofficial) ambassador of the PCP in Peru.

He last Sunday, 06.07, replied to a 3-part posting of mine of the same day, "UNITE! Info #38en: 'NE', Mariategui & "RIMitz'", with one having the subject line: "TEUTONIC KNIGHTS AND NUCLEAR VIKINGS TO THE FUNNY FARM!", and with corresponding text contents too.

As probably most people will agree, it's clear that a person who finds himself forced to "argue" by such "suggestions" doesn't have much to say for himself politically any more. He's at his wits' end, politically bankrupt.

What's it all about this time? Who're those people the writer in question is putting up as candidates for that funny farm of his, to begin with?

Well, "nuclear Vikings", that's easily recognizable, in the light of some earlier discussions. This obviously refers to me.

And btw, in the text that follows, Olaechea also for the first time rather openly states his support for the ultra-reactionary anti-nuclear-energy campaign of the (main) US imperialist and other bourgeois forces. This is significant too.

So that really rather flattering designation of me as being a "nuclear" person quite (new-)clearly can be seen to be meant precisely the other way around, not least since in the text that follows I'm also referred to as "a little verminous individual".

Vicious blackening attempts of this type do in fact make up the bulk of the "argumentation" in this posting. This expression here indicates of course - you don't need to be an expert on diplomacy to see it - that the writer is quite displeased with something or other that I've had to say. My Info #38en must in fact have hit him in a politically very sensitive spot indeed, since actually, even the day before, he still at least was calling me "comrade".

>From this point on, his posting of 06.07.97, the conflict underlying the debate between me and that writer - or, the lack of a debate, since during a long time he above all has been running away from certain important
truths that I've tried to convince him of - clearly has become an antagonistic one. Since last Sunday, Adolfo Olaechea is openly siding with counter-revolution.

What political issues our conflict has been and is about I shall soon (once more) explain.

By the designation "TEUTONIC KNIGHTS", implying that those so designated are a nasty bunch of oppressors and exploiters of foreign peoples since that's what the medieval German Knight Orders were, Olaechea is referring to that small political group in Germany, Dr Sende pause & the Klasberries, which constitutes the actually bourgeois-degenerated remnants of the once quite important proletarian revolutionary party KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) led by Klaus Sender. (On this, see for instance my Info #38en.)

A STRUGGLE ON SOME VITAL POLITICAL ISSUES

What is this conflict all about? What is it that has caused these railings, wailings and ailings by which Ol' Adolfo effectively exposes himself as a bourgeois political swindler?

He by the way made another posting on the same theme later on 06.07 too, commenting on a reply by the Trotskyite Bob Malecki, and again demonstrating the same thing. Below I shall also comment briefly on that posting.

The conflict between me, on the one hand, and Olae chea, on the other, has concerned the question of that correct and necessary ideological and political weapon for the proletariat, the line of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong. I'm advocating and defending that line, as can be seen from my postings since I've been on the Net (from late 1995 on).

Olaechea says that he's the one who's doing so. That doesn't fit in with the facts, as can be seen from *his* postings. His "funny farm" one doesn't precisely advertise him as a Marxist, does it? And this isn't the question of a single instance either.

As I wrote (again) in Info #38en, the Marxist-Leninist movement in the world since 1984 has been confronted with a big evil, the "RIM", whose "Declaration" pretends to give guidance to the struggle of the entire international proletariat and to uphold Mao Zedong's correct line but which is doing exactly the opposite. Olaechea's party, the PFP, all along has made the serious mistake of supporting that "Declaration". I've exposed the fact that this document is reactionary and has strived to explain it to everybody, not least to Olaechea, so that he could help his party correct its serious error.

But he has refused to listen to this, for months has been running away from all discussion of the question and eventually, in March of this year, even started massive attacks on me because of that correct criticism of mine, attacks thus in flagrant defence of the anti-Mao "RIM Declaration". It's this conflict that has now, with his "funny farm" posting, become antagonistic.

