



Proletarians of all countries, united!

**THE IMMORTAL PARIS COMMUNE
OPENED THE WAY OF
THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION**

**Central Committee
Communist Party of Perú
March 2021**



2021: year in defense of Maoism

THE IMMORTAL PARIS COMMUNE OPENED THE WAY OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

On March 18, 1871, the world changed forever. The working class of Paris rebelled against the bourgeois government of France and, daring to take heaven for assault, they conquered political power, establishing the glorious Paris Commune, which, although it lasted only 72 days, it marked the first milestone of the world proletarian revolution.

Armed with the *Communist Party Manifesto* of 1848 (program of the international proletariat) and organised in the glorious International Association of Workers (the First International), the European proletariat developed its first actions politically independent against the bourgeoisie. It fell to the French proletariat, leading the resistance in the face of Prussian aggression and the national betrayal of the capitalist bourgeoisie and feudal nobility, to discover, as Engels said, the way at last resolved to end the capitalist state: “*Look at the Paris Commune: Here is the dictatorship of the proletariat!*”.

The masses of Paris, led by the working class, declared on March 18 in town armed, abolishing the old army and they

elected the Central Committee of the National Guard made up mainly of workers, a leadership that took over the entire economic, political and ideological activity of the capital, radiating their example throughout France. While the Commune raised the red flag to replace the tricolor one, the government of Thiers fled to Versailles, where he conspired with the Prussian aggressors to crush workers insurrection. The Prussian Bismarck, in exchange for money and territory, handed over his French prisoners, so that Thiers would have soldiers to confront and defeat the Commune. In the bloody week of May 21-28, 1871, the heroic resistance of the proletariat defended neighborhood by neighborhood, house by house, man by man the new workers power; the masses gave their blood, their lives, their children and finally they burned hated feudal and bourgeois symbols until they succumbed on the 28th, in which the last worker defended the last barricade by giving his life. The monstrous massacre led by the dwarf Thiers, which killed 30,000 men, women and children, most of them shot, who imprisoned tens of thousands, who exiled another tens of thousands; that vile massacre showed on the one hand, the real murderous nature of the bourgeoisie when threatened their power, and on the other hand, the worker and popular heroism that took up the challenge revolutionary, knowing that they would pay a high cost.

The historical significance of this feat is immortal. The principles and great lessons of the Commune were established

forever in *The Civil War in France* (Karl Marx, 1871) and in the *Introduction* written by Frederick Engels for its 1891 edition.

In 1872, derived from the great experience of the Commune, the AIT approved Marx's proposal in its *Statutes*:

In its struggle against the united power of the possessing classes, the proletariat only can act as a class constituting itself a political party different and opposed to all the old political parties created by the propertied classes.

This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable for ensure the triumph of the Social Revolution and its supreme goal: the abolition of classes.

The coalition of the forces of the working class, already achieved by the economic struggle, should also serve as a lever in their fight against the political power of their exploiters.

Since the lords of the land and capital always use their political privileges to defend and perpetuate their economic monopolies and to subdue the work, the conquest of political power has become the great duty of the proletariat.

In *State and Revolution* Lenin sums up the experience of the Commune:

Chapter III. STATE AND REVOLUTION. THE EXPERIENCE OF PARIS COMMUNE, 1871. MARX ANALYSIS

1. WHAT DOES THE HEROISM OF THE COMMUNARDS ATTEMPT CONSIST OF?

It is known that a few months before the Commune, in the autumn of 1870, Marx warned the workers of Paris and shower them that the attempt to overthrow the government would be folly dictated by despair. But when in March 1871, the decisive combat was imposed on the workers and they accepted it, when insurrection was a fact, Marx greeted the proletarian revolution with the most great enthusiasm, despite all the bad omens. Marx did not cling to pedantic condemnation of an “extemporaneous” movement, such as the sadly famous Plejanov, Russian renegade of Marxism, who in November 1905 had encouraged the workers and peasants to fight and after December 1905 he began to

shout like any liberal: “They shouldn’t have taken up arms!”.

On the other hand, Marx was not content only with being enthusiastic about the heroism of the communards, who, in his words, “took heaven by storm”. Marx saw in that revolutionary mass movement, [...] one practical step more important than hundreds of programs and reasoning. Analysing this experience, drawing from it tactical teachings, reviewing his theory in light of it: here is how Marx conceived his mission.

The only “correction” that Marx deemed necessary to introduce into Communist Manifesto was made by him on the basis of the revolutionary experience of the communards of Paris.

The last prologue to the new German edition of the Communist Manifesto, signed by its two authors, is dated June 24, 1872. In this prologue the authors, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, say that the program of Communist Manifesto is ‘now out of date in certain points’.

*“[...] The Commune has mainly shown that *the working class does not can simply take possession of the existing state machine and start it up for their own purposes*”.*

*The words enclosed in asterisks in this quote were taken by their authors from Marx's work *The Civil War in France*.*

[...] Marx's idea is that the working class must destroy, break the "existing state machine" and not just take it over.

