



Anmerkung auf Deutsch: Es wird vorbereitet, den hier folgenden Artikel auch auf Deutsch herauszugeben, unter dem Titel: **"Warum hilft die RIM dem US-Imperialismus, die PCP einzukreisen?"**.

Nota en español: Se prepara la publicación del siguiente artículo también en español, bajo el título: **"¿Por qué el MRI ayuda al imperialismo EE.UU. a enserrar el PCP?"**.

Note: Earlier leaflets in the **INFORMATIONSBLAD** (Information Sheet) series have been published (only) in Swedish, since 1975. Versions also in German and Spanish of the present one are planned. For some information about the author of the article published here, see Note on the last page

Why Does the RIM Help U.S. Imperialism Encircle the PCP?

By Rolf Martens, Malmö, Sweden

Introduction

Certain events which have taken place during the last 8-10 months call for the attention of the adherents in all countries of the ideology of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong.

With the present article, the writer hopes to reach as many comrades as possible - whether they call themselves "Marxist-Leninists", as in Chairman Mao's lifetime the Chinese communists and all we others who supported his eminently correct line always did, some 20 or more years ago, or whether today they prefer calling themselves "Maoists", as some do - and to reach as many genuinely Marxist-Leninist (Maoist) parties as possible, if such parties today already do exist (again) in the world. I'd like to put forward this suggestion to everybody:

Some consequences should be drawn from these events.

The events in question show a seemingly very strange behaviour on the part of the group of parties and other organizations known as the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM) towards one of the parties which participate in that group, the Communist Party of Peru (PCP).

Both the RIM and the PCP (also called the "Sendero Luminoso") are comparatively well-known internationally. And a con-

siderable amount of propaganda today states that they are forces which are upholding Marxism, Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought - or Maoism, as it has been called since 1982 by the PCP and since 26.12.1993 "officially" by the RIM as well.

As will be shown in this article, only in part and to a certain extent is this propaganda true. The PCP has indeed upheld and defended some vital elements of the ideology of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong, and this under very difficult circumstances. The information available here points to this party's being justified in calling the armed uprising which it has led since 1980 against the reactionary regime in Peru a "people's war".

And one object of the present article is to support this people's war and to support the PCP against that most massive "encirclement and suppression" campaign which just now is being directed against it, both in Peru itself and internationally.

As for the RIM and its politically leading participant, the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) of the USA, it must be seriously questioned whether these are genuinely revolutionary forces at all. The answers to these questions depend, among other things, on whether the comrades in the RCP and in other participants of the RIM will be able to change their respective organization's just now truly scandalous behaviour towards the PCP, or whether this will turn out to be impossible.

Another object of this article precisely is to point out some very clear reasons why the genuinely revolutionary forces in the world today should **not** look to the RIM for political guidance. Yet another is to point out where they **should** look for it.

Such guidance of course is urgently needed. And an enormous treasure of proletarian revolutionary experience today has been collected, too, in the course of several decades of struggle. Those who really want to understand what's going on in the world today and want to represent and further the common interests of the overwhelming majority of people do have access, at least in principle, to some extremely powerful political weapons with which they can, and should, do this, even, if need be, as single individuals.

These weapons can be found, above all, in the writings of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong, in the important documents of the once-revolutionary extremely experienced Communist Party of China under the leadership of Chairman Mao and in the likewise extremely important documents of the former KPD/ML (NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany - a party which probably is unknown to most readers but which existed as a genuinely revolutionary proletarian force, and one of quite exceptional qualities, between 1970 and, approximately, the end of the 1980:s. (See Note on the last page.)

For a few notes on this experience, the reader is referred to the last part of the present article. One of the important very negative things which, all along, the RIM has been doing has been its massive **blockade of information** about this experience, or, in part, its **distortion** of it. Will the RIM dare discuss this publicly? Let's see.

Present-Day "Continuers" of Mao Zedong?

It will be shown here that the present behaviour of the RIM towards the PCP by no means is an "accident" but only a very clear expression of that line which has been prevailing in the RIM during its entire existence, i.e. since 1984.

That is a line of loudly lauding Mao Zedong Thought in words but in reality distorting it and openly attacking vital parts of it. It's a line of constantly misrepresenting the international situation in a way which completely negates Mao Zedong's brilliant analysis of that situation during his time and which favours important aims of U.S. imperialism and its (now half-broken) superpower partner and competitor, Russian new tsarism - formerly, Soviet social-imperialism. It's a line of ridiculously presenting such phoney "leftist" but really ultra-rightist elements as the "Gang of Four", whose line Mao Zedong combated just as intensively as he combated Deng Xiaoping's openly rightist line, as "the real revolutionaries", etc, etc.

That is the line of the RIM's basic document, the Declaration of the RIM, jointly decided on by several organizations in 1984.

One important error by the PCP, clearly showing the serious weaknesses long present in that party's political line, precisely has been its whole-hearted support for this Declaration, documented by a letter to the RIM later in 1984.

The PCP obviously has the support of millions of people in Peru. And for more than 14 years it has led armed insurrection, during most of that time under the direct leadership of its now imprisoned chairman, comrade Gonzalo. It has at least shown the peoples of the world that it's possible to take up arms against imperialism. However, it never completely has understood that theory of the proletariat, Marxism, Leninism and Mao Zedong

Thought. This its available documents show, some of which go back as far as to the mid/late 1970:s.

