

Union of Communists for the Construction of the Party, Spanish state

The New Type and its reconstitution process

Published: *March, 2017*

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Paul Saba and Sam Richards. Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the Creative Commons Common Deed. You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors & proofreaders above.

The new type and its process of Reconstitution

- Discussing with the Unión Obrera Comunista (mlm) of Colombia

After reading the document prepared by your organization on the proposal for the formulation of a **General Line for the unity of the international communist movement** (*Negation of Negation Magazine No. 5, August 2016*), and its subsequent discussion within our collective, we make a very positive general assessment of its ideological content and its political purpose. In particular we value both the effort that has been made in the iron defense of the role of ideological and political guide of Marxist theory in the struggle that maintains the revolutionary proletariat against the bourgeoisie for its political defeat, as well as for the theoretical effort that has been made what to do to develop the Marxist theses on certain assumptions of the general line of the proletarian revolution in accordance with the material development of the capitalist production system in its concrete application in the different social formations.

This general assessment does not invalidate that we have certain discrepancies on some issues that are addressed and that we want to expose. Probably they may be due to not having correctly understood your reasoning in the construction of the concepts with which you articulate the discourse. Be that or another reason we have considered it convenient to openly raise it for discussion and, as far as possible, resolve the discrepancies through a frank discussion in order to reach a common understanding.

In this first approach to the discussion of the content set out in the document, we will focus on the controversies it raises, not without first pointing out, albeit briefly, the fundamental theses with which we agree and that are developed in the proposal. In this sense we have to express our complete agreement with the central thesis of the document, which says: the material development of capitalist production, reached its imperialist phase, elevates the world proletarian revolution to historic law. Accordingly, this law of the historical development of capital reveals two aspects of singular importance: the first is that the proletariat has risen to the revolutionary class par excellence, since it takes into its hands the direction of the revolutionary process in correspondence more with the degree of development reached by the social productive forces by the internationalization of capitalist production relations than with that reached in the national framework in which it operates. In other words, the proletariat ceases to be a potential revolutionary class to acquire the de facto attribute, a revolutionary class in fact, in any state as long as it becomes a new type of communist party, that is, a revolutionary movement. The second is that the different national proletarian revolutions cannot be considered historical milestones of the proletariat, but rather particular stages of the general process of the proletariat in the construction of communist society, due to the international character on which scientific socialism is based: the emancipation of the proletariat as previous step for the elimination of economic conditions that make possible the division into classes of society.

But as our intention is to deepen the ideological debate as a means to achieve a greater ideological and political unity around the tasks of the proletarian revolution, we must put on the table the differences that we appreciate in some issues addressed by the document. The main aspect of disagreement is about the construction of the party, which both you and we consider the main task of the consequent communists at the moment, as you very well manifest on page 66 of the document, and which we also consider a key issue for the realization and correct development of the proletarian revolution. As we say, this is the question that most interests us in the debate right now, in the current phase of the discussion, since with other issues of significance that are developed, we share points of view, analysis and political positions.

Intimately related to the construction of the party there is another aspect of controversy that we consider necessary to address in the debate: the determination of class consciousness and how the process of raising the level of consciousness within the proletariat and popular masses is taking place, it is a key issue for the incorporation of the masses exploited by capital to the revolutionary process. In the context of this issue we also want to address the role of unions in the imperialist phase of capital.

Social class: masses, vanguard and party

We think that the construction of the party is not much lavished the document, perhaps because it is considered definitively settled, going back to the general scheme that has been applied during the October Cycle. Already in the *Compendium of the Mass Line*, published in 2002 and in *To prepare the Congress of the Party !*, prepared in 2016, the conceptions about the construction of the party that are included in the reference document that we analyze. Returning to the subject of the debate, we go to the place where the concept we are discussing is exposed: point 4 of chapter V, The tasks of the communists.

" The new Communist International cannot be a world federation of communist parties, but a centralized world party, where each of its member parties is a national section of the International " (page 139) .

