

Proletarian

Organ of the International Communist Party

WHAT DISTINGUISHES OUR PARTY: The political continuity which goes from Marx and Engels to Lenin, to the foundation of the Communist International and the Communist Party of Italy; the class struggle of the Communist Left against the degeneration of the International, the struggle against the theory of "socialism in one country" and the Stalinist counter-revolution; the rejection of all popular fronts and national resistance blocs; the struggle against the principles and practice of bourgeois democracy, against interclassism and political and trade-union class collaboration, against any form of opportunism and nationalism; the difficult task of restoring the Marxist doctrine and the revolutionary organ par excellence - the class party - closely linked with the working class, and its daily struggle in opposition to capitalism and bourgeois oppression; the struggle against personal and electoral politics, against any form of indifferentism, of tailism, of movementism or the adventurist practice of "armed struggle"; the support of any proletarian struggle which breaks with social peace and rejects the discipline of interclassist collaborationism; the support of all efforts towards proletarian class reorganisation on the basis of economic associationism, with the perspective of a large scale resumption of the class struggle, proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary anticapitalist struggle.

Nr 19

**Autumn-2022
Supplement to the
"le prolétaire" Nr. 545**
£1/US \$1,5/CAD \$1,5/€1,5

Summary

- No to the Imperialist Mobilization Around the War in Ukraine!
- The Ukrainian Government at War with its Proletarians
- Bourgeois War and Propaganda of Horror
- Russian imperialism launches its troops to the territorial conquest in Ukraine
- Against the economic and social war against the male and female proletariat
- Kazakhstan: strikes and riots
- Nationalist Petty bourgeoisie Demonstration in Prague
- Strike on the Norwegian North Sea platforms
- War in Ukraine: "Mouvement Communiste-Kolektivni proti Kapitalu"
- Communist Program Resumes its Publication
- USA: Denial of Abortion Rights

Iran: from bread demonstrations to harsh protests after 22-year-old girl arrested, beaten and killed by religious police for not wearing her veil «according to the rules»

On September 13, Mahsa Amini, a 22-year-old Kurdish girl on vacation in Tehran with her family, was arrested in front of a metro station by the religious police (Gasht-e Ershad) for «improperly wearing the veil». Two hours after being taken to a detention center for a «re-education lesson», she was rushed to Karsa Hospital (in Tehran) in a coma and died there on September 16. Of course the police deny having tortured her, stating that the girl died of a «sudden heart attack»; but «photos of the girl in bed, with swollen black eyes and blood stains on her ears» leave no doubt about the brutal beatings she suffered (1).

(Continued on page 4)

Great Britain :

In spite of all the difficulties and obstacles - the brutality of the conservatives, the hostility of the Labour Party, the unions betrayal - the proletarians mobilize to defend their interests

THE CRADLE OF CAPITALISM HIT HARD BY THE GLOBAL CRISIS

The state of tension into which world capitalism has entered in recent years can be explained by its very nature. This economy of anarchy, of competition, of permanent confrontation, having reached a certain stage of evolution of all its contradictions and antagonisms, is dangerously cracking and finally bursting under all these pressures. The Covid crisis as well as the imperialist war in Ukraine have combined to plunge the already suffering capitalism into a crisis of the level of the years

1975, with as a background not the end of the years of expansion called the "thirty glorious" by the bourgeois economists, but the beginning of a much more gloomy period where the armed and imperialist war succeeds the exacerbated economic war of before, a difference which is not insignificant.

Great Britain, with its "pure and hard" liberal capitalism by secular tradition, was already suffering from the Brexit, which would have caused it to lose 3 or 4% of its annual GDP (1) has more than others received the full force of the effects of the crisis leading to a rise in

(Continued on page 2)

Amadeo Bordiga Socialism and the Defense of the Nation (Avanti!, December 21, 1914)

This article aroused very lively discussions among Italian socialists, mobilizing the militants of the party's left on its positions. Written before Italy entered the war, it denounces any support for war in the name of "defending the nation" against an aggressor: accepting this thesis as did Mussolini, a former figure on the left expelled from the Italian Socialist Party because of its position in favor of war, would mean the liquidation of all class action. This article by the young Bordiga (leader of the Socialist Youth) is fundamentally on the same positions of "revolutionary defeatism" defended by Lenin - although these were then unknown in Italy.

Among those nicely presented dogmatic formulations... that those who, fortunately for them and for society, for a long or short time are living outside our ranks, would like to fasten around our necks like a yoke, is that of the «defense of the nation».

This yoke has been accepted wi-

thout question by many of our people: it is so firm and consecrated that do well these Socialists who as people and as party, are in complete solidarity with the national bourgeoisie in defending their motherland when it is threatened

(Continued on page 22)

Great Britain :

In spite of all the difficulties and obstacles - the brutality of the conservatives, the hostility of the Labour Party, the unions betrayal - the proletarians mobilize to defend their interests

(Continuation from page 1)

all prices worthy of the greatest capitalist crises in history.

Already on April 1, 2022, "Bleak Friday", gas bills were increasing on average for proletarians by 708 pounds (approx. €800) over the year, a 50% increase. At the same quarterly date, housing taxes were rising by 3.5% and social security charges on salaries were rising by 1.5%. Phone operators also announced 10% increases in their rates. In addition to this, there were of course the first significant increases in food and hygiene products, as well as in electricity and fuel.

But that was just the beginning. The increase in gas prices will rise to 78% in October and will triple by the end of the year (2). From the same source it is even indicated a quadrupling of the price in spring 2023. To give an idea of the increase in food products, let's mention the 26% increase in milk, 21% in butter, 19% in flour and 16% in pasta. It is impossible for the proletarians to go down in product range to compensate for these increases, they are already at the bottom.

In March, the specialists of economic smoke and mirrors were talking about a cost of living increase of at least 7% this year. Today they have to admit that at least 13% would be more accurate. But an American bank, Citi, has predicted an 18% increase in the beginning of 2023. To cope with inflation, it explains that the Bank of England could raise its interest rate to 6 or 7%, whereas today, after having already been raised, it is at 1.75%. This would completely strangle the financial market and send all investors home. You have to go back to the years of the oil crisis to find such inflation. In the United Kingdom, in 1975, it had climbed to 25% (3), only to fall back to 16.9% the following year. The period of high inflation lasted until the early 1980s.

For millions of proletarians there is today only one alternative: to eat or to heat. Poverty has increased significantly. According to various sources, 17.1% of the population lives below the poverty line, i.e. 10.5 million people, or on another statistical basis 1 in 8 workers. UNICEF considers that 20% of this population is food insecure. For children specifically, 4 million of them are below

the poverty line and among them 30% are food insecure. Under the blows of an increasingly expensive life, the situation is only getting worse.

THE MOBILIZATION OF WORKERS IS CONTAINED IN THE "SYNCHRONIZED" STRIKES ORGANIZED BY THE UNIONS

To counter these violent attacks of capital against the very essence of their survival, the proletarians of Great Britain mobilized from the beginning of the year, but it is especially from July that strike movements began to spread. The axis of demand of the struggles is not debatable: it is the question of wage increases to face inflation. In an ideal situation where there was an experience of class struggle, this would have been a formidable basis for unifying and merging all the strikes into a single workers' bloc. This was by far not the case!

In August, the transport strikes began. Among the railway workers, following the failure of negotiations, there had already been strikes on 21, 23 and 25 June and on 27 July. The RMT and TSSA unions (4) organized the movement according to the tactic of "coordinated strikes" or "synchronized strikes". Following this method to break the strength and the impact of the struggles, the public transport went on strike on 18 and 20 August. 50'000 workers are involved in the movement. But the train drivers of the ASLEF union (5) will not be associated with the strike of RMT and TSSA. They will strike on July 30 and on August 13, 9 out of 13 railway companies will be affected. On August 19, the London Underground will strike, and bus drivers will also be on strike.

On August 3, a spontaneous strike (which the English bourgeoisie call a "wildcat strike") broke out at Amazon in Tilbury. The management was proposing a 3% wage increase, while inflation was already at 9.4% in June. The wage proposed by Amazon was 11.45 pounds per hour, while the workers demanded 15 pounds. Work stoppages will also take place at Amazon's Coventry and Bristol sites.

On 21 August, a "synchronized" strike by the Felixstone dockers began for 8 days (1900 strikers out of 2500 employees). Here too the demands were for

higher wages. In Liverpool the dockers have also voted for a strike, but the "synchronized" dates are not yet known at the time of writing (6).

The workers of BT (British Telecom) also went on strike, always in the same form imposed by the trade union leaderships, in this case that of the CWU (7). It will be split throughout the summer, on 29 July, 1 August and other strike days are planned for 30 and 31 August. 40'000 workers are affected by the strike.

97% of the 100'000 postal workers of the Royal Mail voted in favor of the strike. Their movement will also have to be split over 3 days, on August 26, 27 and 30. This is also the work of the CWU union.

There are other sectors that go on strike: in the refineries and power plants, but, it seems, in a more spontaneous way.

Finally, the public service sectors will begin to mobilize: teachers, firefighters, health care workers, garbage collectors, airport workers, and also workers in the industrial sector. But the weight of the official unions is such that their strikes will not escape their "synchronized" and locked organization.

THE SERVILE ROLE OF THE UNIONS

What is striking about all these strikes is their total dispersion in organization and in timing, their watertight compartmentalization from one another, whereas very theoretically the powerful British unions would have the capacity to mobilize everyone in a single movement. But that would be asking them to be something they are absolutely not, and it would be a fatal mistake even to think about it. Yet, but that's another subject, some of the so-called far-left is courting certain unions like the RMT.

In fact, the unions are fulfilling their role of guarantor of social peace and public order in a historical moment when everything could go wrong socially and the bourgeoisie might be faced with a free class adversary, independent of the bureaucratic constraints of the unions, which would not let itself be fooled and would use its own class weapons. Their strategy is to chop up the strikes by controlling their organization, their objectives, by undermining any will of the proletarians to fight directly with their

bosses and thus to do the least possible harm to the interests of the national economy, to the political authorities of the country and to the dominant classes comfortably seated on their personal fortune. This strategy of splitting and dividing is skilfully combined with legal constraints and limitations to the organization of strikes. The trade union policy of social control is largely facilitated by the legal arsenal of the state, which imposes an infernal race of procedural obstacles to validate a strike and which, despite the possible cries of orfraying of certain trade union bureaucrats, in reality receives the perfect consent of their apparatus. The legal codification of strikes gives the framework, the tools and the political justification to the trade union leaderships of their anti-worker methods, it strengthens their bureaucratic apparatus.

These procedures have a history that goes back to the great miners' strikes of 1984-1985, which were crushed by the brutal state repression led by the ruthless Margaret Thatcher. After crushing the strikes, the British government imposed a series of laws and legal barriers to prevent proletarians from organizing strikes in the future in both private and public enterprises. The effect of all these restrictions was to strengthen the power of trade union control over the working class. From now on, proletarians cannot so easily escape the unions' control over the direction of their struggles or over the classist organization of solidarity. The union apparatus and its legal specialists appear as the unavoidable means to overcome the procedural pitfalls to make a strike legal. And if there is a union representative who is not comfortable with these laws, he knows that the sword of legal sanctions will fall on his head if he does not follow them to the letter, so he will settle down and eventually get used to them...

What does this legal arsenal consist of?

- To legally call a strike in a company, the proletarians must organize a vote of all their members in the union and obtain at least 40% of favorable votes. This procedure is obviously a brake on the spontaneity and independence of the organization of struggles and starts by devouring useless energy and time, weeks for the big companies. So much time saved for the bosses to organize their response, especially by dividing and demoralizing the workers, by introducing in their ranks the hesitation to undermine their determination.

- Obtaining a majority of members in favor of strike action is necessary, but not sufficient. A minimum quorum of voters must be obtained : a minimum

vote of 50% is required.

- Solidarity strikes by a category of proletarians other than the strikers or other companies in the same sector are simply forbidden.

- The law authorizes the intervention of scabs (temporary workers or those subject to the sordid "zero contract" (8)) to replace the strikers and obviously forbids the pickets, on pain of sanctions, to oppose their entry into the company (in practice, the police are always present to ensure this access and to avoid any contact of the scabs with the strikers who could convince them to turn back).

All these anti-labour laws obviously also bear the signature of the Labour Party. It was only too happy with the protection they afforded it when it was at the helm of the state.

In this year's strike movement, the unions have a total control over the decision to initiate, direct and lead the strikes. They organize them like slicing a sausage and then scattering the slices on the table. This method of dispersion under the pretext of "synchronization" and "coordination" forbids the proletarians any continuity in the action and blocks any convergence and unity of their struggles between them.

The bourgeoisie and the bosses in particular cannot fail to think that the brutal attacks on the living conditions of the working class will not make it react. They are ready to fight and their first measure in this war between classes is to weaken the proletarians by confining their struggles in the trade-union strategies of division, limitation and splitting of the duration of the strikes and of course of respect of the laws and regulations restricting under penalty of judicial sanction all possible enlargements and extensions. Employers and unions are thus intimately associated to break any classist movement of proletarians.

The RMT even congratulates itself for having brilliantly and efficiently organized the so-called "synchronized" strikes (9). But what synchronization are we talking about? The word "synchronization" cleverly hides what is only dispersion and isolation. They don't "syn-

chronize" to make the struggles between different categories of workers a **compact block**, acting simultaneously in the same time of the calendar, but to prevent the workers from uniting in a **united and solidary front**.

The RMT (and its sister unions) also has a bourgeois political objective: to help obstruct the Conservative government in its prerogatives once the Prime Minister is known. Mick Lynch, the general secretary, said: *"If we can get the companies to negotiate freely without being bound by the government, we can negotiate [necessarily on the cheap, ed.] a settlement in this dispute and get the railways running at full speed again ».* (10) The RMT, which is doing everything it can not to unify the strikes, is also calling through Lynch for a general strike (sic!) if Liz Truss - the Conservative candidate to replace Boris Johnson and who has already promised blood, tears and sweat to the proletarians - is elected at the beginning of September as head of the government. This is a show of self-serving and mostly ridiculousness, but it reveals that the unions also want to set conditions on their commitment to ensuring social peace by keeping the workers' struggle within the limits permissible for capitalism and its agents of all kinds. "Don't make it difficult for us!" they seem to be saying to the radicals of the conservative party.

The situation of general and deep degradation of the living conditions of the working class has today a common cause for all workers and in all countries, regardless of their nationality, their sex, their age, their color, their trade, etc. inflation. History gives the working class a tremendous opportunity to unify its demands on a single basis, that of the wage struggle and purchasing power. Rarely has the context been so favorable for it to orient and organize its immediate struggle in a single front against its unique enemy, capitalism. The bourgeoisie, the opportunism and political reformism, the class collaborationist unions know it well and are all acting, each one on its own ground and with its

(Continued on page 4)



Great Britain ...

(Continuation from page 3)

own responsibilities, keeping some appearances of disagreement, to avoid this nightmarish risk of the revival of the class struggle.

THE LABOUR PARTY AGAINST THE STRIKES

It is no longer a scoop that the Labour Party, faced with the apparent cracks in the Conservative Party, is preparing to re-govern the country one day. They already announce the color to the working class: their "reformism" will be muscular and intolerant to any hint of struggle of the proletarians.

Keir Starmer, the party's new leader since March 2022 after Jeremy Corbyn, is very clear about this. As soon as he took office as Labour leader, he forbade responsible members of his party, whether MPs or shadow ministers (11), to show up at picket lines and declared that he would punish any indiscipline in this regard, which he did. Starmer, who wants to show his "responsibility" towards the social order and the national economy, is clearly anti-strike and makes this known to the bourgeoisie, to his party members and to the proletarians. We now know how he wants to implement his wishes as the new Labour leader: *"It is an honour,"* he said on his appointment, *"and a privilege to be elected leader of the Labour Party. I will lead this great party into a new era, with confidence and hope, so that when the time comes we can serve our country in government."* The era he is calling for will not be a rosy one for the proles!

In the "Guardian" one can read an article of 2.08.2022 by John McTernan, ex-director of political affairs of Tony Blair, addressing Labour. An edifying article indeed: *"Strikes are conflicts between workers and management, and they are resolved between them. (...) When the party was founded, it was as an avowedly parliamentary party to deliver the movement's broader aims – it was created to legislate, not to cheerlead from the sidelines of industrial dispute (...) To be an alternative government-in-waiting, you have to show that you will govern for the nation, not for the fraction."* (12)

Such is the subservience of the Labour Party that Labour's elected representatives in Coventry contracted agency workers to break the strike of the 70 garbage collectors fighting for pay rises in March 2022.

Only the Trotskyites in Britain can

think of turning Labour into a spearhead of revolution!

FINDING THE WAY BACK TO THE CLASS STRUGGLE

What is happening in Britain is yet another demonstration of how the bourgeois-democratic state distributes functions and roles among the various bourgeois political forces and trade unions, in order to contain the proletariat's reactions of struggle against the capitalist attacks on its living conditions.

It is with this objective that the unions plan, organize and practice totally atomized forms of strikes by dividing the struggles into as many possible particles that repel each other. When they call for a strike: beware! It is only with the aim of using it as a lever to open negotiations company by company and to quickly extinguish the backfire that

they have contributed to light.

The proletarians must not let themselves be trapped in this infernal game of dupe, where their will and determination to fight are reduced to nothing by the combined action of the bosses-parliamentarians-union bosses.

The road to independent class struggle may seem long, but it is the only road that will lead the proletarians to victory in their struggle against the bourgeoisie, its state and its unions and social lackeys.

**- Down With the Simulacrum of
"Synchronized" Strikes!**

**- For Strike Without Prior Notice
or Limitation of Duration!**

**- For Unity, Workers' Solidarity,
Extension of Struggles and Solidarity
Strikes!**

**- For the Independent Organization
of Proletarians!**

Iran :

From bread demonstrations to harsh protests after 22-year-old girl arrested, beaten and killed by religious police for not wearing her veil «according to the rules»

(Continuation from page 1)

Her death triggered protests in all major Iranian cities, resulting in over 50 deaths and thousands of arrests. The movement started in Kurdistan: Saqqez (the city of Mahsa's family), Sanandadj (the capital of the Kurdish region), Baneh and Marivan. On Saturday 17, already during the funeral in Saqqez, the protests started with a group of Kurdish women removing their veils, and then continued in Sanandadj where the riot police intervened with tear gas, water cannons and rifles loaded with rubber bullets, injuring more than thirty. On Sunday 18, the protests spread to Tehran University, then to Shiraz, Mashhad, Qazvin, Garmsar, Rasht, Bukan, Karadj, West Azerbaijan, many stores remained closed.

Iran is going through a period of great economic hardship and, as always in such cases, the government is reinforcing social control and therefore repression which, given the sectarian regime established by the so-called «Islamic revolution» of 1978, imposes the most odious religious rules.

