


Nicola P.

The eighth discriminating factor



Edizioni del (nuovo)Partito comunista italiano

Edizioni in Lingue Estere (EiLE)
(nuovo)Partito comunista italiano
<http://www.nuovopci.it>

Freedom for Jose Maria Sison!
4th September 2007

(new)Italian Communist Party greet the 4th August 2007
celebrations of 25th anniversary of MLPD

MLPD International Seminar, 2nd-3rd August 2007
The preparation of international revolution in its relation with the
great mass movements

IX ICMLOP, 2007
The struggle of the international working class, the anti-imperialist
struggles of the peoples and the marxist-leninist partybuilding

Let's give the welcome they deserve to Bush and his hosts: the
Vatican and the government of Prodi-D'Alema-Bertinotti!
27th May 2007

Message to *the International Conference*
"With the Resistance, for a just peace in Middle East",
Chianciano Terme 24th-25th March 2007

The future of Vatican
Article from *La Voce*, n. 23, July 2006

The Maoism as the third higher stage of communist thought, after Marxism and Leninism.

The new communist parties must be Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, and not only Marxist-Leninist.

In this phase, the synthesis of Italian communists' tasks is the constitution of the new Italian Communist Party.

We say "new" not only organizationally. First, it is wrong to think that we need only to reconstruct the old communist party corroded, corrupted, disaggregated and at the end closed by the modern revisionists. Not by chance all the attempts to "recreate the old" as it was before the revisionists came to power are failed. In Italy, everybody knows the course of the Communist Party of Italy (m-l) (*New Unity*). As far as I know this failure is universal. Almost all the parties of the old communist movement, that constituted the first Communist International (1919-1943), are fallen a prey to the modern revisionists. This is not happened owing to some single man or traitor leader. We Marxists easily understand it. Then we must understand why, universally, the best part of those parties, their left wing, was not able to oppose the bourgeoisie's influence. This happened owing to the limits of the left wing's conception. The old communist movement fell prey to the modern revisionists and during some decades was carried to death because its left wing has not been able to overcome its own limits and face the tasks set just by the great successes reached in the first half of the century just finished.

The new communist parties must individuate and overcome those limits **(1)**. Only in this way, they will be able to carry out successfully their own role in the new wave of the proletarian revolution announced by the general crisis of capitalism and by the developing revolutionary situation.

The new communist parties must found themselves on the entire heritage of the communist movement, on the balance of its entire historical experience, then not only on Marxism-Leninism, but on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. To limit ourselves to Marxism-Leninism means to refuse to take account of the balance of the first wave of proletarian revolution which covers the first half of the Twentieth century **(2)**.

Never in humanity's history, an ideological-political movement developed so greatly and rapidly as the communist movement did from the half of the 19th century to the half of the 20th century. To limit ourselves to Marxism-Leninism means to refuse to overcome

the old communist movement's limits, which prevented it from utilizing those great successes achieved until the half of the 20th century. Those limits allowed the modern revisionists to gain ground, corrode and corrupt the communist movement from inside until the loss of the great part of its conquests. The balance of the great advancement of the communist movement in the first century of its life and of the great retreat sustained in the next fifty years prepared the instruments for the success of the new wave of proletarian revolution. In the *Project of Manifesto-Program* published by the National Secretariat of the Committees Supporting the Resistance-for Communism (CARC), in October 1998, it is taken for granted that the new Communist Party must be founded on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and that Maoism is the third higher stage of communist thought, after Marxism and Leninism (3). Nevertheless today among the Italian Subjective Forces of Socialist Revolution (SFRS) only the CARC and Rossoperaio openly accept this thesis. The other SFRS are in various ways reticent or even refuse it. In the n. 19 of the August 1998, *Rapporti Sociali* [*Social Relations*, the theoretical review of CARC, n.d.t.], in the article *The Six Discriminating Factors and the Four Problems*, set the acceptance of Maoism as one of those problems about which the siding of the SFRS was not clear. I think that today the situation is substantially the same. The Italian SFRS have not carried out a debate adequate to its importance for the political activity.

About a year ago (in September 2000), the editorial staff of the review *La Scintilla* [*The Spark*, n.d.t.] published a "letter to the Italian communist movement" entitled "Let's join the forces!" They proposed an agreement among "all the communist groups". They set twenty "fixed points", founded on "the acceptance of the Marxist-Leninist ideology" (4). Those points were "equally important and indispensable requirements, discriminating factors, fundamental positions, without which talking of communists' unification was a nonsense". The Marxist-Leninist Committee of Italy recently published an own "letter to the communists". It proposed points and documents of reference for the reconstruction of the communist party to all the communists (*La via del comunismo* [*The Way of Communism*, n.d.t.] n. 13, 9 April 2001). Also these points and documents are founded on Marxism-Leninism. These and other similar platforms have the same characteristic. Each one of them selects some "universal truths or base documents of the old communist movement (that of the Communist International), truths and documents denied and denigrated by the modern revisionists, which they propose to set back in their former positions. Without any doubt every SFSR must agree on this proposal. Nevertheless to propose it now has the same political value as to propose the unity on the base of Marxism or, maybe more precisely, of the *Manifesto of Communist Party* in the Twenties of the last century. Recently the Italian group Iniziativa Comunista [Communist

Initiative, n.d.t.] did a thing like that. They proposed the “fusion between the working class’ movement and the scientific Communism” (in their review *La riscossa* [*The Recovery*, n.d.t.], n. 2). They take for granted that everybody knows what they mean talking of “scientific Communism” and agrees about it. They think that all the divergences concern the fusion between that “scientific Communism” and the working class’ movement (see *La Voce* [*The Voice*, review of the (new) Italian Communist Party, n.d.t.], n. 3, page 15). The study of these proposals confirms the thesis that who does not accept the Maoism as the third higher stage of communist thought after Marxism and Leninism, can not advance in understanding the present problems and can not trace the line to face them successfully. In fact all these proposals are founded on the return to the revolutionary principles of the old communist movement, purified by the deformations and mutilations done by the modern revisionists. If the old communist movement’s weapons are enough to face our problems, why did our old comrades not succeed in facing the modern revisionists and continuing the advancement of the communist movement, even if they were in much better conditions than we are today? Why did Pietro Secchia and the other comrades of the left wing of the old Italian Communist Party not succeed in it, for example? For the renewal of the communist movement, it needs an answer to the problems not solved by our old comrades. In substance, this answer is Maoism.

In 1924, in the lessons at the Sverdlov University then collected in the pamphlet *Principles of Leninism*, Stalin showed what Leninism was. He showed that it was not sufficient to say that “Leninism is the application of Marxism to the specific conditions of the Russian situation” nor that “Leninism is the renewal of the revolutionary elements of Marxism”. He said: “Leninism is the Marxism of the era of the imperialism and of the proletarian revolution”. Then he showed the particular and original Lenin’s contributions to the science of proletarian revolution, to the conception of the world and the method of thinking and acting of the revolutionary proletariat. Stalin reached this conclusion: in the new era, it was no more possible to be Marxists without being Leninists. It was necessary to be Marxist-Leninists. Today we reach this conclusion: it is not possible to be Marxist-Leninists without being Maoist. Then it is necessary to be Marxist-Leninist-Maoists.

Why must the communist parties founded in the Twenties assume the Marxism-Leninism and not only the Marxism as their own foundation?

In order to face the political tasks that they had to accomplish, they had to distinguish themselves from the parties that did not support the October Revolution and the proletariat’s dictatorship, that did not adhere to the Communist International, that limited themselves to the electoral, parliamentary, trade unionist, cultural and cooperative struggles. Thanks to these kinds of struggles during the second half of the 19th century

the working class became an independent actor in the political fight in Western Europe. However those struggles showed themselves completely unfit for the conquest of the power. It was not enough to clear the field of the distortions and mutilations done by the opportunists of the Second International. It was not enough to reject the cooperation with the bourgeoisie and to carry out honestly the old tasks that were even so useful for the proletariat (and in many aspects they continued to be useful). Since the beginning of the era of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution, to refuse the Marxism-Leninism became the banner of bourgeois parties for the workers (that is to say of the left wing of bourgeoisie). It was necessary to acquire new concepts, instruments and kinds of struggle, in order to be equal to the political tasks requested by the period. So it is today. In order to be equal to the political tasks that we must accomplish, we must clearly understand the reason why the communist movement has lost the great part of the successes gotten. We must distinguish ourselves from the parties that do not adopt the long lasting revolutionary popular war as the universal form of the proletarian revolution. We must distinguish ourselves from the parties that do not adopt the mass line as the main method of work and direction of the party. We must distinguish ourselves from the parties that do not adopt the two lines struggle as an instrument for the development and the strengthening of the party. We must distinguish ourselves from the parties that do not see where its bourgeoisie in the socialist countries. We must distinguish ourselves from the parties that do not accept Maoism as their foundation.

