

Workers of the World, Unite!

Unity & Struggle

Journal of the
International Conference of
Marxist-Leninist Parties
and Organizations



No. 39 – December of 2019

Unity & Struggle

Journal of the International Conference
of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations

Published in English, Spanish, Turkish,
Arabic, Portuguese and German
as the responsibility of the Coordinating Committee
of the International Conference

Any opinions expressed in this journal belong
to the contributors.

Postal Address: Verlag AZ, Postfach 401051,
D-70410, Stuttgart, Germany

North American edition printed by:
Red Star Publishers
www.RedStarPublishers.org

Contents

Benin.....	5
The Single Currency of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Maneuvers of Sabotage by France and Its Agents	
Communist Party of Benin	
Bolivia.....	10
The Bolivian Communist Movement and the Communist International	
Revolutionary Communist Party – PCR – Bolivia	
Brazil.....	17
The Increase in the Exploitation of the Working Class	
Revolutionary Communist Party– PCR – Brazil	
Burkina Faso	27
We Denounce the Murders in Yagha!	
Revolutionary Communist Party of Volta	
Denmark.....	32
The Significance of the Communist International in Building the Party in the Struggle against Right Opportunism	
Workers Communist Party, APK, Demark	
Dominican Republic	38
The Revolution Is a Concrete Issue	
Communist Party of Labor – PCT	
Ecuador	45
The Struggle of Ideas	
Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Ecuador – PCMLE	
France	60
On the “Yellow Vests” Movement	
Communist Party of the Workers of France – PCOF	

Italy	66
The Tactics of the “United Front” and the Slogan of the “Workers’ Government”	
Communist Platform	
Mexico	74
The Influence of the Communist International in Mexico	
Communist Party of Mexico (Marxist-Leninist)	
Morocco	86
The Democratic Road and the building of the Party of the working class and the working masses	
Democratic Road	
Peru	97
For a Popular Political Solution to the Governmental Crisis in Peru!	
Peruvian Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)	
Spain	103
The Imperialist Crisis and our Tasks in the Trade Union Movement	
Communist Party of Spain (M-L) – PCE(ml)	
Tunisia.....	113
On the Question of Internationalism in the Circumstances of Our Time	
Workers Party of Tunisia	
Turkey	133
Wallerstein's Analysis and its Impasses: From Rhetoric to Reality	
Party of Labor (EMEP) – Turkey	
Venezuela.....	150
Ideological Struggle and Threats of Military Aggression in Venezuela	
Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Venezuela – PCMLV	

Benin

Communist Party of Benin

The Single Currency of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Maneuvers of Sabotage by France and Its Agents

One of the essential attributes of a country's sovereignty is the control and domination of its currency. In the struggle for the total emancipation of the African peoples, the question of currency independence has for some time been one of the essential demands of the peoples of Africa and especially of its youth.

Indeed, under the irrepressible impetus of the will of the peoples to regain their independence, French colonialism, defeated in Indochina in 1954, undermined by the war in Algeria and humiliated by the historical "NO" of the people of Guinea in 1958, quickly saw that it could not deal with the situation of the countries of Black Africa engaged in a process of armed struggle, as in Cameroon. It was therefore quick to grant them independence while continuing to control the essential attributes of their sovereignty. It thus placed its faithful agents at the head of most of the new states, maintained its military bases, imposed the maintenance of its language as a means of instruction and communication and, above all, imposed the franc of the French colonies in Africa, created in 1945 as the currency of these countries, which had to deposit more than 50% of their currency reserves in the French treasury. It should be remembered that this CFA franc created under colonialism was the common currency of all France's African colonies, including Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia.

In 1958, General de Gaulle's colonial France transformed the CFA franc into the Franc of the African Financial Community; this was the warning sign of a curtailed independence. At the time of the nominal independence which it hastened to grant in 1960 faced with the intensification of the national liberation struggles in the world, France imposed its colonial currency on the 14 countries south of the Sahara and on the Comoros. Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria each created their own currency after independence. In West Africa, the CFA franc became the franc of the African Financial Community,

while in Central Africa it took the name of the Franc of the African Financial Cooperation. In reality, only the name changed but nothing else. Not only do all the countries of the franc zone have to place 50% of their reserves in the French treasury, which supposedly guarantees the currency, but French representatives continue to sit in the administrations where decisions are made unanimously. This means concretely that at the high levels of financial decisions, which are very important for the situation of our countries, not only is France present, but it can also oppose any decision that it considers contrary to its interests.

France and Africa do not have the same interests. The Franc zone is thus completely geared to the satisfaction of the interests of the major French financial and industrial groups, which can easily repatriate their profits thanks to the system of fixed exchange rates and which facilitates plunder. The situation is such that former French President Jacques Chirac could declare, in a 2008 interview on television TV5: “We are forgetting one thing: it is that a large part of the money that is in our wallets comes precisely from the exploitation of Africa for centuries. Not only that, but a lot comes from the exploitation of Africa! So you have to have a little bit of common sense. I do not say of generosity, but of common sense, of justice to give back to the Africans... what we took from them. This is especially necessary if we want to avoid the worst upheavals or difficulties with political consequences that this will involve in the near future.”

This situation could not last forever. It must be said that the fact that a country treats others as children, who are forced to place part of their currency reserves in its treasury, which controls it, is an unacceptable humiliation. This is why, since then, the African peoples have waged a relentless struggle the franc of the French colonies of Africa (CFA).

Besides this struggle, the peoples of Africa have realized that, divided and weakened, they do not have the strength to face the great powers. Pan-African political leaders have always fought for the realization of African unity. Since independence, regional groupings have been moving in this direction as a prelude to the unity of Africa. These frameworks should promote regional integration and thus ECOWAS was created. One of the tools of this integration is the single currency. This is why about twenty years ago, it was decided to move towards the creation of a single currency for

the entire West African region. The problem is that the single currency of ECOWAS means the disappearance of the CFA franc, but France and its agents in West Africa do not agree. This is why since then they have used all maneuvers and obstructions to prevent the monetary integration of West Africa.

In reality and as at the time of the struggle for independence, this position of France and its agents has become untenable, so that the denunciation of this colonial currency has become more vehement. That is why France and its agents pulled the Eco out of the bag to try to calm the anger of the African peoples.

When, on June 17 and 18, 2019, the ECOWAS Monetary Commission met in Abidjan at the residence of Alassane Ouattara, President of the Republic of Ivory Coast and sworn enemy of the single currency to declare that the time had come for go to the single currency, one could see that this was a trap. This became clearer when, on June 29, 2019, in Abuja (Nigeria), the Heads of State and Government of the countries of ECOWAS formally adopted the name of “Eco” for the project of a single currency, setting the stage for 2020.

Immediately after this decision, on July 12, 2019, the APS (Press Agency of Senegal), the official agency of a country whose President is openly against the common currency, reported that when Alassane Ouattara held the 21st session of the conference of Heads of State and Government of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) in Abidjan, everything was clear. Indeed, Mr. Abdallah Boureima, President of the WAEMU Commission, bringing together the West African countries having the CFA



franc as their common currency, stated on this occasion: “The conference reaffirms its gradual approach to the establishment of the single currency of ECOWAS, giving preference to a start-up in 2020 with countries that meet the criteria of convergence of ECOWAS, while the others can join later.”

As for Alassane Ouattara, he declared: “Today, the exchange rate of the euro is 655.9 CFA francs. And of course, if next year the heads of state decide to change the CFA franc into the ECO because we have met all the criteria of convergence, this rate would not change immediately.”

All this clearly means that the Eco that Alassane Ouattara and France are preparing for us is to change the name of the current currency in order to try to calm the anger of the African peoples.

Everything will change in appearance, so that nothing really changes. The parity with the euro, the deposit of our currencies into the French treasury, the creation of banknotes in France etc., the BCEAO (Central Bank of West African States) and the BCEAC (Central Bank of Central African States) will continue to plunge our countries into underdevelopment with a ratio of GDP to debt of 23% while in France it is 101%, 155% in China and 157% in the U.S., according to the figures of the APS. It is not for nothing that at the end of the meeting in Abuja, Ivorian President Alassane Ouattara rushed to Paris to report to Emmanuel Macron.

As one can see, the decision to create the ECO, led by Macron and Ouattara is a real sabotage of African integration and a fight against the march of the ECOWAS towards the single currency. It is not for nothing that Romuald Wadagni, the Minister of Finance of Patrice Talon, the President of Benin, sings the same song as they do.

The African peoples and in particular those of ECOWAS will not long accept these actions of France and its agents against their interests. That is why they say: French imperialism out of Africa!

September 2019

Notes:

- ECOWAS is the Economic Community of West African States. It brings together all the countries of West Africa except Mauritania, which left it. For some time, Morocco has been asking to join.

- The WAMU is the West African Monetary Union: it groups together 8 West African countries that use the CFA Franc (Benin, Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Togo).
- BCEAO: Central Bank of West African States. It manages the CFA Franc in West Africa.
- CEMAC: Economic and Monetary Council of Central Africa. It groups the countries of Central Africa which use the CFA Franc (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Republic of Congo, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea and Chad).
- BCEAC: Central Bank of Central African States. It manages the CFA Franc in Central Africa.

Bolivia

Revolutionary Communist Party (PCR)

Simon Arancibia R.

The Bolivian Communist Movement and the Communist International

With the strength of all races
that make up the peoples of the Andes,
today communism is rising,
like a giant proletarian.

He is an Indian who raises his fists
over all the thundering peaks
and demands his bread and his land
with the voice of the raucous volcanoes.

Guarani, Aymara and Quechuas,
the mountain, the jungle and the valleys,
are united in our Party
in a pact of sun and blood.

Oscar Alfaro

The Communist International (CI) was founded in March 1919, as a direct consequence of the revolution in Russia. It set 21 conditions for admission to the CI, among which were the revolutionary ideological stance (demarcation with social democratic, reformist and revisionist tendencies), the degree of organization and connection with the working and peasant masses, the role of the revolutionary press and the adoption of the name of the Communist Party (Section of the Communist International). In Bolivia, although no Party became a full member of the CI, due to the low level of organizational development, there were important interchanges and relationships between the pioneers of Bolivian communism and the CI. It is important to know and study this historical moment of the Bolivian communist movement, which is often forgotten or ignored, because the current Marxist-Leninist communist organization in the country is the product of the accumulation of experiences of party building with its mistakes and successes.

There are simultaneous processes that must be studied: on the one hand the formation and development of the Secretariats or Bureaus as part of the International with responsibility for Latin America and/or South America; and on the other the development of Marxist groups within Bolivia. The processes of contact and relationship between the Comintern and Bolivian communist groups took place on a personal level (between national leaders and representatives of the Comintern), through the exchange of materials and propaganda, through visits of commissions formed primarily by the South American Secretariat, the participation of Bolivian delegates in events of the International or of the mass fronts and, finally, with the physical presence of Bolivian comrades in the Spanish Civil War.

In the archives of the Comintern, there are a series of reports on the development of the Bolivian political situation and the evolution of the Marxist political groups. In 1926 there was a document entitled *Against Tyranny and Fascist Outrages in Bolivia*, which denounced the relationship between Saavedra and emerging European fascism. It also emphasized the founding of the newspaper *Bandera Roja* (Red Flag), mentioning Oscar Cerruto and Carlos Mendoza Mamani among its directors and collaborators. It also denounced the attacks by the government to which *Bandera Roja* was subjected (RGASPI 495/122/2/1-2). *Bandera Roja* was backed by trade union leaders (Workers Federation of Labor) and left-wing politicians. In its two years of existence (1926-1927), it managed to publish 52 issues. Its relations with the International can be seen in the reproduction of Bolivian articles in *La Correspondencia Sudamericana* (South American Correspondence) (the journal of the South American Secretariat of the CI) and of communiqués of the CI in *Bandera Roja*.

During the first years of communist organization in Bolivia, there was a series of steps taken by parties from sister countries, especially by Bolivian members of these parties. Among these efforts were those taken by M. L. Dick Ampuero, a Bolivian member of the Chilean Communist Party, who returned to the country with the aim of developing the revolutionary organization. Among his legacy is the book entitled *Organización Sindicalista* (Trade Union Organization) (1926), on whose cover there was the slogan “Workers of the World, Unite!” In the archives of the Comintern, there were instructions to the Parties of Chile and Peru to promote the

formation of the Party in Bolivia (RGASPI 495/101/22/71). Later, the Parties of Argentina and Chile were entrusted with the restoration of ties with communist groups in Bolivia and the formation of the Party (RGASPI 495/101/3/42-44).

According to the political reports prepared by the CI, the presidency of Siles (1927) continued with the reactionary orientations of Saavedra. They denounced the situation of total submission to Yankee imperialism that left the country in an almost colonial situation. It reported that in La Paz there was already a communist group, which along with others from the interior of the country had planned to call a National Congress by the end of the year, despite fierce government persecution (RGASPI 495/79/28/43-44). No records of the National Congress have been found; however, starting in 1928, among the documents of the CI, in Bolivia there is mention of the Communist Group or Communist Association.

The First Latin American Communist Conference was held in Argentina in 1929 and was attended by a Bolivian delegation (Carlos Mendoza Mamani, Alfredo Zuazo Lavadenz, Alfredo Mendizábal), who reported on the development of the Bolivian Confederation of Labor (affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions), of the existence of the Labor Party as electoral front and of the *Bandera Roja* newspaper. It raised the need to found the Communist Party (RGASPI 495/122/2/3-5). At this conference, there was a debate started mainly by the Bolivian and Peruvian delegations around the peasant and indigenous questions in both countries. In the CI records, there was a series of invitations and attempts to create conditions for a Bolivian delegation to participate in the Lenin School in Moscow.

On June 16, 1930, the self-proclaimed Villazón Revolution broke out in the south of the country, whose main leader was Roberto Hinojosa. This movement carried out the seizure of state dependencies, under a 70-point program of a radical democratic character. This brief episode was isolated from national politics and was violently crushed by the Siles government. Meanwhile, within the CI a discussion was held about the possibility of creating soviets in a context in which there was no party or mass movement (RGASPI 495/79/137/45). The position that the CI assumed before the Villazón Revolution was to reject an attempt to make a revolution without a party, without cadres and without organizations (RGASPI

495/19/110/178), but to promote the training of cadres and to influence the movement (RGASPI 495/79/153/4-6).

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, communist groups and cells emerged throughout the country. One of these groups was the Confederation of Workers' Republics of the Pacific (CROP) promoted by José Antonio Arze (founding leader of the Bolivian University Federation, 1928). The CROP, as a central thesis, argued that the low level of development of the productive forces in Bolivia, Peru and Chile led to the need to form a single federated communist group among the three countries. The CROP requested affiliation to the Comintern (October 20, 1931) but the response was a sharp rejection by the organization, due to its supposed similarities with the APRA [American Popular Revolutionary Alliance] of Peru. Instead, it was oriented to promote the organization of the Communist Party (CSLA – Montevideo, November 10, 1931).

On December 13, 1931, the Provisional Central Committee of the Bolivian Communist Party was formed, as a result of the merger of the CROP and the Communist Committee promoted by Peruvians Jorge Ilo and Cesar Negri (on behalf of the South American Secretariat – SSA). This Provisional Central Committee, in its founding act, fully adhered to the principles of the Comintern and was proclaimed as the Bolivian section of the CI. The SSA of the CI issued a response (January 25, 1932) in which it requested the removal of 5 members of the provisional CC (J.A. Arze¹, J. Cuadros, M. Álvarez, W. Álvarez and R. Lara) as elements who “do not deserve the confidence”, and demanded a greater presence of worker members (RGASPI 595/122/2 /16-17) so that the full affiliation of the Bolivian Communist Party to the CI could proceed. In the internal reports at the regional level, the communist leader Carlos Mendoza Mamani was also criticized, although it was recommended to keep him in the ranks of the Party for his connection with the working masses in the country (RGASPI 495/122/4/1-5). The SSA raised the need for a direct struggle against the CROP and its drivers, repeatedly arguing its similarities with the APRA (RGASPI 495/122/4/5). In the international context of division of the com-

¹ In October of 1933 there was recorded an extensive note of J.A. Arze to the Secretariat of the Comintern to explain his conduct. Despite all the criticism against him, Arze maintained an iron defense of the USSR of Lenin and Stalin in all his intellectual writing.

munist movement promoted by Trotskyism, the ideological struggle took place at the national level, the formation of groups aligned to the Fourth International were forced to redouble the tasks of ideological clarification. Tristán Marof (Gustavo Adolfo Navarro) was the subject of several reports due to his troubled relationship with the CI, with Marxist intellectuals such as Mariátegui and with other Bolivian Trotskyists (RGASPI 495/122/4 /9-10). In the report to Comrade Van Min (March 26, 1936) mention was made of Marof and Keswar of the Trotskyist POR [Revolutionary Workers Party] and the vacillation of the former with regard to the positions of the Fourth International (RGASPI 495/20/353/1-3).

In 1932, there were several public manifestos signed by the Communist Association, the essence of which was that they called upon the workers, peasants, employees, artisans and poor students to join the ranks of the Communist Association and form the Communist Party (May 27, 1932 – RGASPI 495/122/4/6). The development of these groups was interrupted by the Chaco War (between Bolivia and Paraguay, 1932-1935). In the statement of May 1, 1935, the CI Executive Committee referred to the war between Paraguay and Bolivia, characterizing it as a struggle between U.S. and British imperialism. The SSA of the IC launched a public appeal against the Chaco War for being an inter-imperialist war (RGASPI 495/79/173/ 66-70), in which it called upon the working masses of Bolivia and Paraguay to fight against the war. The anti-war slogan that the communists in Bolivia took up confronted them with the chauvinism propagated by the government and with the nationalist tendencies that emerged during the combat. Among the Bolivian communist leaders who were arrested and deported for their anti-war propaganda was Ricardo Valle Cloza, who came to fight alongside the Republicans in the Spanish Civil War.

Between 1936 and 1939, the international revolutionary movement directed all its forces towards the defense of the Spanish Republic threatened by fascism. The Bolivian communists were not indifferent to the cause that moved the entire world. According to the archives of the CI, the goldsmith Juan Pons Pintos as an internationalist fighter joined the ranks of the Unified Socialist Party of Catalonia, affiliated to the CI (RGASPI 545/6/318 /1-1v.,4). The Party leader Ricardo Valle Cloza (alias Gastón del Mar, Felipe Mamani Willka) joined the International Brigades of the Communist Party of Spain; Valle Cloza showed in his file that he had

participated in the Bolivian Communist Party since 1930, that he was elected First Secretary of the Party at the First National Conference (1933), was expelled from the country in the Chaco War and returned to become the First Secretary of the Party between 1936-1937, when he was deported to Argentina (RGASPI 545/6/318/6-9v). On the other hand, the SSA denounced the fact that in Argentina Trotskyism, through Marof, had infiltrated the campaign to support the republican cause, with counter-revolutionary positions (RGASPI 495/17/15/27).

The political reports of the SSA regarding the Bolivian situation in the 1930s relate to the political control exercised by Patiño and the tin barons (RGASPI 495/122/4 /11-13) and the successive military coups (RGASPI 495/122 /1/48). In that context the regrouping of the communist militants in the country took place at the regional level. Among the groups mentioned in the archives of the CI are: Antahuara Groupin Sucre (among its members Roberto Alvarado Daza stands out), Advanced Bloc of Oruro (in which Ricardo Valle Cloza was a member), the Left Socialist Bloc in La Paz, the Redemption Group in Cochabamba and as well as a communist nucleus in Potosí (RGASPI 354/7/89/7). The unity of the various leftist groups took place with the founding of the Bolivian Left Front (FIB), in 1939 under the leadership of José Antonio Arze, a fact that was reported to the CI (RGASPI 495/17/324/1-2). As a development of the FIB, the Revolutionary Left Party (PIR) was founded in 1940. The CI archives include documents, newspaper clippings and



reports about the PIR, its activities and its leaders (RGASPI 495/17/324/4). Although the RIP was never a section of the CI, they maintained interchanges of information about the country. In 1950, when the Communist Party of Bolivia was founded, as a product of the Marxist-Leninist faction of the youth of the PIR, the CI (1943) had already dissolved, giving rise to new forms of bilateral and multilateral relations within the international communist movement.

It is important that the membership of the PCR know the history of the Bolivian communist movement and its relations with the CI, in order to assess the role of proletarian internationalism, both the contributions from the sister countries for the organization of the Party and the commitment of the Bolivian communists who were to fight in the Spanish Civil War. The founders of the Bolivian communist organization left important lessons about the need for ideological clarity and party structure linked to popular organizations. On the basis of this legacy, today it is time to strengthen the Revolutionary Communist Party, the vanguard of the Bolivian peoples in the struggle for the Revolution and Socialism.

September 2019

Brazil

Revolutionary Communist Party – Brazil – (PCR) ***Luiz Falcão***

The Increase in the Exploitation of the Working Class

The development of the capitalist mode of production has resulted in the division of Brazilian society into two large classes. On the one hand, a minority of big money magnates – bankers and big business owners of industries, chain stores, the land and banks – and on the other hand, the vast majority of society, the proletariat, that is, all those who depend on their labor because they have nothing but their labor power to sell.

In fact, as stated by the Oxfam Brazil Report entitled “Stagnant Country, a Picture of Brazilian Inequalities”, 42 Brazilian billionaires own a total wealth of US \$176.4 billion (672 billion reales), and the richest 5% of the population own the same portion of income as the remaining 95%. (www.oxfam.org.br)

On the other hand, an enormous part of the labor force has no formal contract, labor rights or social protection. According to the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), the Economically Active Population (PEA) of Brazil, the part of the population that is available for the labor market, is 109 million. In July, of this total, 93.3 million people were employed as follows: 33.2 million worked in the private sector with a formal contract and 24.1 million were self-employed. Furthermore: 12.8 million were unemployed, 4.9 million had given up looking for work, and 7.4 million were available for longer working hours but could not find work or were underemployed. (IBGE, July 31, 2019)

The conclusion is clear: the vast majority of Brazilians are unemployed and poor because 98% of the nation’s

wealth is in the hands of a minority of billionaires, who plunder the national wealth and super-exploit the working class. Of course, the aim of the bourgeoisie is always to increase its profits, and, therefore to intensify the exploitation of the workers and to increase their productivity.

The poultry industry, one of the most important sectors in the country, given its role in the export of meat, provides an example of super-exploitation. In a study, Vera Navarro and Marcos Neli describe what happens inside a factory in Toledo, Paraná, employing 6,000 workers:

“The factory runs on the uninterrupted work system, 24 hours a day and seven days a week. The work shift lasts 8 hours and 48 minutes with a one hour lunch break....

“A production line leads the product to be deboned. The work rate varies. For instance, to debone a chicken leg (thigh and drumstick) takes an average of 18 movements in 15 seconds, over an 8 hour period.”

The temperature is between 10 and 12 degrees [Celsius, or 50 to 54 degrees Fahrenheit], the humidity and noise are intense, and the characteristic smell of this type of activity is strong. The results are most frequently physical and emotional exhaustion for the workers, and illnesses and accidents are common, as described in these following testimony:

“In the beginning, the time required was 25 seconds, and now it is 20 seconds. This speed of the line has been increased, the minimum is 19 seconds, but the people still cannot follow the tempo... – M.S., a 27-year-old worker, hired 9 months ago by the company.”

The modern auto industry provides another example of how the intensification of production increases the profit of the capitalist:

“Thanks to technology and the continuous improvement of the process, we were able to gain one or two seconds in the production cycle of each vehicle. To have an idea of how important this is, at the plant in Gravataí,

where 360,000 units are assembled every year, to gain only one second per car in the production operations means the assembly of 7,000 additional cars per year.” (*Luci Praun. Não sois máquina!:reestruturação produtiva e adoecimento na General Motors do Brasil, [You are not a machine! Productive restructuring and illness at General Motors do Brasil]*).

In call-centers and telemarketing firms, backed by state-of-the-art technology, managers and supervisors ensure an extremely tight control of time and the intensification of labor, reducing the freedom and imposing the attendance of the workers, leading to practically uninterrupted work.

Finally, in order to increase capitalist accumulation, the owners of capital boost the workers’ productivity, introduce new machines and mechanisms in the production, carry out extensive robotization of the production process and use outsourcing and the flexibilization of labor laws, which result in increasing the precariousness of the working class. As a result, work accidents and illnesses are increasing. Data from the Digital Observatory for Occupational Health and Safety show that, in six years, from 2012 to 2018, Brazil registered 4.7 million occupational accidents.

Labor reform to increase surplus value

Indeed, the bourgeoisie, the class that owns the means of production, is always looking for ways to boost the exploitation of workers in order to increase the share of unpaid labor and obtain more surplus value. In other words, the capitalist always seeks to impose a labor regime that gives him more freedom to dismiss, hire and pay wages below the value of labor power. The labor reform introduced by Law 13.467 of 2017 was aimed at increasing the informalization of paid labor by expanding work without rights, extending the workday and hampering the organiza-

tion of the workers. It also imposed the intermittent work-day, which leaves the worker unprotected, without any rights and with enormous difficulties to prove the time worked during her or his life at retirement. In practice, the labor reform modified more than 100 points in the Consolidation of Labor Laws (CLT). Other changes were the dismissal through mutual agreement between employee and employer, the formalization of telework, the division of vacations into three periods and the end of the obligation to pay union dues.

Also, pursuing the same objective, the reform allowed outsourcing in all sectors of the economy. With outsourcing, the capitalist companies will increase exploitation of labor power by paying lower wages. In practice, the worker will support two bosses by being hired by one company while actually working for two companies. This is one reason why outsourced workers receive a much lower salary.

A study by the DIEESE [Inter-Union Department of Statistics and Socio-Economic Studies] revealed that outsourced workers receive 25% lower wages, work more than 44 hours a week and suffer more work accidents. Thus, outsourced workers work more and earn less. This means that, with the adoption of outsourcing, capitalists achieve these two objectives. Also, most work-related deaths and accidents occur among outsourced workers.

In addition, the labor reform has failed to comply with international treaties to which Brazil is a signatory, and the International Labor Organization (ILO) has placed it on the list of countries that promote serious violations of labor rights.

The business owners and their economists say that the reform has established free negotiation between bosses and employees. However, in capitalist society, the means of production, the factories, machines, land and also the banks, shops, and companies in general, are owned by a very small class of people, the bourgeoisie. Therefore, in

order to work, the workers have to sell their force of labor to the business owners. Otherwise they have no work, they become beggars or starve to death. So in this system, it is impossible to have truly free negotiations.

Also, a retirement reform was approved to satisfy the bourgeoisie. It puts an end to a retirement pension proportional to the workers' contributions paid during their lifetime, and it imposes a minimum retirement age of 62 years for women and 65 years for men.

The fact is that super-exploitation and poor working conditions have been a reality for decades in our country. In fact, the Brazilian worker is already one of the most exploited in the world and earns a wage even lower than the Chinese worker. While the average hourly wage in Brazil's industries fell from US \$2.90 to US \$2.70 between 2005 and 2016, in China, the average salary rose to \$3.60 an hour, according to Euromonitor International, a consulting firm.

Exploitation of immigrant workers

Also, in recent years, the exploitation of immigrant workers has increased. Bolivians, Haitians, Peruvians and Africans are required to work 17 hours a day or they end up joining our gigantic reserve army of labor.

A survey conducted in 2018 by the Center for Immigrant Human and Citizenship Rights (CDHIC) points out that of the 18 foreign domestic women workers interviewed, all were subjected to precarious conditions in the workplace. Bolivians also work in slave labor conditions. They receive low wages and, because of their clandestine situation, they face the risk of being enslaved.

In the city of Itaquaquecetuba, in the state of São Paulo, the police found immigrant workers in a building with dozens of sewing machines and thousands of garment pieces scattered everywhere: blouses and especially shorts. In exchange for their work, they only received food and

shelter. In the group of Bolivians, some of them were under age. In addition, immigrants in Brazil still have little access to university, health care and social assistance. Jobs are precarious and when, for lack of opportunity, they work in the informal sector as street vendors, for example, they are persecuted and criminalized.

Considering also the long time spent by the worker to travel between home and workplace, we see that the Brazilian worker has very little time for rest.

When the worker retires, he receives much less, his life becomes even more miserable, and being older, he has to spend more on medicine and health care. But those who do not work and live from the exploitation of the workers' labor get rich, live in mansions, have yachts, airplanes and imported cars, have time, ample access to culture and recreational time and enjoy all the goods produced by society.

Exploitation is growing worldwide

Truly, across the planet, the transnational corporations, capitalist monopolies and banks that control the world economy are currently aiming to eliminate any legislation that guarantees workers' rights. This is why, in the so-called modern capitalist economies, there is a regression in social legislation, a withdrawal or elimination of various labor rights, and the implementation of several successive



reforms to suppress rights, as in Italy, France, Spain and many other countries. In other words, in the 21st century, the relations of production are characterized by precariousness, unemployment, low wages, long working hours without rights and the intensification of exploitation, more so than in the 20th century,

Indeed, data from the International Labor Organization (ILO) show that, two billion workers will continue to work in the informal sector, that is without any guarantees or rights, and that, in 2018, more than 3.3 billion employed people did not have adequate levels of economic security, material well-being or opportunities to improve their life. The ILO also believes that, even without a recession, and only with the increase in population, the number of unemployed will inevitably rise in 2019 and 2020 because the market will not be able to absorb the new workers.

Meanwhile, the richest man in the world, Jeff Bezos, the owner of Amazon, has a fortune of U.S. \$112 billion. Only 1% of this is equivalent to the entire annual health budget of Ethiopia, a country with 105 million inhabitants.

Thus, despite all the new information technologies, the use of robots in production, the new “digital era of work” and, more recently, the “4.0 industry” or the Fourth Industrial Revolution, workers’ lives are increasingly fraught with deprivation, super-exploitation and illness. In fact, there is not a single capitalist country where there is no brutal exploitation of the workers.