Already from November 2019 to January 2020, protests had broken out in all

major cities due to the increase in fuel prices from 50% to 200%, and therefore of basic necessities; they began as peaceful protests and quickly turned into revolts against the government, which, after blocking Internet access throughout the country, responded by firing on demonstrators from rooftops, from helicopters and at point-blank range with machine guns (2), killing, according to CNN and NBC, 1,500 people. Despite the carnage, the protests have not stopped, far from it. Again according to CNN and NBC, the violent reactions of the protesters led to the destruction of 731 branches of government banks, including the Central Bank of Iran, nine Islamic religious centers and statues of Supreme Leader Ali Khomeini, as well as the attack on no less than 50 government military bases (3).

For 43 years now, the bourgeois/Islamic regime has ruled Iran; after the fall of Shah Reza Pahlavi, the government has from the beginning sought a compromise between a capitalist mode of production that was pushing internationally for rapid development in Iran as well, and a social formation rooted in the feudal and confessional tradition. But this compromise is unraveling, because of its

**- Down With the Anti-strike Laws!
Only the Class Struggle Will Break
the Stranglehold of these Laws**

August, 29th 2022

(1) See *Le Temps*, 4/01/2022

(2) www.francetvinfo.fr

(3) www.economicshelp.org

(4) RMT (National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport) is the public transport union. Its general secretary is Mick Lynch. TSSA (Transport Salaried Staffs' Association) is a transport and travel industry union. Its general secretary is Manuel Cortes.

(5) ASLEF (Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen). Union of train drivers and public transport. Mike Whelan is the General Secretary.

(6) Note that the German ports of Hamburg, Bremerhaven and Wilhelm-

shaven also went on strike in August

(7) CWU (Communication Workers Union) is the union for communication workers. Dave Ward is the General Secretary

(8) "Zero hours" contracts are the ultimate in labor flexibility. They were developed at the beginning of the 1980s, in a period of deep capitalist crisis, in order to pressurize proletarians to the maximum imaginable extent by reducing them to the status of disposable worker or worker-kleenex. They mean that the bosses do not guarantee any working time. On the other hand, the worker has to remain permanently at their disposal. In Great Britain, this contract is also used against the unemployed. Since 2004, the unemployed are obliged to accept this type of contract or their benefits will be suspended. In many cases, the parties quickly terminate these contracts, as they are only interested in

the £1,500 bonus paid by the unemployment fund (Job Center) for hiring a long-term unemployed person.

(9) In this article we refer to "synchronized" strikes to use the terminology of RMT. This type of strike is similar to that of the railway workers in France in the spring of 2018, which was called "dotted strike" or "intermittent strike". The demoralizing effect of this type of strike is therefore no longer to be demonstrated.

(10) <https://ukdaily.news>

(11) A "shadow minister" belongs to the very official "Shadow Cabinet" of the parliamentary opposition, whose "shadow" ministries are a mirror image of those of the government in power in the Kingdom. Each opposition "shadow minister" is responsible for following the policies and files of his or her counterpart in power.

(12) www.theguardian.com

relative international isolation, and because the development of national capitalism has led to the formation of large proletarian masses and the development of trade, both internal and international, which capital, by its very nature, absolutely needs. The ideological, bureaucratic and police pressure with which first Khomeini's regime and then Khamenei's regime have always tried and still try to imprison the objective pushes of the Iranian society to overcome the confessional formalisms thanks to which the double oppression of women is perpetuated - which also exists in the midst of capitalism - are weapons of bourgeois power to develop national capitalism, and to impose a very tight social control aiming above all at intimidating the proletarian masses whose class revolt every bourgeois regime fears.

The oppression of women, in general, is part of that specific social control with which the bourgeois regime tends to channel against woman - raised as an emblem of intrinsic evil, of the corruption of flesh and spirit - the tensions which are in fact rather provoked by bourgeois society, by its mode of production based on the antagonism between the dominant class and the proletarian class, subjected to the systematic exploitation of its labor power for the exclusive benefit of the privileges of the bourgeoisie, no matter if it is represented by little men in suit and tie or in black cassock.

Religious extremism, in this case Islamic, forces women to cover themselves from head to toe and to submit to particularly humiliating behaviors, relegating them to the role of slaves within four walls. While allowing women to leave

the house, to accompany their children to school or to attend school, they are still considered the private property of their father, husband, brother, in short of the man of the family and, by a logical transmission of the «parental authority», as the private property of the confessional State, which does not limit itself to legislate but also represses any behavior considered as «indecent», «provocative», «incorrect».



The demonstrations of this past week have seen many women mobilized, bravely facing the police, the clashes, the bullets; but it is a courage that really needs to find solidarity with the proletarian masses, men and women, because only their social strength can face and stop the harsh repression exercised by the government. The current confron-

tation seems to be that of the central power against women who do not respect the existing laws and rules; and there is no doubt that a large part of Iranian men think according to the Islamic precept, believing that the «honor» and «dignity» of the family must be safeguarded according to the existing tradition and confessional rules. But respecting and bowing down to this tradition and rules means simply playing the role of silent slaves condemned to live and die as slaves; it means suffering without reacting to every anguish, every vexation, every abuse of the established power. In essence, for the working class, for the class of producers of the wealth of a country from which they only enjoy the crumbs that the bourgeois power decides to distribute, it means to work and die to let live in privilege, wealth and luxury that minority of bourgeois who are masters of everything, even of the life of every human being.

Mahsa Amini has paid for all the other women who want to get rid of restrictions whose only purpose is to maintain an ancient social oppression that also suits modern capitalist society very well. As has happened and continues to happen in every country in the world, even in the most democratic and liberal ones, the police forces are charged with repressing behavior that, in their «unquestionable» judgment seem suspicious or not respectful of the law - the America of George Floyd suffocated helplessly on the ground by the policemen on duty, the butchery in Genoa in 2001 during the demonstrations against the G8 at the Diaz school and at the Bol-

(Continued on page 6)

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

No to the Imperialist Mobilization Around the War in Ukraine!

The invasion of Ukraine by the Russian army and the emotion it has aroused among people is used by the governments and the media of the Western countries to carry out a large-scale propaganda campaign; under the pretext of “solidarity with the Ukrainian people” fighting for their “freedom” it is in reality a pro-imperialist war-mongering campaign in support of the Western imperialisms against Russian imperialism

The media present the Russian invasion as an initiative triggered by Putin alone (whose mental health is also in question); but a large-scale military intervention, involving not far from 200,000 troops and imposing equipment, and with the certainty of exposure to sanctions and negative economic effects, cannot be taken by a single man or a handful of leaders: it can only be the work of powerful economic, social

and political forces, of which Putin is only the instrument at a given moment.

This military attack is furthermore taking place in a situation where the most serious economic crisis of world capitalism in decades has inevitably exacerbated all the inter-imperialist tensions and all the internal and international contradictions of the bourgeois established order. In particular Ukraine, a zone of rivalry between Western and Russian imperialism was the scene since 2014 of a so-called “low-intensity” war pitting the Ukrainian army against the Russian-backed separatists of Donbass, which is said to have resulted in more than 20,000 deaths and the departure of more than one million people. The Ukrainian army is supported by the United States which, according to official American statements, has given it more than a billion dollars in aid over the past year; this aid has accelerated since De-

cember to enable it to “wage a hybrid war against Russia” (1).

The European and American states were outraged by the Russian state’s recourse to war – “politics of another age”; but since the end of the last world war these same states have not ceased to start wars or to participate in them in anywhere in the world: the “peace” that followed 1945 was marked by an endless series of murderous conflicts. It is true, however, that these conflicts took place far from the “democratic” and “peaceful” imperialist metropolises that were often the instigators and beneficiaries of them – and their victims could quietly be turned back at the European borders as suspect migrants...

In reality, if Russia is the invader, it is **the whole world capitalist system** which is responsible for the outbreak of military conflicts as a consequence of the ever more acute clashes of interests

Iran ...

(Continuation from page 5)

zaneto barracks, and all the Regeni tortured and killed like dogs in Egypt because they disturbed the established order, etc. (4), are there to demonstrate it. Their task is to defend first of all the bourgeois power, and therefore the established order, and, from time to time, as they cannot be present in every corner of the country, they take it upon themselves to hit one or another to «set an example» so that the masses know what awaits them if they step out of line.

Bourgeois power can change its method of social management if the mass mobilizations - as was the case in the famous «Arab springs» - are so massive that they endanger its hold; but it will not change until it experiences all the forms of repression at its disposal, even the bloodiest ones; and in any case, it will always tend to throw out of the throne the figure that no longer has the charisma of yesteryear and replace him with other representatives, perhaps even democratically elected, so as to carry out a changing of the guard, in order to keep the political, economic and social power. The Egypt of Mubarak first, and then of Al Sisi, is a demonstration of this.

We are heading towards a period

where economic difficulties will increase more and more, especially for the great proletarian mass, and this means that social tensions will increase because the wages will not be enough to ensure lunch and dinner, because unemployment will throw more and more proletarians into misery, because social repression will inevitably increase and then its pretext will no longer be the veil worn in an «un-seemly» way, but the strike, the struggle that puts the country’s economy in difficulty; then the proletarians, men and women, will be accused of sabotaging the «fatherland», of being the workforce in the pay of foreign enemy countries. ... The struggle will then take on the aspect of a confrontation between the classes and the bourgeoisie will finally show its true interest and its true face: to preserve the power by all means, by suffocating and repressing the great majority of the population.

It is in this perspective that the Iranian proletarians, who today are certainly expressing the greatest anger in the face of such a sinister assassination of Mahsa Amini, must prepare their struggle for the defense of their exclusive class interests, outside of any democratic illusion and any opportunist compromise. The road will be long and difficult, but it is the only one to achieve the resurrection of the class struggle!

25 September 2022

Notes:

(1) See www.tempi.it/iran-in-piazza-generazione-regime/; www.repubblica.it/esteri/2022/09/16/news/iran_girl_dead_from_the_police_fight-365995416/; www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/2022/09/23/iran-dalle-proteste-per-pane-e-liberta-alla-rabbia-dilagante-per-mahsa-amini-lostilita-contro-il-regime-degli-oppressi/6814271/; www.agenzianova.com/news/iran-proteste-studentesche-per-la-morte-di-mahsa-amini-uccisa-perche-indossava-male-il-velo

(2) See *Amnesty says at least 208 killed in Iran protests, sur aljazeera.com*; *Iran protests deaths, in The New York Times*, 1st December 2019; *U.S. says Iran may have killed up to 1,000 protesters*, on *NBC News*.

(3) See *Proteste in Iran del 2019-2020*, wikipedia.

(4) We are referring to the demonstrations against the G8 meeting in Genoa in 2001, where a demonstrator, Carlo Giuliani, was shot by the police, who the day after this murder invaded the Diaz school, to beat up all the demonstrators who were sleeping there, and also where the Bolzaneto barracks was used to imprison and torture the demonstrators; and on the other hand to the death in 2016 in Cairo of Giulio Regeni, a simple student, who was arrested by the police and died under the torture of the henchmen of the regime.

— *Imperialist War in Ukraine* —

which it provokes, and not a particular “war monger” which it would be enough to bring to reason or to put out of action. It is capitalism that must be fought!

Campaigns in support of the Ukrainian people are used to justify not only economic sanctions against Russia, but also military measures; thus, after the great pacifist demonstrations in Germany, the German government announced a historic increase in its military budget and the European Union, where its voice is predominant, decided, for the first time in its existence, to supply arms to a belligerent country. While this last decision is partly symbolic, various European states (including traditionally neutral states like Finland) have announced arms deliveries. The United States is of course not to be outdone: a veritable “air bridge” has been set up to Poland with NATO resources to supply the Ukrainian army with U.S. weapons, while soldiers from NATO countries have been sent to countries close to the conflict, such as Romania.

As for the economic sanctions, which are of “unprecedented” importance, they are part of a logic of economic warfare (2)—even if they carefully avoid anything that might jeopardize the supply of Russian gas and other raw materials to European states. These sanctions, which aim to “suffocate the Russian economy”, could lead, with the cost of the war, to a fall of 7 to 8% of the country’s GDP in 2022, or even more (3). This real collapse will inevitably have harsh repercussions on the population and especially on the proletarians, who are always the first victims of crises and wars.

As far as other countries and the world economy are concerned, the shock of the war in Ukraine is likely to scupper the economic recovery: the soaring prices of gas, oil and other raw materials (including wheat) are as many blows for an international economy which was more and more shaky; already are multiplying the appeals to the proletarians to accept “unavoidable” sacrifices: from this point of view, the war in Ukraine is a war against the proletarians of the whole world!

The proletarians must not let themselves be taken in the trap of a so-called

“humanitarian solidarity” which only serves the imperialist aims; they do not have to take sides with one or the other camp in conflict which are both its adversaries. Their solidarity must be reserved for the proletarians of all nationalities, exploited, oppressed and bombed by the bourgeoisies and their states in conflict.

The war in Ukraine is a warning of what capitalism has in store for the proletarians of countries still at « peace ».

In order to fight against the war in act or in preparation, they must not have any confidence in the hypocritical “good will” of the rulers whose sanctions are already acts of war, nor must they follow the illusory way of bourgeois pacifism; they must return to the classical principles of **revolutionary defeatism** and **proletarian internationalism**:

No to the defense of bourgeois countries and states! No to national union and nationalism!

Union of proletarians over borders and war fronts! Resume the independ-

ent class struggle against capitalism in all countries!

Reconstitution of the revolutionary communist, internationalist and international party to lead the proletarian struggle towards the world revolution!

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

March, 8th 2022

(1) « As war loomed, U.S. armed Ukraine to hit Russian aircraft, tanks and prep for urban combat, declassified shipment list shows », *Washington Post*, 3/4/2022

(2) The French Minister of the Economy, Mr. Le Maire, spoke of a “total economic and financial war”; although he has publicly retracted these remarks, they nevertheless express the bellicose state of mind of French and European political leaders.

(3) The American bank JP Morgan even anticipates a fall of 20% (at an annual rate) in the second quarter of this year!

The Ukrainian Government at War with its Proletarians

On 23 August, the Ukrainian president ratified the so-called Labour Law 5371, which applies to workers in companies with fewer than 250 employees, representing almost 70% of Ukrainian workers.

This law drastically reduces the rights and protections of workers that existed in the Labour Code: bosses can arbitrarily suspend collective agreements, extend the working week to 60 hours, cut holidays, dismiss workers during sick leave or vacation, force them to do work not specified in the contract, dismiss them almost arbitrarily, etc. Weekends can be reduced to one day. British-style ‘zero-hours contracts’ have been introduced. Women could be assigned strenuous and dangerous work, work in mines, etc. that the Labour Code did not allow. Proletarians dismissed “because of the war” would receive little money and would have to appeal to the “aggressor state” for compensation!

The only “reciprocation” consists in the fact that the workers can give immediate notice (and find themselves on the street without compensation!) - unless, of course, they are employed on compulsory defence-related work...

Back in March, the government sus-

pending a number of Labour Code provisions for all enterprises during martial law and banned strikes. The present law corresponds to a pre-war draft drawn up under the influence of British imperialism (1). The mobilisation of the workers made its adoption in 2020 unfeasible.

However, the Ukrainian bourgeoisie is now using the war to launch unprecedented attacks against its proletarians (one expert speaks of a “return to the 19th century”)! It can rely on the sycophancy of the trade unions; according to a British NGO whose report we quoted from, “a trade union spokesman, who refused to criticise the bill for fear of reprisals, explained that in times of war the unions should not oppose the changes”. These scoundrels serve their masters well...

This is what “national patriotic unity” means for proletarians: serving as cannon fodder at the front or dying at work in the enterprises just for the profit of the capitalists!

September 5, 2022

(1) <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/odr/uk-sp-onsors-deregulation-of-labour-rights-in-ukraine/>

Our Internet Site:
www.pcint.org
Our e-mail address :
proletarian@pcint.org
To find our publications:
See informations on our website

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

Bourgeois War and Propaganda of Horror

For the bourgeoisie the propaganda of horror is a weapon of war.

All belligerents use this weapon for their own purposes. The most important purpose of documenting with real or specially fabricated images is to justify the war against the enemy; the population is called upon to gather in the great and miraculous national unity in order to increase the force of impact, or resistance, of military operations. Since the Second World War, the wars waged by the ruling classes for the sharing of markets and the world have increasingly involved the civilian populations of the countries where the military confrontations take place. Of course, by hitting the civilian population of the “enemy” countries, the fighting spirit of their troops is undermined; they are weakened, disoriented, demoralized, pushed to surrender. The more the “enemy” resists, the more its civilian population is hit, massacred, forced to flee their homes. The military operations of the bourgeois ruling classes do not respond to any morality: they are prepared, organized, conducted with the sole aim of bending the enemy to their immediate and future interests, interests which are not only military, but political, economic and domination interests; the human lives massacred are simply necessary damages, often hypocritically passed off as... “collateral”.

In spite of illusory international conventions prescribing that certain weapons should not be used or that unarmed civilians should not be attacked, all means are, in any case, used. Pity disappears; it is an episodic feeling linked to the embarrassment of some soldiers who individually cannot bear the horror in which they participate. The atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the gases, the phosphorus bombs, the cluster bombs, the explosive objects disguised as everyday objects, the anti-personnel mines, the bacteriological bombs and the thousand other inventions that modern technology allows to kill, massacre, annihilate the enemies, demonstrate that bourgeois society, while chattering about democracy, national cohesion, shared values and above all the search for peace, is nothing but a permanent horror. The bourgeois media take it for granted that war brings destruction, death and horror, but they are surprised when these horrors occur even in times of peace.

In fact, capitalist society, by accu-

mulating and multiplying social violence, inequalities, intensive exploitation of wage labor and natural resources, by developing unbridled competition between capitalists and between states, only systematizes the horror on which it has developed and thanks to which it keeps itself alive. What are the systematic accidents and deaths in the workplace? What are the injuries and deaths in continuous disasters caused by landslides, floods, fires, air, sea, rail and road disasters and earthquakes? What are the daily violence and murders, especially against women or for racist reasons, or against defenseless groups of people who serve as targets for acts of revenge, in schools, hospitals, in the street? What are they if not the proof that the current bourgeois society is the society of horrors, the society of disasters, the society of death and atrocities?

The most modern means of communication, thanks to advanced technologies, can now bring into every home, via television and cell phones, scenes and films of destruction, repression, death and wounded, sometimes tortured; in this way horror becomes an everyday thing, arousing morbid curiosity and, at the same time, fear. In the hands of large industrial and financial companies, the means of communication are obviously at the service of their interests. If on the one hand the atrocities committed by the “enemy” are shown and described in detail, the atrocities committed by the other side are hidden or falsified. In both cases, the belligerents use the horror in the same way to induce feelings of solidarity and revenge on both sides and to justify the mutual massacres. It is obvious that war operations conducted by the most powerful and best organized armies cause more destruction, more deaths, and more atrocities, depending on the aims of the war, the course of the war, the resistance and the counter-attacks of the “enemy”. Without going back to the Second World War, it is enough to look at the wars in Iraq, Libya, Syria or Yugoslavia to realize that the horrors of war are only the continuation, by military means, of the bourgeois and imperialist policy carried out previously.