Which were the innovative elements (the new discriminating factors) of the Leninism in comparison to Marxism? I do not itemize them each and every one. I refer back to Stalin and his *Principles of Leninism*.

Briefly the Lenin's theoretical contribution concerns aspects of the conception of the world and of the method of action which in the Marx and Engels' thought do not have an importance and a definition adequate to the political significance they assumed in the new situation (the imperialist phase of capitalism and the beginning of the proletarian revolution). The conception of the world elaborated by Lenin developed those aspects more adequately to the need of the political struggle on the agenda. Thank to these development of the thought, the Lenin's party was able to open the way of revolution and to oppose the opportunist successfully. All the comrades of the other parties of the Second International who opposed the opportunists defending the Marx and Engels' positions but did not develop conception fit for the new situation were not be able to reach the success as Lenin's party did. The Lenin's contributions, the new elements of the new conception of the world, became discriminating factors for belonging to the communist parties but not for belonging to the parties of the Second International. Then

the passage from Marxism to Marxism-Leninism has been dictated by the *political* tasks that the communist parties must accomplish.

Also our science, our scientific conception of the world, that we call sometimes Marxism (broadly speaking considered as conception of the world and method of the communist movement) and sometimes dialectical materialism, develops through evolutions (gradual and quantitative accumulation of experiences and knowledge) and through qualitative leaps. All the members of the communist movement contribute to the development of Marxism: they supply the experience that moves and verifies the development of the theory. Many members of the communist movement contribute to the development of Marxism at a higher level: they draw up the balance of the common experience and elaborate theories. Most of the leaders of the communist movement elaborate theories which develop our learning. The passage from Marxism (now considered in the strict sense of the word as the canon of thought elaborated by Marx and Engels) to Marxism-Leninism is a qualitative leap. The passage from Marxism-Leninism to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is another qualitative leap.

When there is a qualitative leap, a struggle takes place between the advanced and the backward part of the communist movement. The advanced part asserts the necessity of the new term: then it underlines what is new and asserts that the new is the main and leading element. The backward part refuses or attenuate the newness, tries to reduce the new to the old, asserts that “as a matter of fact the so called new is wrong”, or that “there is nothing substantially new”, that “the new is nothing”. Nevertheless the qualitative leap comes true because corresponds to the practical needs. It becomes leading theory and then revolutionary practice just through the struggle of the advanced part against the backward part. The advanced part first becomes the guide of the communist movement and then becomes the new communist movement. The backward part first becomes a restraint within the communist movement, an aspect of its internal struggle between the new and the old, the true and the false. Then it becomes an instrument of the bourgeoisie’s struggle against the communist movement.

We must acknowledge that also Marxism (now considered in a broad sense) develops following the law that “the one parts in two”. A thesis is common to all the movement and presides over a phase of its development. In front of the development of the political struggle this thesis shows itself no more adequate, and so it parts in two.

The history of the communist movement gives an example. During the 19th century, against the utopian socialists, the proudhonians, the anarchists, the blanquists, the Marxists asserted the necessity that the proletarian parties participate actively and independently in the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the nobility (clergy and

monarchy), between the elements of the bourgeoisie most radical and the elements in favor of an agreement with clergy and monarchy. The Marxist also asserted the necessity to participate in the parliamentary form of this struggle. The proletarian parties first supported the most advanced part of bourgeoisie. Then they became the direct mouthpiece of the popular masses' democratic requests (expressed in the "minimal programs" of the socialist parties) against the bourgeoisie that was more and more becoming the reactionary part of the society. From a certain moment onwards, the thesis that the proletarian parties must participate actively and independently to the struggle between the most advanced and most backward elements of the bourgeoisie parted in two. One thesis asserted that the proletarian must take upon themselves the popular masses' democratic requests (in the socialist revolution or in the new democracy revolution) against the bourgeoisie. The opposite thesis asserted that the proletarian parties must proceed together with the progressive bourgeoisie against the reactionary bourgeoisie.

The Leninism was not a negation of Marxism (now considered in the strict sense of the world), as its antagonists asserted, sometimes opposing to Lenin some quotations of Marx (the "letter" of Marxism). The Leninism was the necessary filiation of Marxism in front of the new phase and the new tasks of the communist movement. The Marxism would decay if he had not generated the Leninism. It would be deprived of its revolutionary life. It would become first a useless and sterile tool, then a tool useful for the enemies of the communist movement. This is what the historical experience has shown.

The Marxism is the science of the proletarian revolution and of the passage of humanity from the capitalism to communism. Like every scientist's work, also Marx and Engels' work is not a compendium of all the human knowledge in its field. Only the metaphysicians can think to create a closed and complete system of knowledge for the past and the future. In fact they think that the ideas are not produced by men's mind. They think that ideas exist in themselves independently from men, in God's mind or in some other form. Therefore it is possible to "reveal" all the truth. Actually during their history the men have created new ideas adequate to the tasks that they face as they practically were taking possession of the world. The ideas get more rich and change as the men's practice become more rich and complex. Every science lives this growth process, and so does the Marxism. It will continue to live such a process until the phenomenon that is its object will end: the proletarian revolution and the passage from capitalism to communism. Marx and Engel were the founders of Marxism. Lenin and Stalin were the exponents of a stage of its following development, the Marxism-Leninism. The first wave of proletarian revolution, the construction of the first socialist countries, the development of the communist movement all over the world, the

prevalence of the bourgeoisie's influence within it, its decadence, are a great historical experience which enriched the communist thought. Those who today pretend to remain Marxist-Leninist deprive themselves of this enrichment. They are not able to get through the problems that we must face. Their speeches are right, but are not sufficient. They talk of childhood to a man that has already the problems of youth.

The conclusion of this preamble is the following. We are obliged to conclude that the new communist parties must be not only Marxist-Leninist, but Marxist-Leninist-Maoist. The examination of the *political* phase that we face, the *political* tasks that the new communist parties must accomplish, oblige us to do it.

We communists must face the second general crisis of and capitalism and lead the second wave of proletarian revolution. It is a fact that during the first general crisis of capitalism and the first wave of the proletarian revolution the communist movement reached great results (a socialist field extended to a third of the humanity and the constitution of influential communist parties almost all over the world). This was a confirmation of the Marxism-Leninism. But it is also a fact that during the first wave of the proletarian revolution the communist movement was not able to seize the power in the imperialist countries. It is a fact that since the half of the 20th century it was no more able to utilize the great successes achieved and continue its advancement. It is a fact that during the following 40 years the modern revisionism prevailed within the communist movement, so that it lost also the successes achieved. The Maoism enriches the Marxism-Leninism of the balance of the first wave of the proletarian revolution, of the balance of the short life of the first socialist countries and shows the limits that prevented the communist movement from reaching greater successes, and that allowed the prevalence of the modern revisionism. If this is true, it is clear that the new communist parties must adopt the Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as their conception of the world and their method of thinking and acting. The parties that will not do it and that will obstinately keep still only Marxist-Leninist will not be able to face the political tasks of the communist parties. Sooner or later they will end by opposing to the proletarian revolution and passing in the bourgeoisie's field.

Which are the theoretical advancements needed by the communist party to face its political tasks? Which are the limits of the old communist movement emerging from the balance of its advancement and decadence? Which is the answer to the tasks we must face?

Now I will show that the answer to these questions mostly corresponds to the contributions already given by Maoism to the communist thought and that make it the third higher stage of communist thought.

NOTES

1. *The Historical Role of the Communist International - the Conquests and the Limits*, in *La Voce*, n. 2, July 1999, pages 31-36.

2. The comrade A. Serafini gave an exemplary demonstration of it in its conference “Socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship in Lenin’s thought and in the historical experience of bolshevism” (given in the People’s House “A. del Sarto”, at Florence). In the second and last part his report arrives until 1926. As regards the following period (and we were in May 2001!) Serafini said that “today it is a communists’ task to analyze deeply that experience [following the 1926], both for deducing all the valid teachings... and for verifying...” That’s all!

3. Already long ago the CARC have taken a stand in favor of the Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. *Rapporti Sociali* (n. 9/10, September 1991) published the article *For the Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. For Maoism*, where there are illustrated 10 Mao’s contributions to the communist thought. From 1991 to 1994 the publishing house Rapporti Sociali published the *Mao Tse-tung’s Works* in 25 volumes. In 1993 the same publishing house published the pamphlet *On Maoism, Third Stage of the Communist Thought* (where are shown 22 contributions).

4. In February 2001 the Lenin Circle joined the editorial staff of *La Scintilla* and the two organizations published a joined declaration that proposed again the “fixed points” (meanwhile the 20 points were become 19, because silently the 17th point was lost on the road). In May 2001 also the editorial staff of *Politica Comunista* [*Communist Politics*, n.d.t.] (Florence), subscribed the 19 points.