On April 12, 1871, precisely in the middle of the Commune, Marx wrote to Kugelmann:

"If you look at the last chapter of my 18th Brumaire, you will see that I expose as the next attempt of the French Revolution, not to pass off a few hands to others the bureaucratic-military machine, as it had been doing until now, but to demolish it [underlined by Marx; in the original: 'zerbrechen'], and this is just the precondition of all true popular revolution on the continent. In this, precisely, the attempt of our heroic comrades from Paris".

In these words: "break the bureaucratic-military machine of the State", it is closed, concisely expressed, the fundamental teaching of Marxism regarding the tasks of the proletariat regarding the State during revolution. And this teaching is precisely the one that not only forgets at all, but also

misrepresents directly the prevailing interpretation, Kautskian, of Marxism!

[...]

2. BY WHAT SHOULD THE STATE MACHINE BE REPLACE ONCE DESTROYED?

[...] In The Civil War in France, Marx submits experience of the Commune to the most careful analysis, however brief this experience may have been. Let us quote the most important of this work:

“In the 19th century it was developed from the Middle Ages ‘the centralised power of the State with its omnipresent organs: the permanent army, the police, the bureaucracy, the clergy and the magistracy”. With the development of class antagonism between capital and work, ‘the power of the State was increasingly acquiring the character of a public power for the oppression of work, the character of a machine of domination of class.

After each revolution, which marked a step forward in the class struggle, the character purely oppressor of State power was more and more prominent. After the revolution of 1848-1849 the power of the State became a 'national weapon of war of capital against work'. The Second Empire consolidates it. 'The direct antithesis of the Empire was the Commune. [...] It was the definite form [...] of that republic that was not to abolish only the monarchical form of class domination, but class domination itself [...]'.

What, concretely, had this "defined" form of proletarian, socialist republic consisted of? What was the new created State?

"[...] The first decree of the Commune was [...] the suppression of the permanent army to replace it by armed people [...]".

"[...] The Commune was made up of municipal councilors elected by universal suffrage in the various districts of Paris. They were responsible and they could be revoked at any time. Most of its members were, naturally, workers or recognised representatives of the working class [...]. The police, which until then had been an instrument of

the central government, was immediately stripped of all its political attributes and turned into an instrument of the Commune, responsible to it and revocable at all times [...]. And the same was done with the officials of all other branches of the administration [...]. From the members of the Commune to Botton, all those who held public office did it for a worker's salary. All privileges and expenses of representation of the high dignitaries of the State disappeared [...]. Once the standing army and the police have been suppressed, instruments of the material force of the old government, the Commune hastened to destroy also the force of spiritual oppression, the power of the priests [...]. Judicial official lost their apparent independence [...]. In the future they were to be publicly elected, be responsible and revocable [...].”

[...] It is particularly remarkable one of the measures decreed by the Commune, which Marx emphasises: the abolition of all representation expenses, of all pecuniary privileges of civil servants, the reduction of the salaries of all civil servants at the level of a “worker's salary”. Here is precisely where the turn of bourgeois democracy is expressed in a more evident way towards proletarian democracy, from the democracy of the oppressing class towards democracy of the oppressed classes, from the State

as a “special force” for the repression of a certain class towards the repression of the oppressors by the joint force of the majority of the people, the workers and the peasants. And it is precisely at this very evident point —perhaps the most important, regarding the question of State— where Marx’s teachings have been most relegated to oblivion! [...]

“The Commune”, wrote Marx, “realised this commonplace of all bourgeois revolutions that is a cheap government, when destroying the two major sources of expenditure: the standing army and the bureaucracy of the State”.

[...]

3. THE ABOLITION OF PARLIAMENTARIANISM

“The Commune, wrote Marx, should be not a parliamentary corporation, but a labor corporation, legislative and executive at the same time [...].

Rather than deciding once every three to six years which members of the ruling class must represent and crush

[verund zertreten] the people in parliament, universal suffrage should serve the people, organised in communes, just as individual suffrage serves the employers to find workers, inspectors and accountants bound for their business”.

[...]

Decide once every certain number of years which members of the ruling class are to oppress and crush the people in Parliament: Here is the true essence of bourgeois parliamentarian, not only in constitutional monarchies, but also in the more democratic republics.

[...]

4. ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITY OF THE NATION

“[...] In the brief outline of national organization that the Commune did not have time to develop, it is clearly stated that the Commune should be [...] the political form

even of the smallest village in the country” [...]. The communes would elect the ‘national delegation’ of Paris.

“[...] The few but important functions that the government would maintain would not be abolished (as consciously falsifying the truth has been said), but would be performed by communal officials, that is, strictly responsible.

