

partito comunista internazionale

**THE PARTY'S**

**PROGRAMME**

il comunista  
**Reprint**

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST PARTY  
PARTI COMMUNISTE INTERNATIONALE  
PARTITO COMUNISTA INTERNAZIONALE  
PARTIDO COMUNISTA INTERNACIONAL  
INTERNATIONALEN KOMMUNISTISCHEN PARTEI

WHAT DISTINGUISHES OUR PARTY  
=====

is the political continuity which goes from Marx to Lenin, to the foundation of the Communist International and the Communist Party of Italy (Livorno 1921);

the struggle of the Communist Left against the degeneration of the International, the struggle against the theory of "socialism in one country" and stalinist counter-revolution;

the rejection of the Popular Fronts and the Resistance blocs;

the difficult task of restoring the revolutionary doctrine and organization in close interrelationship with the working class, against personal and electoral politics.

## C O N T E N T S

THE PROGRAMME OF THE PARTY (1921)	1
ON THE TRACK OF THE GREAT MARXIST TRADITION	3
FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST THEORY	6
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY ON A WORLDWIDE SCALE	15
REVOLUTIONARY PARTY AND ECONOMICAL ACTION	17
APPEAL FOR THE INTERNATIONAL REORGANISATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST MOVEMENT (1950)	21



## THE PROGRAMME OF THE PARTY

The International Communist Party is constructed 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 contrast between the productive forces and the relations of production, giving place 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 will be the form of representative system and the use of the elective democracy, constitutes the organ for the defence of the interests of the capitalist class.
3. The proletariat can neither crush or modify the mechanism of capitalist production relations from which derives his exploitation, without the violent knock-down 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, unites the efforts of the working masses transforming their struggles for group interests and contingent issues to the general struggle for the revolutionary emancipation of the proletariat. It is up to the Party to propagate the revolutionary theory among the masses, to organise the material means of action, to lead the working class all along its struggle, securing the historical continuity and the international unity of the movement.
5. After it has knocked down the power of the capitalist State, the proletariat must completely destroy the old State apparatus in order to organise itself as dominant class and set up its own dictatorship. It will deny all functions and political rights to any individual of the bourgeois class as long as they socially survive, founding the organs of the new regime exclusively on the productive class. Such is the programme that the Communist Party sets itself and which is characteristic of it. It is this party therefore which exclusively represents, organises and directs the proletarian dictatorship.
6. Only the force of the proletarian State will be able to put systematically into effect the necessary measures for intervening in the relations of the social economy, by means of which the collective gestion 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.

In the face of 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 exchanges 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 army potential of the State, governments adopting a more totalitarian form. All these are neither new sorts of social organisations as a 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 prevision of the concentration and the antagonistic array of the class forces. So that the proletariat may confront its enemies' growing potential with strengthened revolutionary energy, it must repel 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 middle class as well as the pseudo-proletarian and reformist parties.

9. The imperialistic wars show that the crisis of disaggregation 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 destructions. These wars have caused repeated deep crises in the workers' world organisations 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. It is from its revolutionary nature and not its conformity to any existing constitutional model that the proletarian State draws its power of social reorganisation. The most complete historical example of such a State is up to the present 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 Bolchevik Party. The Constituent Assembly having been dissolved, they became the exclusive organs of power repelling the attacks by foreign bourgeois governments and stamping out inside the country the rebellion of the vanquished classes and of the middle class and opportunist sections inevitable allies of the counter-revolution at the decisive moment.

11. The integral realization of socialism within the limits of one country is inconceivable and the socialist transformation cannot be carried out without failures and momentary set-backs. The defence of the proletarian regime against the ever present dangers of degeneration is possible only if the proletarian State is always co-ordinated with the international struggle of the working class of each country against its own bourgeoisie, its State and its army; this struggle permits of no respite even in wartime. This co-ordination can only be secured if the world communist party controls the politics and programme of the States where the working class has vanquished.

---

ON THE TRACK OF THE GREAT MARXIST TRADITION

Based on this programme, the International Communist Party claims in their integrity the fundamental doctrinal principles of marxism : the dialectical materialism as a system of conception of the world and of human history, the fundamental economic doctrines contained in Marx's Capital as a method of interpretation of the capitalist economy, the programmatic formulations of the Communists' Manifesto as an historical and political lay-out for the emancipation of the world's working class, the whole system of principles and methods shown by the victorious experience of the Russian revolution, the theoretical and practical work of Lenin and of the Bolchevik party in the crucial years of the rise to power and the civil war ; the classic theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International, represented the confirmation, the restoration and the consequent development, of these principles which are today still more emphasised by the lessons of the tragic revisionist wave which began in 1926-27 under the name of "socialism in one country". This wave, that only conventionally we tie up with the name of the individual Stalin, because it originated from the pressure of objective social forces towering above Russia, owing to the failed extension in the whole world of the revolutionary fire of October 1917 -- pressure on which it wasn't believed to oppose in time a programmatic and tactical barrier, that, even if unable to avoid the defeat, would have made less difficult and tormenting the rebirth of the International Communist Movement, - had much more lethal effects than the opportunist disease that troubled the brief existence of the First International (anarchist deviations), than the one that threw down the Second in the abyss of the adhesion to the Union Sacree and then to the 1914 imperialistic war (gradualism, parliamentarism, democratism). Thus today, 30 years after the Second World War, the situation of the workers' movement appears a thousand times more critical than in the days of the vertiginous collapse of the Second International at the outbreak of the First World War.

The Third International was born in 1919 with a programme that, re-establishing the basis of the marxist doctrine, was breaking irrevocably with the democratic, gradualist, parliamentary and pacifistic illusions of the Second (wrecked moreover in the more ignoble chauvinism and warmongering during the war); and the fact that, in a certain measure, the danger of an involution of the Communist International outlined itself since the very beginning, both with a too hurried way of constituting the communist parties, especially in Western Europe, and with very elastic tactics adopted to "conquer the masses", doesn't diminish at all the immense historical contribution of Lenin, Trotsky and of the old bolchevik guard. This method and these tactics for the creators of the Red October, were not signifying and should not signify, in any case, the neglect of the basic principle of the violent conquest of power, of the destruction of the bourgeois parliamentary and democratic state apparatus of the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship directed by the Party, and their application could avoid disastrous effects if the revolution, as it was hoped, would rapidly flare up in the whole world; but, as the Left warned, since the Second Congress in 1920 there was the risk of having the most negative consequences on the insecure body of parties often collected at random, not sufficiently immunised against the possibility of social democratic relapse as soon as the wave had flown back; and unfortunately it did flow back, bringing to the surface not only and not so much the men, but above all the cancerous illnesses of a too recent past.

The criterion which made us oppose the tactics of the "united political front", first, and the tactics of the "worker-peasant governments" (equivocal reserve formula in place of the unmistakable "proletarian dictatorship), after ; the criterion which made us deplore the method of the direct adhesion to the International of organisations independent from the local Communist Party and of the acceptance of sympathiser parties, like in rejecting the praxis of infiltration of pseudo-workers or even bourgeois parties (like the

Kuomintang), and, worse still, of the "blocks", even if temporary, with parties apparently related or contingently aligned on "similar" positions, was and remains the following: the reinforcement of the communist parties depends not on tactical manoeuvres or on displays of subjective voluntarism, but on the objective revolutionary course that hasn't any reason to obey the canons of a continuous and linear progress: the rise to power can be far or near, and in both cases, but above all in the first, preparing for it means repelling any action likely to give rise in the communist organization to an opportunism similar to that of the Second International, namely to a break of the inseparable bond between means and ends, tactics and principles, immediate and ultimate objectives, which result can only be the return to electoralism and to democratism in politics and to reformism in the social fields.

Since 1926, the contrast transferred directly on the political level and terminated in the break between the International and the Left. The two questions on the carpet were "socialism in one country" and, soon after, "antifascism". "Socialism in one country" is a double negation of Leninism, firstly because contrabands as socialism what Lenin used to call "capitalistic development in the European manner in the petty-bourgeois and semi-medieval Russia", and secondly because shares the destinies of the Russian revolution from those of the world-wide proletarian revolution. It is the doctrine of the counter-revolution: to the inside it justified the repression against the old marxist and international guard, starting with Trotsky; outside the borders of the U.S.S.R. it favoured the crushing of the left currents by the centre fractions, often direct social-democratic survivals, "totalling surrendering to the bourgeoisie". (Trotsky).