The five main contributions of Maoism to communist thought

I shall give an introduction, paraphrasing what Stalin says talking about Leninism (1): the exposition of Mao's contributions to communist thought is not the exposition of Mao's conception of the world. Mao's conception of the world and Maoism are not the same, for extent. Mao Tse-tung is a Marxist-Leninist and Marxism-Leninism is the basis of his conception of the world. Therefore, the exposition of Maoism is not the exposition of the whole Mao's conception of the world. It is the exposition of what is new and particular in Mao's work, what Mao brought to the common treasure of Marxism-Leninism and that is tied to his name. This is a discriminating factor between us and all those "Maoists" who present Maoism as a conception apart, absolutely new and independent from Marxism-Leninism, as a break with the old communist movement (2).

In this article I will limit myself to the exposition of five Mao's contributions to the communist thought. They clarify some of the principal political problems that necessarily all the communists must face. They are necessary for the balance of the old communist movement and of the first wave of the proletarian revolution. The new communist parties must be and will be Marxist-Leninist-Maoist referring to these contributions (3). The readers who want to have a wider knowledge of Maoism, can find shown elsewhere other Mao's contributions (4).

1. The long lasting revolutionary popular war

Which way must we communist follow in the imperialist countries in order to carry out the working class to establish the proletarian dictatorship, begin the socialist phase of transformation of the society and contribute to the second wave of the proletarian revolution?

Generally the Subjective Forces of the Socialist Revolution (SFSR) have a spontaneous approach to the struggles. They participate to the "struggles that are present", do "what they can do", try to give strength to present struggles. They believe that, struggle by struggle, at the end we shall win: if the number of the struggles grow up, if the number of the workers who join those grow up, if the struggles become more obstinate and

resolute (more “militant”). When the SFSR go beyond this spontaneous approach, they put themselves the question of the conquest of the power, of the strategy that they must follow from today to the conquest of the power **(5)**: “Which path must we follow for reaching the conquest of the power? Which is the general framework on which the strategy to follow in the necessary phases depends? Which is the general trend founding on which we shall be able to do long-term plans and every single operation, distinguish the good from the bad initiatives, understand which classes and political and social forces we can count on in every phase, how much we can count on them, how we can employ the forces that we lead in the better way?”.

The working class must conquer the power and establish the proletarian dictatorship to solve all its problems. Who believe it has to answer what to do for approaching victory, for carrying out step by step the working class to create the necessary conditions in order to establish its power and open the new era of the transformation of the society, the socialist era. To have a right strategy is to answer rightly this question.

This is also an answer, founded on the experience and science of the communist movement, and not only spontaneous, instinctive, of common sense, to the “democratic and parliamentary way to socialism”, to the “way of structural reforms, to the “pacific evolution towards socialism”, to the “gradual convergence between the two systems” and to the other “ways” propagandized by the revisionists in the imperialist countries and that in the last 15 years have shown their utopian character, now also in practice.

According to the spontaneous political activists the frequency and intensity of the struggles, the quantity of workers who share in them and their obstinacy are the starting points. But everyone who thinks about it clearly understands that, under the same conditions, the number and kind of struggles and, first of all, their efficacy, depends on the direction given to our activity. It depends on the way we follow. Every comrade has lived many situations where the workers want to do something but they do not know what. Even if they know it they concretely do not have any mean to do it because they have not early get it. They are not in the condition to do something because they have not early created that condition. The level of mobilization of the popular masses in front of an event is not the spontaneous and casual fruit of many single wills. It is not the fruit of the relations spontaneously established among the popular masses by the role that they carry out in the bourgeois society. Also the popular masses’ consciousness of an event is not the spontaneous and casual fruit of many single wills. Both the mobilization and the consciousness are fruits of the conditions created by the political struggle and by the previous political movement. With a proper line we can modify the number of the struggles, the number of the workers who share in it and their determination, the

characteristics of these struggles. To have a proper line means to create an organizational network and agreement channels, to diffuse previously a right orientation, to prepare the struggles properly, to call the right struggles at the right moment, to get victories. If we want to win we must have and practice a right strategy, which is according to the objectives conditions of our struggles. These are starting conditions. They don't depend on our will and intelligence. We cannot change these conditions with our activity or we can change them only carrying out a proper activity for some time.

We communists are reconstructing the communist party amidst a phase of instability and upsetting of the existing order. We call this a “developing revolutionary situation”. It will last for many other years, whatever be the initiatives of individuals, groups and parties. In this situation, even if in general and schematic terms, we communists must define the way to follow in the next years, from now till when we shall establish the proletarian dictatorship. We must define our strategy. A SFSR who does not do it, even if it declares to work to the reconstruction of the communist party, is off the road or anyhow gives a restricted contribution.

Since the times of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848) the communists asked themselves which was the way, the general direction to follow for accomplishing the task to lead the working class to the conquest of the power.

In 1848 and for some years after the communists believed that the proletariat could conquer the power during a popular revolution, like the bourgeoisie did against the feudal forces. By its nature the bourgeois society is perpetually a ground for countless struggles of interests among classes, groups and individuals. Sometimes these struggles “resonate”, become acute, form coalitions till they divide the society in two contrasting camps and explode in a conflict that involves the entire society. “It would happen that a minority, constituted by a proletarian party able to leader the movement and to express coherently the economical, political and cultural needs of the proletariat, will be able to lead the majority of the people to the victory against the bourgeoisie, fighting against the bourgeois minority, in alliance with whom the first phase of the revolution was fought” (6).

In 1895 Engels acknowledged that history denied this conception shared also by him and by Marx. The history had taught that “at least until a certain point” the working class “had to elaborate the instruments and the conditions of its power within the bourgeois society itself, in order to overthrow it.”

In the writing to which we make here reference (F. Engels, Introduction to *Class Struggles in France from 1848 to 1850* of K. Marx, 1895) Engels explained that the socialist revolution is different from any other previous revolution in history. All the

revolutions were revolution of minorities, also when the majority of the people participated in them actively. It was always the replacement of the domination of an exploiting class with that of another one. A ruling minority was overthrown and another one took its place. On the contrary by its nature the socialist revolution requires not only the active participation of the majority of the people in the overthrowing of the old power, but it also needs its active participation in the creation of the new power and in the social transformation over which it presides. Moreover between the workers' mass and every exploiting minority there is a qualitative difference that doesn't exist between one and the other exploiting minority. The approach of the workers' mass to the power is even less of the same kind of the succession of a bourgeois party to another in the direction of the State. The new power doesn't consist in taking possession of the old State and of its institutions, and giving a different direction and new laws to its activity. It is necessary to destroy the old State, its institutions and its system and replace it with a new State made to measure of the new ruling class and of its objectives, with its own institutions and systems. Therefore it involves an adequate preparation to this role of the majority of the people, an accumulation of the revolutionary forces that must be done within this society, while the bourgeoisie's power persists, and not after the conquest of the power.

A part of this work was done, as Engels said in 1895. Twenty years later Lenin said that, in the greatest European imperialist countries, "in the last third of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century, during the "pacific" period of the cruelest capitalist slavery and of the fastest capitalist progress, the Second International carried out its part of useful preparatory work, of organization of the popular masses" (Lenin, *The Situation and the Tasks of the Socialist International*, 1st November 1914). In many European countries it led millions of proletarian to unite in parties, to set themselves some common objectives and, as a collective subject and thanks to their number, to assert the same political rights that the bourgeoisie stated assured to each (male) individual, but that no proletarian was individually able to assert, owing to its economic condition. The proletarian party succeeded in asserting those rights and exerting on the political life of the country the influence that every bourgeois was able to gain thanks to its richness and its role in the civil society. But yet in 1895 Engels stated that the bourgeoisie of the European countries would violate itself its own legality, as the following events abundantly proved. He announced the passing of the bourgeois political system from the *bourgeois democracy system* to the *preventive counter revolution system*. He stated also that, on the side of the communist party, the accumulation of the revolutionary forces would no more go on mainly in the electoral and parliamentary struggles nor generally within the existing regulations.

Therefore it was impossible that the working class established its power as the bourgeoisie did. It was also impossible to point to conquer the power by the electoral and parliamentary way. Some forms of aggregation, organization and ideological and political unification of the working class and of the popular masses could be accomplished, but they could no more be considered adequate to the task that the proletariat must accomplish. They are the forms carried out around the parliamentary struggles and the chronic struggles of interests, completely congenial and physiologic to the bourgeois society, which gave rise to the formation of electoral parties, trade unions, cooperatives and other mass organizations. But Engels did not say how the communist party should have to answer to the transformation of the bourgeois political regime that would put offside the way until then done in order to accumulate revolutionary forces within the bourgeois society (7). In the article above quoted in his turn Lenin added that “the Communist International has the task to organize the forces of the proletariat for the revolutionary assault against the capitalist governments, for the civil war against the bourgeoisie of all the countries, for the political power, for the victory of socialism!”. But he didn't specify how the new International could realize this task in the imperialist countries, very different from Russia.

