

105 YEARS LATER: ON THE THESIS OF THE GROUP PROLETARI COMUNISTI-PCm ON THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND ON M-L-M

105 ANNI DOPO: A PROPOSITO DELLE TESI
DEL GRUPPO PROLETARI COMUNISTI-PCm
SULA RIVOLUZIONE D'OTTOBRE E SUL M-L-M



NUOVA EGEMONIA

NUOVA EGEMONIA

On the website of Proletari Comunisti-PCm, in occasion of the 105 anniversary of the October Revolution, erroneous thesis are proposed on some decisive questions of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (<https://proletaricomunisti.blogspot.com/2022/11/pc-7-novembre-la-rivoluzione-dottobre.html>).

It is essential to criticise these arguments which create confusion in our country.

1. On the question of the relationship between theory and practice: Mao or Sorel?

Proletari Comunisti-PCm argues about the development of Marxism in Marxism-Leninism as the guiding theory of the victorious October Revolution: *"In order to translate the October project into today's reality, we must assimilate how an "October" takes place, that is, an authentic revolution. Lenin has given us fundamental teachings on this, certainly not given birth by hand, but given birth and verified in a glorious history that has reached the verification of facts, because in the end it is the verification of facts that confirms the correctness of theories, of ideas and ideologies"*.

This thesis is only apparently correct. In reality it is about Sorelianism and not Marxism. In this thesis the role and importance of revolutionary theory is underestimated. It is denied that Marxism, and thus Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, is composed of three fundamental parts, inseparably linked together: a) the philosophy of dialectical materialism, b) the economic theory of the proletariat, c) the political and military theory of the proletariat, of the proletarian revolution and the continuation of the revolution to communism.

Lenin took in his hands the flag of Marxism in the last years of the nineteenth century in Russia. He applied in a scientific and creative way this great theory to the Russian economic-social formation. He developed Marxism in the struggle against various forms of revisionism and opportunism. In this struggle, conducted in particular against populism, economism and liberalism, he built in 1903 the red fraction, the Bolshevik one. Since then the struggle against Menshevism has developed more and more. In this struggle Marxism itself developed into Marxism-Leninism. Lenin developed Marx's economic theory. To this he added, as a consequent and necessary development, the theory of imperialism. On this basis he developed the theory and strategy of the international proletarian revolution, fighting thoroughly against the Second International and demanding the immediate split of all the parties adhering to this international, now subservient to imperialism. This theory and strategy was the basis of the victory of the October Revolution. Without the development of Marxism in Marxism-Leninism, there would not have been this great revolution.

Of all this Proletari Comunisti-PCm tells us that what counts is the "verification in facts", because "only verification in facts counts". What are the "facts"? The "facts" are phenomena extracted from a specific political, historical and economic context. The choice of "facts" is subjective. The theory of the importance of facts is of Kantian origin and culminates in positivist sociology. From there, it transitioned into Sorel's revolutionary syndicalism and Bernsteinism. Panzieri and Negri's Italian workerism have inherited all this. Proletari Comunisti-PCm has a vision not only empiricist, but also pragmatist: if a "theory" is successful then it is correct, otherwise it is not.

The theory of M-L-M is expression of the whole practice of humanity. It is the highest point of development of this practice, of the struggle

between what is backward and what is advanced, of the struggle between reaction and progress, between counter-revolution and revolution.

Proletari Comunisti-PCm forgets that theory is born on the ground of a practice of universal value and meaning and not on that of "facts". It seems to ignore the principle that without an adequate and correct theory of universal character there cannot be a proletarian revolution, and therefore no real revolutionary practice but only a subjective practice, which justifies the backwardness of the immediate struggles without raising them consciously, but sticking and merging with them in a tailist and reformist manner.

This group interprets the practice as Bernstein did when he said "the movement is all the end and nothing". Bernstein meant by "practice" the practice of economic struggles, vindicative struggles, struggles for reforms, struggles against governments. More modernly this group interprets the practice as did Raniero Panzieri or Antonio Negri. They spoke of practice as a reference to the struggles they promoted and were called upon to confirm their own theories. Without resuming and leading the struggle against the working class in depth, we cannot even speak in Italy of a real struggle against economism.

2.The Trotskyist thesis on the axis of the October revolution

Proletari Comunisti in the aforementioned article states that the theoretical and practical axis that allowed the October Revolution, namely the main lesson of Lenin to be taken to develop the revolution in our country, was: *"The central axis was the transformation of the economic strike into a political strike and the*

political strike into an insurrection. We really must be aware of this, without economic strikes, that is to say general strikes as we call them, which are taking place in a country with large dimensions, and which are calling into question living, working and working conditions, There are no conditions for the masses to turn them into something higher. This is constantly the task of the communists, but if the communists are not unarmed preachers they need to consider the passage of the economic strike as a basic element in the process of transformation; this has nothing to do with economism, but it has to do with the materiality of the path of revolution".

We must read again the book "*La fabbrica della strategia: Trentatré lezioni su Lenin*" written in 1972 by Antonio Negri. We have to read it again to criticize it. Nobody in Italy has ever really criticized Panzieri or Negri. If one criticizes Negri from the point of view of the M-L-M, these thesis of Proletari Comunisti-PCm are also criticized. In this book Negri falsifies Lenin, he tries to appropriate Lenin to take the attack on Leninism further. Workerism never attack Marxism, Leninism or Maoism head-on, but always indirectly, falsifying it, transforming it into its opposite. Workerism has learned and applied the rules of post-modern philosophy, if we understand this last in a broad sense and therefore well before Lyotard.

Is it true that the axis of the October Revolution was the "transformation of the economic strike into a political strike and the political strike into an insurrection"?