The principal manifestation of this neglect of the programmatic supports of the world-wide communist struggle was precisely the substitution of the watchword of the revolutionary conquest of power, with that of the defence of democracy against fascism almost as if the two regimes would not both be defenders of the capitalist regime in front of the danger of a new proletarian revolutionary wave, alternating themselves at the helm of the State, according to the imperious demands of the dynamics of the class struggle. The phenomenon expressed itself not only in the Third International after the fall of the German bastion, owing to the victory of Hitler in 1933, but also in the "Trotskist" opposition which used the Stalinist watchword in the defence of democracy against fascism, even if showing it as a "phase" or "stage", to go through before being able to ask for the maximum rivendications of the revolutionary proletariat. In both cases it brought to the destruction of the working class as a political distinctive force; with objectives antithetical to those of any other social strata, to the mobilization of the workers of different countries for the defence, first of the democratic institutes, then of the "fatherland", to the rebirth and to the exasperation of the chauvinistic hatreds; at last to the dissolution, also formal of the Communist International and to the temporary annihilation of any yearning for its reconstruction.

The working class being joined to the bloody wagon of the imperialist war, 1939-1945, the slender forces of communism, international and internationalist, if and where they had survived, were not therefore able to do anything to influence the situation in any way: the cry of "transformation of the imperialist war into civil war", first announcement in 1914 of the Russian revolution of 1917, fell in the vacuum - and in contempt. Not only did the post-war period maintain the naive "hopes" of an expansion of revolutionary communism at the tips of the Russian bayonets, but saw the triumph of a neo-ministerialism even worse than that of the Second International right-wings, because exercised in the more difficult period of the capitalistic reconstruction in favour of the restoration of the State authority, of the rescue of the national economy (recon-

struction loans; austerity acceptance in the name of the superior interests of the nation, etcetera) and, later, in the "popular democracies", in favour of the re-establishment of an order passed for "Soviet" (Berlin, Poznan, Budapest). At the helm of the State, the "communist" parties affiliated at the Kremlin were driven out again to the margins of an "opposition" merely parliamentary, by the allies of war and of "peace", in a world increasingly more fascist; but, far from finding again Lenin's master way (a thing that on the other hand they would not have been able to do, not even supposing they would have wanted it). They fell still more in the abyss of a complete revision of the marxist doctrine, until touching the bottom of these years, in which it is not foreseen or anymore predicted, the end, either of capitalism or of bourgeois parliamentarism, instead it is supposed to be defended "against" the attacks of the bourgeoisie itself, which would have forgotten its glorious past; and it is not even foreseen or predicted the development of that so-called struggle between "socialist field" and "capitalist field" to which Stalinism had arrived to reduce the class struggle, as on an international scale the watchword has become "co-existence and peaceable competition".

It is from the bottom of this precipice, anticipating the proletarian revolt, that comes the cry "Working men of all countries unite,!" and "Proletarian dictatorship". It is our cry.

FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST THEORY

Back to "Catastrophism"

On the level of the general doctrine of historical and social revolution, the political degeneration at this point complete of the old communist movement, brought to the denial of Marx's catastrophic vision ; neither the class contrasts, nor the conflicts among States, will end up - they say - in the violent struggle, in armed conflicts. Fundamentally the prospective is at the same time that of an international peace, named pacific co-existence and that of a social peace guaranteed by the conservative and reactionary watchword of a "new democracy" based on the "democratic planning", on the structural reforms, and on the "struggle against the monopolies". In reality, "Stalinian" communism (and still more "post-Stalinian") is only an apology of the Progress, in the measure in which exalts the increase of production and productivity ; it is only an apology of Capitalism, in the measure in which exalts the growth of trade.

Opposing these positions, which are the pure and simple reproduction of the ones of the "progressive" bourgeoisie of the second half of the 19th century, the marxist positions remain unchanged : under capitalism, increase of production and of productivity signifies growing exploitation of work by the capital, enormous increase of the unpaid part of work. The workers consumption, - the "reserve" of the surplus value that the working class constitutes whether in individual or social form (assistance against illness and old age ; family legislation etc.) can grow ; at the same rate increase the subjection of the producer to the capital and the insecurity of its condition, tied to the ups and downs of the market economy. The class antagonism is not at all subdued ; in fact it is driven to its maximum.

Extension of trade signifies extension of rule of the under-developed countries by developed countries, and progressive embittering of the natural concurrence between civilised countries. Connecting the different peoples, the different continents in the meshes of a still more world-wide economy which is a real, even if involuntary, conquest - it shows dialectically a 'negative' aspect that all its apologisers pretend to ignore : the preparation of commercial and therefore financial and industrial crises, the outlet of which, today like yesterday, can only be the imperialistic war. Moreover, an increasing part of the productive forces is today wasted, not just in the production of the "goods and services" that the "honest trade" and "at mutual interests" dear to the opportunists of the West and of the East "would lavish" to all "humanity", but in the production of destructive weapons which function is much more economical than military.

In front of more classically reformistic arguments of post-Stalinism, the positions of revolutionary marxism are those that were at the time of social-democracy : modern capitalism is not at all characterised (Engels already verified it ! ) by "absence of a plan" ; but the "planning" alone, whichever it is, cannot at all characterise socialism. Not even the disappearance (more or less real) of the social figure of the capitalist, that is supposed to distinguish the Russian society of today, is enough to try the abolition of capitalism itself (Marx already verified it ! ), since capitalism is nothing but the reduction of the modern worker to the wage-earning conditions and where this survives, that continues to survive.

The apology of capitalism and the reformism of the old-fashioned social-democrat style, which fusion is characteristic of the "communism" of Russian or Chinese mark, even worse than the classic reformism, ally themselves to a defeatism that, as psychological and

ideological reflection of the disintegration of the revolutionary force of the proletariat, sterilizes even the revolt that this apology and this reformism stirs up in certain workers' strata ; it consists, first of all, in denying the working class every possibility of surpassing the exasperated concurrence that divides it today, of rebelling itself to the despotism of the needs created by the capitalistic prosperity, of escaping from the stunness generated by the stupidity of the organisation of welfare, of amusements, or "culture", to rally itself in a revolutionary party ; and secondly consists in admitting, implicitly or explicitly, that the armaments possessed today by the ruling class are invincibles. All these positions are equivalent to the abdication of every revolutionary hope opposite the actual, but for us historically transitory, omnipotence of capital.

Also in this, the marxist positions are those of always ; capitalism divides but at the same time concentrates and organises the proletariat ; and at the end the concentration has the upper hand on the division. Capitalism corrupts and weakens but unwillingly revolutionarily educates the proletariat, and in the end such education has the upper hand on the corruption. In effect, all the sophisticated products of the "pleasure industries" are just as impotent in soothing the increasing disposition of social life (either urban or rural) as the tranquillizers of modern medicine are impotent in restoring to the man of the capitalistic society, harmony in relations with himself and others, that the "modern life" namely, "capitalistic" destroys. Much more than in these kinds of corruptions, the strength of capital lies, today like yesterday, in the crushing of the producer with the length of the working day, of the working week, of the working year and of the working life. But capitalism must, by force of circumstances, historically limit this length; it does so in a slow, miserable way, with continuous steps back, but cannot avoid doing it, and the consequence of that, like Marx and Engels foresaw, will necessarily be revolutionary, if we think that on the other hand it is similarly obligated to instruct (dulling them at the same time ; why not ? ) those that will become its "grave-diggers". Therefore, there are two main prospectives : 1) the explosion of a crisis as in 1929 (for us the most likely) and 2) a long historical phase of expansion and "prosperity" ; but only those who openly practise defeatism can deduce (as on different points of view Maoists, Castroists, Guevarians, etc., are doing) from the disorganisation of the working class a definite historical condemnation, "sociologically determined" impotence to the reconstruction of the Party and of the Class International, and then deduce the need that other social strata or sociological categories (peasants, students and so on) would take its place at the vanguard of the social revolution.

It is all the more reason absurd to believe that, with the superior social power that the same development of capitalism gives to the wage-earning class, this has become impotent to carry out the first duty of any social revolution in history : the disarmament of the class enemy, the totalitarian appropriation of its military potential.

### Back to Revolutionary "Totalitarianism"

On the political and social level, the final victory of democratism on the proletarian revolutionary doctrine in the old communist movement, succeeded in presenting the "resistance to totalitarianism", as the task both of the proletariat and of all the social strata oppressed by capital.