The first Communist International did not establish the dictatorship of proletariat in Europe but, during the long crisis that upset the continent in the first half of the last century, it did a lot to this end. The conceptions and the methods with which the Communist International tried to direct the events of that period, the way it used the available forces in the struggle, the results of its activity are a precious experimental material. We communists must use it for working out the conception and defining the methods and rules with which in our turn we face the same task during this new general crisis which since almost 30 years shakes our countries, bring into question the systems of each country and the international relations and eliminates the conquests of the popular masses of our countries one after the other. Shortly we must use the experience of the first Communist International to elaborate our strategy that aims at the establishment of proletariat's dictatorship (8).

The balance of the experiences of the first Communist International carries some comrades to conclusions that do not clarify and arrange the events even if they are different among them. Those conclusions not only do not direct and stimulate the work that we must do, but also more or less hinder both the understanding and the practical work and demoralize our forces. All these conclusions underestimate the revolutionary capacities of the working class and of the popular masses of the imperialist countries.

Those comrades do not want to recognize that the conceptions and methods of the first

Communist International was not adequate to the pursued aim. Therefore they must fall back on the thesis that the working class of the imperialist countries does not want the socialism, or that in the imperialist countries the establishment of socialism is impossible. At least those comrades are reduced to ignore what to do except to hope in the revolutionary movement of the oppressed countries or in the luck. Generally these balances are invalidated by empiricism (9). On the contrary we must do a balance based on the facts and carried out by the light of dialectical materialism. This balance brings to the conclusion that the path to the conquest of power, the form of socialist revolution, is the long lasting revolutionary popular war also in the imperialist countries (10).

Differently from the Second International, in its experience the Communist International kept in mind the qualitative difference between the struggles of interests (chronic and congenital to the bourgeois society) and the struggles for socialism. But it constantly opposed, as elements mutually exclusive, pacific and violent struggle, work within and outside the bourgeois society, alliance and struggle, antagonistic and not antagonistic contradictions, contradictions between popular masses and imperialist bourgeoisie and contradictions among groups of the ruling class, claiming and revolutionary politics, legal and clandestine organization. On the contrary as a matter of fact these elements are a unity of opposites. The strategy of the long lasting revolutionary popular war recognizes this unity of opposites and develops both the terms of the unity. It makes up with them the working class' struggle in order to undermine and after all eliminate the imperialist bourgeoisie's power and establish its power. The chronic (structural, physiological) conflicts of the imperialist society oppose the members of the popular masses (as individuals, collective working groups, categories, classes) to the imperialist bourgeoisie. But in themselves those conflicts do not unite the members of the popular masses in a front antagonist to the bourgeois society. In fact the bourgeois society involves each member of the popular masses in repeated and chronic conflicts with the capitalists and their State. Contemporarily each member of the popular masses is subjected to the ideological and moral direction and influence of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois society smooths and erodes the antagonistic side that on the other hand it creates and recreates continuously.

Then the communist party must collect and strengthen in proper institutions the antagonistic side that exists and repeatedly resurfaces in the bourgeois society. It must collect and unite in organizations all the antagonism chronically generated by the bourgeois society. We must educate to antagonism all those who are induced to turn into this path by their experience. We must strengthen their antagonism with the force of the organization and action. The party must manage to exercise all its influence overall,

although it is external and opposite of the bourgeois society. Shortly, in every imperialist country the communist party must set about promoting, organizing and leading the popular masses' war against the imperialist bourgeoisie. It is not the question for the communist parties to declare a not existing war. On the contrary the communist party must simply acknowledge the ongoing undeclared war and it must lead the popular masses themselves to face it in a more and more adequate way.

The second general crisis of capitalism and the connected developing revolutionary situation are the context of the ruin of the present society and of the struggle for the establishment of socialism in the imperialist countries. Already now the imperialist bourgeoisie carries out an undeclared war against the popular masses of the imperialist countries in order to increase the value of its capital. This war crushes and in various ways spiritually and physically tortures the great part of the people of the imperialist countries. This war itself destroys the regulations and the practices which regulate as habits the popular masses' subjection in the imperialist countries. Since the last summer (2001) the bosses of the US imperialist group give a direction to the events that confirm in the clearest way that the popular masses of the imperialist countries are the principal target of the imperialist groups. Besides it is clear that until they will succeed in keeping subjected the popular masses of the imperialist countries they probably will also succeed in holding the people of the oppressed countries at bay. They do it dividing them, setting one against the other, bombing the indomitable people and terrorizing. On the other hand the imperialist groups can be the world policemen only establishing growing police States and reactionary mobilization in the imperialist countries. This is the process of the general crisis of capitalism. It develops in various extraordinary ways and frequent changes. It goes on with ups and downs, in a very irregular and differentiated way. Periods of a particularly cruel oppression alternate with period almost of ceasefire. Periods of acute oppression against wide sectors of the popular masses alternate with periods when the worse blows are concentrated against restricted sectors. The bourgeoisie attacks now a group and then the other. Presently every individual, group and category of the popular masses reacts as it can in an open order. The bourgeoisie has many instruments in order to divide, to blow a group after another, to hinder the concentration of the classes and of the damaged groups, to set one against the other. This process will go on until the present general crisis will end or with a socialist revolution or with a new inter imperialist war that will establish a new world order for capitalism (an event that we can not absolutely exclude). Therefore every communist party must transform by stages this ongoing undeclared war. At present the popular masses only suffer this war: communist party must transform this ongoing war in a war that the

popular masses carry out in a more and more organized way, more and more united and taking the initiative.

The experience of the Resistance against Nazi-Fascism in Italy and France shows that also in the most developed imperialist countries the revolutionary war is possible. All depends on how much the popular masses share in it. Each communist party must understand the undeclared war in progress deeper and deeper, collect the forms of resistance opposed by the masses, elaborate them, socialize and bring them to a higher level. It must combine each kind of struggle carried out by the masses, legal and violent, open and clandestine struggle. It must find the way to make more and more combine all the groups, categories and classes of the popular masses in an united front. Obviously each party will have to learn how to apply the general laws of the long lasting revolutionary popular war to its own particular country and to each particular situation. This process will surely be long, winding and painful. The more backward is the political situation the more the party must lever on the particular.

The strategy of the long lasting revolutionary popular war is a strategy for the transformation of the working class in leading class, for driving the popular masses from the bourgeoisie's direction to the working class' direction, for establishing the proletariat's dictatorship, sweeping away the bourgeoisie's dictatorship. The popular revolutionary war is a special kind of war, different from anyone we have seen till now. The working class will carry it out in its own way. Within this war the military aspect is essential, but the importance of its role greatly varies stage by stage. Only the practical development will allows us to define progressively better the tasks to accomplish.

Generally now we can determine the following points.

1. The party will have to individuate the phases to arrive at the establishment of the proletariat's dictatorship, discovering the right targets and lines for each phase (that is to say, targets and lines proper to the objective development of the contradictions), and organizing itself in the way adequate to realize them.
2. The party will have to mobilize each popular masses' class and group to defend in the better way each its particular interest against the imperialist bourgeoisie, and to utilize in any way possible the chronic struggles of interests carried out in the bourgeois society and its institutions, as an auxiliary aspect of the revolutionary process **(11)**.
3. The party will have to identify itself with the organized vanguard of the working class, driving the working class to act accordingly to the lines and the targets indicated by the party itself and to assume the direction of the popular masses **(12)**.
4. The party will have to move in every occasion the masses' most advanced parts

so to open the path of the struggle to the backward part: this goes radicalized only giving practical expression to the anti capitalist trend that oppression and exploitation make arise (13).

5. Staying outside the bourgeois political relations the party (that must be necessarily clandestine) must build and direct a front as wide as possible of classes and political forces to realize the targets of every phase, promoting the greatest organization of the masses in public and clandestine, legal and illegal, pacific and fighting organizations.

6. The party must in any way possible look after the development of the revolutionary armed forces led by the party. The armed struggle has a decisive and conclusive role to realize the popular masses' role and establish the proletarian dictatorship ("the power rises from the gun barrel").

In short the question is to develop the potential of the long lasting revolutionary popular war, constructing a wide front of revolutionary forces and classes around the party which has a relation of unity and struggle with each part of the front itself (14).

Mao Tse-tung elaborated the experience of the Russian and Chinese revolutions and drew out the most advanced theory of the long lasting revolutionary popular war. He systematically developed the science of this long lasting revolutionary popular war.

It is the most complete theory of the form of the proletarian revolution, of the path for seizing the power that the working class must beat also in the imperialist countries. It moreover enlightens and clears the experience of the first International Communist. The passages and the results of the history of the first Communist International cannot be understood without that theory, while by its light they become very instructive.