[...] It was not destroying the unity of the nation, but on the contrary, organising it through a communal regime. The unity of the nation should become a reality by destroying that power of the State that pretended to be the embodiment of this unit, but wanted to be independent of the nation and to be situated above it. In fact, this power of the State was nothing more than a parasitic outgrowth in the body of the nation [...]. The task was to amputate the organs purely repressive of the old State power and take away its legitimate functions of an authority that seeks to place itself over society, to return them to the servers responsible for this”.

[...]

5. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PARASITE STATE

We have already quoted the words of Marx concerning this point, and we are going to complete them here:

“Generally, new historical creations are destined to be taken for a reproduction of the outdated old forms of social life with which the new institutions present a certain likeness. Thus, also this new Commune, which comes to destroy [bricht: break] modern State power, has been regarded as a resurrection of medieval communes [...] as a federation of small states, according to the dream of Montesquieu and the Girondists [...] as an exaggerated form of the old struggle against excessive centralism.

[...] On the contrary, the communal regime would have returned to the social organism all the forces that until then had been devouring the ‘State’, parasite that is nourished at the expense of society and hinders its free movement. With this fact the regeneration of France would have started [...].

The communal regime would have placed rural producers under the ideological direction of the capitals of their

provinces and would have offered them here, in the city workers, the natural representatives of their interests. The very existence of the Commune implied, as something obvious, a local autonomy regime, but no longer as a counterweight to a Power of the State that would now be superfluous”.

“Destruction of State power”, which was a “parasitic excrescence”, his “amputation”, its “crushing”, “a power of the State that would now be superfluous”: This is how Marx expresses himself when speaking about the State, valuing and analysing the experience of the Commune.

[...]

“[...] The variety of interpretations to which the Commune has been subjected and the variety of interests that have found expression in it show that it was a perfectly flexible political form, unlike previous forms of government, which had all been essentially repressive. Here is its real secret: the Commune was, in essence, the government of the working class, fruit of the struggle of the producing class against the appropriating class, the

political form, finally discovered, under which it could be carried out the economic emancipation of work [...].

Without this last condition, the communal regime would have been an impossibility and an imposture”.

[...]

The Commune is the form “discovered at last” by proletarian revolution, under which it can be achieved economic emancipation of work.

The Commune is the first attempt of the proletarian revolution to destroy the bourgeois state machine, and the political form, "discovered, at last", which can and must replace the destroyed.

In March 1908, Lenin once again synthesised the lessons of the Commune:

Teachings of the Commune

After the coup that put an end to the revolution of 1848, France fell for 18 years under the yoke of the Napoleonic regime, which led the country not only to economic ruin, but also to national humiliation. By revolting against the old

regime, the proletariat assumed two tasks, one national and the other of class: liberating France from German invasion and liberating workers through socialism. This combination of the two tasks constitutes the most peculiar feature of the Commune.

The bourgeoisie then formed the “government of national defense”, under whose leadership the proletariat had to fight for the independence of the whole nation. It was, in reality, a government “of national treason”, which considered its mission was to fight the Parisian proletariat. But the proletariat, blinded by patriotic illusions, did not realise it. The patriotic idea started from the 18th century Great Revolution; it seized the brains of the Commune socialists, and Blanqui, for example, who was undoubtedly a revolutionary and a fervent supporter of socialism, could not find a better title for his newspaper than the anguished bourgeois cry: “Homeland is in danger!”.

The combination of these contradictory tasks —patriotism and socialism— was the fatal error of French socialists. In the Manifesto of the International, in September 1870, Marx put French proletariat on guard against the danger of being carried away by enthusiasm for a false national idea. Deep changes had taken place since the time of the Great Revolution; class contradictions had become more acute and, if then the fight against the reaction of all Europe

united the whole revolutionary nation, now the proletariat could no longer merge its interests with the interests of other classes that were hostile to it; bourgeoisie had to bear the responsibility of national humiliation; the mission of the proletariat was to fight for socialist emancipation of work against the yoke of the bourgeoisie.

And, indeed, it did not take long for the true background of “bourgeois patriotism” to emerge. After making a shameful peace with Prussians, the government of Versailles proceeded to fulfill its immediate task and made its raid against the armament —terrifying for it— of Parisian proletariat. Workers responded by proclaiming the Commune and declaring civil war. Despite de fact the socialist proletariat was divided into numerous sects, the Commune was a brilliant example of how to unanimously fulfill the democratic tasks that the bourgeoisie only knew how to proclaim. Without any complicated legislation, in all simplicity, the proletariat, which had power, carried out the democratisation of the social regime, abolished the bureaucracy and established the election of officials by the people.

But two mistakes spoiled the fruits of the brilliant victory. The proletariat stopped midway: instead of proceeding to the “expropriation of the expropriators”, it began to dream of the enthronement of the supreme justice in a country

united by a common task for the whole nation; it did not take over institutions like, for example, banks; the theories of the Proudhonists of “just exchange” etc. ruled even among socialists. The second error consisted in the excessive magnanimity of the proletariat: instead of exterminating their enemies, what it should have done, tried to morally influence them, it despised the importance that purely military actions have in civil war and, instead of crowning its victory in Paris with a determined offensive over Versailles, it gave long in time and allowed Versailles government to gather dark forces and get ready for the bloody week of May.

