

# **THE INFLUENCE OF TROTSKYISM IN THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL "TWO LINES STRUGGLE"**



**NUOVA EGEMONIA**



Revolucion Obrera of Columbia and Proletarians Communists-PCm announced the release of the second issue of the international journal 'Two Lines Struggle' (<https://revolucionobrera.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/L2L-N2-Eng.pdf>).

The magazine 'Two Lines Struggle' claims to position itself as a centre for the unification of the international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement and thus as the basis for the construction of a new international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist organisation (this comes just after the formation of the International Communist League [ICL] following the convening of the Unified International Maoist Conference).

The journal argues that the 'struggle between the two lines' is necessary to achieve this goal. This refers to the supposed relevance and centrality of the question of the struggle against sectarianism, dogmatism and left-wing extremism within the international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement. The ICL is considered by the magazine TWO LINES STRUGGLE as the current expression of these deviations.

The journal speaks for the unification of the international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement. We do not know by what right. One only has to scroll through the two issues of the journal to see how no editorial board is mentioned and therefore no organisations responsible for writing the journal are mentioned. If you look at the index of the two issues, you can see how they were largely written by just two organisations, namely Revolucion Obrera Columbia and Proletari Comunisti-PCm Italia (formerly Agit-Prop-Rossoperaio). This doesn't mean that there aren't also other organisations that apparently support these two formations, such as, for example, the Promoting Committee for a Maoist Communist Party in Galicia<sup>1</sup> or even other organisations in Afghanistan, Iran, etc. Almost all of these organisations, if we exclude the Promoting Committee for a Maoist Communist Party of Galicia<sup>2</sup>, are characterised by belonging to the camp of the positions advocated by Avakian and the PCR(USA) in the early 1980s.

Subsequently, when Avankian advocated the turning point represented by the 'New Synthesis', these organisations separated from the PRC(USA), but without breaking with the previous Trotskyite positions of the PRC(USA)<sup>3</sup>.

---

1However, it must be noted that the Committee for the Construction of the Maoist Communist Party of Galicia puts forward positions which are different or even opposite to those of Revolucion Obrera and Proletari Communist-PCm on the question of, for example, Bureaucratic Capitalism and the Universality of the People's War. It would therefore be useful for these groups to engage in an internal clarifying confrontation, as the various parties adhering to the LCI have done in recent years. This would make an effective contribution and allow these forces to go beyond the pretense of presenting themselves as a united front.

2That even with respect to the formation of the LCI has a position that is largely different from the more sectarian and extremist positions of Revolucion Obrera and Proletari Communist-PCm. For example, Galician comrades say: "Of course, if history proves that the new international organisation, the ICL (International Communist League), becomes a driving force for the world interests of the proletariat, if the World Proletarian Revolution gets a new impulse thanks to the ICL, then we will make a self-criticism and a rectification." (CCPCMG Communiqué on the UMIC and the ICL)

3Revolucion Obrera in the first issue of 2001 of its theoretical journal 'Negacion de la Negacion' repropose the previous positions of the PRC(USA) on various issues of strategic importance. In the 5th issue of 2016 of the same journal (page 131) he reconstructs the civil war in Spain in a Trotskyist way, keeping silent about the heroic guerrilla warfare continued for years by the CP of Spain until the establishment of modern revisionism in the party. Revolucion Obrera states: en España, "...en cuya guerra civil, si bien se formó un Frente Popular, se perdió la independencia de clase en su dirección, dejándola en manos del republicanismo burgués, lo cual se constituyó en una de las causas de la derrota". In the same issue Revolucion Obrera attacks the 7th Congress of the Communist International: "Sobre la política de Frente Único y Frentes Populares, ya existían vacilaciones y el germen de una división en el seno de la III Internacional... Tal lucha de líneas quedó velada en el VII Congreso que no condenó expresamente la tendencia de renunciar a la independencia de clase en el Frente; no delimitó claramente las fronteras entre marxismo y oportunismo en esa cuestión, tolerando el eclecticismo que al final favoreció una aplicación oportunista de la línea de la Internacional por parte de muchos partidos

So they continued to maintain a fundamentally critical view of Marxism-Leninism and of the experience of the Third Communist International, of the Seventh Congress and of the work of Comrade Stalin, and combined with all this was the denial of the theory of bureaucratic capitalism and consequently an erroneous view of the contradiction between imperialist countries and oppressed peoples, and at last the misunderstanding of the problem of the final crisis of imperialism and the rejection of the theory of the universality of the people's war. These types of positions were and still are strongly influenced by dogmatism, left-wing extremism and Trotskyism, combined with similar deviations such as, in the case of for example of the Proletari Comunisti-PCm group<sup>4</sup>, workerism and bordighism.

