

**CRITICAL REMARKS REGARDING THE COMMUNIQUÉ "NOTES
ON FOUNDING DECLARATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNIST LEAGUE [LCI]" OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE
REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISTS NORWAY**



The organization of the "Revolutionary Communists" of Norway released on January 6 a long communiqué entitled "Notes on the founding declaration of the International Communist League [LCI]"¹. This statement was taken from the website Revolucion Obrera of the Communist Workers Union (mlm)²[UOC] of Colombia and from the website Maoist Road³ managed by the Italian group "Proletari Comunisti-pcm Italia" (Proletarian communists-pcm Italy).

The communiqué of the Norwegian Revolutionary Communists takes a position on the foundation of the ICL and the struggle that it is leading for the affirmation of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the leading ideology of proletarian revolution.

The formation of LCI⁴ continuing to arouse deep interest worldwide among communists revolutionaries of different countries.

In some cases it is also provoking critically oriented responses, sometimes radically critical. Also some groups and organizations that refer to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism have taken the field to express their dissent. Among them in addition to the UOC(mlm) and "Maoist Road" also the Promoting Committee for the construction of the Maoist Communist Party of Galicia⁵.

The magazine "Fight between the two lines"⁶, managed primarily by the Communist Workers Union (MLM) of the Colombia, by Proletari Comunisti-PCm Italia and by comrades of the Promoting Committee of Galicia, represents the attempt to accelerate the construction of a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist organization opposed to the ICL. The Norwegian "Revolutionary Communists" Communiqué within this framework going to side with this latest trend.

I. Who are the fractionists? Who is hindering the development of a unitary international organization of Maoists?

As Editorial Board of Nuova Egemonia we begin with some critical considerations to the statement of the "Revolutionary Communists" of Norway. With these considerations we begin to publish a series of assessments and positions on the situation of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist international movement and its various components. This in the light of the question of the approach to the issues that are central to the construction of a new Maoist international organization. The work we will do will be aimed at offering further possibilities for reflection, orientation, discussion and confrontation to revolutionary communists of our country and in particular those that refer to Maoism.

the group of "Revolutionary Communists [CR]" of Norway supports the theses of the international tendency, which is grouping under the hegemony of "UOC(mlm) of Colombia" and "of Proletari Comunisti-PCM Italy", [see the issue of the magazine "Fight between the two lines"(see note 5) and the "number 6 of Negacion"⁷]. According to these theses, the formation of the International Communist League would represent, in a final analysis, a fractionist act aimed at separating the

¹ <https://www.maoisme.no/2023/01/notes-on-the-founding-declaration-of-the-international-communist-league-icl/>

² <https://www.revolucionobrera.com/internacional/mci/lci-2/>

³ <https://maoistroad.blogspot.com/2023/01/por-debate-notas-sobre-la-declaracion.html>

⁴ <https://ci-ic.org/es/>

⁵ <https://www.revolucionobrera.com/internacional/mci/lci/>

⁶ <https://revolucionobrera.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Revista2I-Esp.pdf>

⁷ <https://www.revolucionobrera.com/internacional/mci/negacion/>

international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement and hindering the construction of an m-l-m unified international.

We consider these arguments opportunist and expression of a trotskyist conception and method.

Can one speak of fractionalism towards the ICL if today, apart from the ICL itself, there is no unified international organization? Why would the formation of the ICL be a fractionist and splinter act? Compared to whom?

We believe that today, apart from the ICL, there is no unified world organization of Marxists-Leninists-Maoists and that therefore parties and groups that share a certain vision and approach have the right and the duty to unite on this basis and to fight for hegemony over the whole m-l-m international movement in the development of the struggle for the affirmation of Maoism as the leading ideology of the world proletarian revolution.

The formation of the ICL from this point of view was a significant step forward in the struggle for unity. Those who argue that the ICL is fractionist aim to present their particular positions as universal and seek to speak of themselves as the true and only representative of the aspirations to unity of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement as a whole.