But, despite all its errors, the Commune constitutes a great example of the most important proletarian movement of the 19th century. Marx placed great value on historical scope of the Commune: if, when the Versailles gang staged their treacherous foray to seize the arms of Parisian proletariat, workers would have allowed them to be snatched away without fighting, the fatal demoralisation that such weakness would have sown in the ranks of the proletarian movement would have been far more serious than the damage caused by the losses that the working class suffered by fighting in defense of their weapons. No matter how big the losses of the Commune, its significance for the general struggle of the proletariat has compensated them: the Commune shocked socialist movement in Europe, showed

the force of civil war, dispelled patriotic illusions and put an end to the naive faith in the national yearnings of the bourgeoisie. The Commune taught European proletariat to pose in a concrete way the tasks of socialist revolution.

The proletariat will not forget the lesson received. Working class will take advantage of it, as it has already taken advantage of in Russia during December insurrection.

The time that preceded and prepared revolution bears some resemblance to the time of Napoleonic yoke in France. Also in Russia the autocratic clique led the country to the horrors of economic ruin and national humiliation. But revolution could not break out for a long time, until social development created the precise conditions for a mass movement. Despite all its heroism, the isolated attacks on the government during pre-revolutionary period crashed against the indifference of popular masses. Just Social Democracy, with a persevering and methodical work, managed to educate the masses until they reach the highest forms of struggle: actions of masses and civil war with arms in hand.

Social Democracy knew how to put an end to the “national” and “patriotic” errors of young proletariat, and when the manifesto of 17 October, in which it participated, the proletariat began to energetically prepare for the next inevitable stage of the revolution: armed insurrection. Free

of “national” illusions, it concentrated its class forces in its mass organizations: soviets of workers and soldiers deputies, etc. And despite the great difference between the objectives and the tasks of Russian revolution and those of the French one of 1871, Russian proletariat had to resort to the same method of struggle that Paris Commune had been the first to use: civil war. Keeping its teachings in mind, they knew that proletariat must not despise the peaceful means of struggle that serve its current interests of each day and they are indispensable in the preparatory period of revolutions. But proletariat must never forget that, in certain conditions, class struggle takes the form of armed struggle and civil war; there are times when the interests of proletariat demand a relentless extermination of enemies in open field combat. French proletariat demonstrated it for the first time in the Commune, and Russian proletariat gave a brilliant confirmation in the December uprising.

It does not matter that these two great uprisings of the working class have been crushed. A new uprising will come and the forces of the enemies of the proletariat will prove weak. It will give complete victory to socialist proletariat.

On the 40th anniversary of the Commune, Lenin writes an important published document in April 1911.

In memory of the Commune

Forty years have passed since the proclamation of Paris Commune. According to established custom, French proletariat honored with meetings and demonstrations the memory of revolution men in March 18, 1871. At the end of May they bring wreaths of flowers to the graves of the 'communards' shot, victims of the terrible "May Week", and in front of them they will again swear that they will fight tirelessly until the total triumph of their ideas, until fully comply with the work they bequeathed to them.

Why does proletariat, not only the French one, but all over the world, honor the men of Paris Commune as their predecessors? Which is the inheritance of the Commune?

The Commune arose spontaneously, no one prepared it conscious or systematically. The unfortunate war with Germany; privations during the siege; unemployment among the proletariat and the ruin of the petty bourgeoisie; the outrage of the masses against the upper classes and the authorities, who had demonstrated an absolute incapacity; the dull effervescence in the working class, unhappy with its situation and anxious for a new social regime; the reactionary composition of the National Assembly, which made fear for the fate of the Republic; all this and many other causes combined to promote Paris population to March 18 revolution, which unexpectedly put the power in

the hands of the National Guard, in the hands of working class and the petty bourgeoisie, which had joined it.

It was an unprecedented historical event. Until then power had been, as a rule, in the hands of landlords and capitalists, that is to say, of their attorneys, who constituted the so-called government. After the revolution of March 18, when Thiers government fled Paris with his troops, his police and his officials, the people were in control of the situation and the power passed into proletariat hands. But in modern society the proletariat, economically overwhelmed by capital, cannot dominate politically if they do not break the chains that bind him to capital. Hence Commune movement should inevitably acquire a socialist tinge, in other words, it should tend to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie, of the domination of capital, to the destruction of the very foundations of the contemporary social regime.

At first it was a very mixed and confusing movement. They adhered the patriots in the hope that the Commune would resume the war against Germans, leading it to a successful outcome. They were also supported by small shopkeepers, in danger of ruin if debts of rents were not deferred (postponement denied by the government, but the Commune granted them). Finally, at the beginning the bourgeois republicans (fearing that the reactionary

National Assembly, the “rural”, the savage landowners, will reestablish the monarchy), to some degree, sympathised with it. But the fundamental role in this movement was played, naturally, by the workers (especially the artisans of Paris), among which an intense socialist propaganda was carried out in the last years of the Second Empire, and even many of them were affiliated with the International.

