

Internationalist Voice

For the Reader's Attention:

- The booklet refers to multiple links; the responsibility for the accuracy, reliability, and functionality of these links rests with *Internationalist Voice*.
- The translations included herein have been sourced from various languages. *Internationalist Voice* assumes full responsibility for the accuracy of all translations and references.
- The cover image is from the first issue of *Bilan*, the journal of the Italian Communist Left Fraction, published in November 1933.

Addresses of the Internationalist Voice

Homepage:

www.internationalistvoice.org

Email:

contact@internationalistvoice.org

X (ex-Twitter):

https://x.com/int_voice

Telegram:

<https://t.me/intvoice>

COMMUNIST REVOLUTION

OR

THE DESTRUCTION OF HUMANITY!

Support Internationalist Voice!

A fundamental pillar of revolutionary work is to systematically intervene and provide a perspective for the development of the struggle of the working class. The existence of a revolutionary tendency, though very weak, is a manifestation of the antagonism between the social classes and is a barometer of the class struggle.

A revolutionary tendency is only supported against the enormous resources of the bourgeoisie propaganda machine by those who are against the capitalist society, exploitation, wage slavery etc. Internationalist Voice is truly internationalist without any illusions about nationalism, democracy, and the left of capital, and defends the Communist Left tradition. Internationalist Voice is fighting for the Communist Revolution and needs your support in its struggle, in its defence of proletarian values and principles. Support Internationalist Voice.

Table of Contents

Introduction 6

Fabrication of False Narratives 7

The Communist Left: A Brief Overview 11

The Distortion and Falsification of the Communist Left 16

Russian Branch 31

The Decline of Capitalism: Strategic Developments in the Class Struggle 35

The Inversion of the Class Struggle and Trade Unions 41

The Subversion of Internationalist Solidarity 53

The Material Preconditions for World Revolution 62

The Necessity of a World Party 73

The Communist Left: Conclusion..... 82

Appendix A (International Communist Current) 89

Appendix B (Internationalist Communist Tendency) 102

Basic Positions: 109

Introduction

The *Critique of Political Economy* website is a leftist platform that publishes articles, translations, and theoretical analyses in the areas of political economy and social movements. It gives the impression that its contributors – authors and translators are primarily researchers, theoretical activists, and independent writers working outside the formal structures of academia – although some do hold academic positions.

In other words, while the website is not an academic research centre in the conventional sense, it seeks to demonstrate – through the publication of in-depth, serious, and scholarly content – that its intellectual output is the result of rigorous theoretical work. This work is carried out by thinkers who independently engage in the critique and examination of contemporary issues and concepts from a leftist perspective.

The fact that a leftist website examines various leftist perspectives on political, economic, and social issues – and even introduces different currents of leftist thought – is generally a positive step, as it helps to recognise and highlight the diversity within leftist viewpoints. This matter primarily concerns the broader leftist movements and is not directly related to the communists, provided that, in doing so, it does not distort or falsify communist left.

The website *Critique of Political Economy*, under the heading “Introduction Writing for Translation”, has engaged in the distortion and falsification of the positions of Communist Left. This text, written in defence of Communist Left, aims to expose the nature of these distortions, reversals, and falsifications, and to reveal the underlying motives behind such actions. Furthermore, by translating and appending articles from other tendencies within Communist Left, it seeks to contribute to a clearer political milieu and to take a step towards advancing the positions of Communist Left.

Fabrication of False Narratives

The website *Critical of Political Economy* has published a translation entitled “The Party and the Unprecedented crisis in the World Order: A Crucial Decade”¹, accompanied by a lengthy introduction by the translator, roughly the same length as the original text. In this introduction, the translator attempts – through distortion, fabrication, and the presentation of falsehoods – to portray the *Lotta Comunista* as one of the currents within Communist Left, fabricating a fictitious history and presenting its aims as part of the tradition and practice of Communist Left. This behaviour is not merely the result of Leftist translators’ ignorance of the history and positions of Communist Left, but rather forms part of the objectives of certain Leftist currents aimed at confronting the true history, practices, and goals of Communist Left. Such distortions and fabrications are intended to prevent critics of the left of capital and those seeking a genuine communist alternative from orienting themselves towards authentic communist and internationalist positions, instead trapping them within radical-appearing leftisms falsely presented as Communist Left.

In the 1990s, when worker-communism was at its heyday, not yet in decline and characterised by a very radical discourse, such speculations were also made about it.²

From the very outset, the translator’s introduction seeks to portray the current in question as inherently internationalist, without clarifying what internationalism actually means or by what definition this current could truly be considered internationalist. The introduction begins as follows:

¹The Party and the Unprecedented crisis in the World Order: A Crucial Decade.

²For further information, please refer to the book *Worker-Communism, Radical Conscience of the Left of Capital*.

“The importance of the text at hand lies in the fact that it outlines the general direction of action for an internationalist party active in several European countries for the year ahead. In a world so globalised that even an isolated country like Iran cannot remain untouched by its waves, one cannot afford to ignore the positions and actions of internationalist parties. Moreover, the positions of such parties may help the Left in Iran to make more informed decisions when confronted with similar issues.”³

It must first be emphasised that there is a distinction between internationalism and Communist Left. Internationalism is a perspective that is fundamentally and inextricably tied to the proletarian class struggle on a global scale. The global unity of the working class, the rejection of any collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and a resolute opposition to imperialist wars are among its core principles. Put simply, internationalism means standing with the global working class and opposing all forms of capitalism, statism, and nationalism.

The translator of the *Critique of Political Economy* website presents the journal *Lotta Comunista* as a publication of the Communist Left, claiming that it emerged from the tradition of the Italian Communist Left. He conveys the impression that, since the journal has its roots in the Italian Communist Left and an internationalist party has formed around it, the branches active in other European countries — and even in Russia and Brazil — should be regarded as part of a Communist Left grouping.

“The following article is a translation from the journal Lotta Comunista (Communist Struggle). This journal emerged in 1965 from within the tradition of the Italian Communist Left, and since then, a party has been organised around it. Today, this party is

³ [The Party and the Unprecedented crisis in the World Order: A Crucial Decade.](#)

*active in several European countries, including Italy, France, Spain, Britain, Germany, and Greece, as well as in Russia and Brazil.”*⁴

In what follows, the translator, by providing a brief history of the formation of this current, seeks to present his account as documented, solid, and well-founded — a narrative that apparently rests on historical events and is supported by historical evidence. He attempts to portray a seemingly robust and authentic picture of the emergence of this current.

*“What follows is a brief history of the emergence of this current and an analysis by the party of world developments, providing context for the text below. Arrigo Cervetto and Lorenzo Parodi, the founders of this party, presented theses in 1957 entitled ‘Theses on the Development of Imperialism, the Duration of the Anti-Revolutionary Phase, and the Development of the Class Party,’ known as the 57 Theses, at the first congress of the Communist Left movement. They declared that ‘given the current level of the world market, with large areas still in the primary stage of capitalist development, the revolutionary problem of the emergence of a socialist economy on an international scale is not yet concretely posed.’ However, ‘the absence of the general conditions for a socialist revolution’ cannot prevent theoretical and practical activity towards the formation of the revolutionary party of the working class.”*⁵

Since neither *Lotta Comunista* nor the translator of the *Critique of Political Economy* provides any explanation of the history and background of the Communist Left, we will first briefly examine the

⁴ [The Party and the Unprecedented crisis in the World Order: A Crucial Decade.](#)

⁵ See source 4.

origins and history of the Communist Left⁶. We will then expose the distortions and fabrications of the translator of the *Critique of Political Economy* to public scrutiny.

⁶Undoubtedly, any attempt to describe the more than hundred-year history of the Communist Left in just a few pages will be highly incomplete and inadequate. To date, numerous detailed articles — and especially books — have been published on the Communist Left in Italy, Dutch-German, Russia, and Britain, and reading them is recommended for a deeper understanding of the history and practice of this current.

The Communist Left: A Brief Overview

Marxism represents the maturity of the working class and reflects its emergence as a social class within the process of societal transformation. This class does not seek to fulfil its historical mission through spontaneous uprisings or unplanned revolts, but rather through reliance on a political programme and the path of social revolution: the overthrow of the capitalist system through a communist revolution, the establishment of the “dictatorship of the proletariat,” and the transition towards a classless communist society.

Unlike the First International, the member parties of the Second International were organised on the basis of Marxism and under the banner of social democracy. Since capitalism had not yet entered its period of decline, the communist revolution was not yet on the proletariat’s agenda. As a result, the struggle for reforms and the improvement of the working class’s living conditions formed an important part of the tasks of the social democratic parties.

With the growth and spread of reformism within these parties, the left wing of social democracy emerged in defence of Marxism. Among the most well-known figures of this wing were Lenin in Russia, Rosa Luxemburg in Germany, Pannekoek in the Netherlands, and Bordiga in Italy.

With the entry of capitalism into its era of decline – of which the First World War was a clear and defining symptom – the period of imperialist wars and communist revolutions began. The First World War led the overwhelming majority of social democratic parties to betray the working class, turning it into cannon fodder for the imperialist war and ultimately aligning themselves permanently with the camp of capital.

In this context, only the Bolsheviks and a very small number of minorities in⁷ various countries remained loyal to proletarian positions during the First World War.

The communist current within social democracy not only raised the banner of proletarian internationalism but also, by leading workers' protests and strikes and directing proletarian uprisings, opened up a new horizon for a wave of global revolution. The glorious October Revolution in Russia was victorious, and revolutions were underway in other countries, including Germany.

Although the roots of the Communist Left can be traced back to the left wing of the Zimmerwald Conference, the Communist Left is primarily the product of the needs and necessities arising from the wave of global revolution. Unlike council communism, which resulted from the failure of this wave and symbolises the weaknesses of the proletariat, the Communist Left emerged from and represents the strengths of the proletariat. Specifically, in Russia, the Communist Left – who were in fact the left wing of the Bolsheviks – began publishing the journal *Communist* in April 1918.

In 1919, the communists, breaking away from social democracy, held the founding congress of the Communist International – an organisation established with the aim of overthrowing capitalism and establishing the international dictatorship of the workers through workers' councils. The parties that came together within this International called themselves “communist” to distinguish themselves from the social democrats.

The defeat of the wave of global revolution, which began with the failure of the German revolution and the systematic suppression of the country's working-class vanguard, led to the isolation of the October

⁷ For more information about the Zimmerwald Conference, its left wing, and related discussions, you can refer to the bulletins published on the Internationalist Voice website.

Revolution. The last sparks of this revolutionary wave were extinguished in 1926 in Britain with the suppression of the general strike, and in 1927 with the bloody repression of the proletarian uprising in Shanghai. This isolation of the October Revolution intensified the gradual degeneration of proletarian internationalism and weakened soviet power in Russia.

The Bolshevik Party gradually became increasingly integrated into state structures, with its influence evident in the soviets, factory committees, the Red Army, and other institutions. These conditions, and the consequences of the defeat of the global revolutionary wave, led to the decline of mass working-class activity. Subsequently, there was a growing focus on parliamentary activity, trade unions, appeals to the “peoples of the East” to resist imperialism, and, in particular, an intensification of the Comintern’s policy of forming a united front.

Although the Communist Left emerged with the wave of global revolution, its existential necessity became even more pronounced in the face of new conditions. The Communist Lefts resolutely defended proletarian and communist positions in defence of the fundamental principles of Marxism and against the first signs of counter-revolution.

Whereas, during the betrayal by social democracy, the communists were the true defenders of Marxism within the workers’ movement, this time the Communist Lefts, loyal to proletarian goals and ideals, regarded themselves as the genuine defenders and continuators of Marxism.

Communist Lefts from Bulgaria to Germany, from Russia to America, and from Britain to the Netherlands and Italy upheld communist positions; yet it was in three countries with strong Marxist traditions – Russia, Germany, and Italy – that the Communist Left appeared most coherently and powerfully. In other words, the response of the Communist Left was a global one.

Following the onset of the counter-revolutionary period, the so-called “communist” parties underwent a transformation and became national parties. These parties, which had once regarded themselves as

defenders of the working class, permanently aligned with the bourgeois camp and became part of the political machinery of capital.

The harshest repression of communists occurred in those countries where the revolutionary movement had reached its highest and most advanced stage before being defeated: Russia, Germany, and Italy. In these countries, communists were either repressed and exiled or driven into severe isolation.

The Russian Communist Lefts played a significant role in defending fundamental Marxist concepts, including the dictatorship of the proletariat, the world revolution, and the rejection of the united front policy.

Nevertheless, the relentless repression of the counter-revolution wiped out a generation of communists – the very creators of the glorious October Revolution – and prevented Russian Communist Left from enduring and developing into a lasting tradition within the international workers' movement.

In the 1920s, the German and Dutch Communist Left played a significant role in resisting the degeneration of the Communist International and became one of the main poles of defence for revolutionary positions. This current had a clear understanding of key issues within the workers' movement, including the role of trade unions, parliamentarism, and national movements.

However, after the 1920s, the German and Dutch Left were unable to maintain their position as a revolutionary pole. Part of this current gradually adopted positions that led to a rejection of the Marxist method and even involved retreats from revolutionary principles. Following this decline, the honour of defending revolutionary positions against the counter-revolution fell to the Italian Communist Left.

In the 1930s, the Italian Communist Left Fraction, during its exile and centred around the journal *Bilan*, remained committed to the fundamental principles of internationalism while analysing and drawing

conclusions from the defeat of the global revolutionary wave – particularly the failure of the Russian Revolution.

The Spanish War in 1936 was a major test for this current. Like Lenin during the First World War, the Italian Communist Left was able to identify the fundamentally imperialist nature of both camps and called on workers to pursue an independent class struggle.

Similarly, during the Second World War, the current upheld the same internationalist position, viewing both sides as imperialist, and reaffirmed the necessity of continuing the class struggle on both fronts.

Over the past hundred years, Communist Left has represented the genuine continuity of Marxism and has become an inseparable part of the proletariat's historical memory.

The main currents of Communist Left – including the Internationalist Communist Tendency, the International Communist Current, and the International Communist Parties – are organically rooted in the tradition of the Italian Communist Left and defend the legacy of the Italian Communist Left Fraction.

There are also tendencies which, although not directly descended from the Italian Fraction, nevertheless consider themselves part of this tradition. These include, for example, *Internationalist Voice*, which upholds the achievements of *Bilan* and other historical experiences of the Italian Communist Left tradition.

The Distortion and Falsification of the Communist Left

Given the minimal explanation provided regarding the history and necessity of the formation of the Communist Left, it is clear that *Lotta Comunista* has no connection whatsoever with this current. The translator for the *Critique of Political Economy* website has likewise failed to properly explain how the journal *Lotta Comunista* emerged in 1965 from within the Italian Communist Left. Consequently, in the simplest terms, he has resorted to distorting and falsifying reality, rather than undertaking even the most basic research to understand the social events and then presenting his own account based on his findings.

The claim to have held “the first congress of the Communist Left” is both a distortion of history and conceptually meaningless. The Communist Left encompasses a range of distinct tendencies within the movement, each of which holds its own congress and has no common one, unless the aim is convergence. If a meeting is organised at the level of the Communist Left as a whole, it is usually in the form of a conference—such as the International Conferences of the Communist Left, held four times in the late 1970s and early 1980s. *Lotta Comunista* did not take part in these conferences, as it could not meet the criteria required for participation.

No political current is without an identity, yet many bourgeois currents adopt a leftist, or even Marxist, identity in order to advance their aims and demands more easily under such a guise. Likewise, the translator for the *Critique of Political Economy* website and *Lotta Comunista* itself ascribe a false Left Communist identity to the group. We are therefore compelled to expose the true identity of *Lotta Comunista* – not only to the website’s translator, but also to the wider public.

In fact, *Lotta Comunista* is the name of a newspaper published by this group, but the group itself is called the *Leninist Groups of the Communist Left* – a group that has no connection either to Lenin and his teachings or to the Communist Left. The origins of *Lotta Comunista* lie in political positions that are entirely at odds with those of the Communist Left. In reality, the history of this group's formation dates not to 1965, but to 1951, and its roots lie in the resistance against the German occupation of Italy during the Second World War.

The Communist Left regarded the Second World War as imperialist and viewed both sides of the conflict as equally imperialist. For this reason, it was persecuted and harassed by both sides. The Communist Left considered the resistance forces, who fought alongside the democrats, to be part of the imperialist war and maintained that this conflict had no connection with workers' class protest or the class struggle.

The Communist Left regarded the Second World War as imperialist and viewed both sides of the conflict as equally imperialist. For this reason, it was persecuted and harassed by both sides. The Communist Left considered the resistance forces, who fought alongside the democrats, to be part of the imperialist war and maintained that this war had no connection with workers' class protest or the class struggle.

Arrigo Cervetto, the principal founder of *Lotta Comunista*, joined the resistance movement against Nazi-fascism in September 1943 and, as a successful partisan, was awarded the **War Merit Cross**. In other words, given the position of the Communist Left at that time, Arrigo Cervetto fought alongside the democrats in an imperialist war and therefore could not be considered an internationalist. In 1945, he joined the Italian Communist Party (Stalinist), but in 1946, following the initiative known

as the “Salerno Turn,”⁸ he left the party and chose to identify as an anarchist. Thereafter, he began studying Marxism and, once he had become somewhat familiar with Marxist debates, announced:

*“I consider myself a Marxist–Anarchist.”*⁹

A number of partisans, including Arrigo Cervetto, Masini, and Parodi, later joined the anarchist movement. In Genoa–Pontedecimo, from 24 to 25 February 1951, they held the founding conference of the *Anarchist Groups of Proletarian Action* and established a publication called *L’Impulso* (The Impulse) as their press organ. At this conference, Cervetto presented his anarchist thesis entitled “The Dissolution of the State as a Class Apparatus.” In other words, given the anarchist perspective on the concepts of social revolution and the state, he argued that:

⁸ The Salerno Turn (Svolta di Salerno) was a major turning point in Italy’s political history during World War II, announced in April 1944 by Palmiro Togliatti, leader of the Stalinist (“Communist”) Party of Italy (PCI). Following the fall of Mussolini’s regime and the Allied occupation of Italy in 1943, the National Liberation Committee (CLN) was formed, bringing together various anti-fascist parties. During this period, Salerno was designated as the temporary capital of Italy and the seat of the provisional government under Marshal Pietro Badoglio.