The question is: what interests does the policy implemented by the bourgeois ruling class in peacetime serve? They are exactly the same as in wartime, except that the repressive and coercive means used to maintain the capitalist

order are much more concentrated and destructive, qualitatively and quantitatively, in space and in time, than they are in peacetime. The bourgeois class does not modify its nature as a ruling class by passing from peace to war, or vice versa: what it modifies are precisely the military means on a more or less large scale, more or less destructive, more or less local, more or less global. We must not forget that capitalism has always developed through wars, which are nothing more than the historical moment of a major crisis of bourgeois society. The very development of the capitalist economy leads - when economic and financial crises can no longer be overcome by economic, financial and social compensation mechanisms - to the war crisis. The conflicts of interest between companies, monopolies and states, which have reached the limit of the tension caused by the crisis of overproduction, objectively demand to be overcome by an ever greater destruction of productive forces. Imperialist war is then the only “solution” available to the bourgeois ruling classes. This is why war is **inevitable** in capitalist society; it is bourgeois politics itself - the politics of domination, the politics of conquering ever larger markets at the expense of other competitors - that leads the ruling classes, increasingly in opposition to each other, to extend their economic politics into the politics of war. The “liberation” of territories and countries, always evoked by one or other of the belligerent camps, is in reality the liberation of markets: the markets are “liberated” from a competition momentarily annihilated by the war to make room for the victors; a competition that never disappears, because it is an integral part of capitalism; by renewing itself, it only reconstitutes the factors of tension and contrast that will again lead to war.

When the tension in international relations reaches levels that can no longer be controlled, no matter how well each bourgeois ruling class is prepared for war - as demonstrated by the arms race and its continuous modernization - the bourgeoisie is unable to predict how long the war will last (lightning wars have always been a pure illusion), nor how many resources it will have to deploy to win, nor how long it will be able to count on the “national cohesion” of its population, nor what the consequences of internal social tensions and defeats in the different battles will be,

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

nor if the allies of the first hour will be the same throughout the war. Just as the capitalist mode of production is not controllable by the bourgeoisie - in fact it is only its representative, and it is on it that it has erected its political power, having inherited private property and the organization of the state from older societies - so neither the market, nor capital, nor the development of the productive forces, nor war, nor peace are controllable.

The bourgeoisie, from being a revolutionary class, that is to say, the bearer of the development of the productive forces within the framework of the old feudal society, has inevitably become over time a reactionary class, that is to say, a class that maintains its political power by force while it can no longer develop those productive forces that the capitalist mode of production has generated and which, precisely because of its intrinsic contradictions, must necessarily be destroyed to make way for new cycles of production. The law of value, if on the one hand it has meant a powerful impulse to capitalist development, constitutes on the other hand, at the same time, a powerful brake on the development of the productive forces; capital consumes itself in order to survive, it feeds on human labor, thanks to which it accumulates and valorizes itself, exclusively to survive as capital. To the contradictions intrinsic to the capitalist mode of production are added those inherent to the national state, that is to say, to the centralized organism which was created - in addition to its social functions - to try to overcome the economic contradictions arising from production by enterprises and their competition on the market, but which in reality plays the role of the greatest defender of the most powerful capitalist centers that monopolize the national market, and therefore that of the greatest defender of national capitalism. The war of competition between capitals is transformed, at a certain point in the development of capitalism, into a war between states, into an open war.

The bourgeois policy which supports and defends, politically, diplomatically and economically, the interests of national capitalism against the interests of all other existing national capitalisms, extends its activity - in the struggle of international competition - to the level of military confrontation. The state, therefore, from being the greatest defender of national interests becomes the greatest aggressor of the interests of other bourgeoisies. War, that is, the use

of military means to assert its national interests, has the task of "solving" the inter-capitalist, and therefore inter-imperialist, conflicts that political pressures and agreements no longer manage to "solve", that the tactics of threats, sanctions, embargoes no longer manage to "solve". Consequently, war, in addition to the task of destroying enormous quantities of unsold goods and enormous quantities of productive forces unused because of crises of overproduction, is also the means by which the most powerful states dominate the weakest, sharing the world - and therefore the markets - between the victors.

To wage war, the bourgeoisie needs to mobilize the whole country, especially the productive forces, that is, capital and wage earners; it needs to unite all the social classes into a single army. This "national union" does not form spontaneously, it is not automatic. The bourgeoisie must prepare it, build it and maintain it in the long term because it must attenuate the existing social contrasts which, with the economic crises, and with the war crisis in particular, tend to worsen. In order to achieve this "national union", which is indispensable for its survival as a ruling class, the bourgeoisie uses all possible means: legal and illegal, licit and illicit, moral and amoral, peaceful, repressive, terrorist. To send masses of proletarians and soldiers to the slaughterhouse, it is not enough to force them - which it does, of course - but it is also necessary to convince them of the "rightness" of the war, a war always presented, by any bourgeoisie, as "defensive". And one of the means of conviction used by the bourgeoisie on both fronts is precisely the propaganda on the necessity of arming oneself to defend the fatherland, the sacred borders, civilization, one's traditions, one's way of life; a propaganda that exalts every phenomenon, every situation, every fact, every event susceptible of arousing the strongest emotions so that the members of this "national" army are ready to sacrifice their lives in favor of the fatherland, the sacred borders, civilization, etc. etc. Horror propaganda is an integral part of war propaganda; the more destructive war becomes, the more war actions affect the civilian population, and the more necessary horror propaganda becomes for the bourgeoisie. And the killings, the tortures, the massacres actually perpetrated or purposely constructed, serve both to bend and demoralize the troops and the population that have suffered them, and thus to increase the victims'

sense of revenge; they become a fuel of war themselves.

Just as the bourgeoisie mourns the deaths of the disasters caused by systematic negligence applied to reduce costs, speed up production, gain on the price of materials and earn extra profits, so the bourgeoisie, after having killed and massacred, mourns the deaths of its wars, celebrates the victims, institutes "days of remembrance," "revives" the dead it has caused to reiterate the horror of their deaths in order to solicit pain and the memory of pain. All this to justify and market its capitalist society as a society that "asks for forgiveness" for not having been able to avoid these deaths and pains and that "promises" to do everything - thanks to the moral and political values inscribed in its constitutions - so that these horrors "never happen again"; a society which, on the one hand, starves billions of human beings and, on the other hand, feeds a part of them; which, on the one hand, throws ever greater multitudes of human beings into misery, precariousness and systematic insecurity and, on the other hand, distributes to a part of them crumbs of immediate well-being - destined to disappear abruptly in the next crisis.

The proletarians of the countries on the periphery of imperialism have known for decades the horror of war, hunger and misery; in order to escape this horror, they risk their lives and those of their family members in search of a less uncertain and less painful survival. They flee from countries that offer them nothing for the present or the future, in order to reach the countries of opulence, peace and constitutional guarantees: the countries of Western Europe or North America, the countries where democracy reigns, the countries of "human rights. And what do they find in these countries? As migrants and refugees, when they don't die crossing deserts, woods or seas, they find hatred and mistrust; they find almost the same misery they escaped, but disguised as humanitarian charity; they encounter human trafficking, illegal work, prostitution, drugs and crime; a life of slaves treated worse than animals and on the verge of worsening at any moment. The horror, from which they thought they had escaped, reappears in other forms; in fact, it never leaves them. If it is not the bombs that kill them and break their families, it is the fatigue of living, the life of slaves that sooner

(Continued on page 10)

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

Bourgeois War and Propaganda of Horror

(Continuation from page 9)

or later breaks their resistance.

Most proletarians in the imperialist countries share the same status of wage slaves; but decades of bourgeois prosperity, of capitalist overprofits, of bestial exploitation of the proletarians in the countries on the periphery of imperialism, have provided them with a decent standard of living, but they have also clouded their minds, they have erased from their memory the real conditions of wage slavery in which they live and the traditions of class struggles against the ruling class, the bourgeois class that is directly responsible for wage exploitation, social inequality, market competition between states, the growing misery of the vast majority of the world's population, and wars and their horrors. As long as the horrors of war only concerned the colonies, the countries far from the metropolises of imperialist democracy, the countries where these metropolises sent their soldiers to supposedly "bring" democracy and prosperity, or to overcome ethnic clashes, or to bring these inhabitants from "barbarism" to "civilization", war seemed somehow justified; one pitied the dead of these civilizing massacres and mourned one's own dead, who had fallen for a "just cause".

But now war has knocked on Europe's doors. With the war in Ukraine, as in the 1990s during the Yugoslav wars, peace in Europe has been broken; Europe is no longer a happy island where the bourgeoisie can enjoy its opulence and the indigenous proletarians the crumbs that fall from the table of the rich capitalists. The sanctified democracy has shown for the umpteenth time that it has no possibility to stop or extinguish the ever more powerful forces of inter-imperialist conflicts. It is these contrasts that are in charge, it is the economic and political interests of power that guide the policy of the bourgeois governments. The war in Ukraine is only the latest example which shows that capitalism cannot do without the confrontation between the different national bourgeoisies which are always pushed to conquer new economic territories because of the contradictions and crises of the capitalist mode of production. War is necessary for the very life of national capitalisms, and therefore for the world

capitalist system as a whole, on which all national capitalism depends. This is the demonstration that the horror of imperialist war is not an avoidable accident thanks to the good will of the rulers or the mediators of the moment between the belligerents, but is the norm.

The proletarians who are forced to wage war in the name of the bourgeoisie, both as soldiers, therefore on the war fronts, and in the rear in the production of war as well as in the defense of the territories eventually invaded by the enemy, are in reality weapons of war for the bourgeoisie; and like all weapons, they are used to strike and destroy the enemies, i.e. the proletarians of other countries, or to be destroyed by stronger enemies. In the armed confrontations of the bourgeois war, the proletarians have no national patriotic "duty" to fulfill, because this patriotic duty responds exclusively to the interest of the national bourgeoisie which, even if it is defeated militarily, always remains the ruling class: it will always remain in power and will not cease to be the exploiting class par excellence, no matter what democratic and anti-totalitarian propaganda it uses to deceive the proletarian masses again.

But, against the imperialist bourgeois war, the proletarians have a way to follow, and they have shown it in history: the way of the **revolutionary class struggle**. It is in this class struggle, and only in this one, that the proletarians find their specific dignity, and finally feel themselves human beings and not armed objects, dehumanized, fighting a war which is not and will never be theirs.

Yes, the proletarians are historically called either to make war in the name of the bourgeoisie - and therefore for the capitalist interests, accepting to play the main role of the "national union" promoted by the capitalists - or to make war to the bourgeois war, to the imperialist war, that is to say, to engage in the **class war**. To the "national union", to the national independence, the proletariat must oppose the union and the class solidarity over all borders, the class independence with which it organizes its own struggle, its own war.

Faced with the first imperialist world war, Lenin and the Bolshevik communists launched the slogan of **transforming the imperialist war into a civil war**, i.e. into a class war in which the prole-

tariat fought above all "its" own bourgeoisie. This civil war had nothing to do with the partisan war of the Second World War. The class war sees the proletarian class organized, armed and led by its revolutionary communist party against all its class enemies, above all the bourgeois class and the forces of social conservation fighting together for the preservation of bourgeois power. The partisans are only armed militias that support the bourgeois army; they fight for the supremacy of the bourgeois interests for which the imperialist war broke out. That's why we, revolutionary communists, have always been against the "partisan resistance" which, from 1943 to 1945, supported the Anglo-American armies in the war against the German army and its fascist allies; because, through it, the proletarians were diverted to the support of one of the war fronts; they had become, in fact,

« Il Comunista »

N° 174 Luglio-Settembre 2022

Nell'interno

- E' interesse borghese che i proletari si perdano nei fetidi meandri della democrazia e del parlamentarismo. Gli interessi proletari vanno conquistati con la lotta di classe
- Ucraina: i lavoratori sotto attacco. Il governo ucraino in guerra contro i suoi proletari
- Sulla guerra russo-ucraina: Contro la guerra, su entrambi i fronti, mentre la guerra continua
- Gran Bretagna. Contro la brutalità dei conservatori, l'ostilità dei laburisti, il tradimento dei sindacati, i proletari si stanno mobilitando per difendere i loro interessi
- Riunione Generale, Milano 14-15 maggio 2022: Breve storia del Partito comunista internazionale. La crisi "fiorentina" del 1971-1973
- Pace sociale e guerra imperialista (da "programme communiste", n. 11 del 1960)
- La guerra del gas
- Quadro internazionale/Le nostre prese di posizione: Negato il diritto all'aborto negli Stati Uniti d'America; I disoccupati organizzati di Napoli di nuovo sul terreno unificante della lotta classista
- La democrazia borghese non garantisce mai i diritti che promette anche con le leggi
- Guerra in Ucraina: il disgustoso opportunismo del "Movimento Comunista - Kolektivni proty Kapitalu
- Alternanza scuola-lavoro.

Bimonthly - Price per copy: 2 € / CHF 6 / £ 2 - Annual Subscription: 10 € / CHF 30 / £ 10 - Subscription support: 20 € / CHF 60 / £ 20

E-mail: ilcomunista@pcint.org

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

the armed executors of the interests of one of the two bourgeois war fronts. Their class independence had been sold off and replaced by direct dependence on the bourgeois factions (in this case democratic) who got rid of the enemy bourgeois factions (in this case Nazi-fascist) in order to have the freedom to exploit the proletarian labor force for their own account, for their capitalist profits. Massacres, destruction, prison camps, concentration and extermination camps were part of the horror of the imperialist war, and they were used by both belligerent fronts in order to demoralize the enemy by systematically hitting the civilian population of the enemy countries (Dresden razed to the ground yesterday by the Anglo-Americans was not very different from Mariupol razed to the ground today by the Russians) and to stimulate the thirst for revenge. Today, the same thing is repeating itself, as it has already happened in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Bosnia...

The war that the proletarian class will have to wage in order to impose its class solution to the capitalist crisis will have to use all the violence necessary to break the enemy bourgeois forces, their political, social, military dictatorship; the reactionary violence of the bourgeois ruling class can only be broken by the revolutionary class violence of the proletariat. The proletarians constitute the majority of the population and are the producing class of the social wealth; the goal of the revolutionary class war is the overcoming of the inhuman capitalist mode of production; this makes the proletariat the only class capable of humanizing society, of harmonizing production with the real needs, not those of the capitalist market, but those of the human beings all over the world, developing and strengthening the productive forces that capitalism periodically restrains and destroys for profit. To achieve this goal, there is only one option: **revolution, the overthrow of the bourgeois state, the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and the extension of the proletarian revolution** in all countries of the world, especially in the advanced capitalist countries. Capitalism will not disappear by itself, it will not die out; the bourgeois class which represents the interests of capital will never give up power; even when, because of the proletarian revolution, it has to yield power in one or more countries, it never gives up. It demonstrated this in the revolutions of 1848, in the Paris Commune of 1871 and in the Bolshevik revolution of 1917; it

fights for the restoration of its power by all means, including the massacre of defenseless populations. The more technologically advanced the weapons systems are, the more horrific is the bourgeois revenge; today, with bombing, from the sea and from afar with missiles, armies try to open the way to infantry, to ground troops, because military victory can only be obtained by occupying and dominating the enemy's territories, and this result can only be obtained by ground troops. Indeed, in order to resume its unbridled development, capital needs real economic territories, markets made up of flesh-and-blood consumers, land on which to build factories, offices, warehouses, banks, houses, roads, railroads, ports, airports, and labor forces to exploit.

Once the horrors of war have passed, then begin the **horrors of peace**, the horrors caused in daily life by the exploitation of labor power, by the starvation of a part of the population that cannot find work, by an underlying economic violence that generates violence of all kinds and at all levels of social life, in particular against women, minors, the elderly, inside the home, in kindergartens, in old people's homes, in prisons. Capitalist society is permeated by violence and its preservation is only due to the rivers of proletarian bloodshed in times of peace as well as in times of war.

For the horrors of bourgeois war to end, it is not enough for bourgeois war to end. History amply demonstrates that bourgeois war is the norm, not the exception, and that peace is only an interlude between two wars. The only way out is through the proletarian revolution, which will offer society, on a world scale, a future totally opposed to the one offered by capitalism, because at the center of economic and social interests will be the real needs of human life and not the needs of capital and its necessary and incessant valorization.

It is a difficult, arduous and not brief path, but the wheel of history is moving in that direction.

The development of modern industry - wrote Marx-Engels in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" in 1848 – *therefore, cuts from under its feet the very formation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers... that is, the class of wage earners, the class that produces wealth in all countries, but whose monopoly the bourgeoisie appropriates, stealing it by the violence of the state, by its laws and by its military forces, and thus depriving the great majority of human beings of the enjoyment of this wealth.*

April, 11th 2022

In its Confrontation with American and European Imperialisms, Russian Imperialism Launches its Troops to the Territorial Conquest of Strategic Areas of Ukraine

For the past eight years, armed clashes have been taking place in Ukraine's Donbass region, particularly in the provinces of Lugansk and Donetsk, between Russian-speaking separatists and the Ukrainian army, despite the much-publicized Minsk agreements of 2014 and Minsk II of 2015; these agreements involved Ukraine, Russia, the OSCE, representatives of the two self-proclaimed "people's republics" of Lugansk and Donetsk and, in the Minsk II agreements, also France and Germany.

According to media reports, as many as 22,000 people died during the eight years of "low intensity" warfare.

It was clear from the start that these agreements had no chance of being re-

spected by any of the parties directly involved -Ukraine, Russia, Russian-speaking separatists —so much so that a Minsk II was necessary, that did not bring peace either. On the part of Kiev, the commitment to recognize the two "republics" of Lugansk and Donetsk as having a large degree of autonomy, while maintaining a strong presence of its own army, was not respected; on the part of these two "republics", with Russia as the real protagonist, the attacks against the Ukrainian army, considered as "occupying" the western part of the provinces of Lugansk and Donetsk, have never ceased.