In particular, I in Info #38en supported the correct criticism by the of course today bourgeois writer Dr Sende pause, of the serious weaknesses in the ideology of the founder of the PFP, Mariategui, weaknesses that help explain *why* that party could later be tricked into supporting the "RIM Declaration".
WHAT DOES OLAECHEA SAY THAT THIS STRUGGLE IS ALL ABOUT?

Above all, he tries to obscure what are the real issues.

His "argumentation" mainly consists of name-calling, and in addition he brings some "arguments" that are both slanderous and also openly reactionary, anti-Marxist, in themselves.

He writes that I'm "raising [my] hand against" the leaders of the revolutionary proletariat, "engaging in a campaign" against "giants of thought such as Jose Carlos Mariategui and Chairman Gonzalo".

That's a piece of slander, as all who've read my postings can see.

I've supported a correct criticism of the by no means unimportant weaknesses of Mariategui. I've criticized certain quite serious errors made by comrade Gonzalo. That means *helping* the just struggle of the PCP and its chairman too, and by no means is this "raising one's hand against" them.

Olaechea writes that I'm "collaborating", "overtly" even, with "the Zubatovs and Trotskyism" "against...the living revolution".

All who've read my postings can see that this is vile slander too. The people's war in Peru, for instance, which is probably what's referred to here and which the Trotskyites etc oppose, I consistently have *supported*. Olaechea writes that I'm "caricaturising Chairman Mao Tse-tung" and "aiming...spears at genuine Maoism".

That's really a ridiculous piece of slander, an attempt to turn things upside-down completely.

*I*’m the one who's been exposing and attacking the vile anti-Mao Zedong "RIM Declaration". Olaechea is the one who's *defending* it, quite fanatically even.

Not only this. Together with some openly-revisionist elements he's created a "discussion forum", the Siberia Swamp ("Lenin-List"), where the actual advocacy of Mao Zedong's line is *prohibited* and whose very homepage starts out with a piece of clearly anti-Mao, pro-revisionism symbolism. (See Info #37en; see http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/6380/leninlis.htm)

He even has repeated (one more time quite recently, 04.07), and tried to make people believe, some perfectly ridiculous slander directed against me by one very primitive and extreme propagandist of social-imperialism here in Sweden, Ola Eriksson, referring to that counter-revolutionary as "comrade".

TRYING TO CREATE A SPLIT BETWEEN THE PROLETARIAT IN THE IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES, ON THE ONE HAND, AND THE OPPRESSED PEOPLES, ON THE OTHER

In my Info #38en, I pointed at Olaechea's repeatedly "arguing" with that same flagrant *bourgeois nationalism*, against Dr Sendepause's in itself quite correct criticism of Mariategui that is also evident in his "funny farm" subject line.
To this, he replies in the text that this was (is) to "remind" the Klubberries (the former NE) and also me that we're citizens of oppressor countries, and that (thus) we are "shamed for the crimes of [our] IMPERIALIST countries"[!].

Indeed, he adds, the correct criticism of the weaknesses and errors of Mariategui and comrade Gonzalo means "replicating" these crimes!

A vile slander again. And the particular reactionary line that lies behind this I shall make a couple of comments on too. It's noteworthy that Olaechea now openly supports that line.

I'm *not* responsible for the crimes of that imperialist (2nd-world) country in which I live. I've long been *actively opposing* them. The KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany *most resolutely*, during the time when it was a revolutionary party - and one that represented a *genuine* internationalism, not such a phony one as is Olaechea's - *combated* the crimes of that imperialist state in which it was active.

In the leaflets of the series "INFORMATIONSBLAD" which I've been publishing, mainly in Swedish, since 1975, the basic slogan has always been that call raised by Lenin: "Proletarians in all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!". I can cite a number of facts to show that I've been carrying out that line in practice too.