2. The new democracy revolutions

The communist strategy in the colonial and semi colonial countries oppressed by imperialism.

The first wave of the proletarian revolution and the development of imperialism have made mature further the conditions of the democratic revolution in the colonial and semi colonial countries where the majority of humanity is living. They also have made advance some of the most important conditions for its success. The workers engaged in the capitalist firms are more numerous. The cultural level and the organizational capability are enormously grown. A great revolutionary experience has been accumulated during the first wave of the proletarian revolution and the struggle that

eliminated the colonial system. In many countries communist parties and groups are working. In many of them (Peru, Colombia, Philippines, Nepal, Bangladesh, India, Turkey) popular revolutionary wars are going on, and in many others there are strong revolutionary movements. The defeat of the old colonial system and the failure of neo-colonialism irreversibly changed the situation. At last the financial capital destroyed on a larger scale the conditions that make possible the miserable survival of the other workers that it deprives with taxes, interests, duties, fares, monopoly prices. The general crisis of absolute overproduction of capital clutches the imperialist groups in competition among them and pushes them to invade and plunder more deeply and to attack again the oppressed countries openly. The “bomber politics” repeats the “civilizing enterprises” of the “gunboat politics” of the beginning of the 20th century more powerfully and fiercely. It confirms to all the peoples the “superiority of the Christian civilization”, personified by the conflicting couple Bush-Woityla: the executioner that kills and the chaplain that comforts. The imperialist groups make endless claims everywhere. Their arrogance is as more open as greater is the resistance to satisfy those claims. The agitation that grows in all oppressed countries rises from this ground. The rebellion smoldering in these countries, that more and more frequently explodes, is a manifestation of the great steps forward done by humanity during the first wave of the proletarian revolution. It manifests also the better conditions with which it faces up the second wave. The decay of the old communist movement and the imperialism’s attack has erased only a part of the conquest obtained, while the new and growing claims of the imperialist groups and of its puppets and local agents are made objectively contradictory and subjectively intolerable **(15)**. Just this pushes them to claim with more open and intolerant arrogance, with more powerful weapons and violent terrorism. The class struggle becomes more acute as more the capitalism get near its end, although in detail events and line-ups do not follow all the instructions of our manuals.

Owing to all this the colonial and semi-colonial countries assume a more important role in the advancing new wave of the proletarian, in its preparation and development **(16)**, in comparison to the role that they had in the first wave. Already today the colonial and semi-colonial countries are giving an important contribution to the development of the second wave of the proletarian revolution. At the moment the bloodiest battles are fought there. The struggle for the affirmation of Maoism as third higher stage of the communist thought in the communist movement has been launched by the Peruvian Communist Party and by its president Gonzalo.

The communist parties of the colonial and semi-colonial countries exercise a great influence on the formation of the new communist parties all over the world. Thanks to

the blows inflicted to the imperialist groups' interests, the political movement of the colonial and semi-colonial countries increasingly feeds the political movement of the imperialist countries and accelerates it. Whoever be the promoters, organizers, executors, the attempts of the 11th September at New York and Washington are also effect of the movement of rebellion of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Or the promoters come from there, or the US imperialist groups started a "strategy of tension" on a world level in order to be at the head of the series of blows inflicted to their interests in the Arabian countries.

The colonial and semi-colonial countries start from more advanced positions. The struggle against the racial discrimination, the national oppression and the discrimination and the oppression of the women also starts from more advanced positions. This contributes to assure that with the second wave of the proletarian revolution the exploited classes, peoples and nations and the oppressed races and the women will reach successes and conquests greater than those reached during the first wave.

The revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is so important that some groups and parties, also in the imperialist countries are carried to believe that it (and not the socialist revolution in the imperialist countries) is the first drive of the new wave of the proletarian revolution on a world level. They believe that this is the ground where, after all, the final result will be decided. On the whole this conception is wrong. The contradiction between oppressed and imperialist countries, as the contradiction among the imperialist countries, in determinate phases of the second wave assumes the main role. But on the whole of the second wave the contradiction between working class and imperialist bourgeoisie has the main role. First of all the proletarian revolution is socialist revolution. This wrong thesis strengthens the undervaluation of the revolutionary potentialities of the working class and of the popular masses of the imperialist countries. Therefore it has a negative effect on the revolutionary activity of the communists of the imperialist countries and after all weakens all the revolutionary movement.

In the greatest part of the oppressed countries the developing revolution is by its nature a democratic revolution. Its principal tasks are: 1. the elimination of the feudal rests and of the other forms of economy founded on *personal* relations of dependence and oppression, and 2. the liberation from the imperialist domination, therefore the struggle against imperialism and its local agents (the bourgeoisie *compradora* and bureaucratic).

The strategy of the new democracy revolution is the only one that makes possible to carry out the revolution completely in the oppressed countries and lead it towards success. It is a democratic revolution directed by the working class through its communist party. It is part of the world proletarian revolution and creates the condition

to begin the socialist transformation of the society.

Mao Tse-tung developed the Lenin's conception about the alliance between workers and farmers, about the alliance among workers of the metropolis and oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies and about the two stages of revolution. It elaborated a systematic and relatively complete doctrine of the new democracy revolution and to its development in socialist revolution. Therefore also in this way the Maoism is proving to be the third higher stage of communist thought.

3. The class' struggle in the socialist society

The historical contributions of the socialist countries built during the first wave of the proletarian revolution and the teachings of their experience.

It is impossible to carry out the renewal of the communist movement beyond an elementary and spontaneous level without a balance of the socialist countries' experience. The Soviet Union, the Popular Chinese Republic and the socialist camp had assumed a very important role in the world proletarian revolution. First the degeneration and then the collapse of the socialist camp have produced and produce negative effects over all the world communist movement and over every part of it. In 1926 Stalin said: "What will happen if the capitalism would succeed in smothering and destroying the Soviet Republic? It will succeed an era of the darkest reaction in all the capitalist and colonial countries. The working class and the oppressed people will be repressed. The positions of the international communism will be lost" (17). What he said in the late 1926 has happened a little more than 60 years after and still weighs on us.

Still today the bourgeoisie tells the story that Reagan and his struggle against the "empire of Evil" and Woytila with his Madonna of Fatima have made collapse the socialist camp. Every communist must clearly understand why the socialist camp and particularly the Soviet Union first degenerated and then collapsed. This is necessary both for the ideological strength in the struggle we have to carry out both for not repeating the mistakes before done. Besides, the even short history of the first socialist countries illuminates with a new and fruitful light all the doctrine and the experience of the communist movement. It does it as generally every more advanced experience allows understanding better also the past and the more backward experiences.

Mao Tse-tung developed a systematic and relatively complete balance about the tract of transition from capitalism to communism done in the first socialist countries. Particularly

he shows the laws of transition on the basis of the experience done in USSR and in the Chinese Popular Republic (18).

Marx, Engels and Lenin repeatedly showed some points of the doctrine of the communist movement, and also Stalin did it (even if with some contradictions about the level reached by the extinction of classes' antagonism in USSR). Those points were the following.

1. The socialism was the phase of transition from capitalism to communism, of the transformation of the production relations, of the other social relations and of the ideas, conceptions and feelings corresponding to them, in order to eliminate the foundations and the manifestations of the capitalist society and to establish social relations founded on the principle "from everyone according to his capacities, to everyone according to his needs", with the corresponding conceptions.

2. This transition had to last an entire historical period and would end on a world level with the consequent extinction of the States, of the barriers of race and nation that divide all men and of each form of oppression on women.

3. Until the end of this process, the States and divisions between exploited and exploiting classes would survive, even if in a specific and decreasing way. The class' struggle continued to be the drive of the transformation of society.

Mao showed that it needs to clearly consider three different aspects of the production relations in order to understand the class' struggle in the socialist countries:

1. the property of means and conditions of production,
2. the divisions among men in the productive activity (divisions between manual and brain-work, between men and women, between the city and the countryside, between advanced and backwards zones and sectors, etc.),
3. the relations of distribution of the product.

Considering all these three aspects it was possible understand with certainty where the bourgeoisie was in the socialist countries. It was constituted by that part of the leaders of the party, of the State and of the other social institutions who supported the way towards capitalism (who opposed the march towards communism). Therefore it was possible to do a complete class' analysis of the socialist societies and so to direct the oppressed classes' struggle within the new political and cultural conditions specific of the socialist society. The proletarian Cultural Revolution was a practical manifestation of the strength that the class' struggle can release for communism in the socialist society.