(Continued on page 12)

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

In its Confrontation with American and European Imperialisms, Russian Imperialism Launches its Troops to the Territorial Conquest of Strategic Areas of Ukraine

(Continuation from page 11)

In reality, as our statement of 25 December (1) underlines, the real cause of the confrontation in Donbass is to be found in the fact that this region is absolutely strategic for both Russia and Ukraine from an economic and political point of view and, from the point of view of inter-imperialist contrasts, also for European and American imperialism. It has been so for NATO and the European Union since 1991 – after the collapse of the USSR – when all the countries that were part of the Russian empire broke away from it, becoming independent from Moscow. But in the imperialist era, the independence of a country from other countries, and especially from the imperialism that dominated it before, remains an abstract desire. There are so many economic, financial, political and military aspects that determine the internal and external policy of a state – especially if it is located in a geopolitical zone of great importance in inter-imperialist rivalries, such as Eastern Europe – that it is obliged to sell its “independence”, and thus its territory, economy and government, to one of the imperialist poles that can best promote its national interests or, at least, protect it from the lusts of enemy countries. Of course, the degree of submission of a state to a more powerful imperialism depends on a series of political and economic factors that vary according to the balance of power between the different imperialisms that dominate the international market and, consequently, the world, and the degree of weakness of the country submitted.

In the case of the former “people’s” and “democratic” republics of Eastern Europe that were part of the Russian empire – that the Stalinist counter-revolution, totally distorting Marxism, presented as “socialist” – the transformation from satellites of Moscow to satellites of the European Union and the United States took about fifteen years. It began with the integration of East Germany into West Germany (after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989) and continued with Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia (peacefully divided into the Czech Republic and Slovakia), Bulgaria, the Baltic States, etc., while other countries, such as Belarus and Ukraine, continued to be subject much more directly to

strong influence from Moscow, despite their independence.

This long transmigration has led, in addition to the integration of many of these countries into the European Union, to the affiliation of many of them to NATO (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Romania, Slovakia).

NATO, the Atlantic Military Alliance, was founded in 1949 by the United States and eleven other Western European countries. In 1955, West Germany joined the Alliance; Moscow, seeing NATO military forces stationed at the gates of East Germany – notoriously the most strategic side of the European borders of the famous “Iron Curtain” – hastened to unite, in what became the Warsaw Pact, the armed forces of the USSR and the other Eastern European countries that were part of its Western dominions (East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria), thus constituting an important defensive curtain against land and air attacks along a line from the borders of the Baltic States to the Black Sea.

With the collapse of the USSR, the Warsaw Pact dissolved and the defensive curtain formed by the countries of this Pact disappeared; the serious economic and political crisis experienced by Russia in the 1990s forced it to withdraw within the borders of the Russian Federation, only trying to maintain and consolidate ties with Russian ethnic groups living in some countries (Baltic countries, Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine).

One only has to look at a map to understand that by being present in Belarus and Ukraine, Russia still has, from a military point of view, an effective buffer zone, and from an economic point of view, especially as far as Ukraine is concerned, an excellent ally for agricultural production as well as for industrial and energy production. Obviously, Moscow did not look favorably on Ukraine’s inclination to join the European Union, let alone NATO. Just as the White House did not like the installation of Russian missiles in Cuba in 1962, it would not like the installation of American missiles in Ukraine if it joined NATO. In 1962, America threatened to go to war with Russia, thus triggering a world war; sixty years later, in 2022, Russia, by occupying Ukraine, seeks to prevent the

installation of American missiles in Ukraine... “to avoid a world war”...

At a time when European countries have shown that they do not have the capacity, or the interest, to unite politically given the fierce inter-imperialist competition between them, including between Germany and France, and at a time when even the United States is experiencing serious difficulties in maintaining its political supremacy in the so-called “Western world,” Russia is daring operations that it would not have even imagined only fifteen years ago. Its interventions in Syria and Libya, its subtle “alliance” with Turkey, taking advantage of Ankara’s ambition to carve out a place for itself among the regional powers of the Middle East, as well as the disastrous conduct of the American-European war in Iraq, Libya and Afghanistan, signal a series of steps that Russian imperialism, historically adept at waiting patiently to move (with “General Winter” as an additional ally), is taking to regain at least some of its former imperialist power.

But imperialism is only as strong as its economic and financial basis. And Russian imperialism cannot compete in economic and financial strength with American imperialism. On the other hand, it has a powerful military force, especially nuclear, and it is this aspect that worries Washington, Berlin, Paris, London and Rome and on which it is obviously banking.

The Russian territory stretches from Europe to Asia; this vastness on two continents has proven to be both a strength (in case of an attack, for example from the west, it is possible to retreat to a vast territory to reorganize its forces and counterattack), but also a weakness (in case of an attack from both sides, from the east and the west, it is much more difficult to organize the counterattack). But occupying Russia, taking Moscow (which in the French case would be the same as taking Paris), has never been an easy task; Napoleon tried it, the German Empire tried it in the First World War, Nazi Germany tried it in the Second World War, but no one succeeded.

Only one force succeeded in overthrowing the power in Russia, then centered in Petrograd: the proletarian and communist revolution of 1917; this force represented the spearhead of the world

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

revolution which aimed at overthrowing the bourgeois powers not only in Russia but also in Warsaw, Budapest, Berlin, Vienna and then in Paris, London, with a view to the revolution in the East, in China, and in the deep West, in America. This great revolutionary design was not realized, not only because the European and American imperialist powers resisted and counterattacked with tenfold strength (as Trotsky argued), but above all because of the work of reformist and later Stalinist opportunism, which, like a cancer, debilitated the proletariat, its struggle and the parties that were supposed to guide and lead it in all countries, until they were wiped out from the horizon for decades.

In the last fifty years since the great world crisis of 1975 and the end of the great anti-colonial movements, we have witnessed an endless series of local, regional and even tribal wars in which the various imperialist powers have been constantly involved, directly or indirectly. These wars have almost always taken place on the “periphery” of imperialism, in Africa, Asia, Latin America, in the territories where the most brutal colonial domination has been exercised for centuries, while Western Europe and America have appeared as places where peace reigned, continuing to make the proletarians of the metropolises believe that this peace in which they lived was due to democracy, to modern civilization and to capitalist development. But this development, just as it led to the world crisis of 1975, led to the collapse of the USSR and the clashes in Yugoslavia, which also collapsed under the blows of the economic crisis and the war between nationalisms regaining new strength: then, it was said, war knocked at the gates of Europe – and it did so for a whole decade.

Today, it knocks again, still at the gates of the East, this time in Ukraine; but, contrary to the Yugoslav decade (1991-2001), no Western imperialism, not even the United States, intends to get involved militarily in the defense of the very holy national sovereignty of Kiev!

Russia has calculated its timing well: it has left the door open for diplomatic discussions and, at the same time, it has massed 170 to 190 thousand soldiers on the borders of Ukraine, ready to intervene - as the United States, France and Great Britain have repeatedly done – as “interposition forces”; not as occupying forces, but as military forces defending the “sovereignty” of the two self-proclaimed republics, which had been

formally recognized a few days earlier by the Russian Duma. The pretext of a large-scale military attack was on the table; Putin had no trouble using it to justify the military intervention, whose two objectives he announced: to protect the population of the two separatist republics of Donbass from Ukrainian repression, and to demilitarize Ukraine from the “Nazi” power of the Kiev government.

The American reaction was reduced to the threat of sanctions, harsher than those already put in place in 2014 when Russia took Crimea, both economic and financial. After the rebuff received by Macron and Scholz, who had rushed to Moscow to dissuade Putin from invading Ukraine, the European Union joined Washington: sanctions, sanctions, sanctions.

The commercial and financial interests of Germany, Italy, France, Poland and many other European countries with Russia are important, and not only with regard to natural gas which, through the many existing pipelines, reaches Western Europe to cover about 40% of its energy needs: a percentage that can only be guaranteed by Russia, and that could even increase when Nord Stream 2, the pipeline already ready and which, at the bottom of the Baltic Sea, arrives from Russia directly to Germany without passing through a third country, begins to operate.

Germany and Italy, the two largest industrial countries in Europe, are the ones that depend significantly on Russian gas. If Russia, in reaction to the heavy sanctions imposed on it, were to close the gas taps to Europe, Germany and Italy would be the countries that would immediately pay the highest price. Of course, Russia would also lose out, as it would not easily find an alternative, not even with China, which lately seems interested in Russian gas. Therefore, too heavy sanctions will not be triggered on either side, despite considerable American pressure on the Europeans. The interests at stake are too important to jeopardize them just to please Washington. As long as it is a matter of speeches, as harsh as one wants... and sanctions that do not entail too high a price to pay, fine; but if it is a matter of dealing a mortal blow to the economic recovery that has just been reborn after the years of pandemic..., it is out of the question, first of all for Germany, the only one able to resist the pressure of Washington and, at the same time, of Moscow.

Therefore, Moscow’s military expe-

dition in Ukraine will continue, amidst cries and cries from all Western chancelleries for the violation of national sovereignty and democracy; but business is business; in 2014 in the face of Russia’s military intervention in Crimea, Western sanctions against Moscow stopped neither the occupation nor the annexation; how could they stop Russia’s military occupation of the Donbass (which is Ukraine’s most important mining region), or even the war in Ukraine?

It is more likely, given the current general situation of inter-imperialist power relations, that what happened in part in Georgia will happen in Ukraine; that Russia will 1) prevent the country from being affiliated with NATO, 2) that the part of the country inhabited by Russian ethnic groups will break away into an autonomous republic and serve as a springboard for future larger-scale operations, 3) that the wedges represented by these separatist zones will also bear fruit from an economic point of view and in terms of lines of communication with other countries directly controlled by the Russian power 4) that they will be a constant warning to neighboring countries of the Russian military presence, ready to intervene quickly to defend the sacred borders even far from Moscow, or to annex the territories when the general situation seems favorable to a possible annexation. It should not be forgotten that imperialism means not only the economy of monopolies and financial capital, but also the occupation and annexation of territories.

As we wrote in our statement of December 25: «*Ukraine is one of the places that can become a hotbed of imperialist war when international tensions, sharpened by economic crises, push the big imperialisms back into a third world conflict. The threatening “clouds” keep accumulating, but we are not yet on the eve of such a conflict; moreover, the future war alliances are not yet fixed: will Russia and the USA succeed in reaching an agreement against China, or will the Russian-Chinese axis against the USA materialize, etc.?* »

In the meantime, China is watching what is happening and recording the various reactions of the imperialists involved, in the position of a future protagonist, eager to understand the type of attitude and strength of those who could become tomorrow’s allies or enemies. There is no doubt that at present

(Continued on page 14)

– *Imperialist War in Ukraine* –

Russian imperialism launches its troops ...

(Continuation from page 13)

it wishes to justify Moscow's actions in an anti-American function and that tomorrow, after getting its hands on Hong Kong, it aims to seize the tastiest piece, constituted by Taiwan (the island of Formosa), which Beijing has always considered as an integral part of China, removed in 1949 from the national territorial unity by Anglo-American imperialism, with Russia at its side.

The imperialist epoch is the epoch of permanent wars, at different levels, according to the accumulation of social contradictions and the succession of economic and financial crises that characterize it. It is not, as it has never been, the diplomatic and "peace" agreements that follow conflicts, even the most devastating ones, that will prevent the natural course of capitalism towards war; the two imperialist world wars of the last century cast their shadow on the next third world war towards which the inter-imperialist contrasts are inexorably rushing.

The only force capable of preventing or stopping it will never be bourgeois and imperialist, not even in its most democratic and "civilized" form; it will be the social force represented by the working class, by the proletariat, which all over the world is forced into

the same wage conditions and which the same economic and social contradictions push to make the class antagonism which characterizes bourgeois society, the spring of a non-peaceful, non-democratic, non-parliamentary struggle, but a class struggle; then the imperialist war will turn into a civil war, as Marx and Engels affirmed after the experience of the Paris Commune and as Lenin and the Communist International proclaimed after the victorious revolution of October 1917.

In order for the proletariat to be prepared for this historical appointment with its class revolution, it must rid itself of the thick layer of legalism, pacifism and democratism with which collaborationist opportunism has clothed it, not to emancipate it but to suffocate it, imprisoning it in even tighter chains to the exclusive needs of capitalism.

The bourgeois powers in all countries has appealed, appeals and will always appeal to the fatherland, to the national values, to the national culture and unity, for which they forces and will always force the proletariat to give its sweat and shed its blood in times of peace as in times of war. Today, in spite of the cries of freedom and popular sovereignty, it is the rotten Great Russian nationalism which clashes with the rotten nationalism of Ukraine. It is against all forms of nationalism that the proletarians must fight, because nationalism is one of the most dangerous and effec-

tive vectors of the division between them. The union of the proletarians cannot be made on the ground of the nation, but only on the class, anti-capitalist, anti-bourgeois and therefore internationalist ground.

Against the enlistment of proletarians in the national bourgeois armies!

Against the shedding of proletarian blood to make a band of exploiters and torturers triumph against the opposing band of exploiters and torturers!

Against any form of competition between proletarians!

For the class solidarity between Ukrainian and Russian proletarians, for the union of proletarians of all nationalities and ethnicities over the bourgeois borders!

For the resumption of the class struggle carried out with class means and methods, for the exclusive defense of the immediate and general proletarian interests!

For the reconstitution of the class party, of the internationalist and international revolutionary communist party!

February, 24th 2022

(1) see « Tensions on the Ukrainian border: only the proletariat can put an end to imperialist confrontations », 12/25/2021. www.pcint.org

Against the Economic and Social War which the Bourgeoisie is Waging in All Countries against the Male and Female Proletariat, and Against the War which Imperialism is Unable to Stop

The oppression of women increases and deepens with the development of capitalism. It is an oppression that extends into all spheres of life. Life between the four walls of the household is a typical world of oppression for women, even in advanced capitalist countries, where women can study, work, «make a career», run a business. In advanced capitalist countries, women have been drawn into the «world of labour which, according to bourgeois ideology, is the starting point of their «emancipation». Emancipation from what? from the four walls of the household, where women have been left for centuries, forced to take care of the daily needs

of the «family», that is, of husbands, fathers, children and grandchildren. With the passage of decades, and certainly with the entry of women into the civil struggles forced upon them by the «world of labour» in which capital itself has put them, and with the increased competition among the proletarians - since women's work has always been less well paid than men's -, women have in fact gained a recognition at the social level that was previously unimaginable, to the extent that the bourgeois ideology itself opposed them fiercely by continuing its view of women as inferior beings, as objects of male pleasure, as necessary means to «beget children»,

preferably «boys», through whom the physical inheritance and the name of the family, which was determined only along male lines, could be secured.

The «world of women» which the development of capitalism blew up by destroying the family by the same means by which it supposedly sought to emancipate women, i.e., wage labour, nevertheless has retained a kind of idealisation; both religion and society have overlaid the world of the family with it.

But wage labour is a typical economic and social oppression of capitalism; while on the one hand it destroys the family by tearing women away from domestic work and the care of children and the elderly in order to exploit their labour power in the production processes and in the valorisation of capital, on the other hand it leads women to broaden their outlook to affairs outside the family, outside the four walls of the household; it leads them to be directly affected by the struggle of the wage-labourers, to become involved in this struggle, to perceive its contradictions,

its strength, but also weaknesses of such a struggle, which can become the basis not only of formal but also of de facto emancipation. A struggle that shows that it is strength, not legislation, that can change the nature of existing social relations.

How have women been changed by their entry into the world of wage labour? It has inevitably drawn them into social and political life, and this has been and is a significant step towards no longer considering themselves and not to be considered as someone who remains rather outside the sphere in which decisions are taken that also affect their domestic life, family life and the future of their children. But the affairs «outside» the family is a world that no longer depends on the family, on its internal structure, on its cohesion and stability over time, on its determination to persist despite its contradictions; it is the world of capital, in which every social relationship, every family relationship, depends on the laws of capitalism, on its need to transform every human activity, every expression of life into a commodity; every product, every thing and every person has become an object of commerce, of buying and selling. Where is this emancipation?

The «freedom» to sell oneself to the highest bidder applies to both men and women: the commodification of any human act begins with the obligation whereby the proletarian is forced to sell his labour power to a boss. It is clear that this boss, owner of all the means of production and all the land, also becomes the boss of the production of human beings, of the reproduction of the human species. Woman, apart from being the procreator of human beings through an episodic contribution of the male, apart from being - for capital, and therefore for the bourgeoisie - the means of preserving that particular species of human beings whom we call bosses and wage labourers, suffers at the same time from the same fate as any other means of production existing in capitalist society: the fate of overproduction. Since the economic means of developed capitalism go into crisis because their production no longer finds market outlets, the means of production of human beings, especially families and women, also go into crisis because their specific product - children - no longer finds an outlet in the labour market, and therefore in society. And, as happens every time the capitalist economy enters into a crisis of overproduction, the bourgeois system destroys a part - ever larger in proportion to its productive capacity - of the production and the means of production, on the one hand, by leaving the means of production that are no longer profitable to decay and rot, and

on the other hand, by destroying a considerable part of the products that remain unsaleable, in order to prepare the place in the subsequent period for new cycles of production, so that they can return to the markets at a profit. Wars, as more than eighty years since the last world imperialist war have shown, are one of the most frequently used means of eliminating unsaleable and unprofitable commodities. And capitalism also counts among these commodities human labour power, wage labourers, their families, their children. There are too many mouths to feed and too many human hands to rebel against a power that is willing to liquidate products and massacre human beings in order to preserve its social privileges and the system of production and ownership it defends.

The war that has broken out between Russia and Ukraine has brought the harsh truth before the eyes of Europeans: the capitalist system cannot be reformed, it cannot be modified, it cannot be transformed from a system that lives only on the exploitation of man by man and that resists only by the use of all kinds of violence, into a harmonious, «human» system.

The images of the huge masses of civilians fleeing bombed Ukrainian cities in the last eleven days of the war, reported by television stations all over the world, show the forced migration of women of all ages with their children and elderly family members, while the men, who are subject to war mobilization, must remain and must fight for their country; the proletariat, male and female, is called upon for the umpteenth time in defence of its bourgeoisie, to shed its blood and endure all kinds of violence, both on the Ukrainian and Russian sides, no matter who was the aggressor or the attacked: bourgeois war law does not discriminate on the basis of law, but only on the basis of force.

The same homeland which has always exploited and crushed them, which has always deluded them into believing that they can achieve future prosperity on condition that they peacefully submit to the demands of national capitalism, is the same homeland which forces them today to fight against an enemy dressed in a foreign uniform, who speaks a different language or even the same language, who has invaded their homes with tanks and is destroying houses, workplaces, warehouses and crops and bringing hunger to the entire population. It is the same homeland that presents itself as the attacked victim, even though it is the very place where capitalism, in its national variation, exercises its power with all the economic and social violence of which it is capable and which refuses it to be put into question, even though the «enemy»,

the stronger one, tears down borders and kicks down the doors of homes.

The women fleeing the war want to save not so much themselves as their children, and the millions of strollers in which they take them away from the bombing, to other countries not yet at war, are here as proof not only of their attachment to life but also of their strength to react to violence that was unimaginable only a few weeks ago. They are fleeing with bleeding hearts because they have had to leave everything, their home, their family, their work; in this flight, they carry with them not only their despair and the hope that one day they will return to the places from which they have fled, but also the hope - like all the millions of migrants who have tried to live in Europe - of a life of peace, of a future.