"Against" the NE in Germany, whose revolutionary past and actually very considerable achievements Olaechea knows *nothing* about - mainly because he *hasn't wanted* to know anything about them - he brings forward some quotations from Marx, about how necessary it would be for a revolutionary Germany to disown the whole of its (oppressor) past etc - which naturally is quite true. But that's precisely what the NE did too.

What Olaechea actually is "arguing", by his calling some people now for the second time "TEUTONIC KNIGHTS" etc, simply because they're Germans and he knows nothing more about them except the fact that they're criticizing "his" Peruvian Mariategui, is that "no" Germans, Swedes etc can be revolutionary, "since they're citizens of oppressor countries", while "for all of us Peruvians etc", the situation of course is "quite different".

While one must recognize also the existence of a very pervasive system of parasitism, of imperialist bribery, in countries such as Germany and Sweden, this "line of reasoning" of Olaechea's of course is quite wrong, in essence is a bourgeois-nationalist one too and is one that's rejected even by the "RIM".

The line that Olaechea supports in his "funny farm" posting is one that has long been among the peculiar characteristics of another phony "International", the "MIM", which says that "only the peoples of the third world are revolutionary, not the proletariat in the more highly-industrialized, imperialist countries".

Propaganda for such a line was also made by the phony "left" 4-gang in China, another arch-reactionary group which Avakian, "Quispe" and Olaechea all are joining hands in trying to make people believe were "the real revolutionaries" in China.

From the 1977 book "Comrade Chiang Ching" by US historian Roxane Witke (see also Info #39en, part 3/5), whose information of course need to be checked on but which do seem possible to corroborate on this point, I quote from a speech which Jiang Qing, the leader of the 4-gang, is said to have held in
March 1975 (according to a purportedly verbatim quote in "China News Analysis 1004", Hong Kong, 20.06.1975, reproduced by Witke p. 467):

"Our foreign policy must concentrate on black friends, small friends, poor friends. They will be grateful to us. We may have no white friends[!], great friends, rich friends, but we are not isolated.....".

That wasn't Mao Zedong's line at all but something quite different! As for some facts concerning "white friends" at that time, I in my very first posting to M-G, in Oct 1996, brought a table of figures (on how the number of members of the Swedish-Chinese Friendship Association developed) showing how interest in China and support for that country skyrocketed in Sweden in 1969-76 and then fell like a stone in 1978-82. This was the same in many similar countries too.

The proletariat in the relatively highly-developed, imperialist countries, on the one hand, and the oppressed peoples and nations, on the other, must unite and can unite too. Olaechea's line, on the contrary, is one that goes in for "splitting them up", putting the one against the other, and thus helping ultra-reaction.

Will that "ambassador's" activities, such as demonstrated by his "funny farm" posting, help mobilise support in, say, Europe, for the Peruvian revolution? Quite on the contrary, they can only help discourage it. The PCP comrades need to distance themselves from that person, Adolfo Olaechea.

"FUNNY FARM" "MATHEMATICS"

An very characteristic "line of argumentation" that Olaechea advances in his posting, and which he's constantly been using since a year back now, is that of stressing that the forces opposing his particular reactionary line (I, on the one hand, and also the Klasberries, on the other) are small (true) and "therefore", he says, "isolated" - which is *not* the case at all.

His mathematics is faulty, typically Khrushchevite, precisely contrary to Mao Zedong's. Concerning the latter, I quote again a couple of things from the important Documents of the 10th Congress of the CPC, 1973 (reproduced in part in my Info #13en):

"To build a party for the interests of the vast majority or for the interests of the minority? This is the watershed between proletarian and bourgeois political parties and the touchstone for distinguishing true Communists from false."

"Chairman Mao teaches us that *'the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything.'* If one's line is incorrect, one's downfall is inevitable, even with the control of the central, local and army leadership. If one's line is correct, even if one has not a single soldier at first, there will be soldiers, and even if there is no political power, political power will be gained. This is borne out by the historical experience of our Party and by that of the international communist movement since the time of Marx."