Only the workers remained faithful to the Commune until the end. Bourgeois republicans and petty bourgeoisie quickly departed from it: some were frightened by the revolutionary socialist character of the movement, by its proletarian character; others turned away from it when they saw that it was doomed to an inevitable defeat. Only French proletarians supported their government, without fear or fainting, only they fought and died for it, that is, for the emancipation of the working class, for a better future for workers.

Abandoned by its allies of yesterday and without any support, the Commune had to be inevitably defeated. All France bourgeoisie, all landowners, stockbrokers and manufacturers, all large and small thieves, all exploiters, united against it. With the help of Bismarck (who released 100,000 French soldiers imprisoned by Germans to crush revolutionary Paris), this bourgeois coalition managed to confront with Parisian proletariat the ignorant peasants

and provinces petty bourgeoisie, and they surrounded half of Paris with an iron circle (the other half had been encircled by German army). In some big cities in France (Marseille, Lyon, Saint-Etienne, Dijon and others) the workers also tried take power, proclaim the Commune and come to the aid of Paris, but these attempts quickly failed. And Paris, which had been the first to fly the banner of proletarian insurrection, was left to its own forces and condemned to certain death.

For a social revolution to succeed, it needs at least two terms: a high development of the productive forces and a proletariat prepared for it. But in 1871 both conditions were lacking. French capitalism was still underdeveloped and France was then, in fundamental, a country of petty bourgeoisie (artisans, peasants, shopkeepers, etc.). On the other hand, there were no workers party, and the working class was not prepared or had had long training, and for the most part they do not clearly understand what their goals were and how they could achieve them. There was not a serious political organisation of the proletariat, no strong unions, no societies cooperatives [...]

But what the Commune lacked was, mainly, time, the possibility of realise the situation and undertake the realisation of its program. It had not had time to start the task, when the government entrenched in Versailles and,

supported by all the bourgeoisie, it began military operations against Paris. The Commune had to think first of all in its own defense. And until the end, which happened in the week of May 21-28, it could not seriously think of anything else.

However, despite these unfavorable conditions and the brevity of its existence, the Commune adopted some measures that sufficiently characterise its true meaning and its objectives. The Commune replaced the regular army, a blind instrument in the hands of the ruling classes, and it armed all the people; it proclaimed the separation of the Church from the State; it abolished the cult subsidy (that is, the salary that the State paid to the clergy) and gave a strictly layman to public instruction, which dealt a strong blow to the gendarmes in cassock. It was able to do little in the purely social field, but that little shows with sufficient clarity its character of popular government, of worker government: night work in bakeries was prohibited; fines system was abolished, that looting consecrated by law that victimised workers; finally, the famous decree was promulgated by virtue of which all factories and all workshops abandoned or paralysed by their owners were handed over to the workers' cooperatives, in order to resume production. And to underline its character as a truly democratic and proletarian government, the Commune ordered that the remuneration of all administration and

government civil servants was not higher than the normal worker salary, nor in no case exceed 6,000 francs a year (less than 200 rubles monthly).

All these measures eloquently showed that the Commune was a deadly threat to the old world, based on oppression and exploitation. That was the reason that bourgeois society could not sleep peacefully while in the Paris City Council will wave the red flag of the proletariat. And when the organised government force was finally able to dominate the poorly organised force of the revolution, Bonapartist generals, those generals beaten by Germans and brave in front of their defeated compatriots, those French Rénnenkampf and Meller-Zakomielski, made a slaughter never seen in Paris. About 30,000 Parisians were killed by rampant soldierly; about 45,000 were arrested and many of them subsequently executed; thousands were exiled or sentenced to forced labor. In total, Paris lost about 100,000 of its children, including the best workers in all trades.

Bourgeoisie was happy. “Now socialism is over for a long time!”, said his boss, the bloodthirsty dwarf Thiers, when he and his generals drowned in blood the uprising of Paris proletariat. But those bourgeois crows vainly squawked. After six years of being crushed the Commune, when many of its fighters were still imprisoned or in exile, a new

workers' movement began in France. New socialist generation, enriched by the experience of its predecessors, whose defeat had not discouraged it at all, picked up the flag that had fallen from the hands of the fighters of the Commune and firmly carried it forward with audacity, shouting: "Long live social revolution! Long live the Commune!". And three or four years later, a new workers' party and the agitation raised by it in the country force the ruling classes to release the 'communards' who were still imprisoned by the government.