While comrade Gonzalo's achievements as a revolutionary leader should be recognized, it's necessary also to see that he has not been anything nearly like a complete "continuer" of Mao Zedong. The reactionaries in general and the U.S. imperialists in particular have been pleased to note such errors of his as the signing of the phoney "Marxist" Declaration of the RIM, which favours them so much. Because of these, it has been in the interests of the reactionaries, who today greatly fear undistorted Marxism, to encourage gross overstatements of comrade Gonzalo's international importance and even overstatements of the international importance of the people's war in Peru, which, at the same time, is genuinely feared by the same reactionaries.

In this connection like in so many others, the imperialists are using double tactics and have been trying to make a good thing serve a bad. Recent events have made it easier for everyone to see through that double-dealing.

The Reactionary Counteroffensive against the PCP

In September 1992, comrade Gonzalo (A. Guzmán) was taken prisoner by the reactionary regime in Peru. Shortly afterwards, several other PCP leading cadres also were captured.

The reactionaries under president-dictator Fujimori "sentenced" comrade Gonzalo to lifelong imprisonment, put him into isolation and threatened to kill him in prison. For this they were openly lauded by some representatives of U.S. imperialism.

On the part of other forces, an initiative was taken for an international defence campaign. The International Emergency Committee to Defend the Life of Dr Abimael Guzman (IEC) was formally founded at a conference in Duisburg, Germany, in February, 1993, with participants from 33 countries in several parts of the world. (I took part in that conference and currently am one of two members in Sweden of the IEC's Steering Committee.)

The IEC's campaign, extended over five continents, has been supported by a considerable number of people. Undoubtedly it has increased the pressure of international public opinion on the Peruvian reactionaries and their backers. On October 1, 1993, Fujimori in person put up a show before the U.N. General Assembly, initiating a massive propaganda manoeuvre intended to counter this pressure and above all to try to quell the continuing armed insurrection. (The start was 2 weeks earlier, I've learned.)

Fujimori read out the first of a whole series of so-called letters and other communications purportedly emanating from comrade Gonzalo and/or from other imprisoned PCP cadres including other leaders. The contents of these supposed communications, released either directly by the reactionary regime or by wholly unclear other sources, have been:

Comrade Gonzalo and other prisoners supposedly "wish to negotiate" a "peace settlement" directly with the regime. The PCP's chairman, it's stated, "calls" from his cell for the other party members to "fight for" such a settlement and to follow his "directive" on this. Meanwhile, armed actions "must be suspended except in self-defence". No mention whatever is made of the Central Committee, the PCP's leading organ. Instead it's stated - by whom, nobody can know with any certainty - that "the question of our Party's proletarian leadership cannot be solved within a brief period of time".

In short, the armed struggle "must" be led, and the question of whether to negotiate or not decided on, from within the enemy's prison camps!

Clearly, either the "communications" containing this nonsense, including a video tape shown on Peruvian television, are outright fabrications, or else comrade Gonzalo and other comrades, as a result of the pressure exerted on them, have in fact turned advocates of capitulation. This of course is what the international openly reactionary media have been maintaining during the last 8 - 10 months. Without further information, one cannot rule out such a tragic possibility. But neither can the question of what is true or false here be considered decisive.

The Declaration of the CC of the PCP of 7.10.1993

The propaganda manoeuvre received a quick and sharp reply. On October 7, the Central Committee of the PCP issued an important declaration. It confirmed the PCP's determination to continue waging people's war in order to seize power in the whole country for the proletariat and the people and to serve world revolution. It repudiated and denounced what it called "the counterrevolutionary lie", expressly attacking the sinister machinations in Peru by the CIA and stressing comrade Gonzalo's important role as leader of the party and of the revolution.

Naturally, this principled stand deserved and needed the support of the Marxist-Leninists in all countries, and still needs it.

The declaration said nothing about possible negotiations. In principle, of course there's nothing wrong with negotiating with the enemy, or with one enemy, as long as you don't give up your arms. Those who best know the concrete battle situation can best judge whether negotiations should be tried. In this case, the decision of whether to do so must be taken by the PCP's CC. The standpoint "since we have suffered setbacks, our only chance is to negotiate" amounts to capitulation, as does the idea "only certain prisoners of the enemy can lead the war". Precisely against this was the 7.10.93 declaration directed.

Is this declaration really by the CC of the PCP? By some opponents of it, e.g. the author(s) of an anonymous paper entitled "¡Desenmascar la llamada 'Declaración del CC'!" ("Unmask the So-Called 'CC Declaration'!") and dated 5.11.93, it has been suggested that it's a "forgery". But the "argumentation" of that paper is quite weak, in part silly, and since its author(s) don't even dare to come out into the open, you have to ask: Who is it that really needs to be unmasked here?

One group of so-called "PCP supporters", the "Sol Perú" in France, which advocates capitulation, unwittingly has contributed towards confirming the authenticity of the 7.10.93 declaration. This by copying, word by word, large parts of that document, which it pretends doesn't exist, in an opposing "declaration" of its own, published in No. 1 of its magazine, Dec. '93. And the really suspect nature of that group itself is further shown by the fact that, in its No. 2 issue, Feb. '94, it openly advertises the reactionary provocations of the ill-famed "Red Brigades" in Italy, a group whose real connections to ultra-rightist forces including the CIA have long been publicly known.