"And when a wrong tendency surges towards us like a
rising tide, we must not fear isolation and must dare to
go against the tide and brave it through. Chairman Mao
states, "Going against the tide is a Marxist-Leninist
principle."

(All quotes from Zhou Enlai's report to the Congress)

How "isolated" or not you are, that depends, not on how many forces you can
mobilise quite immediately, but whose interests you're representing; it
depends on your line.

How many people in the world really do have "vested interests" *against*
the proletarian revolution? That's difficult to calculate, but let a
"generously reckoned" number be 100 million. Then, with a world population
of 5.8 billion, they'd make up 1 part out of 58, and the rest 57 out of 58.

These are the numbers that count. Suppose that a group of, say, 5 people is
advocating a line that really represents the interests of the great
majority of people, against one party that is actually in the wrong and so
is helping the minority in the world, but still has managed to get a
following of, e.g., 5 million. Which of them is the isolated one?

According to Olaechea's "reckoning", it would be the small group,
"outnumbered by a million to 1". In reality, it's the "big" party, for even
its "big" number of adherents makes almost no difference at all as to the
fact that on an international scale, it *will in reality be outnumbered* by
57 to 1. His "funny farm" maths thus is wildly wrong, quite upside-down.

"FUNNY FARM" "PHYSICS"

- OR RATHER: "THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE'S WAR IN MY COUNTRY.
IN RETURN, I SHALL NOT ONLY SPIT IN YOUR FACE, BUT ALSO HELP THE US
IMPERIALISTS AND OTHER CROOKS TEAR DOWN THE INDUSTRIES WHERE YOU LIVE"

Olaechea asks: "What have the TEUTONIC KNIGHTS AND THE NUCLEAR VIKINGS of
today done for the revolution so that they may dare complain of
"chauvinism"? To that, I could reply at some length, also citing some facts
in support of what I'd claim. But as has long been obvious, Olaechea
doesn't really want to know anyway. He himself replies to his "question"
with another one, which contains some reactionary propaganda of a, for him,
new kind:

"What have they done - besides scribbling garbage (and nuclear garbage at
that[!]) that could spare them outright rejection...?"

This of course refers to the combating of the arch-reactionary campaign
against nuclear energy, which is just one part of the reactionaries' entire
"green" warfare too, that I have engaged in, as well as the NE in Germany.
Olaechea here openly states his displeasure with these actions of mine and
of my ex-comrades' and thus his support of these vile schemes behind which
lies, above all, US imperialism.

He thereby, too, quite openly aligns himself with the old-time revisionists
and, not least, with the Trotskyites, on this internationally quite
important matter.

R--k-Ola Eriksson, Sweden, (see my Info #37en) and Adolfo Olaechea, UK,
really *are* very close comrades!
"FUNNY FARM" "LOGIC"

(FUNNY FARMER TRYING TO TROT AWAY FROM THE TROTS, HIS REAL ALLIES, AND TO SHOVE THEM DOWN SOMEBODY ELSE'S THROAT)

Olaechea - who since long makes propaganda for the basically Trotskyite "RIM Declaration", who has recently accepted the anti-Mao Zedong, pro-Soviet social-imperialism propaganda of the Siberia Swamp "discussion forum", thus directly aligning himself with Trotskyism in that respect, and who now, as seen above, openly joins the Trotskyites in their anti-industrial propaganda too - in the other posting of his on 06.07 (last Sunday) which I mentioned above once more tries to turn things upside-down and "argue" that *I*'m the one who's adopting Trotskyite positions.

His subject line is almost as funny as his "funny farm" one:

"MALECKI: UNWITTINGLY UNMASKS TEUTONS AND VIKINGS AS 'IDIOT' TOOLS OF TROTSKYISM AND INTERNATIONAL REACTION AGAINST PERUVIAN REVOLUTION!"

How, in the "logic" of Ol' Adolfo's "funny farm extension", does the Trotskyite Bob Malecki accomplish such a thing?