Mao showed that the transformation of the social relations and of the connected conceptions and feelings proceeded by stages (and every stage alternated gradual

evolutions and leaps). The transformation so could be studied precisely (“with the precision of an experimental science”). Then in a certain measure the transformation can be directed in accordance with its own laws which had to be searched, discovered and applied (19). It was possible both to advance as to withdraw. In the socialist society there were two possible paths: to advance towards communism or to withdraw towards the capitalist system. Two classes fought between themselves (the bourgeoisie and the working class) and then two lines contended for the direction of the communist party, of the State and of the other institutions of the society. This also offered the basis to face the struggle against the restoration after the modern revisionists took the direction (20). No analysis of the socialist countries outside Maoism allows valorizing their experience, showing the limits and the real problems and indicating the path for the advancement. All the analyses try to understand the socialist countries with the distorting lens of categories relative to backward societies (State capitalism, Asiatic way of production, bureaucratic system, etc.). Owing to its overall backwardness the Popular Republic of China was not able to replace the Soviet Union as basis of the world proletarian revolution and fell under the modern revisionists’ rule (Teng Hsiao-ping and his successors). Nevertheless the Maoism allows to the communists of the entire world to understand the experience of the socialist countries and to draw constructive lessons from it.

Mao Tse-tung directed the Cultural Proletarian Revolution and the struggle to drive out the leaders of the party and of the State who supported the capitalist way. Nevertheless he indicated that the results obtained in the Chinese Popular Republic were precarious and there were many chances that the modern revisionists succeeded in seizing the direction of the PCC, making the Republic regress from the achieved positions, if there would not have been upheavals in Soviet Union (21). Also this confirms the depth and exactness of Mao Tse-tung’s balance on the socialist society.

4. The mass line

The mass line as principal method of work and direction of every communist party.

Every communist party had to face and will face the antinomy between the ideological and organizational autonomy of the party and the tight tie of the party with the masses. The first is necessary for the party “to elaborate” a right line. The second is necessary for the party “to discover” and “carry out” the right line. Every communist party had to face and will face the antinomy among the immediate, the present and the final targets. Every

communist party often struggled and will struggle against two opposed deviations: the one of those who part themselves from the masses persuaded to go to the target faster and the other of those who mingle with the masses and reduced themselves to show what the masses already do, reflecting the medium, general, common, diffused status of the masses [in Italian language the first deviation is called “avventurismo”, (adventurism), the other is called “codismo”, and means to be in the queue (“coda” in the Italian language) with the masses, n.d.t.]

The mass line is the overcoming of those antinomies and the criterion to avoid both those deviations.

With the mass line, we first collect the elements of knowledge scattered and confused amidst the masses and their aspirations. Then from what we collect we draw out targets, lines, methods, criteria and we bring them to the masses until they take possession of them and carry them out. Then we return to the new situation and again we collect element of knowledge and aspirations in the new situation, elaborate them and draw out from them new targets, lines, methods and criteria and again bring them to the masses until they take possession of them and carry them out. The communists’ conceptions become richer and more concrete every time repeating this process many and many times. So the revolutionary process goes on towards victory.

From another point of view, with the mass line within each group we individuate the left, the center and the right part. The left part is that which aims, if realized, will drive the group to flow together in the bed of the socialist revolution. With the mass line we can mobilize and organize the left part so that it unifies to itself the center and isolates the right part.

In order to carry out the mass line therefore the party must have assimilated the dialectical materialism enough well (“without theory the facts are blind”). It must do good inquiries (“without facts the theory is empty”). It must have a good knowledge of the current revolutionary process and of the role of the various classes in it.

On these conditions the party goes towards its final target (the socialist revolution). It does not point to that target directly and in every concrete circumstance. In every phase and concrete circumstance it points to the target that the masses can realize and which realization brings the masses near to the final target of party. In each phase of the struggle the mass line drives the party to gather a front as wider possible of classes, forces, personalities in order to realize the target of that phase. It implies in the party the greatest ideological and political independence, a great capacity to understand the real contradictions and the current movement, farsightedness, freedom of movement. The

party parts from the masses because is not able to understand the concrete situation, because it is backward, and not because it is too much advanced than the masses themselves. A good doctor or a good teacher is as more advanced or “independent” as better he is able to understand the real situation of the sick person or of the schoolboy. They do not follow what sick persons or students say. They do not do what they suggest. They understand what the sick persons and students are and move them to reach the target that himself want to reach. The mass line allows to the party both to have in its hand the initiative both to be closely connected to the masses and to continuously strengthen this connection. The connection with the masses becomes closer as become higher the party’s quality, as become stronger its political and ideological independence. The mass line is also the synthesis between masses’ party and cadres’ party: the cadres’ party that directs the masses. It is the synthesis between party’s direction and independence of the masses, between politics from above and politics from below.

It was an acquired doctrine of the communist movement that the ideas come from the experience, and that the elements of higher knowledge were in germ, scattered and confused, in the masses’ practice. We can quote countless passages of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin which show and repeat this conception about the relation between ideas and sensations, conscience and experience and its reflections on the political activity. Mao Tse-tung expressed this conception systematically and organically, and indicated the mass line as the principal method of work and direction of the communist party (22).

5. The struggle between the two lines in the communist party

The struggle between the two lines in the party as principle of the communist party’s development and defense against the bourgeoisie’s influence.

Every communist party often had to face and will face the antinomy between “ideological and political cohesion” and “organizational discipline”. The first asks for a systematic and organizational effort (with institutions and levels suitably dedicated) in order to promote the free development of each member and of its experience, and to make a climate of free and open debate reign in the party. The second implies unity of directions in the action, honest, active and loyal applying of the party’ directives and subordination of the individual to the collective, of the lower to the higher levels, of the part to the whole.

The communist parties created by the first Communist International faced this antinomy

recognizing the unity of opposites included in it and adopting the democratic centralism as organizational principle. Lenin was our teacher in this field.

But the experience showed that the struggle for the ideological and political cohesion of the party put new problems. The communist parties of the Communist International had not a clearly defined line as regards the solutions of these problems. Also this opened a breach to the modern revisionists.

Each party often faces new situations and had to solve new problems. Everything changes and also the tasks that the party must face change. The rising of divergences is unavoidable within the party. In fact the divergences are factors of development. Also the ideas develop through slow evolutions and leaps, through the contrast, the division of the one in two. Also the ideas have a history: they are born within few men and acquire consent and followers as they demonstrate their validity in the practice. The bourgeois who has a new idea, realize it. If it goes well, so much the worse for his competitors; if it goes wrong, he fails (in any case the workers pay all the expenses). Amidst the communist and in the socialist society the things go differently. The comrade who has an idea presents it to the collective. It needs that the collective offer him the opportunity to show, defend and verify it. The new ideas are precious. Conceptions and lines derive from the contrast between true and false, new and old, advanced and backward: each development has these aspects. A party without divergences of views is dead (“there is no life without contradiction”). In front of divergences of view we must develop the debate, the research and the verification in order to reach the unity. There is no other way to reach the truth. If the ones who have an idea different from those already acquired and common are not allowed to express and test it, the development of thought in the party is obstructed and the thought is obliged to assert itself by underhand means. We undermine the ideological and political cohesion of the party. After all this is a necessary condition in order to keep the organizational discipline as an element of strength for the party.

We communist are for the freedom of criticism. But we are against the cohabitation and the coexistence of contrasting conceptions and ideas in the party. Therefore we do not want coexistence of divergent conceptions. We are not indifferent to conceptions. If “everybody thinks what he wants” he will also do what he wants, and there will be no organizational discipline. On the contrary, we do an open struggle among different conceptions in order to reach the unity on the most advanced and right revolutionary positions. The party must promote the confrontation, the debate and the verification. A direction that suffocates the contrasts, which fears them, which does not promote the debate and the verification is not a good direction.

Nevertheless, the contrasts of ideas are not only a mean for searching truth. They are

also expressions of contrasting interests. The divergences of conceptions and lines in the party are not only the result of the progress of knowledge (contrast between truth and error) and of the rising of new situations (contrast between new and old, advanced and backward). They are also the result of the struggle between the working class advancing towards socialism and the bourgeoisie, who tries to perpetuate the old world as far as possible. They are the reflection of the antagonistic interests of the two classes struggling for the power. The ideas are a weapon in the struggle. Becoming patrimony of the masses, the ideas are a material strength that changes the world. A wrong orientation carries the party to defeat. A right orientation carries it to victory. Therefore, the conception and the orientation of the communist party are a battlefield, a field hard fought by the classes. Indeed a communist party with a sufficiently right orientation is invincible, as the first wave of the proletarian revolution has showed. In order to defeat the revolution, first of all the bourgeoisie have to conquer the communist party and divert it. In order to prevent revolution, the bourgeoisie must prevent the formation of a communist party able to give itself a sufficiently right orientation. That is why conceptions already theoretically defeated repeatedly present themselves again in the party, in forms hardly changed or sometimes in the same old forms. That is why the bourgeoisie tries by any means to influence the ideas of the party's members. The bourgeoisie try by any means and in every way to avail itself of every divergence unavoidably developing within the party. It tries to contact the dissidents, to support them in every way (the fascism published the Trotsky's work *History of the Russian revolution*). It does it only as something to be exploited. It does not share their theses; it uses them to render antagonistic the divergences within our party. The bourgeoisie levers on individualism (on careerism, presumptuousness, search for glory and money, wish of revenge). It profits by the fact that in the bourgeois society the individual can find in all this fields opportunities that he cannot find in the party. The bourgeoisie levers on divergences physiologically developing in the party. Moreover, the bourgeoisie levers on every popular mass' backwardness that obviously partially extends in the party. The ideological and moral subjection of the oppressed classes to the ruling class is congenital to the class society ("the ruling culture is the culture of the ruling class"). Therefore, until it will exist, the bourgeoisie will have some influence above the popular masses and trough them above the party. There are no "Great Walls of China" among the classes and the influence goes across every wall.