If this type of thesis were supported by a large Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party at the head of a great proletarian revolution and the centre of a ongoing process of building a new communist international, such theses could be, at least in part, justified. But who supports these theses today? Who seeks to imply that the ICL is fractionist? Only small groups who set themselves as representatives of the m-l-m movement make these speeches. All this is indicative of an anti-Marxist conception and method of relations between Marxists-Leninists-Maoists. A conception and a method that we consider wrong from the point of view of principle and dangerous from the political-organizational point of view.

Now it is clear that e.g. The Communist Party of the Philippines has always had and continues to have its own well-known conception of the construction of an m-l-m international organization, which does not share the position of the ICL. However, it must be absolutely emphasized that this party has been very careful from launching accusations of fractionalism against the ICL itself, indeed it fraternally greeted its foundation.

The same applies to the Communist Party (Maoist) of India, which does not share the idea of building a new Communist International and which considers only an "International Forum" possible and necessary of debate and mutual support and that therefore has always participated in the international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement only in this perspective.

So in the end, to speak of the foundation of the League as an obstacle to the formation of a unified international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist organization, there remain only a series of forces that can be defined ex-avakian for their close relationship (never object of a real self-criticism), until the release of the theory of the New Synthesis of Avakian, with the PCR (USA) and, together with them, the Italian group of Proletari Comunisti-PCm Italia. A group that has always tried to resume and develop, mixing with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the semi-workerist, semi-trotskyist and semi-bordighist positions of the PC (M-L) I-La Voce Operaia of the seventies of the last century. These forces were joined by the comrades of the aforementioned Promoting Committee of Galicia, which however have various positions deeply divergent from the ex-avakians or from the Italian Communist Party and therefore also from the group of "Revolutionary Communists" of Norway.

Obviously this tendency, which holds that Marxism-Leninism-Maoism must be combined with Trotskyist positions, has every right to organize itself and to open a struggle for hegemony in the

Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement. Instead, it has no right to do so by presenting itself as the only real interpreters of the needs for unity of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoists of the whole world.

II. On the denial of the universality of the people's war

With regard to the various questions raised in the statement of the Revolutionary Communists of Norway, we consider important, on the theoretical-political level, to intervene on a the question of of the Universality of the People's War.

In essence the "Revolutionary Communists" of Norway, such as the UOC (mlm) of Colombia and Proletari Comunisti-PCM Italy speak of "universality of the people's war" only in a generic sense, reducing the question of "people's war" to that of "revolutionary civil war".

On the level of theory, confrontation and theoretical-political struggle, the concept of "revolutionary civil war", more than a century after the October Revolution and the foundation of the Third International, is obviously indeterminate and profoundly insufficient. To purposely use it as a synonym for "People's War" theory obviously means opposing this theory in an intellectually dishonest, opportunistic and eclectic way.

It is said that revolution will take place in specific forms in different countries. This also means confusing issues. From the theoretical point of view we have the universal, the particular and the singular. Therefore, in order to address the issue of the "specificity" or "singularity" of each country, we must first have defined that of universality and particularity. In essence one must say first of all if one shares the thesis of the universality of the Maoist theory of "people's war".

If this theory is not universally shared, a different one must be proposed. For example. it must be said that the theory that indicates in the October revolution the path that must be followed in the imperialist countries is correct. Or it must be argued that the correct path in the imperialist countries is to re-propose the positions of Autonomia Operaia (Worker's Autonomy) or to argue that we must refer to the guerrilla experiences of forces such as the Brigade Rosse (Red Brigades) of the seventies.

In fact, there are many tendencies in the imperialist countries that declare themselves communists and that speak of "revolutionary civil war" but that, with the latter category, want to support revolutionary theories very different from the Maoist theory of people's war.

Theoretically, the problem is to indicate which guiding theory of the world proletarian revolution is to be supported and which theory is to be opposed. Not to do so is to confuse issues, to reconcile irreconcilable positions and, ultimately, to adopt the methods and spirit of the revisionists and trotskyists.

The real underlying thesis shared by the tendency represented by the magazine "Struggle between the two lines" is that the Maoist theory of Protracted People's War is not applicable outside the to Bureaucratic Capitalists countires. A further problem arises here because this tendency also holds that the same Maoist theory of "bureaucratic capitalism" is no longer really valid because industrial capitalism would be developing even in oppressed countries.