The memory of Commune fighters is honored not only by French workers, but also by the proletariat all over the world, since it did not fight for a local or narrowly national goal, but for the emancipation of all working humanity, of all the humiliated and offended. As a vanguard fighter of social revolution, the Commune has won the sympathy in all places where proletariat suffers and struggles. The epic of its life and death, the example of a workers' government that conquered and retained in its hands for more than two months the capital of the world, the spectacle of the heroic struggle of the proletariat and its sufferings after defeat, all this has raised the moral of millions of workers, it has raised their hopes and has earned their sympathies for socialism. The thunder of the guns of Paris has awakened from their deep sleep the most backward layers of the proletariat and has everywhere given a boost to

revolutionary socialist propaganda. For this reason the cause of the Commune has not died, for this reason it continues to live to this day in each one of us.

The cause of the Commune is the cause of social revolution, it is the cause of the complete political and economic emancipation of the workers, is the cause of world proletariat. And in this sense it is immortal.

Applying Commune lessons, Chairman Mao Tsetung developed the socialist construction and the Proletarian Great Cultural Revolution to ward off the restoration of capitalism.

In April 1958, 43,000 peasants from 27 agricultural cooperatives in the province of Junán agree to form the first popular commune. The masses gave it this name on account of the memory of Paris Commune, although the name of communist commune was discarded. Chairman Mao when visiting them stated: *“The name of popular commune is magnificent”, “It is good to establish popular communes”, “It has a great future”, “Better establish a popular commune than a huge farm. The advantage of the popular commune is that it combines in a single organisation industry, agriculture, commerce, education, medical and military service”*. Whithat guidance the CCP spread: *“Communist construction in our country is not something of remote future. We must establish actively popular communes and explore a concrete way to carry out the communism”*. At the end of October 1958, 120 million families, equivalent to almost the entirety of

the Chinese peasantry, was organised into popular communes. This great socialist experience was dismantled with the restoration of capitalism in China, which implemented privatisation and made the communes disappear in the early 1980s.

The question of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a fundamental question in the struggle between Marxism and revisionism and so it was especially during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Chairman Mao highlighting this stated: *“Why did Lenin speak of the need to exercise dictatorship over bourgeoisie? This problem must be clear. Lack of clarity on this will lead to revisionism. The whole nation must know it”*. Raising the need for the GPCR, he specified that revisionists *“resorted to material incentives, they put profits in command and, instead of promoting proletarian politics, they gave prizes and the like”*, *“This shows that revolution has not finished”*. Thus, developing Marxism-Leninism, he establish that the dictatorship of the proletariat will require several cultural revolutions in its march to communism. The beginning of the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie is a imperishable principle bequeathed to us by the Paris Commune.

And about this first milestone in the conquest of proletarian power, let's see what Chairman Gonzalo teaches us:

The Paris Commune initially contributed to the need for prior destruction of the bourgeois State. If we remember that “The State is only a machine for the oppression of one class by another” (Engels), popular insurrection, which brought the proletariat to power, could not and cannot maintain the apparatus that precisely serves to exploit it. And the Commune proved that the first thing that the triumphant proletariat must do is to dismantle the expired machinery of the State to raise a power that corresponds to new ends.

[...] the dictatorship of the proletariat, against which the revisionists have always risen; speaking of these revisionists Engels said in 1890 these words of current value: “The phrase ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ has once again plunged holy horror to the philistine Social Democratic”. But, despite everything, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the necessary path to proletarian revolution (1963).

Marx and Engels assumed that workers must fight themselves for their emancipation as a class and that the economic emancipation of the proletariat is “the great end to which every political movement must be subordinated as a means”; they raised the need for the working class to organise as a party to fight for their own class interests, to seize power and, consequently, serve its goal, the fulfillment of its historical goal: the abolition of classes and the

construction of a new society without exploiters or oppressors (1976).

“Making history would obviously be very comfortable, if the fight was undertaken only with absolutely certain probabilities of victory.

The scoundrels bourgeois of Versailles had put the Parisians in front of this alternative: either accept the challenge or surrender without fighting. The demoralisation of working class in the latter case, would have been a much greater misfortune than the loss of as many leaders as you want” (Marx).

We have analysed this quote in the IX Plenary. We have to learn from Marx’s words. We cannot expect all the struggles we undertake to have absolute probabilities of victory, certainty of triumph; it is wishful; the circumstances put in a dilemma: accept the challenge or surrender without combat, without quarrel. Surrender is capitulation and it is a much greater loss. Marx says: “[...] loss of as many leaders as you want”. The prestige of an organisation cannot be defended by avoiding the fulfillment of its obligation. [...] we cannot more than subject ourselves to what Marx says: we cannot wait for the fight with absolute

odds of victory. We must strive, we know we will succeed, but first, the price will have to be paid, even in leaders, in command. No matter the loss even of leaders, he tells us. It will lead us to firmly assume our obligation to the Party (1980).