Under these circumstances, the Stalinist (“Communist”) Party of Italy faced challenges in defining its position towards the monarchy and the new government. On 2 April 1944, Togliatti, after returning from Moscow, announced that the party would temporarily set aside its open opposition to the monarchy and instead focus on cooperating with the provisional government to form a national anti-fascist unity government. This decision, known as the “Salerno Turn,” allowed the party to participate alongside other anti-fascist forces in the political and democratic process without immediately raising the issue of the monarchy’s fate. In this context, the Stalinist Party abandoned armed struggle and turned towards political participation.

By participating in the provisional government, the Stalinist (“Communist”) Party of Italy played a key role in drafting the new constitution and was recognised as a legitimate political force. These developments also laid the groundwork for a period of cooperation between the Stalinist and Christian Democratic parties in the following decades.

⁹ [Theses on the Development of Imperialism.](#)

*“Social revolution, which establishes a classless society, is accomplished through the simultaneous liquidation of the bourgeoisie as a class and of the state as a class apparatus [...] It is the task of mass proletarian organisations (factory councils, collective farms, popular committees) to expropriate the capitalist system’s resources and assume their direct and collective management.”*¹⁰

We will not enter into anarchist metaphysical debates here; that is, we will not examine how a social revolution can bring about a classless society overnight, or whether the bourgeoisie and the state are dissolved overnight by ‘proletarian’ decrees following a social revolution.” Nor will we address whether, after the Paris Commune – which anarchists also participated in – society truly became classless, and the bourgeoisie and the state disappeared. Such debates generally do not provide a clear understanding of the socialisation of the means of production and societal institutions after a social revolution. Here, it suffices to note that in February 1951 Arrigo Cervetto held anarchist tendencies and views, and that this period – not historical left communism – is considered the starting point for the entire organisation of *Lotta Comunista*.

Sixty-six years after the founding conference of the *Anarchist Proletarian Action Groups*, in December 2017, *Lotta Comunista*, in response to a letter from the Trotskyists¹¹ under the title “*Internationalist*

¹⁰ [Theses on the Development of Imperialism](#).

¹¹ Trotsky, one of the principal founders of the magnificent October Revolution, a renowned orator of the communist revolution, and a hero of the Russian Civil War, was nonetheless the principal architect of Trotskyism itself – a current whose integration into the left of capital began during Trotsky’s lifetime and was irreversibly completed during the Second World War. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that Trotsky – despite all his mistakes and theoretical confusions – died as a revolutionary. For this reason, it is essential to distinguish between Trotsky and Trotskyism, as they belong to two distinct class camps: Trotsky to the proletarian camp, and Trotskyism to the bourgeois camp. It is entirely possible that, had Trotsky not been assassinated, he would have distanced himself from Trotskyism – just as Natalia Trotsky separated herself from the Trotskyists and refused to be associated with their counter-revolutionary actions.

Communist Union”, emphasised that it regards the establishment of *Anarchist Groups of Proletarian Action* in February 1951 as the moment of birth of its “original group.” It also noted that the roots of *Lotta Comunista* lie in anarchism—namely, libertarian communism—which had close ties with the French Anarchist Federation, and stated the following:

*“First, the history of Lotta Comunista. It is genuinely difficult to understand why you did not mention our roots in libertarian communism in your article...Lotta Comunista regards the founding of the Anarchist Groups of Proletarian Action, on 24–25 February 1951, as the birth of its own ‘original group’. Not only did its historic leaders – such as Arrigo Cervetto, Lorenzo Parodi, and Aldo Pressato – take part in it, but there was also a close relationship in France with the Fédération Anarchiste, which later became the FCL (Fédération Communiste Libertaire), led by Georges Fontenis.”*¹²

Lotta Comunista is outraged that the Trotskyist group *Internationalist Communist Union* – which, according to *Lotta Comunista*, it has had ties with for over half a century¹³ – continues to accuse the organisation of “Bordigism.” By “Bordigism,” *Lotta Comunista* means Italian Communist Left, a mistaken interpretation to which we will return. The crucial point is that *Lotta Comunista* explicitly and repeatedly emphasises that the organisation’s roots lie not in Italian Communist Left, but in anarchist communism.

*“The organisational issue, where the original root, we repeat, lies not in Bordigism but rather in anarchist communism.”*¹⁴

For further information, one may refer to the book *Trotsky and Trotskyism: How Trotskyism Was Integrated into the Left of Capital*.

¹² [The Letter from Lotta Comunista to the Internationalist Communist Union](#).

¹³ See source 12.

¹⁴ See source 12.

After Stalin's death in 1953, and with the onset of the crisis of Stalinism—which had profound effects on other Stalinist parties, including the Italian Stalinist Party – this crisis manifested within the Italian Stalinist Party as internal disputes and clashes between two prominent figures, Palmiro Togliatti and Pietro Secchia. In this tense atmosphere, Giulio Seniga, who had previously been an assistant to Pietro Secchia, founded the *Communist Action* (*Azione Comunista*) movement in 1954 as the voice of the opposition faction within the party.

By this point, it had become clear that the dissenters from the Italian Stalinist Party had formed *Communist Action*, while the anarchists, led by Arrigo Cervetto, had founded the *Anarchist Groups of Proletarian Action*. Each pursued its own specific goals and traditions, and at this stage there was no mention of “Communist Left.” The fundamental question is: how did “Communist Left” enter the literature of *Lotta Comunista*, and how does the organisation essentially relate to it? The roots of this issue go back to December 1956, when *Lotta Comunista* wrote the following in its historical account:

*“In 1956, following the events in Hungary and Khrushchev’s ‘Secret Speech’, the crisis of Stalinism accelerated sharply, and in June of that year the newspaper Communist Action was launched. In December, Communist Action, together with various historically anti-Stalinist currents — the Anarchist Groups of Proletarian Action (GAAP), the Internationalist Communist Party of Onorato Damen, and the Trotskyists of the Revolutionary Communist Groups led by Livio Maitan — convened at the Dante Cinema in Milan to form the ‘Communist Left Movement’.”*¹⁵

Years later, in 2017, *Lotta Comunista*, in response to a letter from the Trotskyists entitled *The Internationalist Communist Union*, referred

¹⁵ [Theses on the Development of Imperialism](#).

to “an initial initiative” for the founding of the Communist Left Movement. Please note the two words “initiative” and “initial”, as we shall return to them later. In this letter, *Lotta Comunista* reaffirmed its earlier statements in greater detail, writing as follows:

“Four groups took part in an initial founding initiative in December 1956:

- *the GAAP, which had become the Libertarian Communist Federation – a section of the Libertarian Communist International – where Cervetto led the now-Leninist current and Pier Carlo Masini the anarchist one;*
- *the Trotskyists of the Revolutionary Communist Groups – Fourth International – led by Livio Maitan;*
- *the Bordiguist branch of Battaglia Comunista, led by Onorato Damen;*
- *the Milanese group Azione Comunista, a maximalist formation that had split from the PCI during the crisis of Stalinism, led, among others, by Bruno Fortichiari, one of the founders of the PCd'I in 1921.”¹⁶*

First, it is necessary to correct an important point. When *Lotta Comunista* writes, “the Bordiguist branch of *Battaglia Comunista*, led by Onorato Damen”, this is not merely the result of *Lotta Comunista*’s ignorance:

- **Firstly**, to label *Battaglia Comunista* and comrade Onorato Damen as “Bordigist” is not only theoretically and politically incorrect, but also a clear factual error.
- **Secondly**, equating the Communist Left with “Bordigism” is likewise a blatant mistake.

¹⁶ [The Letter from *Lotta Comunista* to the Internationalist Communist Union.](#)

Thus, this characterisation, assessment, and statement is not only erroneous but also an attempt to create ambiguity, sow confusion and mislead within the political milieu.

The term “Bordigism” is itself meaningless, for within Communist Left, unlike in many other ideologies, debate and analysis are conducted on the basis of Marxism. However, “Bordigist” can have a specific meaning: namely, militants who accept Bordiga’s positions. It is an undeniable fact that Antonio Bordiga was one of the most prominent and distinguished figures of Communist Left, and that his role in the 1920s in defending Communist Left positions was of great importance and influence.

The heroic speeches of Comrade Bordiga during the Sixth Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, held between 17 February and 15 March 1926, can be regarded as clear evidence of the validity of the Communist Left and of Bordiga’s defence of Communist Left positions. The spokesman for the Communist Left at these sessions, with courage, acuity, and Marxist clarity, explicitly condemned the process of political degeneration within the Comintern, which had begun with the “united front” tactic, the “workers’ government”, the policy of “Bolshevisation”, the ban on forming factions within the Communist International, and other measures. This resolute and internationalist stance, delivered in person at that very meeting, even took Stalin by surprise.

In the 1930s, one of the darkest periods for the labour movement, when the Communist Left was in severe isolation, conditions were such that the Russian Communist Left had been suppressed, the German–Dutch Communist Left was unable to defend its positions, and was in decline. As noted earlier, this duty and honour fell primarily on the shoulders of the Italian Communist Left.

However, unfortunately, at this critical juncture – that is, throughout the 1930s – Bordiga refrained from intervening in political

matters or defending the Communist Left. At the same time, the *Italian Communist Left Faction*, through the publication of the journal *Bilan*, played an essential and decisive role in defending the Communist Left.

In light of these points, it should be emphasised that, contrary to the claim of *Lotta Comunista*, Comrade Onorato Damen was not a Bordigist. He played a significant role in defending the Communist Left during the 1930s and continued to do so in the decades that followed.

Now that we have at least clarified that the Communist Left is not equivalent to “Bordigism”, and before examining the statements of *Lotta Comunista* regarding the “Communist Left Movement”, it should be recalled that one of the four currents involved in this “initiative” was a Communist Left current called the *Internationalist Communist Party*. We should now consider how the comrades of the *Internationalist Communist Party* explain this “initiative”:

*“Between 1952 and 1953, the party established relations in terms of meetings and discussions with the French group **Socialisme ou Barbarie** and the **Partito Operaio Comunista** (a Trotskyist group mainly based in Puglia). In 1956 until the beginning of 1957, the party engaged in discussions with the **Gruppi Anarchici di Azione Proletaria** (animated by Cervetto and Parodi), **Azione Comunista** and **Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari** (Trotskyist) to see if, and to what extent, it would have been possible to undertake common work. The judgement on those experiences can of course vary depending on perspective, but there is no doubt that there were no attempts to bring together different groups to “act” at the expense of revolutionary principles and coherence. Our comrades participated in, and animated, those attempts without preconceptions, but also without illusions, in no case were they ever prepared to sell out our political history in exchange for easy, but confused, groupings. The goal was always to provide a*

political instrument for the class, so as not to waste its anti-capitalist potential, which would otherwise be reabsorbed within the system.”¹⁷[Emphases are taken from the original text]

As noted earlier, and as *Lotta Comunista* referred to the “initial initiative”, within the framework of this initiative one of the Communist Left currents, namely the *Internationalist Communist Party*, examined whether joint collaboration with the three other leftist currents was possible, and, if so, how far such collaboration could proceed. However, this initiative was flawed and could not continue; it reached no conclusion, and the *Internationalist Communist Party* subsequently withdrew from it. For this reason, it is referred to as the “initial initiative”.

Before continuing the discussion, it is essential to emphasise that our attitude towards other Communist Left currents is not religious but dialectical. In other words, we stress the proletarian and communist nature of these currents and their defence of internationalist positions. This defence of the Communist Left currents does not imply acceptance of, or justification for, any mistakes they may have made. Making mistakes and belonging to the bourgeois camp are two entirely different phenomena. Only those who do nothing make no mistakes, and this truth also applies to the Communist Left currents.

The same applies to other Marxists as well. Marx and Engels came to the conclusion that the idea of “permanent revolution” was mistaken and abandoned it before the end of 1850¹⁸. Engels, in his intellectual

¹⁷ [The Internationalist Communist Party](#).

¹⁸ The idea of permanent revolution was that the proletariat would perform both the bourgeois duties and its own tasks through a permanent or uninterrupted revolution. In fact, the concept of permanent revolution was itself an unsolvable problem. Based on the idea of permanent revolution according to Marx at that time, proletarian revolution was possible in some countries, while bourgeois revolution was still ahead in others. However, Marx, together with Engels, abandoned this idea while reviewing the class struggles in France. This issue is examined in detail in the book [Leftism in the Role of Metamorphosed Councilism](#).

greatness, wrote: “History has proved us wrong,” and in 1895, in a preface to *The Class Struggles in France*, he stated:

“History has proved us wrong, and all who thought like us. It has made it clear that the state of economic development on the Continent at that time was not, by a long way, ripe for the elimination of capitalist production.”

With these explanations, we do not seek to justify the participation of the comrades of the Internationalist Communist Party (*Battaglia Comunista*) in this initiative; rather, we state clearly that it was a **mistake** – an action which, in practice, could neither progress nor did progress. By taking part in initiatives led by leftists, communists do not strengthen the anti-capitalist struggle, but instead weaken themselves.

Let us return to *Lotta Comunista*, which itself emphasises that Leninist Groups of the Communist Left (*Lotta Comunista*) are not so called because they originate from Communism Left, but because they represent the latest development of the “Communist Left movement” – an initiative formed by four groups for future collaboration. From this initiative, two groups – the Trotskyists and *Battaglia Comunista* – immediately withdrew, while the other two groups – the anarchists and the disaffected Stalinists, who at that time called themselves Communist Action – adopted the name “Communist Left movement” for themselves.

Lotta Comunista again emphasises that this “Communist Left movement” has no connection with the historical Communist Left, which it itself refers to as “Bordigism”. To put it more plainly, it is an act of political fraud in broad daylight: exploiting the heritage, history, and noble aims of the Communist Left while adopting its name. *Lotta Comunista* writes:

*“The Leninist Groups of the Communist Left are not so called because they are derived from the Bordiguist Communist Left, but because they represent the final outcome of the Movement of the Communist Left (MCL), which has nothing to do with Bordiguism.”*¹⁹

As noted earlier, *Lotta Comunista* emphasises that the Trotskyists and the Internationalist Communist Party immediately withdrew from this initiative, and that the “Communist Left movement” was in practice composed only of the Proletarian Anarchist Action Groups and the “disaffected Stalinists” (who had split from the Stalinist party), who called themselves Communist Action. According to *Lotta Comunista*, their idea of the “Communist Left” could mean anything: Leninist, libertarian, Trotskyist, maximalist, or any other designation. It writes:

*“By the same token, then, that communist left could be described as Leninist, libertarian, Trotskyist, maximalist, and, in only one dissident component, Bordiguist. Almost immediately, however, Maitan’s Trotskyists and Damen’s Bordiguists withdrew from the initiative, and thus the Communist Left Movement (MSC) was formed solely through the merger of the Libertarian Communist Federation and Azione Comunista.”*²⁰

In 1957, Arrigo Cervetto and Parodi adopted “Leninist” positions. Following this, the Proletarian Anarchist Action Groups merged with the disaffected members of the Stalinist party – who at that time operated under the name Communist Action – and held the first national conference of the “Communist Left movement”. In other words, the

¹⁹ [The Letter from Lotta Comunista to the Internationalist Communist Union.](#)

²⁰ See source 19.

anarchists integrated into the disaffected Stalinists, a founding conference was held, and the outcome was presented as what came to be called the “Communist Left movement”:

*“In 1957, the Proletarian Anarchist Action Groups (GAAP) merged into Communist Action, and the first national conference of the Communist Left movement was held in Livorno from 3 to 4 November 1957. Cervetto and Parodi, who now held openly Leninist positions.”*²¹

Arrigo Cervetto resorted to demagoguery, presenting the origins of the Communist Left as the crisis of the Italian Communist Party, and stated:

*“The second set of problems concerns the more concrete aspects of our tactics, namely the programme of action of the Communist Left, tactics towards the Italian Communist Party and its leadership, tactics towards the Italian Socialist Party and the assessment of socialist unity, relations with other old and new opposition groups... the Communist Left, which emerged from the crisis of the Italian Communist Party and the Italian labour movement.”*²²

Apparently, the members and supporters of *Lotta Comunista* accept what their leaders preach, like “Christ’s lambs”, without the slightest doubt, as if it were sacred word. In this organisation, no one stepped forward to seize Arrigo Cervetto by the lapels and ask: You, who claimed to have become ‘Leninist’ in 1957, have you at least read Lenin’s *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder* (published in 1920)? What

²¹ [Theses on the Development of Imperialism](#).

²² See source 21.

kind of sleight of hand is this that you are playing! Do you understand the necessity and context in which this book was published? Whom did Lenin address in that work, and from which countries? What were the reactions and responses to it? And ultimately, did the Communist Left really emerge from the crisis of the Italian Communist Party—specifically at the point in time Cervetto refers to? Which currents in the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s represented the historical Communist Left and defended it?

In the early 1960s, a number of disaffected Stalinists from the Italian Communist Party, who had gathered in the Communist Action Group, developed tendencies towards Maoism. This heterogeneous collection of disaffected Stalinists and ‘Leninist’ anarchists gradually descended into internal disputes, and Cervetto was unable to continue his collaboration with ‘Communist Action’; as a result, he founded a new organisation:

“After experiencing the coexistence of incompatible positions within Communist Action, Cervetto established a new and entirely homogeneous organisation.”²³

Lotta Comunista, employing demagoguery and political charlatanism, presents this incompatibility as a crisis within the “Communist Left movement”. The proposed solution to this crisis is similarly portrayed as the transformation of the “Communist Left movement” into the Leninist Communist Left groups. In this way, the journal of *Lotta Comunista* was published. In response to the Trotskyists, the journal states:

“When, in the early 1960s, some figures from the Milanese maximalist current within Azione Comunista fell under the spell of

²³ [Theses on the Development of Imperialism.](#)

Maoism, the crisis within the Movement of the Communist Left led, in 1965, to a change of name to the Leninist Groups of the Communist Left, as well as to the founding of our newspaper, Lotta Comunista.”²⁴

In summarising this section, we conclude that *Lotta Comunista* has absolutely no connection with the historical Communist Left, and in its formation it made no reference to any of the branches of the Communist Left – whether in Russia, the Dutch-German region, Italy, or elsewhere – nor did it draw on their historical experiences. Contrary to the fabrications of *Lotta Comunista* and the translators who, like ‘Christ’s lambs’, republish these fabrications without the slightest doubt, the Communist Left had already emerged decades before the joint conference of anarchists with disaffected Stalinists of the Italian Communist Party – under the title of the congress of the “Communist Left movement” and within the context of the rising wave of the world revolution. Through political cunning, *Lotta Comunista* engages in political fraud and presents its inferior product under this title, exploiting the proud history and distinguished reputation of the Communist Left as a cover.