This orientation, whose first historical manifestation was war and pre-war anti-fascism, didn't spare any of the parties bound to Moscow leading to the negation of the sole party, undoubtedly com-

munist and leninist form, as a necessary guide to the revolution and to the proletarian dictatorship. Whilst in the "popular democracies" of the so-called "socialist field" the power is in the hands of popular or national "fronts", that is, of parties or "leagues" that explicitly incarnate a block of several classes, the "communist" parties operating in the "bourgeois field" have solemnly abjured the doctrine of the class revolutionary violence as the only way to power, and of the dictatorship exerted by the class through solely the Communist Party as the only way to maintain it; they promise to the courted interlocutors of other parties (socialists, catholics and others) a "socialism" jointly managed by more parties representing the "people". Welcomed favourably by all the enemies of the proletarian revolution, who in the "communism" of Stalinist inspiration, repelled everything that reminded them of the striking red October, this orientation is not only defeatist, but illusive. As the proletariat does not claim any liberty in the picture of capital's despotic regime and therefore doesn't accept the flag of democracy, neither "formal" nor "real" thus as an integral part of his programme, the suppression of all the liberties for social groups bound to the capital, in the pattern of the despotic regime that, once in power, he will impose on the defeated class. If the bourgeoisie masks his own dictatorship behind the democratic fiction, the communists, who, since the time of the Manifesto "disdain to conceal their views and aims", proclaim openly that the revolutionary conquest of power, as a necessary prelude to the social palinogenesis, signifies at the same time the totalitarian rule of the former oppressed class, through its party, on the former dominant class.

Antitotalitarianism is a rivendication of those classes that move on the same social basis as that of the capitalist class (private appropriation of production means and products, but they are invariably crushed by it); it is the ideology - common to the multi-coloured movements of "intellectuals", "students", etc., which infest today's political scene - of the urban and petty bourgeoisie, grasped at the myths of small production, of the sovereignty of the individual and of "direct democracy". It is therefore bourgeois and anti-historical at the same time and for these two motives anti-proletarian. The ruin of the petty-bourgeoisie under the hammer blows of great capital is historically inevitable, and socially constitutes a step forward towards the socialist revolution as it makes effective the true and only historical contribution of capitalism: the production centralization, the socialization of productive activity.

The proletariat, for whom returning (even if possible) to less concentrated forms of production would mean deserting his own historical task of a completely social production and disposal of products, doesn't recognise as his own duty neither the defence of the petty bourgeoisies' against the great ones (equally both enemies of socialism) nor the adoption in politics of that pluralism which it does not have any reason to accept on an economic and social level.

How reactionary is the watchword of the "struggle against the monopolies" in defence of the small production, in the same way are reactionary all those movements that consider the revolutionary course as a gradual conquest of peripheric "power" islands made by undifferentiated proletarian organisms on a factory basis (expressing so-called "direct democracy"), thus ignoring the central problem of the conquest of political power, of the destruction of the capitalistic state, and then of the Party as centralising organ of the class; by the same token are reactionary those movements which present as an already achieved socialism, a system based on "self-managed" firms, thus destroying the possibility of that social production regulated by the social prevision in which Marx indicated the "political economy of the working class", and that can be achieved only by getting over the basic productive cells of the capitalist economy

and the "blind rule" of the market in which they find the only, chaotic and unforeseeable connective element.

Before and after the rise to power, in politics or in economy, the revolutionary proletariat doesn't and cannot make any concession to antitotalitarianism, a new version of that idealistic and utopian anti-authoritarianism that Marx and Engels denounced in the long polemic with the anarchists and that Lenin in State and Revolution demonstrated, being convergent with the democratic and gradualist reformism. For what concerns the small producers, the socialist proletariat will not use the cruelty which capitalism has shown in all its history ; but, for what concerns the small production and its political, ideological and religious reflexes, its action will be infinitely more decided, rapid and, in short, totalitarian. The proletarian dictatorship will spare mankind the infinite amount of violence and misery that under capitalism constitutes its 'daily bread', but will be able to do it precisely in as much as it will not hesitate to use the force, the intimidation and, if necessary, the most decided repression against any social group, small or large, which would obstruct the fulfilment of its historical mission.

Concluding, whoever joins the notion of socialism to any form of liberalism, democratism, localism, pluripartitism, or worse, antipartitism, places himself outside the history, outside the track that leads to the reconstitution of the Party and of the International, both totalitarially communist.

### Back to Internationalism

Since 1848, that is to say since the appearance of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, communism and the fight for the revolutionary transformation of the society are for definition international and internationalists: "The Workers have no fatherland" ; "The united action at least in the civilised countries is one of the first conditions of the emancipation of the proletariat".

At the moment of its constitution in 1864, the International Association of Workers inscribed in its general statutes the recognition that "all the efforts to reach the great end of the economic emancipation of the working class are up till now unsuccessful for the lack of solidarity among the various categories of workers in every country and for the absence of a fraternal union among the working classes of different countries", and proclaimed with force "that the emancipation of the workers is neither a local nor national problem, but a social problem, that embraces all the countries in which exists the modern society and which solution depends on the practical and theoretical collaboration of the more progressive countries". In 1920 the Communist International born from the long struggle of the world-wide internationalist Left for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war whether in the more democratic of the republics or in the more autocratic of the empires, or the most constitutional and parliamentary of monarchies, repossessed the statutes of the First International and proclaimed that "the new Workers' International is created for the organisation of common actions of the workers of different countries, aiming for the sole end of the knocking-down of capitalism, the foundation of the proletarian dictatorship and of an International Soviet Republic, for the complete elimination of all the classes for the achievement of socialism, the first stage of the communist society", adding that "the organisational apparatus of the Communist International must assure the workers of every country the chance of receiving in every given moment the biggest possible aid by the organised proletarians of other countries." The thread of this great tradition has been broken during the first post-war period by the joint action of the theory and praxis of "socialism in one country" and by the substitution of this struggle for democracy against fascism in place of the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. The first direction released the destinies

of Russia's victorious revolution from the ones of the world-wide proletarian revolutionary movement conditioning the growth of this to the fickle diplomatic interests of the Soviet State ; the second, by dividing the world into fascist and democratic countries, but ordering the proletarians living in totalitarian regimes to fight against their own governments not for the revolutionary conquest of power, but for the restoration of the democratic and parliamentary institutions, and by ordering the proletarians living in the democratic regimes to defend their own governments and, if needed, to fight for them against their brothers on the other side of the border, has tied the destiny of the working class to that of the respective "fatherlands" and of their bourgeois institutions.

The dissolution of the Communist International in the course of the Second World War was the unavoidable result of this overturning of doctrine, strategy and tactics. From the new imperialistic massacre appeared states in Eastern Europe which call themselves socialists but which proclaim and furiously defend their own national sovereignty ; calling themselves brothers, while isolated by jealously kept borders ; calling themselves members of a "socialist field" while divided by economic contrasts to solve which, when they reach a point of extreme tension, only remains the use of brute force (Hungary, Czechoslovakia) or where the military intervention is not possible, give way to deep lacerations as in the cases of China and Yugoslavia. In their turn the parties not yet in "power" rivendicate the possession of their own particular national way to socialism (which is for them all the same way of abjuring the revolution and the proletarian dictatorship and of a complete adhesion to the democratic, parliamentary and reformistic ideology) and present themselves, in a proud defence of their autonomy from the other "brother" parties, as the heirs of the purest political and patriotic traditions of the respective bourgeoisies, ready to pick up - to use Stalin's phrase - the flag that these have dropped.

In such a situation, internationalism has become a word still more empty and rhetoric than the phrase of the "international peoples brotherhood", that Marx in 'Critique of the Gotha Programme' violently flung in the face of the German Workers' Party as "borrowed" by the bourgeois league for freedom and "peace". No international solidarity is possible - and no actual international solidarity has further taken place, as a matter of fact, not even in moments of hard social tension (miners' strikes in Belgium , dockers' strikes in England, revolts of black proletarians of the American car industry, general strike in France in 1968, etc.) - since it is proclaimed that every proletariat and every "communist" party have to resolve, and are the only ones able to resolve, their own particular problems, and each one of them sets up as defender of the fatherland's institutions and traditions, of the national economy, and even of the sacred "borders". What for, besides, an internationalism not with words but "with facts" (Lenin) if the message to the world of the "new parties" is that of peaceful co-existence and of emulative competition between capitalism and "socialism" ?

The proletarian movement will revive in the fullness of its historical features only on the condition of acknowledging that in any country there is one unique way towards its emancipation, and similarly unique must be its Party - unique in doctrine, unique in principles, programme and practical rules of action - and not a hybrid whole of confusedly conflicting programmes, "but an organic and secure overcoming of all the particular pushes of proletarian groups, in a synthetic force acting in the sense of the world revolution" (Party's political platform, 1945).