III. Theoretical and strategic presuppositions of the Universality of the Theory of People's War

Let us consider the theoretical presuppositions of the theory of the universality of the people's war. These presuppositions are already given in part relevant in Marxism-Leninism, but have been fully defined only in Mao's theories. They have also been placed and affirmed, with scientific rigor, both explicitly and implicitly, by the President Gonzalo.

What these presuppositions are is, of course, ultimately the object of the development of the world proletarian revolution under the leadership of Maoism, of the struggle against revisionism and the various forms of right and "left" opportunism and the deepening of the work and the theoretical-political comparison of Maoists at the international level.

We believe that the presuppositions relate to the question of the theory of imperialism and the crisis of capitalism.

Here are the following five points and issues:

- 1) The imperialist system is increasingly hindering the development of the productive forces and in this way accentuates at all levels the contradiction with the oppressed peoples and with the proletariat and the masses of the world. With the 1930s and particularly the late 1960s, the imperialist system entered its terminal phase. This was underlined by Mao who said that the imperialist system was heading towards its complete and definitive defeat.
- 2) Today, the imperialist system oppresses most of the countries of the world by allying itself with all the old reactionary, semi-feudal classes and fostering the formation of a bureaucratic capitalism linked, subordinated and functional to the imperialist countries. On this basis a narrow and fragile capitalism develops on a national basis. In oppressed countries, Bureaucratic Capitalism hinders and precludes the development of an autonomous industrial and financial capitalism on a national basis. This results in a state of permanent economic, political and institutional crisis. Nor can a classical bourgeois democracy, that of the old liberal-democratic type, be established within this framework. The tendency for proletarian revolution in these countries is powerfully and constantly active and manifests itself in very different forms. Only when it is directed by the Maoist parties can it develop accordingly in the direction of the New Democratic Revolutions.
- 3) The imperialist system develops an economy controlled by monopolies which, in turn, merge with the bureaucratic-military machine of the various imperialist states. State capitalism, formed by the great public and especially private monopolies, is the basis of the great bourgeoisie and of the relationship with which the various fractions of it mediate their interests. All this, Lenin says, results in the domination of an oligarchy. This oligarchy promotes a process of corporativization of the State. In practice This means that State Capitalism tends to fascism. The democratic-liberal system is replaced by a form of reactionary liberalism that transforms parliamentary institutions making them a transmission belt of the big bourgeoisie and that hinders and precludes in all ways the possibility of a peaceful and legal struggle for the accumulation of forces for the proletarian revolution. In the imperialist countries, under the pressure of the terminal crisis and the tendency to inter-imperialist war, and the contradiction with the oppressed peoples, the attack on the living and working conditions of the proletariat and the masses of the people, the militarization of society and the fascistization

of the State develops, and early forms of fascism are already beginning to assert themselves in some countries.

- 4) The tendency towards world proletarian revolution is objectively developing on the terrain of the terminal crisis of imperialism in all the countries of the world. This tendency is the main one, and interimperialist war can only feed it further. There are various expressions of this tendency in terms of the development of the struggles of the popular masses, the development of revolutionary struggles and people's wars and in terms of the formation and growing affirmation of new Maoist forces and parties.
- 5) In the terminal phase of imperialism, the imperialist system deploys all its resources to combat the tendency to world proletarian revolution. In all countries of the world it is permanently on the offensive against this trend. The proletarian revolution, in a conscious and organized way, under the direction of the communist ideology, can advance only by developing in the various countries the struggle on the terrain of strategic defense as the first stage of the proletarian revolution.

IV. Validity of the Universality Theory of People's War

From these basic presuppositions necessarily derives the thesis of the universality of the People's War.

In the terminal phase of imperialism the general conditions are very different from those of the nineteenth century and from those of the first decades of the last century. All this has been duly reflected in the development of Marxism and Marxism-Leninism and therefore in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The Third International after the October Revolution, because of the influence of right and "left" opportunism, has promoted various failed insurrectional attempts. Only with the civil war in Spain and the Seventh Congress did a new conception of the proletarian revolution emerge. The general line of this conception will find confirmation and development in the revolutions of Popular Democracy in Europe and in the great Chinese revolution led by Maoism. Maoism is also the most complete and elevated synthesis of this whole experience.