²⁴ [The Letter from Lotta Comunista to the Internationalist Communist Union.](#)

Russian Branch

As previously mentioned, the translator of the *Political Critique of Political Economy* website, in introducing the journal *Lotta Comunista*, stated that a party has formed around it, with branches in other countries. In other words, they sought to suggest that we are dealing with an internationalist movement with branches in multiple countries. Undoubtedly, it is true that *Lotta Comunista* strives to establish a presence abroad and has been somewhat successful in this regard. However, merely having branches in different countries does not make a movement internationalist. The Muslim Brotherhood also has branches in several countries and even seeks to give its ideology more weight than nationalism, yet it cannot be called internationalist solely because it has branches in various nations. By the same logic, simply having branches in other countries is not sufficient to demonstrate the internationalist nature of *Lotta Comunista*, even if the existence of these branches abroad is repeatedly emphasised:

“This party is now active in several European countries, including Italy, France, Spain, the United Kingdom, Germany, Greece, and even in Russia and Brazil.”²⁵

The Russian branch of *Lotta Comunista*, which has adopted the name *New Prometheus*, publishes a journal entitled *Proletarian Internationalism*. *New Prometheus* contacted the Internationalist Voice and expressed interest in familiarising itself with the political positions of the Internationalist Voice, particularly regarding the war in Ukraine, Gaza, and the crisis surrounding Taiwan. Notably, the correspondence

²⁵ [The Critique of Political Economy website](#).

made no mention of its affiliation with the Russian branch of *Lotta Comunista*.

The Internationalist Voice stated that it considers itself part of the Communist Left tradition and defends it. It sent its Basic Positions along with an article entitled *In Defence of the Communist Left*, to *New Prometheus*. With regard to the Russia–Ukraine (NATO) war, it also referred to the joint statement of Communist Left groups and provided a collection of articles related to the conflict.

After reviewing the content of the *New Prometheus* website, we concluded that this movement is, in fact, the Russian branch of *Lotta Comunista*. We expressed our views and interpretations on both matters with clarity and transparency, while maintaining due respect.

The first issue concerned the leftist conferences in Milan. Regarding these conferences, we stated that the gatherings were merely assemblies of leftist groups and had no connection with *Proletarian Internationalism*. On this matter, we wrote:

“You inquired about our impressions of the Milan conference. Regarding this matter, you mentioned that, apart from yourself and Lotta Comunista, everyone else present was labelled either an opportunist or a social imperialist:

“Have you been able to familiarise yourself with the proceedings of the conferences in Milan? What can you say? Of course, we believe that a significant number of the organisations that participated in these conferences hold opportunist and sometimes social-imperialist positions. Only our organisation and Lotta Comunista spoke consistently from the position of proletarian internationalism.”

You profess to be communists, yet you attended a conference where participants, according to you, were identified as opportunists or

social imperialists. Can this be reconciled with communist principles? Did Lenin ever participate in such conferences?

In our view, the Milan conference seemed to be a gathering of various leftist tendencies on the left of capital. Some may attempt to characterise themselves as radical, but it appears to have no connection with communism or internationalism.”²⁶

The second issue concerned *Lotta Comunista*. Regarding *Lotta Comunista*, we also made it clear that it has no connection with Communist Left. This current mistakenly and irresponsibly claims to belong to the Communist Left, thereby creating confusion about the history and positions of Communist Left. The Internationalist Voice wrote the following:

“You asked: “Do you know Lotta Comunista? What do you think about this organisation?”

Yes, we are familiar with this organisation. Lotta Comunista is the name of the newspaper it publishes, but the actual name of this grouping is the Leninist Groups of the Communist Left (Gruppi Leninisti della Sinistra Comunista). However, it has no affiliation with the Communist Left. It erroneously and irresponsibly claims to belong to the Communist Left, creating ambiguity about the history and positions of the Communist Left. For instance, reference can be made to the Theses on Imperialist Development (Theses 57) by Arrigo Cervetto. The main currents of the Communist Left, such as the Internationalist Communist Tendency and the International Communist Current, have published highly valuable articles in defence of communism regarding Lotta

²⁶ Excerpted from the response to *New Prometheus* – April 2024.

*Comunista. If necessary, we may also publish articles defending the Communist Left in the future regarding Lotta Comunista.”*²⁷

New Prometheus announced that it would respond to the correspondence soon, but after a while, instead of providing a reply, it only sent a link to an interview on an anarchist website. It seemed to have thought more rationally and realised that it was in its best interest to remain silent, as stirring up these issues at that point could have led to the publication of this pamphlet. Presumably, *New Prometheus* did not want to play the role of the “Christ-like lamb” of the *Critique of Political Economy* website.

²⁷ Excerpted from the response to *New Prometheus* – April 2024.

The Decline of Capitalism: Strategic Developments in the Class Struggle

It is necessary to emphasise an important point here: the aim of this booklet is not to critique or analyse the political positions and actions of *Lotta Comunista*, but rather to demonstrate the fact that *Lotta Comunista* has no connection with Communist Left. It is merely a leftist movement that, through political trickery, presents its substandard positions under the label of communist Left.

Capitalism is merely a particular historical form of social production. Before it, other modes of production existed, each with different levels of development of the productive forces. The origins of this process go back to the time when humanity, within the framework of its natural conditions of existence and for the sake of survival, was compelled continually to expand and develop its productive forces. No social system collapses during its period of flourishing; collapse occurs only at the stage of decline and decay. It is only at this stage that a social system yields its place to a higher one. The same applies to capitalism.

With this clarification, the history of the capitalist mode of production can be divided into two distinct periods:

- **The first**, when the bourgeoisie played a revolutionary role and the relations of production provided the basis for the development of the productive forces.
- **The second**, when capitalism entered its stage of decline, its “era of decay” – a period whose onset is marked by the First World War. In this stage, the bourgeois class is transformed into a counter-revolutionary and reactionary force. It is only at this point that the material conditions for a social revolution in the modern era – that is, the *communist revolution* – are created.

The entry of capitalism into its age of decline signifies that this mode of production has become dominant across the globe and that the entire capitalist system has reached the imperialist stage. In other words, all countries are now capitalist, and in none of them does the bourgeoisie retain its former progressive role. In this period, all countries, regardless of their size or power, are to be regarded as imperialist. We shall return to this point later.

At a time when the bourgeoisie could still play a progressive role in society, communists offered conditional support for certain wars of liberation, as these wars contributed to the expansion of the capitalist mode of production and thereby laid the groundwork for the emergence of the workers' movement, the essential precondition for socialism. A notable example of this was Marx's support for the American Civil War.

In the age of capitalist decline, when capitalism has become a global system, national movements have been transformed into foot soldiers of imperialist rivalries. Subsequent events have clearly shown how these movements have become part of the foreign policy of the imperialist powers and have been turned into instruments of tension between them. Since the 1920s, Communist Left has consistently emphasised this reality:

“The main political argument put forward by the Stalinists and Trotskyists to justify the support of the working class for national liberation struggles – namely, that by developing the productive forces, the national bourgeoisie would also develop the strength and unity of the working class – has proven to be equally nonsensical. The movement of the communist left has opposed this position since the 1920s, arguing that the working class should not support any bourgeois faction, but rather fight against its interests. The current situation confirms our position: through its support for national bourgeoisies, the African working class has remained

*confused and disarmed in the face of attacks carried out precisely by the same national bourgeoisie it had once supported.”*²⁸

This is while *Lotta Comunista* speaks of concepts such as “the struggles of colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism,” “the anti-imperialist uprisings of the African peoples,” “anti-colonial revolution,” “the unity of the state as part of the process of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Vietnam,” and similar ideas.²⁹ More precisely, *Lotta Comunista* discusses national liberation, but framed in a radical rhetorical style. Yet in the age of capitalist decline, the bourgeoisie worldwide, without exception, is a reactionary and counter-revolutionary force, for capitalism has become a global system, and no part of it is capable of playing a revolutionary role in social development.

In the age of capitalist flourishing, when a global revolution could not yet be placed on the working class’s agenda and it was still possible to impose lasting reforms on the bourgeoisie, communists acted through parliament to advance the struggle and realise these reforms. Despite being fully aware of parliament’s limitations, they entered this institution to defend workers’ demands and to enforce reforms on the centres of bourgeois power. Communists knew full well that parliament divided the working class along national lines and that the duty of parliamentary representatives was to defend the interests of their own nation – something inherently at odds with proletarian internationalism.

With capitalism’s entry into its era of decline, the age of communist revolutions and imperialist wars began. In this period of capitalist decline, the imposition of lasting reforms on the bourgeoisie lost its meaning and became practically impossible. Rising non-productive expenditures, staggering military and armaments costs, and

²⁸ [Africa, esempio di declino capitalista.](#)

²⁹ For further information, please refer to Appendix A, which contains the article of the International Communist Current.

the expansion of state apparatus spending, among other factors, demonstrate the undeniable reality that lasting reforms were unattainable at this time, making any manoeuvring for their implementation impossible. Under such conditions, bourgeois parliaments lost their progressive role.

The communists who gathered at the Second Congress of the Comintern - and, in accordance with the new conditions, the arrival of capitalism in the era of decadence and dismay, and the era of imperialist wars and communist revolutions, not the age of parliamentarianism - wrote:

*“Parliament has become a tool for lying, deceiving, violence and a tedious nagging. With looting, destruction, invasion, militarism and imperialist destruction, parliamentary reforms without any sustainable gain have lost any meaning to masses of workers.”*³⁰

After the Second Congress of the Comintern, any illusion that the proletariat can reduce the burden of crises through parliamentary intervention, or any distracting illusion about the electoral theatre and the parliamentary circus, only serves to strengthen the illusions of bourgeois democracy and throw dirty soil in the workers' eyes.

With this explanation in mind, let us consider how *Lotta Comunista* views this issue. From the standpoint of principles, and based on developments in capitalism, *Lotta Comunista* is not opposed to participating in elections; in other words, it has no objection to parliamentarianism itself, having also taken part in several referenda. However, abstention from elections is not due to an outright rejection of parliament, but rather to the crisis of parliamentarianism under contemporary conditions. On this subject, it writes to its Trotskyist comrades as follows:

³⁰ Theses on parliamentarianism from the Second Congress of the Third International.

*“In fact, ours is not principled abstentionism, as we have participated in several referendums. Rather, it is a strategic abstentionism, driven by a key understanding of the crisis of parliamentarism under the new and varied conditions of the era of imperialist democracy.”*³¹

Arrigo Cervetto, the founder of *Lotta Comunista*, explicitly acknowledges that the main reason for not participating in elections is not a principled opposition to parliamentarism, but merely an “organisational insufficiency.” In other words, if they possessed the necessary organisational capacity, they would undoubtedly participate in the bourgeois electoral spectacle. This position is in stark contrast to the understanding of the Communist Left, which regards parliament as a tool for consolidating capitalist domination and for blinding the proletariat.

In fact, by reducing non-participation to the level of an “organisational problem,” *Lotta Comunista* is effectively signalling its acceptance of parliamentarism, stepping aside only due to practical weakness. The clear implication of this position is that, if this “insufficiency” were ever resolved, participation in elections would then be considered “legitimate.” Such a perspective amounts to nothing more than the perpetuation of illusions among the working class.

On the other hand, the stated aim of *Lotta Comunista* in electoral campaigns – namely, “propaganda intervention and self-promotion” – is, in practice, nothing more than fanning the flames of the bourgeois electoral process, reinforcing illusions of democracy, and creating confusion within the ranks of the proletariat. The worker, who should be using their revolutionary strength to overthrow the capitalist system, is reduced, in this perspective, to a passive spectator of an electoral

³¹ The Letter from *Lotta Comunista* to the Internationalist Communist Union.

spectacle. Worse still, all of these reactionary positions are justified and presented in the name of the Communist Left tradition:

“The Electoral Issue. Considering the analysis of the existing material conditions and the organisational weaknesses of our movement, direct participation in the next political elections is ruled out. By abandoning the possibility of presenting lists that could achieve even minimal political success, by forgoing the tactic of supporting other lists, by renouncing the tactic of supporting certain elements of other lists, and by discarding the possibility of presenting our own lists in constituencies, nothing remains for the Communist Left but the tactic of abstaining from elections. The tactic of withdrawing from elections is not an end in itself; its purpose should be propaganda intervention in the electoral campaign, promoting our ideological and political slogans and positions. Our propaganda is, more than an encouragement not to vote, intended to introduce our organisation, its theoretical and political characteristics, and to attract maximum attention and discussion around it.”³²

³² [Theses on the Development of Imperialism.](#)

The Inversion of the Class Struggle and Trade Unions

From a class perspective, leftists are unable to explain why trade unions were once genuine organisations of the working class, and why Marx and the First International regarded them as instruments of workers' struggle. Nor can they explain why, with capitalism's entry into its epoch of decline, trade unions became integrated into the capitalist state, and how this integration came about³³. By clinging to Marx's statements from the period of capitalism's ascent, they extend them into its epoch of decline³⁴, using them as a pretext to defend today's anti-working-class unions.

In the period when the capitalist mode of production had not yet encompassed the entire world, and the bourgeoisie still played a progressive role in society, a distinction existed between political struggle and economic struggle. Trade unions were regarded primarily as economic organisations, while political struggle was the responsibility of the party, carried out largely through parliament. The unions functioned as schools of struggle, and struggle itself was considered a school for communism. In this period, reforms offered the working class an opportunity to achieve relative improvements in its living conditions within capitalist society. As a result, capitalist society could, through everyday struggles, take on a more humane character.

³³ This issue has been examined in detail, and within its historical context, in the book *Leftism in the Role of Metamorphosed Councilism*.

³⁴For example, in the forum of the Internationalist Communist Tendency, debates have arisen in which *Lotta Comunista*, in its articles, cites the writings of Marx and Engels on the political situation and relations between European states in the 1850s and 1860s – writings published mainly in bourgeois journals, but which have been detached from their original meaning and used out of context. For further information, see Appendix B.

However, the separation of political struggle from economic struggle gradually paved the way for the integration of trade unions into the structure of the capitalist state. With the outbreak of the First World War and capitalism entering its period of decay, the social-democratic parties joined the camp of capital, and the trade unions became instruments for providing services and mobilising workers on behalf of the capitalist state. The mobilisation of workers by the unions for imperialist wars clearly demonstrated that trade unions were no longer independent working-class organisations, but rather integral components of the capitalist state within the workplace.

During the German Revolution – as part of the global revolution – the trade unions revealed their role in suppressing workers' struggles, a bloody chapter that left unforgettable lessons for the working class. In November 1918, the German trade unions, by forming a counter-revolutionary guard in support of Ebert and by spreading illusions about a “workers' government,” directly repressed the workers.

The permanent integration of trade unions into the capitalist state has always held particular significance for the bourgeoisie. On the one hand, it facilitates the penetration of bourgeois ideology among the working class; on the other, through the close connection between the lower ranks of the union and workers in the workplace, it serves as a tool for controlling and restraining them. Acting as a policing force – providing individual services on one hand and suppressing workers on the other – has become an inseparable part of the unions' functions.

One of the most recent examples did not occur under a dictatorship, but in the most democratic form of the bourgeois state, namely the United Kingdom: the largest union, Unite, compiled a blacklist of workers and handed it over to employers. Workers deemed

politically “unsuitable” were barred from employment in order to ensure the “security of production and industry!”³⁵

During periods of lull in the class struggle, unions attempt to break the morale and self-confidence of protesting workers by compiling blacklists, resulting in prolonged unemployment. In times of acute class struggle, unions effectively assume the role of the police by directly undermining revolutionary workers. They discredit the most militant workers through slander, defamation, and even by labelling them as political police agents, thereby weakening the class struggle. Whenever necessary, as demonstrated in the experience of the German Revolution, they also engage in the direct repression of workers by forming special guard units.

Trade unions in the era of capitalist decline have transformed into vast, bureaucratic institutions that operate much like state apparatuses, with staff who command all instruments of power – from capital and financial resources to the media, propaganda, and organisational networks. These unions, particularly in metropolitan countries, are themselves among the principal shareholders of major corporations and play a decisive role in sustaining the exploitation of the working class. Their enormous revenues are nothing more than the surplus extracted from workers’ labour.

After the experience of the Paris Commune, Marx concluded that the working class could not simply put a captured bourgeois state to use in its favour; it had to smash it. The same principle applies to trade unions. The idea of “capturing trade unions from within,” cleaning out

³⁵Unite union officials compiled a blacklist of workers, covering more than 3,200 employees and relating to 40 companies. The union authorities had divided the workers on the blacklist into three categories: “militant”, “troublemaker”, and “warning – be careful”. As a result of this blacklist, many workers remained unemployed for extended periods. Long-term unemployment caused serious difficulties for these workers in the democratic United Kingdom. The Guardian’s report can be read at the link: [Guardian](#).

the corrupt bosses and replacing them with revolutionary leaders. Anton Pannekoek, in his valuable work entitled *World Revolution and Communist Tactics*, wrote a century ago about the nature and functioning of unions, stating as below:

“Marx’ and Lenin’s insistence that the way in which the state is organised precludes its use as an instrument of proletarian revolution, notwithstanding its democratic forms, must therefore also apply to the trade-union organisations. Their counterrevolutionary potential cannot be destroyed or diminished by a change of personnel, by the substitution of radical or ‘revolutionary’ leaders for reactionary ones. It is the form of the organisation that renders the masses all but impotent and prevents them making the trade union an organ of their will. The revolution can only be successful by destroying this organisation, that is to say so completely revolutionising its organisational structure that it becomes something completely different.”