The abdication of the communist movement to its international revolutionary duties mirrors, in a similarly crude way, in the complete and shameful desertion of the classic Marxist position in front of the insurrectional struggles of the colonial peoples against the imperialist oppression, struggles that in the second post-war period have assumed forms of extreme violence while the proletariat of the imperialistic metropolis was cowardly subdued to the yoke of the bourgeois "reconstruction". In front of the armed struggles of the colonial peoples which already in the first post-war period were shaking the imperialism, in 1920 the 2nd Congress of the Communist International and the 1st Congress of Eastern Peoples outlined the grand perspective of a unique world strategy which welded the defeatism of the social insurrection in the capitalist metropolis with the national revolt in the colonies and semi-colonies. This revolt, politically led by the young colonial bourgeoisies, pursued the bourgeois aims of unity and national independence, but, at a juncture which "puts on the agenda on a world-wide scale the proletarian dictatorship" (Lenin), on the one hand the active intervention in the struggle of the young communist parties (politically and organisationally independent) at the head of gigantic workers' and peasant masses, and on the other hand the attack of the metropolitan proletariat against the citadels of colonialism, would have made possible the stepping over of the national-revolutionary parties and the transformation of originally bourgeois revolutions into proletarian revolutions, according to the scheme of the revolution in permanence traced by Marx and carried out by the bolcheviks in the semi-feudal Russia of 1917. The axis of this strategy was, and could only be, the revolutionary proletariat of the "more civilised" countries, that is, more economically advanced, because their victory and only that would have allowed the economically retrograde countries of the colonial world to overcome the historical handicap of their backwardness: once master in the West of power and of the means of production, the metropolitan proletariat would have acquainted with it the economy of the former colonies through a "world economical plan" which, unitary like the one towards which capitalism leans, wouldn't, as opposed to this, have wanted any oppression or conquest, any extermination or exploitation; and the colonial peoples, thanks to the "subordination of the immediate interest of the revolutionarily victorious countries to the general interests of the world revolution", would have achieved socialism without having to get through the horrors of a capitalistic phase, more ferocious, because more compelled to rocket to the top to bring itself up to the level of the more advanced economies. No part of this powerful edifice has been left standing by the opportunism, since the years 1926-27 when the destinies of the Chinese revolution were decided. In the colonies, the so-called communist parties, above all after the Second World War (far from "placing themselves at the head of the exploited masses" to speed up the separation of them from the shapeless block of more classes established under the flag of national independence), placed themselves at the tow of the indigenous bourgeoisie and even of "anti-imperialistic" feudal classes and powers, or when they have risen to power they have rivendicated the political programme of constitutional, parliamentary and pluripartitic democracy, "forgetting" to "put in the foreground the question of property" and at least to start confiscating, with no indemnity, the immense properties of landlords (vitaly tied to the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, and through it, to the imperialism), without ever placing the young, inured and concentrated, local proletariat at the vanguard of the semi-proletarian and peasant masses in order that they can shake off altogether the yoke of capital. On the other hand, in the imperialistic metropolis, they have abjured the principles of the violent revolution and of the proletarian dictatorship and, falling still lower than the Second International reformists, they limited themselves, in France during the last part of the Algerian War of Independence and in America during the course of the Vietnamese

war, to invoke "peace and negotiations" and to demand to the respective governments that "formal and merely official recognition of equality and independence" for the young nations, branded by the Third International as a hypocritical watchword of the "bourgeois democracies that camouflage themselves as socialists".

The consequence of this complete loss of the marxist prospect of double revolutions has been and is that the gigantic revolutionary potentialities contained in grand and often bloody riots, the burden of which having always and only been borne by millions of proletarians and poor peasants, have been wasted : in the countries formerly independent, the corrupt, greedy and parasitic bourgeoisies are today in power, the more willing to re-ally themselves with yesterday's "enemy", the imperialism, the more they are conscious of the threat that comes up from the urban and rural exploited masses ; while capital, untouched in its countries, re-enters in the territories from which it was ignominiously forced to take to its heels, thanks to the "aids", the loans and the commerce of raw materials and manufactures. At the same time the paralysis of the proletarian and communist movement could historically justify the degenerate Maoist, Castroist and Guevarian theories, which point out phantom peasants', popular or anarchic revolutions as the sole way to get out of the world marsh or constitutional and pacifistical reformism. Such a point was reached (unavoidably) by the abandonment of the right road of Internationalism.

But how, renegated by the parties which refer to Moscow or Peking, internationalism is ingrained in the facts of an always more world-wide economy and regime of exchanges, thus the end of the nationalistic task which in colonies strengthened the united front of all classes, their forced industrialisation, the rapid transformation of their political and social structures, can only put everywhere on the agenda the question of the class war and of the proletarian dictatorship and from now on point out to the International Communist Party the duty of helping the young, native working class of the so-called Third World to definitively share its own destiny with that of the social strata in power, and to take the place that it harshly conquered for itself in the world army of the communist revolution.

### Back to the Communist Programme

On the programmatic level, our conception of socialism stands out from all the others in that it postulates the need of a preliminary violent revolution, the destruction of all the institutions of the bourgeois State, and the creation of a new State apparatus directed in an opposite way by a sole party : this party being the one which will have prepared, unified and led to the victory the proletarian assaults on the old regime.

But, as we reject the conception of a gradual and pacific transition from capitalism to socialism without political revolution, namely, without destruction of democracy, so we reject the anarchical conception that limits the duties of the revolution to the knocking-down of the existing State power. The political revolution opens, for orthodox marxism, a new social epoch of which is important to redefine the main phases.

#### 1) Phase of Transition

Politically, it is characterised by the proletarian dictatorship ; economically, by survival of forms specifically tied to capitalism : a mercantile distribution of products, even if those of big industry and, in certain sectors, particularly agricultural, a little private production. These forms can only be surpassed by

virtue of despotic measures of the proletarian power : the passing under its management of all the sectors, already with a social and collective nature (large-scale industry, agriculture and trade, transport etc) ; the setting to work of a vast distribution apparatus, independent from private trade, but still functioning, at least in the beginning on mercantile rules. In this phase, however, the duty of the military struggle takes priority on the one of social and economic reorganisation, unless, against any reasonable prevision, the class overthrown on the inside and threatened on the outside would renounce to any armed resistance.

The duration of this phase depends, on the one hand, on the importance of the difficulties that the capitalist class will go forth to create to the revolutionary proletariat, and on the other hand, on the width of the reorganisational work which is in inverse ratio with the economical and social stage reached in each sector and in each country, and which is therefore easier in the more advanced countries.

## 2) Phase of Inferior Socialism (or Socialist Phase)

It dialectically derives from the first phase. Its characteristics are the following : the proletarian State controls at this point all the exchangeable product, even if a sector of small production still exists ; this is the condition to pass to a distribution that is no longer monetary, but still keeps an exchange character, as the assignment of products to the producers depends on their work performance and it is executed through the work-coupons which vouch for it. Such a system differs substantially from that of the wage-labourer which tying the workers' earnings to the value of his labour-force, digs an abyss between the life of individuals and the social richness ; because in socialism there will not be any obstacles between the needs and their satisfaction, except the obligation for all the valid individuals to work, and every progress, (which under the capitalist society's regime transforms into an enemy of the producing class, the proletariat) becomes immediately a means of emancipation of the whole species. Nevertheless we still have dealings with forms directly inherited from the bourgeois society : - "The same amount of labour which the producer has given to society in one form he receives back in another. Here obviously the same principle prevails as that which regulate the exchange of commodities, as far as this is exchange of equal values ... Hence, equal right here is still in principle - bourgeois right, although principle and practice are no longer at loggerheads, while the exchange of equivalents in commodity exchange only exists on the average and not in the individual case. In spite of this advance, this equal right is still constantly stigmatised by a bourgeois limitation. The right of the producers is proportional to the labour they supply". (Marx : Critique of the Gotha Programme). Above all, work still appears as a social constriction, yet always less oppressing by the way in which the general conditions of work improve.

On the other hand, the proletarian state having the means of production at its disposal, it is possible (after the severe suppression of all the useless or anti-social economic sectors, which has already begun in the transitory phase) to have an accelerated development of the sectors neglected by capitalism, above all housing and agriculture : moreover, it is possible to have a geographical reorganisation of the apparatus of production, leading to the suppression of the antagonism between city and country and to the constitution of a production unit on a continental scale.