The facts, including not least a genuinely revolutionary spirit present in the 7.10.93 declaration, which does have its weaknesses, too, point to this document's being authentic. It's only logical that, as far as I know, the openly reactionary international mass media haven't said a word about it and obviously want to prevent all knowledge of its existence. It's only logical that among its attackers are some politically very suspect forces.

In this situation, with the encirclement-and-suppression efforts internationally sharply confronting the efforts at supporting the PCP, what have been the actions of the RIM? Before going into this it's necessary to describe somewhat closer what the RIM is and how it functions. A closer look at the RIM shows something strange.

The Double Character of the RIM

On the one hand, the RIM is **not** an organization in its own right but only a group, set or cluster of certain parties and other organizations. These are in RIM terminology not called "members" of the RIM but only "participants" of it. They have no publicly known statutes or rules jointly decided on to regulate their cooperation with each other within this framework, the RIM, which wasn't "founded" but only "formed", in 1984.

When it appears in this shape, "the RIM" of course cannot really be criticized, for instance, for helping U.S. imperialism encircle the PCP. It can hardly be criticized for anything, since, as an entity in this shape, it can hardly do anything at all. The only ones which, in this case, could be criticized are its "participating" parties etc, and this then separately.

On the other hand and at the same time, the RIM actually is an organization of some kind. It obviously does have some rules, after all, only these apparently are known only to a small number of people. That is, it's a **secret society**.

It's in this shape that the RIM appears, firstly, when it issues statements of its own. This doesn't occur often, but on 26.12.1993, for instance, two statements by "the RIM" were decided on. One of them had to do precisely with the matter discussed here, the struggle of the PCP. There must be some unknown rules by which the RIM's participants can be called together and can jointly make a decision.

Secondly, the RIM has an organ called the Committee of the RIM (CORIM), which obviously it somehow controls. The CORIM also issues statements and this more often, on various topics and e.g. before each May 1. It's not publicly known how the participants of the RIM jointly appoint the members of the CORIM, decide on the rights and responsibilities of that organ and of its members etc, nor who these members are.

Physicists have long debated whether light consists of waves or of particles. The preferred answer today is, that it's both of these things at the same time. The RIM's nature is similar: It's two different things at once, in the manner of a ghost, an actor playing two parts in a film or a ventriloquist plus his/her dummy.

Obviously, this "organisational form" which the RIM has, being a mere "cluster of organizations" and at the same time a closely-knit "secret society", is extremely unsuitable, to say the least, for any forces which are really trying to represent the interests of the great majority of people. It doesn't allow any supervision of, or influence on, the decisions of the forces in question by the masses, such as did, for instance, at least in the beginning, the organisational forms of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Internationals, several decades ago.

The RIM's organisational form is one which in fact would be "suitable" only, for instance, for some representatives of reaction trying, with whatever unwitting help from well-meaning but inexperienced or ignorant people they could get, to stem up against, encircle and suppress the genuinely revolutionary forces in the world.

How Does the RIM Make Its Voice Heard?

The RIM has no official press organ. Pamphlets with its Declaration, of 1984, have been published, in today more than 20 languages, anonymously. They can be ordered from an organ called the Information Bureau of the RIM, which, unlike the RIM itself and the CORIM, has an official address, in London, Great Britain. (See Note on the last page.) Advertisements of this Bureau's appear in a magazine published, since 1985, approximately half-yearly with some 90 pages per issue, the *A World to Win* (AWtW), which has the same address. This magazine is "inspired by" the RIM, it states, but is "not an official organ" of it. Its latest issue so far appeared in September, 1993.

The standpoints of the RIM become known, except through the AWtW, through what press its participants may have and by means of leaflets etc distributed by them. No contact addresses of these participants' appear in the pages of the AWtW except for that of the RCP, USA, a party founded in 1975. When earlier this year I wrote to the AWtW asking for information about possibly existing such addresses, I received in reply only that of the RCP, together with the information that only this RIM participant publishes regularly in English. (See Note.)

The RCP publishes weekly in English and Spanish the *Revolutionary Worker / Obrero Revolucionario* (RW/OR) and about quarterly the magazine *Revolution / Revolución*. The RW/OR has some 18 listed contact addresses in the USA including one in Hawaii. It's obviously by far the most important mouthpiece for the RIM, at least outside Peru. As various publications of the RCP indicate, this party to a great extent has dominated the RIM ideologically, too.

Within the 3rd International, the Komintern of 1919-1943, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was sometimes half-jokingly called the "father party" because of its dominant role in it. The situation in the RIM is not quite similar in this respect (either), but the RIM could rightly be described as having not only a "favourite son" - the one it's now stabbing in the back - but also an "uncle organization", the RCP, USA.

All comrades in the USA may not be aware of this, but they should be. Because of the RIM's "double trouble" organisational character, we who are outside that "movement" cannot tell whether, or how, it can be criticized from the inside. But, unless that party is a complete fraud, it is possible to criticize the RIM within the RCP. The same goes for the other RIM participants, too.

The RIM's Recent Behaviour Towards the PCP

As far as can be ascertained from here at the time of writing, the actions of the RIM in relation to the PCP since October, 1993, have been:

Wholly and completely has the vital declaration of the Central Committee of the PCP of 7.10.1993 been suppressed by the RIM and by all organs over which it exercises control or in which it has an influence.

The RIM neither has published that declaration, or arranged for its being published, nor even has made the slightest reference to its existence.

