

Jacques Grippa

A controversy over principles against an unfair controversy

Published: May 15, 1965 republished <https://centremlm.be/Jacques-Grippa-Une-polemique-sur-les-principes-contre-une-polemique-deloyale>

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Paul Saba and Sam Richards.

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

PREFACE

From the betrayal by POB (Belgian Workers' Party) leaders of the great strikes before the First World War, to the betrayals of Spaak, President of the NATO Council, the history of reformism in Belgium - and in other countries it has played and plays the same role - constitutes a continuous series of lootings against the workers.

Let us cite only the most salient events of this fresco of the felony.

The reformist leaders pushed the workers to the imperialist butchery of 1914-1918.

In the aftermath of the First World War, they betrayed the revolution in the name of universal suffrage.

They are the heralds of the strangulation policy of the Spanish Republic, of the recognition of Franco and of the "Munich" policy which would inevitably lead to the Second World War.

In 1940, the POB was dissolved by its president, collaborator of the Nazis, Henri De Man. During the occupation, most of its leaders took refuge in an Anglophile and pro-American wait-and-see policy, provided that they were not more or less "collaborators" following their president.

After the Second World War, they were the active protagonists - and most essential for the ruling class, for trusts and monopolies - in the restoration of bourgeois power. They immediately became spokespersons for American imperialism which took over from Hitler.

They sabotage the great struggles of the working masses in 1950 and in 1960-61 as they oppose the workers' demand movements.

Since the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism, since the victory of the first proletarian revolution, of the Russian revolution, they have been characterized by the most rabid anticommunism: they are constantly on the side of counter-revolutions all over the world, they actively support colonialist exploitation and oppression - especially in the Congo.

Kautsky, Noske, Henderson, Turati, Léon Blum, De Man, Willy Brandt, Wilson, Saragat, Spaak, Guy Mollet or Defferre, once illustrated or illustrate today the fact that reformism, always and everywhere, fulfills the same role agent of capitalism, of imperialism.

The Belgian Socialist Party, party of the bourgeoisie within the working class

Over the past few years, the Belgian "Socialist" Party (PSB) has continued to demonstrate in ever more openly cynical fashion that it is a key party, the bourgeoisie and the main political supporter of the American imperialism in Belgium.

PSB policy is the application of the "single law" against which a million strikers rose in 1960-61.

PSB policy is the new arsenal of anti-strike and anti-worker laws, it is the strengthening of the gendarmerie, of the unitary bourgeois state.

PSB policy is the decline of Wallonia, it is the chronic underdevelopment of several Flemish regions, it is the application of multiple harassment, bullying, oppressive measures against the Walloon people, the people Flemish and the Brussels population.



PSB policy is expensive life, it is a rigged index, it is the deterioration of the workers' standard of living.

PSB policy is always heavier reactionary taxation for workers.

The PSB's policy is the muzzle of the FGTB by union bonzes, it is "programming" with the employers against the workers.

PSB policy is national treason, it is the establishment of German bases and atomic bases in Belgium.

The PSB's policy is that of NATO, it is the direct and indirect participation in all the companies of this aggressive and counter-revolutionary Pact in the service of American imperialism.

PSB policy is the ever-increasing war budget.

The policy of the PSB is to support revenge militarism in West Germany, a loyal ally and the main bridgehead in Europe of American imperialism.

PSB policy is active support for the aggressions of the Nazi Yankees against Vietnam, against Laos, against Cuba, against the Dominican Republic, against the People's Republic of China, against the Congo, against Rwanda, Burundi and how many other peoples and nations still.

PSB policy is the dirty colonial war against the Congolese people.

PSB POLICY IS THE APPLICATION IN BELGIUM OF THE DICTATORIAL DECISIONS OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM, ENEMY N ° 1 OF THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD, AND ITS ACOLYTES, THE HUNDRED MAGNATES OF BELGIAN HIGH FINANCE.

Reform crisis

The general crisis of capitalism is deepening on a world scale.

The victories of the socialist revolutions and of the revolutionary national liberation movement - an integral part, in our time, of the world proletarian revolution - strike severe blows on imperialism.

In the industrialized capitalist countries, the struggles of the working class and the working masses are experiencing a new awakening.