Finally, all these advances imply the abolition of the general conditions which on the one hand confine the female sex to an

unproductive and menial housework and on the other hand limit a large number of producers to merely manual activities, making the intellectual work, and the scientific knowledges a social privilege for one class alone. Thus it is outlined together with the abolition of classes in their own relations with the means of production, the disappearance of the fixed attribution of given social duties to given human groups.

3) Phase of Superior Socialism (or communist phase)

The more it performs these tasks, for which it was born, and that go beyond its historical function of prevention and repression of the attempts of capitalist restoration, the State tends to disappear as a State, that is as a rule on men, to become a simple apparatus for the administration of things. This decay is bound to the disappearance of classes, distinct and opposed in the bosom of society and then it is realised with the transformation of the peasant (or artisan) into an out and out industrial producer. Thus we arrive at the stage of the superior communism which Marx characterised in this way: "In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all round development on the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly - only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!".

This great historical result goes beyond the destruction of antagonisms among the men, the effects of which were the restlessness, the "general", particular, everlasting "insecurity" (Babeuf), man's destiny in the capitalist society; it is the condition of a real dominion of society upon nature, what Engels used to call "the transition from the kingdom of need to that of freedom", where the same development of the human forces becomes for the first time an aim of man's activity. It is then, also, that in the social praxis, the solution of all the antinomies of all traditional theoretical thought comes to an end, "between existence and essence, object-ivation and affirmation of itself, liberty and necessity, individual and genus (Marx), so that communism merits the attribute that founders of scientific socialism gave to it, of "enigma finally resolved by the history".

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY ON A WORLD-WIDE SCALE

The reconstruction on a national and international scale of a proletarian political party, able to assure the continuity of the revolutionary policy, will historically take place on the sole condition that the vanguard forces of the proletariat of the advanced and under-developed countries will concentrate on the above-mentioned fundamental positions. Orthodox communism stands out from all the varieties of more or less left-wing extremism, in that it denies that the laws which cause in the present substantially fascist phase of capitalist rule, the exhaustion of the political struggles among the bourgeois parties, render the proletariat for the same reason unable to constitute itself as a revolutionary party. It declares, on the contrary, that precisely the disappearance of oppositions between classic right and left wings, between liberalism and authoritarianism, between fascism and democracy, gives the best historical base to the development of a resolutely communist and revolutionary party. The realisation of this possibility is bound not only to the inevitable explosion of an open crisis, whatever be its term or form, but also to the objective deterioration of social contrasts in the phases of expansion and prosperity. Whoever expresses the minimum doubt on this point, in actual fact doubts the historical prospect of the communist revolution.

The development of the Party cannot obey formal rules such as the ones that many anti-stalinist oppositions have claimed under the name of "democratic socialism" and which consist of believing that the right orientation depends on the free expression of thought and the will of the proletarian "base", and, on respecting democratic rules and electoral canons in designating the persons in charge at different levels. Even though the suffocation of oppositions and irregularities in procedure have indeed helped, in Russia and in the world, to get rid of the revolutionary communist tradition, our Party defines and has always defined this liquidation as the liquidation of a programme and tactics, and any return to the sound organisational norms, as wanted by Trotskyists, wouldn't have prevented it at all. For the same reason we rely not just on the statute involving a large and regular use of the democratic mechanism, but on a definition, without misunderstandings and concessions of the means and ends of the revolutionary struggle. The Party must be able to generate in its bosom organisms suitable for the enforcement, with no hesitations, of its "catechism", or it is not the Party. In any case, it is the selection that has to be made and not some sort of model of internal functioning. This is the content of the formula of "organic centralism"; that our current before, and the Party, have always opposed and oppose to the one of democratic centralism. It stresses the only really essential element, that is, the respect not of the majority but of the programme; not of the individual opinion, but of the historical and ideological tradition of the movement. To this conception corresponds an internal structure that puts into effect the sine qua non condition of the existence of the Party as a revolutionary organism: the dictatorship of principles. Once this condition is achieved, the discipline of the base to the decisions of the centre, is obtained with the minimum of friction while an out and out dictatorship becomes necessary when the Party's tactics are no longer under the programme's authority, giving rise to tension and clashes which can be settled only by virtue of disciplinary measures as happened in the International even before Stalin's victory.

The historical development of the class party displays, whenever it occurs the "transfer of a proletarian vanguard from the fields of spontaneous movements stirred up by partial and group interests, to the one of a proletarian action". This result is favoured not by a denial of these elementary movements, but on the contrary by participation to the physical struggles of the proletariat of the

The work of ideological propaganda and of proselytism which naturally follows the infra-uterine phase of ideological clarification cannot therefore be separated from the participation in the economic movements that while never considering the trade union "conquests" as the ultimate aim, is important for two reasons : to make these movements an instrument in order to acquire the experience and training, indispensable for an effective revolutionary preparation, through an unmerciful criticism of forecasts, postulates and methods of the Trade Unions and of the collaborationist parties which control them ; and, on a more advanced level, to realise their unification and their revolutionary overcoming in living experience, pushing them towards their whole and complete realization.

If it is true that, today, all the problems relative to the Party's development show themselves in the historical picture of an unprecedented, ideological and practical crisis of the international socialist movement, nevertheless the past experience is enough to establish a law : the reconstitution of the offensive power of the working class can't be the result of a revision, of a modernization of marxism, and let alone, of the "creation" of an alleged new doctrine, but can only be the fruit of that restoration of the original programme which, in front of the deviations of the Second International, had been assured by the Bolchevik Party and which, in front of those of the Third, was assured by the Italian Marxist Left, in still worse general conditions. Whatever will be the sectors in which the struggle for communism is destined to revive; whenever it will be, the future international movement is the historical stage of arrival of the struggle maintained by this current and it is likely that also physically it will have to bear a decisive role in it. That's why in the present phase the reconstitution of an embryo of International can take only one form : the adhesion to the programme and to the action of the International Communist Party and to the creation of such organisational ties with it, that would meet the principle of organic centralism and would be exempt from any form of democratism.

Communism is an absolute world necessity of the present society. Sooner or later, the proletarian masses will return to the assault of the fortresses of capitalism in an immense revolutionary wave. The destruction of these fortresses, the victory of the proletariat, can happen only if the trend towards the reconstitution of the class party deepens and extends itself to the entire world. The constitution of the world party of the proletariat : here is the end of all those who want the victory of the communist revolution against which the allied forces of the bourgeois International are already fighting.

## REVOLUTIONARY PARTY AND ECONOMICAL ACTION

It is worth reminding the reader of the leaning that the Communist Left held with regard to the Union question, thus examining what has changed in the Union field after the wars and totalitarianism.

- 1) At the time in which the Italian Party had not yet been constituted, in the course of the Second Congress of the International in 1920 two big tactical matters were debated : parliamentary action and union action. The delegates of the anti-electionist current drew up against the so-called left which was for a split in the unions and for giving up the conquest of the trade unions led by opportunists. All things considered these currents placed the centre of the revolutionary action in the trade unions and not in the Party, and wanted them pure of bourgeois influence (Dutch tribuists, German KAPD, American syndicalists, Shop Stewards, etc.).
- 2) From then on the Left sharply fought against those movements, like that of the "Ordine Nuovo" of Turin which considered the revolutionary duty that of emptying the trade unions, to the advantage of the Factory Councils movement looking at them as the skeleton of the economical and statal organs of the proletarian revolution started during capitalism, seriously confusing the moments of the revolutionary process with its instruments.
- 3) On a quite different level are the trade union and parliamentary questions. It is indisputable that parliament is the organ of the bourgeois State in which, supposedly, all society's classes are represented, and all revolutionary Marxists agree that on this organ cannot be founded any power except that of the bourgeoisie. The problem is if the use of parliamentary mandates can be helpful to the aims of propaganda and agitation for the insurrection and the dictatorship. The opposers sustain that, even if with only this aim, the participation of our representatives to such organisations would have had a harmful effect.
- 4) The trade unions' whoever directs them, being professional economical associations, always bring together the elements of the same class. It is possible that the organised proletarians elect representatives with not only moderate but even bourgeois tendencies, and the direction of the union falls under the influence of capitalism. The fact remains, however, that the trade unions are exclusively made up of workers and thus it will never be possible to say about them what we say about parliament, namely, that they are susceptible to only a bourgeois direction.
- 5) In Italy, before the formation of the Communist Party the socialists refused to work in catholic and republican unions. Later on, the communists at the time of the big Federation mainly directed by reformists, and of the Syndical Union led by anarchists, with no hesitation and unanimously decided not to establish new unions and to work to conquer internally the above-mentioned ones, and as a matter of fact aiming at their unification. In the International field, the Italian Party unanimously supported not only the work in national social-democratic unions but also the existence of the Red Unions' International (Profintern), which considered the Central of Amsterdam as unconquerable because it was linked to the bourgeois League of Nations through the International Labour Office. The Italian Left violently opposed the proposal for the liquidation of the Profintern to constitute a unique Trade Unions' International, still maintaining the principle of the unity and of the internal conquest for the national unions and federations.