The international proletarian movement is the theory and practice of the international proletariat. The proletariat struggles on three planes: theoretical, political and economic, and since it appears in History as the last class, it fights, highlighting the following milestones: 1848, when the Communist Manifesto, written by Marx and Engels, lays the foundations and program of the proletariat; 1871, the Paris Commune, where for the first time the proletariat takes power; 1905, revolution general essay; 1917, triumph of October Revolution in Russia, the class establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat and opens a new era; 1949, triumph of Chinese revolution, the dictatorship is established led by the proletariat, and the passage to socialist revolution is resolved, changing the correlation of forces in the world; and in the 1960s, with the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution led by Chairman Mao Tsetung, the revolution continues under the dictatorship of the proletariat in a sharp struggle between restoration and counter-restoration. (1988)

Marx has taught us: insurrection is not played, revolution is not played; but when one raises the insurrection, when one takes up arms, one does not lower the flag, they maintain it victoriously until the triumph, without ever lowering it; so he taught us, no matter how much it costs! (1988)

Several times we have seen the example of French Revolution, 1789, but only the bourgeoisie settled in power in 1871, a hundred years later; meanwhile, there are several restorations, or not?, even an empire, the one that collapses precisely in 1970, that of Napoleon III [...]. Lenin already taught us when they had a setback in a Congress, what did he say?: “Do not whine”. Did not he say that? One does not cry due to setbacks or defeats: one draws lessons from them. What we have to see is how power of the dictatorship of the proletariat is established and is advancing, and these advances are undeniable: 1871, Commune, ephemeral, but Commune, new power, dictatorship of the proletariat for the first time realised on Earth. (1988)

In 1990, in *Elections, no! People’s war, Yes!* these quotes are highlighted in the topic on class struggle:

“In all revolutions, alongside true revolutionaries, there are men of another nature. Some of them, survivors of

past revolutions, who retain devotion to them, with no vision of the current movement; but still owners of their influence in the people, due to their recognised honesty and bravery, or simply due to tradition strength; others, simple charlatans, who, by repeating the same stereotypical declamations against the government year after year, smuggled in a reputation as full-blown revolutionaries. After March 18, some such men did also turn up, and in some cases contrived to play pre-eminent parts. To the extent possible within their power, they hindered the real action of the working class, as well as others of their kind hindered the full development of all previous revolutions. They constitute an inevitable evil; with time it gets out of way; but the Commune had not time.” (Marx)

“By destroying the existing conditions of oppression by surrendering all means of work to the producing workers, and forcing in this way every individual physically able to work to earn life, the sole basis of class domination and oppression will be eliminated. But before such a change can be consummated, a dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary, and its first premise is an army of the proletariat.” (Marx)

Later, Chairman Gonzalo continues, stating:

It can also be observed how the theoretical foundation of the conception goes hand in hand with the organisation and the advice of the class, reaching the organisation of the Communists in the First International, and all this struggle leads to the Commune of 1871; it is the first milestone of the proletariat in the conquest of power; it is very expressive, without ideology cannot be organised, and it is organised to conquer power, the course of '48 to '71 demonstrates this. In '67 it was published the Volume I of The Capital, the only one published in life, and then he wrote The Civil War in France. Here are the characters of the old power, the revolutionary violence, how the Commune was a landmark of the proletariat in the new power, the need of an own army, constructive aspect of the war, what to destroy, the insufficiency of an immature party, the difficulties involved in the fact that it does not lead; he foresaw it would be defeated, but he said this proletariat struggle must be supported, because the class had been challenged, caught by the lapels and, being summoned, it was a need to respond, not to flee; it was when he said that the moral of the class was challenged and its fight should be supported, even knowing that it would be defeated. Having being defeated, he said that the class

would no longer be like before, because there is the fact: for the first time it seized power, it proved that the class was mature, it had already learned to take it through revolutionary violence, that the clergy and those who crushed it left only because the Commune existed.

Marx previously considered that the revolution would be in shorter terms, but his magnificent understanding of reality led him to propose that it would not be like that; however, that did not stop from redoubling his work.

We have to think about the result of all this. '72 comes, a Congress of International Association of Workers; at the same time that Marxism was recognised as a class ideology, in that same session, Marx and Engels raised the defense of class position, being guided by it ideology, in opposition to Proudhon's theses, and the fight against Bakunin's anarchism was intensified. It was the last session of the International, the anarchists swarmed all over Europe to split up by invoking unity, accusing Marx and Engels of divide it by imposing a single ideology: Marxism. So the unity has broken and the Association has been divided. It was when Engels pointed out that they had not broken the unit, but the problem was that, if the unit was maintained without principles, the Association would have died assassinated by the unit; therefore, the problem was to defend the ideology to save it from insidious coups, from the

anarchists. The Association was moved to the United States, but it did not work never again, but Marxism remained as ideology.

Thus, difficult times, the communists again dispersed, divided, arteries flow, hypocrisy to divide, they destroy the organisation, but the ideology remains enacted, organically recognised. In short, the International Association of Workers is the recognition of Marxism as the only ideology of the proletariat. In the midst of their constant struggle and failures, the class is armed with its ideology, it already runs its politics, class war like civil war, and it conquered power, although it could not hold it for more than two months.