Simply by stating, as he did and as Olaechea quotes as a big "revelation":

"What is funny about this is that Rolf is RIGHT in his criticism of the Jones-Adolfo rotten block."

Mark Jones and Jim Hillier are anti-Mao Zedong propagandists and co-moderators, together with Olaechea, of the anti-Mao Siberia Swamp "forum".

Bob Malecki on his part agrees with that anti-Mao propaganda, as he repeated in his posting, e.g. supports the anti-nuclear-energy campaign too and opposes the people's war in Peru.

Thus it's perfectly ridiculous to say that his "telling a truth that anyone can see anyway" makes him and me "allies" on any vital political matter, in particular that of the people's war led by the PCP, which everyone knows I'm supporting and which I, by my pointing at certain errors made by the PCP, am contributing even more towards *helping* too, as I already wrote above.

What was it that old Pausey wrote on the Jesuits, in his criticism of Mariategui's quite conciliatory standpoint concerning them? Here's one sub-title:

"*Fighting science [and] materialistic thinking, defending catholic obscurantism was their main duty.*"

In view of the performance of Olaechea on the subjects I commented on above, his "funny farm" mathematics, physics and logic, it seems that he's made at least the first-mentioned part of those "duties" his own.

On his "funny farm" politics - I'm pleased that I've now finished these comments of mine on it and can turn to some more uplifting matters at least for a while.

Rolf M.
ADOLFO OLEACHEA'S HYSTERICAL REACTION - HIT BY K. SENDER'S ANALYSIS

From: Klasber-AT-aol.com | 10 Jul 1997

Adolfo Oleachea, who describes himself as a representative abroad of the PCP (Sendero Luminoso de J. C. Mariategui), has answered with an absurd shelling of abusive words, in reply to our chairman Klaus Sender's criticism.

Already in his first posting, half of contents is consisting of nothing but invectiveness's. "Teutonic knights", "Teutonic wiseacres", "European geniuses", building an "Aunt Sally" and much more like that, but any proofs or any at least intelligent reference to supposed inconsistencies, you unavailingly look for.

The actual substance is denied directly. Klaus Sender's article thoroughly made great efforts in proving various sides of Jose C. Mariategui's works and is based on Mariategui's own pronouncements.

The rude reactions of A. Oleachea only are proving how much he feels hurt by this criticism. Among his allegations only one is worth mentioning: Mariategui allegedly was slandered by Klaus Sender to be a clericalist. This is untrue.

He rather was described as a revolutionary with certain grave weaknesses. It is an irrational allegation that the quotations are isolated. These significant predicative quotations are consisting of several sentences, reflecting the thrust of Mariategui's argument, and they are unambiguous. These invectiveness's by Oleachea only have one reason: preventing factual arguments.

The second Posting is of a more primitive, infamous and really pathological character. Thereby it is shown that Oleachea has lost his self-control.

It's also rather primitive to mention a paragraph by Karl Marx against German petty-bourgeois representatives of the 19th century without any reference to the concrete matter, only because the author of the analysis is a German.

Above all he is tricking with Rolf Martens. But this criticism wasn't created by Rolf Martens, it was done by Klaus Sender. Rolf Martens only had to have his say about it after he had read the document, and he is adhering to the criticism.

Oleachea uses Martens like a label, sticking it on Klaus Sender and the Neue Einheit. But as we have declared again and again: it's only Rolf Martens who is responsible for his writings, not the Neue Einheit. During the last years Rolf Martens was Oleachea's close companion and not ours. Since seven years he is excluded from the Neue Einheit. Therefore nobody should be deflected by Oleachea's rubbish. This criticism is published and...
Oleachea may scream without limits, like a wounded animal. He will not put it out of the way and there is hope that the manoeuvres to influence the international movement by misuse of the PCP will decrease decidedly. Lumping the opponent together with anything else is a quite old manner of deflection.

Editorial staff of Neue Einheit, July 1997
(Translation)