

Critique of the Maoist Communist Party of Italy, again

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Critique of the Maoist Communist Party of Italy, again

You call our critique "*A hysterical attack to the Maoist Communist Party of Italy*" and further you declare that it is a "*concentrate of insults, subjective judgments, arbitrary and vulgar criticisms, falsehood, without a precise political purpose except to attack our party*". Well, friends, maybe the tone is a bit harsh, but our critique is quite precise and in no way hysterical. We are very concerned about the evils that are going on, but we know that the left will prevail, worldwide, also in Italy, also in your organization. Therefore, we understand our criticism rather as an encouragement for this left to take up the struggle. In the whole world and in all countries, that is generally our approach. That you call this hysterical shows us that you are only trying to denigrate those within your ranks who converge with our positions or even agree with them completely.

This is a very bad way of conducting the internal two-line struggle [you yourselves make this reference: "*words of Chairman Mao: ' ... in inner-party criticism, guard against subjectivism, arbitrariness and the vulgarization of criticism; statements should be based on facts and criticism should center on politics'* "; our emphasis; *ci-ic.org*] and this has hereby become obvious to everyone.

You write "*it is fully evident from our writing that by*

revolutionary theory we mean the Marxism-LeninismMaoism, including the Mao's developments on the party related to the other two revolutionary instruments (the United Front and the People's Army). For any reader in good faith who knows our writings (and the comrades do), it is also clear, by reading the complete quotation, that there is no opposition between the contributions of Lenin and those of Mao in our statement." and this, unfortunately, is simply not true. *"Lenin demonstrated with the victory of the Socialist October Revolution that this is the only way to transform the imperialist war into a socialist revolution."* Again: *"the only way"*. *The only* means there is no other. That you now clarify that you (allegedly) meant otherwise does not change the correctness of our criticism. It causes confusion. Formulations in political documents express content, express politics, ideology and they are not, as art, subject to interpretation. There are those who seek to oppose Maoism through the denial of the People's War as the universal military strategy of the proletariat, and they do so by counterposing it with the so-called "October road". Your May Day document converges exactly with this. If you now think that this was not done in bad faith, then it is at least sloppiness.

Our dear Italian friends state:

"The document turns out to be an 'improved' version of the letter shortly before sent to our Party by one of the parties belonging the fraction gathered around IC,"

The PCm Italy seems to accuse the existence of forces behind the CI-IC. Yes, once more our friends are fully correct, the CI-IC is not another internet page devoted to virtual or imaginary polemics, it is a propaganda organ with tight links with the masses of the international proletariat and with the communists who struggle for their reunification in the world, it is an achievement, a result of a long process to impulse the development of the International Communist Movement (ICM)

by the Maoists.

Our simple and committed work, which we acknowledge that still suffer from limitations and shortcomings, have achieved important results – like making the Campaign for Maoism resound and to enlase the communists who were dispersed in the most diverse latitudes, from Vietnam, China, Bangladesh, Ukraine, Morocco, etc and to develop the support to the People's Wars in the world.

CI-IC have opened a Tribune for the Debate, where it is published all the critical positions to the proposition for Bases of Discussion written by the CUMIC, in addition to the critical answers and comments that altogether are more than a thousand pages.

In this sense, our Italian friends are right when pointing out the differences between CI-IC and *MaoistRoad*. The *MaoistRoad Blog* is a blog which has no trace of initiative, or any ballast with the real movement of the international proletariat and oppressed peoples of the world.

We ask ourselves, why has the “non-sectarian” Italian blog *MaoistRoad* not published any of the statements defending the proposition of the proposition for Bases for Discussion, like the one written by the comrades from the Communist Maoist Party of Spain, or by the comrades from the Communist Party of Colombia – Red Fraction?

In this blog, when a document from a party does not please their editor, it comes out with the stamp “for debate”. We would ask: which debate? An unaware reader could consider that the editors of such blog would publish a criticism to the referred article afterwards, showing its mistakes and defending the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. To act like that would be to help those who made mistakes to correct the path. To act like that would be to safeguard unity of the International Communist Movement (ICM). However, those

who have dedicated themselves to follow the publications of the referred blog could testify that these documents are unanswered, or even uncommented.

To what correspond the methods of the editors of *MaoistRoad*? This method consist in publishing the materials that interest them and to simply put a negative seal on those that dissent from them, despite hiding the documents that do not correspond to their interests, to avoid at all costs the debate. How should this attitude be qualified?

A less important success, but also meaningful, of CI-IC was to allow groups like the PCm Italy to move away from their previous position that “no two line struggle could take place before the International Conference” and break with their isolation and to participate in the debates of the ICM.