6) (a) The proletarian union activity caused quite a different policy of the bourgeois powers in the successive historical phases. As the early revolutionary bourgeoisies forbade any economical association as an attempt to reconstitute the medieval corporations, and as every strike was violently repressed, all the early union movements assumed revolutionary aspects. Since then the Manifesto warned that any economical and social movement leads to a political movement, and has a very large importance in that it extends the proletarian association and coalition, while its merely economical conquests are precarious and do not impair the class exploitation.

(b) In the following epoch, the bourgeoisie having understood that it was indispensable to accept that the social question would be called in just to avert the revolutionary solution, tolerated and legalised the unions, acknowledging their action and their demands; this in the whole period of no wars and relatively growing welfare which occurred up until 1914.

During the whole of this period, the work in the unions was a very fundamental element for the development of the strong workers' socialist parties, and it was clear that these parties were able to determine big movements especially by the handling of the unions' lever.

The collapse of the Second International demonstrated that the bourgeoisie had gained decisive influence on a large part of the working class through its relations and compromises with the parliamentary and unions' chiefs, which almost everywhere dominated the apparatus of the parties.

(c) During the recovery of the movement after the Russian revolution and after the end of the imperialist war, it was precisely a matter of weighing the achievements of the disastrous failure of the former unionist and political outlook, and it was attempted to bring the world proletariat on the revolutionary ground, eliminating, with splits in the Party, the treacherous political and parliamentary chiefs, and making sure that the new communist party arrived at throwing out the agents of the bourgeoisie from the largest proletarian organisations. In the presence of the first vigorous successes in many countries, capitalism found itself in the need, in order to prevent the revolutionary advance, of violently striking and outlawing not just the parties but also the unions in which they used to work. Nevertheless, in the complex happenings of these bourgeois totalitarianisms the union movement was never dissolved. On the contrary it was supported and put into effect the constitution of a new union network completely controlled by the counter-revolutionary party which declares it unique and unitarian and wholly faithful to the administrative and state mechanism.

Even where, after the Second World War, capitalist totalitarianism seems to have been replaced by democratic liberalism, the unions' dynamics keep moving, uninterruptedly, in the direction of the State control and of its insertion in the official administrative organisms. Fascism, dialectical accomplisher of the old reformist petitions, has put into effect the legal recognition of the union; in this way the union can be office holder of collective contracts with the employers, up to the actual imprisonment of the whole union organisation within the bourgeois class power.

This result is fundamental to the defence and conservation of the capitalist regime, because the use of, and the influence on, trade union organisations is an unavoidable stage for every revolutionary movement led by the Communist Party.

7) These radical changes within the unions, do not obviously depend on the political strategy of the classes in contrast and of their own parties and governments, but are also deeply bound to the changed nature of the economic relations existing between employer and wage-labourer. In the early union struggles in which the workers

tried to oppose the monopoly of the means of production that of the labour force, the keenness of the contrast derived from the fact that the proletariat stripped for quite a time of any consumption reserve, didn't have absolutely any other resource except every day's wage, and every little struggle became a conflict for survival.

It is unquestionable that, while Marx's theory of growing misery is confirmed by the continuous increase in number of pure proletarians and by the closely following expropriation of the last reserves of the middle and proletarian social strata (increased a hundredfold by wars, destructions, monetary inflation, etc.), and while in many countries the unemployment and the massacre of proletarians reach enormous figures there, where the industrial production flourishes, the whole range of the reformist measures of assistance and providence for the wage-labourer creates for the employed a new kind of economical reserve which is a little wealth that can be lost, in a sense; similar to that of the artisans and of the little peasants; thus the wage-labourer has something to risk and this (phenomenon on the other hand already noticed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, in the case of the so-called workers' aristocracy) makes him hesitant and even opportunist in the moment of the union struggle and, worse, of the strike and of the up-rising.

8) Apart from the problem of time whether participating or not to the work of given types of unions for the revolutionary communist party, the elements of the question so far resumed lead to the conclusion that in every perspective of every general revolutionary movement must be present these fundamental factors: 1) a numerous and widespread proletariat of pure wage-earners; 2) a big movement of associations with an economical content, involving a large part of the proletariat; 3) a strong, revolutionary class party in which militates a minority of workers, but which in the course of the struggle has had the chance to set against that of the bourgeois power, his own influence on the union movement.

The factors which led to establish the need of each and every one of these three conditions that usefully combining themselves will determine the outcome of the struggle were settled: a) by the right statement of the theory of historical materialism which links the elemental economic need of the individual to the dynamics of great social revolutions; b) by the correct perspective of the proletarian revolution with reference to the problems of the economy, of the politics and of the State; c) by the lessons of the history of all the organised movements of the working class, either in their greatness and their victory, or in their corruptions and defeats.

The general line of the perspective we have developed does not deny that the most varied circumstances can occur in the course of the modifying, the dissolving and the reforming of workers' unions; that is to say, those associations which in various countries appear either tied to the traditional organisations which declared to base themselves on the method of the class struggle or more or less tied to the most various social methods and tendencies, even conservative.

---



APPEAL FOR THE INTERNATIONAL REORGANISATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY  
MARXIST MOVEMENT

---

The following writing, though written in 1950, with a view to be published in French, has lost none of its validity. This is mainly because the evolution of the capitalist world, including Soviet Russia, has more than confirmed our expectations and also because the reactions to stalinism of some groups of vanguard workers never ceased to be hybrid and confused, taking the form of democratism and even of the negation both of the role played by violence in the class struggle and of the revolutionary party as a fundamental and prominent organ of the proletarian dictatorship. Thus it became a serious and urgent task for the Marxist Left to draw a demarcation line between itself and the rainbow of political groups and currents, lacking all ideological background and class struggle tradition, which grow on the rotten soil constituted by democratic or parademocratic criticism of the Soviet regime.

The organisation of the working class of all countries of the world is, as a result of a series of splits and the spread of defeatism, dominated by two forces.

The first of these is the traditional form of democratic socialism. Based on peaceful relationships between classes, these organisations support a programme of social and political collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and plan to defend the workers' interests by legal means within the framework of the bourgeois constitution. They suggest that private enterprise will gradually change to socialism, and on principle reject the use of violence and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The second section is formed by those parties which follow the government in power in the USSR. It heralds the USSR as a Workers State with a policy modelled on revolutionary communism as defined by Marx and Lenin, and consistent with the great victory of the October Revolution.

This section of the proletarian movement pretends, in theory, not to reject the tactics of insurrection, dictatorship and terrorism. At the same time however, it says that it is convenient in capitalist countries to utilise those propaganda slogans, demands and tactics which can be shared with the property owning and non proletarian classes. Among these shared beliefs can be exemplified: national welfare, the safety of the fatherland and the possibility of peaceful co-existence between classes with opposed interests, within the framework of a parliamentary democracy.

Such a social democratic policy could only be applied when certain conditions are satisfied. There would have to be peace between the government of the Soviet Union and the bourgeois governments. The workers of the world would have to admit that the existence of the Soviet Union was the premise and the promise of world socialism, and that therefore in safeguarding the Russian power they were guaranteeing themselves against future capitalist exploitation. Both the workers and the capitalists would have to acknowledge that for an unlimited period the Soviet Union could co-exist with the capitalist powers in a normal and peaceful manner. The presumption of such conditions is summed up by the bourgeois democrats in the hackneyed formula of "non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign States" and by the new slogan of "peaceful competition" between socialism and capitalism.

From time to time the rank and file of the working class has rebelled against these obvious contradictions in this assessment of the long-standing political position ; until now these rebellions have been limited and uncertain but they will without doubt gain strength.

This constant propaganda is increasingly less successful in hiding these contradictions. It is skilfully directed to deliberately confusing the long-term, with the immediate objectives, the tactical expedients with the principled positions, and is chosen according to the particular social setting.