The following is the concept of a revolutionary party, which we are going to ignore for the time being in order to return later, when we address the different characteristics that appear:

" The party must use different forms of open work according to the conditions; "Move like a fish in the water "implies understanding that the policy of the communists is public, but the character of the organization is always clandestine" (p.141) . Party with public presence and organization clandestine

" The struggle of lines is the engine of the development of the Party, its purpose is none other than steel unity for the combat. This is one of the laws that governs the construction of the Party and is the reflection of the class struggle of society within it; it demands to develop it correctly to maintain and elevate the conscious unity of the party's militants " (p.141). Party that promotes both external and internally the fight of two lines.

" It is impossible to sustain the political struggle against the exploiters without the entire Communist Party express your opinion about all political issues, and for that you must have your own press " (page 144) . Party as a collective organizer.

Characteristics that we share in its totality but that we consider at the moment secondary, since what is essential is the concept that we have about the party, its nature, and the process of its formation, logically influenced by this concept. The synthesis on the conception of the game is exposed on p. 140 of the reference document, as follows:

" The Party is the organized, vanguard detachment and the political leader of the working class."

" It must be a unique system of organizations, led by committees at all levels and governed by functioning by democratic centralism

" With the necessary experience, correct line and authority to lead the working class and the masses popular His guide is Marxism Leninism Maoism. "

" It must carry clear ideas about the armed struggle of the masses as a superior form of their struggle policy, in which, the principle of the Communists is clear and forceful: the Party sends the rifle and the gun will never be allowed to send the Party "

" Discipline in the Party is only a consequence of its iron unity, a discipline bordering on military but conscious "

" It is the mission of the Party to bring the socialist consciousness to the workers' movement, to guide the proletariat to the front of the working masses, to the conquest of political power and to build, on the ruins of the old reactionary State, the new State of Dictatorship of the Proletariat "

In the "Compendium of the mass line", the following is said about it:

" In the effort to build the Revolutionary Communist Party of Colombia we must link ourselves to the masses to fuse socialism with its spontaneous movement to direct all its manifestations towards the goal of the conquest of political power "(1- General considerations).

In the document on the preparation of the Congress, it is said:

"We reaffirm the exhortation to all the authentic revolutionary communists in Colombia to face a period of tenacious work to realize the unity of the revolutionary communists in a single party. We reaffirm our confidence that this call will be well received by our comrades from other organizations and all the revolutionaries in Colombia who fight for its construction. "

The reading of the texts invites us to understand, as we do, that the proletariat is divided into two parts: the party constituted by the party -which first exists as the vanguard- and that formed by the masses. Following this thread, the party is defined as the vanguard of the class that aims to direct the masses; that is to say, that the party is considered the vanguard of the class with respect to the masses, without taking into account that party and vanguard can not be identified because they are different terms, which refer to qualitatively different realities. Indeed, the party is the vanguard of the class, but it is something very different from the organized vanguard. By identifying the party with the politically organized vanguard, we are taking it for granted that there is no intermediary between the vanguard and the

masses and, therefore, a direct relationship between you and the two parties can be established, when in fact it is through that intermediary as it becomes possible and effective the political articulation between vanguard and masses to build the party. We must bear in mind that both the vanguard and the masses are not homogeneous totalities, there are different levels within them that differentiate them as part of the totality that determines specific political relationships to resolve these differences.

This is how we understand the general process of forming a new type of communist party:

The concept of class is determined in the beginning by the social relations of production (it is an abstract totality). Those individuals who perform a certain function according to the place they occupy in production belong to a class. It is a determination external to the conscience and will of the individuals that is imposed by their social condition. But this determination does not yet cover the whole concept. If every concept is an expression of a material or social reality, the result of objective relationships, in the case of the social class concept, it is the result of social relations between different classes and between the elements that make up the classes. In this sense, the class is defined by **its position before the conditions that determine it as a class** : belonging to a class is no longer the result of function that performs in production or in society, but the political position that is adopted before the conditions of production. **The class is class insofar as it is totality in action, and belonging to that class no longer depends on the function it performs but on the position it adopts as part of the class.** Within the working class there are two spheres of consciousness: the spontaneous (masses) and the revolutionary (vanguard), and within the spontaneous: the unconscious (broad masses) and the conscious (certain masses). The broad masses are part of the class (it is an objective condition) but they do not have class consciousness, much less political (revolutionary) consciousness, since it is the result of scientific knowledge of social reality and the acceptance of a revolutionary theory (Marxism-Leninism). The understanding and acceptance of the revolutionary propaganda spread by the vanguard is only possible if one has class consciousness, that is, a certain understanding of social reality but dominated by an economic conception of the class struggle, so that it can not be assumed by the broad masses if it is not through the intermediation of a part of the class: those who have class consciousness.

This is the general process, where the proletariat is raising its level of consciousness to become a communist party to address its historical mission: the construction of communist society, which has to adapt to the political conditions of concrete social formation in which the revolutionary process will be developed. This is very important, because otherwise we will be applying general formulations without taking into account the concrete conditions, that is, we will be falling into dogmatism instead of applying the materialist dialectic.

According to what is stated in the document, we understand that there are two aspects implicit in the reasoning:

one) that the party is the vanguard, 2) that in the party-mass relationship there are no intermediations, considering the process of formation of the vanguard as the process of formation of the party, directly linking the party to the masses through the link of the vanguard m/m with the broad masses. According to this conception, when could it be determined that the party is constituted? When the vanguard m/m is, and when is it? When it conquers the ideological and political hegemony within the vanguard in general, made up of the set of organizations that face the capitalist system.

The paragraphs cited contribute to confuse two processes different even though interrelated: we understand that one thing is the process of construction of the vanguard and another very different process of construction of the party, although, as we have been saying, one process necessarily includes the other. The process of formation of the vanguard is necessary for the formation of the party, but not directly, initially, through the broad masses, but of certain sectors of the class to build the revolutionary movement by merging Marxist theory with the movement of the class as a communist party. It is from the culmination of this process of constitution of the revolutionary communist party that the "rapprochement" of the Party begins as a political vanguard of the class with the broad masses, that is, with the spontaneous movement of the masses. The Party, thus constituted, as a revolutionary movement, living on the margin and in union with the spontaneous movement of the broad masses, exists as a social relationship manifesting itself in the class struggle in three stages: relationship between the different vanguards (the ML and the m/l), relationship between said vanguard (where the ML is conquering its ideological and political hegemony) and the sector of the working class that accepts the principles of scientific socialism, relationship between the Communist Party as a revolutionary movement and the broad masses of workers and the popular . We say social and not only organizational relationship (the supposed leadership of the vanguard on the masses, which is what is reduced by the organic conception of the construction of the party, which has nothing to do with the reading that follows from What to do?). The revolutionary movement, the fusion of theory with Marxist practice, that is, of scientific socialism with the sector of the proletariat that assumes the general line of proletarian revolution is not the same, although it tends to be conceived of it, that spontaneous movement transformed by the action of the vanguard through the dissemination of the principles of scientific socialism.

During the process of building the party the MLM vanguard acts in the mass movement, but not politically in the spontaneous movement of the broad masses, but in the bosom of certain masses. It acts, mainly, in the movement of the avant-garde

through the struggle of two lines between the conception and practice ml and the no ml to conquer the ideological hegemony within this movement as theoretical vanguard, first, and practical vanguard, later. It is, in this sense, that we say that it is not the vanguard that acts in the spontaneous movement of the broad masses, but the Party once constituted as a revolutionary movement (system of organizations) to attract the spontaneous movement towards its given positions. that the link with the masses has been forged through their revolutionary conception and the political articulation of the natural leaders of these masses.