Against the entire massive propaganda manoeuvre built up around the "negotiations and peace communications" allegedly from comrade Gonzalo and other imprisoned PCP leading cadres, not a word has been said by the RIM. This not even after

this propaganda attack internationally had already been developing for months, with the major openly bourgeois and revisionist mass media supporting it to the hilt, and despite the fact that other forces, also outside Peru, forces with much smaller propaganda resources than those media, publicly have counterattacked this propaganda manoeuvre since its start.

Why wasn't the PCP's CC's declaration immediately reproduced in, for instance, the *Revolutionary Worker / Obrero Revolucionario*? Why wasn't the Committee of the RIM, for instance, convened as soon as possible to defend the PCP against the serious attack?

On December 26, 1993, the 100th anniversary of Mao Zedong's birth, the RIM itself apparently somehow convened - whatever that means. It issued two statements that same day. The first of these contained the news that the RIM was now calling Mao Zedong Thought "Maoism", as the PCP had done since 1982, later criticizing all who didn't use this terminology of the PCP's as "less revolutionary". Thus with that statement the RIM smiled at the PCP. With the second it stabbed it in the back

The second statement, not published immediately as was the first but only on February 6, 1994, in the RW/OR, was entitled "In Support of People's War in Peru Led by the Communist Party of Peru and in Defence of the Life of Chairman Gonzalo". It started out by stating how "proud" the RIM had always been to count the PCP in its ranks and that it considered the people's war led by that party as "the foremost struggle against imperialism and reaction in the world today".

Then what about that recent important development in this "foremost struggle", the enemy's massive propaganda attack intending to sow confusion and capitulationism? Not a word in this "support" statement. What about the crucial reply to that attack, a reply showing, among other things, that the CC of the PCP was still functioning, in the existing extremely difficult situation? "Sorry, comrades whom we're proud to have in our ranks. Your Central Committee hasn't issued any declaration. Nor should anybody outside Peru think it has."

That's the meaning of such a statement's icy silence on this point. All earlier pronouncements by the CC of the PCP had been widely propagandized by the RIM, and now there was silence. That was a vicious attack on the 7.10.1993 declaration, and on the PCP's Central Committee.

The general phrases of "support" which the statement contained could be of no assistance to the PCP when the burning question of its fight against capitulationism pointedly was ignored. Nor could the "piece of advice" which it may be read as also containing be of any help. The only sentence in the statement which perhaps, indirectly, touched on the concrete situation at the time was one which lauded the PCP i.a. for being "flexible in tactics" in "new situations". This may be read as: "You should now be flexible and try negotiations". But the struggle going on wasn't about "negotiations". It was against "negotiations and peace at any price". So this "advice" was, if anything, worse than useless.

The "uncle party" in the RIM, the RCP, USA, likewise has made no comment of its own on the PCP's struggle against the capitulationist attack, hasn't even reported it and thus, as a party, likewise in practice is helping those trying to suppress it.

While reporting Fujimori's visit to the USA on 1.10.93, the RW/OR avoided all mention of the important thing which happened during that visit, his reading out in the U.N. building the first of the "letters" allegedly by comrade Gonzalo, initiating the

massive propaganda attack. Complete silence on this continued in the RW/OR for six weeks. After that, observant people could note that the text in a box carried each week by the RW/ OR and headlined by the number of days comrade Gonzalo at the time had been held in isolation, had been changed somewhat.

From its issue of 21.11.93 and onwards, the RW/OR each week now carries a second paragraph of text in that box. It reads in part: "Recently, Fujimori claimed that Chairman Gonzalo has made a call for negotiations from prison. In this situation, what possible excuse can Fujimori now offer for continuing to deny Comrade Gonzalo independent contact with....friendly and neutral visitors from outside the prison..." "It's vitally important for people in Peru and around the world to hear what Chairman Gonzalo's views are from Chairman Gonzalo himself - directly and unimpeded."

This apparently is the "sum total" of the RCP's "reporting on" and "standpoint in" the fierce struggle centred around this alleged "call". Can anyone find this acceptable?

Other International Forces, Including The IEC, and the RIM

In contrast to the RIM, other political groups outside Peru have supported the PCP's struggle against the capitulationist attack. In France, the group Voie Proletarienne immediately reproduced the 7.10.93. declaration in its monthly, Partisan. (See Note.) The paper Rossoperaio, Italy, also supports the PCP (July '94). According to the April '94 issue of El Diario Internacional, a monthly aiming to "serve the oppressed masses in Peru" and published in Brussels, Belgium, the Partie de Travaille, Belgium, (PTB), the Communist Party of Greece, the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist-Leninist (TKP/ML) all have taken the same stand.

The TKP/ML also is a RIM participant. I don't know whether, within the framework of the RIM, it has opposed the RIM's opposite stand. Most of us of course don't know whether, or how, it **could** do that, if it wanted to.

In several countries outside Peru there are groups having as their proclaimed aim support of the people's war in that country and called Movimientos Popular Perú (MPP, People's Movements Peru). In Sweden, as apparently in some other countries, the MPP has split over the question of the "call" attributed to comrade Gonzalo. A Stockholm group maintains that the "call" is genuine, and has been misled into supporting the "prisoners must lead the war" capitulationism. A Malmö group opposes this, rightly supporting the 7.10.93 declaration - at least, locally.