The same 'Two Lines Struggle' journal, however, also claims to represent another component, consisting of two Maoist parties in Nepal that are on the way to unification and the Communist (Maoist) Party of India.

One need only to read carefully the abundant material in the two issues of the journal to realise how between these two components, the first one, so to speak, led by Proletari Comunisti-PCm and Revolucion Obrera, and the second one, the one including the two Maoist parties of Nepal and the Communist (Maoist) Party of India, there is no united project or perspective on the question of forming an international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist organisation. While the first component says it wants to quickly pursue the formation of a new international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist organisation, the second is not of the same opinion. The CP (Maoist) of India openly rejects this hypothesis and merely speaks about the necessity of an international forum for debate and mutual support. All of this is evident from the same materials published in the second volume of the journal 'Two Lines Struggle'.

The consequence of this is, firstly, that the first component's criticism of the ICL is not the same as the second component's criticism of the ICL and, secondly, that what possibly brings these two components together is not a unitary project, but the fact that the ICL would not match the expectations neither of the first nor of

---

comunistas, y que degeneró francamente hacia la concepción browderista, según la cual la lucha contra el fascismo suprime la lucha de clases en cada país —renuncia a la lucha contra la burguesía antifascista— y considera al imperialismo antifascista como progresista, ocultando el carácter reaccionario y rapaz de todo imperialismo —sea o no fascista— desviando al movimiento obrero hacia la socialdemócrata conciliación de clases y la renuncia a la lucha anti-imperialista” ... “El Comité Ejecutivo no clarificó a fondo en el movimiento [Movimiento Comunista Internacional, ndr], el carácter de los compromisos de la URSS con Estados Unidos, Gran Bretaña y Francia” ... “En un balance general, la Declaración del MRI en 1984, señaló correctamente tres desviaciones que se presentaron en el seno de la III Internacional: Primero, la distinción entre el fascismo y la democracia burguesa en los países imperialistas... tendió a hacer un absoluto de la diferencia entre estas dos formas de la dictadura burguesa y también a hacer de la lucha contra el fascismo una etapa estratégica aparte. Segundo, se desarrolló una tesis que sostenía que la creciente pauperización del proletariado crearía la base material para remediar la división de la clase obrera en los países avanzados... Tercero, cuando el fascismo se definió como el régimen del sector más reaccionario de la burguesía monopolista en los países imperialistas, esto le dejó la puerta abierta a la peligrosa tendencia reformista y pacifista de identificar a un sector de la burguesía monopolista como progresista”, ... “En el VII Congreso se derrotó formalmente, las tendencias de derecha, en el terreno organizativo, pero no en el terreno ideológico. La resolución de disolución, por las circunstancias de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, donde muchos partidos comunistas fueron diezmados por la reacción, no contó con unas condiciones favorables para llevar la lucha de dos líneas hasta el fondo, hasta la delimitación exacta de fronteras entre los oportunistas de derecha —nacionalistas partidarios de la liquidación completa de la Internacional— y los internacionalistas, para quienes era aceptable una disolución temporal pero no una liquidación de este vital instrumento de lucha que materializaba el internacionalismo proletario”.

<sup>4</sup>This group has always held even more Trotskyist positions than Avakian himself. In the phase of defining the first declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, that is immediately before 1984, it urged the RCP(USA) to criticise the Seventh Congress of the Third International more strongly. Previously the current ruling group of Proletarian Communists-PCMm had generally attacked Marxism-Leninism and accused Mao of nationalism in its Agit-Prop newspaper.

the second component. It is not a joint conception of what it is necessary to do, therefore, but a vision of what should be avoided.