But the bourgeoisie leaves nothing to chance. It uses the masses of these women fleeing the bombings as a vector for its ideology: It opens the doors of its borders in Poland, Moldova, Slovakia, Romania, even Hungary, and of course in Italy, Germany, France and Spain, to welcome the working population, coincidentally of white race, which has never caused any problems in the countries to which it has migrated, has never rebelled, on the contrary, has easily integrated itself and accepted even the most menial jobs that European proletarian women are unwilling to do. And so competition between proletarian women finds another channel through which it can flow. Moreover, this mass of refugee women is used as an example of women who are capable of enduring any hardship, any dangerous situation, any threat to their own lives and the lives of their children, in the name of peace, their country and their family; these fleeing women are counterbalanced by the young women who have remained to fight against the invader.

Democracy, this is the mantra that is insistently coming to the fore from all sides of bourgeois propaganda. The invader is always the evil dictator, the totalitarian, the barbarian, the enemy par excellence. But today's democracy, imperialist democracy, is only a veil over the totalitarianism that characterises the functioning of capitalism in every corner of the world, because no human being can escape its laws: if he wants to live, he must either be exploited through wage labour or exploit the labour of others. Either he becomes a proletarian or a boss. And the struggle for survival unfolds again at each moment as a struggle for the exploitation of the labour of others - so it is the struggle between exploiters, between bourgeoisies - or as a defence against this exploitation - and

(Continued on page 16)

Against the Economic and Social War which the Bourgeoisie is Waging in All Countries against the Male and Female Proletariat, and Against the War which Imperialism is Unable to Stop

(Continuation from page 15)

so it is the struggle against the ruling bourgeoisie. It is the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the struggle that has existed ever since the capitalist bourgeoisie triumphed over previous social systems and penetrated everywhere in the world thanks to its industrial production progress, its development and its financial system, and has subjected every population, not only the weakest and most remote from the great commerce, to its laws.

Despite industrial progress and women's involvement in production, politics, business and government, the woman symbolizes both the weaknesses and strengths of social struggle.

Weaknesses because she is still subject to gender oppression, which goes back to ancient times, to the first-class societies, and which has been incessantly transmitted from one class society to another, until capitalism. Weaknesses, because in the bourgeois social order she continues to suffer, even though she works like men, from domestic oppression, taking care of the household and the children. Weaknesses, because her natural tendency is to save the life of the children she gives birth to and raises, which generally means safeguarding the reproduction of the species; it is a struggle which, in the society divided into classes, is no longer a struggle of the whole society but an individual struggle. And it is also a strength, because it is precisely her natural tendency to safeguard the reproduction of the species that can assign to the woman a social task of paramount importance in a society in which the community takes precedence over the individual, whereas in capitalist society the woman is, on the contrary, even more tethered to the single family, to the individual and domestic life.

It is precisely in political struggle that proletarian woman can recognize her task in the history of human societies; not in a political struggle conducted, influenced, and organized by the bourgeois ruling class, which has every interest in keeping women subject to the classical dual oppression of domestic and wage labor, but in the proletarian political struggle; that is, in the struggle that the exploited through wage labor are impelled to wage precisely against the exploiters of wage labor. Proletarian women objectively and historically have their place in the struggle of the

entire proletariat, without distinction of gender, age, nationality or race. However, to recognize this place is the most difficult thing they must do, because the economic and social pressures of capitalism, which make it very difficult even for the male proletariat to recognize its own class interests clearly distinct from those of the bourgeoisie, make it even more difficult to break with the social and political stereotypes into which women have been thrown by contemporary society.

The fact remains, however, that the same social contradictions of capitalism and its own crisis are and will continue to lead proletarians, men and women, to take up the struggle, in peace and in war, not any longer for a fatherland, for democracy, for civilization, which in fact symbolize total dehumanization, but for real emancipation, a emancipation from the commodification of human life and all its activities, the emancipation that will be exclusively proletarian, because its revolution is the only way out of capitalism and out of the society that has reduced men and women to commodities that can be sold, bought, thrown away or destroyed according to the interests of capitalist profit.

The solidarity that Ukrainian women fleeing bourgeois war receive today, on the borders of European countries not yet in a state of war, is a solidarity that is distinctly different on its immediate level from the treatment that African, Middle Eastern and Asian migrants have received and receive from the same European countries that today indulge in this pageantry of showing their own proletarians that they are «good», «humane» towards proletarians who do not bring social unrest but who, on the contrary, can be exploited as submissive labour. It is certainly a temporary «solidarity», because the war that will blow up the Ukraine is the war that will have long-term consequences, will intensify the imperialist disorder that has come with the collapse of the USSR, will inevitably strengthen the nationalisms of each country more than it may seem today, and which will have to disappear at the first attempts of the proletarians of the European countries to enter the struggle by the means and methods of the class struggle. At such a moment the bourgeoisie will treat the proletarians with the usual repression, all the more so if they are of a different nationality.

The real solidarity that contributes

to the defence of the living conditions of today's Ukrainian proletarian women, as well as those of women of Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, Somalia, Libya or any other country tormented by the wars of the imperialist bourgeoisies, is only proletarian solidarity that is based on the struggle of the proletarian class for its own class interests. Bourgeois and petty-bourgeois solidarity is only the fig leaf for the real social violence that permeates the whole of capitalist society.

Against bourgeois and imperialist war, class struggle!

For the unity of proletarian men and women in all countries in the common struggle for emancipation from capitalism!

For the revival of the class struggle in Europe and in the world!

March, 8th 2022

CORRESPONDENCE

France: Programme, B.P. 57428, 69347 Lyon Cedex 07 **Italy:** Il Comunista, C.P. 10835, 20110 Milan **Spain:** Apdo. Correos 27023, 28080 Madrid **Switzerland:** Please write to the address of Lyon.

PARTY'S PRESS

- **“le prolétaire”** - (*bimonthly in French*)
- **Price per copy:** £ 1,5 / € 1,5 / USA \$ 1,5 / CDN \$ 1,5 / CHF 3. **Subscription:** £ 7,5 / USA \$ 7,5 / CDN \$ 7,5 / € 7,5 / CHF 15. **Subscription support:** £ 15 / USA \$ 15 / CDN \$ 15 / € 15 / CHF 60.
- **“programme communiste”** - (*Theoretical review in French*) • **Price per copy:** £ 3 / € 4 / CHF 8. Latin America: US \$ 2 / USA \$ 4 / CDN \$ 4. **Subscription:** price for 4 copies. **Subscription support:** £ 36 / € 40 / CHF 80 / Latin America: US \$ 16 / USA \$ 40 / CDN \$ 40.
- **“il comunista”** - (*bimonthly in Italian*) • **Price per copy:** £ 2 / € 2 / CHF 6. **Subscription:** £ 10 / € 10 / USA \$ 10 / CDN \$ 10 / CHF 30. **Subscription support:** £ 20 / € 20 / USA \$ 20 / CDN \$ 20 / CHF 60.
- **“el programa comunista”** • **Price per copy:** £ 2 / € 3 / CHF 8 / Latin America: US \$ 1,5 / USA \$ 3 / CDN \$ 3. **Price support per copy:** £ 4 / € 6 / CHF 16 / Latin America: US \$ 3 / USA \$ 6 / CDN \$ 6.
- **“el proletario”** • **Price per copy:** £ 1,5 / CHF 3 / € 1,5. Latin America: US \$ 1,5 / USA \$ 2 / CDN \$ 2.
- **“Proletarian”** - (*Supplement in English to “le prolétaire”*) • **Price per copy:** £ 1 / € 1,5 / USA \$ 1,5 / CDN \$ 1,5 / CHF 3.
- **“Communist Program”** - (*Theoretical review in English*) • **Price per copy:** £ 2 / € 3 / USA \$ 3 / CDN \$ 3 / CHF 8

Registration number to the “commission paritaire de presse”: 52926. Managing Editor: Dessus. **Payments:** by checks or international money, **order to:** Dessus. Printed on our press.

Kazakhstan

Strikes and Riots Teeter the Regime

The protest and revolt movement that has been affecting the country for a week was triggered by the sudden decision of the government to double the price of gas and petrol; as soon as this announcement was made, protest demonstrations by workers and unemployed began to take place on Sunday morning, January 2, in the oil city of Zhanaozen, in the west of the country (Mangystau region) (1).

During this same day, protest actions (rallies, sit-ins, etc.) spread to the nearby port city of Aktau to demand the withdrawal of the increases – or the doubling of wages! The next day the protest continued to spread despite the deployment of the police and more and more companies stopped work; social networks broadcasted scenes of fraternization between police and demonstrators. On January 4, although the prefect (the «akim») and the minister of energy announced a reduction in the price of gas and petrol for the inhabitants, the strike was almost general in the whole Mangystau region (oblast), where part of the country's extractive industries are concentrated.

Also on 4 January, at the other end of the country, miners in the Karaganda region went on strike, while demonstrations and blockades spread throughout most of Kazakhstan. In several places the demonstrators attacked the symbols of the regime: statues of the former autocrat Nazarbayev, who continues to pull the strings as president for life of the «National Security Council», official buildings and even police stations. The departure of Nazarbayev and his creatures (including Tokayev, the current president) was at the center of the slogans.

The regime responded by dismissing the government and Nazarbayev himself, and by declaring a state of emergency; it unleashed a bloody crackdown, particularly in the economic capital Almaty on Wednesday night (more than 100 deaths according to the Health Ministry). Faced with the social explosion, the president asked for Russian help, which was immediately granted: 3,000 Russian soldiers, flanked by a handful of soldiers from other countries, arrived on Friday 7 January. The same day Tokayev declared on television that he had «*given the order to shoot to kill without warning*». On Saturday, journalists in Almaty were still reporting gunfire in some parts of the city, but the presi-

dent said that «*constitutional order had been restored*».

It was restored in blood, according to the authorities themselves: on 9 January the official toll of the repression was more than 160 demonstrators killed by bullets, several thousand injured, and 6000 arrested.

This «order» is the capitalist order, sanctioned by all imperialisms; if China, in a message from Xi Jinping, congratulated Tokayev for the «*strong measures*» taken to quell the revolt, the more hypocritical Western imperialisms called for «*restraint*» «*on all sides*», putting the demonstrators and the murderous forces of repression on the same level; no one protested against the Russian intervention. This is because Kazakhstan, rich in oil and other minerals, has received significant investments from Western companies, including American ones: fearing social unrest that could jeopardize their capital, they see in the Russian intervention a guarantee against this danger...

For several years, Kazakhstan, a geographically large but sparsely populated country (19 million inhabitants) that occupies a strategic position in Central Asia, has experienced strong economic growth, based on oil and gas (despite some setbacks in its dream of becoming the Kuwait of Central Asia), but also on coal and uranium (world's largest producer). It had taken advantage of this to emancipate itself from Russian domination; it had drawn closer to China and the West, signing a military agreement with Italy, one of its first clients, and then with the United States; it had also drawn closer to Turkey by joining the «Organization of Turkic States», an embryonic alliance of the Turkic-speaking countries of the former USSR with Ankara. Turkish President Erdogan phoned Tokayev on 6 January to assure him of his support and to offer him «*his experience and technical expertise*»; but the experience and expertise of the Russian godfather are far superior...

The proletarians have not benefited much from the economic prosperity; the regime has continued to use repression against any attempt at independent workers' struggle and organization; police brutality and torture are common. In 2011, it brutally repressed a strike by oil workers in Zhanaozen to improve their conditions: the police shot at the striking demonstrators, kill-

ing at least 16 people.

Some analysts, including in the West, claim that the current unrest is at least partly caused by internal rivalries within the regime. It is quite possible that there are attempts to settle scores between bourgeois cliques in the current events; but it is undeniable that their cause is the increasingly intolerable situation of the proletarians and the poor strata, in a situation of economic crisis which leads to layoffs (40,000 layoffs in the Tengiz oil field in December, with more planned) and inflation (officially 8% but in reality much more). The proletarian character of the revolt is demonstrated, if it were necessary, by the fact that it started from a strike movement based on demands for improved living and working conditions and higher wages. The petty bourgeois democrats indicate to the proletarians the objective of a «democratic Kazakhstan», rid of the clique in power; some pseudo-socialists like the neostalinists of the «Socialist Movement of Kazakhstan», demand the return to the Constitution of 1993, supposedly more democratic.

But it is not for a simple change of facade of the regime that the proletarians must struggle, because, by leaving intact the capitalist mode of production, such a change would not modify their fate. The struggle for political and trade union freedoms is undoubtedly necessary, but only if it is part of the struggle against capitalism, which exploits them and reduces them to misery. Only the proletarian class struggle can have the strength to put an end to capitalism, by uniting proletarians over the borders: this is what the bourgeois and petty bourgeois democrats fear...

The current social explosion has shaken the regime, it has shown the power of the working class and the gravity of the social tensions accumulated under capitalism; tomorrow the revolutionary struggle of the proletarians of Kazakhstan, Russia and all countries, under the leadership of their international class party, will overthrow all the murderous capitalist regimes, and will avenge their countless victims.

While the economic crisis inexorably pushes the proletarians to revolt, this is the perspective that must guide them in their struggles, in Kazakhstan and everywhere!

January, 10th 2022

(1) We take the information from the site socialismkz.info

In Prague, Nationalist Petty Bourgeoisie Protested against Galloping Inflation and Skyrocketing Prices, and Fought for Social Preservation Proletarians Have Another Way to Go: that of the Class Struggle

On Saturday, September 3, Prague was the scene of a protest rally of tens of thousands of people, called by a wide range of citizens' organizations: conservatives, right-wing reactionaries, nationalists, sovereignists, no-Vax and other groups, under the slogan "*Czech Republic First*". In the critical situation created by the pandemic crisis, then the energy crisis and the exceptional rise in the prices of electricity, gas and food, and the exceptional influx of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian refugees fleeing the war in a few months, this slogan expresses, under the effect of the crisis, the typical competition between the native population and the immigrant population, which is well known in Germany, France and Italy. The Czech Republic has a population of just over 10 million people, and to date there are more than 400,000 Ukrainians among them, including those who have been living in the country for years and recent war refugees. And as is the case in all European countries when the economic crisis knocks on the door, one of the outlets for the social unrest offered by the right-wing bourgeois fractions is to accuse the government of taking resources from the native population to distribute them to... migrants.

But many proletarians also participated in this demonstration, joining the protests against the government that has not supported with relief and adequate aid the families and companies that have fallen into difficulty because of the latest crisis caused by the hyperbolic rise in energy costs (from October 2021, many companies have closed down laying off thousands of workers).

The official trade unions, the parliamentary opposition and the government itself were surprised by this "spontaneous" demonstration of such magnitude; naturally, the usual accusations of "pro-Russian" were hurled at the demonstrators. It is a fact that in the absence of class-based workers' organizations for immediate defense, the proletarians, driven to express their deep unease, are easily sucked into such nationalistic demonstrations.

Seeking to save face, the official unions, took advantage of the traditional September conference they have been holding since 2015, demagogically titling

it: "*Against poverty*", and announced a demonstration for Saturday, October 8, stating that "*the government has until October 8 to act. Unfortunately, until now, we have little reason to believe that it can do so. We are dissatisfied, angry, determined to fight for a better Czech Republic. The government has plenty of time to act...*". So nationalism is not only "right-wing".

And, in an attempt to gain some trust from the workers, the unions are demanding an increase in the minimum wage for the current year from 18,200 to 20,200 Czech crowns (from 740 to about 820 euros). No doubt that the government will be terrified if it doesn't do... something...!

It is typical of collaborationist trade unions to threaten in word and deed to finally give in to the demands of capital, systematically sabotaging the workers' struggles and demands, which, on the one hand, causes the paralysis of the workers' movement and, on the other hand, drives the most backward proletarians into the arms of the nationalist right.

The economic crisis is hitting all countries hard, and it is not the "fault" of speculation on gas or grain. In capitalist regimes speculation has always existed; in situations of more general economic crisis, it is even exalted: yesterday, the Covid-19 pandemic was the occasion of overprofits for pharmaceutical companies; today, the "gas war" and the "wheat war" give rise to overprofits in the energy and food sectors. Due to the consequences of the Russian-Ukrainian war, there has been a new period of crisis this year, especially in European countries.

In this war - which has now lasted 200 days and has no end in sight - the countries of the European Union, strongly urged on by the United States, have agreed to support the cause of Ukraine against that of Russia. The European Union and, of course, the United States entered the field of economic-financial and commercial confrontation with a series of sanctions packages that would put Russia in such a difficult position that it would have to quickly end its so-called "special operation in Ukraine" and, at the same time, would have to give Ukraine back its "full sov-

ereignty". For its part, Russia responded with its own economic-financial measures related mainly to raw materials (primarily gas and oil), for example, by demanding that its supplies be paid for in rubles rather than dollars and by opening or closing the valves of gas pipelines. Neither the economic-financial measures nor the enforcement measures produced the results that both sides had hoped for. Initially, the effects of European sanctions on Russia were even much more negative for European countries than for Russia.

For its part, the Czech Republic, of course respecting the EU sanctions, not only produces electricity from coal-fired power plants, but also produces more than a third of its national needs from the two nuclear power plants in Temelin and Dukovany, thus consolidating its position as a net energy exporter. But this does not make it immune to the general rise in prices that depend on international markets. Its most important trade (between imports and exports) is with Germany, and when Germany goes into recession, as it did recently, the Czech Republic follows the downward trend, with ever more serious consequences for the proletarian masses in terms of wages and working conditions, as well as unemployment.

Meanwhile, the Russian-Ukrainian war continues. Russia has increasingly reduced gas supplies to Europe (for the past twenty years, Germany and Italy have been the two countries most dependent on Russian gas), and while the Europeans are frantically looking for other suppliers, especially for gas, Russia is looking for other client countries to which it can supply its gas and other raw materials whose export to Europe has been blocked for months; China, India and other Asian countries are partially replacing European importers, albeit in reduced quantities and at a reduced price, especially in the absence or because of the limitations of the transport infrastructure.

As has been seen from the first moments, the war in Ukraine, has triggered an unprecedented economic war, in which speculations of all kinds and inevitable clashes of opposing interests between the allies themselves are developing. In the EU countries, for example,

the much-vaunted demand to agree on a cap on gas prices to mitigate the rising prices not only of energy, but also of all industrial and agricultural production that depends on electricity produced largely by gas-fired power plants, remains a pious illusion, because dependence on Russian gas has turned into dependence on gas from Norway, Algeria and other countries and liquefied gas from the United States. Thus, in addition to the disproportionate rise in prices in all countries between the European allies, there is a new economic war which, despite the declared search for a “community” policy (like that adopted for the anti-Covid vaccines), tends to exacerbate the disagreements and contradictions which, in the long term, can only lead to real economic-political confrontations.