In China, billionaires like Jack Ma, founder of the giant Alibaba group and owner of a personal fortune estimated at U.S. \$37 billion, which makes him the third richest man in the country, advocates the deployment of the so-called 9-9-6 system, which consists of working from 9 AM at 9 PM, six days a week. Jack Ma wrote in an article to the company employees that the opportunity to work 12 hours a day is “a blessing”, and that, without such a workload, the Chinese economy “is very likely to lose its vitality and

momentum.” “The number of employees has increased in recent years..., and the number of lazy people has grown rapidly. If this continues, the company will be quickly eliminated from the market!” he wrote.

Richard Liu, chief executive of JD.com, another Chinese billionaire, defends the system and calls those who refuse to work hard “good-for-nothing”. The Chinese technological sector, with companies such as Huawei and the e-commerce group Alibaba, has adopted the 9-9-6 system, despite the fact that the country’s legislation stipulates that the working period must not exceed 40 hours per week. “Wu Linfeng, an engineer who works in the Chinese technology sector, works from nine to nine, six days a week. That is the “9-9-6” system. He is exhausted, badly paid and feels like a hamster running in a wheel. When, some time ago, he watched the comedy “Modern Times”, he began to cry, seeing the assembly-line worker played by Charlie Chaplin, because it was like looking in the mirror. The 9-9-6 system governs the working lives of many engineers, programmers, video game developers, and other computer professionals. Wu has been under this yoke for three years.” (AFP, May 2, 2019)

In the United States, the exploitation of workers is also intense. Considering a labor force of approximately 130 million people, about 9.5 million U.S. citizens are looking for work with online tools with companies such as Uber, TaskRabbit (mostly home maintenance services), and Upwork (freelancers in general).

A survey in the country by Gallup shows that most workers work at least 41 hours a week. Moreover, the average workweek is 47 hours. This means that there is almost one extra work day per week, instead of five work days. The survey, which involved more than 1,200 adults, shows that 21% worked between 50 and 59 hours a week, while 18% said they spent at least 60 hours at work. Another 11% said that they spent 41 to 49 hours on their professional ac-

tivities, which means that 50% exceeded the 40-hour work week.

On the other hand, nearly half of the 7,500 people stated on the CNNMoney site that they feel pressured by companies to work more than eight hours a day and even on weekends.

In the United States, forced labor is used mainly in domestic services, agriculture, industry and civil construction. In some cases, workers are victims recruited in other countries, especially in Latin America, and they pay to get jobs in the U.S., which makes them vulnerable to debt bondage.

In 17 states in the U.S., even prisoners are super-exploited. They held a strike against the “prison industrial complex.” Prisoners are forced to work for free or for a few cents per hour on degrading or high-risk jobs, as happened recently fighting fires in California. The prisoners were paid only one dollar per hour as firemen. The average pay in U.S. prisons is U.S. \$0.20 per hour. The United States has the largest prison population in the world, with about two million three hundred thousand prisoners.

India surpassed France last year, becoming the sixth world economy. Only 7% of its labor force is employed in the formal sector; that is, with rights. The remaining 93% are informal workers, and are not protected by labor laws. In addition, there are millions more Indians living in debt bondage. They work in pottery, rice mills and agriculture. Children are also subjected to forced labor, earning their living as female domestic workers, farm workers or beggars. One of the loopholes that allowed the development of this degradation of labor relations in India was the creation of the National Program of Employability by Apprenticeship, which allows the hiring of apprentices. The program has been used as a loophole by many employers to avoid paying wages to the workers. According to the Indian Trade Union Federation (CITU), while work in India has become increasingly precarious, in recent decades workers

in the country have organized various mobilizations such as the 2016 and 2018 general strikes, which were joined by about 200 million people.

In the European Union, super-exploitation is hardest on immigrant workers, of which there are about 50 million. The vast majority of them earn low salaries, often even below what the contract stipulates. On the other hand, they have the toughest, most unhealthy jobs and suffer on average twice as many work-related injuries as European-born workers. They work longer hours, often at night and on weekends. They work without a contract or in temporary jobs, which leads to long periods without employment or pay. Working conditions are generally precarious and workers have no rights under the law of the country in which they are located. Thus they have no vacations, they cannot get sick, and women, if they become pregnant, are summarily dismissed. Their right to strike is also denied.

Thus we see how relevant Karl Marx's words in his article *Wages, Price and Profit* are today:

"Time is the room of human development. A man who has no free time to dispose of, whose whole lifetime, apart from the mere physical interruptions by sleep, meals, and so forth, is absorbed by his labor for the capitalist, is less than a beast of burden. He is a mere machine for producing Foreign Wealth, broken in body and brutalized in mind. Yet the whole history of modern industry shows that capital, if not checked, will recklessly and ruthlessly work to cast down the whole working class to this utmost state of degradation." (*Karl Marx. Wages, Price, and Profit*)

September 2019

Central Committee of the
Revolutionary Communist Party (PCR) Brazil

Burkina Faso

Revolutionary Communist Party of Volta

We Denounce the Murders in Yagha!

We Demand the Dismantling of the Death Squads!

On May 31, 2019, two young people belonging to the Democratic Youth Organization (ODJ) were savagely murdered in the city of Sebba. The young people killed were Fahadou Cisse, President of the provincial section of the ODJ, and the militant Hama Balma. Both were well-known social activists of the ODJ in the province of Yagha, who stood out as representatives in the great mobilizations of the popular insurrection of October 2014 and, who had to meet with the governor of the province of Yagha, at an already scheduled appointment.

In that meeting, some local problems had to be discussed, among others the artisanal exploitation of gold and the procedures for obtaining a citizenship card for the inhabitants.

Unfortunately, Fahadou Cisse and Hama Balma did not reach their destination, because, near Sebba, killer bullets prevented it. The body of a third person, also killed, was found near theirs.

In these painful circumstances, the PCRBF [Revolutionary Communist Party of Burkina Faso] expresses its deepest condolences to the closest relatives of these courageous fighters of the revolution, as well as to all the fighters of Yagha.

Cisse and Balma are martyrs in the struggle of our people to achieve social and national liberation.

The PCRBF has repeatedly denounced terrorism in our country, mainly by certain terrorist groups organized with the complacency of the government and of others, which have caused numerous victims.

Similarly, our party has denounced the extra-judicial executions carried out under the pretext of combating terrorism.

In our view, the murders of Cisse and Balma constitute an important turning point in the repressive policy of the regime. Since May 31, the regime has carried out a policy aimed at assassinating social and popular leaders who are fighting for democratic political freedoms, for the social and political rights of the population and for human rights that disturb the authorities and their allies.

The two comrades had previously been threatened with death and intimidated by the police and local authorities of the neocolonial government of Burkina Faso in this town located in the north of the country.

These crimes were well planned and executed by professionals in the field, who knew the victims and apparently left no trace of their punitive action. The fact that they mutilated the body of Fahadou Cisse shows the visceral hatred of the murderers. Paradoxically, the assassins intervened when at that time the authorities announced the control of the area by the defense and security forces.

This being the case, the youth and the people of Yagha received the news of the crime against the two young people, perpetrated by what is now considered “death squads,” with great sadness, but with great indignation. This has led to many mobilizations, denouncing these murders as a state crime, and reminding people of the sad days of repression in Latin America, particularly in Pinochet’s Chile, where the death squads had free reign. The method of operation reminds us of another execution, against a journalist, Norbert Zongo, and his colleagues, on December 13, 1998.

In these circumstances and with good reason, the popular youth and our people are asking:

Why are these crimes targeted at the leaders of this organization, the ODJ? Who benefits from these crimes?

What are the reasons for them?

Why these crimes? Why right now?

In the face of the inability to make any gains in their reactionary plans already put into practice by imperialism, mainly French imperialism, the most backward bourgeoisie chose armed confrontation against our people, mainly using terrorism to defeat the working class and people. They mainly use fundamentalist, paramilitary and religious groups and certain state militias, making use of death squads in various regions of the country. This is seen specifically by:

- selective assassinations, such as those that we just described in the town of Yagha, as in other regions of the country. It should be noted that there have been crimes against certain religious leaders and local authorities, which would also show that there is an internal struggle between various sectors of the bourgeoisie;

- the summary execution of various leaders who are defenders of human rights;

BURKINA FASO – WE DENOUNCE THE MURDERS IN YAGHA!

- the terror and desolation **caused** by these terrorist attacks have led to hundreds of deaths, tens of thousands of displaced people, the closing of schools and colleges, misery and famine that are aggravated by the government decisions to cease fire or states of emergency decreed in several regions of the country.

In Yagha, the crimes are explained by the important actions and raising of consciousness that the ODJ has been carrying out, especially among the poor youth. They have established a platform for their demands and led to important struggles for their economic, political and social rights, which delivered certain blows to the plans of the big bourgeoisie, which was a “dangerous” example for that bourgeoisie.

Indeed:

- In the economic field, this is a fight for the natural resources of the region that includes the exploitation of gold. These areas have been temporarily taken back by the inhabitants of Yagha, expelling the mining company Adama Kindo, which exploited this mineral, which translated into a lower income of profits, both for the central and local authorities.

- From a political point of view, the actions of the people of Yagha, together with the youth of the ODJ, of the democrats and revolutionaries, played a very important role, especially in unmasking the local authorities and leaders of Yagha. They had colluded with the multinational Adama Kindo and the bourgeoisie, a company that had its own jail to lock up the insurgents and with state security forces at their service for repression.

The objectives of the bourgeoisie with these state crimes

They are to terrorize the people in order to subdue them, to break the spirit of the insurrection that has been created among the masses and to restore the neo-colonial state at the service of the bourgeoisie



and imperialism, mainly French imperialism.

The crime in Yagha is not an isolated incident or event, nor is it merely a local or regional deed. It is another stage in the radicalization of the class struggle in our country.

It is the beginning of the implementation of a macabre and criminal plan against the democratic and revolutionary movement in order to stop the revolution that is underway in our country. There have been various threats in all regions of the country against social leaders, leaders of popular organizations, as well as against the ODJ itself.

There is already an open declaration of war by the president of the assembly, by the former and current prime minister, who are confronting the leaders of the trade union organizations, against those whom they accuse of being “stateless persons,” as well as against those who oppose or are simply skeptical of government policies, where there is a “sacred union against terrorism.”

To the above, we must add the laws approved in the National Assembly regarding the Criminal Code and the proposals to restrict freedom of the press. This can be seen as a fascistic turn by the government of the MPP (Movement for Progress) under the pretext of the fight against terrorism, a terrorism implemented by the bourgeoisie itself and imperialism to attack our people.

Therefore, we denounce the government’s double talk. On the one hand they speak of the rule of law, of confronting terrorism with the union against terrorism; they call for national reconciliation. However, on the other hand, they attack the most elementary freedoms, such as those of assembly, mobilizations, organizations and strikes. They attack the trade union organizations, which they persecute everywhere, in order to eliminate, weaken or intimidate them, for which they use all repressive methods at their disposal.

The government aims at the demoralization of the masses, the weakening of the democratic and popular movement, in order to take the situation back into their hands and draw up a plan, which is that of French imperialism.

These crimes will not go unpunished, regardless of what they do to disguise their authors and their perpetrators.

In view of the importance of the assassination of Fahadou Cisse and Hama Balma and their evil objectives, this crime cannot go unpunished. The authors and their perpetrators must be held accountable.

Through these targeted assassinations against democratic and revolutionary organizations and their members, the corrupt MPP government has declared war on the working class and the people. The popular youth and the people must organize to give an appropriate response.

It is for these reasons that the PCRBF calls on the working class, the poor youth, the laboring people and the entire population in general to organize and fight to:

- demand clarification of the murders of Fahadou Cisse and Hama Balma and the punishment of their intellectual authors and perpetrators;
- popular vigilance and unity against terrorism;
- vigorously denounce and reject summary and mass executions under the pretext of combating terrorism;
- reject state terrorism and terrorism in general;
- strongly denounce and reject and demand the dismantling of the death squads established by the government and directed against the fighters for freedom, human rights and justice in order to break the revolutionary advance of the masses and subject them to their neo-colonial and reactionary policies under the pretext of the fight against terrorism;
- organize against neo-colonial exploitation and imperialist oppression;
- organize against attacks and for political and democratic freedoms.

The only alternative to terrorism, to neo-colonialism, particularly French neo-colonialism, and to the neo-colonial state is the popular unity, that is, the unity of the popular and revolutionary classes and strata against imperialism, mainly French imperialism, and the reactionary bourgeois classes and for a revolutionary change in favor of the people. Our people can take on this challenge.

To clear up the heinous crimes!

To dismantle the death squads!

Our people, united under the leadership of the PCRBF, will win!

Bread and freedom for the people.

Central Committee Revolutionary Communist Party of Volta

July 1, 2019

Denmark

Workers Communist Party, APK, Demark

The Significance of the Communist International in Building the Party in the Struggle against Right Opportunism

The Third International – Comintern – gained great importance everywhere, also in Denmark, in the struggle of the working class and the revolutionaries to form and build the Communist Party. The formation of communist parties that completely broke with the ideological, political and organizational influence of the rotten reformist social democratic parties of the Second International, was a crucial and essential part of the Comintern's work.

In a summary of the historical development of the international working-class organization based on Marx's great phrase: *Workers of the world, unite!* and applying scientific socialism, Lenin emphasized in *The Third International and Its Place in History*

"The First International [1864-72] laid the foundation of the proletarian, international struggle for socialism.

The Second International marked a period in which the soil was prepared for the broad, mass spread of the movement in a number of countries. (1889-1914)

The Third International [1919-43] has gathered the fruits of the work of the Second International, discarded its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois dross, and has begun to implement the dictatorship of the proletariat." [Collected Works, Vol. 29.

The First World War was a war between imperialist powers to redivide the world, to enslave and suppress the peoples and nations. It was an unjust war, a war of robbery on the part of all the warring parties, a war at the expense of the peoples with the workers as cannon fodder in the power games of the monopoly capitalists. It is common knowledge that the leaders of the Second International openly joined their own bourgeoisie, betrayed everything the working-class movement stood for and brought disorganization and division to the world movement of the workers.

But the result of this war was something quite different from what its imperialist instigators had imagined. It led to the develop-

ment of revolutionary situations in Imperial Russia, in defeated Germany and in several other countries. Under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik party, which had never abandoned the revolutionary path of Marxism, the October Socialist Revolution, the first victorious proletarian revolution, was brought about.

These events illustrate the general content of the historic epoch in which we still live: the epoch imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

In 1917, the question of the position on the October revolution was the main issue of the international workers' movement, which had entered a period of great revolutionary recovery. From the first days of the October revolution the leaders of the Second International appeared as its worst enemies. Against the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the slogan of "pure democracy" was raised above classes and the irreconcilable class contradictions – rejecting the teachings of Marxism on the class character for the state.

The Communist International was founded in 1919, at a time when it was imperative that the theory of Marxism-Leninism had to be deeply anchored in the revolutionary working class, and that the working class in all countries ideologically and organizationally joined together and formed real Communist parties that completely broke with social democratic reformism and all the opportunism that the Second International had evolved into.

Despite the betrayal of the Second International, the workers everywhere, under the influence of the October Revolution with Lenin and the Bolshevik Party as the leading force, organized large strikes, demonstrations, uprisings against famines, army and naval mutinies, uprisings, seizures of power, as well as organizing and forming of Soviets. During these battles Communist parties were formed in several countries, including Denmark.

The Founding of the Party

The background to the founding of the Danmarks Kommunistiske Parti DKP – the Communist Party of Denmark – was the complete betrayal by the Social Democrats of the working-class cause. From the 1870s and the following decades, the socialist workers' movement in Denmark was organized with trade unions, the cooperative movement and the Social Democratic Party. The Social Democrats remained on the opportunist positions of the Second International. At a time when Lenin and the Bolshevik Party

and the revolutionary forces in several countries were preparing the revolution during the revolutionary crisis, which developed in the context of the First Imperialist World War, the Danish Social Democratic Party entered the cabinet with a minister in a national government. The Social Democrats adopted the role it has played ever since – as the preferred caretaker of the capitalist state for the monopolist bourgeoisie, the best party to ensure “peace” within the working-class ranks.

The founding of the Communist International on its clear revolutionary platform ensured that three different groups, which had broken with the Social Democrats, joined together into one party on November 9, 1919 and endorsed the Third International. The following year the party changed its name to the Communist Party of Denmark (DKP) in connection with the Second Congress of the Communist International (1920).

At that time the class struggle sharpened immensely. The working class, in the aftermath of the October Revolution, had gained important victories through major battles; among other things it secured the 8 hour working day. Now the bourgeoisie and the employers came together in a counter offensive. In 1920 the Danish king and the country’s largest capitalists carried out a coup d’état suspending the elected government. Everywhere in the country, the workers and people came out in the streets and protested vigorously. The reformist Social Democracy Party put the brakes on the revolutionary drive and prevented the removal of the king’s power and made a so-called national compromise with the election of a new government.

The Second Congress and the “Moscow Theses”

The important decisions of the Congresses and the Executive Committee of the Communist International were often given the name and form of theses. The term the “Moscow Theses” came into use in 1920 following the decisions of the Second Congress of the Communist International in July-August of that year. The Moscow Theses included all the important decisions of this Congress, the theses on the fundamental tasks of the Communist Party, on the colonial question, on the trade union movement, on the parliamentary work, on the agrarian question, on the Statutes and finally the 21 conditions for membership in the Communist International.

Later, the concept of the “Moscow Theses” has often been reduced to only the 21 conditions of membership. However, these conditions are a summary of all the Second Congress decisions and they must be understood in conjunction with the others.

On the conditions for entering the Communist International, *The Terms of Admission into the Communist International* at the Second Congress in 1920, states:

“The First, Inaugural Congress of the Communist International did not draw up precise conditions for the admission of parties into the Third International. When the First Congress was convened, only communist trends and groups existed in most countries.

It is in a different situation that the Second World Congress of the Communist International is meeting. In most countries, Communist parties and organizations, not merely trends, now exist.

Parties and groups only recently affiliated to the Second International are more and more frequently applying for membership in the Third International, though they have not become really Communist. The Second International has definitely been smashed. Aware that the Second International is beyond hope, the intermediate parties and groups of the “Centre” are trying to lean on the Communist International, which is steadily gaining in strength. At the same time, however, they hope to retain a degree of “autonomy” that will enable them to pursue their previous opportunist or “Centrist” policies. The Communist International is, to a certain extent, becoming the vogue.

...In certain circumstances, the Communist International may be faced with the danger of dilution by the influx of wavering and irresolute groups that have not as yet broken with their Second International ideology.” [Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31.]

The clear revolutionary program of the Communist International, the demands contained in the theses to build a Communist Party of a Leninist character, to put an end to reformism in practice as well as ideologically, was of great importance to the young Danish Communist Party. The organizational structure of the International with different sections for the different continents under the Executive Committee was likewise of major significance. The Danish Party had in its leadership people from different currents and ideological backgrounds to conduct the struggle for unity on a Marxist-Leninist basis. At the same time there was immense pressure from a society where the working class was bloated, so to speak, with the

ideas of social democracy, class cooperation and reformism from cradle to grave.

The conditions for admission stated that:

"It is the duty of parties wishing to belong to the Communist International to recognize the need for a complete and absolute break with reformism and "Centrist" policy, and to conduct propaganda among the party membership for that break. Without this, a consistent communist policy is impossible." [Ibid.]

This is not just a general requirement, but a specific one, as stated in the first two theses of the conditions of admission, for example:

1. Day-by-day propaganda and agitation must be genuinely communist in character. All press organs belonging to the parties must be edited by reliable Communists who have given proof of their devotion to the cause of the proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat should not be discussed merely as a stock phrase to be learned by rote; it should be popularized in such a way that the practical facts systematically dealt with in our press day by day will drive home to every rank-and-file working man and working woman, every soldier and peasant, that it is indispensable to them. Third International supporters should use all media to which they have access—the press, public meetings, trade unions, and co-operative societies—to expose systematically and relentlessly, not only the bourgeoisie but also its accomplices—the reformists of every shade.

2. Any organization that wishes to join the Communist International must consistently and systematically dismiss reformists and "Centrists" from positions of any responsibility in the working-class movement (party organizations, editorial boards, trade unions, parliamentary groups, co-operative societies, municipal councils, etc.), replacing them by reliable Communists. The fact that in some cases rank-and-file workers may at first have to replace "experienced" leaders should be no deterrent." [Ibid.]

Common features of reformism

To the extent that DKP really followed and carried out the line and directives of the Comintern, the party also developed and made great advances. The Scandinavian section of the Third International intervened several times in serious party disputes between the various currents within the Danish party. In 1929 the political and ideological disagreements had evolved into a crisis in the party, and the

Third International sent an open letter to the party and party members. This “Open Letter” pointed out the necessity of a direct confrontation with the right-wing opportunism and the right opportunist passivity that characterized the party’s leadership and work. The letter also called for the party’s leadership to be expanded by revolutionary workers at the next Congress.

The fact that the Communist Party of Denmark followed the Comintern’s instructions and made this direct confrontation was of decisive importance for the party’s further development and the working-class struggle and its fight for socialism. It made it possible for the party to become the leading nucleus in the struggle against fascism and the armed resistance struggle during the Nazi occupation in the Second World War.

Ever since, these actions by the Third International have been a target by the Trotskyites and other anti-communists as “proof of the dictatorship of the Communist International” and especially of Stalin.

In the various forms of reformism and revisionism in Denmark, the following features have always been repeated and maintained:

The notion of a peaceful and parliamentary path to socialism – without revolution and without smashing the capitalist state apparatus.

The notion of a “mass communist party,” first and foremost understood as a party of voters for elections – not as a working-class vanguard party and a party of revolutionary action.

And it is the consistent trade union legalism – the illusory and opportunist endeavor to push the Social Democratic leadership and the LO (the central organization for the majority of trade unions) apparatus to fight for the interests of the working class – which replaces the line of the development of a fighting and revolutionary trade union movement by promoting the break of the working class with the labor aristocracy. The reformists minimize the fight against the LO trade union leadership and apparatus as instruments of the interests of capital in the working class movement.



September 1, 2019

Dominican Republic

Communist Party of Labor – PCT

The Revolution Is a Concrete Issue (Reflections in the light of the Dominican experience)

I.

General introduction.

The revolution is a work that is built up day by day and under certain conditions. It is an event that is flowing from less to more, with advances and possible setbacks, as the conditions through in which it develops change. To propose it is to conceive of a big undertaking to which steps must be added every day, knowing that each of these can be different, easy or difficult.

It is not a dream nor a utopia. It is an objective, achievable purpose. It is real.

One must desire it and have the will to build it. This is fundamental, and is an important factor in the revolutionary project, without which the corresponding tasks cannot be carried out.

But it is not only will; to support the work on this can lead to confusing desires with reality, to a deviation to voluntarism. The will must be correspond to the circumstances, to the objective conditions external to our consciousness, which are equally necessary. The revolution is the result of the combination of a will to build it and of circumstances in which it is built.

It is a reality of mutual influences. The revolutionary will influences improving the factors of the circumstances; and these can influence certain wills. An idea and an action sometimes create situations that change the mood of the masses, create a fighting subjectivity, or their willingness to fight, different from what prevailed prior to that idea and action.

There may be a lot of emotion in this new disposition of the popular masses; in fact it is almost always so at first. And it is the task of the conscious factor to understand it, and to maintain that mood, to do everything so that it does not fall, and to give it direction, to raise their level of consciousness every time, with ideas and actions that correspond to the level of the movement.

To advance from that instinctive and emotional state, which the mass movement sometimes has, to a state of consciousness of why and for what reason, is a purpose for everyone who always intends to build the revolution in the movement of the masses in struggles.

II.

The mobilized popular masses are the possibility of the revolution in the Dominican Republic.

In some countries, the guerrillas, or other military action, opened the perspectives or created elements of civil war that were favorable to the revolution.

But in our country, the guerrillas or attempts at military actions with revolutionary intentions only caused setbacks of historical proportions, such as the losses of Manolo Tavárez and others of his comrades in the Las Manaclas mountains in December of 1963; also that of Colonel Caamaño and other fighters after the Caracoles beach expedition in February of 1973. In those guerrilla actions, which sought to copy the experience of Fidel Castro in the Sierra Maestra in the Cuba of the 1950s, the Dominican revolution lost its two greatest leaders so far.

And, unfortunately, dozens of young revolutionaries have been lost in events that were intended to lead to marking the revolution. Some of those took place when the mass struggle was growing, and these deaths contributed to slowing down the movement.

This voluntarism has led to the collapse of important popular organizations, because policies and methods of struggle of a revolutionary situation were imposed on them when such a situation did not exist; the development of the mass struggle, damaged by these rushed policies and methods, was the immediate possibility of contributing an element of political crisis in the national situation.

We know statements of revolutionary militants who were key in the struggles of that period, who said that when their political collective realized that they were not in the news, they created some action that caught their attention, and then they evaluated the effectiveness of the action by how much it was mentioned on television, on the radio or in the press.

In those days, the success of the strikes called was measured in the first place by how much they were mentioned by the newspapers; thus, no demands were realized, and the movement would go

back to nothing once the social tensions accumulated over months had dissipated.

Those voluntarist mentalities still exist.

The young militants, who are increasingly decisive in the processes of the current struggles, and the Marcha Verde [Green March against corruption – *translator's note*], which in total has mobilized about one million people since January 26, 2017, is an example; they should review the experiences of the last 20 years and learn from them.

As communist militants, it is our duty to recommend this review of the experiences in the light of the Leninist Theory of the Revolution, and it will be very useful to analyze categories such as Relationship of Forces, the Revolutionary Situation, Political Crisis, Possibility and Reality, Objective and Subjective Conditions for the Revolution, among others, in order to continue in the mass struggle.

And of course Dominican history.

In the Dominican Republic, only the political struggle of the popular masses has created revolutionary situations, or political crises that could develop into those.

The April 1965 War is the most relevant case, which was a continuation of the upsurge of the masses in the streets after the fall of the Trujillo dictatorship in 1961, demanding rights, public liberties, social justice and the distribution of wealth.

The elections of 1962, won by the PRD and Professor Juan Bosch as a candidate, dampened this process of the rise of popular struggles; but it would return to take shape once he was overthrown



by a coup d'état on September 25, 1963, and the people began to demand in the streets "the return to the Constitution of 1963 without elections."

There was then a political crisis that created elements of civil war, and these developed into a civilian-military insurrection.

This whole experience should be the object of further study, to nourish the revolutionary purpose, and of less tales about the 500 Commanders of this deed, who are now presenting, through literary and oral means, some of the roles that should have been performed, but were not.

They did not act in an objective manner when there was a revolutionary situation in the country, and now they are telling stories, that is, they say what they now believe they should have done in those circumstances; not what they really did.

Other situations in which elements of political crises appeared in the country, which did not develop, were the moments of verification of electoral fraud by the governments in office against the parties and candidates who contested for power in the elections.

In 1978, 1990, 1994 and 2012, there were allegations of electoral fraud that, to varying degrees, created a tense political situation. In cases such as in 1978, 1990 and 1994, when there were popular street demonstrations demanding respect for the popular will expressed at the polls, the situation progressed to becoming a political crisis. The continual taking of the streets by the workers and the people in general was the most distinctive element of these situations.

What a thing! National elections took place in Dominican history that created situations of political crises; incipient, elementary, embryonic situations, or whatever one could call them, that could have developed into a revolutionary situation.

In all these cases, the Left was outside of the electoral process; some of its sectors proclaimed in a general way that "elections are not the solution, the road is revolution." This is a general truth, one that is always valid strategically; but it does not respond "to the concrete situation", which is what the tactic must address.

Each time the electoral trauma arose, the Left came from outside the ongoing process, wanting to lead it and direct it to its own revolutionary proposals. But the masses in struggle were under the main influence of those who led them throughout the process, and

they were led to understandings, pacts, or the simple acceptance of what happened, all of which put an end to the crisis.

It is correct, revolutionary, to be involved in the mass movement, and to set out to build a political army within it that can move towards a situation of higher consciousness by the participants. This demands a lot of work and much more patience. More if an important part of the participating masses is politically distant from you.

The prospect of building the revolution within the mass struggle must never be lost; one must always pay attention to reality.

When the mass struggle is blocked, even unconsciously, a reactionary attitude develops. It does not matter how ultra-revolutionary is the speech with which this is usually done, by proposing slogans or carrying out actions within the movement, for which these are not yet mature.

The young members must review the experience and learn, so as not to repeat the mistakes to which a sector of the left recurs again and again, and again, and again,.

III.

April of 1984 confirms the need for a combative and revolutionary vanguard for the revolution.

In April 1984, the popular masses took to the streets of almost every city in the country, in protest against the agreements that the government, headed by Jorge Blanco, agreed to with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which caused a rise in all prices of goods and services of mass consumption. It was a systematic protest, in waves of the masses, in the course of seven days throughout the country.

It began as an isolated protest in one neighborhood of the capital; in a few hours it began to expand, and the next day it was a national movement. It overwhelmed the ability of the national police to control it, but also of the leftist groups to lead it, including our party. We were in the organization of the protest in one neighborhood of the capital, as has been said. But we did not foresee the accumulated indignation among the people, for whom one spark was enough for the whole country to be set on fire in protest.

The ruling party was divided in evaluating the causes of the protest and how to stop it. The President of the Republic and some

of his officials called the movement "seditious" and so responded with military repression, with an undetermined number of dead, and about 7,000 arrested. Instead, the rank and file of that party took to the streets, and the main leadership, including some who were government officials who rejected the act, condemned the pact with the IMF and the repression.

For seven days there was a national popular uprising. It was a political crisis. The masses were in the streets, at the barricades; and the government party was split. It was an elementary expression that "those from below did not want to remain ruled as before," and "those from above" presented a split so that, in order to continue governing, they had to use military force to massacre the people.

The objective conditions for the revolution were expressed at that moment. But the political and military leadership that could lead the movement to a revolution did not appear. The objective conditions that Lenin spoke of as necessary for a revolution were met; but the subjective ones, the other condition, especially that of political leadership, were missing.