The next process is the second withdrawal, longer than the first, but in the midst of it we have the masterful vision of Engels, as great as Marx, but not the head by his own decision, recognizing Marx as such; an extraordinary man who was able to carry out the same struggle for the Marxism and fight against revisionism that was beginning to rise. At Prologue to The Civil War in France he made a great balance of 50 years of revolution. He says that the proletariat will not be able to conquer power or defend it in that moment, but in the future, when it creates new ways of fighting and new ways of organisation; what was possible was accumulation of forces, he suggests the use of all forms

of struggle, including parliamentary, until the proletariat could come to conquer power through revolutionary violence; he said that the use in all other ways should serve the future seizure of power by revolutionary violence, which was misrepresented by Kautsky and Eduard Bernstein, who represent the old revisionism, systematised by Engels and thoroughly fought by Lenin. (1993)

The development of the revolutionary movement leads to 1871, when the Paris Commune, when for the first time the proletariat seizes power in its hands and overthrow the bourgeoisie. This is the first great historical milestone in the conquest of the power by the proletariat, which could hold it for only few weeks, not even ten, and it was defeated. Marx, apart from foreseeing that the triumph of the Commune was not possible, concluded that it lacked more revolutionary violence, demolishing the bourgeois State and, the main thing, it lacked a Party to lead it. With this defeat, the proletariat entered the withdrawal of '71, a second and longer withdrawal in the revolution.

In short, during the first withdrawal, a struggle is fought for the foundation of the ideology of the class, the foundations of Marxism are laid, Marxism, which from 1872, after the failure and defeat of the Paris Commune, was recognised as the ideology of the proletariat; the class struggle is developed, the First International was created and worker's

movement is launched; all in the forge of the class struggle, which stirred up leads to the conquest of power by the proletariat in the glorious and imperishable Commune, the first great victory of the international proletariat. And it is so because without ideology you cannot organise, and without organisation you cannot conquer Power. The course from '48 to '71 clearly shows that the class fights, fails and fights again, the class does not fear failure and the failure is relative, the proletariat builds victory through a ladder of failures, in a constant struggle. So it goes on and this is the normal process of the life and struggle of the proletariat.

*In the second retreat Marx continued the reasoning of the the ideology and its unavoidable revolutionary struggle without ever separating theory from practice. Alongside its continuing work in *The Capital*, he wrote *The Civil War in France*, about the Commune, laying down the great Marxist thesis of the dictatorship of the proletariat.*

[...]

Engels, in the same difficult and adverse circumstances, made a masterful analysis of 50 years of proletarian struggle. In 1891 he wrote his famous "Introduction" to 'The Civil War in France' written by Marx, where he said (and

History has convincingly proven it) that the proletariat could not conquer power for a long time, as long as the conditions of political struggle will not change, and the working class will not create new forms of struggle and new form of organisation, especially military ones. He did not say to stop fighting nor renounce the principle of revolutionary violence to seize power, as Kautski and Berstein and their revisionist henchmen misrepresented; but he fought against old revisionism. (1994)

In 2012 Gonzalo Thought, penetrating walls and barbed wire, established:

- I. PUTTING MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM AS THE IDEOLOGY OF THE PROLETARIAT is the specific need of communists in the world in this second decade of the XXI century. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism remains the basis of ideological unity of the communists in the world; therefore, the task is putting Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in command as the ideology of proletariat.*
- II. IT IS THE TASK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES of the world. Assuming it is decisive to unite in function of world proletarian revolution, socialist revolution or democratic revolution.*

III. THE UNION OF COMMUNIST PARTIES is the realisation of proletarian internationalism, and it must be ideological as a guide, political as a general course towards world proletarian revolution, and organisational, beginning with bilateral, local or regional relationships towards the reconstitution of the Third Communist International that assumes the world revolution as a unit.

IV. THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION derived from the general economic crisis of capitalist system in imperialism and globalisation is a concrete reality in this XXI century decade: it calls on communist parties to assume their role of directing it to turn it into a revolutionary crisis and shape the world proletarian revolution.

150 years ago Parisian proletariat, rising as a giant, took the sky for assault, overthrew bourgeois power and established the first dictatorship of the proletariat. It only lasted just over two months, but its beginnings are eternal. From the Commune arose the unbeatable Marxism, the ideology of the proletariat; Lenin developed it to its second stage: Leninism; and Chairman Mao elevated it to a new, third and higher stage: the Maoism.

On the sesquicentennial of the Paris Commune, we pay solemn tribute to the heroic communards, who, defying death, paved the way for the emancipation of the proletariat and all humanity.

LONG LIVE THE EVERLASTING COMMUNE OF PARIS, FIRST
MILESTONE IN THE CONQUEST OF POWER BY THE
PROLETARIAT!

PUT IN COMMAND MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM AS THE
IDEOLOGY OF THE PROLETARIAT!

March 2021

Central Committee
Communist Party of Perú