The plan of convincing the capitalist countries that they can very well let the Soviet regime survive without making a military attack or engineering a social upheaval, can only mean convincing them that it is not a working class State and therefore no longer anti-capitalist. Such a policy emphasises the true state of affairs.

To convince the workers in capitalist countries that they need not organise their forces for an insurrection and the overthrow of the economic, administrative and political system of their country, may help to recruit members from the social strata where the social democrats are successful, but it has no effect on the more advanced workers. However, this policy is combined with the perspective that a third World War can lead to the conquest of power by the proletariat, thus diverging from the teaching of Marx and Lenin who envisaged this role being fulfilled by civil war. When a third world war breaks, the stalinists promise the advanced workers that, whichever side starts it, they will urge a guerilla war, and they support this vain promise by saying that these "partisans" will be able to rely not only on their own forces but also on the parallel action of a perfect modern military machine.

The other section of their followers which of course forms the huge majority, are made up of workers having no revolutionary consciousness ; artisans, small land-owners, shop-keepers and middle-class manufacturers, while collar workers and civil servants, intellectuals and professional politicians. To this section the stalinists continually put forward proposals which go as far as offering a permanent united front not only with the propertied classes, but also with the bourgeois parties which they themselves classify as reactionary and right-wing. They also promise them a future of peace, both internal and world-wide ; of democratic tolerance towards any political party, organisation or creed ; of economic progress without conflict or expropriation of the wealthy, and of equal welfare for all social strata. It is increasingly difficult now even for them to justify, in the eyes of the masses, the existence in the Soviet Union and her satellites of a harsh totalitarian police state, controlled by stalinists through a rigid one-party system.

This degeneration of the proletarian movement has gone further than that of the revisionist and chauvinistic opportunism of the Second International and it will last longer. We can fix the beginning of this modern opportunism at the latest, in 1928 ; the opportunism of the Second International reached the culminating point of its cycle in the years 1912-1922, though its origins went back much further than 1912, and its consequences went well beyond 1922.

#### First symptoms of reaction to Stalinism

Recently there have been signs of impatience of Stalinist opportunism, both from militants and from groups which have appeared on the political scenes of different countries, advocating the return to the doctrine of Marx and Lenin and the theses of the 3rd International at its first four Congresses. These latter denounce

the stalinists for their complete betrayal of the original policy.

However most of these splits cannot be regarded as a useful regrouping on a genuine class basis even of a small vanguard of the proletariat. Many of these groups, as a result of their lack of theoretical work and because of their class origin, show in the very nature of their criticism of stalinist activity both past and present, that they are more or less directly influenced by the political schemes originating from the imperialist centres of the West and by the hysterical and hypocritical propaganda of liberalism and humanitarianism.

Such groups are more harmful in that they may divert unwary militants than in being the result of the underground work of secret agents of imperialism.

However, fundamentally, the historical responsibility for the possible victory of various types of defeatism in the revolutionary movement rests entirely on the stalinist opportunists. It is they who have in their work approved of many bourgeois ideologies and theories, and have tried to prevent the working class movements from being autonomous, independent, and ready to defend themselves, although these attributes were so often stressed by Marx and Lenin.

This confused and unfavourable course of the proletarian struggle, coincides with the irresistible growth of highly concentrated industrialisation, which is taking place, as much in the old industrial centres as in the extension of industry to the whole world. It therefore aids the offensive waged by the United States against the masses of the world. The United States is the greatest pillar of imperialism and, as with all large concentrations of metropolitan capital, forces of production and power, it tends to forcefully exploit and oppress the world masses by breaking down all social and territorial obstacles. The stalinists have shifted the struggle from international objectives and have confined themselves to the defence of precise national objectives delimited by the political and military aims of the Russian centre. As a result they will be less and less able to lead either the international or the national struggle, and will become more and more tied up with western imperialism, as was openly shown by the war alliance.

The Marxist position has always been that the foremost class enemies are the great powers of the highly overindustrialised and super colonial countries, which can only be overthrown by the proletarian revolution. In accordance with the Marxist viewpoint, the communists of the Italian Left today address an appeal to the revolutionary workers' groups of all countries. They invite them to retrace a long and difficult route and to regroup themselves on an international and strictly class basis, denouncing and rejecting any group which is influenced even partly or indirectly by the policies and philistine conformism emanating from the State controlled forces throughout the world.

The reorganisation of an international vanguard can only take place if there is absolute homogeneity of views and orientations ; the International Communist Party proposes to comrades of all countries the following basic principles and postulates.

I. REAFFIRMATION OF THE WEAPONS OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION :  
VIOLENCE - DICTATORSHIP - TERROR

For revolutionary marxists the knowledge of acts of repression, cruelty or violence towards individuals or groups, even if these acts were authorised or controllable, is not in itself a decisive element in the condemnation of stalinism or of any other regime. Manifestations of repression, even cruel repression, are an insepar-

able part of all societies based on the division into classes. Marxism was born out of the rejection of the so-called values of a civilisation based on class struggle, of the negation of the rules of "fair play" by which the opposing classes are supposed to practise self discipline in readiness for the day when they will confront one another in a death struggle. No mutilation, slurs cast on individuals, genocide, either legal or illegal, can be fought by ascribing them to the individual or to those who direct him not only by a revolutionary eviction of all class division. In the present phase of capitalism characterised by increasing atrocities, cruelty and supernilitarism, only the most stupid revolutionary movement would limit its methods of action with conditions of formal kindness.

## II. COMPLETE RUPTURE WITH THE TRADITION OF WAR ALLIANCES, PARTISAN FRONTS AND "NATIONAL LIBERATIONS".

Stalinism was first irrevocably condemned just because it abandoned these fundamental principles of communism by throwing the proletarians into a fratricidal war which separated them into two imperialist camps, and strongly reinforced the shameful propaganda issued by the camp to which it had become allied. This camp was no better than that facing it, but it disguised its imperialist greed which was exposed decades ago by marxist-leninist criticism, by its delusion that its respect for "civilized" methods of war made it different from its adversary. It pretended that if it had to bomb, to "atomize", to invade and finally after prolonged agony to use hanging, it would not be in order to defend its own interests but in order to restore the "moral values" of civilisation of human liberties so gravely threatened.

When, in 1914 this same disgraceful lie saw the traitors of the Second International proclaim the patriotic alliance against the imaginary ogre of teutonic or tsarist "barbarism", Leninism was the answer.

It was this fraud that was the basis for the western imperialists entering the war against the new nazi or fascist barbarism, and the same betrayal formed the alliance concluded between the State of Russia and the imperialist States, first with Nazis themselves, and then between the workers and the bourgeois parties with a view to winning the war.

Today history has proved these lies and betrayals. The Russians accused the Americans of being aggressors or fascists, a charge returned by the Americans, who admit that, had they been able to use the A bomb, not ready in 1941, to massacre Europe, they would have done so, instead of using the armies composed of mobilized Russian workers for the same task.

It is true that Marxism looks for and has always looked for the origin of all conflicts between states, in the increasing struggle between groups and factions of the ruling classes and from this it draws its deductions and gains its foresight. But any conception which opposes a civilised wing of capitalism to a barbaric wing of the same system is a real negation of marxism. Indeed from a determinist point of view it may well be that the proletariat gains more from the victory of the attacking party using the roughest methods of combat than otherwise.

For human communities to pass beyond barbarism the development of productive techniques was indispensable ; but man has had to pay for this passage by subjecting himself to the countless infamies of class civilization, and the suffering arising from the exploitation of slavery, serfdom and industrialisation.

It is therefore a fundamental condition for the rebuilding of the international revolutionary movement that the traditions of chauvinistic politics shown in the support of the 1914-18 and the 1939-45 war alliances, popular fronts, guerilla resistance and national liberation, are equally condemned.

### III. HISTORICAL DENIAL OF THE DEFENCE OF PACIFISM AND FEDERALISM BETWEEN THE STATES

The guiding line of the marxist position on the possibility of a new war can be sought in Lenin. According to him wars of the great powers since the time of the Paris Commune are imperialist wars as the historical period in which there were wars and insurrections systematising the national boundaries of capitalist countries, was over. Therefore with the occurrence of war, all class alliances, all suspension of class opposition and pressure, with the war in mind, constitutes a betrayal of the proletarian cause. For Lenin, also, the revolt of the coloured masses in the colonies against the imperialists and the nationalist movements in under-developed countries in this modern phase of capitalism have a revolutionary significance only if the class struggle of the industrialised sectors is never interrupted, and never loosens its tie with the international objectives of the proletarian organisation. Whatever may be the foreign policy of a State, the real internal enemy of the working class of each country is its government.