Inter-capitalist, inter-imperialist contradictions are getting worse.

American imperialism, the main international policeman, which aims at world domination, sees rising against it a growing number of peoples and nations, ever more determined.

The peoples and nations of the revolutionary storm zone, in Asia, in Latin America, in Africa, strike him directly.

Opposition to American domination is growing in capitalist countries. Thus American imperialism, its allies, its agents, find themselves increasingly isolated.

In Belgium, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism has increasingly deep repercussions.

These repercussions reduce the possibilities of manoeuvring of big Capital. They reduce the possibilities of corruption of the layer of the working class aristocracy within which reformism establishes its social base through which its ideology is diffused. The great mass of the oppressed, ever more exploited, rejects with increasing consciousness, class collaboration.

The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism leads to the aggravation of the crisis of reformism which is forced to expose itself more and more.

More and more workers repudiate PSB

It was certainly not to be expected that the awareness by all these workers of the real nature of the essence of reformist betrayal would be immediately total: this awareness is a process, the process of knowing reformism, by the theory and by the practice of the class struggle.

This process certainly brings the most aware avant-garde workers to Marxism-Leninism, to joining the Marxist-Leninist party, to our Communist Party.

But it is not surprising that for many have long remained the illusions of an internal "recovery" of the PSB, illusions maintained by the leaders of the socialist "left", which we find today in the leadership of the UGS (Union of the Socialist Left) and of the PWT (Walloon Workers' Party), among those who have reaffirmed their allegiance to the PSB

The development of the class struggle, the experience acquired during this struggle, led to the growing discredit of the PSB and destroyed more and more the vain hopes in this "recovery"

of social democracy, internal recovery than theoretical knowledge of the nature of reformism demonstrates to be impossible.

By taking coercive measures against certain representatives of the socialist left, the leaders of the PSB have further exposed themselves. The current of disaffection with the PSB was accelerating. The creation of new political formations - UGS in Brussels, PWT in Wallonia - was going to capture part of this current of workers hostile to Spaakist reformism.

The complete break with reformism would have been the adoption of consistent revolutionary positions, Marxist-Leninist, ideologically, politically and organizationally.

This is why we have said that the creation of such "left socialist" parties was neither necessary nor essential: the revolutionary avant-garde Marxist-Leninist party exists, it is ours.

Nevertheless, the creation of a party carrying out a break, even incomplete, with reformism could have been a positive fact reflecting a phase in the process of revolutionary awareness.

But the facts have shown that this hypothesis is not realized. There was no break with reformism. Most of the leaders of these two new formations are content to make some superficial criticisms of the politics of the PSB and above all give another form to reformism.

Consequently, if this orientation were to persist, the enterprise would be harmful. It would practically, objectively, constitute an attempt at diversion and deception with regard to the workers.

In Brussels, the management of the UGS is completely under the Trotskyist influence.

In Wallonia, the PWT is in full political and organizational inconsistency. The PWT is made up of independent regional groups, presenting themselves rather as "movements" with ill-defined political contours, claiming to be a labor movement encompassing Christian executives.

The lines and the conceptions of these regional, although different in their modalities, are always of general reformist orientation.

In Liège and Verviers, however, the PWT asserts certain positions of struggle - not always consistent, unfortunately - for federalism. And this, despite pressure from union leaders affiliated with the PWT, leaders reputed to be "left", completely reformist in fact.

It is characteristic that, precisely in Liège and in Verviers, the PWT did not make a cartel with the Khrushchevite revisionists: where there remains a certain orientation of struggle against capitalist oppression, even in a partial aspect, the agreement with the Khrushchevites became impossible.

Everywhere else, the leadership of the PWT disqualified itself with astounding speed. It, like that of the UGS, joined forces with the Khrushchevite party of Burnelle and others.

The revisionist party betrays the class struggle in Belgium

Enumerating the betrayals of this revisionist party would take volumes. In "Marxism-Leninism or Revisionism", in our weekly "The Voice of the People", an enormous number of examples were given which demonstrated that the Khrushchevite party is an auxiliary of capitalism, that it is a docile spokesperson in Belgium directives for international class collaboration with American imperialism, directives given first by Khrushchev, then by his

successors. The ambition of this party is to bring back to the PSB the workers who deviated from it; and also to demonstrate to Spaak and the PSB that his advice could be useful to them to continue to carry out their dirty work against the workers.