It is an undeniable fact that, in major class uprisings, trade unions are the first strongholds that the working class seeks to seize. The anger and resentment of workers in class struggles towards the unions is no less than that directed at employers. One need only consider a specific example: after the unions crushed workers’ protests in the metal industries in Turkey, the workers openly declared that, before confronting their employer, they first had to settle accounts with the union:

“The wildcat strike by metalworkers at the Çimsaşat factory in Mersin in January 2022, which was suppressed with the help of

trade unions. These workers' struggles could have become a model for others, but the trade unions intervened to suppress them. In the absence of an independent committee, union officials such as Mehmet Kurt managed to wrest control from the workers and place it firmly in the hands of the union. After the union successfully crushed the workers' protests, the workers themselves said they had to settle accounts with the union before confronting their employer.”³⁶

After examining trade unions from a historical perspective and drawing on Marxist arguments about their evolution within the framework of capitalist history, let us now consider the views and outlook advanced by Arrigo Cervetto, the founder of *Lotta Comunista*, concerning trade unions in relation to the positions of the Communist Left.

“Cervetto criticized those groups of the Communist Left, heirs of Bordighism, which understood the counter-revolutionary phase as barring any union action. Since they considered trade unions as completely integrated and controlled by the “two blocks”, they ended up rejecting any commitment of militants inside them. On the contrary, Cervetto considered intervention inside trade unions as a permanent duty of the party, even though he was fully aware that it is dependent on the capitalist cycle.”³⁷

Cervetto was dissatisfied that Communist Left groups refrained from engaging in trade-union activities and rejected involvement within the unions, even though he was fully aware that any intervention in the

³⁶ [Neither Erdoğan nor İmamoğlu – Class Struggle is the Only Path Forward!](#)

³⁷ [Arrigo Cervetto](#).

unions remained subject to the capitalist cycle, ultimately serving the accumulation of capital and leading to further exploitation of workers. By contrast, Cervetto argued that the Communist Left —by which he did not mean genuine Communist Lefts, but rather the counterfeit Communist Left represented by *Lotta Comunista*—ought to organise itself within the trade unions, since he claimed that within the Italian General Confederation of Labour there existed a current of revolutionary character. He further recommended, in order to strengthen this revolutionary current, that *Lotta Comunista* negotiate with the anarchists (reflecting its earlier tradition) so that, through a possible alliance, a unified revolutionary minority might emerge within the Italian General Confederation of Labour:

*“The Communist Left must organise its trade-union current within the Italian General Confederation of Labour and make use of all initiatives and available tools to support the organisation (including union votes and conferences, the appointment of worker representatives in the union, the union bulletin, and so on). Given the nature of the only existing revolutionary trade-union current within the Italian General Confederation of Labour—the workers’ defence committees—the Communist Left must negotiate with the anarchist comrades so that, through a possible alliance, a unified revolutionary minority current may be established within the Italian General Confederation of Labour.”*³⁸

Arrigo Cervetto does not specify how a trade-union current of revolutionary character could exist within the Italian General Confederation of Labour. By “revolutionary character” is meant that the current in question must be opposed to capitalism, rely on social

³⁸ [Theses on the Development of Imperialism](#).

revolution to abolish capitalism and wage slavery, and instead demand the socialisation of the means of production and societal institutions. However, Arrigo Cervetto distorts the concept of class struggle and offers a pro-capitalist interpretation of it. In his view, class struggle is realised through the entry of *Lotta Comunista* cells into the Italian General Confederation of Labour and the stimulation of trade-union struggles—something similar to what European social-democratic parties propose, with the difference that Cervetto presents it under the guise of radical rhetoric.

*“Cells of the Communist Left must take action and, in proportion to their strength, encourage class struggle and contribute to its development. The form of these interventions is entirely organisational: they can occur within specific political groups or within trade-union currents organised inside the Italian General Confederation of Labour (CGIL).”*³⁹

It was noted earlier that Arrigo Cervetto presents a pro-capitalist and social-democratic interpretation of class struggle, albeit framed in radical rhetoric. The translator of the website *Critique of Political Economy* has reproduced the same interpretation. *Lotta Comunista*, in order to strengthen and expand itself, has organised a network of “Internationalist Workers’ Clubs”, whose task is to promote the movement and recruit members through the sale of its publications⁴⁰ in

³⁹ [Theses on the Development of Imperialism](#).

⁴⁰ For more information on the methods and practices of *Lotta Comunista*’s distribution, one can refer to the discussions taking place [on the forum of the Internationalist Communist Tendency](#). It is worth noting that *Lotta Comunista* and its branches—for example, the Russian branch—appear to endorse ownership, as they have designed their website in such a way that downloading and copying content is not possible. In our view, copyright is a bourgeois right, and its meaning is nothing other than the defence of the most sacred principles of the capitalist system, namely the right to ➡

workplaces, schools, universities, and working-class neighbourhoods. In other words, this current pursues its organisational expansion and influence via the trade unions of Europe, and regards this very organisational expansion and influence through the unions as the true form of class struggle—a struggle which, in their view, has enabled the internationalist positioning of the working class during the war.

The translator claims that, thanks to the influence of *Lotta Comunista*’s levers—that is, its workers’ clubs—a Coordination Committee has been established among the three major unions representing steel industry workers in France, Italy, and Spain. According to him, this Coordination Committee has been able to adopt an internationalist stance against both sides of the conflict; for example, regarding the war in Ukraine. He writes as follows:

“Alongside its study and theoretical activities, this party has organised a network of ‘Internationalist Workers’ Clubs’, whose task is to promote the movement and recruit members through the sale of its publications in workplaces, schools, universities, and working-class neighbourhoods, as well as to hold analytical meetings. Members of these clubs wield considerable influence within major European trade unions (such as the CGIL in Italy and the CGT in France) and have even succeeded in establishing a Coordination Committee among the three major unions

property. Communists do not believe in any form of ownership. For this reason, none of the publications, texts, or websites of the Communist Left contain the term ‘copyright’, whereas all circles of the capitalist right and left insist on including copyright notices on their websites and publications.

Stamping a copyright on revolutionary and communist texts contradicts the primary duty of communists: the tireless effort to disseminate and spread communist and internationalist ideas. The Internationalist Voice never stamps its texts with copyright. For further information, see the article “[Copyright and the Internationalist Position](#)”.

*representing steel industry workers in France, Italy, and Spain, which, for example, has adopted an internationalist stance against both sides of the conflict in relation to the war in Ukraine*⁴¹

As explained earlier, the integration of trade unions into the structure of the capitalist state has always held strategic importance for the bourgeoisie. The reason is clear: the lower levels of the unions, due to their direct contact with workers in the workplace, are the first to become aware of changes and movements within the working class. This early access to information enables the bourgeoisie to design policies that engineer and channel workers' anger and demands. A prominent example of this process is the planning of controlled strikes by the unions: when workers' anger and discontent reach their peak, these strikes are used under union control as a means of releasing class energy and directing it within a manageable framework. In other words, unions effectively become political and operational instruments of the bourgeoisie for managing, channeling, and limiting class protests.

This issue also applies to the Russia–Ukraine (NATO) war and, in particular, to the genocide of Gaza by Israel. Trade unions are well aware that when capitalist governments turn to a war economy and increase their war budgets (defence budgets)—which, according to plan, are expected to rise to 5 per cent of GDP by 2035—the consequence is nothing other than the imposition of austerity policies. Such policies can only be implemented through compulsory sacrifices and the curtailment of workers' and labourers' demands, as mandated by bourgeois governments.

Although serious protests by the European working class against the war economy policies of European governments have not yet occurred, workers can clearly observe the effects and consequences of

⁴¹ *The Critique of Political Economy*.

austerity measures in their daily lives. Discontent is beginning to take shape, and the possibility of independent workers' struggles based on class grounds is increasing day by day. In such circumstances, the importance of the role of trade unions becomes even more pronounced.

As during crises or the implementation of bourgeois austerity policies, trade unions exert every effort to channel workers' latent anger and discontent into unionised and manageable forms through planned protests, limited and controlled strikes, and other legal forms of action—thereby preventing the emergence of a genuine class orientation arising from the real experience of workers' struggles.⁴² The same approach is applied in the context of war: unions, taking into account specific conditions, the level of workers' discontent and militancy, and other factors, undertake controlled measures and channel them so as to obstruct the development of proletarian class consciousness.

This issue is even more significant in relation to the genocide in Gaza than in the case of the Russia–Ukraine (NATO) war. Despite extensive efforts by the media, the press, and bourgeois ideologues to shape public opinion, justify Israel's actions under the guise of “the right to self-defence,” and present distorted narratives, millions of workers and ordinary people around the world express their disgust and discontent at the ongoing genocide and brutality in Gaza.

The European bourgeoisie acts with greater cunning and hypocrisy than any other bourgeoisie, exerting every effort to poison its class enemy, the proletariat. It pursues its imperialist objectives through deceit.

⁴² Here, if we set aside the theoretical and conceptual aspects of the issue and focus solely on the actions of trade unions, we can highlight several specific and concrete examples:

- [The Widespread Dissatisfaction Among Public Service Workers in Canada and the Union's Maneuver to Vent the Workers' Discontent](#)
- [The Widespread Dissatisfaction of Canadian Railway Workers and the Union's Maneuver to Vent the Workers' Discontent](#)
- [Three Days that Shook the 'Safe Island' of Capitalism](#)

As workers and the masses become increasingly sceptical of the manipulation of public opinion and the brainwashing carried out by the official media, the primary concern of the European bourgeoisie is the potential reaction of the working class within its own continent.

The anti-Israel actions of certain European trade unions, such as the Confédération générale du travail (CGT), the Confédération générale du travail – Force ouvrière (FO), and other unions, are more a means of controlling and venting workers’ anger in a managed way than a reflection of a genuinely radical or proletarian stance. In other words, these reactions—especially from factions of the left of capital that employ “internationalist” rhetoric—represent an attempt to create confusion and divert the development of proletarian class consciousness amid crisis and war.

Given the anti-war activities of the Trotskyists and their influence within the unions, as well as the role of the *Lotta Comunista* current in trade unions and the longstanding ties between these two currents, it is possible to see how they complement each other through the use of “internationalist” rhetoric. In reality, this approach functions as a form of “soft repression” against the working class, preventing protests against the genocide in Gaza from developing into a genuinely rooted, class-based stance and from fostering the growth of proletarian consciousness.

If the class consciousness of workers were to orient towards revolutionary defeatism—that is, when workers realise that the main enemy is at home everywhere: in Paris, Moscow, London, and other centres of capital—the bourgeoisie, particularly in Western countries, would face a serious and direct challenge. The reality is that not only the Israeli state but the entire global capitalist system is responsible for the genocide in Gaza.⁴³ For this reason, the efforts of trade unions and various

⁴³ For further information, refer to the article ‘*Gaza Genocide: A Product of Global Capitalism’s Organized Barbarism*’.

currents of the capitalist left to contain protests are nothing more than an organised attempt to prevent the development of proletarian class consciousness. Their aim is to ensure that workers' struggles and public anger remain confined within the framework of "managed protest" and do not develop into a fundamental struggle against capitalism as a whole.

The Subversion of Internationalist Solidarity

The struggle of the proletariat, like that of all exploited classes, arises from the conditions of their life and labour. When confronted with the pressures and oppression of the ruling class, workers are compelled to react. Yet the fundamental difference between them and other oppressed classes throughout history is that their struggle is, above all, conscious in nature. The advancement of this struggle results from the experiences and political maturation of the working class; for this reason, proletarian organisations differ fundamentally from the organisations of previously oppressed classes.

In ancient times, solidarity among human beings was largely instinctive and natural. However, as society grew more complex and social contradictions intensified, people required greater awareness and understanding to establish solidarity. Solidarity is the force that brings individuals together and unites them.

Among all classes, the proletariat is the only one in human history that is both exploited and inherently revolutionary. Throughout the history of class societies, this class has been the sole force capable of creating genuine class-based solidarity. The ruling classes have always been exploitative, and their unity has amounted to little more than temporary alliances to maintain power. Likewise, past subordinate classes, though sometimes united, possessed solidarity that was fragmented, sporadic, and lacking long-term class objectives.

In contrast, the proletariat can build conscious solidarity with a long-term class perspective, because the shared conditions of life and labour drive it towards collective, class-based goals.

With the emergence of the working class as a social class, the necessity of class solidarity arose in response to the harsh conditions of life and daily struggle. This solidarity gradually became a lasting

tradition among workers and laid the foundation for mutual trust between them. At this historical stage, workers had not yet experienced widespread betrayal, mistrust, or division, and the bourgeoisie had not been able to seriously undermine this nascent solidarity. This very characteristic had endowed the workers' struggle with a hopeful strength.

With capitalism entering its period of decline, most conspicuously marked by the First World War, class solidarity was severely damaged for the first time. At this stage, the working class experienced betrayal, and its trust in labour organisations—and, by extension, in class solidarity—was undermined. Prior to the war, social-democratic parties were regarded as workers' parties, and trade unions were seen as instruments of the working-class struggle. However, with the outbreak of the war, European social-democratic parties betrayed class solidarity and led workers towards imperialist slaughter. Trade unions not only played a role in mobilising workers for the imperialist war, but also participated in suppressing workers' protests. Under such conditions, workers directly experienced the betrayal of class solidarity in their everyday lives.

The period of the wave of world revolution between 1917 and 1923 was able, to some extent, to make amends for the experience of betrayal of class solidarity. However, the failure of this revolutionary wave and the rise of counter-revolution once again severely weakened proletarian solidarity. The most upright and devoted communists were suppressed in the name of communism, and this time workers were drawn into imperialist wars under the banner of "socialism"; as a result, proletarian solidarity was once again undermined.

At this stage, although the communist Left upheld the banner of class solidarity in complete isolation, their defence could not find resonance within the working class. In other words, there was a serious interruption in the transmission of the experiences and lessons of proletarian solidarity from one generation to the next. Under such

conditions, the Stalinist counter-revolution left devastating effects on the proletarian solidarity of the working class.

With the organisation and renewed advance of the communist Left at the global level, the restoration of proletarian class solidarity and its experiences became fundamentally important. It was necessary to recover this legacy from beneath the weight of distortions, falsifications, and fabrications so that the historical lessons and experiences could be transmitted to future generations.

Proletarian class solidarity goes beyond a mere moral value or charitable act; it is an objective and tangible bond among workers that develops through their daily struggle for survival and collective freedom. Unlike charitable aid or individual acts of self-sacrifice, which are primarily moral in nature and arise from differences in personal needs and interests, class solidarity is founded on shared interests and common goals. Charitable assistance is usually temporary and creates a distance between the giver and the recipient, whereas workers' solidarity establishes a genuine, reciprocal bond that strengthens collective power and shared resistance.

For this reason, proletarian solidarity is not a utopian ideal, but a material and historical force that has its roots in the emergence of the working class and social movements, and throughout history has served as a primary instrument of resistance and revolutionary advancement. Solidarity within the workers' and communist movements is based on class criteria, not moral ones. Workers and communists express sympathy and class solidarity with their class brothers and sisters, whether on the basis of class instinct or class consciousness.

With these explanations in mind, let us examine the characteristics of the solidarity described by the translator of the *Critique of Political Economy* website from the perspective of *Lotta Comunista*. *Lotta Comunista* has established workers' clubs that, in addition to promoting the party, also carry out practical activities. These include collecting

donations outside shops and distributing them to needy families, holding Italian language classes for migrant families, and providing tutoring sessions for schoolchildren. The provision of such services to the working-class base is regarded as class solidarity, which has enabled *Lotta Comunista* to gain influence among workers, resulting in widespread participation in demonstrations on International Workers' Day:

*“Alongside these propagandistic activities, these clubs have also managed to address the immediate needs of the working class by organising volunteers – from collecting donations outside shops and distributing them among families in need, to holding Italian language classes for migrant families and remedial lessons for school pupils. Taken together, these activities have enabled the party to gain significant influence within the working class, to the extent that during May Day demonstrations in Italy, the number of participants in the party’s own independent marches is considerably greater than those attending the joint rallies of other parties and trade unions (ranging from various communist and social-democratic parties to the major trade union federations).”*⁴⁴

Before examining the statements of the translator of the *Critique of Political Economy* website, let us consider how he recommends *Lotta Comunista*’s policy of internationalist solidarity for other countries. According to him, working-class youth must transform internationalist solidarity from the abstract level of merely translating books and articles into concrete, practical actions aimed at achieving class unity against the divisive policies of the ruling class. He argues that this policy of

⁴⁴ *The Critique of Political Economy*.

internationalist solidarity should be realised in practice by addressing the problems of Afghan workers and their families:

“This should lead to the formation of volunteer groups dedicated to addressing the problems of Afghan workers and their families – that is, a network of working-class youth who transform internationalist policy from the abstract act of translating books and articles into concrete, practical measures that advance class unity against the divisive policies of the ruling class.”⁴⁵

What distinguishes Caritas Italy⁴⁶ (the Catholic charity), the Community of Sant’Egidio⁴⁷ (a Catholic religious–social institution), and similar organisations from the activities of *Lotta Comunista*? These charitable institutions also provide aid to families in need, and their scope is often broader than that of *Lotta Comunista*; they offer everything from food distribution and language classes to healthcare, educational and counselling services, and more.

The translator of the *Critique of Political Economy* website, like *Lotta Comunista*, has stripped the concept of proletarian class solidarity of its real meaning, reducing it to the level of charitable acts. Charity, by contrast, is usually a top-down relationship: an individual or institution in a better position provides aid to someone in need, without altering the underlying structure of social inequality. Proletarian class solidarity, however, is based on the shared interests and struggles of workers. Here, a worker helps a fellow worker not out of compassion or benevolence, but as part of collective struggle and to strengthen the unified power of the proletariat. For this reason, solidarity is an equal, conscious relationship that reinforces collective strength, whereas charity often

⁴⁵ *The Critique of Political Economy*.