Experience confirms the need for a vanguard communist party, capable of leading the popular masses in a revolutionary process. But one is not the vanguard because one proclaims oneself to be, but because it is proved in practice.

The facts highlight another experience, which is that the military question must be addressed as a necessity for the development of the party itself, always in view of the circumstances that are unfolding. This is not something that must be resolved when the movement has already broken out; it must largely be prepared in advance to respond to situations such as those of April 1984.

As Lenin said, the membership of the party must be prepared for mass struggles in the streets, on strikes, on the barricades, as agitator and propagandist, when the movement takes that form. It must be willing to participate in the electoral processes, when circumstances so demand, and it must be willing to abandon the peaceful and legal struggle, to take up the role of revolutionary combatant or commander, when the insurrection is on the order of the day.

The communist militancy is a whole, like the well-known Three-in-One oil. It is all three at once. It is built in these three dimensions. And it puts into practice what the circumstance demands at the moment.

The revolution is possible and necessary, but it must be built and in the process the communist party must also be built, as a combative and revolutionary vanguard of the working class and the laboring masses.

September 2019

Ecuador

Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Ecuador – PCMLE

Pablo Miranda

The Struggle of Ideas

Since the birth of social classes, the history of mankind has been one of class struggle, as was accurately stated in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1848.

The way to understand scientifically the history of mankind is to look at it from the historical materialist point of view starting from the theory of the modes of production. In each mode of production, there are two main social classes which wage a fierce struggle for their interests. The ruling classes fight to preserve, expand and perpetuate them, and the oppressed classes fight to achieve their social liberation, for the recognition and development of their interests. Throughout history, these struggles opposed the slave owners and slaves, the landlords and serfs, and now the bourgeois and the workers.

The confrontation of the antagonistic classes within society is fought under concrete conditions, in the circumstances under which production develops. Under the capitalist-imperialist system, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie face each other in conditions of the domination of capital over labor, of the appropriation by the possessing classes of the wealth created by the workers, of the dependence imposed by the international monopolies and imperialism over the workers, the peoples, the nations and the dependent countries.

Essentially, the class struggle is the struggle for political power, to determine which class exercises political power, and due to its positions, holds economic power (the ownership of the means of production and the wealth created by the workers), and exercises social and cultural domination over society as a whole.

In capitalist society, the struggle between the working class and the class of bosses is fought in a fierce way in all the areas of activity, economic, social, cultural, political and military sectors, as well as in the realm of ideas. These confrontations are the reflection of the material interests of the classes; they are independent of the will of the people, the social organizations and political parties that par-

ticipate in them. These elements are nevertheless actively involved in this struggle.

The economic base, the way production and distribution are structured are fundamental in the positioning of the social classes, of their representatives and spokespersons. On the one hand, there are the classes that own the large means of production and, on the other, the workers who create the wealth but who do not enjoy it.

As is known, the class struggle manifests itself mainly in the fields of economy, politics and ideology, but it is in the political field that its most acute and decisive expressions are concentrated. The political struggle is the daily confrontation between the class of the capitalists to remain in power, and the working class to overthrow them and assume the role of ruling class.

Another aspect of the class struggle is also waged within the working class between two sectors: the one that has become conscious of its role in production and in social change, that has at its head its political party, the Communist Party; and other sectors of the same working class, which are influenced by the employers' points of view, by reformism, revisionism and opportunism, that lead their actions only in order to improve their salaries and their social and political rights.

The political struggle develops independently of the will of people, including the social and political organizations. All the ideas and positions that are expressed in society have political connotations. Apoliticism does not exist. In reality, each social class, each class sector develops political activities. Human beings cannot escape from this situation. They carry out political tasks, regardless of whether they are conscious of this or whether they are manipulated by the social and political leaders of the ruling classes.

The ideological struggle is developing constantly

As in political confrontations, the ideological struggle, the concepts and the positions of the working class and the bourgeoisie clash on nature, the manner in which human beings transform it to meet their needs, on all social phenomena, the exploitation and oppression of the workers, the means of production and distribution of wealth. In short, no aspect of human activity is not deeply linked to ideas, to conceptions.

The struggle of ideas, the ideological confrontation between the working class and the bourgeoisie, is the strategic expression of the

class struggle. It is the confrontation between the revolutionary new and the reactionary old, between independence and imperialist domination, between revolution and counter-revolution, between socialism and capitalism.

The ideological struggle is a constant in the different circumstances, in the different periods and places in which the confrontation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie takes place. Every positioning, every manifestation of the class struggle expresses, in itself, the interests of the classes in conflict, in capitalist society, the conceptions of the working class and the class of capitalists.

In these times, after the overthrow of the proletariat in power and the defeat of the Great October Revolution and the socialist system, the ideological struggle of the working class and its communist party is unfolding in adverse conditions. Capitalism and reaction have won a battle of great proportions. They have temporarily brought down the glorious period of social revolution, the ideal of socialism and communism; they restored capitalism on a third of the earth's surface, and pushed a quarter of the world's workers out of power.

As a consequence of these events, a good part of society, of public opinion and even broad sectors of the working class consider that the imperialists and capitalists are the winners over socialism. The imperialists proclaim that capitalism is the highest expression of the material and cultural development of humanity, they decreed the end of the revolution and socialism, and they believe in the unfeasibility of social emancipation.

According to reactionary and imperialist ideologues, socialism failed; it was unable to resolve the workers and the people's problems, it had set up dictatorial governments, buried democracy and freedom, could not deal with the technological, technical and scientific development of capitalism, it made use of violence and war leading to the sacrifice of millions of human beings for nothing, only to let things go on as before.

Actually, socialism was defeated, but has not been eliminated. The causes and the subjects of the social revolution are alive, which are capitalist exploitation and the struggle of the workers and peoples for their liberation. The communists are carrying on the struggle for revolution and socialism.

However the facts are stubborn.

The social gains and rights that the workers and people have achieved with the triumph of the revolution and of socialism cannot be hidden: social equality for all who work, equal opportunities for all, the elimination of hunger and misery, education at all levels for the entire population, universal health and social security, freedom of women from patriarchal and bourgeois oppression, the independence and sovereignty of the peoples and nations that undertook the building of socialism are still present in the historical memory of millions of human beings; they testify to the substantial differences between capitalism and socialism. Capitalism is the exploitation of one human being by another; socialism is the elimination of exploitation.

In the same context, the capitalist-imperialist system has nothing new to offer. It is responsible for the super-exploitation of millions of workers throughout the world, for the appropriation and accumulation of the enormous wealth created by them. It is responsible for the looting of natural resources, the extractivist policies, the deterioration of the environment of the entire planet, the subjugation and underdevelopment of the vast majority of dependent countries. Capitalism is the generator of unemployment for more

than a thousand million people, of the poverty that plagues hundreds of millions of people, of unhealthiness and infant mortality, of the lack of drinking water and sewage facilities, of the great lack of public education in all countries.

With the development of the technical-scientific revolution, the progress of techniques and technologies, and the improvement of the instruments of production, robotics and computer science,



the creation of 4G, cyber-physics, the internet and nanotechnology, hundreds of thousands of jobs have been eliminated. This has had a significant influence on the material conditions of the working class and in the subjectivity and the consciousness of the proletarians.

A good number of large factories with great concentrations of workers have ceased to exist. They have been replaced by highly technical industrial plants that require fewer workers and are spread out over regions and countries. The imperialist states move their dirty and polluting industries outside of their own countries, looking around for cheap and technically specialized labor. In some countries such as China and India there are big factories of tens of thousands of workers. The growth of land, sea and air transportation brings markets and raw material closer together, and profits grow for the monopolies.

Capitalism grows, accumulates and concentrates wealth continuously. To meet these objectives, it cannot do without the labor power, which remains, now as in the past, the main source of the creation of wealth.

The working class has grown numerically as never before; it is now spread across the planet. The emerging economic powers, China, India, Brazil and Turkey as well as other states that welcome the industrial plants of the imperialist countries, such as Bangladesh, Vietnam and Indonesia become seats of great concentrations of workers. As always, the super-exploitation of the workers is the main component of surplus value.

The great majority of the working class is influenced by the ideas and the proposals of the employers, of reformism, opportunism and revisionism. The unionized membership in the working class is very low: only in very few countries does it exceed 10%. Class unionism has lost ground. The main expressions of struggle by the working class in several countries of Europe, in India and China, in Brazil, Argentina and the United States, are demonstrations of dissent. They look for immediate responses to the material situation, and in some cases, they have political connotations, as in Argentina and Brazil, where they are opposed to neoliberalism and fascism. In all circumstances and places they confront capitalism.

The former communist parties, that had fought heroic battles against fascism and dictatorships, against capitalism and for socialism, ended up being victims of opportunism; they got stuck in the mud of modern revisionism, they lost their class nature and became

reformist organizations; they lost strength and presence in the working class; they decreased in number to the point of being small expressions that have little influence on politics.

Petty bourgeois opportunism and Trotskyism tried to replace the revisionist parties and, to a small extent, they have been successful.

In reality, the bulk of the trade union movement is under the rule of social democracy, and as such, it does not represent the genuine interests of the working class; it is a lever to help the capitalist system, which, in exchange, grants it small concessions.

These are the conditions – and there are no other ones – that we communists are facing today, and it is in these conditions that we have to carry on the struggle for revolution and socialism.

The struggle for social emancipation, for the liberation of the workers and the independence and sovereignty of countries dominated by imperialism, must be developed in the field of the ideas, of the ideological struggle. But to lead to the overthrow of capitalism and establish people's power and socialism, the revolution must take place.

One must start from a few conceptual issues.

What are ideas? Where do they come from? What is ideology?

Ideas are always a reflection of the surrounding reality, but they are not a simple graphic reproduction; they express a work of abstraction produced in the human brain.

Ideas do not arise from nothing, spontaneously, they are not a divine inspiration, they are not born with us; they are formed and are expressed in a concrete reality, they are a consequence of the sensory perception of the things and phenomena that are present in nature, of the events that occur in the development of society; they are the result of the development of human beings, they are proven in practice. Ideas are born from social practice, they are interpreted, they become concepts that are validated in practice.

Ideas take shape in human subjectivity through perception by one's senses, by the vision of things and phenomena, by conversation and reading. This first stage is followed by the interpretation and the acceptance of these ideas as one's own. Ideas develop in the brain, which turns them into concepts. The correctness of these ideas can only be verified by practice, by their implementation and application in nature and social life. In other words, knowledge is first of all born from objective reality, through practice, then it is

processed and it returns to practice for verification of its correctness.

When a set of ideas that represents the material interests of a social group is shaped and presented as theses, the group, in turns, identifies itself with these theses, resulting in the formation of a system of ideas, of an ideology.

Ideology is a set of ideas, concepts, opinions on the various phenomena of nature and society, on the past and present, including proposals for the future; it is an interpretation of history, of the issues that interest of human beings, positions on different situations, the way to see issues and problems, the way of thinking, living, working and fighting for the interests of a social group, of a political party, of a social class. It is an ideological system, a conception of the world. Ideology is the way of thinking and acting of a collective or a sector of society that is shared in various fields. Therefore, ideology is not a position, a phenomenon of an individual nature; it is a type of social consciousness.

Ideological systems correspond to social classes and sectors. They express the material situation, their economic, political, social and cultural interests. Each social class has an interpretation of life and sets its course according to its interests. The way of life always corresponds to a specific material base, unlike the lifestyle that encompasses family and personal particularities.

“Ideology is the reflection, in human consciousness, of the existing objective social conditions. It is mainly a reflection of the relations of production. It is also determined, to a large extent, by the habits, traditions and conceptions that are transmitted from generation to generation, and by the work of dissemination.” (Marx and Engels, *Letter to the League of Communists*)

In a nutshell, all the phenomena of nature and society are interpreted and fought for according to the material interests of the social classes in conflict.

In capitalist society, the class ideology of the bourgeoisie is engaged in a battle to the death with the world view of the working class. Also involved in this struggle are the ideologies of the other classes of society, the petty bourgeoisie, the semi-proletariat, and even the ideologies of classes of the past, of the landowners and feudalism.

When the points of view, the conceptual appraisals belong to different sectors of a single social class, they express the material interests of these groups and are generally part of the theoretical support of the political parties; they are expressed in programmatic, social and cultural proposals, and compete with each other, sometimes bitterly, but they also come to compromises, to agreements to defend the general interests of the social class.

When the ideologies of antagonistic social classes clash, a merciless struggle erupts and sets the course of society and of the social, economic, cultural and political life. This confrontation is part of the class struggle.

The struggle between the conceptions of antagonistic social classes' is expressed in all fields: in the struggle of ideas, that is, in the struggle of opposites to defend their respective conceptions; in the economic field, to satisfy and expand their material rights and aspirations; in the cultural and military fields; and in the political field, the struggle between the owners, who want to maintain their power, and the oppressed, who fight to overthrow the instituted power and establish a new power.

When ideas transform themselves into a system of ideas, into an ideology, they become conceptions, which are expressed in assessments of reality, of the contradictions, and of the ways to resolve them for the benefit of the collective that upholds them. They are expressed in proposals and programs, in ways and methods to reach the objectives. These are the circumstances in which theory is born.

The conceptions of the working class were abstracted and systematized by the social fighters and the revolutionary intellectuals and became the revolutionary theory of scientific socialism. Marx and Engels, and later on Lenin and Stalin, played an important role in the elaboration of the theory of social emancipation, they systemized the principles and the objectives of the social emancipation, they systematized the principles and aims of the social revolution of the proletariat, the role of the masses in history, the use of revolutionary violence to overthrow the capitalists and to establish the working class as the ruling class of society and the leading force of the working people, the international character of the working

class and of proletarian internationalism, and the need for the political party of the working class, the communist party.

The revolutionary theory, scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism is the conception of the world of the working class, it is proletarian ideology, the guide for the construction of the communist party, to organize and lead the revolution to victory, for the building of the society of the workers, socialism, and for the continuation of the struggle for the establishment of communism on the global scale.

Marxism-Leninism becomes a material force when the working class, the other laboring classes, the youth and women organize and fight according to its principles, when the party of the proletariat defines the political orientations on the field and according to the concrete conditions, guided by its principles, and fulfills the role of bringing them to the consciousness and action of the working masses and youth.

By itself, the revolutionary theory, Marxism-Leninism is valuable. It is the result of the scientific analysis of society, of the experience of the struggle of the workers' and peoples' movements. It is the heritage of the working class of all countries. It constitutes a guide for the people's struggle for emancipation. The working class can only fulfill its transforming role as long as it is deeply involved in the class struggle.

Marx, in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, points out the following:

“The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism of the weapon, material force must be overthrown by material force, but theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses.”

Lenin correctly pointed out that “theory without practice is sterile, practice without theory is blind.” Theory, when limited to books and is only used for discussions in a café, is useless for the revolutionary organization and struggle. Workers' activities, when they are limited to demands and struggles for immediate improvements, cannot put an end to capitalist exploitation and oppression. Moreover, social struggles, even when they reach high levels and turn into rebellions and insurrections, do not lead to the revolution without the guidance of Marxism-Leninism under the leadership of the communist party.

These statements confirm the validity of the revolutionary theory as the indispensable tool for organizing and making the revolution, and the need for the unity of theory with practice.

The struggle of ideas, that is the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism, can bring results in favor of the cause of the revolution if it develops in the heat of the class struggle, amid the fights of the workers for their own interests, against coercion and repression, against the reactionary theses and proposals defended by the capitalists and their lackeys, against the proposals of the reformists and opportunists who try to influence and divert the organization and the will of the struggle of the masses.

The current scenario of the ideological struggle

In the bid to preserve its privileges, the bourgeoisie always used all means: the imposition of laws, of open repression, the forging of representative democracy, the division of powers, to universal suffrage, to military dictatorships, to fascism and Nazism, to state terrorism.

Under capitalism, the dominant ideas are those of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. They are spread throughout the world and affect the whole of society. They are used as the support to legitimate the system and to justify all sorts of outrages, wars of conquest and the domination by a handful of imperialist countries over the great majority of States.

The constitution of the working class as a class in itself, its transition to the status of a class for itself, its persistent struggle for social emancipation, the strength and potentiality of its ideas embodied in Marxism-Leninism, broke into the world of capital and threatened its existence, announcing its liquidation.

Direct, brutal and reactionary repression has never been and will never be enough to contain and, much less, to liquidate the organization and march of the proletariat towards socialism.

Capital sought alternatives to confront the liberating ideals of the proletariat and found them in the field of ideas.

For centuries, it has tried in vain to demonstrate the unfeasibility of socialism, the failure of Marxism-Leninism, the futility of the revolution; and, it has proposed to glorify and praise the world of private property, the kingdom of the individual, the qualities of competition, etc.

The revisionism of the early twentieth century, modern revisionism, “Eurocommunism” and “21st century socialism” were set up as philosophical proposals, as social and economic models that aimed at sweetening capitalism through reformist policies, through a few material concessions to the working class, wage increases, material well-being that kept untouched the private property of the big capitalists.

Historical experience showed that everything that had been presented as socialism by the social democrats, revisionists and opportunists was nothing more than a caricature of socialism, a disguise to maintain capitalism.

Presently, after the overthrow of socialism, after the collapse of “real socialism,” the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the disappearance of the Soviet Union and of the people’s democracies of Eastern Europe, the defeat of socialism in Albania, the ideological offensive against socialism has intensified, and has gained audiences in public opinion, even in the working class.

The ideas of the bourgeoisie, the exaltation of individualism, free competition, free trade, ideological pluralism, representative democracy, free elections, the possibility to alternate parties in government, the superiority of capitalism; the denunciation of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the oppression of the workers, as the dictatorship of a party or of a person, the preaching of the failure of the revolution, of the obsolescence of socialism, have an echo, credibility among broad sectors of the population and of the working class.

The fallacies that reformism, social democracy, the various forms of opportunism and revisionism spread: that the workers’ interests and desires can be fully realized within bourgeois democracy, with the force of peaceful demands and struggles, with the revolution in freedom, the revolution by votes; about the atrocities of Stalinism, individual terrorism, the failure of the dictatorship of the proletariat and much other nonsense have reached considerable levels of acceptance among the working masses and youth.

We, the proletarian revolutionaries, have to confront the reactionary positions of the bourgeoisie, to denounce their lies, unmask the social scourges of capitalism, the responsibility they have for unemployment, hunger and misery of thousands of millions of human beings, for wars of plunder which cause the death of millions of people, the destruction of the economy of countries, the depreda-

tion of nature and the environment that threaten to destroy life on the planet.

We must also give specific answers to the ideas propagated by social democrats and opportunists; we must expose the idealistic, reactionary and counter-revolutionary nature of the ideas of class conciliation and petty bourgeois adventurism.

In Ecuador, we proletarian revolutionaries confront the traditional bourgeois thinking, the reactionary ideas of the conservative sectors of the ruling classes, the widespread proposals of U.S. imperialism and of the European Union, the sudden aggressive appearance of the Chinese and Russian imperialists. We also face the offensive of social democracy and reformism, of the “citizen’s revolution” and of “21st century socialism” that until recently had been placed in power, the influence of the conciliatory ideas of the revisionists and opportunists within the workers’ and popular movement.

The “citizen’s revolution,” the “21st century socialism,” express the reformist thinking of the petty bourgeoisie in the country. They are ideological and political instruments of finance capital to divert the workers and peoples from their objectives of the revolution and socialism, of the need and the feasibility of seizing power and building the new world, socialism, with the masses and for the masses.

Democracy, decentralization, the role of the individual were and are the ideological and political fallacies preached by “Correism” [President Correa’s type of administration] and by the progressive governments of Latin America to try to undermine the centralized economy, the role of the working class as vanguard and leader of the revolutionary process. In reality, these statements support capitalism and oppose the role of the working classes in the revolutionary process.

The “non-violence,” “the revolution of the votes,” the peaceful revolution are intended to disarm the working class and the peoples regarding the role of revolutionary violence and of the masses in social transformation.

The so-called “progressive governments” of Latin America certainly failed to respond to the interests and aspirations of the workers and peoples. The economic measures, the welfare policies and the glittering public works only partially mitigated the scourges of capitalist exploitation. Democracy, respect for the human rights of the workers, became words that concealed anti-worker policies,

demonized the workers and youth in the struggles, stigmatized indigenous peoples and nationalities that defended their rights and their cultures. Defense of nature and the environment, the respect for the opinion of ancestral communities were words that contrasted with the facts, with the cult of extractivism as the engine of progress of the countries, with the handing-over of the land and subsoil to the big oil and mining companies. The promise of honesty and clean hands were only a façade that concealed the most highly paid administrators and the theft of public monies; each of the progressive governments are being unmasked as centers of corruption, as organized gangs for personal and group enrichment. The national sovereignty and independence of the countries were transformed into objects of negotiation for their dependence and their opening to the inflow of Chinese and Russian capital, of the imperialist claws of China and Russia without definitively breaking with the Western imperialists.

The peoples punished the majority of the progressive governments at the polls but they did not have the capacity, the will and the decisiveness to replace them with popular governments. They were succeeded in power by other sectors of the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie, by the accentuation of neoliberal policies, which were never completely done away with under “21st century socialism.”

It is clear that most of the progressive governments no longer exist in Latin America; they only remain in Venezuela, Nicaragua and Bolivia. But their policies, their proposals persist; they have an impact on appreciable sectors of the working masses and youth. Therefore, the task of unmasking their fallacies among the working class and peoples continues to be relevant.

The struggle of ideas for the revolution and socialism

The ideological struggle must aim firstly at the promotion of Marxism-Leninism, of revolution and socialism.

We communists have the obligation to arm the working class with its ideology, scientific socialism, with the relevance of the principles of the class struggle, the role this class plays in the organization and the leadership of the other laboring classes, of youth and women, its vanguard role in the revolution, the role of the trade union struggle for achieving their immediate interests and rights, the necessity to always be aware of the need to seize power, to maintain the existence, activity and development of the revolutionary party of

the proletariat, the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Ecuador, the PCMLE.

We proletarian revolutionaries have the responsibility of bringing socialism to the other laboring classes, to the peasants, the self-employed, the intellectual workers, of insisting among them about the relevance of the revolution and socialism, of clarifying that the society of the workers, the full realization of their interests can only become a reality with the seizure of power, with the decision to participate in the revolutionary struggle to achieve full independence and national sovereignty, with the role of developing the unity and struggle among the workers of the city and the countryside in the process of social and political struggle for the establishment of people's power.

We communists must also direct the revolutionary offensive towards the broad sectors of working women and youth. These are historical-social subjects who have been upholding, in their advanced sectors, the rebellion against inequality and the outrages of the imperialists and capitalists. These are social sectors in which the party has been playing an important role, recording experiences that must be processed and generalized. The struggle for the revolution and socialism, the victory that we must and can achieve, will not be



possible without the decisive participation of the working women and youth.

We communists must face the ideological offensive not only by writing for and distributing our publications: the newspaper “En Marcha” [“On the March”], the “Revista Política” [“Political Journal”], “Unidad y Lucha” [“Unity and Struggle”] and the two central documents of the Party, its “Political Line” and its “Program and Statutes”. It is not limited to manifestos and distributing leaflets, to speeches by members at union meetings. The Party must promote these publications and mechanisms but, above all, it must serve the ideological and political confrontation against the capitalists and the government in office, against the domination and oppression of imperialism. In short, it must wage the direct combat of the working class and the laboring masses for their rights, of the Ecuadorian nation and the peoples of Ecuador for independence.

Each of these struggles constitutes an important link in the building of the revolutionary consciousness of the workers and youth.

We affirm that we are convinced about the superiority of socialism over capitalism; we must prove it in theory and in practice with an analysis of the situation, of the general crisis of capitalism, by denouncing the social scourges, with the correctness and the justice of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the relevance of the class struggle, the vulnerability of capitalism and imperialism, the possibility of defeating them again.

The Party must fulfill, in theory and practice, its responsibility as the vanguard of the working class and of the struggle for the revolution and socialism.

September 2019

Consulted Bibliography

Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels
 Letter to the League of Communists, Marx and Engels
 Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, Marx
 La teoría de la lucha de clases (The Theory of the Class Struggle), Agustín Cueva
 El maestro, la comunidad y la construcción de la escuela para la emancipación (The Teacher, the Community and the Construction of the School for Emancipation), Pablo Miranda

France

Communist Party of the Workers of France (PCOF)

On the “Yellow Vests” Movement

On November 17, 2018, a broad social movement mobilized tens of thousands of people, who all put on yellow vests, occupied for weeks road junctions throughout the countryside, and demonstrated every Saturday in medium-sized and some large towns in the countryside and in Paris. This movement has evolved during the last several months and it continues today, even though every attempt to demonstrate on Saturdays is met with intense repression. Today, the yellow vests are participating in the demonstrations and actions organized by the trade unions, in mobilizations “for the climate” and above all in protests against judicial and police repression. Although these days the participants at the Saturday demonstrations are far less numerous and are almost absent at the crossroads protests, which were a distinguishing characteristic of the movement, they remain devoted to their symbol, the yellow vest, and many of them have come to understand that “they will not be able to achieve anything alone.”

The images of violent clashes between hundreds of yellow vests and heavily armed police and gendarmes, of looting of stores in wealthy Parisian neighborhoods, and of tens of thousands of demonstrators shouting “Macron resign!” may have given the impression of a “people’s insurrection”. There are even those who saw these events as the beginning of a “revolution” and uttered excited calls for people to put on the yellow vest, to put down their banners and flags and to integrate into this movement with the hope of creating a “direct citizens’ democracy.” The resulting disappointment is as great as their illusions.

This yellow vest movement, which has attracted a lot of sympathy in France and in other European countries, but it has also raised questions about its nature, objectives and prospects. It has upset the political forces and the trade unions, and it has “shaken up” the government. It has involved Macron, who crystalized in his person, functions and style much of the anger of the yellow vests.

The dazzling beginning of a movement never before seen

This movement started with the opposition to a new tax increase on fuel adopted by the state. It spread very rapidly by the social networks in the rural areas and the outskirts of the big cities. After lowering the speed limit on departmental roads, installing an armada of speed radars that automatically send heavy fines of hundreds of Euros, the new tax heavily penalizing diesel fuel¹ was the trigger for this movement. From the beginning, the movement benefited from strong media coverage, particularly from news groups and constantly spread through social networks, around a number of “figures” of this movement, especially single mothers with children, forced to drive for miles to go to work in low paying jobs, along with route drivers, who often are workers or small businesses owners.

From the first days of this movement, our party analyzed it to be able to understand it, and to establish guidelines for its work, considering the fact that this movement was developing among sectors and in areas in which the party and its mass work are not sufficiently developed, a valuable feature for the very great majority of political, trade union and social organizations of our country.

We characterized this movement as follows: the “yellow vest” movement is the starting point in the social struggle for new sectors of the popular masses in the rural and suburban areas. These are sectors of the petty bourgeoisie, workers who mainly work in small and very small enterprises, a few unionized workers, poor workers, artisans, professionals, small bosses, etc. All suffer the consequences of neoliberal policies, administered for years by right-wing and social democratic governments, that Macron has further aggravated and amplified.

This movement, due to its heterogeneity, the confusion of those involved, and the reactionaries’ work within it, is a people’s move-

¹ Most of the drivers of the popular social strata have cars equipped with diesel engines. This is the result of a government policy that, for a long time, widely encouraged such engines by setting a tax advantage for diesel fuel. This allowed French car monopolies to specialize in this type of engine, thereby guaranteeing their market shares, in the face of competition from higher-priced gasoline vehicles of superior quality, especially those produced by German monopolies.

ment. The working class had to take this into account, starting from the just popular demands that it fights for.

From there, our party laid out its line of action and guidelines oriented to the trade union members and organizations that it influences and for all of the fronts of struggle, as follows: “to work especially within the organized workers and trade union movement, so that it carries out the social and political demands around which the widest unity can be built and concretized, including the workers and popular sectors of the yellow vests, through struggles, strikes, demonstrations.... The breach that was opened by the yellow vest movement must be enlarged, and the balance of power must be reinforced through strikes and the paralysis of production.”²

Work so that the organized working class takes charge of the just demands that this movement has taken up

For this, it was necessary to fight and overcome the reluctance within the trade union movement itself, which was “shaken up” by this radical movement and its forms of struggle. We are not talking about the reformists at the head of the unions, whose main concern was to avoid losing their status as negotiator with the government and the employers. We are talking about the numerous trade unionists who have been fighting for years and who felt completely neglected, both by a movement that did not want them and by the propaganda particularly of the big media who announced the end of trade unionism.

This movement, given its heterogeneous social composition, the absence of a tradition of struggle and organization of the vast majority of men and women who wear this vest³, a symbol of distress, has mainly targeted Macron as chief of state. The movement never blamed the employers, much less the capitalist system. As the bosses themselves pointed out, “no demonstration has taken place in front of the headquarters of the employers.” During the first months

² This is an excerpt from the document of December 13, 2018, “On the political and social situation in France and on the yellow vest movement,” sent to the parties of the ICMLPO.

³ The wearing of a fluorescent yellow vest is mandatory for all drivers, when a breakdown happens on the road. This symbol of “distress” was adopted by the participants of the movement, a symbol of “unity” beyond its social identification.

of mobilization, what dominated the movement was the rejection of political parties and trade unions, described as “sold out”. This tendency, very present on social networks and among the activists wearing the yellow vest, was largely encouraged by the far right.

For some time, this rejection has been a major obstacle for the trade union movement. This rejection took violent forms at a few crossroads. This situation was also part of a general climate developed by “Macronism,” the employers, the media, etc., which discredited the trade union movement. This discredit was accompanied by counter-reforms that facilitated the exploitation of workers and other laborers and considerably reduced the unions’ means of struggle. We are referring to the El Khomri laws and the Macron ordinances⁴ against which a significant part of the workers and trade union movement fought for many months.