Is this the "lesson of Lenin that communists must apply in Italy to make the Proletarian Revolution?

It is completely false. These are the lessons of Negri and Trotsky, not of Lenin. Lenin never argued that first the economic and then the political struggle must be developed. He never argued that the

proletarian revolution stems from a vast movement of economic struggles. He said the opposite. He has always maintained that the economic struggle and the political struggle are born from different presuppositions and that waiting for the development of the economic struggle to insert in this struggle the question of politics is economism.

The October Revolution was not the product of the insurrectional development and radicalization of the economic movement of the proletariat. It was a product of the building of the party, the workers' and peasants' bloc under the hegemony of the proletariat and the building of the red army.

The Trotsky thesis on the October Revolution are well known as an expression of an increasingly radical mass struggle movement and here Proletari Comunisti propose them again in workerist sauce. The "lessons" drawn by Trotsky on the October Revolution are also well known. It is well known that the synthesis of such "lessons" is set out in his "Transition Program". This program is both gradualist and overtly extremist. The scheme of Communist proletarians follows it well: economic strike, political strike, insurrection.

Of course, Proletarian Communists-PCM knows more about Negris than they know about Lenin, and therefore speaks of insurrection, but means insurrectionism. That then define all this "people's war" is obviously another way to make confusion on the question of the M-L-M. Lenin wrote more than a dozen articles against economicists, including the text "What to be done?" between the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century to criticize precisely positions such as those of Workerism. Lenin wrote other fundamental articles during World War I to criticize the "imperialist economicists". All these articles are an absolute reference for communists, for Marxists-Leninists-Maoists. Obviously,

this is not the place to present Lenin's positions. We have already done so in our book "Lenin's Actuality: Economic Struggle, Political Struggle, Party", and we will do it again. Our book consists of about three hundred pages. Most of them are quotations from the works of Lenin and Stalin. To be able to argue systematically with the positions of the group of Proletari Comunisti-PCm is sometimes also difficult. It is not an organization that has a party working method. After all, it never says anything particularly systematic and organic. they don't have the shadow of a program, they wrote thesis in the first issue of his magazine, which are a sort of exposition of the results of the budget of his practice for the use of his militants. This group then, first pulls the stone and then withdraws the hand. In Italy he supports a thesis, on the other hand, when it suits him, especially on official occasions or on the arena of international confrontation between Marxists-Leninists-Maoists, he supports the opposite thesis.

3.About economism: how to interpret Lenin in the manner of Sorel

This group in its article states: "The second issue is the fight against economism. One can speak and cry out against economism but it is a cancer... Economism is the terminal sick of every idea of revolution and revolutionary party. We have already said how important the economic struggle is and how important the economic strike is as a broth of culture of the political strike, but this has nothing to do with considering the economic struggle as the center of activity. The centre, the main commitment that the communists must have in the economic struggle is bringing in elements of science and conscience. A struggle in itself is a struggle in itself, a daily thing in a society, it is the physiological manifestation of the capitalist system".

This piece is an excellent example of how apparently economism is criticized and then re-proposed it completely. In fact, this group criticizes economism in the manner of Negri and Autonomia Operaia, who considered economic struggles towards "revolutionary violence", which in itself would be political struggle. In fact a sorelian and anarcho-syndacalistic conception. What does this group mean by "economism"? Perhaps the lack of distinction between economic and political struggle, between the struggle against the bosses and the governments and the struggle against the state structures? Perhaps the lack of a political program for the construction of a New State with proletarian hegemony? Perhaps the denial of the primacy of the economic struggle over that political one? Perhaps the refusal to raise the question of initiative and political struggle from the outset? None of this. This group considers economism the "lack of development of the political struggle starting from the economic struggle", "from within the economic struggle". And wouldn't all this follow the point of view of Negri?

4. The singular theory of extremism of the Proletari Comunisti-PCm group

This group says, *"The alternative to economism is always extremism. When economism dominates, and then follows reformism and revisionism, the rebellion against it throws the child in the bathwater, and extremism is this: infantile disease; but beware, infantile because extremists are childish not because they are young, because unfortunately for example in the communist movement of today*

extremism is senile, we talk about old caryatids who have done nothing, They have not made a fair assessment and continue to depreciate the universe of the communist movement with radical ideas in words but senseless in deeds. Fight against economism and extremism go together and in the general movement there are phases in which the main is the fight against economism and vice versa. It is a collective and not a personal problem and should be conceived as an instrument of the collective life of an organization..."

The language of this group does not shine with intelligence. This group has the habit of placing itself, "its own practice" as a universal model. There would therefore be "old caryatids" that have done nothing and "old caryatids" that instead have done a lot. According to Proletari Comunisti-PCm, economism and "left" opportunism would exclude each other. If you are "extremists" then you are not "economicists". This group ignores that during World War I Lenin defined opportunist deviations of the "left" as "imperialist economism". Similarly, he does not seem to have any idea of the fact that Gramsci defined, among other things, a series of "left" opportunist tendencies such as Trotskyism, revolutionary syndicalism, Bordighism, Counsellism, etc. deeply marked by "economism". The thesis of this group is simple: who does not focus on the economic struggle as a ground from which to emerge the political struggle and the insurrection is an "extremist".

For decades the group of Rossoperaio-Proletari Comunisti-PCm does not seem to have made significant self-critical assessments. They continue to repeat the same positions as if nothing had happened compared to the hypothesis of creating alternative unions to the confederal ones as a basis for a resumption of the class opposition movement of the workers and proletarians. Not even the state of increasing crisis in which alternative syndicalism finds itself

represents for Proletari Comunisti-PCm a good reason, among others, for reflection.

NUOVA EGEMONIA