Every attempt to prevent the bourgeoisie's influence only and mainly with disciplinary measures, suffocating the divergences, keeping the divergences within narrow circles of party's leaders and showing outside a compact wall, with control commissions, at the

end show themselves disastrous. Every attempt to ensure the ideological and political cohesion of the party through organizational discipline or fails or carries the party first to sluggishness and soon or later to disintegration. The bourgeoisie individuated and exploited the divergences in the party when they were forbidden and therefore secret. The history of the Italian Communist Party presents many events of this kind. The prohibition favored the transformation of the divergences in conspiracy. The bourgeoisie conquered the party's direction in the greatest part of the communist parties of the first Communist International. At that point it was helped by the practice established in the party to suffocate the divergences or keep them in narrow circles of leaders and imposed its line with disciplinary measures to the party until its corruption and desegregation. The dogmatic refusal of the struggle between two lines in the party paralyzed the left wing.

Unavoidably in the communist party, the class contradiction (the bourgeoisie's influence and the struggle against it) combines with the contradiction between true and false and the contradiction between the advanced and the backward (the new and the old). Nevertheless, there is no other way to treat these contradictions but the open debate, the active ideological struggle, the research and the verification in the practice. To do otherwise means to prevent the development of the party, to prevent it to carry out its task and to open wider ways to the bourgeoisie's influence.

We must fight the bourgeoisie's infiltration and influence within our ranks with a series of instruments. It is required the engagement of honor of the party's members and of every structure of it to respect and favor the debate and the verification of the ideas and not to accept the bourgeoisie's supports (exploitative or not) to single elements or opinion groups of the party (reviews, circles, centers of study). We must carry out the open political and ideological struggle and the mass struggle against spies, infiltrators, connecting agents, etc. However, absolutely we must not in general forbid or even only discourage the expression of ideas and their open debate. On the contrary, we must favor it with proper initiatives and measures. The party needs a most strengthened knowledge. If we do not practice a line consciously and after due consideration, we practice a line unconsciously. Then both the backwardness and the bourgeoisie's influence find a favorable ground. Carrying out a right battle the left wing can always avail itself of the class' experience of the party's members and win.

We do not free ourselves from bourgeoisie's influence eliminating the open debate among us and forbidding the dissent by statute. Only the struggle between two lines ensures the ideological and political cohesion. The party must be conscious that the bourgeoisie's influence within its ranks is unavoidable. The party must be trained to identify the class' matrix of the ideas and to look for which class each idea reflects

interests and way of acting. The more the party does it the more it is able to drive back the bourgeoisie's influence and so to strengthen its ideological and political cohesion. Therefore, every party must put the principle of the struggle between two lines together with the principle of the democratic centralism.

The struggle between two lines has ever existed in the communist parties. Thinking back to the history of the Communists' League (1847-1850) and of the First International (1864-1872) we can reconstruct the sequence of struggle between lines, which marked their development. In the Second International, there were many struggles between lines, but they were carried out without consciousness of the class' character of the lines in struggle (as if the ideas were above the classes) and with a conciliatory spirit. The history of Lenin's party is a sequence of struggles between two lines. The *History of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of USSR* drawn up by Stalin (1938) shows it brightly. Lenin and Stalin were masters in searching for the class' meaning of the conceptions and lines conflicting in the party. Nevertheless, in the first Communist International the law of the unavoidableness of the struggle between two lines was not recognized. Therefore, the attempts to keep away the bourgeoisie's influence with disciplinary measures were largely carried out. They hindered the development of many parties and after all did not prevent the bourgeoisie's influence. Those who carried the bourgeoisie's influence within the parties often allied with the dogmatists, asserting that in the party the bourgeoisie's influence had been eliminated and for ever. Therefore, they could carry out their work of destruction in more favorable conditions.

Mao Tse-tung carried out the conception of the struggle between two lines in the party enough in detail. Also for this aspect is necessary that the new communist parties assimilate the Maoism and be Marxist-Leninist-Maoist.

At the end of this illustration of the most important five contributions of Mao Tse-tung to communist thought for our guideline at this stage, I think useful to recall, although it's obvious, that the study of Maoism, and generally the study of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, it is not enough by itself for making a Communist, as the study of a manual chemistry, even an excellent manual, it is not enough for making a successful chemical. The study of Maoism will serve those seeking a way for the socialist revolution, assuming the ability to assimilate and apply the practical and specific characteristics of the revolutionary movement in our country.

NOTES

1. Stalin, *Principles of Leninism*, (1924), Introduction.

2. Such “Maoists” are a race appeared above all in the Seventies, and not yet extinct. On the wave of the enthusiasm for socialism that during those years pervaded many strata and classes, many people converged there. There were communists enthusiastic but a little ingenuous. There were also people (particularly coming from the catholic world and from university) without any connection with the old communist movement and even real active and anti-Soviet opponents of that movement. They were members of socialist groups as that of *Quaderni Rossi* [*Red Exercise Books*, n.d.t.], intellectuals and students grown up within Right circles like for example “Student Youth” and “Young Workers” (founded by the priest Don Giussani). I point out this discrimination because amidst those who oppose themselves to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, there were and will be some people that did not and will not face the arguments here exposed. Those people (in good or in bad faith) resort to the polemic expedient to refer to those “Maoists”, rising up against “the attempt of Maoists to deny or revise the Marxism-Leninism”. I put the readers on his guard against these expedients.

3. Probably the argumentations in this article will not completely resolve all the doubts of some readers. It is understandable. After all the value of a conception verifies itself testing it, and applying it. It is easy to oppose to the argumentation here exposed the objection that “nevertheless Mao’s followers did not succeed in preventing the revisionists’ advent even in the Chinese Communist Party”. In fact some people ought to give an answer to this objection (for example those of Rossoperaio [Rossoperaio is an Italian Maoist group, now Proletari Comunisti, n.d.t.]) if they would seriously be interested in the theory. They are those who proclaim that the Maoism is the third higher stage of communist thought and at the same time assert that colonial and semi colonial countries can play the role of center of the proletarian revolution. Therefore, they refuse the truth that the Chinese Popular Republic was not able to be the center of the world revolution, in spite of Maoism.

I invite the readers “to do the test of practice” and so answer to the following questions. 1. Why in a certain phase has the modern revisionism taken the direction of almost all the communist parties created by the Communist International corroding them till the transformation in their contrary (in promoters of the pacific and gradual restoration of capitalism) and destroying them? 2. Which were the limits of the left wing of these communist parties, owing to which it was not able to prevent the success of the modern revisionism? 3. Which are the main teachings that they draw out from the experience of the first wave of the proletarian revolution, that we must esteem as treasures for the reconstruction of the communist parties and in the preparation, promotion and direction of the second wave of the proletarian revolution?

Everybody who wants to have a vanguard role in the reconstruction of the communist party must answer to these three questions. Who tries to do it will find in the Maoism the guide to reach fecund answers. So he will verify that Maoism is the third higher stage of

communist thought.

4. For a wider survey of the Mao's contributions to the communist thought see the following three sources:

- The article *For Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. For Maoism*, in *Rapporti Sociali*, n. 9/10, pages 7 onwards (September 1991). There are illustrated 10 contributions of Mao related to the following themes: the analysis of the classes in which the society is divided, the developing revolutionary situation, the theory of knowledge and the style of work of the party, the leading methods of the party in the revolutionary war, the attitude towards the enemy, the people as a field of forces not hostile to the revolution, the socialist society, the modern revisionism in the socialist countries, the modern revisionism in the imperialist countries, the dialectical materialism.