⁴⁶ *Caritas Italiana*.

⁴⁷ *Comunità di Sant’Egidio*.

merely provides temporary relief from poverty and perpetuates unequal relations.

Let us highlight a few examples of class solidarity at the heart of the struggle.

During the Second World War, a large Jewish population lived in Amsterdam and made up a significant part of the city's proletariat. A considerable portion of this Jewish proletariat was aligned with the labour movement. The arrest and deportation of Jews to forced labour camps provoked intense anger among workers in Amsterdam and the surrounding towns. These attacks on Jews were perceived as a direct assault on Amsterdam's proletariat. The Spartacus Group maintained that the only proper response to Nazi brutality could come through class solidarity and widespread strikes:

*“In all working-class districts, defence troops will have to be formed. The defence against the brutal violence of the National Socialist bandits must be organised. But the workers will also have to use their economic power. The disgraceful acts of the fascists must be answered by mass strikes.”*⁴⁸

During the workers' protests at the Haft Tappeh Sugarcane Agro-industry Company⁴⁹, the employer's agents attempted to weaken the demonstrations, strikes and protests by fomenting ethnic divisions and turning workers against one another. In this context, one of the workers was insulted. It was at this moment that Esmail Bakhshi stepped forward and declared in a loud, clear voice that an insult to one worker is an insult to the entire working class:

⁴⁸ [The February 1941 strike in Holland: class solidarity against racist persecution.](#)

⁴⁹ For further information on the struggles of the workers at the Haft Tappeh Sugarcane Agro-Industry Company, see the pamphlet [Lessons from Strikes, Labour Struggles and Internationalist Tasks.](#)

“Today, Haft Tappeh Sugarcane Agro-industry Company workers’ struggle in the country has become a fully fledged pattern of struggle for free elections to independent workers’ councils and our demand to be consulted, all of which have become possible in light of our unity of workers. But, for me, one of the most beautiful human manifestations is our human collective... But, my dear brothers and sisters, I need us to remember a very important point: one of the most important goals of the struggles of the workers’ movement is to fight the ugly and immoral act of racism and racial divisions. This is because racial division is one of the old means of the capitalist system to divide the working class, which has historical roots, creating a wide gap in the united and occupied ranks of the workers and pushing them away from the main goal and engaging them in internal warfare... Dear brothers and sisters, we must not let these ignorant and notorious individuals undermine our unity and fraternity. We are all workers and brothers, we are all one. If the family and honour of even one single worker are insulted, the entire working class is insulted and we will stand against it”⁵⁰

Another point is that the bourgeoisie has always sought to fragment the working class and undermine its class unity, in order to exploit the proletariat more easily and efficiently; for this reason, it assigns workers national identities. The truth, however, is that before we are “Italian,” “French,” or any other nationality, and before we bear ethnic, racial, or religious identities, we are first and foremost sellers of labour power and members of a class subjected to exploitation. We are wage slaves, and nationality is a hollow and meaningless concept for us.

⁵⁰Esmail Bakhshi.

Nevertheless, the translator of the Critique of Political Economy website, like many other leftists, constructs an “Afghan” identity for workers. At the time, we declared firmly that, in the face of the capitalist system’s efforts to divide and fragment the working class—by turning them into ethnic and religious minorities—it is our duty, consciously and unitedly, to rise as a single class. This means defending shared class interests and standing resolutely against racism and deceptive identity politics, whether propagated by the right or the left of capital:

*“The fight against the humiliating deportation of a section of the working class of Afghan origin is not a defence of a particular ethnicity or nationality; rather, it is a defence of our class identity and interests. Capitalism, by fuelling ethnic, racial, and national divisions, seeks to keep us scattered, weakened, and submissive. But despite all our differences, we belong to one class: the working class. Now is the time to stand united and shout: “Class against class!” and to defend our fellow workers against xenophobia – not in the name of nationality, but in the name of our shared class destiny.”*⁵¹

If we are to draw a conclusion from this section, from the perspective of the Communist Left, proletarian solidarity can never be reduced to mere moral assistance or individual acts of help. Class solidarity, which the Communist Left has always defended, is based on shared class interests and collective struggle against capitalism, and it only acquires meaning within the context of collective struggle and class consciousness. What *Lotta Comunista*—and its reflection as presented by the translator of the *Critique of Political Economy* website—have presented as “solidarity” is, at best, a form of moral assistance aimed at

⁵¹ [The Working Class Is a Class of Migrants.](#)

recruiting members to their party, a task that charitable organisations carry out without expectation and without any aim of recruitment.

As noted earlier, *Lotta Comunista* has a leftist understanding of imperialism that is entirely at odds with the interpretation we have presented. The logical consequence of this understanding is that, in social events, it adopts positions that effectively support the weaker imperialist power against the stronger⁵²; in other words, it aligns the proletariat behind the weaker imperialist power in opposition to the stronger, a stance that constitutes a breach of internationalist principles.

⁵² For further information, please refer to Appendix A, which contains the article of the International Communist Current.

The Material Preconditions for World Revolution

As noted earlier, no social system collapses during its period of flourishing; it is only after passing through a stage of decline that it gives way to a superior social system. It is precisely at such junctures that the material conditions for a social revolution—and, in the present era, for a communist revolution—are established.

Capitalism, along with the development of the productive forces, generates its principal contradiction: on the one hand, the productive forces become increasingly collective, yet on the other hand, the relations of production remain based on private ownership of the means of production. In other words, the expansion of the productive forces under capitalism intensifies the contradiction between labour and capital, thereby creating the objective conditions for a communist revolution. The communist revolution is the first revolution in human history in which the exploited class, possessing class consciousness and a relative understanding of future relations of production, rises up to resolve the contradiction between the productive forces and the existing relations of production.

The communist revolution is inherently a global revolution. In other words, it operates like a political earthquake: its epicentre may emerge in one or several countries, but its victory is only possible if the waves of this earthquake spread to other nations and regions. Otherwise, as the experience of the October Revolution demonstrates, the revolution remains isolated, and despite all the sacrifices of the proletariat in that country, it eventually degenerates. This is because socialist relations of production are only feasible on a global scale; it is impossible to create socialist enclaves within the capitalist system.

After providing at least a brief explanation of social revolution and its material basis, we now return to Arrigo Cervetto and *Lotta*

Comunista.⁵³ The translator of *Critique of Political Economy* has outlined Cervetto's views and emphasised that, without a crisis in the capitalist system, the material conditions for a socialist revolution cannot be established. He writes:

*“Cervetto and Parodi argue that, without fundamental crises in the structure of unitary imperialism, the material conditions for a socialist revolution—which can only be a global one—are not yet in place.”*⁵⁴

It must be acknowledged that, without a crisis in the capitalist system, the material conditions for a socialist revolution cannot be established. However, for *Lotta Comunista*, there is fundamentally no crisis in the capitalist economy; indeed, they have even published a pamphlet entitled *“But What Crisis?”*. From the perspective of Cervetto and *Lotta Comunista*, since vast regions of the world are still in a stage of capitalist development and capitalism has not yet fully conquered extensive markets and territories, society is therefore not yet ready to transition to a socialist economy:

*“Given the current level of the global market, with vast regions still in the initial stage of capitalist development, the revolutionary problem of establishing a socialist economy on an international scale has not yet arisen in concrete terms.”*⁵⁵

⁵³ The question of why, in the nineteenth century, a communist revolution could not feature on the proletariat's agenda, and the fact that the realisation of a proletarian revolution does not depend solely on the will of the proletariat—together with the fundamental differences between a proletarian revolution and a bourgeois revolution, as well as other related issues—are examined in detail in the book *Leftism in the Role of Metamorphosed Councilism*. It is highly recommended that this book be studied.

⁵⁴ [The Political Economy Critique website](#).

⁵⁵ [The Theses on Imperialist Development, Duration of the Counter-Revolutionary phase, and Development of the Class Party](#).

Let us examine, from the perspective of Cervetto and *Lotta Comunista*, why the conditions for a socialist revolution are not yet in place. According to Cervetto, since parts of the world still have underdeveloped economies, they must first undergo a stage of industrialisation. That is, only when these regions become sufficiently industrialised so that they can no longer absorb imports of goods and capital from the imperialist powers will a socialist revolution be placed on the agenda:

*“The Absence of the General Conditions for a Socialist Revolution. For these conditions to be concretely established, the part of the world with underdeveloped economies must complete the entire first stage of industrialisation. Only then, and in chronological sequence within an economic cycle, will the problem of a socialist revolution emerge with such weight of class contradictions that it can be addressed politically and economically within the framework of international tactics. In practice, the problem of a socialist revolution on an international scale will only come onto the agenda when the economic development of underdeveloped regions reaches a stage of self-sufficiency such that they are no longer able to absorb imports of goods and capital from other imperialist powers.”*⁵⁶

Before continuing the discussion, it must also be emphasised that *Lotta Comunista*’s appropriation of Lenin is just as hollow and demagogic as its appropriation of the Communist Left, which is spurious and fraudulent. Decades before the ramblings of Cervetto and *Lotta Comunista*, Lenin maintained that the world socialist revolution was on

⁵⁶ [The Theses on Imperialist Development, Duration of the Counter-Revolutionary phase, and Development of the Class Party.](#)

the immediate agenda of the proletariat. Contrary to the demagogy of Cervetto and *Lotta Comunista*, when Lenin returned from exile in April 1917 and arrived in Petrograd, he mounted an armoured railway carriage at the station and concluded his historic speech to the thousands of assembled workers with the slogan “Long live the worldwide socialist revolution!”, insisting—without the slightest ambiguity or compromise—on the necessity of the worldwide socialist revolution:

*“Dear comrades, soldiers, sailors, and workers! I am happy to greet in your persons the victorious Russian revolution, and greet you as the vanguard of the worldwide proletarian army ... The piratical imperialist war is the beginning of civil war throughout Europe ... The hour is not far distant when at the call of our comrade, Karl Liebknecht, the peoples will turn their arms against their own capitalist exploiters ... The worldwide socialist revolution has already dawned ... Germany is seething ... Any day now the whole of European capitalism may crash. The Russian revolution accomplished by you has prepared the way and opened a new epoch. Long live the worldwide socialist revolution!”*⁵⁷

Unlike the leftists, communists derive the necessity of social revolution not from the conditions of a particular country, but **from the development of capitalism on a global scale**. That is why, when Lenin was preparing to leave Switzerland, in his farewell letter to the Swiss workers he described the notion of a revolutionary class in Russia existing separately from the workers of Europe as utterly alien. He emphasised that such a situation would in all likelihood be very short-lived; in other words, that the workers of Europe would rise in revolution. Lenin wrote:

⁵⁷ [Speech at the Finland Station](#).

*“To the Russian proletariat has fallen the great honour of beginning the series of revolutions which the imperialist war has made an objective inevitability. But the idea that the Russian proletariat is the chosen revolutionary proletariat among the workers of the world is absolutely alien to us... It is not its special qualities, but rather the special conjuncture of historical circumstances that for a certain, perhaps very short, time has made the proletariat of Russia the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world.”*⁵⁸

It was not merely the specific conditions of Russia, but the particular situation of capitalism at a certain stage of its development that provided the material basis for the world socialist revolution. With capitalism entering its period of decline, the material forces necessary for the world communist revolution emerged. For this reason, the Communist International declared that the era of communist revolutions and imperialist wars had begun.

All attempts by leftists and *Lotta Comunista* to appropriate Lenin⁵⁹ are an effort to justify their reactionary and essentially bourgeois positions. These currents, by exploiting Lenin’s authority and popularity, seek to mobilise workers within imperialist alignments and present this under the guise of “supporting national liberation revolutions.” In reality, such a policy is nothing more than the defence of a weak imperialism against a stronger one—a policy that, under the cover of seemingly revolutionary statements, uses the development of productive forces as a

⁵⁸ Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers – Lenin.

⁵⁹ A segment of leftist currents, presenting themselves under labels such as councilism, anarcho-communism, and the like, attempt to attribute tendencies like *Lotta Comunista* to “Leninism” in order to portray the actions of these currents as a direct result of Lenin’s theories. They then use this ruse to attack both revolutionary theory and Lenin’s character. For this reason, exposing the bourgeois nature of these tendencies is simultaneously a defence of Lenin’s revolutionary integrity.

pretext, effectively preventing the opening of the horizon for socialist revolution and keeping the working class trapped within bourgeois conflicts. For this reason, exposing these tendencies is an inseparable part of the proletariat's struggle for its genuine liberation. Mobilising workers behind a weak imperialism is justified as a means of developing productive forces in preparation for the socialist revolution.

“In 1957, at the height of anti-colonial and independence struggles in the colonies, Cervetto and Parodi emphasised the dialectical nature of this process: namely, the increase in political independence alongside a decrease in economic independence, and the integration into the global capitalist market, which inevitably led to an unprecedented development of the productive forces and the proletariat. In fact, support for national liberation revolutions was justified solely on the grounds that, through the growth of productive forces—and consequently of the proletariat—they prepared the material basis for the socialist revolution. While in 1957 some might have doubted this and awaited the advent of socialism, today, observing China, India, Vietnam, Indonesia, and other countries, there can be no doubt as to the correctness of this analysis.”⁶⁰

In fact, whereas in 1957 leftists might have entertained doubts about the statements of Cervetto and Parodi, communists certainly harboured no such uncertainty; for decades earlier, the Communist Left had already openly assessed these positions as reactionary and counter-revolutionary. Even decades before the pronouncements of the “false Leninists,” namely Cervetto and Parodi, Lenin had his eyes set on the achievement of socialism, yet the world revolution failed and socialism

⁶⁰[The Political Economy Critique website.](#)

was not realised—not due to a lack of development of the productive forces, but because of the betrayal of social democracy, the weakness of German communists in breaking swiftly from the dead corpse of social democracy, the ability of the German bourgeoisie to suppress the revolution, and other similar factors. We shall return to the issue of China, India, and other countries, but before that, a look at another observation regarding “pre-capitalist relations” will aid a better understanding of the subject:

“In fact, these developments prepare the ground for the socialist revolution, which cannot arise out of pre-capitalist relations; rather, the socialist revolution simply breaks the constraints that the existing relations of production have imposed on the development of the productive forces.”⁶¹

That in 1957 Cervetto and Parodi believed in “pre-capitalist” relations in certain regions of the world, supported “anti-colonial” struggles, and even described this support as “dialectical,” may at first glance appear to stem from a lack of understanding of the development of capitalism and debates within the Marxist movement. However, such an interpretation is naïve. In fact, these positions were rooted in their class allegiance to the bourgeoisie and represented an attempt to present a bourgeois account of social developments and events.

Did China have pre-capitalist relations in 1957?⁶² By this reasoning, Britain would probably also have structures with “pre-

⁶¹ [The Political Economy Critique website](#).

⁶² Here, in order to avoid straying from the main subject, we refrain from delving into issues concerning China. What is significant with regard to China are the historical background, political developments, the rise of Maoism, the formation of the People’s Republic of China, and the events that followed—all of which are examined in detail in the booklet [Maoism: The Real Child of Stalinism](#). Reading this booklet is recommended for a deeper understanding of issues related to China.

capitalist” characteristics, and arguably still does, since the monarchy in that country persists, which is more compatible with feudal modes of production. Likewise, do Israel and Iran possess pre-capitalist relations or superstructures? By the same reasoning, one could say that they do, since the ruling class in both countries is strongly ideological and religious, and parts of their legal systems are subject to religious rules, which are largely consistent with feudal modes of production.

This is while, decades before the nonsense of *Lotta Comunista* and its defenders, at the Second Congress of the Communist International, the delegate of the Iranian communists took a position on the left wing of the Congress during one of its most sensitive debates, namely the question of nationalities and colonies. Emphasising the necessity of a purely communist movement and in opposition to bourgeois-democratic movements, he declared that the **era of the world revolution** had begun. Avetis Mikaelian (Sultanzadeh)⁶³ stated the following at the fifth session of the Congress:

⁶³Avetis Mikaelian (Sultanzadeh) was born into a poor Armenian family in Maragheh, Iran, and, due to financial difficulties, was forced to continue his education at a school affiliated with the Armenian Church in Yerevan. He joined the workers’ movement in the Caucasus and became a member of the Bolsheviks in 1912. Sultanzadeh was active in the October Revolution in Saint Petersburg and subsequently played a role during the Civil War in recruiting for the Red Army in Central Asia. He was the founder of the first Communist Party of Iran, led the party’s left wing, and was elected its First Secretary. Sultanzadeh also attended the Second Congress of the Comintern, and thanks to his Marxist knowledge, he was admitted to the Comintern’s Executive Committee. Among the documents of this Congress is *The Workers’ Revolution and the Communist International*, which emphasises that the Comintern is the world party of the workers’ uprising and the dictatorship of the proletariat; Sultanzadeh’s signature appears alongside those of Lenin, Trotsky, Bordiga, Pankhurst, and other leaders. Due to his opposition to Comintern policies and his assessment of the national bourgeoisie as reactionary, Sultanzadeh was expelled from the party leadership a few months after the Congress, but he continued to criticise the Comintern’s incorrect policies. This great proletarian theoretician was executed in Moscow in 1938 on charges of “spying for Germany.”

“Just imagine that the Communist Revolution has begun in India. Could the workers in this country, without the help of a revolutionary movement in Britain and Europe, resist an attack against the bourgeoisie? Naturally not...the revolution that has begun in the West has also prepared the background in Iran and Turkey and has given power to the revolutionaries. The era of World Revolution has begun...The issue is that, unlike the bourgeois-democratic movements, a true Communist movement must be created and be kept on foot. Any other assessment of the realities can lead to unfortunate results.”

Apparently, from the perspective of *Lotta Comunista* and its defenders, India remained in pre-capitalist relations and was considered “under colonial rule” until 15 August 1947, the day of independence. However, the interesting point is that, contrary to the nonsense of *Lotta Comunista*, Abani Mukherji⁶⁴, one of the Indian delegates, took a position alongside Sultanzadeh and the left wing at the Second Congress of the Communist International. They opposed the views of Roy⁶⁵, the other

⁶⁴ Abani Mukherji was a prominent Indian revolutionary and one of the founders of the Communist Party of India. He attended the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920 and, due to his radical views, was aligned with the left wing of the Congress. Mukherji was arrested in June 1937 and, in October of the same year, was executed during the Stalinist purges and the widespread massacre of communists.