As in every period of economic crisis, and even more so in war, the proletarian class is directly affected in its living and working conditions; but its capacity to react on the field of class struggle, after decades and decades of inter-class collaborationism practiced both on the trade union and political level, has been practically reduced to zero. Therefore, as it happened today in Prague, but as it happened in all capitalist metropolises until now, the most marginalized and backward layers of the proletariat are easily influenced by the most vicious nationalism, while the bulk of the proletariat remains isolated, fragmented, paralyzed. As long as it is not able to get out of the rut generated by the drug of democracy and by individualism, it will remain trapped in the collaborationist policies in which trade union and political opportunism has plunged it. And it will not be able to see that the near future that the bourgeois ruling class is preparing for it will be made of tears and blood.

Today, in Prague, Berlin, Warsaw, Bucharest, as well as in Rome and Paris, the echoes of the war in Ukraine arrive not with bombs and missiles, but through the great masses of refugees, mainly women and children. This does not detract from the fact that this is a **European** war and that it has an **imperialist** character, even if it is so far geographically localized in Ukraine. It is imperialist, not only because Russian imperialism has invaded Ukrainian territory with its troops - justifying itself by the fact that for eight years after the pro-Russian secession of Crimea, the Ukrainian state has systematically oppressed the pro-Russian population of the Donbass regions (the most industrialized region of Ukraine and full of raw materials) - but also because in Ukraine, as yesterday in ex-Yugoslavia,

and in Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, in the Caucasus, in Syria, are at stake the imperialist interests of all the imperialist powers, more or less directly involved in these **local** wars.

Supporting the war politically, economically and militarily means further compressing the living and working conditions of the proletarian masses in the countries affected by the imperatives of the war, which inevitably also affects large sections of the urban and agrarian petty bourgeoisie. Frightened by the idea of plunging into the precarious conditions of existence proper to the proletariat, it is precisely these petty-bourgeois strata that mobilize against the governments that fail to protect them from this precipice. And in mobilizing, they take with them proletarians, generally the most backward ones, who share the same individualistic and narrow mentality typical of the petty-bourgeoisie.

Always in conflict and struggle by all means on the world stage, all imperialist powers act on the basis of the same motives: to conquer markets and territories by removing them from the influence of competing imperialisms, and to exploit not only their own national proletariat, but also the proletarians of the countries subjected to the policies and interests of the dominant imperialist countries. It is now the turn of Ukraine, whose ruling bourgeoisie, after the collapse of the USSR in the 1990s, had to decide whether to ally itself with Russian imperialism or with Russia's rival imperialists, first and foremost the USA and, at its heels, the countries of the European Union. It is no coincidence that, since its independence in 1991, its relations with NATO began with a view to future membership. During its first twenty years as an “independent” country, Ukraine continued to oscillate between Russia and the United States/European Union, but since 2008, negotiations for Ukraine's membership in the European Union have been formalized, following the same direction as most of the Eastern European countries formerly dominated by Moscow. The ongoing war has accelerated the bureaucratic steps of EU membership, and since June 23 of this year, Ukraine's application to the European Union has become official; meanwhile, as a candidate, moreover at war with the “common” Russian enemy, it enjoys many economic and financial advantages.

The Ukrainian bourgeoisie knows that it is indebted to the imperialist bourgeoisies of the West, which support and finance it in the war against Russia in order to bend it to their interests once peace is restored. Meanwhile, Ukrainian proletarians, and Russian proletari-

ans sent to the front, are being killed to defend a “homeland” which is nothing but the prison in which they are forced to be overexploited both as wage earners and as soldiers. The same fate has befallen all proletarians who were mobilized in past world wars and in all the local wars that have punctuated the recent history of imperialist capitalism. In Prague, the nationalist right and the “left” nationalists shout the same slogan: long live the Czech Republic, for some it must be “first of all”, for others it must be “best of all”. This means only one thing, that proletarians must give their lives in peace and war to the “Czech Republic”, i.e. to the ruling bourgeoisie class, as if there were no alternative.

But for the salaried class of workers, the alternative exists, even if today it does not see it, nor does it perceive it. It is the one to make itself **independent** from the bourgeois class and from all the forces of social conservation and collaborationist opportunism. Defeatism against the imperialist war of today and tomorrow must be based on the defeatism applied in peacetime against the economic, corporate, national or international interests of the capitalists. The class antagonism that the bourgeoisie applies daily against the proletarian masses - crushing them in intolerable conditions of existence and work - must also be openly recognized by the proletarian

(Continued on page 20)

le prolétaire

N° 545

(Juillet-Août 2022)

- Défense du pouvoir d'achat? Lutte pour le salaire!
- Afrique. Y a-t-il le feu au pré carré?
- Grande-Bretagne. Les prolétaires se mobilisent pour la défense de leurs intérêts
- Rapports à la réunion générale (14-15 mai 2022 à Milan): -- Dans la continuité du travail collectif du parti pour la préparation du parti communiste révolutionnaire de demain -- L'économie mondiale en 2022
- Grève sur les plateformes norvégiennes en mer du Nord.
- Négation du droit à l'avortement aux Etats-Unis
- Proletariat et guerre impérialiste. Proletaires de tous les pays unissez-vous !
- Paix sociale et guerre impérialiste (fin)
- France-cul contre Bordiga et le PC d'Italie

Bimonthly. Price per copy: £ 1,5 / US \$ 1,5 / CDN \$ 1,5 / 1,5 € / 3 CHF. **Annual subscription (5 Nr.):** £ 7.5 / US \$ 7,5 / CDN \$ 7,5 / 7,5 € / 15 CHF

E-mail: leproletaire@pcint.org

In Prague, Nationalist Petty Bourgeoisie Protested against Galloping Inflation and Skyrocketing Prices, and Fought for Social Preservation Proletarians Have Another Way to Go: that of the Class Struggle

(Continuation from page 19)

class and must incite it to fight for **itself** and not for the bourgeoisie, starting to fight by defending its **own** immediate interests which - and it is the bourgeoisie itself that demonstrates this - are materially and objectively antagonistic to those of the bourgeoisie. To struggle on the **class** terrain means exactly that: to struggle **exclusively** for one's own class interests, which are recognized as such insofar as they unite the proletarians in the same struggle. Fighting for higher wages and a drastic reduction of working hours, fighting for full pay for the unemployed and equal pay for men and women, are **unifying demands** that fight competition between proletarians and generate the class solidarity that is the motor of the proletarian struggle, even when it stops or is defeated. In the same way, fighting against

the sending of soldiers to the front, against the sending of armaments to the belligerents, are class actions, in the line of the anti-bourgeois proletarian solidarity.

In the face of the general paralysis from the class point of view in which the proletariat finds itself today, in all the countries of Europe and of the world, these demands may seem "disconnected from reality", "utopian", "unrealizable". The opportunists said it already in 1914, at the beginning of the first imperialist world war, after having embraced the national cause and subscribed to the war demands; they repeated it again and again in front of the second imperialist world war, reinforcing this time their anti-working class action with the justification of the "patriotic" and "anti-fascist" war; they have repeated it continuously in the face of all the wars that imperialism, whether from the

East or the West, has unleashed in order to share the international market in another way; they repeat it today, in the face of the enemy of the moment, Russia, and perhaps tomorrow China, drawing dramatic scenarios of chain invasions in the highly civilized countries of Europe and of imminent dangers of atomic war. But the main social objective does not change: for the bourgeoisie and the collaborationists, it is important that the proletariat does not start fighting only for itself, so it must be systematically subjected to the imperialist demands of the moment, exploiting its labor power as intensively as possible in production, distribution and services, in order to turn it into cannon fodder when the imperialist war will come knocking at the doors.

Against the certainty of this perspective of destruction and death, only the proletariat can stand up like a giant breaking the chains holding it captive of capitalism and the bourgeoisie. The future of the proletariat lies in the resumption of the class struggle, not in the defense of the "fatherland"!

September, 12th 2022

Strike on the Norwegian North Sea Platforms

After the diktat of national concord against the enemy Covid, the proletarian struggle must not submit again to the blackmail of the crisis and the imperialist war

On 5 July this year, a strike by some of the staff of the North Sea oil and gas platforms broke out. The workers involved in the strike are managers with responsibility for production control, and a work stoppage on their part also means the interruption of activity on the platforms concerned by the strike (1). Their demands are increase of wages. As usual with any strike that is embarrassing for the bourgeoisie, the lack of information does not allow us to dissect the whole course of this struggle. But as brief as it was, only one day, the 5th of July, it took place in an international context of economic and military war, where the bourgeois states only tolerate proletarians' submission and their recruitment in the service of capitalism. There are therefore lessons to be learned from this point of view.

Let us recall the context. With the imperialist war on the Ukrainian battlefield and the parallel and simultaneous war of economic retaliation between the two belligerent blocs, energy and raw materials have become a weapon of economic and financial destruction. Re-

sponding to the cannon fire of the West's economic sanctions, Russia has retaliated with other economic missiles to avoid the collapse of the ruble and to benefit today from the super high prices of gas and oil.

With these energy materials, Russia also has an absolute weapon of blackmail against the European countries. By demanding payment for gas and oil in rubles and no longer in dollars, on pain of shutting off the taps, Russia has succeeded not only in strengthening its currency and raising the price of gas, but also in weakening the opposing European imperialism **economically** and **socially**. Inflation is hitting hard the working class, which already had no reserves after the Covid-19 crisis, and which today can potentially explode the social peace outside the control of the political, trade union and social forces intended for this control function. The economic and military enemy is known, **Russia**. The internal social enemy is also known, the **proletariat**. It makes all the European democracies tremble, and they hurry a little more to set up their securi-

ty cordon of associations, trade unions and reformist parties, but also to reinforce permanently their security cordon and police surveillance.

For countries such as Latvia, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary and Estonia, Russian gas imports, which are more critical in terms of supply than oil, represent 93% to 100% of their energy needs. As for Germany, whose economy pulls the whole of Europe and whose deep crisis would drag all the other European countries into a total collapse, it depends on Russia for 66% of its gas supplies. The other suppliers of gas to Europe are Norway for 20% to 25, Algeria for 12%, the United Kingdom for 6%, then the United States and Qatar, each for 5%. Justifying itself by refusing to pay in rubles or for other reasons, Russia has therefore closed or reduced the tap for many European countries: Poland, Bulgaria, Finland, the Netherlands, Denmark, France. Italy has seen its deliveries halved and Gazprom has reduced its gas deliveries through the Nord Stream 1 pipeline to Germany by 60%. Europe's dependence

on Russia for oil is 25%, and even though alternative supplies are easier to find than for gas, they are only available through the purchase of crude oil, the price of which is through the roof, further fuelling inflation.

Whatever the reassuring words of all the bourgeois politicians of Europe in front of the cameras, the crisis is deep and its unpredictable social repercussions distress them more than they show. The friendly or “neutral” gas or oil producing countries are therefore firmly urged to compensate for the Russian gas cuts by a maximum increase in their production, whatever the consequences for the proletarians at the front of this production. Norway in particular is targeted, as the economic survival and social equilibrium in Europe are at stake. The bourgeoisie trembles at the idea that companies, deprived of gas or oil or unable to absorb price increases, will one day have to close down, that the heating of buildings will no longer be assured, that workers will no longer be able to go to work, in short that chaos will set in. The fear of the bourgeoisie is more than ever the specter of the class struggle which always arises at the worst of times, when the social, econom-

laws to confine struggles and social agitation to the terrain of legally obligatory and forced “social dialogue”, to those of clearly assumed judicial, physical and armed brutality.

It is a kind of “battle of the coal” (2), which is engaged today in Europe so that the proletariat accepts its state of slavery in the capitalist exploitation and that it gives itself body and soul to the sacrifices imposed by the capitalist economic and war crisis. Coal today is gas and oil, and the bourgeoisie in Europe counts on the proletarians of Norway who work on the platforms of the North Sea, to take up this challenge of production in these new times of war. So, no strikes! In 2022 as in 1945-1948!

But in July, the horizon of consensus and social sacrifice suddenly darkened on the North Sea oil and gas platforms with the strike on the platforms of the company Equinor (majority owned by the Norwegian state). Initially, it involved a small number of management workers and affected three platforms, those of Gudrun, Oseberg South and Oseberg East. The strikers are organized within the large trade union Lederne.

The struggle began with the issue of inflation and its impact on purchas-

could only spread like wildfire to all platforms. The employers’ organization Norsk Olje & Gass estimated the impact of the strike at 56% of gas exports if it were to spread from one platform to another and last until the end of the week.

The media did not dwell too much on the history of the strike and the reasons for it, but they all echoed the terrible bourgeois concerns about its economic and strategic consequences. The mere prospect of this strike, even before it started, shook all the leading strata of the Norwegian state but also of the client states, in particular Great Britain, for which Norway supplies 42% of domestic needs and which re-exports a large quantity to Belgium and the Netherlands, and France, for which 40% of the gas consumed comes from this country, which certainly made the telephones of the leaders hot.

Faced with the risk of losing huge profits, and also faced with a situation where the Norwegian state was unable to keep its commitments to the war effort for production for European countries, the Norwegian social-democratic government, warned two months in advance, lost no time: On Tuesday evening, July 5, the first and only day of the strike, it placed the strikers under a law obliging them, on pain of legal sanctions, to return to work and to rely on an “independent” but official class collaboration body to “manage” the continuation of the conflict.

The Minister of Labour of the “left” government, Marte Mjos Persen, declared: “*The announced aggravation of the movement is very worrying in the present situation, with the energy crisis and the geopolitical situation, there is a war in Europe*”, but also “*When the conflict can have such important social consequences for the whole of Europe, I have no other choice than to intervene in the conflict*”. He thus expressed how much the social question is primordial today for the bourgeoisie and how much the danger of social explosion carries it.

Another quotation that sheds light on the method of legal regulation of the proletariat in Norway, as in the Nordic countries in general, is that of Maria Schumacher Walberg, minister delegate: “*In accordance with the process of resolving wage disputes in Norway, it is the responsibility of the social partners to find a solution to any conflict*”. The union, which belongs to the large LO Confederation (Landesorganisasjone), which is a staunch supporter of the Social Democrats (New Labour), complied with the agreement.

(Continued on page 22)



ic and political shock absorbers rub against the pitfall of the capitalist crisis with the imperialist war as a backdrop, geographically localized for the moment, but which could extend beyond Ukraine if it became the interest of imperialism of the East or of the West.

In these moments of violent tensions and warlike confrontations of the imperialist blocks, the bourgeoisie needs the most perfect social cohesion and collaboration of the proletarians to the efforts of economic and military war. When it does not achieve this through the consenting and “responsible” submission of the proletarians, it uses coercion and constraint that range from the means provided by the arsenal of democratic

ing power. The mobilization of workers began in May, and the unions, including Lederne, quickly negotiated a wage agreement with management providing for a 4% to 4.5% wage increase. But by then inflation had already reached 5.7%! The unionized workers at Lederne reacted to this farce by rejecting the agreement by a large majority, forcing the union to file a strike notice... for Tuesday, July 5.

Three platforms, representing 1% of Norwegian gas exports, were initially affected by the announced strike. The movement was quickly joined by four other platforms, this time representing 13% of these exports. According to the bosses themselves, the strike movement

Strike on the Norwegian North Sea platforms ...

(Continuation from page 21)

We obviously do not know all the real conditions and the history of this short strike of the Norwegian offshore managers, and are unable to draw all the lessons with confidence.

Except one: the one that makes this strike on the subject of the resistance to the national consensus, an example for all the proletarians who undergo the powerful and incessant pressures of capitalism to make them pay for the crisis, in particular by means of recruitment and ideological identification consisting in sacrificing themselves for the "good cause" of the "just war" and the "just side". The bourgeois propaganda of the war of the democracies against the barbarity of Russia in Ukraine, hides the real imperialist nature of the war and the full responsibility in its triggering of the capitalist society which exacerbates the

antagonisms of the bourgeois states until they are solved by war rather than by diplomatic and economic negotiations which appear to be peaceful, but which have become sterile and unable to settle the questions of the economic relations of force. The proletarians must not fall into the ideological trap set for them by the bourgeoisie.

To refuse to participate in social peace and to submit to the productivist diktats of an economy that has gone to war, but on the contrary to affirm and fight with its weapons and its class independence to defend itself against the deteriorating living conditions, in particular against the brutal erosion of wages in the face of inflation, to use in any circumstance the weapon of the strike, to refuse all the blackmails to the betrayal of the "good cause" and to the "irresponsibility", and finally to show that the interests of the proletarians are not soluble in those of the capitalism and that there is no convergence between them: here is the lesson that we can certainly draw.

July, 11th 2022

Notes:

(1) Audun Ingwartsen, leader of Lederne: "*Our members are key people who control production, so when they go on strike, it would be normal for the employer to shut down the platforms.*"

(2) At the end of the Second World War in France, the de Gaulle government demanded a superhuman production effort from the miners to enable the reconstruction of the country. In 1945, Thorez, secretary general of the French Communist Party and minister of this government, declared to the miners: "*To produce is today the highest form of class duty, of French duty*". Driven by these chauvinistic propaganda, the miners gave their lives to ensure, in exchange for a few salary benefits, the tonnage of coal required. Once the production result was achieved, all their wage and social benefits were swept away without mercy or remorse and they returned to the material conditions of the past. In 1948 the resulting strike of 200,000 miners lasted 54 days and was fiercely repressed: 6 deaths, 1342 prison sentences and 3000 dismissals.

Amadeo Bordiga Socialism and the Defense of the Nation

(Avanti!, December 21, 1914)

(Continuation from page 1)

by an aggressor.

We have here, to the consolation of many, an exception which is now firmly planted in our ... boring neutrality at all costs. Well, let us examine this question a little more deeply, to go beyond the schematic and external aspect, to examine it by an analysis of doubt and criticism, which for this time we will use, against the Truth which has already received official consecration ... from the anti-socialist coalition.

Like a religious person who hears blasphemy, the bourgeoisie, the nationalists and the warmongering democrats bristle when they see that the sanctity of «defensive war» has been called into question. And this is because the widespread opinion has become justified, in the good old priestly way, with the quotation of a Latin proverb, or with a simplistically unhinged example - *vim vi repellere licet* - if I am attacked by a bully, I resort to violence to defend myself. This way of cutting the head of the snake, - unworthy of those thinking heads that have detected and identified our collective error and stupidity - completely fails to consider all the factors that must be taken into account if we really want to avoid the mental stereotypes of the crudest dogmatism.

The fact is that a few months ago, the former editor of «L'Avanti!» after making the question we are dealing with the criterion for distinguishing Socialists from Anarchists (?!), presented it from a proletarian point of view roughly in the following way: although the workers are the ones who own nothing and therefore have nothing to lose, it is they who are in fact the greatest victims of the foreign invasion, because they cannot flee from the enemy army as those who have the financial means can do. The workers are therefore more exposed to reprisals, cruelty and oppression by the enemy and the Socialist Party cannot ignore this fact. In such a case, it has the duty to engage with all its forces in the war against the invaders and to renounce its principled political opposition to the bourgeois state.