- The pamphlet *On Maoism, Third Stage of the Communist Thought*, Editions Rapporti Sociali (1993) There are illustrated in detail 5 contributions (the theory of the revolutionary process as theory of the contradiction as motive-power of the process, the class struggle in the socialist society, the developing revolutionary situation, the united front of the classes and of the revolutionary peoples, the mass line as principal method of work and direction of the communist party). There are indicated 17 other contributions and precisely: 2 in the field of philosophy (theory of the contradiction and theory of the knowledge), 3 in the field of political economy (bureaucratic capitalism, semi colonial and semi feudal countries, political economy of socialism), and 12 in the field of socialism (class analysis in the bourgeois society, developing revolutionary situation, united front of the revolutionary classes under the direction of the working class, distinction between the contradiction among us and the enemy and contradictions within the people [antagonistic and not antagonistic contradictions], the long lasting popular revolutionary war as universal form of the proletarian revolution, the military theory of the proletariat, the struggle between two lines as law of development of the communist party, the mass line as principal method of direction of the communist party, the theory of the class struggle in socialism and the class analysis [where bourgeoisie is in the socialist countries; the three aspects of the production relations, the second aspect and the State), the sources of modern revisionism, the cultural proletarian revolution).

- The *Mao Tse-tung's Works*, Rapporti Sociali Editions, (1991-1994). 25 volumes, available also on CD and on the web site <http://lavoce-npci.samizdat.net>.

5. Here I mean spontaneity and not "spontaneism". The first is a positive beginning condition of growth. First every individual does what the other already do. Then he begins to think how he can do better what he is doing and what he must do. Then he comes out from spontaneity and begins to act more and more consciously and after due consideration. On the contrary the spontaneism is the theory according to which we must remain at the primitive stage. According to it we must do what we are used to do and what we happen to do. We must not elaborate a science in the field where we are operating, try to foresee the circumstances of the fight, draw plans and do projects, create the more adequate conditions, make alliances, find the more advantageous paths, etc. Spontaneism is also the behavior of those who do not want to think over, use grey matter in the struggle, of those who only want to act.

6. CARC, *F. Engels, 10, 100, 1000 CARC for the Reconstruction of the Communist Party*, 1995, page 14.
7. In the letter of the 8 march 1895, where he defends its *Introduction to the Class Struggle in France from 1848 to 1850* from the censorship respectful of legality by the party's leaders, Engels writes: "If you do not want to make understand to those of the government that we wait to rouse a revolution only because we are not enough strong to do it by ourselves alone and the army is not yet infected by our ideas, then why, my darling, every day you boast about the gigantic progresses and the successes of the party? They know very well that we are strongly marching towards victory and that within some year they will not be able to offer resistance to us. That's why they want to eliminate us now, but they do not know how to do it. Our speeches cannot change anything. They know all this as well as us and they know as well that when we shall seize the power we shall use it how it suits us and not them... Legality until when and so much it suits us, but no 'legality at all costs', neither by words" (F. Engels, *Complete Works*, vol. 50).
8. See the article *The Activity of the first Communist International in Europe and the Maoism* in n. 10 issue of *La Voce*.
9. The undervaluation of the revolutionary potentialities of the working class, of the proletariat and of the popular masses permeates the conception of many SFRS. See the positions expressed by *Il futuro* [*The future*, n.d.t.], the review of the ex - MPA [Anticapitalistic Proletarian Movement, n.d.t.], now become ANA [Anticapitalistic National Assembly]. They say that the working class is an enormous worker aristocracy (see *Rapporti Sociali*, n. 23-24, "First of all, clean up our heads!"). The position of the group Rossoperaio is another example (see their Statement "Let's oppose the popular war up to communism to the "global war" of the imperialism", published in "*Rossoperaio*", n. 12, October 2001). Analyzing the attacks of the 11 of September at Washington and New York and their effects, they do not see that the popular masses of the imperialist countries are within the targets of the imperialist groups. This position is connected with the thesis that today in the world the principal contradiction is that one between oppressed and imperialist countries. A thesis not reconcilable, for who deeply think over the questions, with the thesis that Maoism is the third higher stage of the communist thought, thesis that Rossoperaio says to share. These conceptions are empiricists. They found themselves on how many struggles and which kind of them are carried out by the working class of the imperialist countries, without enlighten these data with a theory explaining origin, shows its contradictory state and then shows also how to act starting from them and from the potentialities within them.
10. With regard to it see *On the Form of the Proletarian Revolution*, in *La Voce*, n. 1, page 23 and following. Also the PCE(r) [(reconstituted) Spanish Communist Party, n.d.t.] reached this conclusion in its balance of the story of Communist International Spanish section. This balance has been published in Italy by the *Rapporti Sociali* Editions with the title *The War of Spain, the PCE and the Communist International* (1997).
11. The militarists assert that the struggle for the particular and immediate interests averts (deviates) the masses from the revolution. We communist assert the contrary. During the general crisis of capitalism, as a rule, the bourgeoisie damages the immediate and

particular interests of all the classes of the popular masses, even if it does in various measures and times. Therefore, the working class must mobilize, support and lead every group and class of the popular masses to struggle also for its specific particular immediate interests against the imperialist bourgeoisie. This struggle can mobilize also the most backward strata of the masses on a great scale and make them flow in the struggle led by the communists towards the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. If the party does not accomplish this task, it leaves the road open to the reactionary mobilization.

12. We must not mainly carry the workers to share the ideas of their communist vanguard and to proclaim the same targets. We must mainly carry the workers to struggle for the targets and according to the lines indicated by their vanguards.

13. It is wrong the thesis supported by some subjective forces according to which if the masses are radicalized then the communists can work; if they aren't radicalized, the communist must wait.

14. The circumstances decide which of the two opposites (the unity or the struggle) is principal in every moment. The party can direct both the allied and the hostile forces, if it knows the laws of the contradiction to which the hostile armies submit. Many times Mao showed how the communist party carried the hostile armies to get to the trap.

15. The thesis that the colonial and semi colonial countries have had an absolute regression in comparison with the "past", can be supported only by who ignores, hides or beautifies the wickedness of the natural economy, of the slave and feudal society and of the old colonialism. Otherwise, this thesis arbitrarily generalizes particular phenomena and cases, limited to some zones, to relatively short periods, to relatively limited sectors.

16. We remember the revolutions in China, Mexico, Persia, Afghanistan, Turkey, Sudan and in other colonial and semi colonial countries that at the beginning of the twentieth century contributed to prepare the first wave of the proletarian revolution.

17. Relation on the Russian question done by Stalin on 7th December, at the 7th Plenum of the Enlarged Executive Committee of the Communist International (November-December 1926).

18. *On the Historical Experience of the Socialist Countries in Rapporti Sociali*, n. 11, (November 1991).

19. National Secretariat of the CARC, *Project of Manifesto-Program*, pages 45 onwards.

20. *The Restoration of Capitalism in the Soviet Union*, in *Rapporti Sociali*, n. 8 (November 1990).

21. The importance of this alarm launched by Mao shows up even more if we remember that, on the contrary, Hoxha did not have any suspect of the upsetting in preparation in Albania, neither at the beginning of the Eighties. He did not suspect of it, in spite of the tenacious defense of the revolutionary positions that he led against the modern revisionists.

22. *Mass Line and Marxist Theory of Knowledge*, in *Rapporti Sociali*, n. 11 (November 1991), and *Mass Line*, in *Rapporti Sociali*, n. 12/13 (November 1992).

Edizioni in Lingue Estere (EiLE)
(nuovo)Partito comunista italiano
<http://www.nuovopci.it>

The political order of socialist countries

Message to Symposium on the political order of future socialist countries the Maoist Communist Party of Turkey/North Kurdistan hold in Frankfurt (Germany) on 24 - 25 January
4th February 2009

Let the new year be the one of the establishment in our country of a Popular-Bloc government that puts an end to the crisis!

1st January 2009

Solidarity with Palestinian people resisting Zionist occupation!

28th December 2008

The new general crisis of capitalism opens the way to socialism!

19th December 2008

Let's become communist, let's form the leading group of the Communist Party!

Let's be morally tenacious, intellectually sharp!

Article by Anna M. from La Voce

(The Voice of the (new)Italian Communist Party)

No. 30, November 2008

The victory of Barack Obama in US presidential elections is an excellent sign for the Communists, the progressives and Democrats of the entire world, for oppressed peoples and classes in every corner of the world, who resist the undeclared war of extermination carried out by the imperialist bourgeoisie and its agents and accomplices!

5th November 2008

The eighth discriminating factor

(from *La Voce* - organ of the CP of the (new)Italian Communist Party,
n. 9, November 2001 and n. 10, March 2002)

First part

The Maoism as the third higher stage of communist thought, after
Marxism and Leninism.

The new communist parties must be Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, and
not only Marxist-Leninist.....1

Second part

The five main contributions of Maoism to communist thought

1. The long lasting revolutionary popular war.....9
2. The new democracy revolutions.....17
3. The class' struggle in the socialist society.....20
4. The mass line.....22
5. The struggle between the two
lines in the communist party.....24

Edizioni del (nuovo)Partito comunista italiano

<http://www.nuovopci.it>

[email: lavocenpci40@yahoo.com](mailto:lavocenpci40@yahoo.com)

4 €