Due to the radical nature of the forms of action of the yellow vests, which every Saturday transformed cities into zones of very violent clashes, Macron was forced to retreat on the question of the rise of fuel taxes, which was at the basis of the protest, by postponing it. He also had to postpone tax increases that affected the vast majority of retirees.

These announcements were undeniable retreats, even if the amounts announced (11 billion euros) very often represented declines in tax revenues without affecting the profits of the monopolies⁵. Macron thought that this would be enough to stop the movement, but it didn’t happen. What is more, the worker and trade union movement had already remobilized on the issues of wages, the guaranteed minimum wage (SMIC) and pensions. It organized union demonstrations in which the yellow vests began to participate.

⁴ These two sets of laws eliminated the labor code, the same for all, to give the bosses of each company the means to “negotiate” agreements that violate the legal minimum (whether in regard to wages, hours of work, etc.) and that weaken combative unionism. The movement against the El Khomri law lasted for months, with unitary demonstrations of virtually all the trade union federations, which were very violently repressed.

⁵ The symbolic demand for the reintroduction of the tax on wealth (ISF), that Macron had withdrawn upon his election, was not met. It is a powerful characteristic of Macron’s policy, “at the service of the rich, the bosses and arms merchants.”

The big bosses saw a danger of “contagion.” They came to the support of Macron, announcing that “companies that could make a gesture should do it” in the form of a bonus of 1000 euros. In the wake, Macron announced a false increase in the SMIC. In reality, this increase is much lower than that demanded by the unions and the movement of the yellow vests, and, in addition, the “premium” was not of 1000 euros, except for the giant firm Total, which did not grant it to all employees, far from it. The civil servants in particular, whose salaries are mostly low, did not gain anything, except for members of the police forces.

Once these concessions were made, Macron and the government announced that it was no longer necessary for the people to demonstrate, and they considerably increased the crackdowns on the Saturday protests. The number of the seriously wounded reached the hundreds and the number of arrests the thousands. A new law was passed introducing important limitations on demonstrations, the police continued to use weapons of war, such as the grenade launcher known as the LBD, whose ban as well as prosecutions against the police has been demanded by many organizations, which never succeed, etc. However protesters, especially young people, are often heavily sentenced.

This criminalization of social protest has been extended well beyond the movement of the yellow vests, as we saw in Paris, on May 1, 2019, where the police attacked groups of yellow vests as well as trade union demonstrators themselves. This event had precisely allowed everyone to demonstrate on the same day and along the same route. The intelligence services are now mobilized for “the anticipation, analysis and monitoring of social movements.”

In one year, the yellow vests movement has evolved, and the social strata, i.e. the members of society it has brought out into the streets, have experienced a collective struggle, a sense of fraternity among the sectors left behind in society, the violence of the state exerted by its organs of repression. A part of society has a less hostile attitude toward the worker and trade union movement. The latter was “jostled” by the radical nature of this movement: as many trade unionists say, these events “broke down some taboos in our minds, such as respect for legality. They showed that the violence of demonstrators has legitimacy in the face of the increasing establishment of a police state.”

It is undeniable that these ideas influence a great number of trade unionists, who are now mobilizing on the different fronts of resistance that have developed in the fields of health care, education, or in the struggles to defend the pension system, etc.

The first lesson we learn as a Marxist Leninist party, the party of the working class, is that the objective bases of the revolution are constantly widening, and that the social strata that have been brought into action through the movement of the yellow vests are part of it. This reinforces the need to continue to raise the question of the necessity of the revolutionary rupture with the capitalist im-



perialist system, in times of great upheavals which will accelerate and broaden, which will proceed by leaps, because of the sharpening of all the contradictions of the capitalist imperialist system.

September 2019
www.pcof.net

Italy

Communist Platform – for the Communist Party of the Proletariat of Italy

The Communist International in the Years 1921-1924:

The Tactics of the “United Front” and the Slogan of the “Workers’ Government”

In this article we aim to illustrate the political action led by the Third International, chiefly under the influence of Lenin, in the years 1921-1924 with regard to the tactics of the “united front” and the slogan of the “workers’ government”.

A premise: In the international communist movement today there are two different but converging realities: in some European and non-European countries for many years there have already been communist parties formed as vanguard detachments of the working class on the basis of Marxism-Leninism; in other countries there are nuclei of communists and advanced workers who are struggling to form independent and revolutionary Parties of the working class, in some cases also through intermediate organizations preparatory to the founding of the Party. We are convinced that, owing to its historical and international importance, the experience of the Comintern in the above-mentioned years includes lessons that are fully valid today both for the Marxist-Leninist Parties already formed and for those which are in the process of formation.

After the great victory of the proletarian October Revolution in Russia in 1917 and the failure of the proletarian revolutionary movement in Germany in 1921, the leaders of the International, and Lenin first of all, realized that a slowing down of the revolutionary process was happened in the countries of Western Europe; that some errors of left extremism were being committed.

Therefore, it was necessary to correct them vigorously and to adopt a tactic which was summarized in this fundamental slogan:

“To win communist influence among the majority of the working class and lead into struggle the determinant part of this class”.

The theses “On Tactics” adopted by the Third Congress (1921) of the Communist International declared:

*”From the day of its foundation the Communist International has clearly and unambiguously stated that its task is not to establish small Communist sects aiming to influence the working masses purely **through agitation and propaganda, but to participate directly in the struggle of the working masses, establish Communist leadership of the struggle, and in the course of the struggle create large, revolutionary, mass Communist Parties.**”*

The same directive was strongly reaffirmed in the “ECCI Appeal to Proletariat of All Countries” (17 July 1921):

*“The Third World Congress of the Communist International calls on all Communist Parties and Communists working in the trade unions to make the maximum effort to liberate the broadest working masses from the influence of the social-democratic parties and the traitors in the trade-union bureaucracy. [...] We will defeat these traitors, these agents of the bourgeoisie, not by theoretical arguments about democracy and dictatorship, **but by taking up the questions of bread and wages, of clothing and housing for the workers. [...] Only by fighting for the basic, day-to-day needs of the working masses can we create a united proletarian front against the bourgeoisie.**”*

This tactic was defended and developed by the Communist International in the following months as well, and was confirmed at its IV Congress (1922), again with the presence and contribution of Lenin.

IV Congress: Resolution on Comintern Tactics

*“It is true today that, with the present precarious equilibrium of bourgeois society, **a most severe crisis** may quite suddenly break out as the result of a major strike, a colonial rising, a new war or even a parliamentary crisis. This is precisely why tremendous importance accrues to the ‘subjective’ factor, i.e., the level of consciousness, militancy, and organization in the working class and in its vanguard. **To win the majority of the American and European working class – this was and is the key task facing the Communist International.***

...*"There is consequently an obvious need for the united front tactic. The slogan of the Third Congress, 'To the masses', is now more relevant than ever.*

...*"Using the united front tactic means that the Communist vanguard is at the forefront of the day to day struggle of the broad masses for their most vital interests. [...] The united front tactic has nothing to do with the so-called 'electoral combinations' of leaders in pursuit of one or another parliamentary aim. The united front tactic is simply an initiative whereby the Communists propose to join with all workers belonging to other parties and groups and all unaligned workers in a common struggle to defend the immediate, basic interests of the working class against the bourgeoisie."*

What were, for the communists, the means and organizational instruments needed to implement these directives of the Third International?

"It is particularly important when using the united front tactic to achieve not just agitational but also organizational results. Every opportunity must be used to establish organizational footholds among the working masses themselves (factory committees, supervisory commissions made up of workers from all the different parties and unaligned workers, action committees, etc.). The main aim of the united front tactic is to unify the working masses through agitation and organization. The real success of the united front tactic depends on a movement 'from below', from the rank-and-file of the working masses."

The tactic of the proletarian united front had its high point in the slogan of a "workers' government" that was elaborated on and debated thoroughly at the IV Congress (1922) and V Congress (1924) of the Communist International.

V Congress: On the Workers' Government

"As a central political slogan, the workers' government is most important in countries where the position of bourgeois society is particularly unstable and where the balance of forces between the workers' parties and the bourgeoisie places the question of government on the order of the day as a practical problem requiring immediate solu-

tion. In these countries the workers’ government slogan follows inevitably from the entire united front tactic.”

...”The most elementary tasks of a workers’ government must be to arm the proletariat, *disarm the bourgeois counter-revolutionary organizations, bringing control over production, shift the main burden of taxation onto the propertied classes* and break the resistance of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.”

After having drawn a complex enumeration of cases about the various types of workers’ government, the Theses asserted with great clarity:

“Communists are also prepared to work alongside those workers who have not yet recognized the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Accordingly Communists are also ready, in certain conditions and with certain guarantees, to support a non-Communist workers’ government. However, the Communists will still openly declare to the masses that the workers’ government can be neither won nor maintained without a revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.”

But in Germany, under the influence of a right-wing trend (Brandler, Thalheimer) in the German Communist Party (KPD), the KPD in autumn of 1923 went – in the two regions of Saxony and Thuringia – into some regional government coalitions with the social democratic Party, without the arming of the proletariat and without the preparation of appropriate defensive measures against the foreseeable military reaction of the Reichswehr, which entered Saxony in order to liquidate that experiment. The communists then launched an appeal for a general strike, but the Social Democrats refused to give their consent, and the event ended with a defeat: hundreds of militants were arrested or hit by arrest warrants.

In its resolution on 19 January 1924 the Executive Committee of the Communist International expressed itself as follows:

“It is necessary for communists in all countries to get clearly into their minds what the united front tactics are, and what they are not; they are tactics of revolution, not evolution. Just as the workers’ (and peasants’) government cannot, for us, be a fixed democratic transitional stage, so united front tactics are not a democratic coalition, an alliance with social-democracy. They are only a method of

revolutionary agitation and mobilization. We reject all other interpretations as opportunist.”

Theses on Tactics adopted by the Fifth Comintern Congress (1924)

“At the fifth congress it has become unmistakably clear that in some countries, of the utmost importance for the workers’ movement, the representatives of the right-wing tendency tried to distort completely the tactics of the united front and of the workers’ and peasants’ government, interpreting them as meaning a narrow political alliance, an organic coalition of ‘all workers’ parties’, that is, a political alliance of communists with social-democracy.”

The Congress introduced a series of clarifications and specification, which in the following years proved to be of extreme importance for the revolutionary activity of the communists in Europe and other countries of the world

The united front tactics

“United front tactics are not a democratic coalition, an alliance with social-democracy. They are only a method of revolutionary agitation and mobilization for the duration of a determined period of time. We reject all other interpretations as opportunist.

*...”The tactics of the **united front from below** are necessary always and everywhere.*

*...”**Unity from below and at the same time negotiations with leaders.** This method must frequently be employed in countries where social-democracy is still a significant force; it is understood that the communist parties*



*maintain their complete and absolute independence. However, even in this case, **unity from below** should form the basis for the implementation of united front tactics.*

...”**United front only from above.** This method is categorically **rejected** by the Communist International.

*The tactics of the united front **from below** are the most important, that is, a united front under communist party leadership **covering communist, social-democratic, and non-party workers in factory, factory council, trade union, and extending to an entire industrial center or area or industry.**”*

The workers’ and peasants’ government

...“Opportunist elements in the Comintern tried to distort this slogan too by interpreting it as a ‘government within the bourgeois-democratic framework’ and as a political alliance with social-democracy. The Fifth world congress emphatically rejects this interpretation. For the Comintern the slogan of a workers’ and peasants’ government is the slogan of the proletarian dictatorship translated into popular language, into the language of revolution.

... The formula workers’ and peasants’ government, derived from the experience of the Russian revolution, was and can be nothing but a method of agitation and mobilization of the masses for the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of Soviet power”.

The tactics of proletarian united front, in its fundamental elements, is also valid today, in the 21st century, because also today the communists must rescue the proletarian class and the working masses from the counter-revolutionary political influence of social-democrats and social-liberals, and – in many countries – also of populists and reactionary nationalists.

For the success of this tactics there are two fundamental conditions.

- **The first condition is the existence, in every country, of a single, strong, disciplined and cohesive communist (Marxist-Leninist) Party, vanguard detachment of the working class.**

- **The second condition is the ability of the working class to win hegemony over large strata of the oppressed and exploited laboring people.**

Why must and can the working class exercise its hegemony with the policy of the united front? The working class, the industrial proletariat, is the most resolute antagonist of capital, because the

most general development of capital does not threaten the existence of the working class (as it does the petty-bourgeois social strata), but absolutely, worldwide, increases the number of workers and their economic and social role as the principal producers of the material wealth of society, so that the material interests of this class coincide with the fundamental tendency of development of the productive forces (including science and its technical applications to production).

The industrial proletariat – which does not own the means of production – is the class directly exploited by capital, which derives from the unpaid surplus labor of the workers the profit on which the whole bourgeois class in all its ramifications lives. Thus, the working class is the only social class that has an antagonistic relation with capital in the sphere of the productive process. For this reason it is the most combative class, the only fully revolutionary class in capitalist society.

The work in big capitalist industry daily educates the workers to activity carried out in common, to organization, discipline and the spirit of collectivism. All this enables the industrial proletariat to raise its class consciousness, to make the ideas of scientific socialism their own and to prepare itself for its revolutionary task: the violent overthrow – at the head of all the exploited and oppressed people – of the political domination of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship for the transition from capitalism to socialism and communism.

These are the fundamental reasons by which, in all the historical phases of the revolutionary process, the working class can exercise its hegemony over other strata of the oppressed and exploited laboring people, and – under the leadership of its Party, the Communist Party – can extend its hegemony and play a leading role also over a part of the working petty bourgeoisie.

Due to its condition as a class from which capital extracts all surplus value on which the entire capitalist economic-social formation is based, the proletariat is the most revolutionary class, the only class that, under the leadership of its independent and revolutionary political party, the Communist Party, and with the aid of its class alliances, has the ability and strength to demolish capitalism and build communist society.

“Only a definite class” – wrote Lenin in “A Great Beginning” (1919) – “namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people in the struggle to throw off the yoke of capital, in actually carrying it out, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system and in the entire struggle for the complete abolition of classes.”

July 2019

Mexico

Communist Party of Mexico (Marxist-Leninist)

The Influence of the Communist International in Mexico

The Foundation of the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist International

The Communist International (CI) was founded in Moscow, in March 1919 under the leadership of the Bolshevik Communist Party of the USSR, headed by Lenin and Stalin, two years after taking power in Russia. This was a result of the betrayal of the socialist cause by the Second International, which placed itself on the side of imperialism and its bourgeoisies, by legitimizing World War I, claiming that this was the defense of the bourgeois homeland. Eight months later in that same year, the Mexican Communist Party (PCM) was formally constituted.

In those years, the international class struggle and particularly the ideological struggle within the Second International, between social democracy (headed by the German Social Democratic Party) and the communists (represented by the Bolshevik Communist Party of Russia), synthesizing the positions between class conciliation and proletarian revolution. This led to the important task of developing an international proletarian organization that consistently defended Marxist theory and practice. Thus, organized communist parties assimilated this need, and, in November 1919 the PCM (Mexican section of the Communist International) was founded. Communist leaders of the International took part in that event and in the process of building the Party.

The intervention of the CI in Mexico contributed enormously to establishing the bases and clarifying theoretically and practically the doctrine of scientific socialism elaborated by Marx and Engels. It also showed how to learn from the valuable experience developed by the Bolsheviks led by Lenin and Stalin, who consistently applied Marxism and had recently seized power through the socialist revolution in October (today November) of 1917.

The PCM was founded after the holding of the Socialist National Congress in August-September 1919, one among other efforts that tried to bring together the majority of those who supported the

socialist cause. It is important to keep in mind that those who considered themselves socialist were not ideologically homogeneous, nor were they clear in applying Marxism. This was due to a strong influence of anarchism, as well as of liberalism as a bourgeois ideology recently given a boost by the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1910-1917 in Mexico and that, in 1919, was marking its culmination as a revolutionary process.

The formation of the Party did not go through a pure or linear process. It was influenced by the revolutionary, socialist-communist theory and practice of the CI, of the parties that had just been formed, headed by the Bolshevik Party, but it did not cleanse them of the influences that weighed down on the newly formed Communist Party. The PCM had a heterogeneous membership; formally they were communists because that was how the Party was defined. But among these members there was confusion: tendencies of petty-bourgeois or bourgeois socialism derived from the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1910. However, the Marxists or communists who were a minority in the PCM barely grasped the consistent Marxist theory and practice, which came in its most developed form through the CI.

As we saw, the fight against anarchism and opportunism had not developed in Mexico as it had at the time of the First and Second International (particularly in Europe), or as the Bolsheviks had experienced in the formation of their own Party. This process of discussion and struggle in Mexico would have to be undertaken within the PCM itself, with the elaboration of its political and programmatic line and with the struggle that later developed against anarchism and bourgeois positions within it.

Marxist literature and its influence came late compared to other countries in Europe and even Latin America. Later Mexico with the Communist International and the building of the Mexican Communist Party tried to take a firmer step forward with the theory and practice of Marxist socialism and communism, with the whole baggage that it would have to deal with throughout its existence until its extinction, going through several stages and processes. The socialist ideas in Mexico spread around the 1870s, through the leaders of the Paris Commune, of anarchists like Proudhon and Bakunin, or the utopians like Fourier.

The Communist Process in Mexico

The first textile industry was built in Puebla in the first third of the 18th century, and later more industries of the same type and others were developed, with technology from the United States and other countries. These were set up in various states of the country. In this process of growth of the working class, the first class struggles were taking place in the textile industry, influenced by one of the first political groups, the Student Socialist Club. This took place in 1865 and later in the Great Workers Circle of Mexico (1871). The Proletarian Circle “La Social” became a revolutionary expression of the proletariat, of the workers and plantation laborers, “influenced by Fourier and the Christian anarchists.”

The process of development of the working class, which was going from the artisanal workshop to capitalist industry, showed the limitations that this had when considering in its organization only the struggle “to overcome technological backwardness and for technical training along the path of class struggle.”

In 1878 the Mexican Socialist Party was formed, -whose objective was to “take by legal means the political power of the republic and establish the law of the people.” It was with this Party that the idea of communism spread mainly among the peasants, with its publications and even by participating in an uprising that was finally put down.

In 1884 the Mexican edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* of Marx and Engels was printed in the workers’ newspaper called “*The Socialist*,” which was an important effort in spreading it.

In 1904 the Socialist Workers Party was founded as an anarchist variant, since “classical” anarchists were against the idea of building any Party. In 1906 the Great Circle of Free Workers, formerly



called the Mutualist Savings Society, was organized with its press “The Social Revolution.” In 1906 the Mexican Liberal Party appeared, of essentially liberal origin, headed by the

Magon brothers, which adopted anarchism (later, they would make this a variant, strongly influenced by radical liberalism). In these times the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz carried out a systematic and bloody repression against strikes, organizations and their leaders; several of them carried out political activity in hiding, such as the historical strikes of Río Blanco and Cananea, which were brutally repressed. These sparks contributed to the bourgeois-democratic revolutionary uprising of 1910.

In Mexico under the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz, where the pace of capitalist development was marked, organizations continued to appear that would represent the struggle of the working class, such as the Mexican Typographic Confederation in 1911, which would become the Confederation of Graphic Arts. In that same year the Socialist Workers Party of the Mexican Republic appeared, or the Socialist Workers Party (POS) as it was also known.

It is noteworthy that, in the POS, there were members, even though they were not the main force, who already knew about the international workers movement and scientific socialism, since in their publication *"The Socialist"* there appeared Marx's slogan used in the International Workingmen's Association: "The emancipation of the workers must be the task of the workers themselves." Finally, the ideological expression that would predominate would be anarchism. From the POS two tendencies arose, which were combined in the House of the Worker, which was essentially anarchist: one would be known as the House of the World Worker (COM), linked to some currents that gave in to the bourgeois State, and the Light Group. The leaders of the COM played an opportunist role within the working class during the 1910 revolution, since they made up the "Red Battalions" subordinated to Venustiano Carranza (1914). This was one of the bourgeois expressions of the Mexican revolution, which fought the forces of peasant leaders Francisco Villa and Emiliano Zapata.

In 1916 there were already other local socialist parties, among them that of the Yucatan headed by Felipe Carrillo Puerto stood out. In 1917 another Socialist Workers Party appeared, headed by Luis N. Morones, a personality who would be linked to the new State that emerged from the Mexican revolution, which deepened the control or corporatization of the working class, at the service of the development of capitalism.

In general, the organizations of the working class that were built in Mexico always marched at the tail of the bourgeoisie that had just taken power. At the same time, this bourgeoisie had assimilated the world socialist process so well that it even used socialist language in its speeches to project itself as an advanced social class to entrap the proletarians. In Mexico, “socialist” was a term used interchangeably by different parties, even being used by the governments emanating from the bourgeois revolution saying they were identified with communism: Álvaro Obregón, Plutarco Elías Calles, Emilio Portes Gil or Lázaro Cárdenas. Even in 1924, the Border Socialist Party was founded with open sympathy for Calles. The Revolutionary National Party itself in its founding process came to propose that it be called the Mexican Socialist Party. Finally, it became the Party of the Mexican Revolution (now the Institutional Revolutionary Party).

In August of 1919, the Socialist National congress was held, attended by workers associations and organizations, such as the Mexican Workers Regional Confederation, and socialist parties, such as that of Michoacán and Mexico. From this Congress the Socialist National Party was derived, from which one of its splits was called the Communist Party of Mexico.

The Foundation of the Mexican Communist Party (PCM)

A few months before the founding of the PCM, there was already the Communist Party of Mexico (PCdM), which was dissolved in 1921, an organization that also called itself communist but was in conflict with the PCM. Both claimed to be the Party and it was the work of the communists of the International who were in Mexico that helped to develop a process to establish the existence of a single Communist Party. Starting from 1921 the International and the PCM managed to march forward with a single organizational movement. It was at its First Congress that the PCM decided to call itself as the Communist Party of Mexico (PCdM). This name was maintained during the 20 following years, then returning to the name PCM.

It was at the Second Congress of the CI that it resolved the conditions of admission to its ranks or to be a section of it. Among all the parties that thus committed themselves to respect these conditions and make them concrete, the PCdM took them up in its First Congress and thus became the Mexican section of the Comintern or

Third International. Since its foundation the building of the Communist Party was watched by the nascent Mexican bourgeoisie that was victorious in the 1910 revolution (Carranza and others later), by U.S. imperialism (E. Gale) that had the main capital investments in the country and by the anarchist petty-bourgeoisie, which also wanted to influence it. Another factor was the CI itself that sought to consolidate a strong Party for the seizure of power. Borodin and Katayama contributed to that, representing the interests of the proletariat of the International in the communist tasks in Mexico.

The relationship between the CI and the PCdEm was established by the cadres sent to the country, as well as by the direct relationship through the congresses held throughout its existence as well as in the direct communication with the Executive Committee of the CI. The political and programmatic line, as well as the tactics during the International's influence, was developing according to the conditions of the Party and the class struggle in the country, as well as the general and particular orientations for Mexico issued by the CI.

In the first elements of its Program, the PCdEm showed the anarchist influence that affected the Party, establishing an anti-electoral attitude; but already in the 1920s it drew up tactics of participation supporting the candidacies of Obregón and Calles. In the workers' movement, it could not defeat or influence the governmental reformism that affected the first organizations of the working class and peasant, the Regional Workers Peasants Confederation of Mexico (CROM) that would become the official trade union federation and on which the bourgeoisie would build the Mexican Labor Party, an organization of the labor aristocracy. However, the PCM developed an important influence and leadership among the railroad workers, miners and oil workers, from which the first general secretaries of the Party came.

The CI played an important role, since it helped the Mexican communists to study and deepen their understanding of dialectical and historical materialism, the history of Mexico and the world, a situation that did not exist and was reflected in the characterization of the Mexican revolution, which was initially presented as a *political riot*.

In 1922, the League of Agrarian Communities was organized, influencing the creation of the National Peasant League in 1926, which was the most important independent peasant federation be-

fore the 1930s. In 1923 it participated against the rebellion of Adolfo de la Huerta, in defense of the revolutionary regime.

The anarcho-syndicalist and bourgeois influence in the ranks of the Party was fought to the degree that the study of Marxism was broadened and deepened. Marxist literature grew due to the influence of the CI in our country. Communist publications were reproduced that gradually formed the basics of study and training of Party cadres and the masses through “*El Machete*,” the Central Organ of the Party, and other publications and direct talks.

In 1927-1928, the PCdEM supported the re-election of Obregón, with the aim that he could reverse the return of the counter-revolution expressed by Calles. Obregón’s assassination took place at the same time as the fall of the CROM. These were the years in which the labor unions were influenced by the Party and their party membership grew, the greatest years in the Party’s history.

The influence of the CI in the application of Marxism did not exempt the PCdEM from errors and misunderstandings in its concrete application. The PCdEM did not go through the discussion and rupture with the Second International, an experience that it did not undergo and only learned the results of that experience. From the First to the Fourth Congress of the International, there was a Mexican section consistent with its line; deviations of the PCdEM occurred from the Fifth to Seventh Congress of the CI, where the PCdEM was adopting another line that was moving away from Marxist-Leninist positions. It is a fallacy that these deviations were due to Stalin. On the contrary, after Lenin’s death, Stalin contributed to clarifying and orienting the Bolshevik Party of the USSR itself from within, as well as with its permanent influence in the CI, on the fight against Trotskyism and against Bukharin and Zinoviev, who were defeated on both fronts, in the USSR and in the CI.

In 1929 the Unitary Trade Union Federation of Mexico was founded, faced with the official federation, the CROM, and the anarchist General Federation of Workers (CGT).

Also in 1929, the PCdEM decided to participate in the elections with a communist candidate – a general – for the presidency of the republic, through the National Worker Peasant Bloc, while supporting the failed rebellion of Escobar against Calles-Portes Gil. This action unleashed repression, forcing the Party to act from underground.

In 1934, it organized the League against War and Fascism, against the offensive of the global financial oligarchy that had been established in several countries. At the same time, the first historical crisis of the Party, that would not be the only one, took place, although previously there had been problems of internal organization and unity.

When it was possible to head the Federation of the Workers of Mexico (CTM), it missed the opportunity to occupy the Secretariat of Organization and Propaganda, ceding it to Fidel Velázquez, who years later would become the longest-serving leader of pro-boss unionism, represented in the CTM.

At this time, the intervention of Earl Browder, Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, took place, whose influence made the Party veer towards opportunism. This was expressed in the policy of alliances with the forces of Cardenas, in the erroneous application of the tactics of the Popular Front. This took place from 1934 until 1939, when it made a mistaken characterization of the transition from the Maximato [the period from 1928 to 1934, when Calles, although not president, was the maximum leader – *translator's note*] to Cardenas, the rise of fascism, the Party of the Mexican Revolution (PRM) and Lázaro Cárdenas, who would lead the subsequent government. This politics led the Party to subordinate itself and lose its political and ideological independence from the bourgeoisie of the country, as it lost influence among the working masses. It also led to the degeneration of leading cadres and members who later would be at the service of the Party of the bourgeois.

The orientations of the Sixth and Seventh Congresses of the CI, which was characterized by the building of the Popular Front in the fight against leftism and opportunism, showed that it was a correct tactic that had positive results in several countries. In Mexico, not only was it poorly applied, but it subordinated the PCdM to the bourgeoisie headed by Cárdenas.

In the 1940s, particularly in its Eighth Extraordinary National Congress, expulsions of leaders were carried out where the differences did not vary greatly, as the new leadership essentially maintained the same opportunist policy and later deepened it. This continued until 1943, the year in which the Communist International was dissolved. This process led to the adoption of Browderism, which modified the organizational structure of the Party.

For the Party, the 1950s were the policy of “Peace and National Independence,” collaborating with the government. At that stage, the Marxist-Leninist line became more blurred that, once adopted, could also be observed in its electoral participation. And in this process of greater degeneration of the Party, the influence of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, held in 1956, was decisive.

After its Thirteenth Congress, in the 1960s, programmatic policies continued to be adopted that responded more to conciliation than to revolution: that the revolution had to be peaceful; thus the basic distortion of revolutions, whose nature is violent, was sown. They adopted slogans for a Democratic National Liberation Front and for a Democratic Revolution of National Liberation. It maintained a mass presence grouped in federations such as that of peasants and students, highlighting the participation of these latter. And in the debate between the CPSU and the Chinese Communist Party, they deepened their adherence to Khrushchev’s line, which they had already endorsed since the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

At the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, with the growing repression there appeared armed movements from which the PCM demarcated itself. At the same time, in the face of the pressure of the movement as a whole the regime established political reforms in which they stabilized the system faced with a scenario of revolutionary crisis; this was a strategy of class conciliation and repression. By 1975, the Party already took the path of abandoning the revolutionary struggle, to enter the “democratic” struggle. They defined acquiring the electoral registration of the Party; this period marks their adherence to Eurocommunism. It was in 1981 at its 20th Congress when its existence as a Mexican Communist Party was terminated, to become the Unified Socialist Party of Mexico, which in turn became the Mexican Socialist Party and finally the Party of the Democratic Revolution.

The Press of the Communist Party

“*El Machete*” was the central organ of the Communist Party and existed from 1924 to 1938. At the beginning it was led by prestigious plastic artists of the Party. It was read aloud in broad circles, in part because a large part of the population was illiterate. *El Machete* tried to stay as the Leninist press of the Party, a role that it largely fulfilled.

The Influence of the Third International in Mexico

The CI or Third International was the result of the process of struggle of the working class that began since the emergence of capitalism in the world, when Karl Marx and Friederich Engels, together with other proletarians from other countries, were given the task of organizing the First Workers' International or International Workmen's Association. Marx and Engels played a leading role in this organization, which functioned from 1864 to 1872, one year after the defeat of the first proletarian revolution, the Paris Commune.

While the First International emerged in London, United Kingdom, in that year, in Mexico, capitalism had barely appeared. It was transitioning from its independence from Spanish colonialism to liberalism or nascent capitalism. It was forming what we know today as Mexico, which formally took place in 1824, under the name of the United Mexican States (earlier, during the independence struggle it was called Mexican America or the Mexican Empire).