However, this group's members within the IEC group in Malmö also energetically opposed my suggestion that our group propose that the IEC as a whole should publish this PCP CC declaration. Why? Because "this might embarrass the RIM"(!). Some friends here are sitting on two chairs at the same time. Here also is evident the very negative influence exerted today by that entity, the RIM.

As for the IEC, on the one hand, its executive organ, the Coordinating Committee, immediately on Fujimori's release of the two so-called "letters" to him allegedly from the imprisoned comrade Gonzalo and comrade Miriam (E. Iparraguirre) issued a statement condemning the reactionaries' psychological warfare and arguing, citing that person's past record: "Why should anyone believe the US-lackey Fujimori now?" (Emergency Bulletin No. 39, 20.10.1993).

On the other hand, the IEC has **not** published the PCP's CC's 7.10.93 declaration - and even, as it turns out, has suppressed a statement by its own chapter in Bolivia, of 7.2.1994, which i.a. expressly supported it. Why? Though of course not a party type but a united-front type organization, the IEC would be quite justified in reproducing, for information purposes, such a vital document. It did reproduce internationally an earlier statement by the PCP's CC, of December, 1992. Its fourthnightly or monthly Emergency Bulletins, in English and in Spanish, have a considerable audience, being sent to over 40 countries.

Therefore I, in my capacity as IEC Steering Committee member, on April 12, 1994, sent the IEC's Coordinating Committee a letter which I requested it circulate to all other SC members as well, proposing that we as an organization should see to it that, at last, that important PCP CC declaration did reach a wider audience internationally. This was after the IEC Malmö group had declined to support such a proposal.

In contrast to the RIM, the IEC does have publicly known rules, its by-laws. They were decided on by us delegates from the different countries at its founding conference. They stipulate, i.a., that "The IEC is led by its Steering Committee" and that this committee's members have the right to "make suggestions to the Officers and the Coordinating Committee on any question and to have these suggestions circulated to all other members of the Steering Committee upon request".

However, my suggestion of 12.4.94 has still **not** been circulated. I've received no explanation why. Regrettably, the IEC's executive organ is going to the length of non-compliance with our organization's by-laws in order to prevent international knowledge of the PCP's CC declaration. Doesn't this likewise mean helping U.S. imperialism encircle the PCP?

It's natural to conclude that this quite unacceptable action has something to do with the IEC's very close connection to the RIM. Its Coordinating Committee all along has been based at the same address in London which also houses the RIM-inspired magazine AWtW and the Information Bureau of the RIM. The IEC often has advertised the RIM as internationally leading defender of comrade Gonzalo's life. Conversely, its campaign has been reported on as a major event in the world today by the organ of the RIM's "uncle party", the RCP, USA. The IEC in fact may be described as an "enlarged family circle" of the RIM's.

An Organizer and a Discussion at the IEC's Founding Conference

It may be relevant in this connection to recount two different things which I noted in the course of the IEC's founding conference, as a whole a quite successful event of considerable importance. Among those organizing that event, at the Kulturzentrum Effendi, Duisburg, on February 27-28, 1993, a small number of German-speaking persons of U.S. origin working closely together appeared to be in charge. One of them I had encountered before. Some of the conference's nearly 1000 participants may recall, among those in charge of translation, seating etc, a smallish person with a red handkerchief tied around his head.

This person's name is Rob Weltman - or it was, in Sweden ten years earlier. He was then the most influential leading member of the PGS, an organization in Sweden with the proclaimed aim: "For a Democratic Palestine". But it no longer supported armed struggle nor even combated zionism as such. As a member, I criticized this, pointing out, and publicly proving, that Rob Weltman was working for forces wishing to subvert the PGS. For this I was kicked out of the PGS, in 1983. But some leaflets

published by me must have made Weltman's position untenable in the PGS, perhaps in Sweden, too, in the long run. His turning up in Duisburg ten years later need not mean much concerning the character of the IEC. But it does seem to indicate that some very shady forces indeed were involved in the founding of that "enlarged family circle" of the RIM's.

At the conference's IEC Steering Committee plenum, our first and so far only, one member proposed that the already developing international campaign include a call for the liberation of comrade Gonzalo. This was supported by some other members including me. I i.a. pointed at a nearby big banner proclaiming comrade Gonzalo to be "the most important political prisoner in the world today" as an argument why of course we should demand that prisoner's freedom. But the proposal met curiously strong resistance on the part of other speakers, who argued its being "useless", since "only the people's war can liberate Abimael Guzman". The matter was not voted on.

Why was this proposal considered so "useless" by some? There are several instances of political prisoners' having been freed precisely as a result, at least in part, of national or international public-opinion pressure. One originally scheduled speaker at the conference, José Maria Sison, founding chairman of the Communist Party of the Philippines, which since 1970 has led a people's war against the regime, himself had been thus released from captivity in connection with the fall of Marcos in 1986.

Originally, when issuing the call "Move Heaven and Earth to Defend the Life of Comrade Gonzalo!" immediately after his capture, the Committee of the RIM had ended it by saying: "We Need Comrade Gonzalo at His Post, in the Forefront of the Revolution in Peru and the International Communist Movement! - Fight for His Liberation!". But soon afterwards, that last very natural and just call disappeared from the RIM's propaganda; by February '93, RIM adherents were dead against it as "useless".

Why this; why the RIM's so "illogical" change of heart?