Only the influence of revisionism, trotskyism and workerism, the revisionist overturning and the opportunist rejection of the Thought of Antonio Gramsci (founder of the PCd'I), the absolute ignorance and misunderstanding of the experiences of the anti-fascist war (e.g. in a country like Italy) can lead to the denial that the anti-fascist resistance was, in substance, a Popular Democratic Revolution with proletarian hegemony. A revolution that, although embryonic, limited and with little theoretical awareness, has developed for several years in the form of what Mao has thematized as the first stage of the people's war.

Mao synthesized with the theory of People's War the complex of revolutionary experiences from all over the world of that historical phase and not at all only the experience of the Chinese revolution. Here the question ultimately returns to that of the relationship between Marxism-Leninism and Maoism. If Marxism-Leninism is opposed to Maoism, we have only two possibilities or we affirm Marxism-Leninism against Maoism reducing the latter to Mao's Thought, that is to say, the theory of revolution and the construction of socialism valid only for the countries of bureaucratic capitalism, or

we oppose Maoism to Marxism-Leninism and, in this case, in the name of Maoism we re-propose Trotskyism, Workerism, Guevarism etc.

Once the impossibility of opposing Mao to Marxism-Leninism has been recognized, it is a matter of clarifying the relationship between Maoism and Marxism-Leninism. This question can be resolved only in the terms that Maoism has responded in a more organic and complete way to the problems and needs posed by Marxism-Leninism. Maoism, the third stage of Marxism or "mainly Maoism", not only does not deny Marxism-Leninism, but considers how only Maoism today, as the development of Marxism-Leninism, can also truly understand Marxism-Leninism in itself.

The positions of the Norwegian "Revolutionary Communists" are a mixture of Hoxhaism and Trotskyism. Talk about the popular war theory of Maoism and argue that this theory involves peasant war, encirclement of cities by the countryside, a vast territory and a weak state apparatus opponent, etc., means identifying the form with the content. According to this method, e.g. "Left" Social Democrats, Councilists, Workersists have always argued that Leninism was a theory valid for Russia, but not for the industrialized capitalism of the main European countries.

This identification between form and content, that is, between the specific forms of a great proletarian revolution and the general guiding theory of such a revolution, essentially means supporting a vulgar empiricism, address the issues from a social democratic point of view and deny the necessary and objective dialectic between universal, particular and singular.

The "Revolutionary Communists" of Norway see only the specific forms taken by the Chinese revolution, but deny its universal value, deny that Mao synthesized not only the experience of the revolutionary war in China, but also the experiences of the Third International, the general line of the Third International, the problem of the three instruments and the uninterrupted revolution and, therefore, ultimately, the revolutionary war in Spain, of the anti-fascist revolutionary war on the path of socialism in the imperialist countries of Western Europe and in the countries of Eastern Europe.

As far as Italy is concerned, we consider that Gramsci's Thought, focusing on the dialectical relationship between "war of position" and "war of movement" contains in itself a theory of proletarian revolution adapted, in that historical period, to the conditions of our country, which has found in Maoism and in the theory of People's War a systematization and an organic foundation on a universal level.

It is no coincidence that the Gramsci's Thought is distorted and denied by the revisionists and attacked by opportunists, in particular by the Trotskyists and the Bordigists, who in turn fall ultimately behind their revolutionary and internationalist phraseology, in reformism and economicism.

In short, the present conditions impose in imperialist countries such as Italy the resumption of the path of popular-democratic revolution in terms of uninterrupted revolution to socialism. The analysis of the concrete conditions and the assessment of the work of Antonio Gramsci confirms the correctness of this approach and the inseparable link that connects this perspective to the theory of the People's War of Maoism. Obviously, we cannot conceive an international organization of Marxist-Leninist-Maoists that does not provide for the full recognition and assumption of these theses.

NUOVA EGEMONIA