For some time, the Italian comrades accuse us of sectarianism, of factionalism and of having formed a “bloc”. Our Italian friends seem to have not understood the true meaning of the words factionalism and sectarianism.

Chairman Mao has described “sectarianism” as a policy of “closed doors”, as the attitude of a “small sect that considers itself unfailing”. The Great Lenin defined factionalism as “**nominal recognition of unity and actual disunity**”. Let us examine a little more carefully the problem of “sectarianism” and “factionalism” in the ICM.

A great part of the revolutionaries nowadays have not participated or do not know the two-line struggle that has been developed in the last decades of the ICM. There are those who took part directly or indirectly in these struggles, but who have forgotten its main lessons or that, after many years, have a blurred and even distorted vision of those events. For these ones, it is also necessary to remember or to make some basic questions of the recent experience of the ICM be remembered.

All those who minimally know the principles of Marxism and the history of the struggle for maoism in the last four decades know perfectly that the struggle against revisionism and for reunifying the ICM is closely intertwined with the struggle against the sectarian, factional, and dogmatic tendencies and different opportunist positions, never forgetting that revisionism is the main danger.

The liquidation of the RIM in the beginning of the 2000s, by the combined action of Avakian's and Prachanda's revisionism and their accomplices, deepened the dispersion of the forces of the ICM. In that period, the dispersion of forces was characterized as the main problem and revisionism was the main danger.

The Great Lenin have warned us that factionalism in the proletarian movement was characterized by a period in which the proletarian movement was united at the base, but facing any serious problem, the two fractions would elaborate two different tactics. The dispersion of forces, sectarianism and factionalism was a distinctive feature of the last decade of the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century.

Dispersion has its origin in the vile action of revisionism and opportunism in dividing the international proletarian movement. However, it is necessary to repeat that the action of revisionism is the source, but not the cause for the dispersion. The overcoming of the dispersion was, and still is, a supreme duty for those who assume the left line in the ICM. Therefore, it was, and still is, urgent and necessary to raise the level of the two-line struggle within the ICM, to overcome and break with the wrong methods that are contrary to democratic centralism (sectarianism, hegemonist mentality, the doctrine of father party, etc.) and that have contributed to its weakening.

In that period, the sect spirit, the policy of closed doors and unity without principles represented a serious obstacle

for the two-line struggle to be able to be raised to a new level so that the dispersion could be overcome. The overcoming of the dispersion of forces in the ICM demands the achievement of real, ideological, political, organizational, theoretical, and practical unity forged in class struggle.

In 2012, your Party, together with the C(m)PA and the CPI-ML (Naxalbari) held a meeting that published a declaration called "special resolution". This document was a step forward in showing the will of breaking with the sectarian attitude of closed doors originated from the RIM, however, unfortunately, as history testifies after 10 years, and as some of its protagonists have acknowledged, this initiative was nothing but an intention letter without any real consequence.

As it is publicly known, since 2009, there were held Five Meetings of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Parties and Organizations from Latin America, a Conference of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Parties and Organizations of America, Seven Meetings of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Parties and Organizations of Europe, in addition to dozens of meetings. From these events, a series of coordination and campaigns were set in motion which concentrates thousands of unified actions in dozens of countries. These meetings, with a previously prepared agenda, took weeks to approach theoretical and practical aspects of the ICM, raising the ideological and political struggle on fundamental problems of the world proletarian revolution. Communist parties and organizations from the whole world have participated on these meetings and campaigns, from Chile to India, from Canada to Finland.

As part and resulting from this process, the ICM has experienced an important impulse in the last decades with the emergence of new forces and a further development of forces that were already persisting. This was a real answer to the liquidation of the RIM and a solid step in overcoming the dispersion of forces in the ICM and in combating revisionism as the main danger. The situation of the unification and

coordination of Maoist forces in continents like America and Europe by itself has completely changed, and the communists in these regions could impulse and strengthen their efforts in a unified way. This is a great success.

Your Party was repeatedly invited to take part on many of these events, and what was your attitude on that? As it is known, your party has repeatedly rejected to get together and work with those who dissent from you and to put the problems on the table to be discussed. How should one call this attitude, if not the policy of closed doors?

On the contrary, your Party started to advocate the alien criteria that all debate previous to the UMIC would be harmful to the unity of the ICM. As Marxism-Leninism-Maoism teaches us, true unity can only be achieved through struggle. Two-line struggle serves to achieve and defend unity among communists and not the opposite. Only revisionism and opportunism could be against two-line struggle. This criteria made us think that your party have not yet healed from the ideological hangover of Prachandaism, of its "two combine into one", or the "theory of fusion", to which you were such an eager defender.