It is not the vanguard that acts in the spontaneous mass movement, but the Party, that is, the mass revolutionary movement that acts on the spontaneous movement of the masses, attracting it to its positions. Without a revolutionary movement, that is, without the fusion between the vanguard and the sector of the working and popular class under its influence, the spontaneous movement towards the political line of the revolutionary party cannot be attracted, that is, the general line of the revolution proletarian. The spontaneous movement of the masses can never make the qualitative leap of assuming and developing a revolutionary policy for the simple development of the struggle for demands; all it can aspire to is to reproduce a trade-unionist and reformist politics due to its own conditions of existence, where it reproduces socially the capitalist social relations and the bourgeois ideology of conceiving the world, and the necessary scientific understanding of the social structure in which it develops as a condition to transform the world. The spontaneous movement of the masses cannot understand the principles of scientific socialism by the mere diffusion of said science by the action of the avant-garde, because it is necessary an intermediation that makes it comprehensible and assimilable through the revolutionary movement or Communist Party. .

The fusion between the vanguard and the broad masses of the workers is not done directly, because it is intellectually understandable, but through an intermediation: the revolutionary movement, fusion of the vanguard and the most ideologically advanced sector of the masses. As soon as this fusion takes place, an effective, real mutation begins to take place at the level of consciousness among the broad masses, given that they are incorporated into the practical tasks of the proletarian revolution from different phases. But it is more, to be effective that process has to carry out another process, stage of the general process, which we call the process of Reconstitution, stage where the vanguard adjusts its accounts with the different conceptions and **practices of revisionism that have been happening as genuinely mlm.** During this stage the main aspect of the relationship vanguard mlm and theoretical vanguard is the avant-garde aspect mlm, what determines that the tasks are centered in this main aspect, that is, in the ideological theoretical formation of the vanguard mlm, the unraveling of the revisionist conceptions that go through mlm and the criticism to these conceptions within the theoretical vanguard through the struggle of two lines, while aspects of the general line are being elaborated in accordance with the changes produced in the class struggle motivated

by the material and political development of the capitalist regime in its imperialist phase.

In the stage of creation of the revolutionary movement the main task is to elaborate the general line in agreement to the concrete situation where the class struggle unfolds (general contradictions of the class struggle at the national level) as a concrete aspect of the concrete situation of the imperialist chain (general contradictions of the class struggle on a world level), at the same time that the practical movement of the revolutionary sector is cemented and becomes present in the struggle of the proletariat. Of course, on the margin and in relation to the spontaneous movement of the different classes that face capital.

Marxism: science, ideology and class consciousness

Marxism is a science, the science of the proletarian revolution. This science is based on the dialectical conception of the world, the Dialectical Materialism, which conceives things in continuous movement propelled by their internal contradictions, which is the cause of their qualitative changes. The application of this conception to the knowledge of society gives us the Historical Materialism, which conceives the conditions of production the basis of the ways of life and thinking of each concrete society and the class struggle the engine of the Histories, the changes of some production modes to others.

With the deep analysis of Marx and the contributions of Engels, both contributed in a decisive way to the knowledge of the economic structure of the capitalist production system, as well as to the role that the proletariat will play in said regime. For this, the discovery of two aspects contributed decisively: 1) that in societies divided into classes, human work has a double character (on the one hand, as concrete work, producer of use values, on the other hand, as abstract work, producer of exchange values), essential to produce the concept of surplus value and the unraveling of human work in certain social conditions constitutes the content of value, that is, the source from which the exploitation of the work of others emanates), 2) that the salaried workforce also acquires a double character (on the one hand, as a producer dependent on capital and creator of surplus value for capital, on the other hand, as a creator of material and spiritual conditions independent of capital) that under certain conditions linked to development class politician in line with the material development of capital there is a qualitative leap for the concept of subject revo and the unraveling of the proletariat by constituting itself as a revolutionary class, synthesis of consciousness and class action as revolutionary praxis, is the condition from which the transformation of capitalist society towards communism emanates.