The Second or Socialist International developed from 1894 to 1914 (the year of the outbreak of the First imperialist World War). This was the second organizational effort of the working class. Now this was undertaken with the influence of the socialist theory elaborated mainly by Marx and Engels. Engels, without Marx's valuable

company, undertook the task of continuing the effort to develop proletarian internationalism and took the lead until the end of his days. Mexico in that period already had a not very powerful industrial development, mostly in the textile, oil and mining industry, but it was mainly dependent on foreign capital (from the U.S. and England) as well as a working class strongly repressed by the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz, without Marxist influence



and without its Communist Party.

The Comintern (1919-1043) arose precisely from the political, ideological and organizational rupture with the Second, Socialist International, which had betrayed the interests of the proletarians by voting for credits for the imperialist war, placing themselves on the side of the bourgeoisies of their countries, for their inconsistency and hypocritical stand on socialism.

The Communist International thus emerged with a Marxist definition, breaking with false, petty-bourgeois or bourgeois socialist positions. It arose with the perspective of defending socialism, that of the Soviet Union and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is why, with the strong effort of the CI, the communists in Mexico, on a clearer basis of theory and practice, undertook the task of fighting for the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, scientific socialism and communism. Unfortunately, they were not able to achieve this during that period, among other reasons due to the deviation and degeneration of the PCM for just over half of its existence, which led to its dissolution in 1981.

The experience of the development of the three internationals, of the discussion about capitalism, the struggle of the working class and socialism that took place with those efforts and in those countries, did not take place in Mexico at the same time and with the same intensity. This experience came later, as did the theory of scientific socialism, developed by Marx and Engels.

When the Communist International was founded in March of 1919, the bourgeois revolution in Mexico, which had begun in 1910, was coming to an end. The First World War had ended; the Russian socialist revolution had been victorious for two years and, in 1918, the revolution in Germany had been defeated. These were among the most outstanding international events.

By the year 1919, in Mexico capitalism was just beginning its development, as was seen with the revolution that had just concluded. In that sense, the development of socialist-communist ideas and practices in our country were scarce, because by then the working class was beginning to appear on the scene, concentrated in these first factories and largely moving from the craft workshops to the nascent enterprises. That is, the working class was beginning to develop as a class. On the other hand, the socialist and/or communist theory almost did not exist and what did exist was a confusing idea of this, partly because of the lack of literature on the matter and the

existence of anarchist theory that had arrived and imbued itself in the proletarian sectors in the process of formation.

The foundation and construction of the Comintern came to play an important role on the situation that confronted the working class in Mexico, both in its development as well as its class consciousness. It was with the CI that the Mexican communists could better elaborate their strategy and tactics in a consistent manner, leading the proletariat to its goals of emancipation.

The Need for a Marxist-Leninist Party in Mexico and the World

The efforts to build or rebuild the Communist Party were not achieved from within, but rather from outside and things were advancing. Several attempts were undertaken and are still being undertaken to achieve a Party of the working class. In this effort our Party has determined its great task, beginning by continuing to deepen its study of Marxism-Leninism, in the practical construction that we are carrying out in this direction and in the need to recognize the existence of efforts that other organizations are making. We are confident that on the basis of dialectical and historical materialism, of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and of consistent practice, we will achieve the objectives of liberation of the working class and of all the exploited and oppressed.

In that sense, our Party in Mexico is assimilating the experiences developed in these one hundred years of struggle of the communists and the proletarian masses. It is contributing to the historical objectives of the working class at the side of the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations (ICMLPO), in an effort to build the Marxist-Leninist International, which unites the proletarians of the world to realize the world communist revolution and the emancipation of humanity victoriously and definitively.

Today, in the context of the 100 years of the founding of the Communist International and the Communist Party of Mexico, as well as of the 102 years since the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, we communists, Marxist-Leninists, the consistent socialists and revolutionaries of Mexico have a responsibility towards history: to organize the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and to build scientific socialism and communism.

September 2019

Morocco

Democratic Road

Abdallah Elharif

The Democratic Road and the building of the Party of the working class and the working masses

A. The current context:

– At the national level:

Morocco is experiencing a very deep economic, political and social crisis.

The dependent, mafia and rentier capitalism in Morocco has reached such a level of decadence that it is impossible for it to respond to the most urgent needs of the people. Still worse, the social gains in education and health care are being dismantled at an accelerated pace, wages are frozen, unemployment is rising and young people only think of emigrating to Europe at the risk of their lives, the cost of living continues to rise and State debt is reaching the maximum limits.

The head of state has recognized this situation, pointing out the failure of the Moroccan model of development, but he does nothing concrete to correct the problem.

In addition the regime has sucked the blood from both the political forces and the so-called tools of social mediation, with the exception of the Marxist revolutionary forces and some Islamist forces and mass organizations, that it is naked in front of the people.

Given the increase in the popular struggles, the discrediting of the forces of intermediation and the inability to respond to popular demands, the use of repression is systematic and fierce: the arrest of more than 1000 activists of the Rif region, dozens in the city of Jerrada, harsh and unjust prison sentences, repression of peaceful protest movements, harassment (prohibition of using public spaces, of access to public media, neglect of local regions, deprivation of access to public service, etc) and threats against Democratic Road, the Moroccan Association of Human Rights and “Justice and Benevolence.”

MOROCCO – THE DEMOCRATIC ROAD AND BUILDING OF THE PARTY

The regime has the support of imperialism, especially French imperialism, and of the Gulf oil regimes in confronting the increase in dangers. In exchange, there is the deepening on all levels of the dependence of Morocco on imperialism and its financial institutions and the alignment with the positions of imperialism and the reactionary Gulf regimes and its participation in their wars against the Arab peoples, in particular, the inhumane war against the Yemeni and African peoples.

Since the Arab Spring, Morocco has undergone a revolutionary process characterized by phases of ebb and flow of the popular struggles.

In this context, the popular masses are developing a multi-faceted defensive struggle and are massively boycotting the electoral farce. It is the youth, especially from marginalized areas, who are organizing large-scale peaceful popular movements based on precise demands, especially social and economic ones. Some of these struggles are long-lasting (more than a year in the Rif and several months in Jerrada); others are more short-lived. But these struggles are not integrated into a general struggle for radical change because of the weaknesses and divisions of the militant political, trade union and associative organizations and their shallow roots within the working masses.

In fact, the true opposition forces, leftist and Islamist, have failed to structure and unify these innumerable struggles and make them converge into a political objective destined to break with the despotic and predatory dominant political system.

– At the regional level:

The revolutionary processes are blocked by the intervention of imperialism, of the reactionary Gulf regimes, Turkey and the obscurantist and Takfirist [Islamic extremist groups who denounce others who do not agree with them as apostate – *translator's note*] forces supported by them. The defeat of DAESH [Islamic State] and other obscurantist forces in Iraq and Syria has not yet resulted in political solutions to the armed conflicts.

The second wave of revolutionary processes that caught fire in Sudan and Algeria has drawn lessons from the first wave, continuing the struggle after the departure of the despots and demanding the dismantling of the existing regimes and for a genuine democracy. But, in Sudan, where the revolutionary process had a leadership

with a program of change, the Communist Party was not able to establish an alternative that radically breaks with the ruling regime. However, even so, it allowed a democratic opening and the neutralization of the Islamists. In Algeria, the process is continuing, but a positive result necessitates the formation of a broad popular front and the emergence of revolutionary forces capable of responding to the expectations of the Algerian people and sufficiently rooted in the working classes. In both cases, peaceful change has struck the power of the army and other repressive forces, which are the pillars of the ruling classes.

Despite the unfavorable context, the resistance of the Palestinian people continues and their just struggle is more and more attracting sympathy. This is evidenced by the development of the BDS [Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions] campaign and the recognition of the Palestinian State by European parliaments and governments, while the conspiracy to liquidate the Palestinian question has intensified since Trump's arrival in the White House and the explicit alliance of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates with the Zionist entity.

– At the international level:

The crisis of the capitalist mode of production is profound and long lasting. But the socialist alternative is also in crisis. This is the reason why people are vacillating between the illusions of a return of the “welfare state” raised by leftist anti-austerity forces (Syriza, Podemos, etc.) and xenophobia, racism and the isolationism of the extreme right. This is also the reason why, despite their obvious failure, neoliberal policies still have the advantage.

Trump's rise is part of this general movement in an extreme form: exacerbated warmongering, trade wars, denunciation of the nuclear agreement with Iran and the Paris Accord on the environment, aggressiveness against the progressive regimes in Latin America, protectionism, breach of international law and institutions (withdrawal from UNESCO, UNRWA, etc.).

Bourgeois democracy is in crisis in the countries of the center, where the traditional left and right are increasingly worn out and the real nature of these democracies, the dictatorships of multi-colonial societies is becoming clearer, especially with greater recourse to presidential regimes and states of emergency, under the pretext of

fighting terrorism more effectively, confronting the increase in protests, in social and popular fights.

The fraudulent evolution of a multi-polar world is increasing the room for maneuver of small states and national liberation forces. But the real solution to the current crisis lies in the struggle of the Marxists for an alternative that goes beyond capitalism.

B. The Democratic Road and the building of the Party of the working class and the working masses:

1. A brief history of the process of building the Party of the Working Class and the Laboring Masses:

The Fourth National Democratic Congress of Democratic Road was held on July 15/16/17, 2016 in Casablanca, under the slogan: “Build the Party of the working class and the working masses and the united front to get rid of the Makhzen¹ and build the national, democratic and popular state.”

This congress, which took place 21 years after the formation of the Democratic Road, which is considered the political and ideological continuity of the Moroccan Marxist-Leninist movement, in particular, of the Ilal Amam organization, is based on:

- The achievements of the struggle, the break of the Moroccan Marxist-Leninist movement and in particular of the Ilal Amam organization with reformism and revisionism, and the latter’s theoretical contributions on the fundamental contradictions (between the bloc of the ruling classes and imperialism, in particular French imperialism, on the one hand, and the working class and the popular classes, on the other); the designation of the Makhzen mafia that maintains power and controls a large part of the country’s wealth as the direct enemy and the main impediment to any democratic and social advance and the specificities of the formation of the Moroccan nation as an Amazigh-Arab and Muslim nation with strong regional specificities that require the establishment of great autonomous regions.

¹ Makhzen is an Arabic word that formerly designated the Moroccan State and today means its oligarchy or shadow government, derived from the Arabic word for warehouse. (Wikimedia). *Editor’s Note.*

- The 21 year lessons of struggle of the Democratic Road that led to define four processes of structuring of our action and our struggle:

- The process of formation of the independent political organization of the working class and the working masses through its rooting in the working class and the working masses and the unification of the Marxist organizations.

- The process of formation of independent organizations of the popular masses (unions, associations, neighborhood committees, popular movements, etc.), their unification and integration into the struggle for national liberation and democracy.

- The process of formation of a front of the popular classes.

- The process of participation in the building of a Marxist international.

The implementation of these processes in the concrete reality of our country allowed us to draw the following lessons:

- The unification of the Marxists, which we had considered as a precondition for the formation of the Party of the working class and the working masses, proved difficult (sectarianism, leftism, dogmatism, etc.), if not impossible (differences on the strategy for change, the policy of strategic and tactical alliances, etc.).

- The February 20 movement, which is part of the revolutionary processes that engulfed the Arab world in 2010-2011, did not achieve its objectives, in particular due to the absence of a Party that organizes the working class and the working masses, that represents their interests.

Also Democratic Road decided in this Congress to address, without delay and with all its strength and unwavering determination, to build the Party of the working class and the working masses that it considered as its central and urgent task, while continuing to reach out to Marxist militants.

- The February 20 movement forced us to revise and refine our strategy and tactics because it raised, in a concrete way, the question of power, alliances, slogans, organizational forms and the struggle.

Our third national congress, held in July 2012, echoed these concerns by adopting the slogan: “For a united front of the popular struggle against the Makhzen and for a democratic regime.”

The theses adopted by the 4th National Congress went further, defining them with greater precision:

MOROCCO – THE DEMOCRATIC ROAD AND BUILDING OF THE PARTY

- On the strategic level: the nature of the State allows for the increase of all the demands of our people, that is, the national, democratic and popular State as a phase that prepares the stepping stones for socialism, the objectives and the stages of revolutionary change (stage of national, democratic and popular change, stage of socialist change and the relations between them), the instruments of revolutionary change and fronts of the class. The program of radical democratic change in transition towards socialism has been reexamined, enriched and made precise.

Independent organizations of the popular masses are a strategic issue of paramount importance because, thanks to them, the masses learn to organize themselves, to defend their interests and manage their affairs. They constitute embryos of opposition-power. The party must defend them against the control by the existing power and related forces and help their unification and participation in the general struggle for change, but one must be attentive to their weaknesses, suggestions and criticisms and should not in any case, consider them as simple transmission belts.

- At the tactical level: tactical alliances allow one or another task to be carried out, isolating the fiercest enemy in a given period, and trying to bring together the broadest possible front for combat. It is clear that this front cannot be created only on a political and non-ideological basis and that it will be superseded as soon as the tasks for which it was formed have been carried out.

That is why Democratic Road fights tooth and nail for the for-



mation of a democratic front, of which its hard core and backbone must be the militant left, fighting in one movement, for a broader front, regrouping all the forces and personalities that suffer from the control of the Makhzen mafia over the power and wealth and prepared to fight to bring it down.

The question of the Marxist international was addressed in the theses proposed in the congress that validated the action currently developed and the defined approach, concentrating our efforts on the concrete answer to the question: “What is to be done?” in the current circumstances of the struggle and of the evolution of capitalism, drawing lessons from the different Marxist contributions and experiences of building socialism without turning it into a dogma.

The National Commission, meeting in July 2018, to evaluate our action two years after our congress, made the following observation:

The positive points taken note of are the following:

- The most important achievement is our ideological and political line based on Marxism as a method of analysis and revolutionary theory, our union and mass work in general, leading the working class and the working masses towards our positions and in defense of their interests .
- The maintenance and strengthening of the unity and cohesion of our Party and collective consciousness of the tasks it must perform to ensure its development.
- Occupation of a political place for elections as a Marxist political force of radical opposition to the regime. We, as the Party of the Left, together with the Islamist association “Justice and beneficence,” are the spearheads of the opposition to the regime.
- Consciousness within our Party of the crucial importance of the unitary spirit, particularly in struggles. We carried out a unitary offensive, both in the mass organizations, leading the trade union struggle and within the left and with “Justice and beneficence.”
- Increased awareness in our Party of the centrality and urgency of advancing in rooting ourselves within the working class and the working masses to promote the building of their Party.
- Establishment of organizational structures (labor sector, labor-union commission, labor cells – trade unions, etc.) in order to close the gap between our trade union and mass work in general and our political and organizational work to build the Party of the working class and working masses.

Despite these positive points, the concrete advances in rooting ourselves in the working class and working masses and the building of their Party are slow and insufficient.

Based on this observation, the National Council held on September 30, 2018 considered that the founding of this Party is an urgent task that does not admit of delays and adopted a plan and program of action in this direction.

2. Why the urgent need for a qualitative leap in the process of building the party of the Working Class and Working Masses?

- The capitalist mode of production has entered into a structural, profound and increasingly serious crisis. It cannot be overcome only through wars, the super-exploitation of the working class, the looting of natural resources and the destruction of the environment. This forces capitalism to abandon its democratic facade and reveal its true nature as dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. This will accentuate popular anger against capitalism and create favorable conditions for socialism, provided that the working class, as the antagonistic class to capitalism, builds its organizational tools, especially its Party, independent of the bourgeoisie.

- The revolutionary processes in the Arab world have shown the decisive role of the working class in the fall of Ben Ali and Mubarak. But the absence or weakness of the Party of the working class allowed the bourgeois forces to hijack the revolution. In addition, the working class around the world has experienced a rebirth and in some countries has made many attempts to build independent Parties of the Working Class.

The realization of the tasks of national liberation and their commitment to the path of socialism demand the building of the Party of the proletariat and its leading role in this process.

- Our country is experiencing a revolutionary process that can, at any time, lead to a general popular revolt; as long as the working class does not have its own organizational tools and especially its Party, this will serve the interests of other classes, particularly the bourgeoisie. Also any delay in the formation of this Party will have dramatic consequences for the Moroccan people.

- The class struggle, here and now, essentially takes the form of the struggles developed by the independent popular organizations (Hiraks of the Rif, Jerrada and elsewhere, coordinators of hired professors, medical students, etc.). These organizations need this Party

to unify their struggles and give them a political outcome. In the same way, this Party will play a positive role in overcoming the deep crisis of the trade union movement and will contribute to putting itself at the service of the working class and also in the building of the front of the popular classes and uniting a correct link between the tools of struggle of the working class (the union for the economic struggle and the Party and the front for the political struggle) and the various independent organizations of the working masses.

- The conditions are favorable to achieve a qualitative leap in the process of building the Party of the working class and the working masses, because the many popular struggles are playing an important role in the consciousness of the working masses, of who are their enemies and who are their friends and the importance of organization and unity.

- The working class does not have its Party and our efforts in this direction are insufficient.

3. How to achieve a qualitative leap in the process of building the Party of the Working Class and the Working Masses:

In principle, one must insist on the fact that the building of the Party is an uninterrupted process that will continue even after the victory of socialism. What is at stake now is to make a qualitative leap in this process for a radical change in our conception and practice in order to build this party and also to root ourselves in the working class and the working masses.

As was pointed out above, Democratic Road has many positive reasons to be optimistic, without breaking up or being self-satisfied in its ability to achieve this qualitative leap.

Our understanding as to how to achieve this qualitative leap is based on the following fundamentals:

- The need to revolutionize our members theoretically and practically, so that the task of building the Party becomes a daily task.

- The building of this Party will take place in the heat of the class struggle, on all fronts, ideological, political, organizational, in the media, etc. This forces us to redouble our efforts and strengthen the organization.

This building will be done under the fire of the enemy. Therefore, it is necessary to give crucial importance to the formation of cadres of a high ideological and political level and of great firmness in the storms of the class struggle.

MOROCCO – THE DEMOCRATIC ROAD AND BUILDING OF THE PARTY

- The preparation of a plan and program of action aimed at transferring the slogan of qualitative leap into the building of the Party of the Working Class and the Working Masses in concrete tasks defined in time, including all the dimensions of our ideological, political, organizational, militant, sectoral, training and propaganda work.

- The implementation of this program is subject to rigorous monitoring and periodic evaluation by the various organs of the Party. This is a voluntary work that demands the change of our methods and style of work and organization in order to adapt ourselves to the demands and setbacks of the workers.

- All the organs of the Party (national, regional, sector leadership, circle, cell, commission, etc.) must make this task a priority in their work. They must draw up their own plans and programs of action taking into account their specificities and being part of the plan and program of national action.

- Give particular importance to the work in the masses, and first of all, the union work, provided that it does so in a manner that links the daily struggle for demands and to defend the achievements and rights to the struggle for emancipation and the building of the Party of the Working Class and the Working Masses.

- Carry out an uninterrupted campaign within the working class and working masses in general to convince them of the urgency of building their Party.

- Try to convince the greatest number of Marxist militants of the urgency of creating this Party and of participating in the development of its ideological and political line that, for us, is a permanent task that is enriched by rooting ourselves, as an organized force, within the Working Class and Working Masses.

- This plan of action does not replace the political, ideological and general militant work of our Party.

- In this context, it is necessary to emphasize the importance of our action, aiming at forming the front of the popular classes as a strategic front of classes and the tactical political fronts (Democratic Front and Front of struggle in various fields) that must bring together the greatest possible force against the fiercest enemy at any given time. Similarly, the importance of building independent popular organizations that have experienced a notable development since the “Arab Spring”: a popular protest movement in the Rif region that lasted a year, from the devastated mining city of Jerrada, a mas-

sive boycott of three monopoly companies, of long-term struggles of hired professors and medical students, the struggle of the peasants to defend their collective lands, etc.

All this without forgetting the building of a Marxist international whose premises are promising, provided that they overcome sectarianism and dogmatism.

August 19, 2019

Peru

Peruvian Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)

For a Popular Political Solution to the Governmental Crisis in Peru!

On October 7, 1928, 91 years ago, José Carlos Mariategu La Chira, along with other combative leaders of the popular movement and honest intellectuals, founded our Peruvian Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist). They did so with the aim of providing political leadership to the struggles of the working people in our country, in particular to the struggle of the working class, to ensure their political development with class independence, to organize the socialist revolution and establish the Proletarian Dictatorship as a transition to communist society without classes.

From their different fronts of work, our members are celebrating the anniversary of our Party, involved in the political work, clarifying, organizing, mobilizing and leading the popular struggle. They are doing this within the context of disputes within the bourgeoisie that are taking place in our country, as part of the smoke screen that allows them to move forward with the implementation of neoliberal policies that undermine the rights of the workers and peoples.

These disputes have unleashed a governmental crisis, which has revealed the influence-peddling and compromises that the APRA and Fujimori political parties and other parties that are represented in the Congress of the Republic have maintained. They do this to continue the policy of looting of our natural wealth, shredding of the rights and interests of the working class, embezzlement of the fiscal coffers and the continuing impunity in cases of corruption.

The pressure from the streets and the exhaustion caused by the disputes between the powers of the State, Executive and Legislative, caused the President of the Republic, Martín Vizcarra, to call for a vote of confidence. This was not accepted by the Congress, and this made it possible for the Constitutional solution of dissolving the Congress, which should be followed calling for new elections of this branch of the state.

Background of the Governmental Crisis

The information was leaked through the investigations of corruption cases brought about by the Brazilian company Odebrecht, which has involved the entire ruling political class in the country. In addition there were large popular mobilizations rejecting the corruption and influence-peddling. This led the party forces involved in corruption to seek by all means to control the Judiciary, the Constitutional Court and the investigation commissions that were established by Congress. This was done in order to hide evidence and make it disappear, to obstruct investigations and block any attempt to bring to light information that links Odebrecht directly to past governments, both national and regional, as well as links to leaders of the main party political forces of reaction.

The investigation of the Odebrecht case shows us the thieving, exploitative, sell-out and miserable nature of the local bourgeoisie in our country. All the government officials received bribes in the exercise of their functions or as candidates so that once in office they would be able to hand over megaprojects. Once in operation, amendments to the contracts could be made in order to inflate costs and so pay more bribes to the government officials in office and their figureheads.

The popular pressure, with large demonstrations called by the organized people, and the overwhelming evidence showing how the various political parties of reaction embezzled from the government coffers and stole the future of many Peruvians, led to the following:

- Former President Alejandro Toledo, who was in office from 2001 to 2006, has been detained in the United States for having received bribes from Odebrecht; it said that about \$20 million dollars went into his pockets. Currently the process of extradition against him has begun.

- Former President Alan Garcia, who was in office in Peru from 2006 to 2011, killed himself with a gunshot to the head as police officers entered his home to conduct a preliminary search and arrest against him for having received kickbacks from Odebrecht through people close to his government and APRA.

- Former President Ollanta Humala, who was in office from 2011 to 2016, together with his wife Nadine Heredia, was held in detention while they were being investigated for having received bribes from Odebrecht while he was in office.

– Former President Pedro Pablo Kuczynski, who was in office from 2016 to 2018, had to resign after accusations that he had received bribes from Odebrecht through companies linked to him. Recordings were made public in which a deal was brought to light that, to avoid his having to resign, he would compensate Kenji Fujimori by freeing former dictator Alberto Fujimori (his father). The latter is serving a prison term for assassinations in the case of the killings of Barrios Altos and Cantuta and for human rights violations. This took place in the context in which the Peruvian people were subjected to two reactionary sides, on the one hand from the police and military forces and on the other from the paramilitary force of Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path).

To these cases must be added the trial of the former mayor of Lima, Susana Villaran, who was given a sentence of 18 months, as was given to the president of the People's Force party, Keiko Fujimori. She, through her parliamentary majority in Congress, was in charge of obstructing the investigation when her party was accused of having created a criminal organization to launder the money she received through Odebrecht for her campaign. Currently under investigation are: the mayor of Lima, Luis Castañeda Lossio; the candidate of the Popular Christian Party, Lourdes Flores Nano; among others.

From what has been pointed out previously, besides robbing the Peruvian people who suffered in the Fujimontesinist decade [referring to Alberto Fujimori and Vladimiro Montesinos, his head of the security agency and closest advisor – *translator's note*], we are faced with almost thirty years of neoliberal continuity to which we must put an end. The parasitic bourgeoisie in power must be overthrown by the working class in order to build a different future, where the working people can exercise their power, diversify production, orient the industrial development of the country, develop new relations of production and create proletarian democracy with its own organs of power.

The Governmental Crisis of Martín Vizcarra

Martín Vizcarra, who took office after the resignation of Pedro Pablo Kuczynski, with an overwhelming opposition, such as the Fujimorist parliamentary majority, sought to disguise his failures and political ineffectiveness with supposed confrontations with this majority. This was a smoke screen with mutual accusations of cor-

ruption, totalitarianism, violation of the Constitutional order and with a series of accusations that could delegitimize one or the other reactionary force. We point out that these were smoke screens because they always had a consensus for the application of a neoliberal economic policy. This was true of APRA and other reactionary parliamentary party groups. There was consensus in approving the extension of *Law No. 27360 for the Agrarian Promotion*, which took away the rights of agrarian workers who, in addition to bad working conditions, do not receive bonuses nor CTS [Compensation for Length of Services, or retirement compensation – *translator's note*], and only half of the vacation time of other workers. This is discriminatory and abusive. This law also subsidizes agro-exporting companies, which have long seen sustained growth and an immense accumulation resulting from the exploitation of the agricultural proletariat.

Moreover, there was consensus with the reactionary parties to promulgate the *National Competitiveness and Productivity Plan, with Supreme Decree No. 345-2018-EF*. This seeks to continue the policy of embezzlement, promoting the realization of infrastructure projects under Public Private Partnerships. These are the greatest expression of corruption and theft that may exists in the country. The well-known cases include: the building of roads and toll collection with concessions for more than 20 years, aimed to benefit the large construction companies and not to fill the infrastructure gap that exists in the interior of the country. Social benefits for the workers are eliminated, and procedures in cases of arbitrary dismissal are eliminated, thus promoting job insecurity. It also seeks to make the almost non-existent environmental regulations more flexible, making it possible to ignore the best studies of environmental impact, social authority and processes of environmental remediation. This benefits the large transnationals and their Peruvian figureheads.



There is also unity among the reactionary parties to impose mining and oil exploitation projects with fire and sword. This is being done without the social authority of the tradi-

tional owners of the land, the rural and native communities. They seek to make Peru a sinkhole, but the peasant and popular resistance is gaining renewed vitality to carry out the struggle for the defense of the rural and native communities, the national agricultural production, national and food sovereignty, the environment and water.

The APRA, Fujimorist, Peruvians For Change [spelled PPK in Spanish, the initials of Pedro Pablo Kuczinski – *translator's note*] parties, among others, are trying to cover up the extent of their corruption, taking positions in the state powers and the government and uniting to take away the rights of the working class and peoples. There can be no doubt that one of the factions of the parasitic bourgeoisie, represented by Martín Vizcarra, is trying to make the people believe that he is defending the popular will or “defending democracy.” Martín Vizcarra is another representative of the local bourgeoisie who is colluding with the other forces to benefit the employers and facilitating the exploitation of the working people and the looting of our natural resources.

We communists do not trust, we do not believe in the political maneuver of the President of the Republic. These are disputes that are giving respite to the exhaustion of the neoliberal model established by the Fujimori presidency and continue under the current government.

We want all the representatives of the parasitic bourgeoisie that governs our country to leave, we want the foundations of a popular democratic government to be laid and we are focusing our main efforts on this.

The Popular Solution to the Governmental Crisis: Constituent Assembly

We of the PCP (ml) salute the efforts that the working class, the peasantry and the popular movement are making to try to forge political unity by calling for a Constituent Assembly which will seek to restore all the rights taken away from the workers and peoples. It will call for the revision of all international treaties signed behind the backs of the working people and thus the formation of a new stage of the Republic in Peru will be based.

We call on the working class, the peasantry, youth, women and the peoples to take the path of political unity in order to participate compactly in the new scenario of class struggle in Peru.

It is time to fight harder against capitalist corruption, against neoliberal continuity, against the looting and plundering and for the winning of greater democratic freedoms and regaining of the rights that have been violated.

**For the political unity of the working class, the peasantry
and the peoples for the struggle of national and social liberation**

October 2019

Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the PCP (m-l)

Spain

Communist Party of Spain (M-L)

The Imperialist Crisis and our Tasks in the Trade Union Movement

The big imperialist powers have begun a trade war and are preparing themselves for an open confrontation at all levels. Changes are happening very fast, and the political arena is full of confusion. Under the capitalist system, it is one crisis after another, where a new one arrives before the effects of the old one ends. The deep contradictions that developed during recent decades have sprung forth and are now affecting all sectors.

When the majority of communist organizations abandoned Leninism and its revolutionary goals, they left the way open for the development of modern revisionism and its dissemination throughout the communist camp. The triumph of revisionist theories has resulted in the domination of the petty bourgeoisie in the people's camp.

The problem is that imperialism, as we have said, is advancing with giant strides towards a confrontation between the main hegemonic super-powers, which is shaking the political life in all of the states, provoking a true social catastrophe, the consequences of which we are only now beginning to feel. Under these circumstances, the communist camp is too weak right now to take on the leadership in the struggles, not only quantitatively, but also, particularly, ideologically, with the result that in the realm of ideas a state of confusion predominates.

After the victory of the revisionist theses in the majority of the old communist parties, the ideological degeneration has continued to grow. It followed that "post-Marxism" gave way to aberrant theories that deny the central character of the class struggle, emphasizing reforms without denouncing the imperialist system, and proposing half-way measures as central in the people's struggle for emancipation. The emergence of national populist tendencies (Podemos in Spain, Syriza in Greece, Bolivarianism in Latin America, etc.) has been the final conclusion of this long process of ideological and political degeneration.