⁶⁵ Manabendra Nath Roy returned to India in 1930 and met with Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose. However, in 1931, he was arrested in India for his previous anti-colonial statements and was finally released from prison in 1936. Defying the Comintern’s directive to boycott the Indian National Congress, Roy called on Indian “communists” to join the party. With the outbreak of the Second World War, he supported the struggle against fascism, led by Britain and France. Roy severed his ties with the Congress Party and, in 1940, founded the Radical Democratic Party, becoming one of the staunchest defenders of democracy. He believed that India could achieve true independence only within the framework of a free world. Roy died on 25 January 1954, and in 1987 the Government of India issued a commemorative stamp in his honour.

Indian delegate, regarding the “national and colonial question”—views which, it can be said, closely resembled those of the founder of *Lotta Comunista* in 1957 concerning the national question. In contrast to these positions, they emphasised the necessity of attending to the class interests of the proletariat and the continuation of the class struggle.

On the other hand, yesterday’s “colonial” Pakistan, which until independence was part of India and existed within pre-capitalist relations, in the view of *Lotta Comunista*, now appeared in the role of a “coloniser” with regard to East Pakistan (Bangladesh). The question arises: at this stage, on what basis did “colonial” Pakistan act towards Bangladesh—pre-capitalist relations or capitalist ones?

Bangladesh declared its independence on 26 March 1971 and, after a nine-month “liberation” war—or, as defenders of *Lotta Comunista* would call it, a “national liberation revolution”—achieved independent statehood with **direct support from India**. This was a war which, according to *Lotta Comunista*, was supposed to prepare the ground for the development of the productive forces and, ultimately, the realisation of the “socialist revolution.”

But before continuing the discussion, a fundamental question arises: how should India’s direct support for Bangladesh’s “national liberation revolution” be assessed? Was India truly acting as a defender of the colonised, or did this support primarily reflect the pursuit of its own imperialist interests and regional rivalries?

Unlike the “false Leninists,” Lenin always began with a historical and class-based analysis, grounded in the general and historical interests of the proletariat as a social class and in connection with the development of capitalism. He consistently based his evaluations on what aligned with the historical, rather than the immediate, interests of the labour movement. A clear example of this is the April Theses, which Lenin formulated in light of the global development of capitalism and the new tasks confronting the proletariat.

The globalisation of the capitalist mode of production does not mean that all countries are inevitably destined to follow the same path of industrialisation. What is decisive is the dominance of the relations of production and the mechanisms of capital accumulation over the entire world economy. Capitalism, as a mode of production, expands not on the basis of balance and harmony, but through competition and structural inequality. It is precisely for this reason that the development of capitalism does not occur uniformly across the world; rather, its uneven and combined forms always reflect the competitive logic of capital.

The Necessity of a World Party

It should first be emphasised that the purpose of this section is solely to clarify that the party known as *Lotta Comunista* has no connection with the Communist Left or with Lenin and has no roots in the tradition of the Communist Left. The task of examining the party's activities is left to the comrades of the International Communist Current⁶⁶.

The question of revolutionary organisation has always been one of the most contentious issues within the labour movement. This is because the issue could not, from the outset, be determined independently by the proletariat; rather, it has assumed different forms over the course of the historical development of the working class. In fact, the form of workers' organisation has been shaped not by the working class itself, nor even by its vanguard, but by the historical development of capitalism. In other words, at each stage of capitalism's growth and development, the revolutionary organisation assumes its own distinct role, functions, and form.

During the period of capitalist development, the task of revolutionaries, as representatives of the overall and ultimate goals of the labour movement, was to participate actively in the organisation of the working class. In this period, the party functioned as the organ that united the body of the class: a party that campaigned for parliamentary reforms while, at the same time, allowing revolutionaries to defend the programme of the proletarian revolution from within. Simultaneously, alongside the political party, trade unions also operated as organs of the class in the economic sphere.

⁶⁶ For a deeper understanding of the concept of the party from the perspective of Cervetto and *Lotta Comunista*, it is recommended to consult the three-part article by the International Communist Current entitled "[*The Conception of the Party held by Cervetto and Lotta Comunista.*](#)"

In the period of capitalist decadence, proletarian political organisations are inevitably compelled to take the form of a revolutionary minority. Their task is neither to organise the working class directly nor to seize power on its behalf, but **to fulfil a political leadership role**. Under these conditions, the political clarity of the revolutionary organisation and the extent of its influence among the working class are fundamental elements for the realisation of the communist revolution.

The revolutionary organisation is a political organism created by the proletariat to develop, advance, and deepen its class consciousness, and, through political leadership, to guide the working class towards the overthrow of the state and the capitalist system, and the establishment of a communist society. Political leadership is collective, not individual, as is common in bourgeois parties, and should not be reduced to personal, technical, or similar attributes. It does not matter what different groups within the proletariat call themselves; what matters is how political leadership is reflected within the class, for it is in this way that political leadership becomes a reality in practice. One example from Russia demonstrates how political leadership is realised in practice:

“The sailor Khovrin tells in his memoirs how the seamen who considered themselves Social Revolutionaries would in reality defend the Bolshevik platform. This was to be observed everywhere. The people knew what they wanted, but they did not know how to call it by name.”⁶⁷

A fundamental issue is why Marx dissolved the Communist League and the First International, rather than attempting to preserve them under all circumstances. Undoubtedly, a full answer to this question requires a comprehensive study, but briefly it can be said that the

⁶⁷ *The History of the Russian Revolution* – Volume Two - Page 391 - Leon Trotsky

communists, led by Marx, strove to sustain the organisation as long as its existence was necessary—that is, while class struggle in society reached a critical stage. However, when class struggle subsided and a period without serious class confrontations began, the new conditions no longer demanded the continuation of the revolutionary organisation, but rather placed theoretical work and the training of cadres at the forefront.

Even so, during such periods, transmitting the experiences of previous generations to new ones became difficult, and many lessons and insights inevitably had to be rediscovered—a process that was detrimental to the labour movement. Most importantly, the growing power of the bourgeois state and its extensive capacity to poison the working class highlighted the necessity of countering bourgeois and even petty-bourgeois ideological influence within the working class, thereby emphasising the critical importance of maintaining the revolutionary organisation.

Therefore, in conditions where it is not possible to establish a Party or an International—a Party which must reflect the objective conditions of the class struggle and the level of workers’ consciousness—the task of revolutionaries is not to create a Party purely on the basis of will, but to preserve and develop the political, theoretical, and organisational framework in the form of fractions, tendencies, or minority currents. In such circumstances, the fraction constitutes a specific form of organisation whose tasks are defined by a period in which the Party cannot yet exist in its real form. For this reason, the main currents of the Communist Left present themselves either as a “current”, such as the International Communist Current, or as a “tendency”, such as the Internationalist Communist Tendency—a position which we consider entirely correct.⁶⁸

⁶⁸ The comrades operating under the name “International Communist Party” are an exception. As noted earlier, we regard the understanding of the comrades of the International Communist Current and the Internationalist Communist Tendency as correct.

The strength of the proletariat lies in its class solidarity, its class consciousness, and its revolutionary organisation. The revolutionary organisation is a product of the class itself and an inseparable part of it. It must therefore be regarded as part of the proletariat – not just any part, but the section that unites the most militant and most conscious elements of the class; those who have grasped, earlier than others, the aims and historical tasks of the working class.

Now, after clarifying certain points about the revolutionary organisation, let us return to *Lotta Comunista*. No group, organisation, or party falls from the sky; it can only arise where the material and historical conditions for its formation exist. In other words, contrary to naïve assumptions, no organisation or party is without an identity. What actually happens is that some groups or parties construct a false identity for themselves. A striking example of this is *Lotta Comunista*, which, despite lacking any roots in the tradition of the Communist Left, nevertheless claims to belong to it.

We have taken a brief look at the Communist Left and observed that *Lotta Comunista*, in responding to the Trotskyists, has emphasised that the “Communist Left movement” it refers to has no connection with the historical Communist Left, which *Lotta Comunista* dismissively labels “Bordigism.” In fact, *Lotta Comunista* emerged from a crisis within a convergence of *Anarchist Groups of Proletarian Action* and “dissident Stalinists” (those who had split from the Stalinist party), who called themselves *Communist Action* and whose roots lay in Italian anarchism. This group traces its origins not to 1965, but to 1951.

However, Cervetto, through a cunning political manoeuvre, attempted to endow his party with a “Leninist concept” and present it as part of the Communist Left. In practice, the party appears as an umbrella organisation and seeks to establish a foothold in other countries—a strategy more reminiscent of the Trotskyist tradition. *Lotta Comunista* presents this role as an “umbrella party” and its international expansion

as evidence of its internationalism. Yet, an examination of its performance in various social events shows that this current is nothing more than a representative of a form of radical phrase leftism.

In the 1930s, the Italian Communist Left made a significant contribution to the Communist Left movement by establishing an international fraction and publishing the journal *Bilan*. *Bilan* sought to draw lessons from the historical experiences of the proletariat and to prepare the ground for revolutionary struggles and future uprisings of the working class. For this reason, their theoretical journal was called *Bilan* (meaning “Balance Sheet”), as its aim was to provide an account of the historical struggle of the proletariat. In other words, the fundamental strength of the Italian Communist Left lay in its organisational perspective and method of work—an approach that not only enabled it to fulfil the tasks of that period, but also became a source of inspiration for subsequent generations of revolutionaries and the working class:

*“The Italian communist left’s strength was its methodology, and theoretical and organizational strength, which made it passed the counterrevolutionary test much better; and, in the meantime, this made it possible to integrate its ‘balance’ in a more global approach. Although their work process was slow but more thorough, they never rejected basic Marxist achievements.”*⁶⁹

After the historic defeat of the proletariat, particularly during the dark period of counter-revolution, the influence of the ruling class’s ideas and ideology within the working class became more important than ever. In the Eastern Bloc, this domination was exercised through Stalinist ideology, while in the Western Bloc it was cloaked in the ideology of bourgeois democracy. Bourgeois democracy has become an effective

⁶⁹ *The Italian Communist Left*, 1926-45 - IR No. 48

tool for the protection of capital and the poisoning of the proletariat's class consciousness. The emergence and strengthening of the left wing of capital is not only an internal necessity of capitalist society, but also part of its metabolism in the era of decadence. The existential necessity of the political apparatus of the left of capital demonstrates that:

- Firstly, a wing of the bourgeoisie, in order to achieve its aims, adopts the guise of the Left or even “Marxism,” and expresses its demands through left-wing ideology.
- Secondly, capital is capable of producing parties and tendencies that can constrain or control the working class, even if only temporarily. It is an undeniable fact that the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class, and this rule is only overturned under revolutionary conditions.

Marx makes this point very clearly:

*“The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance.”*⁷⁰

⁷⁰ *The German Ideology* – Marx&Engels

Returning to the subject of *Lotta Comunista*, it should be emphasised that the tradition of the Italian Communist Left is one of the richest legacies of the workers' movement. It might be assumed that Cervetto could, by critiquing his own past, studying this tradition in detail, and drawing on its experiences, place himself in the service of the historical and genuine Communist Left and enrich it. However, to understand his true position and that of *Lotta Comunista*, it is not sufficient to view the matter solely from a moral or individual perspective; such an approach would be idealistic rather than dialectical. Social events and orientations can only be understood within the framework of a class perspective. It is precisely at this class level that it becomes clear where Cervetto and *Lotta Comunista* occupy their real position within the course of social events.

We can now return to the question of the necessity of the Party from the perspective of the defenders of *Lotta Comunista*, and examine the functions they attribute to this Party:

“In fact, the slaughter of the war in Ukraine provides the clearest evidence of the horrific consequences of the absence of an internationalist, class-based Party in a country. Had such a Party existed in Ukraine or Russia, Ukrainian and Russian workers, instead of massacring each other in the trenches, could have risen against the ruling class of both sides. In a direct war between imperialist powers, it is the revolutionary Party of the working class, equipped with an internationalist strategy, that advances the tactics of revolutionary defeatism, calling on the working class to refuse participation in the war between powers and to transform the imperialist war into a civil war against the ruling class. Until that time, however, the struggle must continue against the various manifestations of the ruling class's ideology, and the class-based

*Party must be expanded as widely as possible in the major industrial cities.”*⁷¹

This statement implies that if a Party similar to *Lotta Comunista* had existed in Russia or Ukraine, the war could not have continued, because such a Party would have called on the workers to adopt the tactics of revolutionary defeatism. In other words, it would have urged the workers to transform the imperialist war into a civil war and, instead of slaughtering one another, to rise against the ruling class of both sides. However, this claim is nothing more than nonsense:

- Firstly, the German Social Democratic Party was one of the most experienced parties within the Second International. However, with the outbreak of the First World War, this party succeeded in mobilising the proletariat to support the war, whereas it was the Bolsheviks who called for the tactics of revolutionary defeatism. This situation arose from the hesitation and indecision of the Spartacists in breaking away from the “dead body,” namely Social Democracy; they remained within the German Social Democratic Party for a long period, until the right wing of the party was able to poison the working class, betray the proletariat, and join the bourgeois front.
- Secondly, studies have shown that *Lotta Comunista*, from a class perspective, cannot offer a genuine horizon for the liberation of the workers. Contrary to its superficially radical and misleading slogans, the activity of this current within the trade unions does not serve the tactics of revolutionary defeatism; in reality, it is engaged in poisoning the working class and dissipating their class anger.
- Thirdly, the defenders of *Lotta Comunista*, who are themselves aware of the unreliability of many of their claims, justify this by

⁷¹ *The Critique of Political Economy*.

saying that “until that time, the class-based Party must be expanded in the major industrial cities.” Yet this statement is nothing more than a cover for concealing the true nature of their Party. A revolutionary Party is formed and expanded not on the basis of sheer numbers or the mere gathering of forces, but through political clarity, proletarian class consciousness, the transition of the class struggle from a defensive to an offensive form on a global scale, loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism, and a decisive break from the political apparatus of capital.

The Communist Left: Conclusion

The upsurge of the world revolution led to the emergence and spread of the Communist Left — an internationalist current that became prominent in countries such as Russia, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Britain. The defeat of the world revolution isolated the October Revolution and absorbed the Bolshevik Party into the state apparatus. The Communist Left, unlike council communism which reflected the weakness of the proletariat, expressed the strength of the working class and was therefore able to take on the vital task of defending proletarian aims and ideals, while carrying forward the Marxist tradition.

With the onset of the counter-revolution, the so-called “Communist” parties underwent a metamorphosis into national parties, fully joining the camp of capital, while the Communist Left faced severe repression. Although the Communist Left in Russia, Germany and the Netherlands played a significant role in defending proletarian aims during the 1920s, it was the Italian Communist Left that subsequently managed to remain a prominent pole in defending revolutionary proletarian positions and laid the foundations for the continuation of the international Communist Left today.

The Italian Communist Left faction in the 1930s, relying on the journal *Bilan*, sought to provide a Marxist analysis of the defeat of the world revolution and the degeneration of the Russian Revolution, emphasising the necessity of adherence to proletarian internationalism. Unlike other leftist currents, which during the Imperialist Spanish War⁷²

⁷² Following the decisive victory of the “People’s Front Republic” in the 1936 elections, the Spanish army prepared a coup under the command of General Franco against the republican government. During the coup, the workers of Barcelona armed themselves and stood up from their class ground to face it. But since the “proletarian front” dissolved in the quagmire of the anti-fascist front, all the political forces active in the working →

and later in the Second World War were absorbed into one of the two warring camps, this current assessed both sides as imperialist and sought the only solution in independent class struggle. This principled, proletarian stance, which placed it in political isolation, led to repression from both sides of the conflict. Nevertheless, the historical significance of this experience lies in the fact that the Italian Communist Left managed to preserve a Marxist tradition — one that, in opposition to currents absorbed into capitalism or to deviant tendencies such as councilism, continued to defend the achievements of the world revolution and the October Revolution as part of it, upholding proletarian independence in struggles and the perspective of global revolution.

The analyses in this booklet indicate that *Lotta Comunista* has neither roots in the historical tradition of the Communist Left nor advances its goals and ideals. This current emerged on an anarchist basis and, even after its metamorphosis into a “Leninist” formation, became nothing more than a form of leftism with a radical appearance. In other words, by relying on radical rhetoric and eloquence, it effectively pursues the same aims as ordinary leftism.

class demanded a fight against fascism instead of a class struggle. By accepting the struggle against fascism instead of the class one, many currents belonging to the working class joined the camp of capital forever and made the workers cannon fodder in the imperialist war. Following the decisive victory of the “People’s Front Republic” in the 1936 elections, the Spanish army prepared a coup under the command of General Franco against the republican government. During the coup, the workers of Barcelona armed themselves and stood up from their class ground to face it. But since the “proletarian front” dissolved in the quagmire of the anti-fascist front, all the political forces active in the working class demanded a fight against fascism instead of a class struggle. By accepting the struggle against fascism instead of the class one, many currents belonging to the working class joined the camp of capital forever and made the workers cannon fodder in the imperialist war.

We have examined the existential reasons for the historical Communist Left, reasons which fundamentally encompassed the rise of the world communist revolution. We also explored the role of the Communist Left in defending proletarian aims and ideals following the defeat of that very revolution. This approach allowed the Communist Left to become the genuine continuation of the communist tradition. We shall now consider how the existential purpose of the Communist Left — which was ostensibly the central aim of Cervetto’s life — is misleadingly justified.

“This is the central aim of his life:

‘...Only if we know how to work seriously to create an organisational network, however small, and to form groups, however small, of revolutionary cadres, will we, when material conditions become favourable, have laid the necessary groundwork for initiating the revolution. If this historical mission were not established as the central aim of life, the Communist Left would have no reason to exist.’”⁷³

Do not Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists, and other leftist currents follow the same course? Do they not engage in forming groups, expanding their organisations, and training cadres? Undoubtedly, they carry out these activities with equal seriousness and claim that all of them are undertaken for the purpose of realising a future revolution.