Let us cite some facts.

During the GREAT MILLION STRIKE, the revisionists condemn the plan to march on Brussels, the plan to abandon the tool, they are pushing communist union activists to become scabs; they dissociate themselves, in the middle of the strike, from the strikers who resist the provocations and attacks of the gendarmerie near the Guillemins station in Liège.

In the matter of CLAIMS OF WORKERS, they constantly practice division in order to prevent the constitution of the unit of action of all employees and paid against the attacks of Capital. Thus they oppose their slogan "against the freezing of wages" to the slogan of "10% increase", slogan on which rightly fought hundreds of thousands of workers during the last eighteen months.

They oppose categorical demands to interprofessional demands in the hope of defusing general movements of the working class and, ultimately, to isolate and even defeat categorical struggles.

They are propagandists of capitalist social programming.

They declare to unconditionally support the reformist union bonzes. In particular, they approve the treason agreements recently concluded in metal manufacturing.

They are hatefully AGAINST DIRECT ACTION which they want to substitute "the most serene negotiation possible" with the employers and representatives of the bourgeois state against the workers.

Is it any wonder that they have taken no action against anti-strike laws, relying on the decisions of the bourgeois parliament? They cannot be against the Servais anti-strike project, because the Khrushchevites are unconditionally for the referendum that Servais wants to make compulsory in order to paralyze workers' struggles.

They are the Trojan horse of the unitary bourgeois state in the federalist ranks: for Burnelle, the federated states would have no powers since all politics, internal and external, would not be within their competence.

We say that there can be no self-determination of the Flemish people, the Walloon people and the Brussels population if, for example, the whole of Belgium remains in the shackles of the Europe of trusts and NATO.

The Belgian revisionist party betrays the class struggle on an international scale

In 1960, the revisionists "tolerated" the presence of Belgian troops in the Congo in order to restore colonialist "calm" there.

They were the first to advocate the intervention in the Congo of the UN, this instrument of American imperialism. It was this intervention that cost Patrice Lumumba and his companions their lives, which served for years for the action of the Belgian-American colonialists against the Congolese people.

They sometimes spared Tshombé by advocating the cease-fire in Katanga in December 1962, and simultaneously they supported Adoula, this American puppet.

In all circumstances, they are the PROTAGONISTS OF AMERICAN NEO-COLONIALISM in Congo and elsewhere.

Kennedy, then Johnson, these leaders of Yankee imperialism, the main force of aggression and war in the world, are glorified by them as "wise" and "reasonable" "defenders of peace".

The election of Johnson, chief executive of the Yankee Nazis, responsible for war crimes in Vietnam, the Congo, and now in Santo Domingo, is for them the result of a "great movement of popular thought in the USA" and they cynically admit that "the ideas of the 20th and 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the journeys of Mikoyan and Khrushchev, contributed to it".

Agents in Belgium of the great power chauvinism of the Union revisionists. Soviet, with or without Khrushchev, they supported plans - besides defeated - to sacrifice the sovereignty of CUBA and this socialist country itself.

They are AGAINST FULL PROHIBITION AND TOTAL DESTRUCTION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS.

They wholeheartedly support the "Moscow Treaty" which claimed to legalize American nuclear hegemony and blackmail with revisionist collaboration.

Is it any wonder that they oppose the slogans "Let's leave NATO!" "And" reduction of 10, or now 15 billion military expenditure "in the name of the collaboration of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, collaboration called" pact of non-aggression ", The exit of Belgium from NATO, for them, now, it is a problem to be examined ... in 1969!

When Khrushchev's group took odious economic blockade measures against the People's Republic of China and the People's Republic of Albania, wishing to bring the peoples of these two countries to their knees by causing famine, the Burnelle revisionist clique, Terfve , Blume et al. Applauds and spreads slanders against the heroic Chinese and Albanian peoples, against the glorious brotherly parties, the Chinese Communist Party and the Albanian Labour Party, and their leaders.