The correct or incorrect understanding of this second aspect is what determines the thin line between the ML and other non-ML theories (anarchist and revisionist,

fundamentally) about the construction of the new type party and the way in which it establishes its close relationship with the broad masses of workers and people to make the proletarian revolution a reality. The different revisionist versions consider that the working class *acquires* its "revolutionary conscience" through the own unfolding of the class struggle, since they understand that the revolutionary conscience, necessary to participate consciously in the revolutionary process, is given in the consciousness of the worker in itself, since it is the repository of that consciousness that in its direct participation is *revealed* by its own action together with other classmates or by the propaganda and agitation of the general principles of Marxist theory as the work of the constituted party. However, reality is something else very different, since the average worker can only aspire to consolidate a class consciousness since the revolutionary consciousness is the result of an understanding, assimilation and implementation of the Marxist theory, revolutionary conception of the class struggle, that is, contributed from outside the spontaneous movement of the class, economic, or reformist political movement of a part of the class. The revolutionary consciousness among the most advanced sectors of the masses can only be created from the theory of the vanguard as a synthesis of the political vanguard of the proletariat and part of the masses that follow the general line of the revolution as a revolutionary movement.

To address this issue, class consciousness and the process of its formation, we will proceed as with the first. Let's start with the literal exposition of the ideas expressed:

" Thus, as the number of capitalist magnates that usurp and they monopolize all the benefits of the social process of production, the mass of misery grows, of wage slavery, of degeneration, of oppression and exploitation; but the rebellion of the working class also grows , taught, unified and organized by the mechanism of the capitalist production process itself (page 17).

" All these theories have a common revisionist essence: conciliate with imperialism, prevent the union of the main forces of society against imperialism, put out the revolutionary impetus of the masses of workers and peasants in oppressed countries in order to spoil the real imperialist struggle ... " (p.31).

" As oppressed countries are forced to live in dependence and backwardness, the masses workers in ruin and miserable life, the proletariat to suffer more intensely waged exploitation and to fall en masse in the misfortune of unemployment, all being unbearable economic and social conditions for the forces whose work sustains and develops society, and as such , they are the material basis of the repudiation of imperialism and its lackeys, of the growing antagonistic class hatred of the world proletariat against the world bourgeoisie ... (p.32).

" For the party as part of the new international and led by it, for which the workers immigrants from oppressed nations and countries, because of their weight in the proletariat of the imperialist countries, because of their position vis-à-vis the means

of production, their conditions of life and work very similar to the workers of the oppressed countries, their combativeness in the ranks of the vanguard of the workers' struggles, they constitute the most important sector of the social base of the Party ... " (p. 150).

We agree that the revolutionary consciousness is formed by the belief and practice of the role of the class struggle in the historical development of society and the concrete role of the proletariat in the construction of a new society that eliminates the conditions of existence of the classes social. We also agree that the proletarian class consciousness is the conscious belonging to that class, that is, the assumption that it has to assume the role of an individual of that class as a social class, to act collectively as an individual of that class. Both one type of consciousness and another cannot be acquired as a result of the process of the spontaneous, economic struggle of the working class if it is not necessarily linked to the understanding of the role of classes in the class struggle, that is, it is assumed the principles of scientific socialism.

And this is what the UOC does not take into account, in our opinion, because of what is expressed in the paragraphs that we have reproduced verbatim. They do not place the essential aspect for the formation of class consciousness, intermediate stage for the formation of revolutionary consciousness, in the taking of political position, that is, in the understanding, assimilation and acceptance of the principles of scientific socialism, but in the development of the material conditions in which the social being lives. It is situated in the external condition (material reality) instead of the internal condition: the Marxist theory and the historical experience of the class struggle.

In our understanding, this is given to the spontaneist conception of the formation of class consciousness due to the excessive valuation that is given to the struggle of the protesting economist, of the working class, considering the broad masses a quality that does not possess Yes, because the revolutionary impetus that is observed can only be the fruit of the maturation of a position and a political practice from the assimilation of Marxist theory. From the struggles derived from the spontaneous movement of the masses can be produced a greater or mere impetus of struggle (more or less radical) but for this impetus to be considered revolutionary, a prior process of raising the level of class consciousness must be achieved. of knowledge, acceptance and social practice of the conception of the class struggle derived from scientific socialism. The revolutionary impetus is a consequence of revolutionary consciousness; in no case derived from the miserable conditions of the existence of life of the exploited.