The cult of "diversity," the temporary and vague concepts, the degradation of the organizational forms with the adoption of the cult

of leaders, the contempt for collective life and the substitution of the effective participation of the members in the political life of the organizations for the holding of "primaries," the virtual consultations, etc., are forms imposed by these bourgeois currents that have contributed to separating the proletariat from the organization.

It is now important to see how to confront this situation and what weapons the working class has at its disposal to face a combat for which it is currently ill prepared. One of the most relevant questions that we communists must face with determination in the immediate future is, therefore, the overcoming of the serious limitations within the organizational structures that could allow the proletariat to face the upheavals to come, by unifying their immediate and objective struggles, and by preparing themselves for a political confrontation at a higher stage.

Among these organizational structures, the priority rests on the unions, because they are presently the main instrument that the workers have to face the immediate struggles to improve their working conditions, or, at least, to avoid their deterioration, as this is already happening.

In Spain, the decomposition occasioned by revisionism is profoundly affecting the union movement, which, as in all other countries, is also affected by the changes in the imperialist production process itself. The more centralised the production process of goods and services is under the control of a handful of multinationals whose networks extend over the whole world and who monopolise the national economies, the more the relations between the diverse sectors of the production chain become unclear. This, together with the advances in the process of production and distribution due to the improvement of technology and the development of computing and robotization, contributes to the cheapening of the labor power and the intensification of the competition between workers.

All these and other factors have consequences such as the weakening of the big class unions, the loss of union members, although not significantly in all of the sectors. Increasingly, the unions are being firmly controlled by sectors of the labor aristocracy, which are dominant in the big enterprises and the public sector. Since these workers are less scattered, they can more easily benefit from the standards of union representation, which are the basis for agreements on union rights and resources signed with management and

the government: delegates, union representatives, etc., who support of the union organization.

Thus, it is the labor aristocracy that controls the union organization and which leads the union actions for their defense against the constant pressure by management and its political representatives, who step by step are limiting the rights of the whole class. This is also happening in the fastest growing sectors of the working class, where workers are defenseless before the bosses, such as those with precarious jobs or in service sectors not linked to production, youth, immigrants, etc.

There is a contradiction between the need to reinforce the organization of the working class, and the actual organizational structure. It is clearly concentrated in those sectors dominated by the labor aristocracy. The contradiction has been causing an ongoing struggle for several years, a struggle that is silent but growing within the unions of the big capitalist economies.

In addition, the crisis in the union movement is intimately linked to the crisis in the political movement in the popular camp, and both are equally deep and growingly clearer.

The union movement is essential for the development of class unity, above all in times such as now, when the imperialist oligarchy exerts pressure on workers to the point of threatening to cause a real social drama throughout the world, including in the most economically advanced countries. Our class has distanced itself from its primary organization and therefore imperialism has taken advantage of the unions' weakness to harden its adjustment policies. Thus, the most organized sectors, which because of their larger concentration could develop the union struggle most efficiently, and gradually gain a stronger institutional representation, have suffered too, in recent years, due to the strong attacks by the employers and the governments, which are gradually isolating them and separating them from the rest of the working class. The various labor reforms and counter reforms, the concentration of the economy in a handful of companies not only in production but also in the service industry, including public industry, have been weakening the workers' main organizational instrument in their daily struggle to sell their labor power in the most favorable way. This is a type of organization that has allowed the training of the proletariat in the most important tasks and has prepared the most conscious and militant sectors for the political struggle.

The statistics are undisputable. In Spain, since the beginning of the last economic crisis, the brutal job adjustment resulted in the layoff of over three million workers, many of them from big industrial and financial enterprises. There has been a wave of laws (none of which have been revoked by the present PSOE government) that reduced labor and social rights, cut wages and made the firing of employees easier. Nevertheless, in the last months there has been talk of a new period of employment recovery (although with more precarious jobs and much worse conditions, to the point that more than 20% of employed workers are poor).

However, this tendency has stopped. Throughout 2019, several Employment Regulation Measures (EREs) have been announced or are already being implemented, affecting the big enterprises, above all in the sectors of banking (in which, during the crisis, over 85,000 people lost their jobs), energy, industry and telecommunications. A long list of big enterprises, such as Santander Bank, Caixabank, Naturgy, Vodafone Spain, Airbus, Cemex, Endesa, Alcoa and Ford, have announced severe layoffs and adjustments, which in some cases could affect up to 40% of workers.

In fact, much of the union activity is only focused on the negotiation over these EREs in order to reduce their scope and improve the settlements for those laid off compared to the remaining workers, who since the beginning of the crisis in 2009, have suffered much worse conditions of layoff.

The offensive against the sectors in which workers have better possibilities to defend themselves in a company has been accompanied by (and also promoted) measures that cause a greater dispersion of the workers, including within the same big enterprise, by means of outsourcing, subcontracting of services and other ways that make it even more difficult for the workers to unite the struggles against management and that reinforce the corporative tendencies.

Therefore, the question is that as globalization has created a world market and generalized competition between workers; at the same time the means to unify and organize the struggles have weakened. With successive legislative reforms, the governments have been limiting not only the individual workers' rights but also the representation and juridical defense of the workers facing the bosses.

In the beginning, the imperialist globalization was extending the precariousness and weakening the concentrations of the workers in big enterprises. In a process parallel to the political degradation

in the revisionist camp (through the 1980s and 1990s), the answer of many union groups was to create unions with radical rhetoric but with corporate practices. None of the later attempts to unite these unions has been successful. The creation of Podemos led to the last attempt to set up an alternative union organization, “Somos CCOO” (“We are the Confederation of Workers’ Commissions”), which took advantage of the so-called “black cards” scandal of Caja Madrid. The scandal tarnished various political and union representatives who were part of the Administration Council in that financial institution, which had declared itself to be an alternative to the crisis in that union. It was short lived.

In Spain, the successive reforms implemented with a particular harshness by the social liberal governments of Felipe Gonzalez in the mid-1980s had generalized rotation of work, the precarious and low-wage jobs, especially for the youth, women, immigrants and those over 50 years old. We insist that this has contributed to the distancing of the union organization from these sectors, which are growing in number and in proportion within the organic composition of the working class.

After the triumph of revisionism, the ideology of the petty bourgeois became dominant within the popular camp. It is an ideology which does not question the imperialist mode of production but only its “protagonists,” as if they were not connected. They are seeking an impossible task: to reduce the clear and ever-growing capitalist contradictions without eliminating the system, to improve the situation of the working class with regard to the national oligarchies that rely on the state power to place the burden of the crisis on



other classes, and that fight among themselves to maintain their status against their competitors in the economic international arena.

This process has been developing gradually over decades. We insist, it was connected to the abandonment of revolutionary positions by the revisionist forces, which were often dominant in the structures of the union leadership. While the contradictions were developing, the tension within the big union organizations was growing. It was, most of the time, a hidden conflict, although sometimes it led to important consequences, such as the conflict between a critical sector and the majority of the leadership the Confederation of Workers' Commissions (CCOO) over the last 20 years. It is a conflict that from still persists despite the withdrawal of sectors of revisionist members of the labor aristocracy from participation in the battle against the reformist positions.

This confrontation, as the capitalist crisis develops, is continuously intensifying, even if it is not clearly expressed on the Convention floor. This is due, in part, to the lack or insufficiency of political leadership in the different currents of the class opposition within the unions, with positions that could facilitate their unification and coordination.

This confrontation is not limited to Spain. In other countries, this is beginning to cause a confrontation, with more or less clarity. This last May, there was a debate at the Congress of the French General Confederation of Workers (CGT). (It is worth recalling that this union had 2.4 million members in 1975 and now it has only a little more than 650,000). Its General Secretary, Phillippe Martinez pointed out: *The yellow vest movement, which groups together women, retired people, small business employees and precarious workers, is a reflection of the wilderness of our unions.*

Something similar is happening in Italy, where the current General Secretary of the General Confederation of Italian Workers (CGIL), Maurizio Landini, was elected at its congress this last January. Two years ago, he pointed out the following in an interview:

"...All the organizations representing society... are in crisis.... Nothing will be the same as before. Never before have we had so much precariousness in the workplace as today. There is so much inequality, so much social fragmentation and so much competition between people. And on the other hand..., there is no longer a clear point of view about labor, or an alternative vision of society. On the contrary, the dominant point of view is that of the market and financ-

es.... The union... should adopt a social model as a reference... the union should represent and unite everyone in the world of labor....

Often, this struggle is expressed in formal and organizational terms through issuing proposals aimed at strengthening the territorial structure at the federal or sectoral level, at preparing collective bargaining by sectors for the agreement with the company, and at developing more suitable means of grouping together sectors of the scattered proletariat. These proposals are often limited to rhetorical debates which become diluted, if they are not implemented in a coordinated manner due to the urgent needs of the organization.

Until now, in Spain, to deal with this increasing isolation in the unions in the weakest sectors, the union organization has only developed a fusion process, often without any other objective than to put its leadership under their control and that of the federations which have the most means that were agreed to with the employers and the government in office, such as the Banking and Services and the Hospitality and Trade Federations. This process has brought temporary improvements to the control of the various structures in the union in order to use them in a corporative way, but at the same time it has intensified the internal contradictions between the different groups and sectors in contention.

To present a synthesis of the situation, we can point out that the emergence and consolidation of revisionism depoliticized the people, dispersed the objectives and demoralized the proletariat. This has led to a deep crisis within the unions, with the following main characteristics:

Domination by the labor aristocracy in the union organization, which applies a defensive corporatism; renunciation of the political struggle in fields not strictly related to collective bargaining; abandonment of the sectors that are hardest hit by imperialist capitalism, that suffer the harshest job conditions and low salaries, that do not find ways within the union structure to defend their immediate interests and end up despising the union organization; the crisis of the actual union organization due to the fact that this dispersion weakens the effectiveness of the union action and strengthens the implementation of company policies; etc.

Many union cadres understand this situation and the fact that if the working class does not act urgently and firmly, it runs the risk of regressing to conditions that existed more than a century ago and

suffering an extremely difficult situation of economic, political and social crisis fostered by imperialism.

A growing number of union members and cadres are aware of the seriousness of the problem and of the urgent need of confronting it decisively. This does not necessarily mean that the solution is getting closer, to the degree that the organizational weakness of the communists is growingly becoming a determining factor.

We have to recognize that, within the communist camp, there exists a certain contempt for the tasks to be done under the pretext that the unions are institutionalized, that the dominating sectors exert a rigid and often narrow-minded, reactionary and brutal control over them. Such disparagement exists among many sectors of the workers (precisely those that have been the most harshly struck by the system), who consider union activism useless. Certain forces who call themselves communists adopt a radically opportunist attitude, they defend political positions that are openly revisionist and defeatist, they maintain an ultra-radical and anarchistic attitude and stir up the vaguest forms of organization and despise the “bourgeois” character of the big union leaderships.

This error also affects us directly. This why last year our party held a Conference on the Workers’ Movement which dealt with all of these points. One of our new priority objectives is to strengthen the permanent organizations that regroup the proletariat, and particularly urgently, to reinforce the unions. One cannot expect that better days will come. It is now that we must get involved in the development and consolidation of the union sections and in the ongoing political discussion within the class union movement, precisely because its reformist drift puts its very existence in danger.

In France, in mid-September, a big strike took place in the transportation sector against the reforms to the pension plan that the Macron government wants to impose. This is probably the beginning of a long-term campaign of struggles.

As this article is being written, it is not clear whether in Spain a social liberal government will be formed or whether early elections will be held in November. Whichever is the case, the government in office, and its leader, Pedro Sanchez of the Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party (PSOE) has made clear that it will change certain particularly harsh aspects of its policies, but also that it will not repeal the brutal labor reforms imposed by the Partido Popular (PP) (and even less the reforms approved by its own party). Furthermore, an institutional

propaganda campaign is increasing to promote a pension reform that goes beyond the cuts agreed to by the leadership of the Workers Commissions (CCOO) and the General Workers' Union (UGT) in 2011, and the reforms imposed by Rajoy during his government. The regressive cutbacks have been declared inevitable, including by some union officials (such as Carlos Bravo, a former employee of the biggest Spanish bank (Santander), a former leader of the bank employees' union, who is now a member of the Confederal Executive of the Workers Commissions (CCOO), a union federation that is strongly involved in the task of cutting pensions).

Within the political sphere, there is a great deal of confusion. The various forces of the bourgeoisie are taking positions in various national and international arenas and are defining their immediate future. The two main forces that have taken turns in the government until now have led the successive plans of the oligarchy that have deindustrialized the country and weakened its economic structure to the point of putting it in the last ranks of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. If they have to face a crisis such as the one that is coming, these political forces will get help from new forces of the right, which are increasingly orientated towards fascism to strengthen the regime that emerged during the transition from the Franco regime, in order to maintain its main elements intact.

The various revisionist and reformist forces continue in the most complete confusion. The programs they propose have a common characteristic: they do not question the imperialist system, the commitment to the monarchical state with the bloc to which it belongs, nor the regime itself, which emerged from a transition that has conditioned in a determining way the constant deterioration of the economic and political situation. This is the present situation, and nothing indicates that it will significantly change in the next months.

The crisis will continue to sharpen the contradictions to an extreme degree. As has been stated clearly over and over, the problems faced by the popular classes, and in particular the Spanish workers, are worsening. Sooner rather than later this will cause the radicalization of political life and struggle.

As communists, we must advance with determination and develop the popular unity. The most conscious elements of the working class are beginning to realize what is at stake, despite today's

feeling of weakness that plays a negative role, making it extremely difficult to make effective steps in that direction. We must carry on the task of setting up a united tactical alternative.

And we must do so with the ideological determination required by the situation. The experience of the last few years has taught us that if before a battle, we ignore the determining characteristics of the popular struggle and the need to break with the system, the only result will be defeat before the battle is waged. This is because the conditions that were constituted as the framework in the unity based on the “tide of the citizens” fostered precisely the division of the various popular sectors.

This is also true concerning the trade union front. The struggle to revive the unions as useful tools to develop the whole working class belongs to all of its sectors. Those who believe that they can save themselves from the imperialist offensive without counting on the rest of the working class is destined to failure.

The building of unity with clarity and strength, the strengthening of the unions as main instrument for the defense of our class, are the urgent tasks that we communists have before.

September 2019

Tunisia

Workers Party of Tunisia

Ali Jellouli

On the Question of Internationalism in the Circumstances of Our Time

1. Introduction: The working class is an international class and the communist movement is an international movement.

The international dimension was a fundamental dimension in the struggle of the Communists from the very beginning of the formation of socialist scientific thought in the mid-nineteenth century. This dimension was not an expression of a moral / humanitarian tendency, as was the utopian socialism, which highlighted the unity of the oppressed and the unity of their aspiration for a just human society.

Together with Marx and Engels and the Communist movement, it became a practical and militant task that was already being accomplished. The concept of the working class party, which was only subsequently crystallized, initially meant that the international framework that transcended the limits set by the bourgeoisie within the market framework as a national space, which has itself been overtaken for narrowing its own interests to link the market later to the whole world space as a space for the movement of capital, both in a competitive stage, especially in the monopolistic phase.

The concept of the working class was based on universality not as a horizon and aspiration, but also as a given reality. Capitalism has historically transcended the status of serfdom, which did not create a unified social and economic framework for serfs, small and poor peasants who had been scattered for centuries, But the capitalist industrial system has created an inclusive space for growing numbers of workers both within the same country, and within all emerging capitalist countries in Europe. Within this framework, Marx and Engels noted that the workers' class is a global class, or more precisely, the "European class" as capitalism began to become a dominant mode of production in Western Europe and then began to expand and stretched to Eastern Europe and to North America and later this will include the whole world, especially, gradually in the rest of the world, which has been linked to the new market sys-

tem. At the same time, capitalist centers are proletarian centers, and they are also centers of neo-class consciousness, which began to be organically linked to socialist and communist thought. So Marx and Engels opened their founding book, *The Communist Manifesto*, with the famous sentence “A Ghost Terrifies Old Europe, the Ghost of Communism” Which reflected and summarized the reality of the transformations that began to embody in the consciousness and practice of the new class that emerged on the surface of history, as a new player that will shape the direction of history through the social revolution that will turn upside down production relations and its pattern and achieve the historical project of the crushed and oppressed.

Capitalism produced the birth of its grave digger, the proletariat. This class is required to provide the necessary conditions necessary to dig the grave of its class enemy. The founders of scientific socialism realized that the two critical conditions were those of consciousness and organization. Awareness of the working class of itself and for itself, ie the awareness of the situation of exploitation and attention to its causes directly linked to the system of division of property and work in society, This awareness ends in creating the organizational and practical frameworks to resolve the contradiction between the labor force and the capital in favor of the hard-working people in a complex and long process of struggle to accumulate the conditions of the transition from the At this level, the issue of the creation of the framework / class frameworks that reflect these new ideas has been raised, so that labor parties have been formed here, but at the same time, an international framework has been established that consists of activities from different countries.

The “First International” was founded in 1864, which considered itself in its literature the Collective Party of Workers and the framework for organizing the struggle against emerging capitalism in Europe mainly. While the circumstances of repression (after the failure of the Paris Commune in 1871) and the extent of the difference between its components, ruled on this experience to dissolve in 1873, the Communists continued and created a new international framework, the Social Democratic Workers’ Party (Second International) led by Engels in 1889.

When this International went bankrupt by taking right-wing positions in favor of capitalism, the Communists thought of a new framework, which the Bolsheviks had struggled to achieve since

1912, when the International turned its previous position on the war at the Extraordinary Congress in Basel (Switzerland) to review the decisions of the Stuttgart Conference (1907), Calling for the use of war to carry out socialist labor revolutions and get rid of the bourgeoisie, to become the position of “defending the homeland and the nation”, that is, to engage in banditry in the same ditch of capital, which is enshrined in the positions of the bankrupt internationalist parties that led and were involved in the killing of workers by workers. Only the Bolshevik Party, which practiced and enshrined the position of the Stuttgart Congress, survived the shame of this deviation. Life and experience confirmed its integrity and revolution, which was the basis for the establishment of the Communist International in early 1919 after the victory of the revolution in Russia. The development of the situation in the world ended in the dissolution of the International in 1943. Since then, there have been global, continental and regional frameworks to coordinate the struggle to serve the cause of the revolution in the world. While the international framework has not been established, the work for it continues and rises here and there despite the stumbling blocks.

2. Why the International?

We do not bring anything new when talking about the motives and backgrounds of the creation of the International as a framework to unify attitudes and efforts for the cause of the working class and socialist revolution. It is true that the working class is part of their countries, from their own conditions and circumstances. However, this does not negate the fact that the workers as a class and as part of the army of hard-working and poor people, their situation is similar to the same extent in many cases, This similarity is due to the fact that the laws governing the development of society are the same, and that the laws governing the prevailing class system are the same. Capitalism has united the world as a space for market, investment and exploitation. It is a unified class in terms of the backgrounds and objectives it leads. It is everywhere governed by the law of profit and maximum profit, as Lenin said. Capitalism in its monopolistic era has transformed the world into a governed village with the same interests and goals. Giant companies and economic and financial institutions are global institutions that invest and exploit everywhere in the world through its branches spread in the globe as a market. These conditions, in addition to their unifica-

tion of workers through the similarity of their circumstances and their demands, also highlighted the importance of the class struggle waged by workers in any country against their landlord as a struggle that not only serves their own interests despite being the organizers, It is a struggle against capitalist status regardless of where that struggle is taking place. To achieve gains of any size, the concrete struggle between the workers of this country and other countries in the capitalist branches of production is confirmed by concrete experience. These struggles, in addition to spontaneously and automatically creating a state of solidarity and support, gradually create a state of awareness that the struggle of workers of one country will not succeed and win unless it is linked to the struggle of workers of another country in another branch. Therefore, the working class is a global class, universal and international, just like its exploitation, which is universal and global. Attention to this idea was made early and from the very beginning of the thinking and struggle of Marx and Engels.

While the aforementioned experiences were formed through the three internationals, and since the post-World War II frameworks for coordination and communication existed (the Cominform, the journal "Theory and Practice" ...), the post-Soviet conditions and



the final disintegration of the Eastern camp, new missions were presented to the Communists, in situations characterized by the imperialist uniqueness of the world and the establishment of a unipolar world order in which the social and political gains of workers, toilers and peoples have diminished, and the ideological assault on socialist ideology escalated with a terrible retreat of the revolutionary parties, the na-

tional liberation movement and the whole class and social struggle movement with the total collapse of the traditional parties associated with the capitals of the eastern camp in Moscow and Beijing.

But the euphoria of global capitalism with its alleged victory was transient and circumstantial, and the class struggles soon returned to their place in the center countries and in the dependent countries. The idea of a “new world order” and “the end of ideology,” which means “the end of socialism,” was also not believed.... Not surprisingly, the intractable contradictions that divide the world capitalist system have remained intact, rather, it is aggravated by the reversal of the gains accumulated by the labor movement and socialism here and there, and the contradictions of capitalism at the local and international levels are worsening, the contradiction of capital to the labor force is on the rise due to the growing greed of capital and the systematic impoverishment of the labor force as an inevitable and mechanistic outcome. The contradiction between the world monopoly capitalist system and the oppressed classes, peoples and nations is steadily exacerbated by the same characteristics and characteristics of capital mentioned above. Moreover, the struggle between capital centers of states and institutions is on the rise for dominance and control. In fact, the conflict today has reached great levels between the major countries and the monopolistic groups to seize the capabilities and wealth of peoples. The harbinger of war and military clashes is worsening in more than one part of the world, The world is now living in the arms race and demonstrating power at the expense of the entitlements of the peoples and the poor classes that target their rights to accumulate wealth, double the budgets of wars and the hegemony tendencies.

This characterization is neither subjective nor voluntary nor selective. It is an objective description that resonates even with some bourgeois experts, journalists and researchers. In our own language as communists, capitalism brought humanity only barbarism, destruction, hunger and tragedy. Therefore, overcoming this era is a just and historic project, not only by desire, but by the depth of contradictions that plague the capitalist system, which will end sooner or later by the disintegration of this system. This is what we want and want the workers of the world and its peoples and oppressed nations, to be in favor of a new era , the real human era in which human society enters history, as Marx said, Actual history begins with the beginning of the extinction of man’s exploitation of man,

with socialism, communism, when completely erasing exploitation and alienation, becomes part of the memory of man and his deep past placed in the Museum of History.

Defining our mission is a small part of our project. The left-handed issue is the mechanisms and means by which the objectives can be achieved. Awareness is only the first step, and the next step is how to achieve this awareness, which raises the issue of the organization that must be dealt with in its two dimensions, local dimension related to the struggle issues of a country, and an international dimension related to how to find and develop mechanisms and frameworks to coordinate and deepen the struggle to serve at the same time local, national and international dimensions. Our conviction is in this organic linkage between the two dimensions, therefore, it is not correct, in our opinion to isolate the two dimensions from one another. The arguments confirming this conviction are what we have already said about the characteristics of the historical stage we are living in, in addition to what has been confirmed by various revolutionary experiences since Marx and Engels to this day. This is about the urgent need for any organization, movement, party and any struggle anywhere in the world for solidarity, synergies, lifting the siege, organizing joint campaigns and sharing experience. This is something that we live every day in the various moments of our struggle. In all our countries, we always proceed from diagnosing situations and identifying their characteristics, so that we can determine the general and special missions of the struggle. Diagnosing the situation is meaningless without linking the local situation to the regional and international situation. The local situation in many aspects is a reflection and correlation with the international situation. These international conditions concern the situation of the capital, States and institutions, and the situation of the labor force, classes and struggles. The diagnosis and identification of features in their movement and change is not absurd, but is a fundamental process in our understanding and awareness and from our practice, and we diagnose the situation we pay attention to all manifestations, indicators and elements, whether useful or harmful to our movement and our local struggle, and here exactly we understand the organic bonding between internal and external factors. Through the experience of the First International, Marx argued that the framework of the struggle must be internationalized through the movements that were active in Europe in particular. And Engels consid-

ered that the emergence of Marxist organizations had created a more favorable circumstance for a global organization dedicated to unity, and since the bankruptcy of the Second International in 1912, the Bolsheviks turned to think and work for the creation of the Communist International. In exile, Lenin worked for this goal, especially after the war began in 1914. His conviction was profound in the importance of creating an international framework, first to confront the war and exploit its conditions and consequences to ignite socialist labor revolutions, second, to support the revolutionary positions and important struggles of the Russians and the Bolsheviks. One of the first tasks put forward for implementation after the victory of the revolution was the resurrection of the Third International as a necessary framework for the Communist Movement, its victorious party and its fledgling State. Today we are deeply convinced that the workers, communists and revolutionaries of the world have no choice but to resurrect the International, in our time and in front of our movement, and also benefit from past experiences in their creations and abilities, and also in the basis of setbacks

and pitfalls to learn how to create conditions of success, progress and victory.

3. Past experiences are the product of their contexts.

What should be recalled is that past international experiences are a product of their circumstances, facts, challenges and stakes associated with their objective and historical context. It is true that the overall objective of all experiments is the same: to create the conditions for the victory of the revolution and socialism. However, all previous experiments ended in failure and decay under the special circumstances of those experiments, and To talk about failure, this does not mean at all the neglect of the achievements of these experiences of the tasks and activities that contributed in general to the development of the international trend in the socialist movement.

The return to the experience of the First International, which lasted from 1864 to 1873, confirms that it is an experience of its era and the product of its circumstances. When Marx and Engels thought and embarked on the revival of the international framework, scientific socialism was only a limited stream of workers' socialist currents in the mid-19th century, and the rising labor movement, especially in the advanced capitalist centers, France and

Britain, was under the influence of anarchist and reformist currents. Therefore, it was necessary to create a common framework aimed at strengthening and coordinating the class struggle between the different countries, and also as a basis for sorting out the socialist movement by organizing the conflict with these different currents and exposing them to the working class to rid them of their influence. This was largely achieved through the hard work of the intellectual, theoretical, political and practical work led by Marx and Engels against the various non-Marxist currents that were organized within the International. These currents stretched from the Lassalists (followers of Ferdinand Lassalle) to the supporters of Proudhon, the followers of the English socialist Robert Owen and the followers of the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin, to the followers of the French socialist Auguste Blanqui. Of course, in addition to the supporters of Marx and Engels. The period of nine years was the age of this experience, a period of fierce struggle with the various tendencies with which there was sometimes agreement and joint action to accomplish this task or that which is of interest to the struggle against capitalism and work for the new society. Disagreement with them often dominated, both in the struggle movement, where anarchism with its currents, for example, was dominant in France; whereas Lassalism and reformism were influential in Britain. There was a political, intellectual and theoretical struggle to formulate the concepts and ideas that drew the boundaries of the discrepancy between scientific socialism and utopian and anarchist socialism. The works of Marx and Engels for that period were interpretations of the



tasks of criticism and undermining, on the one hand, and of founding and building, on the other. From this point of view, the First International succeeded in fulfilling its mission, which was impossible to continue after 1873 when there were objective and subjective reasons for deciding to dissolve it. The failure of the Paris

Commune in mid-1871 and the escalation of bloody repression in France and most of the European countries to confront the labor movement, which dared to work to undermine the capitalist system, as well as the lessons of the Commune, which imposed a review of how to create the conditions for victory of the revolution, the most important of these is the unity of the workers and socialists who lead the revolution. In addition to what has become a conviction that it became impossible to continue being organized with the anarchist and reformist teams that began to damage the labor movement, especially in areas of their influence. Also, The steady rise of the trend of scientific socialism in all countries gave this stream self-confidence and depth of orientation to work as an independent current from the rest. That's why the decision to dissolve the International was defended and consecrated by Marx and Engels in 1873. Thus, The internationalist struggle that was essential to Marx and Engels' life did not stop. However, the emphasis was placed on further crystallization of scientific socialism cognitively, philosophically and economically, as well as the association and action at the heart of the movement, especially the creation of its socialist parties, which would later form the nucleus on which the theme of the resurrection of the International was examined, after Marx's death and under the leadership of Engels. This was in 1889 by parties adopting scientific socialism and Marxist thought (ie, adopting the Communist Manifesto) and mainly the German Social Democratic Party, which was the locomotive of this work. The birth of the "Social Democratic Party" or the Second International in Brussels was announced in the presence of European parties. Also, for the first time, the presence of parties from outside the old continent, from Argentina, Uruguay and Turkey. The present parties agreed with their Marxist ideological reference and again put forward the task of pushing all the conditions for the proletarian and socialist revolutions. But this experience began to deviate from the famous revolutionary position taken at the Stuttgart Conference (1907) which called for exploiting the conditions of war, all of which were brewing in the bowels of the capitalist system, using this to ignite labor revolutions and seize power to rid European societies and the world of the specter of war and exploitation. This was at the extraordinary conference in Basel in 1912, when the vow of war turned into a real possibility. The Conference adopted a resolution reviewing the previous resolution in order to urge the socialist parties to engage in the

“battle for the defense of the country and the nation” by virtually turning into “chauvinist nationalist parties” in the service of the bourgeoisie. This was practiced by the outbreak of war in 1914, which ruled on the whole experience of total dissolution in 1916. This was clearly influenced by the German party led by Kautsky and Bernstein, but also by resistance from the Bolshevik Party and the Communist wing of Germany (Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg).

The failure of the Second International and the entry of the world into a new phase is the era of imperialism, which is on the eve of the socialist revolution as Lenin had observed, opened up to a new revolutionary situation created by the conditions of world war and the intensification of the contradictions of the capitalist system. The new situation has put on the table of priorities two overlapping and complex tasks, the creation of new parties that are revolutionary, and engage in the historic moment of opportunity for the revolutions. So since the outbreak of the war, especially since 1915, Lenin put forward the idea of a new International, the Communist International. However, the great difficulties experienced by the Bolshevik Party and the whole labor and socialist movement in Europe under the aforementioned conditions made the task difficult to achieve before the outbreak and victory of the glorious October Revolution, which was a creative and revolutionary consecration of the decision of the Stuttgart Conference, which Lenin drafted under the slogan of turning the global banditry into a civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which ended in victory for the Bolsheviks. Less than a year and a half later, the first Congress of the Communist International was held in Moscow (March 1919).