From a more general point of view, it could be said that the proletariat is interested in preserving the territorial integrity of the nation in order to avoid the oppression of foreign power being layered on top of its class subjugation. In the face of such a danger, which constitutes a threat to the degree of political freedom and economic prosperity already achieved, the workers are to unite with the bourgeoisie and establish a pause in the class struggle until the security of the frontiers is guaranteed...

It is true that the threat of invasion leads to a convergence of interests of all the social classes of a given state, and that in such a case the victory of the enemy represents a material and po-

litical damage to the proletariat; but such a threat, because of the widespread militarism in all countries and its constant and general expansion, permanently afflicts all proletarians in time of peace, and immediately after the severance of diplomatic relations between two or more bourgeois governments, it is fulfilled to the detriment of the working classes of all countries which enter into war.

At such a critical and heated moment, the Socialist party should have to examine whether or not exist the imperative need to defend the nation, so that it can decide whether its position should be one of complete agreement with the other parties and the government or of unequivocal opposition - which can be expressed in very different ways: from banal ballot action to the declaration of a workers' uprising. Such an examination is hampered above all by the fact that in modern states foreign policy is a strict monopoly of the ruling spheres and all diplomatic activity is kept secret, even exempt from parliamentary control. How, then, can it be ascertained which of the warring bourgeoisies is responsible for the war, when all the governments declare that they have been drawn into it by force, while they were working to secure peace; and this, moreover, at a time when it is urgent to decide on one's own course of action?

However, that is not the principal point of the matter. Even if the state that provoked the war is clearly identified, there is no significant difference between the situations in the different countries in terms of the risks and dan-

gers of invasion to which border regions are exposed. While the mobilization of opposing armies takes place with a difference of only a few hours, while it is unknown which states will ally with the aggressor or the invaded, all of these nations involved find themselves at risk of invasion, facing the risk of future political oppression, all of these countries are at risk, and for all of them the conditions for national defense are ultimately fulfilled. When France and Piedmont declared war on Austria in 1859, the Austrian army immediately occupied the province of Novara. In 1870 the French state, whose object was to crush Prussia, soon found itself in conditions of the most disastrous defense. It is evident that in all wars between neighboring states the lesser or greater danger which threatens different countries is not due to the origin of the war, but to the greater or lesser efficiency of the troops or the quantity of arms; and this is especially true because all armies have always prepared their plans of mobilization and the strategic plans of defense and attack which they intend to follow against possible enemies.

Only in colonial wars can those who wish to follow legal standards regarding the use of violence, determine with certainty, both factually and legally, the existence and origin of domination. But strangely enough, it is the colonial wars that find support among the democratic defenders of the nationality right; because then they pull another excuse out of another compartment of their highly developed cerebellum: namely, the spread of democratic civilization!

Returning to our subject, we note that at the very beginning of the war, after having established the responsibility of one of the states, in the face of «History» or «Right» - which for us Marxists always remains an empty and useless abstraction - when applying this difference of responsibilities of the bourgeoisie to the different duties of the socialist proletarians according to whether they belong to the state invaded or to the attacking state, it has only been achieved that the proletariat and the Socialist party of the state that wanted war have been subjected to the consequences of the shameful policy of their own ruling classes, that they are forced to take anti-war action, while the proletarians of the other state are authorized, under the leadership of a Socialist minister of war, to march into the ranks state army to defend the fatherland and, if necessary, to cross its threatened frontiers in heroic fervor....

These are the consequences to which the absurd concept of the socialist legitimacy of defensive war has logically led us. Moving from theory to practice, this limitation of the proletariat's anti-militarist activity led to the fail-

ure of the proletarian International in the face of the European war. Let us add in passing that when we speak of the action of the Socialist party against the war, we limit ourselves to referring to the minimum effort to maintain class political opposition to the state even in times of war, with further action depending on the possibilities of the moment.

The ideal method is simultaneous anti-militarist activity; but this very simultaneity has been disturbed by the pernicious and specious reservation about «national defense», which is always, rightly or wrongly, playfully invoked and misled by those Socialist parties which are at the moment in favor of war. On the other hand, it is absurd to suppose that the political or revolutionary opposition which the various Socialist parties carry out on the basis of their own strength or training will not cause a change in the probability of military success of the belligerent countries. And since the probability of the victory of a particular state, whether invaded or attacking, will depend on its military strength and on the greater or lesser development of socialist tendencies in the ranks of the proletariat, it is certain that the socialist party vigorously intervening against the bourgeoisie of its own nation, regardless of its political-diplomatic responsibility, increases the chances of military defeat, hostile invasion and future political oppression.

In each case, therefore, the socialist party finds itself at a crossroads: either to sacrifice its own peculiarity and, to a large extent, its future on the altar of the motherland, or to weaken the nation to which it belongs by pursuing its specific activities without scruples.

In the face of this responsibility, the seriousness of which does not depend at all on the proverbial understanding of defense or attack, socialism should never hesitate not to deny itself completely.

But according to the aforementioned Mussolinian theory, formulated at an unsuspected moment, and according to other very fashionable considerations, such a betrayal of the socialist party in the face of the enemy should result in a bloody proletarian sacrifice. It is this infamous way of formulating the question that deceives many socialists.

Above all, we do not understand how a war situation created by the bourgeoisie could not result in a bloody sacrifice on the part of the proletariat, and we do not believe that the tears of the mothers of the slain soldiers would be less painful at the thought that they had fallen when invading a foreign country. Every socialist activity results in hardship for the proletariat. Our program is a program of negation, the aim of which is not to make the present institutions just

and useful, but to break up their constant agonizing contradictions under the onslaught of the revolutionary surge. The proletariat will redeem the blood of its children at the cost of its own blood; and socialism can find no other way to overcome the filth and shamefulness of the capitalist world. Will not the whole present era of trade union demands, carried out by the method of the strike, in which the workers condemn themselves to hunger and misery in order to win a relative increase in prosperity, seem absurd to the people of the future? These contradictions lie at the crux of the regime against which we are fighting, and are necessarily reflected in our entire struggle, which will go down in history as a heroic but painful martyrdom, in which conflicts aimed against the interests of the ruling class always end in the massacre of the oppressed, strikers, cops, proletarians who have become soldiers under this or that bourgeois flag.

The dilemma and crossroads facing the socialist party is similar to Shakespeare's «to be or not to be».

In no case, without denying itself, socialism must resign itself to national cohesion. This is common and praised by all other parties whenever the motherland is in danger, even by mistake or by the government of the state's own volition. But such cohesion cannot and must not be our own, even if the reason for the horrible phenomenon of war is the perfidy of hostile governments, perhaps with the deceptive complicity of their populations.

The sacrifice made by other parties is quite different from the one required of us. The others aim at cohesion and social peace in their hypocritical ideologies that mask the hidden tendencies of the ruling minorities to preserve the privileges of oppression. We, on the other hand, are the party of open social conflict, of the declared struggle between the classes, and to take socialism away from this battlefield under phrases adopted from the other side is to bury it.

We hold that those who pretend to find a point of contact between socialism and national problems will be forced to conclude that the only conceivable historical mission which the nationalities constituted in state formations have is nationalism, for which a particular nation, and always the same one, is the one which is always right; and it is the more right the greater its armed strength and the lesser its internal class contradictions.

In any case, it can certainly be stated that the least happy, the least Marxist, the least socialist solution to the problem of the relationship between socialism and nationality is that which is vulgarly expressed by the slogan «defense of the nation».

War in Ukraine: the Disgusting Opportunism of «Mouvement Communiste-Kolektivně proti Kapitálu»

«Mouvement Communiste-Kolektivni proti Kapitálu» is a group active in Belgium, France and the Czech Republic, which was formed by a fusion of elements from the Internationalist Communist Current (ICC) and a group referring to the Italian «operaismo» of the 1970s; it enjoys a certain reputation for a kind of political and theoretical radicalism among those attracted by its discourses.

In its vague and confusing presentation (see its website), we read that it intends to defend «Marxist concepts»; according to this «Movement» the theory «is always plunged into a deep crisis.» because of its «distortion (class collaboration; nationalism; parliamentarism; pacifism; trade unionism) brought about above all, through many decades, by social-democratic, Stalinist, Maoist and Trotskyist currents». It sums up its «ambitions and its hopes» in the formula: «maximum intransigence towards the classes represented by the existing regime and the maximum freedom and self-organisation among those who engage in the fight for a collective and individual future which is worth living».

We have already had the opportunity to show that its demands for theoretical and programmatic rigour and intransigence are only a pretext for its practical opportunism. The war in Ukraine has become a new, particularly repulsive example, with the publication of a text on the subject: «UKRAINE: The Russian colonial expedition accelerates the race to world war» (27/2/22) (1).

In a detailed analysis of inter-imperialist relations describing the positions of the various states, it writes that «European capitals [continue] in disarray»; but despite their differences, they presented a united front and took measures (economic sanctions, military aid to Ukraine) that undoubtedly surprised Russian imperialism by their magnitude. This is a recurring error in analyses of European imperialisms, whose strengths (and thus dangers to the international proletariat) the MC-KP always tends to downplay in comparison with their competitors on the world stage. However, we will not develop this point now.

In the rest of its text, the MC-KP multiplies its commitment to orthodox Marxist beliefs, which contrast with the flatness of most currents of the so called «extreme left» in the face of official pro imperialist propaganda:

«Our positions are known. Workers have no country; they do not defend frontiers of any sort; they fight first of all their own bourgeoisie and all imperialist and colonialist policies of an-

nexation. Workers aim for fraternisation between proletarians in uniform from the opposing camps with the aim of transforming imperialist wars into class war.»

Shortly thereafter, however, it adds that «*Fraternisation between proletarians in uniform from both fronts is impossible in the conditions of the conflict in Ukraine*». The Russian soldiers are, according to the MC-KPK, professional groups that are «most loyal to the Russian regime». In writing these sentences, the MC-KP was for sure unaware of the many testimonies of the lack of «morale» and combativeness of many of these often very young soldiers, who sometimes abandoned their equipment, even refused to fight, etc.(2) The 200,000 soldiers arrayed around the border could not, of course, have been mostly professional soldiers or «mercenaries» who would not have allowed any fraternization...

Regarding the calls for sacrifice for the homeland published by the Ukrainian government and neo-Nazi militias, the MC-KP assures: «*It is obvious that the proletariat in Ukraine has nothing to gain from this patriotic combat whose advocates are no different from Putin*». But immediately afterwards it adds: «*On the other hand, it is not completely impossible for sectors of the exploited class and inheritors of the democratic Maidan movement of 2013 to try to organise a resistance, armed or not, to the invasion which breaks with the Ukrainian state and its Nazi militias*».

The «democratic movement» of 2013–2014, extolled by «far-left» opportunism, was a broad petty bourgeois protest movement against the disputed electoral victory of a pro Russian candidate and in favour of Ukraine's adhesion to the European Union. The driving force behind this movement was far right nationalist groups funded by Western-linked oligarchs...

But the MC-KP goes on to argue that this prospect would strike a «terrible blow against the Ukrainian state», strengthen opposition to the war in Russia, enable «the rise of independent workers' struggles» and send a clear signal of «*political class autonomy to millions of emigrant Ukrainian workers in Europe and Russia as well as, more generally, the world proletariat*». But to achieve this, it concludes, «*proletarians must use legal and illegal weapons*».

In fact, in complete contradiction to the above orthodox Marxist statements and despite the quotations from Lenin scattered throughout the text, it proposes a repetition of the «partisan» policy

of the Second World War: the self proclaimed autonomous participation of the proletariat in the imperialist war. Thus, the rupture between the war fronts and revolutionary defeatism, which Lenin and the Bolsheviks stubbornly defended as a condition for the resumption of the revolutionary class struggle, disappears; according to the MC-KP, participation in the war can, on the contrary, lead to «class political autonomy» (whatever this vague term means), and this «autonomy» can be the work of the successors of the democratic, i.e. politically bourgeois, movement! It is hard to deny the communist revolutionary positions any more clearly...

In a reply on its Czech website to a user's request for explanation, MC-KP writes: «*Can resistance to a colonialist military aggressor be trivialized into 'it's fighting (and dying) for the state'? It certainly can't, I think it's a fight to defend life from its Stalinization, a return to 'Soviet times' with repression and censorship and suppression of individual and collective freedoms is what people in Ukraine fear and resist. Hence the 'definition' of the Ukrainian struggle as an armed democratic one. If it remains 'just' that, it risks the consequence that every democratic movement risks: the strengthening of the state. Is any other consequence conceivable? Yes, if the workers establish that struggle on a class basis...»*

The circle is complete: for the MC-KP, as for the dirtiest bourgeois propaganda, we are witnessing in Ukraine the resistance of a people fighting for their freedom, not a war between two bourgeois states! To rechristen the war on the Ukrainian side, with the general mobilisation of the male population as cannon fodder, as «armed democratic struggle» is nothing but a pathetic justification of total alignment with the war front, despite all the pseudo-classist phrases.

Invariance of opportunism: even if the consequences for the proletariat are infinitely minor, it is the same betrayal of the fundamental principles of the class independence that was committed in 1914 by the majority of the parties of the Second International, which the Bolsheviks denounced as a sell-out to the bourgeoisie and which made it imperative to break with them in order to constitute the revolutionary parties and the International.

Engels explained that the basis of every political error is a theoretical error. The theoretical emptiness, which the MC-KP implicitly acknowledges when it speaks of a deep theoretical crisis, disarms it in the face of ideological pressure from the ruling class, lead-

ing it in fact to side with the bourgeois camp. In reality, Marxist theory is not in crisis: what is «in crisis» are the forces that have broken with this theory, this programme. The rupture with these forces, whether large or small, the return to that theory and programme and the reconstitution of the class party on this basis is, without wishing to offend the MC-KPK, the only way out for the proletarians of Ukraine and Russia, who are called upon to shed their blood or make sacrifices in defence of «their»

capitalism, as well as for the proletarians of the whole world, who will sooner or later be confronted with the same prospect.

(1) [http:// movement-communiste .com/documents/MC/Leaflets/BLT2202FRvG.pdf](http://movement-communiste.com/documents/MC/Leaflets/BLT2202FRvG.pdf)

(2) British intelligence chief says Russian soldiers refused to obey orders, others damaged their equipment (Financial Times, 7/4/22). We don't take this

information literally, but the discontent that exists even among groups described as closest to the Russian regime is evidenced by other information: a lawyer in Krasnodar (southern Russia), who took on the defense of dozens of members of the Rosgvardia (National Guard, considered staunch supporters of the regime) who refused to be sent to Ukraine, said that nearly a thousand people had contacted him on the same issue. (Financial Times 2/4/22)

(3) <https://bit.ly/31yjbu6>

«Communist Program» Resumes its Publication

Our party has always tried to spread internationally its program, its theses, its positions, showing the theoretical and programmatic continuity with the revolutionary communism founded by Marx and Engels, restored at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century by Lenin, reaffirmed and fiercely defended by the Communist Left of Italy, which was at the origin of the Communist Party of Italy and fought with intransigence against any deviation, anarchist, reformist or «centrist» («*maximalism*»), but also and above all against Stalinism.

The Stalinist perspective of «building socialism in one country» meant that Soviet power broke its ties with the international proletarian revolution to devote itself exclusively to the development of the country; in an economically and socially backward Russia reduced to its own forces, this development could only take place in the direction of state capitalism. It was then inevitable that the Communist International, which was de facto led by Moscow, would degenerate completely. This degeneration, which began on the tactical level in 1922, continued on the organizational level, then on the more general political level and finally on the theoretical level, led to the transformation of the International into a mere instrument of the Russian state, which finally decided to dissolve it in 1943 in the middle of the world war. The participation of «Soviet» Russia in the imperialist war of 1939-1945 was the conclusion of the long degeneration of the international communist movement.

The proletarian revolutionary movement could only emerge from this abyss on the basis of the full restoration of the Marxist theory and communist program, which had been disfigured and falsified by the Stalinist movement, the agent of the capitalist counterrevolution in Russia and in the world.

What forces, however infinitesimal, were capable of carrying out this colossal task?

Trotskyism had demonstrated, both

on the tactico-political level and on the theoretical level, that it was incapable of restoring Marxism. Sick of democracy and expediency, even if it referred to the great political and theoretical battles of the Trotsky of «Terrorism and Communism», and to his polemics of 1926 to defend Lenin's positions against the false «Leninists» of Stalin or Bukharin, it never succeeded in raising itself to the best political and theoretical positions of its founder, and even less to those of a Lenin.

It only retained from Trotsky his opportunist and false positions of his last period of struggle, making them even worse: from the defence of bourgeois democracy to the «entryism» in the counter-revolutionary reformist parties, from the support to the so-called socialist state capitalist regimes to the alignment with nationalist organizations in the anti-colonial struggles, etc.

The Communist Left of Italy, of which Amadeo Bordiga was the best representative, demonstrated that it was the only political movement to set and carry out the vital task of restoring integrally the Marxist doctrine and the programmatic line consistent with it.

The struggles it waged in defence of Marxism within the Italian Socialist Party since 1912, before, during and after the First World War, and then within the Communist International founded in 1919, formed the basis for the constitution of the Communist Party of Italy in January 1921. Its theoretical and programmatic intransigence was taken at the time for a formalist mania and reduced too simplistically to anti-parliamentarianism – which was undoubtedly one of the characteristics of the Left.

It is the achievements of its theoretical, programmatic, political, tactical and organizational struggle, from its critique of parliamentarianism in the countries of old democracy, its analysis of fascism, to the conditions of admission to the International, to its fight not only against traditional reformism, but above all against the pseudo-revolutionary maximalism «centrism» and Gramsci's

deviations, that allowed the current of the Communist Left to begin the work of restoring Marxist positions and reconstituting the class party.

It knew that this work would be long and difficult. After the ravages of Stalinism, it was necessary to find in history, in the contradictions of society, in the causes of the defeat of the world revolution, the demonstration of the powerful validity of authentic, non falsified Marxism.

After the reorganization in Italy before the end of the Second World War of the militants who had resisted Stalinism, the elements most coherent with the traditions of the Communist Left succeeded, through discussions, clashes and ruptures, in picking up the thread not only from the programmatic and theoretical point of view, but also from the organizational point of view. In 1952 the Partito Comunista Internazionale-Il Programma Comunista was born, and it linked its work, its activity and its perspectives to that *thread of time* that had been broken by Stalinism. From then on, one of the priority tasks of the party was to disseminate as widely as possible, in the different languages, the results of the theoretical restoration and the definition of the political and tactical lines around which it intended to develop, without forcing the pace with tactical or organizational expedients, but following a propaganda plan; as people of different nationalities came into contact with and integrated into the party, the need and the practical possibility of translating into the different languages theses and texts that, in the great majority of cases, had been written in Italian, emerged.