When the Indian reactionary bourgeoisie went on to open military aggression against the People's Republic of China, the Belgian revisionists unconditionally took the side of the Indian aggressors who were armed both by American imperialism and by the Soviet Khrushchevites.

The revisionist allies of the UGS and the PWT supported Khrushchev's split in the international communist movement and currently support the split of his successors.

In Belgium itself, they can give lessons in divisionism and anti-democratic methods, even to PSB leaders!

In April 1963, did they not fabricate a fully rigged Congress to approve entirely reformist and counter-revolutionary theses and statutes, and to "exclude" the Marxist-Leninists by refusing even, not only to hear them, but still to let them enter the congress hall!

Must we say that with such a policy and such methods, it is the revisionists who have excluded themselves from the international communist movement.

In recent times, they have reached new heights of ignominy by betraying the heroic Vietnamese people.

They praised Johnson's speech on April 7 in Baltimore, presenting it as a victory for world public opinion when that heinous speech was nothing more than the conditions for "Pax Americana" in south-east Asia.

They are the propagandists of the pro-American "negotiation", legalizing the American aggression in Indochina, the occupation of South Vietnam by the Yankee imperialists. This negotiation, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, the entire Vietnamese people, reject it as a betrayal. The Khrushchevites would like to impose capitulation on the South Vietnamese people, when they are on the verge of wresting complete victory by beating out the Nazi Yankee occupier.

They went so far as to present the US army gangsters as VICTIMS of the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam (!)

Become aware of the dangers of reformism

The bourgeoisie has well recognized the services of this Khrushchevite party by attributing to it the "quality" and the advantages of a "national" party, such as the PSC (Social Christian Party), the PLP (Party of Freedom and Progress) and the PSB

The SKU and the PWT (the latter except Liège and Verviers) are now allies with those who, barely four months ago, called them "irresponsible" and "helpless" and condemned them because they refused to bow to the ukases of the PSB

Did the members of the base of the UGS and the PWT want such degeneration, such compromises? We are convinced not.

We examine below a draft program drawn up by the management of the SKU

We believe that this analysis is a contribution on the theoretical front to the anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist struggle that this contribution will help the members of the UGS, the PWT, and others, to become aware of the dangers of reformism, in whatever form it occurs.

We hope that this study will encourage avant-garde workers to join the consequent anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist struggle waged by our Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Our Party, for its part, will spare no effort to achieve the unity of action of the working class on the objectives of the anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist struggle, to weld the vast working class fighting alliance with the other strata of the working population to carry out the Popular United Front program.

Jacques GRIPPA, May 15, 1965.

ABOUT THE SKU

A controversy over principles against an unfair controversy

We reproduce in this brochure the full text of an article by Ernest Mandel published in "The Left" of April 17 under the title "Displaced polemics",

Let us examine here more particularly the "theoretical argument" by which Mandel claims to settle our account in 44 lines ...

He denounces our "reformism" by making Louis de Brouckère a Marxist theorist, or, if you prefer, Rosa Luxembourg a revisionist, or even Lenin a Trotskyist!

Our platform of Popular United Front, in ten points, is qualified by Mandel of electoral program, whereas it is about a program of struggle globalizing the main IMMEDIATE objectives for which we call the working class, the working masses of Belgium to lead daily, right now, concretely the anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist combat.

The use of this program during the electoral campaign has the meaning of a call to action which alone will make these objectives triumph.

Through this program, Mandel tells us, "you are getting dangerously close to the practice of reformism".

Curious reformism which would practice total solidarity with the Vietnamese people, with the Congolese people, with the revolutionary classes and peoples.

Curious reformism which would lead the fight against American imperialism, for national independence, so that Belgium leaves NATO.

Curious reformism which would call for effective action for a demand program including in particular the 10%, the 40 hours, the national health service, etc ...

Reformers generally openly oppose such goals. And if, in front of the combativeness of the masses, they pretend from time to time to adopt one or the other, it is to distort the scope, to water it down, it is to deceive the workers, it is to try to undermine, to sabotage the struggle of the working people for valid objectives.