The first component puts forward positions similar to those of the first RIM declaration and has a similar conception of the so-called 'unification' of the 'Marxist-Leninist-Maoist forces'. The second, at least in the case of the CP(Maoist) of India, is unwilling, however, to repeat this experience. On the other hand, this party has never really been internal to the RIM. Obviously, the first component rejects this accusation. But here it is not a question of good intentions but of what, objectively, one is led to do on the basis of certain positions. And it is clear that from this point of view there are only three options on the ground for the international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement. The first is that of the ICL, the second is that of the semi-Trotskyist components of the "Two Lines Struggle" journal which, objectively speaking, wants to re-propose the model of the Internationalist Revolutionary Movement, the third is that of the CP(Maoist) of India, which is relatively close to that of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

The Communist Party (Maoist) of India has some powerful and important arguments to support its position. Basically, it argues that Mao never promoted the establishment of a New International. Such questions need further study and debate. The consequence of such positions, however, is that this party is no longer committed to the international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement because it does not believe there are the conditions to start a battle for its unification. The position of that party is therefore relatively passive and marginal on this issue. There is a risk that in doing so it will be tolerated the semi-Trotskyite leftist deviationist positions that traffic with Maoism.

The RIM ultimately failed because its foundations were eclectic. The RIM's first declaration itself, that of 1984, contained an eclectic conception of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The formation of a new RIM is therefore unfeasible today. All the work of the semi-Trotskyist component on this ground is doomed to failure. The two issues of the journal 'Two Lines Struggle' are the expression of a failure. Both are the expression of a dogmatic and sectarian polemic against the ICL; but what do they propose in new terms? What project? What perspective? What answer to the urgent problems of the International Communist Movement?

All that is left is the option represented by the LCI. The LCI's merit lies in having set the problem of a new international organisation on a principled ideological basis and in having worked inflexibly for decades to build such an organisation. Now the work of the ICL continues in this direction. The League talks about 'Marxism-Leninism-Maoism', but emphasises that the decisive aspect today is 'Maoism'. Who can deny that this thesis is not fundamentally correct? During the October Revolution and the formation of the Third International, the decisive aspect was the assumption of Leninism. There were those who fought Leninism in the name of Marxism, so the decisive aspect was not Marxism, but Leninism. Nor it was possible to say, without falling into eclecticism, that Leninism was fine but Marxism was also fine. When the Third International placed the struggle against the influence of right-wing and left-wing deviationism (trotskyism, councilism, bordighism, anarcho-syndicalism, etc.) at the centre, it also placed the line of the Bolshevization of communist parties at the centre because, from a theoretical and political point of view, the decisive question for the formation of communist parties and the development of the world proletarian revolution was Bolshevism, Leninism and not 'Marxism'.

Leninism was a more developed stage of Marxism also because it contained Marxism itself, which is to say, it contained the essence of Marxism. It's not enough to say that there are three stages in the development of Marxism, one must also formulate this statement in accordance with materialist dialectics, which holds that each stage is a qualitatively superior development to the previous one. This means, however, that it also contains the essence of the previous ones.

Once the principles have been affirmed, they must be carried out organically in accordance with objective reality and with its movement, which implies praxis and its development, but it is decisive to begin to

approach the question from the point of view of principle. We begin to build, we unify, starting from the ideological clarity of the principles.

The principle of the universality of the people's war (or the three stages of development of the people's war and the construction of the people's army and popular power within this process) is today the subject of a heavy ideological offensive carried out by the semi-trotskyist positions and by those who have not yet fully elaborated on this issue (as regards at least the imperialist countries) the distinction between the "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong thought" and Maoism. And the ICL's principled position on this issue is also fundamentally correct. The assertion and defense of the principle of the universality of the people's war has nothing to do with the fact that this principle may be erroneously declined in a mechanical and subjective sense in one country or another of the world, in this or that imperialist country. To confuse the question of the principle of the universality of the people's war with that for which this principle can be applied in a subjective and mechanistic way is eclecticism and revisionism. The issue under discussion is not whether this principle should be developed and applied in one way or another depending on whether a country is imperialist or not. The issue under discussion is the principle itself.