This is how translations of some texts began, in the form of pamphlets; and when in a given country sympathizers had the capacity to carry out a continuous activity, they organized themselves to publish reviews then papers.

Thanks also to the presence of Italian emigrant militants, this process took

(Continued on page 26)

«Communist Program» Resumes its Publication

(Continuation from page 25)

place in France, Belgium and Switzerland. In 1957, *Programme Communiste*, the party's theoretical review in French, was published, followed in 1963 by the paper *Le Prolétaire*. Since French is much more widely spoken internationally than Italian, especially in Europe and Africa, but also in the Middle East and elsewhere, it was important to be able to spread the voice of the party in this language. It was also thanks to the emigration from Latin America and Spain to France and Switzerland that the party was able to count on elements from these regions, who had become militants, to organize the activity of sections around a magazine and a newspaper: in 1972 the Spanish-language review *El Programa Comunista* was published, and in 1974 the periodical *El Comunista*.

During this period there were many social and political upheavals; in Greece, Spain, Portugal, South America it was not only a post «68» type of agitation as in Germany and the Nordic countries, but real political earthquakes caused by economic and social crises; in some countries they led to brutal dictatorships, as in Greece with the dictatorship of the colonels, in Chile with Pinochet, in Argentina with the dictatorship of Videla, while in Portugal the dictatorship had to give way to a slow democratization, following the national liberation struggles in Angola and Mozambique which became independent in 1975. From 1974 to 1975, the party published a number of pamphlets in Portuguese («Characteristic Theses»), «Lessons from the Counter-Revolutions», «The Fundamentals of Revolutionary Communism», etc.) to meet the need for knowledge of our positions in that country. 1974 saw the publication of the first issue of the Greek-language journal *Kommunistikô Programa*, while from 1969 to 1971 several issues of the Danish/Swedish-language journal *Kommunistisk Program* were published.

In Germany, the efforts to publish a party press, which had already begun in the early 1960s, took shape in 1974 with the publication of what was to become *Kommunistisches Programm*. In the same year the first issue of the Swiss supplement to *Le Prolétaire* was published, while the Belgian supplement was published in 1977. In 1978 *El Oumami* was published for the proletarians of the Maghreb and *El Proletario* for Spanish-speaking Latin America. They were followed by the publication in 1981 of a bulletin in Turkish *Enternasyonalist Proleter*, firstly for immigrant proletarians, and a bulletin in Portuguese *Pro-*

letário for Brazil...

The Party's effort responded to the need to provide militants of different nationalities with theoretical and political materials, knowing that this effort could not give short-term results; by attacking the theory, the program, the political, tactical and organizational lines that had constituted the basis of Lenin's Bolshevik Party and of the Communist International and of the Communist Party of Italy, the Stalinist counter-revolution had destroyed the international communist movement for many decades.

The weak point of this effort was the English-speaking zone (Britain, the United States of America, especially), i.e., the zone where capitalism is the oldest and where imperialism has its strongest world gendarme. With the contribution of a few sympathizers, in the early 1970s texts began to be published in English that combined the balance sheet of the counter-revolution with the foundations of Marxist theory. The first text published was «The Fundamentals of Revolutionary Communism»; the party's theoretical journal, *Programme communiste*, also was used to disseminate several texts in English: «The International Communist Party», «The Conditions of Admission to the Communist International», «The Theses on parliamentarism presented by the Communist Abstentionist Fraction of the Italian Socialist Party», and so on..

Finally, the first issue of an English theoretical review, *Communist Program*, was published in October 1975. The 8th issue of the journal should have been published in September/October 1982, but the internal crisis that occurred between July and October of that year prevented it.

This crisis, the most serious in the history of our party, provoked by the development within it of tendencies that ultimately liquidated the party («contingentist», «movementist», opposed by the academic and wait-and-see tendencies), broke the organization. The underlying theoretical errors – in particular the false evaluation of the historical situation and the erroneous ambition of the party to be a point of reference for the anti-nuclear and workers' social movements – could only cause the explosion of an organization that had swollen numerically too lightly, relegating theoretical and programmatic assimilation to second or even third place.

After this crisis a small group of militants, conscious of the absolute necessity to make a ruthless assessment of the errors in which the party had fallen, resumed the work of re-establishing the theoretical, programmatic, political, tactical and organizational bases that had always distinguished the Communist Left of Italy and the International Com-

munist Party that represented it at the international level.

Le Prolétaire, then *Programme Communiste* and *El Programa Comunista* ensured the continuity of this work, especially in France and Switzerland. In Italy, the crisis, at first, did not seem to have hit the organization as hard as in other countries; but from 1982 to 1984, it resulted in the complete fragmentation of what seemed to be the «hard core» of the party. *Il Programma Comunista*, the party's historic title, ended up in the hands of a group of old comrades who, without even attempting an internal political struggle, appealed to the bourgeois law to take it over – before shutting themselves up behind Italian borders. Another group organized around a new publication, *Combat*; they defended the thesis of the «original vice» of the Italian Communist Left (an old accusation already formulated by Zinoviev at the beginning of the 1920s), which would be impeccable on the «theoretical» level, but completely deficient on the «political» level (as if it were possible to separate the theory from the political line of the

Issue No. 8 February 2022

communist program

ORGAN OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST PARTY

CONTENTS

- Communist Program resumes publication 1
- The Commune was great because of what it was forced to be, not because of what its creators wanted it to be
(«programme communiste», N° 51-52, 1974) 4
- In defence of the continuity of the Communist Program: Theses on the tactics of the Communist Party of Italy
(Rome theses 1922) 18
- The party and the trade union question
(«programme communiste», n°63 64, 1071 1072) 27

WHAT DISTINGUISHES OUR PARTY: The political continuity which goes from Marx and Engels to Lenin, to the foundation of the Communist International and the Communist Party of Italy; the class struggle of the Communist Left against the degeneration of the internationalism, the struggle against the theory of «socialism in one country», the line of mass course-revolution, the rejection of all social fronts and all reformist lines; the struggle against the principles and practices of bourgeois democracy, against interclassism and political and trade-union class collaboration, against any form of opportunism and nationalism; the difficult task of restoring the Marxist doctrine and the revolutionary spirit; the existence – the class party – closely linked with the working class, and its daily struggle in opposition to capitalism and bourgeois oppression; the struggle against personal and electoral politics, against any form of opportunism; the claim of movement or the presentist practice of «armed struggle»; the support of any proletarian struggle which breaks with social peace and respects the discipline of internationalist collaboration; the support of all efforts towards proletarian class organization on the basis of economic associations, with the perspective of a large scale resurrection of the class struggle; proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary anti-capitalist struggle.

Price per copy: Europe: 3 € / 2 £; 8 FS; 25 Krs / USA and Cdn: US \$ 3 / Latin America: US \$ 1.5

«Communist program» No. 8 (February 2022)

Summary

- Communist Program resumes its publication
- The Commune was great because of what it was forced to be, not because of what its creators wanted it to be
- In Defense of the Continuity of the Communist Program: Theses on the Tactics of the Communist Party of Italy (Rome theses 1922)
- The Party and the Trade Union Question

Price one copy: Europe: 3 € / £ 2 / CHF 8 / USA: US \$ 3 / Canada: CA\$ 3 / Latin America US\$ 1,5

party!). But most of the comrades, completely disoriented by these events, abandoned political militancy and withdrew into private life. Only a handful of militants, grouped around the paper *Il Comunista* (which was already a party paper before the crisis), opposed these deviations; in 1985 the activity of the party was able to reorganize itself in a homogeneous way on an international scale with the militants of *Le Proletaire*.

It took years to consolidate the activities of the party overcoming the crisis of 1982-84. In 2002, thanks to supporters in Britain and Canada, the publication of the *Proletarian* newsletter began, aimed primarily at informing English-speaking readers of the party's activities.

On the basis of the work of translation of the texts and theses of the party carried out for a long time, we finally have the possibility of publishing again

the theoretical review *Communist Program*. No doubt that it will be a very important tool for the development and international implantation of the party in the period of renewal of proletarian struggles that is coming.

To symbolically underline the continuity with the previous work of the party, it was decided to continue the numbering interrupted almost 40 years ago: the first issue of the new publication is therefore number 8.

Denial of Abortion Rights in the United States of America

The abolition of the federal right to abortion in the U.S.A by the Supreme Court has sent shockwaves through the Western world. From the most openly social democratic and parliamentary parties to the self-proclaimed «Marxist» opposition parties, cries of indignation have been raised against this affront to human rights, an affront apparently made even worse by the fact that it is an «advanced» country that has implemented it. We, on the other hand, claim that it is a confirmation of our theses on democracy and on the so-called «civilization» of today's bourgeois society. But in order to deal with the question in more depth, it is necessary to recall briefly the history of the right to abortion in the USA.

In this country, it was institutionalized at the federal level by the «Roe versus Wade» decision in 1973. Prior to this decision, abortion was regulated by each state's laws independently, making it illegal in all cases for a large number of states (at least 30), given the choices of conservative and Christian-leaning local governments. The case of Jane Roe, a pseudonym for Norma McCorvey, was particularly important in the development of the law in the United States. This woman, born and living in the so-called «Deep South», married at the age of 16, was prompted to sue the state of Texas over its anti-abortion legislation while she was expecting her third child. The state's defense attorney was Wade, who gave his name to the case. The U.S. Supreme Court, called into the debate after three years of litigation, argued that the U.S. Constitution (particularly the 14th Amendment) should guarantee limits on state interference with individuals, including in the case of abortion. This was a momentous decision, forcing many states to change their abortion laws and directly paving the way for federal legislation on the subject. In this story, it should be noted that, although there were obviously social pressures, the sentence was an essentially legal decision by a small circle of bureaucrats; thus, this lib-

eralization should be understood as a process (as often happens in the modern capitalist system) of limiting class friction through concessions to alleviate the difficulties of proletarian life.

If we take the Italian case, we must remember that the great struggles, instrumentalized by different bourgeois currents, have resulted in a law that is anything but satisfactory; on the other hand, the number of conscientious objectors is very high, weakening the possibility for young proletarians to have access to abortion with safety and discretion. The pressure of reactionary families and the difficulties of access to this service further increase the problems created by the limits of the legislation: the question is therefore not closed in this country. An the same is even more true in other European countries, like Poland where the abortion law is very restrictive and the doctors very reluctant to implement it. As we wrote at the time: «*only a dictatorial power of the working class will be able to impose the interests that are dominant today to no longer be dominant*» (1).

In the United States, then, the Supreme Court's ruling overturned *Roe v. Wade*, causing a legislative setback of nearly 50 years. And while «Trumpism» rejoices in the great result, the Democrats' controversy over the issue has begun, in an endless debate worthy of the worst theological universities of the Middle Ages. Who is paying for these unscrupulous political maneuvers? What a question! It is the 40 million women of childbearing age who now live in anti-abortion states (representing 58% of those living in the United States, as the *Center for Reproductive Rights* reminds us), and primarily proletarian women. Once again, an issue that first and foremost concerns the conditions of proletarian women becomes a pretext for increasing the power of bourgeois democratic institutions, by feeding a polemic between forces that can never solve the problems and contradictions of this system.

Indeed, this ruling is once again the

proof of the bankruptcy of the democratic system, insofar as it is only an instrument of the bourgeois class to carry out its claims at the behest of an abstract «popular will». The proletariat will never be able to obtain truly human living conditions and a system that defends its interests, except by forging it through its international class revolution: only the dictatorship of the proletariat will be able to put an end to the contradictions of the capitalist state by eliminating the contradictions of democracy at the same time as democracy itself.

So where should revolutionary Marxists stand?

As always, in the continuity and invariance of Marxism. We have always called for «*totally free, free, safe abortion extended to minors*» (2), but not in the name of a miserable social-democratic humanitarianism. It is a complementary demand to all the other demands for the improvement of the lives of proletarian women; it is therefore «*necessary to fight to defend all the conditions of life and work that beset proletarian women in the first place*» (ibid.). It is very important that these demands are understood in a fundamentally classist sense, and not as separate struggles: otherwise it is to fall into bourgeois reformist practice, abandoning the proletarian revolutionary orientation.

The Supreme Court's decision is undoubtedly reactionary and anti-proletarian, because it hits not only women in general, but especially proletarian women, since if bourgeois women cannot have an abortion where they live, they can afford to go to another state of the Union or abroad, as they have always done. For proletarian women, the only option left is clandestine abortion, paid for dearly, sometimes with their lives.

The counter-revolutionary terrain, Marx affirmed, is dialectically and historically also the revolutionary terrain. Thus, the terrain of the most odious reaction, such as that against the dignity and the body of women, will dialectically become the terrain of the resumption of the class struggle in the

(Continued on page 28)

Denial of Abortion Rights in the United States of America

(Continuation from page 27)

United States, as in any other country. But without a class orientation of the question, to react to this reactionary judgment with the usual impotent methods of parliamentary debate, to believe in the promises of the Democrats and President Biden to help women, is to fall back into the illusions of bourgeois democracy, to legitimize it for the umpteenth time. It is not the vote that can change society, but only the hard class struggle.

About a referendum in 1981 for the repeal of a law on abortion in Italy, we wrote: «*This law, therefore, must not be*

defended (and voting, even if it is to vote no, defends it). It must undoubtedly be challenged, but by the women's struggle, which must be prepared by agitation, propaganda and organization, first of all in the factories, in the workplaces, embracing not one, but all the claims that concretely defend the conditions of the proletarians, since it is only with their fundamental contribution that the defense of women in general can be carried out».

We therefore do not join in the cries of indignation of American, European, Asian or African democrats, because for almost two centuries our cry has always been the same: **proletarians of all coun-**

tries, unite! In the name of this motto, let us prepare the world awakening of the working class.

PROLETARIAN WOMEN! GET ORGANIZED TO CONQUER A REAL RIGHT TO ABORTION!

WORKERS, UNITE FOR THE RESUMPTION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE!

LONG LIVE THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL REVOLUTION!

July, 4th 2022

(1) See "Aborto: solo con la lotta proletaria, con la sua organizzazione si può agire per gli interessi proletari", il programma comunista, n. 6/1981

(2) Ibidem.

PROGRAM OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST PARTY

The International Communist Party is constituted on the basis of the following principles established at Leghorn in 1921 on the foundation of the Communist Party of Italy (Section of the Communist International):

1. In the present capitalist social regime there develops an increasing contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, giving rise to the antithesis of interests and to the class struggle between the proletariat and the ruling bourgeoisie.

2. The present day production relations are protected by the power of the bourgeois State, that, whatever the form of representative system and the use of elective democracy, constitutes the organ for the defense of the interests of the capitalist class.

3. The proletariat can neither crush or modify the mechanism of capitalist production relations from which its exploitation derives, without the violent destruction of the bourgeois power.

4. The indispensable organ of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat is the class party. The Communist Party consists of the most advanced and resolute part of the proletariat; it unites the efforts of the working masses transforming their struggles for group interests and contingent issues into the general struggle for the revolutionary emancipation of the proletariat. It is up to the Party to propagate revolutionary theory among the masses, to organize the material means of action, to lead the working class during its struggle, securing the historical continuity and the international unity of the movement.

5. After it has smashed the power of the capitalist State, the proletariat must completely destroy the old State apparatus in order to organize itself as the ruling class and set up its own dictatorship; meanwhile depriving the bourgeoisie and members of the bourgeois class of all political rights and functions as long as they survive socially, founding the organs of the new regime exclusively on the productive class. Such is the program that the Communist Party sets itself and which characterizes it. It is this party therefore which exclusively represents, organizes and directs the proletarian dictatorship. The requisite defence of the proletarian state against all counter-revolutionary initiatives can only be assured by depriving the bourgeoisie and parties which are enemies of the proletarian dictatorship of all means of agitation and political propaganda and by equipping the proletariat with an armed organization in order to repel all interior and exterior attacks.

6. Only the force of the proletarian State will be able to systematically put into effect the necessary measures for intervening in the relations of the social economy, by means of which the collective administration of production and distribution will take the place of the capitalist system.

7. This transformation of the economy and consequently of the whole social life will lead to the gradual elimination of the necessity for the political State, which will progressively give way to the rational administration of human activities.

* * *

Faced with the situation in the capitalist world and the workers' movement following the Second World War the position of the Party is the following :

8. In the course of the first half of the twentieth century the capitalist social system has been developing, in the economic field, creating monopolistic trusts among the employers, and trying to

control and manage production and exchange according to central plans with State management of whole sectors of production. In the political field, there has been an increase of the police and military potential of the State, with governments adopting a more totalitarian form. All these are neither new sorts of social organizations in transition from capitalism to socialism, nor revivals of pre-bourgeois political regimes. On the contrary, they are definite forms of a more and more direct and exclusive management of power and the State by the most developed forces of capital.

This course excludes the progressive, pacifist interpretations of the evolution of the bourgeois regime, and confirms the Marxist prevision of the concentration and the antagonistic array of class forces. So that the proletariat may confront its enemies' growing potential with strengthened revolutionary energy, it must reject the illusory revival of democratic liberalism and constitutional guarantees. The Party must not even accept this as a means of agitation ; it must finish historically once and for all with the practice of alliances, even for transitory issues, with the bourgeois or petit-bourgeois parties, or with pseudo-workers' parties with a reformist program.

9. The global imperialist wars show that the crisis of disintegration of capitalism is inevitable because it has entered the phase when its expansion, instead of signifying a continual increment of the productive forces, is conditioned by repeated and ever-growing destruction. These wars have caused repeated deep crises in the global workers' organizations because the dominant classes could impose on them military and national solidarity with one or the other of the belligerents. The opposing historical solution for which we fight, is the awakening of the class struggle, leading to civil war, the destruction of all international coalitions by the reconstitution of the International Communist Party as an autonomous force independent of any existing political or military power.

10. The proletarian State, to the extent that its apparatus is an instrument and a weapon of struggle in a historical epoch of transition does not derive its organizational strength from constitutional rules nor from representative schemas whatsoever. The most complete historical example of such a State up to the present is that of the Soviets (workers' councils) which were created during the October 1917 revolution, when the working class armed itself under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. The Constituent Assembly having been dissolved, they became the exclusive organs of power repelling the attacks by foreign bourgeois governments and, inside the country, stamping out the rebellion of the vanquished classes and of the middle and petit-bourgeois layers and of the opportunist parties which, in the decisive phases, are inevitably allied with the counter-revolution

11. The defense of the proletarian regime against the dangers of degeneration inherent in the failures and possible retreats in the work of economic and social transformation – whose integral realization is inconceivable within the limits of only one country – can only be assured by the constant coordination between the policy the workers' State and the united international struggle, incessant in times of peace as in times of war, of the proletariat of each country against its bourgeoisie and its State and military apparatus. This co-ordination can only be secured by means of the political and programmatic control of the world communist party over the State apparatus where the working class has seized power.