In the current situation in Belgium, it is a directly sensitive, visible aspect of reformist betrayal that his opposition to any real action, that his sabotage of the struggle of the working class, of massaging them, labouring for valid objectives.

And when the revolutionary situation comes, the reformists, always to save capitalism, always betraying the working class, then try to divert the working masses from the concrete revolutionary combat for power, by fixing, in collusion with the big bourgeoisie, "concessions" "Material or" democratic "leaving intact the power of the possessing and exploiting class. So the revolutionaries will have to rightly denounce as a betrayal the reformist attempts to save capital, consisting in fixing at this moment "demands" which would not be directly linked to the objective of the destruction of the bourgeois state machine and of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES AND FINAL GOAL

The proof of our "reformism", according to Mandel, is that these objectives are "perfectly achievable within the framework of the capitalist regime".

Eh yes ! Indeed they would be perfectly achievable within the framework of the capitalist system ... to the extent that the working class, the working masses, will carry out a determined action. That is why these are immediate objectives of the struggle and not more

distant objectives. It is much less our ultimate goal, the accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution, and we are doing the opposite than sowing illusions about it.

And we are trying every day to forge our Party, to raise the consciousness of the working class, of the working masses so that the Party, the class, the masses, are able to face the victories victoriously, when the time comes, the fighting decisive and then to carry out the tasks of the socialist revolution.

For us, even the simple economic claiming struggle of the working class has the scope that Marx had already defined:

"If the working class let go in its daily conflict with Capital, it would deprive itself of the possibility of undertaking such and such a larger movement. (" Wages, Prices and Profits ".)

During the incessant class struggle which, for the time being, in Belgium is still waged "within the framework of the capitalist system", the combative capacity of the Party, the working class, the working masses, their conscience and the organization, necessary for the realization of revolutionary actions which will destroy both the "framework of the capitalist system" and capitalism itself.

THE UGS PROGRAM, A FULLY REFORMIST PROGRAM

Mandel and the leaders of the "Union de la Gauche Socialiste" (UGS) are not careless in bringing against us the accusation of being reformists.

Consider for example the draft program recently published by them.

Certain points of our immediate combat program are found there - very often watered down, it is true.

How could a goal be "reformist" when it is our Party that makes it a goal of immediate action, and could become "revolutionary" when it is the UGS that quotes it?

In reality, the opposite is the case. It is that there is a difference between our position and that of the UGS with regard to these claims which we find in the two programs.

In fact, for the UGS, these demands are part of a general program and this program is totally of reformist conception: this is what we will demonstrate below.

Our Party, it always has in view its final goal and its revolutionary principles; the current struggles are valid for their immediate results certainly, but also because they must allow the Party, the working class, the working masses, to raise their capacity to use any objectively revolutionary situation in order to carry the revolutionary victory.

But note immediately that by showing his disregard for the immediate demands of the workers, by qualifying these objectives as "reformist", Mandel wants to give a pseudo-Marxist, pseudo-revolutionary "ideological" basis - to an attitude which meets in practice that of PSB reformism and that of neo-reformism of the Khrushchevites. These last two parties are no longer workers' parties but on the contrary agencies of the bourgeoisie, parties of the bourgeoisie within the working class.

By having abandoned all struggle for the realization of the final goal of the workers' movement - socialism (through the socialist revolution), then communism - by having renounced this goal itself, having passed to the positions of class collaboration - and more

particularly to collaboration with American imperialism, that enemy No. 1 of the peoples of the whole world - inevitably they had to betray, and they in fact betray the proletariat, the working masses, also in the daily conflicts of the class struggle.

Their intervention consists in particular in deceiving, deceiving the workers, diverting them from action for valid objectives, trying to ensure the functioning of the capitalist system at the lowest cost to the ruling class, by loyal managers of the latter, to possibly advance the "solutions" of patching up the capitalist regime, especially when it is seriously threatened.

In certain circumstances - notably during the electoral period - PSB and the Khrushchevite party find it useful to remember this or that valid claim: these, on their part, are only demagogic exercises specific to bourgeois parties, playing the game of bourgeois parliamentarism. They have proven it enough!

What Reformers always have in mind is sabotaging the action of the working masses.