On the contrary to taking part on these initiatives and serving its development, supporting the new forces, your Party started to dedicate itself each time more to disqualify and insult all the initiatives to which you disagreed.

On this spirit, your Party has promoted a meeting on January 2020, whose sole real aim was to oppose those who advanced in unity. We ask which is the real unity, if not nominal, among those participating in that meeting? What were the practical effects for class struggle and the struggle for the unification of the communists? What was made out of the (nominal) committee that was approved by it? Wouldn't it get in contact with the hegemonist and sectarian attitudes of your Party? We would tell you that what you call "bloc" is a true unity, and the definition of factionalism made by the great

Lenin "nominal acknowledgment of unity and fraction in reality" seems perfectly fit to designate the meeting of January 2020 promoted by your Party.

However, we consider that these questions do not constitute the gravest ones and the essence of our divergence. The true conception of the PCm Italy reveals itself in their position on the ICM and the People's Wars in the world.

You affirm:

"We remind the comrades of IC that 'the standards in the International Communist Movement' are not established by our subjective desires but by the concrete and objective experience synthesized by the highest development of our ideology, MLM with at its peak the experience of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese masses in the GCPR. All this has already been synthesized by Chairman Mao in his writings and not by Chairman Gonzalo and the PCP, who instead creatively applied MLM to the concrete reality of Peru, particularly through the launch and development of the People's War. In addition, some standards can also be established in a conjunctural way by the most advanced subjective force of the ICM itself, as long as they are not in contradiction with MLM."

You continue to affirm:

"The point is: how to define what is the most advanced subjective force established based on objective criteria? In the aftermath of October Revolution it was evident: the only party in power had such a responsibility. After the Chinese Revolution and the raise to power of revisionism in the USSR, it was just as easy to understand who should play this role. In the current stage, with not any Communist Party in power, such standards should be collectively established in an appropriate venue (a large and representative International Conference of MLM parties and organizations, or an

International Organization as large and representative as the RIM could have been before its collapse). In this context, the parties leading People's Wars and therefore having condensed a higher understanding than the others should be particularly taken into consideration. These parties are today the Communist Party of India (Maoist) and the Communist Party of the Philippines, which lead the People's Wars and the TKP / ML which leads an armed struggle in the path of the People's War."

We reject your version of the (temporary?) end of history with the end of the GPCR. You claim: "the concrete and objective experience synthesized by the highest development of our ideology, MLM with at its peak the experience of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese masses in the GPCR. All this has already been synthesized by Chairman Mao" We are not aware of any corresponding documents from Chairman Mao or the CPCh. A simple assertion on your part is not enough for us, cannot be enough for anyone. We would like to clarify that the issue of synthesis has been dealt with frequently and incorrectly even by us. The point is: Chairman Gonzalo has defined Maoism. You are free to see it differently, but then please explain to us who should have done it, or if you think, that it is not necessary, because Maoism is not really anything new. If you explain "some standards can also be established in a conjunctural way by the most advanced subjective force of the ICM itself, as long as they are not in contradiction with MLM", then you claim at least implicitly that there has been no such development, ergo end of history, for 46 years. We are surprised that you think there could be "most advanced subjective forces of the ICM", which are "in contradiction with MLM". We do not believe that there can be such a thing. Not in the sense you mean, contradiction as something negative, destructive and not as positive, creative.

From where does such a point of view come from? Our Italian friends reveal themselves as true heirs of the *realpolitik* of

the revisionist Togliatti and not of the Marxist-Leninist leader Antonio Gramsci.

Our friends mix truths with forgery to confuse the international proletariat. Its document obscures the truth on the relation between the objective and subjective factors. It is not up to discussion for a Marxist that practice constitutes the criteria for truth.

With the counterrevolutionary coup of Deng Xiaoping in 1976, capitalism was restored in China and the CPCh was converted into a fascist Party; this meant that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution ceased to be the highest point – so far – of the World Revolution? After 1976, the ICM should have opened a “great debate” “on the mistakes of Chairman Mao” (Avakian style) or rather the flag of Chairman Mao should be hoisted even higher? Was it not precisely from the defense and application of the principles of Chairman Mao that the People’s Wars in Peru, India, the Philippines and Turkey were raised?

But, something else, regarding the GPCR in China, although it was the highest point of the Chinese revolution, at the moment it is not on the agenda, because at the moment there is no socialist country, so it will again be the most important thing in perspective; now, what is on the agenda in the ICM is the definition of Maoism, the people’s war, the new democratic revolution, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, the Italian friends, what they seek with this kind of argumentation is to divert us from the discussion and our present tasks.