The Third International was more mature and more effective because it was formed, moved and struggled as the socialist dream became a material reality. This gave the experiment a boost that lasted for nearly a quarter of a century (from 1919 to 1943). It was also the product of its era and in response to the conditions and challenges posed to the communist movement at the beginning of the twentieth century. Returning to its decisions and debates, the International was one of the most important spaces at the core of which the most important Marxist-Leninist approaches and responses to the various issues posed by the development of class struggle at the global level were crystallized. These approaches also included the issues of socialist construction launched in the Soviet Union.

The decisions of the Third International are an important reference for the Communist movement of the twentieth century. Many positions still maintain their current status, and the Comintern under Lenin and Stalin was able to bring together the Communist parties from most of Europe and the capitalist world, as well as a number of colonial countries from East to South America, through the Arab world and Africa.

Special circumstances governed the Soviet Union and the course and conditions of the Second World War and imposed on the Soviet leadership to declare the dissolution of the International in 1943, depriving the communist movement of a comprehensive framework for joint coordination and communication and thinking and practice. The background of the Soviet Communist Party was to “signal goodwill to the Allies”. The solution of the International was to avoid the “suspicion” that the Soviet Union “penetrated its allies in war” through the Communist parties. Our intention is not only to condemn the resolution of the dissolution of the International, but also to highlight the perilous circumstances of the resolution, which, in our view, are due to the transformation of the International into a space governed by the “Great Party” and the “sponsoring state”. It is true that the state and the party in the Soviet Union provided all working conditions and progress for the International, but also at the same time deliberately or unintentionally turned the International into a tool to support and justify Soviet policy in various internal and external facets, until the resolution of the solution, which invoked the circumstances of concern to the Soviet Union in the first place. It is true that the victory of the Soviet Union in the war was a vital issue of concern to the entire communist movement in the world and to the development of class struggle, but turning the whole movement into tributaries to serve the supreme Soviet goal, more analysis, interpretation and evaluation are needed if they are indeed in the interest of the global working class issue first. Even after the end of the war and the victory of the socialist homeland, the International was no longer by the will of the Communist parties but by a decision of the Soviet Center, which created the “Office of Relations” (the Cominform), which generally remained a framework for regulating bilateral relations between the Soviet Party and the rest of the world parties. It even turned into an office to guarantee and protect Soviet interests abroad, and at one point it was even suspected of being linked to the interests of the KGB. Un-

der Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev, the office was transformed into a client space with the Soviet party (acceptance of student missions...). The overwhelming majority of the parties have already become mere followers of the Soviet revisionist party, and The Communist parties that adopted and supported Enver Hoxha's positions against Soviet and Chinese revisionism were not able to create the effective frameworks to reconstruct the communist movement, Despite the important role played by the writings of the leader Enver Hoxha and the magazine "Theory and Practice" of helping to establish new parties that emerged, especially in the seventies and eighties in Europe, South America and Africa.

The new communist parties put forward the idea of reestablishing the International, and in the meantime, it established the frameworks of communication and coordination, which they succeeded in 1994, when the "Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations" was launched as the nucleus of a new International project. And despite the achievements made over a quarter of a century of work, numerous and complex obstacles continue to characterize the work of the Conference, perhaps the most important of these concern the effectiveness of parties and organizations and their impact on the class struggle in their countries and in the world, and at the same time, especially in recent years, coinciding with the deep crisis of global capitalism and the emergence of features of recovery of the labor and social movement against the imperialist policies, new initiatives, ideas and projects have emerged that present the task of creating a global framework for the struggle. There have also emerged continental and global blocs and groups moving towards the same goal. So how should we deal with these initiatives? How can we build and defend our independent project?

4. How to put forward the subject of internationalism today?

No one of us disagrees about the importance and necessity of the International framework either as a background to our struggle or as a goal. Internationalism is an urgent need for which the struggle of the communists and revolutionaries would not be won without it, especially in the circumstances of our time when capitalism was at the peak of its progress (including technological and technical) and It has exhausted all its possibilities, and today knows the height of its crisis, which seriously raises the need to overcome it, given its historical limitations. The unity of the communists is a

prerequisite for the task, and this unity is not only in one country but also essentially in the whole world. The unity of the intellectual background and the political objective impose a logical and objective unity of action, that is why all the “leftist” blocs in more than one part of the world present this task. We are fighting for the establishment of the Communist International and its nucleus, the Conference of parties and organizations, and Chavez has called for the creation of the Fifth International, the same idea that has been worked on in recent years by the Egyptian socialist thinker Samir Amin. The idea is spreading here and there, and revisionist conglomerates, including Maoism, are also developing their coordination under the same name and purpose.

In this regard, the issue must be dealt with in two relatively different dimensions. The first dimension concerns internationalism as a framework. It invokes a number of high conditions, ie those that concern the intellectual, ideological, political and organizational line of the parties. They concern the unity of the vision of the International, including the evaluation of past experiences and the evaluation of the experience of socialist construction and the conclusions and lessons that are important to the tasks of today and tomorrow in various facets of class struggle. This matter concerns a specific faction, the parties with the same reference, the Communist reference, which makes no sense without agreement and unity on the various issues and the implementation of the tasks before us today, tactical and strategic issues, intellectual issues as well as political and practical. This does not mean total harmony and the absence of any difference in the appreciation of one side or the other, we develop through the difference and struggle that exists between us. But this high and respected level of unity is necessary to promote the conditions of the internationalist resurrection, which pushes all objective situations towards its resurgence, but the self-barriers prevent and disrupt its establishment, which is an issue we have to think about and progress in practice. We believe that the basic guarantee for the launch of this project is to strengthen our parties and remove them from the situation of weakness and sometimes marginality. It is not a requirement that we have dozens of parties, rather, the condition is that they should be efficient and active parties, linked to the issues of their countries and the movement of struggle. This not only gives credibility to our project, but also gives the ingredients for starting and continuing.

Engaging on this front does not mean closing and not dealing with projects and other frameworks presented here and there. We believe that the conditions of the communist movement today are similar to those of the mid-nineteenth century (i.e., the period of the First International) in terms of its weakness. These conditions (along with other factors) forced Marx and Engels to work with various other currents despite awareness of the limits of that work. The aim was to strengthen the movement and progress of the working class in different countries. The point is not to reproduce or copy Marx's experience. On the contrary, what is meant is awareness that the resurrection of the International has always been tied to its historical context. History is not repeated and is not the same. What are similar are some factors and it is important to take advantage of that. Our subjective circumstances are still immature for the resurrection of the International, which seriously raises the need to tend to accumulate conditions. In this regard, it is important to link with other actors, and we mean the struggling ones that are actually linked to the working class and the issues of their societies and countries in order to develop the class struggle. This presents us with an essential and vital facet in our international struggle today: the issue of the world front, the front of workers, peasants and toilers, the front of revolutionary forces in their countries struggling for social emancipation and national liberation. We are concerned and demanded to be present and take the lead in this facade which is now imposed by the crisis of global capitalism and the rise of the class, social and national struggle in many countries of the world. The unconscious and unorganized class and national struggle is sometimes directed towards populist, reformist or anarchist movements, while the original is to turn to the communist movement, this movement is today either absent or weak, and in rare cases influential and leading. History today presents us with the dual task of building the internationalism through its core (Conference of parties and organizations) by deepening the intellectual and political debate, as well as the pragmatic and militant spirit of progress and growth, and the task of building the world front for workers and revolutionary forces. It is a front of struggle, coordination, communication and exchange of experiences, as well as a space for intellectual and political struggle in the horizon of influence and bringing as many forces as possible to Marxism-Leninism and its thought, policy and struggle.

Both tasks are complementary and require common awareness and implementation, and addressing reformist or anarchic tendencies, as well as addressing serious revisions of socialist ideology, as evidenced by many currents such as the “socialist thesis of the 21st century” by the late Chavez, the ruling party in Venezuela, some movements in South America and the world, and “postmodernist currents” who want to review The cognitive, economic and militant pillars of Marxism, including the denial of the existence of the working class itself or the refusal of its party organization to defend itself. Addressing these currents requires direct confrontation, as Marx and Engels did with Proudhon, Bakunin, Blanqui, Lassalle and Owen. Our victory today for Marxism-Leninism requires the ability to confront and thus erode the merit of the reformist, anarchist and authoritarian forces. Confrontation and lethality are in the battlefields, and the battlefields of today require the presence alongside all the struggling forces that oppose capitalism, fascism and outside interference and win over the workers, the crushed classes, the oppressed peoples and nations. These struggling forces, with whom we disagree in terms of reference and theses, can meet with them in this task or that or this goal or that, and in all cases, the “natural space”, the closest we move through alliances, fronts and meetings, is the struggling space. In our relations with the various forces, we do not judge what is ideological, but rather what is political, that is, the position on this or that issue. The conditions of our time are complex and difficult and require the ability to move on more than one facet at the same time, the facade of self-building and the facade of working with the other. We are required to build our parties and our internationalism, while building the revolutionary fronts in our countries and in the world. As we work with others, the awareness is profound and clear to us that others do not resemble us but are different from us to some degree or another, but our intersection with them and our common need for each other imposes on us a common struggle, and in the midst of this struggle, the law of mutual influence works. Marx and Engels founded the First International with the participation of their ideological opponents, Proudhon, Bakunin, Blanqui, Owen and Lassalle. The International consisted of parties, trade unions and people who were incompatible with ideas, visions and programs. It was the product of its era and time, and achieved and failed where it could. This experience (and others) is not for reproduction, but for taking advantage and learning.

Our answer today after a century and a half of the international struggle is that the global struggle requires the creation of multiple organizational forms with multiple and integrated objectives, the internationalism for the Communists, and the global front for all the labor and revolutionary expressions of workers. At the beginning of 1922, the Third International (International Executive Committee statement, January 1, 1922) called for the necessity of establishing fronts with all the reformist, anarchist and other labor expressions, ie mobilizing and gathering forces to face the challenges before the working class and the socialist movement. The challenges before us today impose the necessity of working on the front of the international front of workers and revolutionaries. This front will also enable us to ripen the conditions of the resurrection of the Communist International.

5. How do we start today?

This question has always been the most difficult. According to the answer, all the features of the road are determined by its direct, interim and distant tasks. We are well aware of the contradictions that make up the world today, and therefore the tasks of the Communists end up with us that we must work as we have already done on two fronts and stand on two legs in the front of our international struggle. We must work for the maturity of the conditions of the declaration of the establishment of the Communist International, including adjusting the intellectual and ideological line and the international political and organizational tasks, and we believe that the work of the “Conference of parties and organizations” over a quarter of a century is important and useful and constitutes the original material of the Communist International Project. The maturity of the circumstances does not make sense outside the task of strengthening the parties, especially in terms of their association with the class struggle and political tasks in our countries, and the maturity of our understanding and assimilation and then unity in the face of the conditions and tasks of our time. This is a necessary act that must be undertaken by each party individually and by the whole of our movement collectively. At the same time it makes no sense for our communism today without actually linking to the movement of struggle on various facets that erupt in all countries and continents. The origin is to be at the heart and at the forefront of this struggle. A massive social struggle is taking place in defense of the

rights of workers, peasants, laborers, women, youth, people with special needs, the environment ... It also concerns the rejection of the occupation and foreign intervention and the drums of war and the creation of hotbeds of tension and the growth of terrorism in its various forms, including the escalation of fascism and racism.

Confronting these conditions is not only important to us as communists, but to large sectors of revolutionary and militant forces, whether of socialist or other tendencies. We are required not only to engage in this struggle but also primarily to work with all the forces involved. That is why we must open up to the militant spaces with which we have political and practical intersections, the spaces associated with the oppressed classes and peoples to participate in the struggle movement and to develop and equip them with real communist ideas.

The focal point to which we must appeal today is the circumstances of our time as they are exactly, not as we imagined or as we want. Our age is characterized by the great intractability of the contradictions that divide the world capitalist system. Capitalism has transformed into a prevailing system and has penetrated the whole world vertically and horizontally. This control and penetration has changed production structures and methods in the most underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and South America. This transformation, although distorted and not a result of the natural evolution of these societies, has created transformations in all societies whose main contradiction has become the contradiction with capitalism and large numbers of the population have become victims of the new system, which brought these countries only the formal manifestations of “modernization” and “civilization” brought by the transcontinental giants, but in the womb of society have doubled the impoverishment and dependency and external control of the wealth and capabilities fully harnessed to double the surplus value in favor of global monopolies. In order to dominate and control the world, the struggle between the wings of capitalism is increasing. These are the manifestations of the struggle between the classical components of capitalism that are growing and emerging from within Europe between France and Germany to win the hegemony and leadership of the European Union, the monopolistic capitalist space, and between these powers and Britain, whose old capital decided to leave the Union to be more liberated from the controls of the movement, and more associated with the American monopoly capi-

tal, which is struggling to maintain its dominance threatened by the old and especially the newcomers represented in China, Russia and Japan, and the BRICS bloc formed by the rising capitalist forces led by Russia and China to dispute over the share of hegemony, which affects the traditional space of European and American hegemony. The most prominent aspect today is the commercial war, especially in the technological branch, in which the major countries, institutions and monopoly branches of production are involved. This war has reached a point where it has become incontrovertible. Indeed, its manifestations have become visible to the naked eye and the drums of war are beating here and there, from the Strait of Hormuz to the south of the American continent through the Strait of Gibraltar to dominate the oil and energy sector, and to impose the dollar as the single dominant currency on the world market. In the interests of their greedy interests, the countries and the giant companies do not hesitate to intervene violently and create hotbeds of tension and war, as is the case in Syria and Yemen, to ensure that areas of wealth and influence are seized, this is done in a blatant challenge even to the system of laws enacted by imperialism itself (the laws of the United Nations and international legitimacy). More than ever, the world has become an open space for hegemony, domination and influence, and of course the first and primary victim of this is the peoples, nations, and toiling, crushed and impoverished classes. And the misery and want of the world affects not only the dependent and plundered countries of the world, but also the workers and laborers of the capitalist countries. A drastic decline today affects the gains that workers have been able to accumulate and achieve after a hard struggle that began in the early 19th century when capitalism began to stabilize as a new mode of production. Through their parties, trade unions and heroic struggles, workers and laborers were able to impose important rights that concern working conditions, social protection and retirement, especially after World War II when the



struggle escalated and capitalism was trembling for fear of the socialist revolutions that were important for the achievement of the working class agenda. The contradiction between capital and labor forces is a major and eternal contradiction that breaks through the capitalist mode of production and will not end until it ends. This contradiction finds its sensory and physical manifestation through the systematic impoverishment of millions of people, many of whom are growing and joining the struggle and protest, as well as the systematic destruction of nature and the ocean to accumulate wealth and profit, thus making human existence (as well as animal and plant ..) already threatened. In a word, the contradictions of global capitalism are deepening and bringing the world to the brink of an abyss, seriously raising the need to resolve these contradictions for the benefit of society and toilers.

The national and class struggle is spreading in many parts of the world. Here are the red flags flying in the heart of the great struggles in the east and west of the earth as in the north and south. At the same time, many struggles are suppressed, employed or directed at a non-class and non-revolutionary destination. In all cases, our Marxist-Leninist movement in the countries of the center and in the peripheral countries is not influential and in most cases weak or absent, allowing ample room for reformist, revisionist and anarchist movements, as well as for populist, right-wing and fascist movements to play leadership roles, which of course are harmful and even destructive to the class and popular struggle movement.

There are many tasks before us today, which do not accept any postponement in any way, and of course we as communists determine our tasks starting from our observation of the contradictions of objective reality and the state of subjective reality. The main task today is to engage in the struggle movement and its leadership and if it does not exist, create it and ignite it. Secondly, we are asked to work, coordinate and ally with other forces that exist with us in the same space and field, of course the revolutionary and leftist forces that must work with their advanced factions not only for joint action, but also as a basis to address the growing fascist tendencies that pose a serious threat to the present and the future, not only of workers and laborers, but also of society and humanity as a whole. Fascism has been able to rise to power in Brazil, Colombia, Italy and India, and it is on the rise in many countries. This situation imposes on us a great ability to understand the reality, especially put

forward appropriate tactics of confrontation and here exactly we consider that the issue of the front locally and internationally is central to the struggle of the working class and communists.

We believe that the achievement of the International and the Global Front are not separate tasks, but rather serve each other, and the two frameworks themselves are not mutually exclusive, but serve and complement each other. We establish The internationalism with those we broadly agree with, and connect with on the basis of the unity of the line of thought and political vision. It is the international party. As for the front, the terms of its formation are lower and lower and the terms of its creation are the conditions on which we form the fronts in our countries, which means on the basis of agreement on a specific program, project or political missions. It is a necessary mechanism in our struggle because it brings together as many forces as possible around the task (s) needed to develop the class struggle and advance its cause. Today, the world situation requires the formation of the Global Front for Workers and Revolutionaries as a task not to delay, to address the outstanding tasks of rejection of intervention, occupation and international neoliberal policies, which cost is paid by the peoples, nations, and toiling classes. A front against imperial arrogance, war, subordination, impoverishment and marginalization. Front to unite efforts and movement as well as understanding and awareness in its general headlines of most of the most important labor, socialist and revolutionary factions fighting in their countries and ready for coordination and common struggle. This front takes flexible forms of action and organization, continental, regional, sectoral and general.... It also poses the struggling tasks that the special situation requires in a region, area or even a continent. Our enemy is united in confronting us, and our unity against our enemy is a huge historic task that must be carried out without hesitation and confusion. The world front of the oppressed and oppressed classes is one of the links to improve and reinforce the conditions for the creation of the Communist International, that world situations prove its necessity and inevitability.

August 29, 2019

Turkey

Party of Labor (EMEP)

Wallerstein's Analysis and its Impasses: From Rhetoric to Reality

I. Wallerstein died on the 31st of August of this year. He put forward some interesting ideas. By calling the Soviet Union, which was a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a "*bureaucratic workers' state*", Trotsky had put the blame only on Stalin and the "*bureaucracy*" of "*Stalinism*". Yet, referring to "*bureaucratism*" and by including Lenin, Wallerstein went further and made a total rejection. For him, socialism had never existed, and what was called "*socialism*" was in fact something within the context of capitalism!

With his interesting views, he deserves a posthumous analysis.

Prologue

As is known, those years when socialism suffered its temporary defeat also represent the time when Marxist-Leninist theory was targeted. The attacks on Marxism-Leninism were based on a simple reasoning: Socialism was defeated, so its theory must have been invalid!

This period had serious ideologically and politically destructive effects on the left-socialist circles, leading them to turn away from Marxist-Leninist theory, in search of various ideas from anarchism to the new left. It was in this period that the U.S. sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein came to the fore with his analysis of the world-systems. At some point, his writings and ideas were much referred to by some circles in Turkey, too, especially the Kurdish national movement and the liberal left.

Wallerstein formulated his criticisms of the old left (Marxism-Leninism) and his ideas about the new left in his writings in the period 1990-93, right after the disintegration of the USSR and the Eastern bloc. He brought together these articles in 1995 in his book *After Liberalism* in which he criticised capitalist world system and argued for the possibility of a more democratic and egalitarian world system.

However, it was not only capitalism that he criticised. He argued that what collapsed in 1989 was not communism but liberal-

ism, though it may sound nice at first instance, and claimed that Soviet socialism (and Leninism) was a version of the world capitalist system (liberalism). Then he went further from "criticism of socialism" to the denial of the idea of Marxist-Leninist revolution and political power. Denying that the contradiction between labour and capital was the fundamental contradiction that characterises the system, he equated class struggle with struggles of an ethnic, gender, religious, ecological, etc. character. As he rejected organised struggle in the name of rejecting hierarchy (and because there is no power to seize), his answer was unclear to the questions of how the system would be "transformed", by which "subjects", and what it would be replaced with.

Therefore, despite his critical rhetoric and his claim of the "possibility" of a more democratic and egalitarian system, Wallerstein's ideas do not go beyond being a supplement to bourgeois ideology. For this reason, a settling of accounts with his ideas would mean fighting against the destruction caused by bourgeois ideology on left-socialist ideology and politics.

Introduction

In his *"world system analysis"*, Wallerstein, just like all post-Marxist authors, sets a new mainstay for his analysis, claiming that Marxism has shortcomings. For him it was the *Annales*, "*Structuralist School of Historiography*", led by Fernand Braudel and claimed to "*develop a holistic and many sided, demographical, geographical, linguistic, cultural and anthropological understanding of historiography*", "surpassed" the Marxist materialist approach which it considered to be "*economic determinist*".

The Structuralists consider Marxism to be "*economic determinist*" because Marxism puts the mode and relations of production at the centre when analysing the laws of development of society with a historical materialist approach. In the name of "*developing a holistic approach to historiography*", the Structuralists equate these laws with other historical, cultural, geographical, demographic, linguistic, etc. factors, which are in fact of secondary importance. The abandoning of the laws of development of societies and the replacement of the relations covered by these laws with the relations between secondary factors in order to form a structural-holistic approach inevitably leads structuralism to a positivist historical-societal understanding. It is this positivist understanding that forms

the basis for all claims that class struggle has lost its significance and withered away, since at the present time class struggle is relatively weak and the struggles in the ethnic, religious, gender, ecological etc. areas have come to the fore.

Yet, the starting point of Marxism is not the relations between those secondary factors: indeed, leaving aside the geographical factors, all others depend on and are determined by the material economic basis of society and its laws of development. Marxism affirms the fact that human beings' social, political and intellectual lives are determined by the production of material life, which is independent of their will, and by the objective relations formed around it.

Contrary to the criticism directed at it, Marxism does not claim that the economic factor (mode of material production) is the one and only determinant. Engels responds to such criticisms with the following words: *"According to the materialist conception of history, the ultimately determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. Other than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted."*

Therefore, the fact that the economic structure is the base does not mean that the political, legal, religious, etc. elements of the superstructure have no effect on the process of social development. On the contrary, the Marxist laws of development of society enable us to understand the conditions in which these elements occur and the levels and limits of their effects on social processes. For this reason, Marxism defines social classes and the struggle between them in accordance with the place they hold in the historically-determined production system, their relations with the means of production, and their roles in the social organisation of labour. However, those who claim that the working class has changed its character and has lost its revolutionary role cannot say which of these objective criteria that determine classes have changed for the working class.

Yet the primary thesis of the book *After Liberalism* by Wallerstein, who was influenced to a great extent by the *Annales'* structural/holistic conception of history, is based on the claim that *the "dissolution of the U.S.S.R., the fall of communism and the collapse of Marxism-Leninism as an ideological force in the modern world"* shows *"even more the collapse of liberalism and our definitive entry into the world after-liberalism"*. Wallerstein bases his thesis on

the following claims: That, although the period from 1789 to 1989 was perceived to be a period of struggle between "*three ideologies*" (conservatism, liberalism and socialism), liberalism had in fact likened the other two to itself and declared its hegemony; that Leninism, though seemingly opposed to liberalism, was in fact "*one of its embodiments*" and by its defence of the right of nations to self-determination it implemented the "*Wilsonian liberal programme*"; and that "*the 1968 revolution*" had invalidated the Marxist-Leninist idea of revolution and political power. In accordance with these claims, what "*collapsed*" in 1989 "*was not socialism but liberalism*". Wallerstein goes on to say that what is possible "*after liberalism*" is not a world without classes and exploitation but "*a more egalitarian society*," meaning something "*a bit better*" than liberalism, but definitely a form or manifestation of capitalism.

Let us go into some details.

I

In his book, in the chapter titled "*Three Ideologies or One? The Pseudobattle of Modernity*", Wallerstein opens for discussion the "*three great political ideologies*" of *modern times* – conservatism,



liberalism and socialism. He argues that, although "*most people believe that there are some essential differences between these ideologies*," there are disagreements "*about what these presumably essential differences are*." "*There are conservatives who see no essential difference between liberalism and socialism, socialists who say the same thing about liberalism and conservatism, and even liberals who argue that there is no serious distinction between conservatism and*

socialism". To prove his point, Wallerstein goes on to talk about the "proof" that there was a "reconciliation" between liberals and socialists until 1830s and between liberals and conservatives after 1848. Again, by reducing the "difference" between these "three ideologies" to their position on modernity and development, he defines the points differentiating conservatism, liberalism and socialism consecutively in the following manner: "circumscribe the danger as much as possible; achieve the happiness of mankind as rationally as possible; or accelerate the drive for progress by struggling hard against the forces that were strongly resisting it." Then the author explains the conclusion he has reached as a result of his analysis with this question: "In this case, would it not be correct to conclude that since 1789 there has been only one true ideology, liberalism, which has displayed its colours in three major versions?... In the 120 years after 1848 – that is, at least until 1968 – under the guise of three ideologies in conflict with each other, we really had only one, the overwhelmingly dominant ideology of 'liberalism.'"

What is his definition of ideology then? Wallerstein defines "modern ideologies" as "the ways in which people coped with this new situation" in the face of political change, the turning point of which was the French Revolution. However, even this definition does not alter the fact, as stated by Marx in his *18th Brumaire*, that ideologies are shaped by different forms of ownership and by the conditions of social existence. Different classes and strata, whose distinction Wallerstein obscures by calling them "people", try to stop the "new situation" from harming their interests or to use it for their own interests. This shows that different ideologies are in fact "different world views" determined in accordance with the interests of different social classes and strata.

Marx expresses the struggle between the two camps of bourgeois ideology, which Wallerstein considers "conservatism" and "liberalism", in the following way:

"Orleanists and Legitimists found themselves side by side in the republic, with equal claims. If each side wished to effect the restoration of its own royal house against the other, that merely signified that each of the two great interests into which the bourgeoisie is split – landed property and capital – sought to restore its own supremacy and the subordination of the other. We speak of two interests of the bourgeoisie, for large landed property, despite its feudal

coquetry and pride of race, has been rendered thoroughly bourgeois by the development of modern society."

It is understandable that different classes and strata blame other ideologies on the basis of their own "*ideologies*" in defence of their interests, which the author describes as "*the way they overcome the new situation*". However, rhetorical ambiguity (which obscures the differences between "*ideologies*", each of which claims to defend "*the interests of the whole nation or of all humanity*", not just of "*one class or social stratum*") does not change the fact that "*ideologies*" correspond to different social beings and class interests. Therefore, basing one's analysis on the rhetoric and coming to the conclusion that the differences between these "*ideologies*" are vague means to deny the existence of social conditions that determine these "*ideologies*" and the existence of different class interests.

Obviously, this approach leads to an upside-down relationship between social being and thought (here ideology) and replaces the 'essence' with the appearance, in the name of developing a "*holistic*" approach. However, what the author said earlier, regarding the "*compromise*" between liberals and socialists against conservatives before 1848 and between liberals and conservatives against socialists after 1848, does not prove the vagueness of differences between these "*ideologies*". On the contrary, it proves the existence of struggle between different classes and strata for their own varying interests. Before 1848, when the working class was relatively weakly formed, they and the other toiling strata sided with the industrial bourgeoisie against feudalism and its continuation, the "conservative" land bourgeoisie, but after 1848, when the working class struggle began to grow, the "conservative" and "liberal" sections of bourgeoisie united against the working class. Marx explains the "*compromise*" between various bourgeois camps during the 1848 Revolution and how they got the support of other social strata as follows:

"During the June days all classes and parties had united in the party of Order against the proletarian class as the party of anarchy, of socialism, of communism. They had 'saved' society from the 'enemies of society'. They had given out the watchwords of the old society, 'property, family, religion, order', to their army as pass-words and had proclaimed to the counter-revolutionary crusaders: 'In this sign thou shalt conquer!'"

Let us state again: Wallerstein bases his analysis on ideological rhetoric while ignoring the class interests that shape this rhetoric, thus falling into idealism. For example, based on their rhetoric and without considering their aims, he makes equal the two different approaches by Wilson and Lenin to the right of nations to self determination, and falls into the mistake of saying that Wilsonianism compared Leninism to itself.

On the other hand, the struggle between the "*traditional*" and "*liberal*" factions of the bourgeoisie during its fight against feudal remnants was replaced by the struggle of all bourgeois factions, including the aristocracy, united and "*reconciled*", against the working class when this class began to rise against the bourgeoisie. As different forms of "*bourgeois ideology*", "*liberalism*" and "*conservatism*" have become different rhetoric of the same ideology used against the working class. In their initial period of development, for instance, bourgeois liberals acted together with and united with the working class and other toiling masses in their fight against the church and religion, but when the struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie heightened, they did not refrain from approaching these institutions once again.

Wallerstein is mistaken again when he reduces the differences between ideologies to the "*pace of development*"; he in fact distorts the fact in preparation for what he is to argue later. In various places in his book, Wallerstein himself suggests that "*capital accumulation*" is capitalism's *raison d'être*. If capital accumulation is the *raison d'être* of capitalism and "*liberalism*" is its hegemonic ideology, then what lies behind the liberal ideology envisaging a better future as society advances – as production increases – is nothing more than its desire to win over the whole society to the side of this type of exploitation, and to prevent the rebellion of the working class and other toilers against this order. Therefore, replacing "*socialist revolution*" with "*liberal reforms*" and preaching that society will keep going forward in this way implies that the difference between the two ideologies is much more than the "*pace of advance*."

In Wallerstein's analysis of this topic, the mode and relations of production are consciously ignored. This is because even if liberalism promises "*a happier and freer future*", for this to be materialised the capitalist mode of production needs to change, as do the relations of exploitation between capital and the working class (the working class has to sell its labour power in order to live and the

bourgeoisie holding the means of production buys this labour power in order to accumulate capital through the production of the surplus-value). Liberalism bases all its rhetoric on "class cooperation and reconciliation" for the continuation of this order. Yet, socialism envisages an "*advancement*" based on the elimination of capitalist private property and of the contradiction between labour and capital, arguing that the future classless, stateless, free society could only be possible on this basis – on the basis of class struggle. Thus, what determines the difference between liberalism and socialism is not the "*pace of advance*" but which social-class interests and what kind of "*transformation*" they envisage.