There are good reasons to suspect that those persons who behind the scene are controlling the RIM, persons who are just as faceless as were the hooded "judges" who "sentenced" comrade Gonzalo, in reality never did want his liberation but only wanted a certain propaganda to be focused on him as someone who "guaranteed" the "correctness" of the RIM Declaration's reactionary international political line. Perhaps the IEC campaign was already growing "too" fast and being supported by "too" many people for the liking of some of its initiators, so that they now saw a "risk" that an international demand for comrade Gonzalo's freedom might actually succeed in bringing it about.

Why Does the RIM in Fact Help U.S. Imperialism Encircle the PCP?

Because of many facts already recounted above, it's necessary here openly to voice the suspicion that those unknown persons who control the RIM in its "secret society" shape in reality are agents of reaction and that this is the reason why today the RIM is helping U.S. imperialism encircle the PCP. These persons hereby are asked to step forward to explain their actions, so that this suspicion may be either allayed or else confirmed.

The situation for the PCP today obviously is a very difficult one, both in Peru itself and internationally. For the latter part of this at least, the RIM is very much to blame. Nothing has been heard here from the CC of the PCP since its 7.10.93 declaration. Possibly, the information blockade just now is very tight. But there are reports indicating that the people's war continues.

The Revolutionary Line of Mao Zedong and of The Former KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), and The Phoney"Marxist" Declaration of the RIM

The RIM Declaration of 1984 contains some vicious open attacks on (at least, formerly) well-known correct principles of Marxism and some flagrant untruths about the then existing situation in the world and recent history, including omissions of vital facts. It's difficult to see how these things could have been the results of even gross ignorance on the part of its authors.

With particular fury, the Declaration attacks Mao Zedong's extremely successful foreign policy of a united front against imperialism in general and against one or two superpowers in particular. By the 1960:s, U.S. imperialism had long been the main protagonist of reaction. Such imperialist former big powers as Great Britain, Germany, France and Japan could no longer compete for hegemony. Mao Zedong correctly analyzed them as belonging to an intermediary zone between the then only hegemonic power and the socialist countries. In the well-known "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" of 1963, one of the CPC documents of "the Great Polemics" unmasking Soviet revisionism, he correctly urged the working-class in the capitalist countries which U.S. imperialism was controlling or trying to control to "direct their attacks mainly against U.S. imperialism but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests".

For heaven's sake, no!, the Declaration cries out (p. 23, English version). We're all for Mao Zedong, of course, but that was one of his mistakes! Imperialist countries, you see, can have **no** legitimate "national interests" but **only** imperialist ones. Mao Zedong's "erroneous" view "seriously affected the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement in these countries". It also "had a long history in the international communist movement", and it definitely "should be broken with" (p. 23). You must never advocate such united fronts against one or two superpowers!

Mao Zedong's view did have a long history in the communist movement. As all who have had to use Marxism to fight back against the attacks by phoney"Marxist" helpers of imperialism and social-imperialism on this point know, it was precisely the correct view of Lenin, too. His "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", for instance (in Collected Works, Vol. 22), written in 1916 in the middle of the then raging imperialist war, was aimed precisely at refuting the view of some Dutch and Polish socialists that there could be "no" **national** wars, at least not in Europe, in the imperialist period and that it was "impossible" ever to support the national independence of an imperialist country. He wrote, i.a:

"If Belgium, let us say, is annexed by Germany in 1917, and in 1918 revolts to secure her liberation, the Polish comrades will be against her revolt on the grounds that the Belgian bourgeoisie possess 'the right to oppress foreign peoples'! - There is nothing Marxist or even revolutionary in this argument. If we do not want to betray socialism we **must** support **every** revolt against our chief enemy, the bourgeoisie of the big states, provided it is not the revolt of a reactionary class."

Was this unknown to the RIM Declaration's authors? If you read some of the many articles and books by the chairman of and one other "theoretician" (RW/OR) of the RCP, USA, comrades Bob Avakian and Raymond Lotta, you can see that they at least are very well read in the works of Marx and Lenin. Did they have a hand in, in 1984? This is unknown but does seem likely. Anyway, calling that Declaration "Marxist-Leninist" is a lie.

China's successful foreign policy under the leadership of Mao Zedong, which helped the proletariat in the world and the oppressed peoples and nations enormously and which gave China itself an international prestige which was never greater than in 1976, was one of the important achievements of the Chinese revolution in general and of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, 1966-1976, in particular, which made the leadership remain in the hands of the revolutionary proletariat.

The last five years even have seen an enormous "posthumous victory", so to speak, of that foreign policy. By 1974, the situation in the world described above had developed further so that, against a rising tide of national liberation struggles in or by countries of the third world, of revolutionary struggles by the masses in many other countries as well and even some struggles by capitalist/imperialist countries to shake off foreign domination, the entire imperialist system was being upheld mainly by two superpowers, which also were contending with each other for hegemony, Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism.

Mao Zedong in that year presented his famous and correct analysis of the countries' in the world being divided into three groups, three worlds, neither then nor later forgetting the class struggle continuing also within the different countries, never ceasing to advocate revolutionary war as the way for the proletariat to seize power. And he was at that time already advocating the forging of a broad international united front against the two superpowers, in particular against social-imperialism, and later sought to include not only small and medium-sized imperialist countries, those of the second world, but even certain forces of U.S. imperialism into a united front against Soviet social-imperialism as the then most dangerous source of war, which had put its economy on a military footing and above all was threatening an aggression against Western Europe.