But the answer of the Communist Left is a resolute NO: its reason for existence has never been deception or organisational display. The purpose of the Communist Left, beyond forming groups or training cadres, is the direct defence of proletarian aims, the continuation of proletarian traditions, and the safeguarding of the historical duty of the

⁷³ [The Critique of Political Economy website.](#)

working class — a duty that is nothing less than the realisation of the world communist revolution.

Empty rhetoric and the false claim of adhering to the tradition of the Communist Left are not only unhelpful in advancing communist positions, but also become a factor that intensifies intellectual confusion within the ranks of the proletariat. Such currents, instead of illuminating the path of struggle, turn into serious obstacles for workers and groups sincerely seeking to adopt communist and internationalist positions. The outcome of this process is nothing other than the frustration, dispersion, and disillusionment of a section of working-class militants and vanguard.

A mirage is not merely a trick of nature that deceives the eyes under certain conditions; in the political arena, this deception is far more dangerous. Currents that present themselves as the “Communist Left” through verbal radicalism and a false identity are nothing more than such a mirage. They cannot serve as a reference point for the struggles of the working class; on the contrary, by fostering confusion and theoretical distortion, they sterilise the energy and capacity of workers’ struggles, thereby obstructing the fulfilment of the historical duty of the proletariat — namely, the realisation of the world communist revolution.

As noted earlier, this current has no substantive difference from other leftist currents and speaks only through eloquence and radical rhetoric. Its supporters also regard other leftist currents as communist; for example, one can point to their long-standing relationship with the Trotskyists, which is referenced repeatedly in this booklet. Similarly, the defenders of *Lotta Comunista*, following the main current, present other leftist currents as “communist”.

“Although this party has always been a minority current, it continued to grow in the industrial cities of Europe despite the

*disappearance of almost all communist currents following the collapse of the Soviet Union.”*⁷⁴

Let us examine which of the so-called “communist” currents disappeared with the collapse of the Soviet Union⁷⁵. The bourgeoisie, by launching a campaign portraying the collapse of Stalinism as equivalent to the collapse of communism, dealt a serious blow to the working class and paved the way for the discrediting of communism. This situation also created an opportunity for the growth of leftist currents with anarchistic rhetoric and their various offshoots. Other leftist currents, such as the Trotskyists, were less affected; however, the main blow fell upon the Stalinists, who were the ones that disappeared — yet the defenders of *Lotta Comunista*, through deception, still regard them as “communist”. Stalinism experienced two major crises, and we shall shortly examine both periods.

First, in 1956, following the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union — where Khrushchev, in a secret report to the congress delegates, criticised the cult of personality surrounding Stalin and its catastrophic consequences⁷⁶ — the publication of this report dealt a severe blow to Stalinist parties worldwide. Many of these parties

⁷⁴ [The Critique of Political Economy website](#).

⁷⁵ Here, so as not to deviate from the main topic, we will not enter into an analysis of how the democratic bourgeoisie made every effort to present the collapse of the Eastern Bloc as the collapse of communism, thereby poisoning the working class and delivering a serious blow to the proletariat’s class identity and consciousness.

⁷⁶ At the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when Khrushchev read his secret report on Stalin’s cult of personality and his crimes, he wept several times from the “intensity of his feelings,” despite being one of the main perpetrators of those very crimes. The bitter paradox was that someone who had played a central role in the purges, repressions, and massacres of communists and other dissenters now appeared as a whistleblower. It is said that during the reading of this report, around thirty of the attendees were so shocked that they fell into a coma — an event that not only exposed the horrifying scale of the crimes but also demonstrated that the foundations of Stalinism were beginning to fracture even among its most loyal supporters.

gradually metamorphosed into social democracy, while those that remained loyal to Stalinism faced a widespread exodus of their membership.

The second and even more devastating phase occurred with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Eastern Bloc. Stalinism effectively disintegrated, the majority of Stalinist parties once again shifted towards social democracy, and those that remained loyal to Stalinism suffered a severe loss of members.

Unlike leftist currents or circles that are known merely for their radical rhetoric and exhibit various versions and dialects, the Communist Left, despite ambiguities, confusions, and even mistakes committed throughout its proud history, has consistently remained faithful to proletarian positions and objectives. This current has served as a compass, showing the path in class struggles and acting as a genuine reference point for the struggles of the working class. The Communist Left represents the true continuity of Marxism over the past century and forms part of the proletariat's historical memory; since 1928, communism has meant the Communist Left.

We are confident that many militants within currents such as *Lotta Comunista* believe they are fighting for the communist cause and within the ranks of the Communist Left. Yet, as noted earlier, this is merely a mirage in which they are trapped. We encourage all these militants to study and examine the true Communist Left; at that point, they will grasp the reality of communism and emerge from the mirage.

Capitalism drives not only the working class but all of humanity ever deeper into barbarism. Communists are not fatalists and play a decisive role in class struggles. Instead of being part of a leftist movement, instead of creating confusion and intellectual disorder among the working class through the false rhetoric of the so-called Communist Left, and instead of succumbing to political frustration, grow through the internationalist struggle. Become part of the true Communist Left and aid

its advance, so that through active, internationalist intervention in class struggle, you can fulfil your real role in advancing the working class struggle on a global scale.

Instead of devoting your energy and effort to a leftist, false internationalist party, thereby serving the perpetuation of wage slavery and the barbarism of capitalism, strive for the formation of a truly communist, internationalist Communist Party. For without such a party, a global communist revolution will not be possible. All efforts must serve the historical mandate of the working class; for if the working class fails to fulfil this historical duty — that is, to overthrow capitalism through a global communist revolution — the destruction of humanity will be inevitable.

Internationalist Voice

29 August 2025

Appendix A (International Communist Current)

What is ‘Lotta Comunista’ in reality?

In Britain, the group Lotta Comunista hides behind the “Internationalist Workers Club”, which runs food banks in London. It may at first sight look like an internationalist organisation from the tradition of the Communist left. This article argues that appearances can be deceptive.

There exists in Italy a group called *Lotta Comunista* (Communist Struggle) that not only claims to pass itself off as a vanguard of the working class, an internationalist group, but even to be one of the political formations belonging to the communist left, i.e. to come at least politically if not organisationally from the political current that, starting in the 1920s, opposed the degeneration of the Third International. We will see how this is completely without foundation and how *LC* in fact pursues very different objectives.

LC and the Communist Left

In reality, *Lotta Comunista* is the name of the newspaper it publishes, but the real name of this grouping is Leninist Groups of the Communist Left. *LC* has never explained what its political and theoretical connection to the Communist Left consists of. In its press we have never found any reference to the experiences of those minorities that in various countries, such as Italy, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Russia, Mexico, France, clashing with the forces of capitalist repression, have tried to maintain the real thread of marxist continuity.

If *LC* carefully avoids any reference to the positions of the Communist Left, while continuing to bear its name, it is because the

origins of this organisation are at the political antipodes of the Communist Left. They are in fact rooted in the so-called 'Resistance' to the occupation of Italy by German troops during World War II. A number of partisans, including Cervetto, Masini and Parodi, later joined the anarchist movement, forming the Proletarian Anarchist Action Groups (GAAP) in February 1951 with *L'Impulso* as their press organ. The GAAP founding conference, held in Genoa-Pontedecimo on 28 February 1951, is considered by *LC* itself to be the starting point for the whole organisation as we know it today, so much so that on 28 February 1976 a 25th anniversary commemoration event took place in Genoa-Rivarolo. In those days the city of Genoa was plastered with posters indicating the place and time of the demonstration and with the words in big letters "*Lotta Comunista* - 25 anni"; nothing else.

It is more than evident, therefore, that *LC*'s reference to the Communist Left is a pure historical forgery.

LC and Marxism

For *LC*, marxism is something metaphysical, suspended above society, the classes and the struggle between them and not, instead, the expression of the real movement of emancipation of the proletariat. It is but a revelation, a religion - passed off as a science to be applied, detached from the reality and material situation of the proletariat in its contradictory relationship with capital. *LC*'s 'marxism' is merely the product of the thinking of ideologues based on philosophical speculation. To give itself some credibility, *Lotta Comunista* attaches the adjective 'scientific' to its elucubrations and thus believes it is saving its soul: we then have the party as the place where the science of revolution is born and lives, we have the 'scientific' revolutionary programme, 'proletarian science'. The development of this purported marxist science takes place in the brains of thinkers, albeit armed with 'revolutionary science' and

not as a theory expressed by the proletariat in its movement, which is antagonistic to capitalist society. Today this immutable corpus of “marxist science” is supposedly the dowry of *Lotta Comunista*, which uses it to develop itself outside the oscillations of the real movement and outside the ebbs and flows of the class struggle.

LC and the analysis of society

For *LC*, the economic crisis does not exist; on the contrary, it is a fable invented by the bosses to attack the working class. In 1974 *LC* even printed a pamphlet with the significant title “But what crisis?”.

Capitalism is said to be expanding thanks to whole areas and markets that capitalism has yet to conquer.

LC sticks to the statistics of the OECD or *Fortune* magazine or the *Financial Times* without any marxist interpretation. The paper, instead of being a journal of study but also of propaganda and struggle is, after the front page that could be described as a colourless, aseptic examination of the concentration of car companies, pharmaceutical firms, the mass media, with nowhere a concern for the emerging revolutionary perspective. The references to the working class in the column on workers’ struggles in the world are just a photographic statistic of strike hours without any reference to the level of consciousness, the degree of combativeness, let alone autonomous organisation. After all, it is not strange: *LC* sees in the proletariat only a producer of surplus value, of variable capital, exactly like capital does. There is no analysis, no dynamic vision of the becoming of the class struggle and its prospects, but only a static vision, in which the proletariat is conceived as a statistical summation of atomised individuals, to be led, tomorrow, to the revolution - or what is believed to be the revolution.

LC, the class struggle and trade unions

In order to understand *LC*'s position on the working class and the class struggle, we must refer to three different elements that combine to determine *LC*'s conception of the problem: the 'Leninist' conception of the party, the role of the trade unions, and finally the current economic phase that apparently requires an "orderly retreat" on the part of the class. Let us try to analyse these three elements in order.

LC has a conception of consciousness and of the party according to which the proletariat is unable to develop a communist consciousness; this should instead be transmitted to it exclusively by the party, made up of bourgeois intellectuals dedicated to the revolutionary cause.

In this view, *LC* takes no account of the real struggles of the proletariat, but focuses mainly on the level of unionisation of the working class and its own influence within its adopted union, the 'red' CGIL. *LC*'s argument is simple: being the revolutionary party, we have to organise and direct the working class and, to achieve this, we have to take over the union, by whatever means.

The consequence of this is that its interventions in the working class are never aimed at raising the consciousness of the proletariat, but only at gaining new political spaces to control and recruiting a few more cadres.

Finally, insofar as *LC* believes that the economic phase of capitalism is one of continuous growth and that it is essentially up to the working class to wait for events to mature, i.e. for capitalism to be implanted in all its glory, in 1980 this group launched the watchword of "orderly retreat":

"... we have long since taken up the courageous Leninist watchword of gathering around the revolutionary party the conscious and healthy forces of the working class willing to fight

in an orderly retreat, without zig-zags, delusions, confusions, demagoguery."⁷⁷

This implies working to dampen the aggressiveness of struggles, in order to avoid, apparently, having to suffer a "disorderly rout". In this sense LC even goes so far as to reproach the old Italian Stalinist party, the PCI, for having gone too far on this level for mere party interests:

*"As it is no coincidence that the PCI has instead gone so far as to use the trade unions to aggravate the disorderly course of workers' struggles in order to defend its own parliamentary weight in the exclusive interest of the bourgeois factions."*⁷⁸

Same criticism of the 'big union', namely the CGIL, a union of which LC dreams of being able to put itself at the head:

*"Having, instead, disregarded the task we indicated at the beginning of the restructuring crisis, of organising an orderly retreat to then be able to reorganise the recovery, the big union has ended up making entrepreneurs and rulers cry not because of its strength but because of its crisis of authority and confidence."*⁷⁹

Here are the mosquitos who advise - unheeded - the union on what to do. But the latter does not listen to them and goes into crisis, making entrepreneurs and rulers cry. And why would entrepreneurs and rulers cry over the union's crisis? Because those whose moral and material authority keeps the workers chained behind the wagon of capital are failing in their job. This is how base committees⁸⁰ come into being; if, on the other hand, the union had listened to LC's advice, it would not have

⁷⁷ *Lotta Comunista* No. 123, Nov. 1980.

⁷⁸ *Idem.*

⁷⁹ Parodi, *Criticism of the Subaltern Trade Union*, Lotta Comunista editions.

⁸⁰ Parodi, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

to contend with the base committees, i.e. the workers' tendency to break free from the union prison and start organising themselves autonomously, forcing unionism to radicalise in an attempt to better contain the workers.

All of this produces a political practice whose objective is not to foster maturation in the working class, but only the strengthening of 'party' positions on the skin of the class itself. Here is an example of this policy with profoundly negative consequences. In the first half of 1987, when the school workers organised themselves into base committees, *LC* peeped into a few assemblies to proclaim that the problem was not to set up a new trade union organisation, but to take the political direction of the existing ones. This meant not abandoning the CGIL but leaving the leadership of the movement to *LC* itself, and everything would be fine. But the school workers' movement in 1987 was a movement that was beginning to organise on a class basis, albeit with all its weaknesses. Well, given that it was sent packing, *LC* subsequently preferred to denigrate it publicly by calling it a "*southern' movement*" (due to the fact that it was more developed in southern Italy, almost as if it were a regionalist movement), a "*breeding ground for future leaders of parliamentary parties*", calling instead for an extraordinary congress of the CGIL. Put simply, the CGIL had to wake up and not let the struggling school workers slip through its fingers. Here are the 'revolutionaries' at work!

LC and bourgeois institutions

LC declares itself "*against all parliamentary parties*" and "*against the state and democracy*", but then signs a press release together with the main bourgeois parties - PCI, DC, PR, DP, PSI - in which it unanimously reaffirms its "*firm condemnation of terrorism and all those forces linked to it*" and invites "*all workers to reject the serious attack carried out by*

those economic and political forces that tend to destabilise democracy in our country”.

As far as elections are concerned, *LC* declares that it does not believe in them and is abstentionist, except when abstentionism becomes too unpopular to be maintained, as in 1974 on the occasion of the referendum on the abrogation of the right to divorce, demanded by Fanfani’s DC. *LC* then brought out an issue of its newspaper consisting of a single sheet, at half price, in which it denounced “*petty-bourgeois mass-based state capitalism*” and called for a ‘no’ vote. Of course, the whole thing was peppered with phrases like “*the vote is not enough, we must continue the struggle*”. In fact *LC*, like the extra-parliamentarians of those years, took sides for one bourgeois faction against another.

LC and the Resistance

The question of participation in imperialist war is a particularly loaded question because it acts as a watershed between the proletarian and bourgeois camps. Although *LC* claims to be internationalist, it appears particularly compromised on this level.

In a pamphlet of April 1975 it is explained to us that after 8 September 1943 “*faced with the collapse of the bourgeoisie the first workers’ nuclei spontaneously organised themselves: from strikes they moved on to armed struggle. IT IS THE BEGINNING OF THE RESISTANCE! The workers go to the mountains, organise themselves clandestinely in the cities and factories. The first obstacle to the construction of the new society is the presence of the fascists and Nazis. It is against these servants of capital that the partisans must begin to fight. But the workers know well that this cannot be the goal but only an obligatory step towards socialism*”.⁸¹

⁸¹*Viva la Resistenza operaia*, pamphlet of Lotta Comunista, April 1975, page 5.

This discourse is completely on a bourgeois terrain. In fact the partisan bands are groupings at the service of ‘democratic’ imperialism, and even the organisations that acted in the city and in the factories, the GAP and the SAP⁸², although formed by workers, were totally led by the PCI and the other bourgeois parties. The revolutionaries, on the other hand, had to denounce the fact that workers had allowed themselves to be caught up in a ‘people’s war’ in the service of imperialism in which they were not defending their own interests but those of their class enemy. It is true that in March 1943 the workers went on strike with class-based and not anti-fascist demands, but it is equally true that these strikes and those that followed were distorted and diverted into an anti-fascist function. The proletarians in German army uniforms - either because of class instincts or because of memories of workers’ struggles handed down to them by their parents - in some cases sought contact with the striking workers or showed their sympathy by throwing cigarettes at them,⁸³ but they were confronted by the Stalinist scum of the PCI who shot at them to prevent fraternisation between proletarians regardless of nationality and language. Italian workers and proletarians in German uniforms⁸⁴ were beginning to spontaneously put proletarian internationalism into practice. *LC*, on the other hand, saw these proletarians - defined as Nazis tout-court - as the first enemy to be put down.

Again in the same pamphlet we read that the workers will understand that power must be taken away from the bourgeoisie “*and this is what they will try to do where they will succeed in seizing power, even if only for a short time: formation of new political structures in which the power to make laws and enforce them is unified, appointing mayors and*

⁸² Patriotic Action Groups and Patriotic Action Squads.

⁸³ See Roberto Battaglia, *Storia della Resistenza italiana*, Einaudi.

⁸⁴ We are of course talking about the German army, formed for the most part by proletarians like all armies, not the Gestapo or the SS.

officials directly; management of the factories; direct exercise of judicial power and liquidation of the fascists”⁸⁵. Here *LC*’s shamelessness has no limits. They would have us believe that the National Liberation Committees (CNL), referred to in the previous passage, were proletarian bodies, when it is well known that in the CLN there were only the parties of the bourgeoisie that subjected the workers to the demands of imperialist war.

The tragedy of the Resistance is that proletarians allowed themselves to be caught up in a ‘people’s war’ in the service of imperialism for objectives that were not their own; and it is a further misfortune that groups like *LC*, passing themselves off as the heirs of the Communist Left and Lenin, come to exalt the Resistance by presenting it as a failed revolution. For revolutionary communists, on the other hand, the Resistance was the culmination of counter-revolution, the blackest period of counter-revolutionary stagnation, where true internationalists had to guard against both the Gestapo and the Stalinists, often being killed by the latter.