In the formation of revolutionary consciousness, the material conditions of existence of the individual or classes have nothing to do, since this depends on the assimilation and implementation of Marxist theory. Therefore, either bourgeois, proletarians or peasants can individually adopt a revolutionary class position without class extraction being determinant, depending only on the will and predisposition of the

individual. Another very different thing is what class can and should undertake the communist revolution. Logically, the bourgeoisie cannot assume this task for going against their interests as a class. Only the class that has nothing to lose because it does not have any **social** property, but it does control the means of production: the ability to decide what to do economically and politically with the means of social production, because the same what sets it in motion leaves it in suspense, without producing.

Now is the time to address the third issue in the construction of the party: the concept of labor union in the epoch of imperialism.

" Trade unions must go hand in hand with the Party and led by it, as they are organizations for the resistance struggle, schools of socialism and transmission belts between the leadership of the Party and the broad working masses " (p.143).

" Communists must work with energy, perseverance and firmness to conquer the great Most unions, and in no case should be discouraged by the reactionary and reformist tendencies that exist. Communists must strive to conquer a revolutionary leadership in the unions through agitation and propaganda - mainly among the rank and file - they must raise their class consciousness and, when appropriate, call for action. Communists should never restrict their work to the limits established by the trade unions, and even less adapt their policy in order to make it acceptable to opportunistic trade union leaders " (p.143)

The development of capitalism to its current imperialist stage has achieved among other things to convert the basic organization of the working class, the union (in its beginnings an organization at the service of the resistance struggle of the working class to improve their conditions of existence) in a device more of the bourgeois state to frame and discipline the workers in the fulfillment of the plans of the capitalist economy. Both its internal functioning (where the bases are not more than simple affiliates-contributors, in front of the management, who are true officials-managers of this apparatus, relying on a body of salaried-administrative that perform the function of administratively control the union apparatus), as the external (the leading officials rub shoulders with the employers and the State in large tables of "work" and expensive restaurants in order to regulate capitalist social relations within the companies.) A type of workers' union more proper of the reformist politics that of the revolutionary as it becomes evident with the evolution of the development capitalism, that has fulfilled a historical stage while it has not been configured a superior stage of the construction of the communist party of new type, more linked to the functions of the different apparatuses of the bourgeois state under the dominance of finance capital: plan the global economy, where the workers are a leg of the productive forces.

Nor can one fall into the very common error of the revisionist policy of politically separating the bosses from the bases of these union apparatuses, since both defend the same material interests: that of the labor aristocracy. The bosses and their administrators do not form an elite (the "bad guys") apart from the class fraction that dominates the affiliation of these structures ("the good guys"): elite and union masses form a unit in the defense of the capitalist system, although with different functions; the first, directing class conciliation through the social pact; the second, putting into effect the agreements reached among the non-unionized workers, hoping to obtain some prebend granted by the employers.

Does this mean that communist work should not be done in the unions? No, what it means is that the union cannot be understood as a workers' structure that can develop as a school of communism, because it is impossible given the nature and functions of the union structure in the imperialist stage of capital. The workers' union is the fruit of a historical stage of capital, an organization of the formation of the class itself, according to the political organization of that stage: the workers' party. The current stage does not correspond to this organization, but to the organization of the Communist Party of a new type, that is, of the Party as a revolutionary movement, fruit of the fusion of the vanguard and the most advanced sector of the working class.

We do not say that we should not go to the unions, as we do not say that we should not go to any mass structure where they are "organized" to defend certain particular interests. We do not discuss this, what we question is the determination of when to go to these mass structures. For the communists to act in them, whatever they may be, they must cling to build the revolutionary movement, which is the one that will act collectively in these organisms with the intention and possibility of acting in the class struggle as a revolutionary class. .

*Union of Communists for the Construction of the Party
Spanish state
March, 2017*