We still ask you if was it not essentially the same program that was defeated in 1905 which has triumphed in 1917 in Russia? After the defeat of 1905, the revolutionaries should invalidate the principles of Lenin or, as they did, uphold, defend and apply, mainly apply, and thereby developing? Why should that attitude be adopted now with the People’s War in

Peru that persists after it has suffered a hard blow? What happens, dear comrades, is that class struggle, revolutions, that are true generate a powerful counterrevolution and its course is neither a straight line nor punctual.

Following the same criteria that was established above by your Party, it is curious that you erect yourselves as authority in other's People's Wars. According to what we know, your organization is 30 years old and according to what we could know there is not and there was not a People's War, nor anything similar in that period, despite that in your country there is one of the most important experiences of armed struggle in imperialist countries, during the years of 1960-1970. according to what we could deduce, your direct experience comes from decades of peaceful unionist struggles.

However, our Italian friends affirm:

"The desire of every revolutionary that a defeat never happened in Peru (as well as in Nepal) cannot replace the harsh reality of the facts. We cannot uphold something that does not exist, this is dialectical materialism, comrades, deal wth it! What is useful to the ICM, as Marxism (Marx in particular) teaches us, is, on the one hand, to understand the defeat and, on the other hand, to start over even when everything seems lost (as Gramsci said). We wish that the revolutionaries in Peru re-found the Communist Party of Peru and resume the path of the People's War, strengthened by experience and having assimilated the positive experiences and taking stock of the temporary defeat of the People's War.

This is evident for any coherent MLM, but perhaps the fraction of IC has an interest in 'keeping artificially alive' the People's War in Peru for their own purposes and being trafficker with a People's War that does not exist and with a Communist Party of Peru whose sources have been unknown for years, in order to attribute a certain authority to themselves, establishing an erroneous equivalence between a

generated organism now devoid of any authority (the so-called MPP) and the generating organism and 'transforming' the first into the second with the same mystifying method with which their 'criticisms' are written."

Likewise, your Party aims to affirm that what exist in Turkey is not People's War, but only an *"armed struggle in the path of the People's War."*

We ask you, how have you reached such a conclusion on the end of the People's War in Peru? Once more, we are not aware of the existence of possible Italian delegates that lived on the mountain ranges or poor neighborhoods of Peru, but according to what you yourselves have affirmed, this definition seems to be based on the following criteria:

"If it is possible to have news of armed actions and in general of the People's Wars in India, the Philippines and Turkey and of the parties that lead them, for some years now there has been no news of the actual existence of the People's War in Peru or of the Communist Party of Peru."

The existence of a thing is not dependent on any articles in the bourgeois press about it or your confirmation or perception of its existence, nor does the existence of a thing end by you claiming it does not exist. This is materialism. You claim to be "partisans of the launch and development of people's wars in all countries", in fact you sit in your comfy office chairs and sit in judgment on those who are really in combat.

It is no secret in the ICM that the People's War in Peru faces a complex and hard moment. Have not the People's Wars in Turkey, India or the Philippines also faced similar situations? Have not the revolutions in China or in Russia also been declared dead (by their enemies) before they could reemerge? What should be the attitude of true communists before a party that have handed over the best contributions

and efforts to the ICM, when they announce they have entered in a process of general reorganization, if not to dedicate all energy to support them?

The hard struggle developed by communists, combatants, and masses in the mountains, in prisons, and in the poor neighborhoods who pay with blood for keeping hoisted the glorious flag of the People's War in Peru or Turkey seems to not fit the filter of the specialists of "PCm Italy" who, while converging with the propaganda of imperialism, the reaction and revisionism, hurry up to attest the end of the People's War. This treacherous attitude is not only a crime, but it is also a warning for the future.

The communists are not like summer moths who are fascinated by the light of lamps. The true proletarian revolutionaries work in the shadows of the searchlights, in the daily work among the masses, in which the Party and the Revolution lives. To the Italian communists who want to struggle, we assure you, the People's War in Peru, in the midst a thousand difficulties, have not stopped for a second. The communists are still combating for the General Reorganization of the Party, take the time it takes, as it was taught by Chairman Mao "to go back to Yenan" once more and a thousand times if necessary.

The "Pulcinella secret" of the Italian friends is that the "great assessment" on the People's War in Peru that they propose is the same of the Right Opportunist Line of Peru, to attack Chairman Gonzalo, Gonzalo Thought, the First Congress, to liquidate the People's War, to affirm that Peru is not semi-feudal anymore, laying the basis for the rotten parliamentary path.

The true communists cannot fear the two line struggle, this one can only serve the aims of the international proletariat. This is why we cannot but to greet the open debate. We hope that the initiative of the Italian comrades of getting out of

their previous position (of no discussion, no two line struggle) and taking active role in the two line struggle, to be coherent and put an end to their fractional and closed doors policies.