Now it's clear to anyone familiar with imperialist societies and the history of class struggle in this type of society that bourgeois democracy no longer exists at least since the beginning of the 1930s and, in particular, since the end of the Second World War. In place of the democratic-liberal orders that survived on average until the 1930s, we subsequently had either fascism or reactionary liberalism. After the Second World War, a corporate state developed in the imperialist countries that was increasingly characterised by a process of fascistization. Gramsci therefore spoke of a 'passive revolution' and pointed out that it was a reactionary response to the advance of revolution.

The positions of the semi-Trotskyist component merely refer to the strategic defence against imperialist offensive. All this has revisionist consequences. A distinction must be made between the process that takes place on a general level, concerning the terminal crisis of capitalism and the development of the tendency towards world proletarian revolution driven by the oppressed peoples, from the concrete development of revolutionary processes in different countries and the relations that develop between these processes. On a global level, imperialism is in a strategic defensive position because it's a decaying, dying system, and also because the world proletariat has accumulated and is accumulating new revolutionary experiences that are of decisive character and, at the same time, it has developed its ideology to the highest levels up to Maoism.

Imperialism today is accentuating at all levels its contradictions within the oppressed peoples, the popular masses and the proletariat, forcing itself further and further down the road to fascism and a world war. This war cannot lead to a new reactionary order, from this point of view its duration is indefinite and this encourages and will encourage proletarian revolution as the main trend. At the same time, on each country, imperialism is concretely on the offensive against the proletariat, the popular masses and the oppressed peoples. What is the principal aspect? Are the semi-Trotskyists right that the principal aspect is the force expressed by imperialism's reactionary offensive? This is another question of principle and even on this question the LCI is right compared to the semi-trotskyists and left-wing opportunists.

The question of dialectics is of extraordinary importance for Marxist-Leninist-Maoists and the proletariat throughout the world. The struggle for dialectical materialism plays a central role in the affirmation of Maoism and today it is a decisive battle for the defeat of eclecticism, sectarianism and dogmatism of the left deviationist, semi-Trotskyite positions.

Only by mastering the materialist dialectic it is possible to advance towards the world proletarian revolution. Even on this the LCI correctly sets the question. What is materialist dialectics in extreme synthesis? It is the universality of the law of contradiction. The semi-Trotskyites are eclectic on this, they claim that of course there is the law of contradiction and it's important, but that there is more than just this law, that there are

also other laws such as the 'transformation of quantity into quality', the 'negation of negation' etc.<sup>5</sup> Such an eclectic way of dealing with issues fragments the dialectical approach and opens the way to empiricism, pragmatism, opportunism and revisionism. On the other hand, one can clearly see their misunderstanding of this law when they try to pass off as fractionalism what is in fact the inevitably contradictory and dialectical process of the development of the International Communist Movement. The thesis of the universality of the law of contradiction lays the foundation for a correct approach to ideological and political questions. It states that all laws of the dialectic are forms of a single universal law, the law of contradiction.

A struggle is underway in the international Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement. A struggle to unify the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement on the basis of the defeat of the influence of "left" deviationism, eclecticism, trotskyism, bordighism and workerism.

As for our country, in order to pave the way for the formation of a Maoist party in Italy it is necessary to conduct this struggle thoroughly.

NUOVA EGEMONIA

---

<sup>5</sup>In doing so, they deny Mao's fundamental contribution to the materialist dialectic reiterating the attacks of Hoxhaists and Khrushchevists on Maoism. As the following quote also attests: "Engels talked about the three categories, but as for me I don't believe in two of those categories. (The unity of opposites is the most basic law, the transformation of quality and quantity into one another is the unity of the opposites quality and quantity, and the negation of the negation does not exist at all). The juxtaposition, on the same level, of the transformation of quality and quantity into one another, the negation of the negation, and the law of the unity of opposites is 'triplism', not monism. The most basic thing is the unity of opposites. The transformation of quality and quantity into one another is the unity of the opposites quality and quantity. There is no such thing as the negation of the negation. Affirmation, negation, affirmation, negation ... in the development of things, every link in the chain of events is both affirmation and negation."