The danger of a war in Europe being started by social-imperialism was a very serious threat in the mid-'70's. Mao Zedong's China and, in Europe itself, above all the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), whose genuinely proletarian revolutionary character enabled it to see the facts, persistently warned about it, while almost the entire bourgeoisie pretended there was "detente". When the Russian new tsarists could not realize their hegemonic plans, their entire empire got into increasing difficulties and by 1989 started to crack. The masses oppressed by it revolted.

The recent partial downfall of that pillar of reaction, Soviet social-imperialism and social-fascism, on the whole greatly has improved the world situation. This upheaval also has caused further economic misery but it will in the long run be very beneficial for the peoples in the world. Bourgeois leaders as one man are calling it "a defeat of communism". That's a good one. Most of those people licked social-imperialism's boots while Mao Zedong and his adherents told all how like Hitler fascism it was.

"Never Unite the Many to Defeat the Few!" "Superpower Lackeys Are the Real Revolutionaries!"

Even louder than at Mao Zedong's correct analysis of the world situation in the '60's, the RIM Declaration howls at his correct analysis of the situation in the '70's and at the immensely important foreign policy decisions which followed from it, which were intensely disliked by that group within U.S. imperialism which had connived at the social-imperialists' aggressive plans because they suited its own counterrevolutionary aims.

Those decisions weren't Mao Zedong's at all, you see! It was

"the revisionists" in China who then "to a large degree" "controlled" its diplomacy! (p. 25) (Precisely when in fact Chairman Mao was receiving more foreign heads of state than ever, precisely when more people than ever listened to his words.) And to advocate unity of the third world was "all wrong"! To portray countries of the second world as intermediate forces was even - "counterrevolutionary"! "The Marxist-Leninists" (who? - perhaps the above-mentioned "uncle" comrades Avakian and Lotta, who both had published books with such attempts) have "correctly refuted" the "revisionist slander" that "the 'Three Worlds Theory' was put forward by" Mao Zedong! (p. 25) It was indeed a "nasty" theory to the superpowers and their helpers.

Here again, one basic principle of this Declaration stands out: By no means must there be a united front against those reactionary forces in the world which at the time are the most dangerous! This "principle" is being upheld by today's "RIMlers", too.

The Declaration does contain many phrases which may look very revolutionary. It even repeats some important truths, including some of those extremely important principles concerning inner-party struggle which were stressed by the Documents of the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC), in 1973. However, it never refers directly to those Documents, which, like practically all the other very important CPC documents of the 1966-76 period, the RIM always has been discouraging people from studying in the original. And, significantly, it leaves one thing out which, i.e., precisely hits at the RIM's line:

"It is imperative to note that one tendency covers another. The opposition to Chen Tu-hsiu's Right opportunism which advocated 'all alliance, no struggle' covered Wang Ming's 'Left' opportunism which advocated 'all struggle, no alliance'. The rectification of Wang Ming's 'Left' deviation covered Wang Ming's Right deviation. The struggle against Liu Shao-chi's revisionism covered Lin Biao's revisionism." (CPC's 10th Congress, Zhou Enlai's report, Peking Review 35-36/1973, p. 21)

This element, one tendency covering another, also was present in the struggle within the CPC at that time and played a significant role in the later overthrow of socialism in China, in 1976-78. Here, too, the RIM Declaration grossly falsifies the demonstrable facts of what happened, this time in order to justify the admiration which the RIM always has tried making people feel for its quite particular "heros", the phoney "leftist", in reality ultra-rightist, group of persons who had degenerated into becoming, i.e., superpower lackeys, known as the "Gang of Four".

The "gang" was named so by Mao Zedong, who in 1974 repeatedly urged them to stop functioning as a such. Their leader, Jiang Qing, in 1972 already, through a series of secret unauthorized interviews with historian Roxane Witke, had started seeking U.S. support for herself as "Dowager Empress" after Mao Zedong's death. Even better suited their line social-imperialism. The CPC's CC's two decisions, proposed by Mao Zedong, on 7. 4.1976 to dismiss the publicly criticized openly-rightist Deng Xiaoping and to appoint Hua Guofeng First Vice-Chairman also hit the "gang", whose member Zhang Chunqiao had "outranked" Hua Guofeng but was "bypassed" as less to be trusted.

Mao Zedong at CPC meetings towards the end of his life repeatedly sharply criticized not only Deng Xiaoping and his "right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts" of 1975-76 but also Jiang Qing's phoney "left" reactionary line, explicitly warning against her "wild ambitions" of "becoming CPC chairman" and even saying: "After I die, she will make trouble".

This the Gang of Four did. Less than a month after Mao Zedong's death (9.9.1976) they attempted a coup to seize power.

How Was Socialism Overthrown in China, How Did the Marxist-Leninists Analyze This and What Has Been the RIM's Fairy Tale about It?

The phoney"left" gang was dealt a decisive blow and its coup attempt foiled when all its four members were arrested on 6.10. 1976 by the forces of Hua Guofeng, who publicly promised to continue Mao Zedong's line completely and thus also continue the criticism against the "traditional"-rightist Deng Xiaoping.

This blow against the long-hated Gang of Four, therefore, received massive and enthusiastic support from the Chinese people and also from genuinely Marxist-Leninist forces abroad.