In the 1970s, when *LC*’s pamphlet on the Resistance came out, anti-fascism - democratic or militant - was in fashion, and *LC*, in order to gain militants, adapted to the times. Thus, while other groups collected signatures to outlaw the MSI⁸⁶, *Lotta Comunista*, like the nascent ‘workers’ autonomy’ current, opted for action in the streets. One was for democratic anti-fascism, the other for militant anti-fascism. The result does not change: both practices go against class interests.

In other cases, against fascism, *LC* preferred denunciation: in a 1976 pamphlet, it complained that the MSI received 4.5 billion in public

⁸⁵ *Viva la Resistenza operaia*, pamphlet of *Lotta Comunista*, April 1975, p. 5.

⁸⁶ Movimento Sociale Italiano (MSI), at the time a neo-fascist party later converted to ‘democracy’ under the direction of the current president of the Chamber of Deputies, Fini, with the name of Alleanza Nazionale and then merged into Berlusconi’s Party of Liberties.

funding. *LC* really has a delicate stomach: let them fund the DC, the PCI and all the other parties, but not the MSI, it just doesn't go down well. Of course this would be class-based, proletarian anti-fascism, as if the proletariat's historical task was to fight against a specific form of bourgeois rule and not against the bourgeoisie as a class and its state.

***LC* and internationalism**

Finally, one has to ask: on what does a group like *LC*, which came out of the Resistance and has not made any attempt to separate itself from this experience with a minimum of criticism of its past, base its internationalism? On nothing, given that, again in homage to the idea of completing the bourgeois revolution before being able to put its hand to the proletarian one, *LC* has set itself the task of supporting all national struggles against particular countries defined as imperialist. It has never taken on board Rosa Luxemburg's lesson that shows how in the age of capitalism's decadence all states, big or small, strong or weak, are forced to pursue an imperialist policy.

Thus *LC* puts forward the idea that:

“to actively intervene against every manifestation of the predominant imperialist force in one's own country means to place oneself in the front line of the international class struggle. To participate in every struggle that directly or indirectly affects one or all sectors of imperialism, to participate by distinguishing oneself ideologically and politically with one's own theses, watchwords, resolutions and by denouncing the unitary dialectic of imperialism”. And it sets as its task “in the colonies and semi-colonies to fight imperialism by all means by supporting all those

actions and initiatives of the national bourgeoisies that actually concretely go against imperialist forces, foreign or local.”⁸⁷

LC has also republished all the articles of its historical founder Cervetto⁸⁸ where it defends, among other things, both the policy of support for Korea:

“... we consider it the task of the working masses to fight so that American and Chinese troops leave Korea and the Korean people are left free to conduct their national and social emancipation by the revolutionary path alone, without Soviet or Chinese or UN interference.”⁸⁹

And in favour of African independence:

“The anti-imperialist revolt of the African peoples in no way preludes the formation of socialist society on the continent. It is a necessary stage for the rupture of imperialist domination, for the disintegration of feudal stratification, for the liberation of economic forces and energies necessary for the establishment of a national market and an industrial capitalist structure, (...). For this reason alone we support the struggle for African independence.”⁹⁰

⁸⁷ *L'Impulso*, 15 December 1954, now published in *L'imperialismo unitario*, p. 133, edizioni Lotta Comunista (emphasis ours).

⁸⁸ Arrigo Cervetto (1927-1995) was born in Buenos Aires to Italian emigrant parents. As a young worker in Savona he participated in the liberation with the partisans against fascism and militated in libertarian trade union organisations. He collaborated on the editorial staff of *Prometeo* and *Azione Comunista* until 1964, creating the LC group around him and working on the construction of the new ‘revolutionary workers’ party’, founded on a ‘daily work of organisation and education of the proletariat’.

⁸⁹ From *Il Libertario*, 13 December 1950, now published in *L'imperialismo unitario*, p. 70, edizioni Lotta Comunista.

⁹⁰ From *Azione Comunista* No. 44, 10 April 1959, now published in *L'imperialismo unitario*, p. 258, Lotta Comunista editions.

The logical consequence is feeling obliged to pay tribute to the personalities of the bourgeoisie, who fell in the struggle fought against other bourgeoisies:

*“Lumumba is a fighter of the colonial revolution on whose grave the proletariat will one day lay the red flower. We who, as marxists, have criticised and criticise his confused political actions, defend him from insults (...). Lumumba knew how to die fighting to make his country independent. We internationalists defend his nationalism against those who make their (white!) nationalism a profession.”*⁹¹

LC also has flattering words for Castroism:

*“Castroism becomes revolutionary despite its origin, that is, it is forced to make a decisive break with the past”*⁹².

And, of course, for Vietnam:

*“For those who, like us, have always supported the struggle for state unification as a process of the Vietnamese bourgeois-democratic revolution, the historical significance of the political and military victory in Hanoi transcends the contingent fact.”*⁹³

To conclude ...

There are many other critical points in LC's remote and less remote past that should be examined, such as the coexistence for about 10 years

⁹¹From *Azione Comunista* No. 59, 25 March 1961, now published in *L'imperialismo unitario*, p. 326, Lotta Comunista editions.

⁹²From *Azione Comunista* No. 54, 10 October 1960, now published in *L'imperialismo unitario*, p. 329, Lotta Comunista editions.

⁹³From *Lotta Comunista* No. 57, May 1975, now published in *L'imperialismo unitario*, p. 1175, edizioni Lotta Comunista.

with Raimondi's Maoist-like current (which in 1966 would merge into the M-I Federation of Italy)⁹⁴ or with a character like Seniga, who had left Togliatti and Secchia's PCI taking the party's cash box with him⁹⁵, or the policy of forming power bases, often involving episodes of physical violence against unwelcome characters or ex-militants⁹⁶.

But concretely what emerges from what we have seen is that, faced with the class struggle and the problems of internationalism, fundamentally *LC* never takes the right position in the class confrontation and therefore, beyond all the goodwill and even good faith that *LC* militants may put into their work, this is destined to produce effects exactly opposite to those necessary for the triumph of the class struggle.

Ezekiel, 6 April 2010

[Source of the article.](#)

Contact Information for the International Communist Current:

Website:

[**www.internationalism.org**](http://www.internationalism.org)

Email:

[**international@internationalism.org**](mailto:international@internationalism.org)

⁹⁴The conception of the Party held by Cervetto and Lotta Comunista (Part 2), ICC Online.

⁹⁵ Idem.

⁹⁶ Idem.

Appendix B (Internationalist Communist Tendency)

Note: Numerous discussions have taken place on the Internationalist Communist Tendency forum regarding *Lotta Comunista*. Among these, three posts that most thoroughly examine the positions and actions of *Lotta Comunista* have been selected. It is important to emphasise that not all the posts were written by members or supporters of the Internationalist Communist Tendency; rather, some were authored by others.

* * * * *

[Regarding the call for solidarity with union bossmen facing legal proceedings:](#)

You Can Ask Whatever You Want

You can ask whatever you like; our solidarity is with all workers fighting in every corner of the country and the world, especially those who are forced to endure dismissals and harassment without being establishment bureaucrats.

The leaders of *Lotta Comunista* within the union bear joint responsibility for CGIL's anti-worker policies. The fact that two of them are now on trial confirms two facts:

- 1) The scope for mediation is steadily shrinking; any notion of defending workers' interests through the unions is a sheer illusion. Those who collude in spreading this illusion among the working class play a reactionary role.
- 2) The fact that two leaders have been targeted demonstrates that, during the crisis, employers are increasingly trying to do without the unions... CGIL has so thoroughly undermined workers' capacity to respond that it is no longer even useful to employers for controlling the labour force, which largely regulates itself thanks to decades of defeats and disappointments orchestrated by CGIL, CISL, UIL, and their associates.

No solidarity whatsoever with the leaders of the bourgeois institution CGIL; our utmost solidarity lies with the proletariat in struggle, in all its forms, especially when it is threatened and attacked by the CGIL–*Lotta Comunista* leadership.

Another glaring fact emerges: the militants of *Lotta Comunista* are so fearful of this situation—with the union losing ground, members, and economic privileges—that they periodically feel compelled to attack the *Battaglia Comunista* stance on the matter.

And with that, I believe the discussion can be closed, because if we remain here arguing that CGIL is useful and that *Lotta Comunista* Ltd is a revolutionary organisation (for the revolution of 2543), we are simply wasting our time. This forum is intended for debating the positions of *Battaglia Comunista* and its platform, not for spamming opportunist propaganda.

I'll conclude by pointing out that I have never read a single line of solidarity with proletarians affected by bourgeois repression in *Lotta Comunista* or their publications. It takes the brazen audacity of a professional provocateur to demand it from others! This is what provocation is called.

* * * * *

Regarding What Is to Be Done?

It is the habit of *Lotta Comunista* and similar counter-revolutionary organisations to take the “spirit” rather than the letter of a speech. In fact, to be precise, *Lotta Comunista* doesn't even do that, since it understands nothing—not only of *What Is to Be Done?* but of Marxism as a whole—distorting and twisting it just as opportunists and counter-revolutionaries have always done. I read, until my stomach gave out, the introduction by Cervetto and *Lotta Comunista* to Lenin's *Imperialism*: it seems as if Lenin had written a diplomatic manual rather than a razor-sharp weapon of critique and, therefore, action against the capitalism of our era. A bit

of a sense of the ridiculous wouldn't go amiss, but that is a commodity utterly absent in that highly organised commercial enterprise called "*Lotta Comunista*."

* * * * *

[Lotta Comunista: petty thieves of a theoretical heritage believed to be unguarded](#)

From a theoretical standpoint, especially over the past fifteen years, *Lotta Comunista* stands out for its conception of "international relations," which it has borrowed – or rather, more accurately, appropriated – from the bourgeois realist school, citing figures like Paul Kennedy, Henry Kissinger, and others, and then passing it off as "Marxist." Simply reading any issue of their journal reveals so-called "analytical" articles that are, in reality, a patchwork collage of excerpts from bourgeois newspapers across the US, Europe, China, India, and so on, typically concluding with a vague and undefined appeal to a "Marxist" interpretation of the "relations between powers."

But the worst aspect is the endless series of editorials citing newspaper articles written by Marx and Engels about the political situation and relations between European states in the 1850s and 1860s, often published in bourgeois magazines. The explicit aim of these editorials is to lend credibility to the idea that *Lotta Comunista's* current conception of international relations is rooted in the theoretical work of the two founders of scientific socialism. *Lotta Comunista's* approach is a superstructuralist one that, through absurd formulas such as the "LAW of non-correspondence between the superstructure and the base" and the "relative autonomy of the superstructure," denies any significance to the economic factor – which ultimately determines (a phrase often misused by those intent on entirely dismissing all forms of determination) the movements of fractions of global capital and underpins the political dynamics of the state apparatuses these fractions create; furthermore, it

disguises the abandonment of Marxist determinism – which is dialectical by nature and requires no qualifying adjectives – as “dialectics.”

Essentially, *Lotta Comunista*, without openly declaring it, regards the formidable tool for understanding and struggle that Marx and Engels bequeathed to the global workers’ movement – *Capital* – as useless. They have even had the audacity to claim that the proletarian revolution has no connection to the economic crisis of capitalism analysed by Marx (which lies at the root of the crisis of the entire bourgeois society), but is instead a possibility tied exclusively to a “breakdown of the world order” and the “balance of powers,” to a war whose connection to the tectonic movements of capital is minimised. Consequently, these crafty individuals believe such a war can be analysed and strategically predicted not based on the dynamics of global capital accumulation, but solely on the political relations between states.

The study of the “art of diplomacy” has replaced the study of *Capital*. Furthermore, people who for many years believed themselves to be active members of *Lotta Comunista* and who have had close contact with its leaders report statements claiming that “some of Marx’s considerations in *Capital* are no longer valid,” naturally without specifying which ones.

No one is denied the right to reject the validity of Marxist theory, but allow me to call a scoundrel anyone who does so in the corridors of the “bureaux,” posing as a “revolutionary leader” without openly and publicly declaring it, thus perpetuating the deception of being considered Marxist and, worse still, seeking confirmation in Marx himself for the distortion that replaces the class struggle with the struggle of bourgeois states. Shameful. I conclude this introductory statement, which I hope will spark fruitful discussion, with an invitation to relentlessly attack these revisionist social democrats of the sixteenth generation on a ground that is very slippery for them: let us strike them with materialist blows and, if necessary, physical ones as well.

- - - - -

Hello comrades,

In one respect, [user] 1971 is partly right: a lot has been said about *Lotta Comunista* on this forum, but revisiting the topic never hurts, given the harmful role played by this organisation that claims to be communist but, in reality, has nothing to do with communism for a whole series of reasons so clearly identified by both Leo Wolf and Kioshy. For this reason, I have little to add to what these two comrades have said, to their clarifications, and to their unmasking of a theoretical-political, and therefore practical, approach that attempts to pass itself off as communist when, at best, it is merely social democratic.

Putting aside the “analytical” nonsense which, like elixirs of immortality, are supposed to solve everything but actually solve nothing (only making the illness worse), a fundamental question, in my view, is to ask where all this leads and what concrete political consequences it has. The answer is obvious: support for the CGIL union in all its misdeeds, keeping combative or potentially combative workers trapped inside that cage, thus wasting class energies that could be spent in a very different direction.

I have heard *Lotta Comunista*’s worker militants giving speeches like CGIL trade unionists, alongside representatives of the institutions, rallying workers with arguments that could just as well have come from any unionism of any union of any bourgeois politician from any party. In short, it’s a disgrace, but also a cause for anger at the political poisoning of the working class to which *Lotta Comunista* contributes, in its small way.

Ah, one last thing: I was struck, almost confirmed, by this particular phrase from [user] 1971: “I advise those who haven’t already done so to BUY [my emphasis] and read...”; there’s nothing to be done — marketing is in *Lotta Comunista*’s blood and they never miss an opportunity to sell, sell, sell...

Finally, an answer

It seems obvious to me that you read your newspaper [*Lotta Comunista*] little and poorly. Anyway, to refresh your memory, I recommend (although I obviously advise against this for all communists who don't have time to waste) two works by Guido La Barbera: *Europe and War* and *Europe and the State*. If you haven't bought them yet, I could give you my copies; otherwise, simply leafing through the articles on the penultimate page written over the years by La Barbera (I'm sure you keep them safe somewhere) will be more than enough.

Here, amidst a sea of meaningless quotations that, apart from glorifying randomly selected journalists, bore the reader to death, you will find the thesis that the process towards a European imperialist bloc has been achieved economically, while steadily marching towards political and military unification.

In the foreign and national press, La Barbera's pompously named "scientific laboratory" (those who can no longer sell and are recycled to read and translate newspapers for him) desperately search for quotations that confirm this analysis, and when they succeed, their satisfaction borders on ecstasy.

However, the problem, dear Briscola, is that the strategic directive of "proletarian opposition to European imperialism" disarms our class, leaving it exposed and vulnerable against what is, in fact, the enemy in our own home: an Italian imperialism which, in order to maintain its position in domestic politics over the past 20 years – from the Treu Package⁹⁷ onwards – has secured legislation from every successive

⁹⁷ The Treu Package refers to a set of economic and social policies implemented in Italy from the early 1990s onwards, particularly in 1997, under the leadership of Ciriaco De Mita and the then Minister of Labour, Treu. These policies made working conditions easier for employers and tougher for workers. The changes included measures such as making it easier to dismiss employees, restricting workers' rights, and altering employment contract laws. [Explanation by Internationalist Voice]

government that has worsened working conditions and suppressed wages. All this without the need for European mediation.

A tricolour imperialism that fights on international markets to divide trade routes, raw materials, and spheres of influence, whose fiercest competitors are almost always its “European partners.”

Contact Information for the Internationalist Communist Tendency:

Website:

www.leftcom.org

Email:

info@leftcom.org

Basic Positions:

- The First World War was an indication that the capitalism had been a decadent social system. It also proved that there were only two alternatives to this system: communist revolution or the destruction of humanity.
- In our epoch, the working class is the only revolutionary class. Furthermore, only this social class can deliver the communist revolution and end the barbarity of capitalism.
- Once capitalism entered its decadent period, unions all over the world were transformed into organs of the capital system. In turn, the main tasks of unions were to control the working class and mislead them about its class struggle.
- In the epoch of decadent capitalism, participating in the parliamentary circus and elections only strengthens the illusion of democracy. Capitalist democracy and capitalist dictatorship are two sides of the same coin, namely, the barbarity of capitalism.
- All national movements are counterrevolutionary, against the working class and the class struggle. Wars of national liberation are pawns in imperialist conflict.
- The reason for the failure of the October Revolution was the failure of the revolutionary wave, particularly the failure of the German Revolution, which resulted in the isolation of October Revolution and afterwards its degeneration.
- All left parties are reactionary: Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists and official anarchists etc. represent the political apparatus of capital.
- The regimes that arose in the USSR, Eastern Europe, China, Cuba etc., while being called “socialist” or “communist”, only offered a

particularly brutal and barbaric form of capitalism: state capitalism.

- The revolutionary organization constitutes the avant-garde of the proletariat and is an active factor in the development and generalization of class consciousness. Revolutionary organizations may only take the form of revolutionary minorities, whose task neither is to organize the working class nor take power in its stead, without being a **political leadership**, or a political compass, where revolutionary organizations' political clarity and influence on the working classes are **the fundamental elements for the implementation of a communist revolution**.

Political belongings:

The current status, positions, views and activities of the proletarian political tendencies are the product of past experiences of the working class and the effectiveness of the lessons that political organizations of the working class have learned during the history of the proletariat. Therefore, Internationalist Voice can trace its own roots and origins back to the Communist League, the First International, the left wing of both the Second International and the Third International, and the fractions that defended proletarian and communist positions against the degenerating Third International, which was represented by Dutch-German fractions, and **particularly Italian Fraction of the Communist Left** and the defence of Communist Left traditions.

The Internationalist Voice Already Published!