Seen in this perspective and reinforced by the formidable confirmation given by the evidence in World War 11 the many explicit forecasts in the theses and resolutions of the Third International at the time of Lenin's death, the period of imperialist wars can only end with the downfall of capitalism.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat must therefore deny all possibility of a peaceful settlement of the imperialist conflicts. It must energetically fight against the lies which that federation promises, leagues and associations between States will avoid conflicts by the means of an international armed force to repress "those who would provoke them".

Marx and Lenin, although aware of the rich complexity of the historical relationship between wars and revolutions, nevertheless condemn as idealist and bourgeois frauds, all fallacious distinctions between "the aggressor" and "the aggressed" in wars between States. Similarly the revolutionary proletariat should know that all State institutions are only designed as a repressive force in order to conserve capitalism, and their armed forces are but a class police and a counter-revolutionary guard.

Real International Communism is therefore characterised by a total refusal of any ambiguous propaganda based on the defence of pacifism and the stupid slogan of a condemnation and punishment of the "aggressor".

### IV. CONDEMNATION OF COMMON SOCIAL PROGRAMMES AND POLITICAL FRONTS WITH NON WORKING CLASSES

It is a tradition of leftwing opposition in many groups, dating back to the first tactical errors of the Third International to reject as incorrect the methods of agitation, rather badly defined as "bolchevik".

In working towards the final confrontation between the proletariat and the ruling class for the formation of a workers State, and a worldwide red dictatorship and for political terror and economic expropriation of all privileged classes, there must be

a programme exclusively and fully communist. It is not possible to keep silent at certain moments and during particular situations, especially once the elimination of all feudal institutions is completed and irrevocable.

It is an illusion to think that one can conquer the masses more quickly by substituting for a class position, orders for popular agitation. Equally it is a defeated illusion to confidently suppose that the leaders of the manoeuvre are not themselves deluded by it, although this is often proclaimed, at best it is nonsense. Every time that the pivot (always said to be transitory) of a political manoeuvre has been a united front with opportunist parties, the demand for democracy, peace non-class popularism or even worse a national and patriotic solidarity has been the result. It has not been a case of setting up a clever camouflage which abandoned at the right moment would have revealed an army of soldiers of the Revolution prepared to fire on the temporary allies of yesterday after weakening the enemy front.

On the contrary it has always happened that the masses, both militants and leaders have become utterly incapable of class action, and their organizations and their rank and file, progressively disarmed and domesticated through such ideological and functional preparation, have become fitted to act as instruments and the best tools of the capitalist class.

These historical conclusions are no longer based only on doctrinal criticism but from the terrible historical experience, so dearly paid for, of thirty years of bankrupt efforts.

Therefore a revolutionary party will never again attempt to gain mass support by demands likely to be independently made by the non-proletarians and a cross section of classes.

This particular basic criteria does not apply to the immediate and specific demands which arise from the concrete antagonism of interests between wage-earners and employers in the economic sphere. It is however, in opposition to the classless or interclass demands, especially political ones whether they are made by one nation or internationally. This criteria, flowing from a criticism of the politically united front of proletarians, of the slogan workers government, and of popular and democratic fronts, establishes a boundary between the movement which we support and that which calls itself the Fourth International of the Trotskyists. Our movement is separated in the same way from all neighbouring versions which under a different title renew the slogan of revisionist degeneration "the object is nothing, the movement is all", and thus reveals itself as superficial agitation deprived of all contents.

#### V. PROCLAMATION OF THE CAPITALIST CHARACTER OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The way in which the economy, legislation and administration of the Soviet Union has developed over the last thirty years give historical proof that the workers revolution can be submerged not only in a bloody civil war as was the case in Paris in 1871 but also by progressive degeneration. This is equally illustrated by the ruthless repression, and extermination of the revolutionary bolchevik kernal which paid dearly for having allowed the party to be transformed from an iron vanguard to an amorphous mass incapable of controlling its own legislature or executive. The monetary and mercantile character of the greater part of the Russian economy, which is in no way contradicted by the State control of important services and industries, also existing in several big capitalist countries, presents us not with a workers State menaced by degene-

ration or in the course of it, but by a completely degenerated State in which the proletariat is no longer in power.

Power has passed to the hands of a hybrid and shapeless coalition of internal interests of the lower and upper middle classes, semi-independent businessmen and the international capitalist classes. Such a combination is contradicted only in appearance by the existence of a police controlled and commercial iron curtain.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Consequently a war which seems superficially (as all wars do) to arrest co-operation of the privileged classes of various countries in administrating the world will not be a revolutionary war in the Leninist sense ; that is a war for the protection and diffusion of proletarian power throughout the world. Such an historical possibility, which is not today on the agenda, would never include justifying the political and military co-action in any country. Above all, this is because revolutionary States, if any, could find no allies in the capitalist camps, as was obviously the case at the end of World War I. If this possibility did arise a strong international communist party would put the strength of all sections against the power of the ruling classes in order to stop military "punitive" expeditions organised by world capitalism against the revolutionary countries. It would mobilize the workers so that they used their arms against those who armed them.

In all cases where the offensive is less developed, and the struggle of lesser potential, it would be even more important that any revolutionary movement constantly maintained a universal anti-capitalist and anti-State orientation. The communists know that to stop capitalists indulging in punitive expeditions against the proletariat they must destroy the capitalist class, and that this cannot be done unless the vanguard of the working class is everywhere kept prepared for war.

Disarmament of class consciousness is always, therefore, a betrayal, wherever it takes place and even if it only be temporary, or merely ideological, or organisational or material. The centre of the communist movement must not succumb to it, even where the discipline is firmly established that the choice of timing and form of action over all the front is left to the centre. Any party or group which accepts such disarmament especially if it calls itself a workers' party, whether communist or socialist, is the first enemy to fight and quell. It is its very existence and function that holds back the overthrow of the capitalist system foreseen by Marx and Engels and awaited with conviction by all revolutionary marxists.

The completely contrary strategy which was applied during the last war by the residue of the Communist International and which led to its shameful self-liquidation was undertaken so that the western governments should not be hindered in their war efforts but it has only had the effect of strengthening the western imperialist power. Too late the Russian government and military circles admit that this is more of a menace than Germany, even now, when their objectives are overtly national.

While fascism and barbarism have launched a new but no less false and sinister attack, revolutionary workers forming a vanguard, must continue to draw their forces together ; for a combat in which they will expect neither help nor ammunition from existing military forces. They must work in the hope and the certainty that the crisis and downfall of capitalism, expected in vain for 150 years will strike at the heart of the highly industrialised States, the hitherto unvanquished black guard of the world.

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMUNIST PROGRAM

IL COMUNISTA

LE PROLETAIRE

EL PROGRAMA COMUNISTA

PROGRAMME COMMUNISTE

---

Organs of the International Communist Party

Editorial and business offices: Editions Programme, 17 rue René Leynaud  
69001 LYON (France)

Editions Programme, 12 rue du Pont  
1003 LAUSANNE (Suisse)

Il Comunista, C.P. 10835, 20110 Milano  
(Italia)

Subscription: - unsealed: £ 2.00 / \$ 4.00

- closed mail (first-class mail in the U.S.): £ 3.50 / \$ 7.00

Payments by check or international money order to Dessus (France)

Our Internet Site: [www.pcint.org](http://www.pcint.org)  
Our e-mail address :  
[proletarian@pcint.org](mailto:proletarian@pcint.org)  
To find our publications:  
See informations on our website

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**France:** Programme, B.P. 57428, 69347  
Lyon Cedex 07 **Italy:** Il Comunista,  
C.P. 10835, 20110 Milan **Spain:** Apdo.  
Correos 27023, 28080 Madrid **Swit-  
zerland:** The address will soon be  
modified. Please write to the address of  
Lyon.

COMMUNIST PROGRAM

IL C

LE P

EL P

PROGRAMME COMMUNISTE

Organs of the International Communist Party

Editorial and business offices: Editions Programme, 17 rue René Leynaud  
69001 LYON (France)

Editions Programme, 12 rue du Pont  
1003 LAUSANNE (Suisse)

Il Comunista, C.P. 10835, 20110 Milano  
(Italia)

Subscription: - unsealed: £ 2.00 / \$ 4.00

- closed mail (first-class mail in the U.S.): £ 3.50 / \$ 7.00

Payments by check or international money order to Dessus (France)