But the RIM, e.g. in its Declaration (pp. 25-27), portrays this blow as "the counterrevolutionary coup d'état in China". This "theory" is not only obviously very strange, it also defies the facts. How could suddenly, in revolutionary China, a coup d'état have succeeded without at least great turmoil; why wasn't there mass resistance against the action hitting Mao Zedong's "closest comrades in arms"(!), as the Declaration calls the gang? What really is inferred here, together with the untruth that China's diplomacy "to a large degree" was controlled by revisionists, is: The great beacon of the early '70:s, China, was "half revisionist". It's pure fantasy, aimed at promoting "Gang-of-Four-ism" today.

What actually happened was that Deng Xiaoping's right-deviationist group utilized the damage caused and threatened by the phoney"left" clique and the intense hatred it caused, to further their own purposes step by step, secretly being joined by Hua Guofeng's group, who as early as in November, 1976, started breaking their promise wholly to uphold Mao Zedong's line.

One revolutionary party in the world - as far as I know - analyzed this correctly: the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany. Comrade Gonzalo's PCP (fraction), for instance, never did show an understanding of it. It never distanced itself from the Gang of Four and, even before its "RIM days", held some correspondingly phoney"left" views on international issues.

Such a stand, as taken by an isolated revolutionary party in a comparatively backward country like Peru, may well be judged to be an honest and relatively harmless mistake.

It takes on a different character when propagandized internationally and systematically since 1984 by an entity such as the RIM. This all comrades inside or outside the RIM must see.

The RIM's Utter Silence on a Historic Reverse By the Bourgeoisie, Led by U.S. Imperialism, And What This Reverse Must Mean

During the decade before the RIM Declaration was written, a series of mutually interconnected issues had risen to great importance, at least in Europe: The extremely reactionary anti-growth, anti-nuclear-energy, anti-science, anti-technology and anti-industry campaigns instigated by the most right-wing bourgeoisie, including the revisionists, in general and by U.S. imperialism in particular. And it was the preceding phoney"Marxists" who had provided and misled those groups of ignorant people who supported these assaults on vital interests of the masses, mainly under the upside-down pretext of "environmental protection".

These attacks, which continue today, with ever more bourgeois forces behind them, stem from the bourgeoisie's fear that the technological and industrial development might make conditions ripe for a revolutionary workers' movement which would endanger their entire rule in the world. Marx even noted the beginnings of this fear some 140 years ago, pointing out: "Steam, electricity and spinning machine were revolutionaries of a much more dangerous character than even the citizens Barbès, Raspail and Blanqui." (Speech in London, 14.4.1856)

Today the bourgeoisie on certain vital points already completely have reversed their earlier striving for more and more industry, better and better technology. In most so-called "advanced" countries, they are retreating from nuclear energy, in part even from the use of oil; they are advancing backwards into the coal age, even into the windmill age, are systematically creating mass unemployment and tearing down earlier welfare systems.

Clearly, all this calls for radical counterattack by the Marxist-Leninists. Such has been delivered by one, only one, party, the former KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), which thereby also, when it was still revolutionary, gruesomely further unmasked the earlier phoney"Marxists". And what do the RIM and its Declaration say on this enormous subject? Not one word. Again, the RIM's standpoint greatly pleases, above all, U.S. imperialism, which is engineering anti-nuclear-energy campaigns and other foul things in the world and greatly fears those counterattacks against them which only our ideology, actual Marxism, makes possible.

In order also to reverse the reversal, the proletariat must strike down the bourgeoisie's rule in the world completely, and the genuine Marxist-Leninists must begin to do some uniting.

NOTES: 1. **On the author:** Since decades back, there is no Marxist-Leninist party in Sweden. In pamphlets, leaflets etc published since 1974 I've been advocating the creation of one. I've studied CPC writings since 1973 and was even more influenced by representatives of the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) who because of persecution in Berlin(West) and West Germany at the time were in exile in Malmö 1972-76. That party's line proved very effective in practice here. I continued close cooperation with that party until April, 1990, when I criticized it as now bourgeois. See my article (in German): "EINE KRITIK der bürgerlichen Politik der KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), oder wie sie nunmehr heißt, und ihres Vorsitzenden Klaus Sender, 1989 / Mitte 1990", August-September, 1990. Since 1990, some mutual exchange of publications has continued.

2. **On the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT):** Address: Verlag NEUE EINHEIT, Körnebachstrasse 50, 44143 Dortmund, Germany, or: Postfach 309, 10973 Berlin, Germany; tel. (49) (0)231-83 89 32, (49) (0)30-693 74 70. Chairman: Klaus Sender. Among its earlier publications are some extremely important articles, urgently recommended for study. Mostly available only in German. Statement, Oct '78, and article on international situation, '73, available in English from me. An important series of pamphlets by Klaus Sender ('86 etc) point out some serious errors by Lenin, i.a. on panslavism.

3. **On other addresses:** Magazine A World to Win, Information Bureau of the RIM, IEC have BCM World to Win, BCM RIM and BCM IEC, respectively; all: 27 Old Gloucester Street, London WC1N 3XX, U.K. Weekly RCP paper Revolutionary Worker / Obrero Revolucionario: RCP Publications, Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, IL60654, USA Voie Prolétarienne (monthly: Partisan, magazines: Cahiers): BP No. 95, 93803 Epinay/Seine cedex, France