II

Wallerstein does not randomly suggest his theses mentioned above. When he talks about the "*overwhelmingly dominant ideology of liberalism*" for at least 120 years (from 1848 to 1968), he also claims that Leninism was "*tamed*" by liberal ideology (one of the manifestations of this was the Wilson programme, the principles put forward by US president Wilson in 1917 when he declared war against Germany). This is because, he says, "*The key issue to which both ideologies addressed themselves, ... was, both for Wilsonianism and for Leninism, 'national development,' and that the essential dispute between them was merely about the path to such national development.*"

There were similarities in the struggles for the right of oppressed nations to self determination which were linked to different strategic objectives: one (Wilson's) had to be opened to imperialist plunder, and the other (Lenin's) to emancipation from imperialist capitalist exploitation. Wallerstein based his "*advance*" on just these similarities, and struck his "*fatal*" blow with his description of the "*new role of Leninism*": Based on "classical liberal postulates" Wilsonianism "*defended the right of the peripheral and semi-peripheral regions to self-determination*" while "*Lenin pursued very similar policy objectives under the quite different slogans of proletarian internationalism and anti-imperialism.*" From Lenin's new emphasis on the "*East*" at the Comintern's 1920 Congress of the Peoples of the East in Baku, Azerbaijan, Wallerstein comes up with a "*new emphasis*" for Marxism: "*Marxism-Leninism in effect was moving from its origins as a theory of proletarian insurrection against the bourgeoisie to a new role as a theory of anti-imperialism.*"

For Wallerstein, there were some differences between Wilsonianism and Leninism, both of which he considered to be '*national developmentalist*'; however, these had to do with "*details*" rather than the essence, although even according to his description they should be considered part of the essence. Wilsonians, for example, were for the dissolution of the colonies through a "*constitutional path*", i.e. "*negotiations*"; Leninists, on the other hand, were for "*more insurrectional paths*" and for independence "*to be taken rather than given*." Also, there were disagreements between these two ideologies regarding the "*leadership of the struggle for the right to self determination*". It was the "*bourgeoisie*" for the Wilsonians, and the "*party modelled on the Bolshevik party*" for the Leninists. However, for Wallerstein, these differences should not be "*exaggerated*" because they were no more than "*different paths*" towards "*national development*"!

Although what he said does not exactly correspond with the meaning he wanted to convey, Wallerstein wanted what he constructed in his mind, in other words, his construction was apt for his want.

Wallerstein adopted the approach of *Annales* which denied the interaction between the material production of life and the ideological-cultural-political shaping of society in the name of eradicating the "*artificial difference*" between social sciences (economics, history, geography, anthropology, etc.). We see the same approach in his analysis of liberalism and Leninism. First of all, although free competition, which was the main pillar of liberalism, was replaced by monopoly, and neoliberalism was now the norm in the economic field, the continuation of the liberal rhetoric in the ideological-political field was enough for Wallerstein for the "*absolute hegemony*" of liberalism. In connection with this, Wallerstein's "holistic" approach (taking capitalism as a 'whole'), which was one of the most important starting points of his 'World Systems Theory,' denies the fact that monopolies



and imperialism was a stage of "*historic capitalism*" for the sake of the "*study of the long-term cycles of the system*".

Liberalism emerged and developed as the ideology of the bourgeoisie against feudalism in the "*Enlightenment*" era (and later as an ideology of industrial bourgeoisie against the land bourgeoisie and its "*conservatism*"). Economically the liberal bourgeoisie was for the liquidation of the feudal order and for free competition, and politically for the "fundamental rights of the individual from birth" for the sake of the creation of "free individuals," free to hire their labour power instead of the feudal relations of production, which bound the producer (the serfs) to the land. With its banner of "*liberty, equality, fraternity*," it was able to unite the toiling masses (workers and peasants) against feudalism. According to liberal ideology, the social order must be based on two principals: Free competition (free enterprise) and the freedom of the individual. For free competition (with the slogan "*laissez faire – laissez passer*") there should be no state intervention in the economy, as it was already being regulated by the "*hidden hand of the market*".

Capitalism is a system where production is carried out for maximum profit in order to accumulate capital and it is based on the exploitation of the labour power (which has become a commodity, which the worker has to lend to the capitalist, and through which "surplus value" is produced). Without the exploitation of the labour power of the worker (surplus value) it is not possible for the capitalist to make profit and accumulate capital. Thus, the capitalist mode of production necessitates the encounter of the worker who sells his/her labour power and the capitalist who hires it for a certain period of time, as "*free individuals with equal rights before the law*". It is these production relations which require liberalism as a bourgeois ideology to be "*libertarian*", taking the individual at its centre against feudalism and "*conservatism*". Free exchange, i.e. trade, and the freedom of selling one's labour power in order to feed oneself, i.e. to be exploited! Otherwise, this "*libertarian*" approach of "*laissez faireism*," which is so against state intervention, since the 1848 Revolution has not refrained from calling for the help of the police, army and judiciary of the "*liberal state*" when working class actions become a threat to bourgeois interests.

Free competition is the basis of libertarianism; thus, one side of this libertarianism involves all capitalists united against workers in order to hire their labour power as cheaply as possible, and the

other, there is a harsh competition among them. This competition leads many capitalists into bankruptcy and dispossession, as laws of capitalist production function: rapid development of productive forces to maximise surplus value, contradiction between the development of the productive forces and the mode of production based on the private ownership of the means of production; this contradiction leads to economic crises, capitalist accumulation, centralisation of capital, etc. *"That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralisation of capital. One capitalist always kills many."*

This means that capital is concentrated in fewer hands and leads to monopoly at a certain stage of the development of free competition. Although Marx confirmed this tendency of capital in his writings, it was not possible to pinpoint an *"absolute hegemony"* of monopolies in his time. Engels wrote about this process of monopolist hegemony, and as production continuously concentrated and intensified, in the late 19th and early 20th century a small number of monopolies began to dominate capitalist production and, though laws of free competition seemingly continued to exist, *"old capitalism"* was replaced by the *"monopoly"* capitalism. Monopolies dominated every sphere of the economy and this went hand in hand with the emergence of finance capital, i.e. industrial capital becoming intertwined with bank capital. Thus, Lenin describes this *"new"* capitalism as the *"stage"* when *"the domination of capital in general"* was transformed into the *"domination of finance capital"*. Finance capital does not only increase the capitalists' power; it also gives them the opportunity to control much more than what they own. Thus, imperialism emerged as a *"new stage"* of capitalism when at a certain stage of capitalist development some of its fundamental features turned into their opposites (free competition into monopolies).

Regarding our subject, what is important here is that under imperialism, liberal (free competition) capitalism left its place to monopoly capitalism. In this era, the continuation of the use of *"liberal rhetoric,"* which was to consolidate the material bases of capitalism in the liberal stage, means nothing more than benefitting from it as a veil for monopolist expansion. This also causes a distortion in Wallerstein's approach to what he calls democracy when he denies

the fact that imperialism is a new stage of capitalism and talks about the "*absolute hegemony*" of liberalism.

In the liberal period of free competition the bourgeoisie used "*individual rights and freedoms*" against feudalism in order to win over the toiling classes and consolidate the material bases of capitalism. However, in the monopolist stage it uses these "*freedoms*" as a "*veil*" and as an instrument for legitimising its hegemony. Yet from these developments, Wallerstein draws the conclusion that "*democracy and liberalism*" are "*opposites*"!

He argues that "*democracy and equality*" are "*inseparable*," and defines liberalism on the basis of an abstract concept of "democracy" that he constructed in his mind. However, at some point the bourgeoisie had no complaints against "*liberal democracy*". What is also debatable is his abstract concept of "*equality*," which he formulated as a denial of the determining character of the material living conditions. For example, Wallerstein says that the difference between the bourgeoisie and the working class should not be "*exaggerated*" on the question of who should lead the struggle for the right to self determination. Knowing this, one wonders where he places the elimination of class exploitation in the relationship he sets between "*democracy*" and "*equality*", or whether what he calls "*equality*" could be realized when classes still exist.

It is understood that in Wallerstein's vision of "*equality*", the eradication of exploitation is an insignificant detail, just as is the question of class! Does it envisage a formal equality in appearance, just as the one between the feudal aristocracy and the then "*young*" bourgeoisie when certain privileges of the feudal aristocracy such as racketeering or taxation were lifted, or an equality in the sense that classes would be eradicated? In bourgeois democracy, as one form of the bourgeois state, "*equality*" is something formal, just as is democracy, and it is a veil for the protection of bourgeois interests, mainly the hegemony of capital over labour. In this sense, bourgeois democracy is in fact a "*dictatorship*" over a large, toiling, section of society, but working class democracy (proletarian dictatorship) is democracy for the working class and toiling strata, while it is a "*dictatorship*" for the bourgeoisie whose hegemony in the bourgeois state and whose relations of exploitation are eradicated. Therefore, despite his seemingly nice words, Wallerstein lives in a dreamland with his mistaken conceptions, if he is not covering up the fact that

with bourgeois objectives democracy is a form of state and has a class character.

In the imperialist stage, "*liberal democracy*" is meaningful in the elimination of obstacles to the bourgeois class for its monopolist exploitation, expansion and force. US President Wilson's principle of the right of nations to self-determination, put forward in January 1918, must be evaluated in this framework. Just as in its liberal (free competition) stage, when capitalism needed "*free individuals*" who had nothing to sell but their labour power (which is in fact a sine qua non for capital accumulation, capitalism's *raison d'être*), what was needed after the First Imperialist War of Redivision was "*the right of nations to self determination*" as a form of redivision of the defeated countries by the victorious imperialist countries. In other words, under the guise of "*freedom of self-determination*," the nations under the yoke of others, such as the defeated Ottoman Empire, were opened up to plunder by the victorious imperialists and to redivision by the victors. In this respect, what Wallerstein calls the Wilsonian principle of "*liberalism*" "*in defence of the right to self-determination of the peripheral and semi-peripheral zones of the world system*" was in fact brought about and functioned as a principle of imperialist expansionism during and after the imperialist war. By confusing Lenin and socialism with liberalism, with his defence of Wilsonianism, Wallerstein's position is clear: Covering up imperialist expansionism.

What is also clear is that Marxism-Leninism defends the right to self-determination as a democratic right of the oppressed nation against the imperialist yoke and against repression by the oppressing nation, and considers it a contribution to strengthening the possibilities of the struggle for socialism, to break down the nationalist walls through equal rights of nations, and pave the way to the advancement of class consciousness and the struggle of the working class as an internationalist class. Also, in such conditions where the working class (socialism) is in power in any part of the world, the defence of this right would strengthen socialism and the solidarity between oppressed nations, and weaken the imperialist front.

In short, for Marxism-Leninism, the right to self-determination, with its aim of preventing imperialist expansionism and lifting the barriers to the struggle of the working class for a world free from exploitation, is completely different from Wilson's principles with their imperialist essence; they in fact serve two opposite aims.

However, if, like Wallerstein, one does not see the class character of democracy and the connection between ideology and the relations of production, then one would not see any harm in equating Wilsonianism and Leninism by just looking at their words on the right to self-determination, and claiming that there is no need to "*exaggerate*" the differences between the two.

Regarding the question of who is to lead the national movement (the bourgeoisie and its national party or the working class and a party of the Bolshevik type), another difference Wallerstein also suggests should not be "*exaggerated*" is the question of which path the fight for the right to self-determination should take: the "*conciliatory*" path or the "*revolutionary*" path? Having received praise particularly from the conciliatory national movements, what Wallerstein suggests is unimportant and should not be "*exaggerated*" is in connection with the debate on who is to lead the movement. When it is not possible to stop the oppressed nation's national movement, the question is whether this "*self-determination*" should be turned into an instrument of reconnecting the oppressed nation to the imperialist-capitalist system, or whether it should be an instrument for freeing the oppressed nation from the imperialist yoke and establishing a revolutionary-democratic people's power. If the struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie is not meaningful and therefore the question of who leads the struggle for "self-determination" is insignificant, and if the capitalist system is considered to be an absolute fate, then, of course, the difference between this right being used to reconnect the oppressed nation to the imperialist-capitalist system in order to continue with national enslavement, or to be used to move forward to socialism via a revolutionary-democratic line, is also insignificant.

III

Is Leninism for "*national development*"? Since Wallerstein denies the imperialist stage of capitalism (and the law of unequal development) he comes to the conclusion that it is. The law of unequal development, in connection with the development of contradictions of the imperialist world system, creates the conditions for the revolution to develop in the weak link(s) of imperialism. The Soviet Revolution is the most typical example of this. To consider the attempt to construct socialism in one country, as if it is a preference, as being for "*national development*", just as Trotsky did, is in fact nothing more

than a submission to imperialist expansionism under the guise of "revolutionary" rhetoric such as "permanent revolution" or "world revolution". As a result of the law of unequal development, when revolutionary conditions emerge in an "advanced" or "less advanced" country – in terms of the level of capitalist development – in the imperialist chain, what should the proletariat of that country do? Should they wait for the "world revolution" to take place before they move or should they take the path of seizing power and advancing the prospects of the struggle of the working class and the oppressed peoples against the imperialist-capitalist system on a world scale on the way to the ultimate victory of socialism?

Drawing a "national developmentalist" conclusion from socialism shows that Wallerstein has a distorted view of a "nation", since a nation is "a historical category" which emerged at the dawn of capitalism. For the bourgeoisie, "nation" means, above all, the control over the lands where this historical category took shape, i.e. its own market. However, after this control is exerted, the concept of "nation" becomes an instrument for the bourgeoisie to conceal its exploitation and its expansionist desires. The bourgeois ruling class presents the relations of exploitation that it had established in their states and its expansionist imperialist desires to be in the "national interest".

One of the fundamental differences between Leninism and those social-chauvinist parties of the Second International that went to war in support of their own bourgeoisie in the First Imperialist War of redivision was that the revolutionary party of the working class (Bolshevik Party) rejected the notion of "national interest" and exposed it as in fact the interest of the bourgeoisie. The Bolshevik Party responded to the imperialist expansionist war policies of the Russian bourgeoisie with the slogan "a revolutionary civil war". The Marxist-Leninist party defends the international interests of the working class instead of the bourgeoisie's "national interest", and carries out its fight on this basis. Here, it comes to the same point: when the opportunity arises to seize power in one or more countries, whether the working class will take this opportunity to break the imperialist capitalist chain and use it for the ultimate victory of socialism, or whether it will accept the defeat beforehand of the "world revolution" and submit to imperialist capitalist exploitation and expansion. (Another option for the latter path is, if power was seized in one country but revolution did not break out in other coun-

tries, to be adventurist and try to follow the tall order in order to expand the revolution. We know that Wallerstein did not make such a suggestion, since he considers even the difference between the bourgeoisie and the working class to be over-empathised!) Therefore, for Marxism-Leninism, the struggle of the working class to take power in one or more countries and construct socialism is a new dimension of the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the working class in the imperialist capitalist era. However, socialist construction under such conditions does not mean an ultimate victory of socialism; it means that the continuous class struggle bears the danger of a "*reconstruction*" (of the old system).

As the most important proof of Leninist "national developmentalism," Wallerstein points to Lenin's slogan "*Communism equals the Soviets plus electricity*." As the question of which class holds power is an insignificant detail for him, he ignores the question of the "*Soviets*" and concentrates on electricity. Yet the Soviets were an instrument of working class democracy and its sine qua non.

The Soviet system is based on people organising in assemblies in their living and working places and their participation in the processes of governing through these organisations. In this respect, the Soviets are an instrument of democracy in complete opposition to bourgeois democracy, which only involves people going to the ballot box at certain times, and which the bourgeoisie uses to cover up its relations of hegemony and exploitation. The Soviets emerged as a model of organisation for the working class and toilers under the conditions of an uprising, and became an "*organ of power*" under working class rule. In this respect, it is a "*specific*" form of working class democracy. The workers and toilers elect their representatives and hold them to account. In this respect the Soviet system is based on the elimination of the conditions of exploitation by the bourgeoisie and the formation of a "*new life*" that represents the most advanced form of democracy with its principle of "*from each according to their ability, to each according to their work*."

For this reason, "*development*" in the Soviet Union was not a national one; if we have to speak of "*development*" then it is one in a land where it involves the working class, which is an international class, taking power and realising the elimination of the bourgeois order of exploitation. In other words, this "*development*", which is also economic progress, becomes meaningful, in essence, with the construction of the socialist economy as a transition to a communist

society free from classes and exploitation. This was true not only with the liquidation of the Russian bourgeoisie but also as a pillar of the working class struggle against the international imperialist-capitalist order.

This is in fact the reason for the all-around encirclement and attacks against the Soviet Union by the imperialist-capitalist system since the working class took power in 1917. In other words, it is not the "*national development*" of the USSR that drove out imperialist capitalist attacks, but the fact that the working class eliminated the conditions for bourgeois exploitation in that particular part of the world, and this posed a threat to the bourgeoisie as a whole. Therefore, the first part of Lenin's slogan "*Soviets + electrification*" refers to working class democracy (and its dictatorship over the bourgeoisie), while the latter refers to socialist production and construction against the bourgeoisie who had lost power but was still very resistant, and to the "*advancement and development*" of course, to the working class and toilers establishing an economic system free from exploitation.

However, Wallerstein skips the part about which class leads this "*development*" and for what purpose, and declares Leninism to be "*national developmentalist*" on the basis of a "*development*" that had taken place in the USSR where the working class had seized power. Yet the answers to the questions of who leads this "*development*" and for what purpose determine the direction of this development, and explain its position vis-a-vis the exploitation of human labour and nature.

To conclude, in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, it is not only that "*liberalism*", which is a veil for imperialist expansionism, and Leninism, which is the theory of proletarian revolution, have two different paths, but they also have two completely opposite visions of the future. However, if one leaves aside the laws of development of society and class struggle and uses a method of analysis, with one foot on rhetoric and the other on facts (as in the case of equating the rhetoric of liberalism and Leninism on self-determination and policies of "*development*"), one could equate Leninism with liberalism and find a possibility to distance oneself from the Leninist idea of revolution and power, just as one could draw the conclusion that there is no difference between the sea and the atmosphere because they both contain oxygen!

Venezuela

Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Venezuela – PCMLV

Ideological Struggle and Threats of Military Aggression in Venezuela

Ideological struggle has various expressions and assumes a concrete form in the laws and categories of dialectics; particularly important in the area of politics, it shows itself in different visions regarding different phenomena: The development of the class struggle, the fundamental contradictions, the main enemy, the allies, the use of tactics and strategy, the principles and forms of organizations, relations with other ideological currents, the role of the party, the development of work within the working class, the peasants, social movements, etc.

It is also expressed within organizations, as well as the relations between them; it sets limits, defines methods of work, forms of struggle and organization, differentiating Marxist-Leninist positions from other ideological tendencies which make themselves known, not only by their analysis, but also in their discourse, their positions on concrete matters and forms of action.

Ideological struggle does not stop and that is why it affects the internal and external, both on the national and the international level. In this context, we Marxist-Leninists have waged a permanent struggle throughout our history which is consistent with our situation.

In addition to confronting capitalism and imperialism, understanding the latter as its highest stage, ideological struggle also takes place against external influences on the proletariat, such as reformist, revisionist, conciliationist, dogmatic and sectarian tendencies. This creates processes that result in overcoming weaknesses through the use of the tools of Marxism, especially criticism and self-criticism.

During the period of the First International, the internal ideological struggle focused on the contradictions with bourgeois liberals, anarchists and followers of Lassalle. The positions of Marx and Engels in the International Workingmen's Association of Workers (IWA) against the positions of Lassalle, Blanqui and Proudhon are

well known. All their literature, *The Critique of the Gotha Program*, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, and especially the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, among others, clearly and strongly expresses the level of ideological struggle in that period.

Later, in the Second International, it was up to first Engels and later Lenin to take up the fight, mostly against social democracy, which we can place in two different periods: The positions during the first years of the Second International were not like the level of contradictions which developed later as a result of its positions taken with regard to the war, and which Lenin would take up later faced with the conciliatory and reformist deviations by leaders like Bernstein and Kautsky during the First World War.

The struggle promoted starting with the Zimmerwald conference was an important event in the development of positions which led to the denunciation of the conciliatory nature of some tendencies within the Second International which took up the positions of the imperialist governments, betraying the slogan of war against war.

The Communist International, since its inception 100 years ago, also fought an intense ideological battle to establish a common tactic for all member parties; it decisively tackled the problem of imperialism as the new stage of capitalism and explained how it should be tackled, especially in its theses on the national and colonial question, giving a new vision to the international struggle, incorporating the proletariat of the oppressed nations as part of the strategy of international struggle.

Lenin's masterly understanding of this problem is expressed in a manner which leaves no room for doubts, when he states: "First, what is the cardinal idea underlying our theses? It is the distinction between oppressed and oppressor nations." This translates into the need to develop a coordinated international policy between the proletariat of the oppressed and oppressor nations, to confront the common enemy and "to establish the concrete economic facts and to proceed from concrete realities, not from abstract postulates, in all colonial and national problems." ["Report of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions", in "The Second Congress of the Communist International," Vol. 31 of Lenin's *Collected Works*.]

The national question is a determining element of Marxist-Leninist politics which is guided by a particular approach: it is approached from an internationalist perspective and not from a narrow

view which may favor elements of internal politics in view of the incredibly complexity of international problems. It recognizes the importance of the struggle against imperialism, emphasizing very clearly the question of the “bourgeois democratic movement in the backward countries” as part of the entire struggle against imperialism at the international level.

In his writings Lenin clarifies that this topic has “been the cause of some disagreements.” He established the differences between the reformist movement and the revolutionary movement and as a result in the relations with bourgeois democracy in the colonial and backward countries it is a central element to build alliances, but without merging with them, on the contrary always maintaining the independence of the proletarian movement while adding forces in order to defeat imperialism.

This concept was developed further in the struggle against fascism by applying the politics of a United Front of the proletariat and the Popular Front with which the Third International managed to create a tactic to defeat the reactionary offensive.

It fell upon Stalin to lead the struggle against Trotskyism, as well as against other deviations, on the left and the right, mainly consolidating Marxism-Leninism as the concrete politics of the proletariat always in ideological struggle against deviations and deformations.

After the Third International was dissolved, ideological struggle has continued in various areas, and in recent decades various situations have emerged, in which we Marxist-Leninists have continued defending the positions of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, the CI, Dimitrov, as well as the documents of the ICMLPO, its resolutions and agreements.

After the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the ideological struggle assumed other forms: It expressed the need to denounce the revisionism of Khrushchev and his followers, as well as Eurocommunism, Chinese revisionism, and [Guevara’s] focalism, having among its leaders Enver Hoxha and other cadres worldwide.

Today the ideological struggles includes the clarification of the role of imperialism, the actions of the USA-EU bloc as expressions of traditional imperialism, China and Russia as emerging imperialist powers, the various forms of the inter-imperialist struggle for a new redivision of the world, the aggressions against the dependent countries, the experiences of resistance, the denunciation of modern revi-

sionism and reformism, the confrontations with the various opportunist tendencies that play into the hands of reaction, the forms of the contradictions between capital and labor and the recognition of the role of the working class and its allies.

Each party takes on this general framework in order to carry out its actions, to work on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, on the general orientations, the directions created by the development of experiences condensed in the program, political line and theses, as well as the conclusions from the conferences, the orientations from leading bodies, its own practice and that of others, always using clear definitions of the role of the proletariat, its link with the political struggle, the relationship of the working class with the peasantry as a strategic alliance, and its work with other social strata.

A key element which serves as a guide for the political positions of the Marxist-Leninists is defined by the resolutions of the ICMLPO and its agreements, which serve as a reference for our organizations and for many others, political and mass organizations, on a global scale.

In the imperialist phase of capitalism, during the liberation process, it is important to analyze the different ways to carry out the ideological struggle in the Popular Front and the United Front, as places to advance and attract the broad masses, not only nationally, but also internationally, keeping in mind the ratification of the central importance of the working class, of the alliance with the peasantry, as well as work among women, intellectuals and youth.

In the work for the construction of the front it is important to



evaluate the role of the agreements with other organizations, with factors which struggle against the common enemy, imperialism, keeping in mind the independence of the class, the defense of its principles against political pragmatism, of internationalism against cosmopolitanism, of democratic centralism against democratism and liberalism, with their ideas on consensus as opposed to democratic centralism, of the principles of the party of the proletariat against other tendencies, defeating sectarianism; these are important elements to widen our influence at the international level.

The permanent public position of the ICMLPO, its solidity and the efforts of its members in demonstrating firmness in the ideological struggle, has led to the positioning of its concepts within the world revolutionary movement. This places us as one of the organizations with the greatest development and seriousness in the arena of the revolutionary struggles.

The Declaration of 24th plenary session published at the end of 2018, as well as the regional expressions, ratify the internationalist and anti-imperialist position: “the exacerbation of the intrinsic contradictions of the capitalist imperialist system are sharpening the general crisis of capitalism... it affects millions of the workers, the dependent countries, the oppressed peoples and nationalities.”

The confrontation between the dominant powers and their interference in dependent countries helps us see more clearly the common enemy, which is expressed through aggression and looting and which therefore ratifies “the validity of the struggle for the right of self-determination of the peoples as a current matter, and which is expressed in various continents and within various States; in the anti-colonial struggles and in opposition to neocolonial policies.”

In various regions of the world the fundamental contradictions are sharpening, and so is the ideological struggle at all levels. In Latin America there are various points and Venezuela is one of them. For that reason, it is important to analyze events and evaluate the situations that presently exist.

The Incidents on the Border and the Declaration of an Orange Alert by the Government of Venezuela

This is not the first time that the bourgeoisie is using a blockade and a push for war between oppressed countries as an excuse to stop the actions of a rebellious people which is advancing in a democrat-

ic process; with those threats they are trying to create the conditions for direct aggression.

They are trying to apply this old imperialist policy against the people of Venezuela, who have been resisting and struggling against imperialist aggression. We are living in a period of great danger as a result of the activation of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (TIAR) and the heightened tensions on the border with Colombia as steps preceding a military action.

Possibly the capitalists who control the US State Department are not in condition to provoke a direct military action against Venezuela with their own troops, because their economic situation is not the best; they have a trade war underway, problems on all the continents and a military confrontation in the Middle East which is on the rise.

So in order to not get directly involved in a new adventurist war, the US government utilizes its puppets and tries to evoke the nationalist sentiments of the right wing, religious fanaticism, as well as fascism, xenophobia and other concepts of a deep reactionary nature in order to provoke fights among the same peoples.

The inhabitants of the Colombian-Venezuelan border, who have been neglected by the State, which only remembers them when it needs to send troops in order to demonstrate to the mass media that it is taking actions against guerrillas, know that they have nothing to win by taking part in a war against their own brothers. That is why the peoples clearly reject the destabilizing actions that the reactionary government of Colombia, using the paramilitary, is trying to whip up in order to reach the point of a direct act of aggression.

The class struggle is not absent there, and is clearly expressed when peasants and the working class serve as the base for guerrillas, and in the anti-Yankee political as well as social sphere by the Bolivarian government. On the other hand, the land owners and the bourgeoisie promote paramilitarism and support the fascist government of Colombia.

In the middle of this economic boycott that is more severe and ruthless every day, of plundering by businesses and international consortiums, of a financial and trade blockade, of the threats of direct and indirect military aggression, of negotiations between factions of the bourgeoisie, our party has been consistent with the principles of Marxism-Leninism which were expressed in a timely manner by CI in its theses on the national and colonial problem, as

well as in other documents, it is deepening its policy of revolutionary mobilization together with the people.

Under these conditions we call upon the democratic, revolutionary forces and especially the Marxist-Leninists to express in a manner which leaves no doubt, their solidarity with the people of Venezuela who are resisting and struggling against imperialist aggression, which in the middle of a complicated situation is building the bases for the revolutionary struggle, which defines imperialism in all its forms as the main enemy. It is accumulating forces for a struggle which is more difficult every day.

The activation of the TIAR is an expression and step forward in the violent escalation at the regional and global level. Preparations are being made for acts of military aggression by a group of governments under the control of the United States against the people of Venezuela at first, but which will expand against Cuba, Bolivia, Nicaragua and also Colombia and Brazil and other peoples of the region, where the revolutionary forces are gaining strength and are preparing for the confrontation. For in the face of military action on the borders of Venezuela, the peoples of the neighboring countries will be affected and the revolutionaries of the region cannot close our eyes, which will take this conflagration to a wider area than the territory of Venezuela.

The activation of phase 2 of the defense protocols of the Bolivarian National Armed Forces (FANB), which has been expressed as an orange alert, and the mobilization of troops to the border with Colombia for military exercises, as well as the activation of the Bolivarian militias, means that a part of the Venezuelan government wants to maintain itself, as well as the support of the revolutionary peoples on both sides of the border.

These actions force revolutionaries to establish positions, to stop ambiguities and to take up without vacillations the program of the CI with respect to the struggles of the oppressed peoples and revolutionary national processes.

For the revolutionaries of the world, of Latin America and especially in Venezuela, Colombia, and Brazil, this is the time to join forces, to coordinate actions and create an important unity in action in order to together with the people, to defeat the ultra-reactionary paramilitary gangs, the fascists, the reformists and the initiatives of the international bourgeoisie in the region.

The situations which are approaching are all of great complexities. The popular masses and the revolutionary vanguard need to be prepared to confront them; imperialist aggression, the government's heterogeneity, the incorrect policies, the weakness of the popular movement as well as the lack of strength of the vanguard, determine the present reality. The task is to change it in order to take up the great challenges and defeat the class enemy through popular mobilization.

**Socialism Is Only Built With the Worker-Peasant Alliance
in Power and the People in Arms.**

Political Bureau of the PCMLV

September of 2019