Our Communist Party, Marxist-Leninist Party, Revolutionary Party, consistently fulfills its vanguard role in these daily struggles of the workers against their exploiters, their oppressors, taking care to always defend, always represent the general and fundamental interests of the entire workers' movement, of the world proletarian revolution, the future of the movement and proletarian internationalism.

DEVELOPING QUOTES AND SILENCES

There would be much to say about the reformist nature of the UGS program. Let us limit ourselves to broadly sketching this analysis.

And first of all, some comparisons between the immediate combat program of our Party and the project of the UGS. Let us note in particular the absence, in the program of the UGS, of the slogans of fight for national independence, for the liberation of the country from the yoke of American imperialism, the exploiter and the aggressor, for the claim of international scope for the total ban and destruction of nuclear weapons.

On two occasions, on the other hand, the UGS project takes up the well-known theme of nuclear blackmail, this keystone of the ideology of modern revisionism, of the ideology of class collaboration with American imperialism on an international scale, who claims to bring people to their knees.

In terms of wages, the project is limited to demanding "automatic and sincere indexing (!), The union veto right on the retail price index being the guarantee of this sincerity ... and a significant increase in the share of salaried employees in national income" without further details.

A WELL-LIMITED SELF-DETERMINATION FEDERALISM

Taking up the demand for federalism, the UGS grants the federal state "the prerogatives that are usually (?) Recognized by federal states (Foreign, monetary, military, etc.) ...", which a priori limits the full possibilities of the right to self-determination and is thus in fact akin to "federalism" according to the Khrushchevite Burnelle, for whom external and internal policies are the responsibility of the federal state (what would remain then, under these conditions, as a prerogative to federated states?).

In the conception of the UGS, a Constitutional Court to "settle the conflicts of attribution between the federated states and the federal state" would still, in fact, reinforce the coercive character of the "federal" bourgeois state.

We also find in the UGS program this "remarkable" idea of a "public press society" (in capitalist regime, with a bourgeois state machine, instrument of domination of the possessing class!) Which would have the monopoly of material services (printing and distribution) as well as the collection of commercial advertising and its distribution according to "objective" criteria! In short, it would be the supervision of the press, directly under the control of the bourgeois state.

In fact, and this will be the common thread allowing to unmask the reformist character of this program, it adopts a fundamentally anti-Marxist position by constantly wanting to ignore the class character of the State.

IS THE CURRENT WORLD A WORLD WITHOUT WAR AND WITHOUT WEAPONS?

The UGS is "in favour of the abolition of the army".

Who is the less conscious worker who will not consider that making such a claim in today's world is a joke?

Once again, the question must be asked that elude the leaders of the UGS

Which army is it? Being part of which power, which state?

Have the leaders of the UGS become followers of the mystifying theory of Khrushchev and his successors of a world without war and arms, while imperialism subsists?

The slogan of suppressing the army is a slogan that is both misleading and reactionary.

Deceptive because it spreads the illusion that it would be possible to envisage the capitalist state without armed force, this essential element of class power.

And, with regard to the capitalist army, there is no other revolutionary position than that indicated by Lenin ("About the watchword of DESARMEMENT" - October 1916):

"Will they confine themselves (the women of the proletariat) to curse all wars and all that is military, to demand disarmament? Never will the women of a truly revolutionary oppressed class accept such a shameful role. They will say to their sons:

"Soon you will be tall. We'll give you a gun. Take it and learn the profession of arms properly. It is a science essential to the proletarians, not to shoot your brothers, the workers of other countries, as is the case in the present war, and as the traitors to socialism advise you, but to fight against the bourgeoisie of your own country, to put an end to exploitation, misery and wars other than by pious wishes, but by triumphing over the bourgeoisie and disarming it. "

Reactionary: in the face of imperialism, in the face of the bourgeois state and its repressive forces which are and will be used against the workers, in the face of the permanent violence of Capital, the working class, the working masses cannot contemplate the conquest of power if they condemn the use of revolutionary violence, the revolutionary armed struggle, the revolutionary war.

In this case, for the revolutionary situation to give birth to the socialist revolution, it will be essential to arm the proletariat.

And that is why, as proletarian internationalists, we salute the armed struggles of the peoples who have taken up arms against imperialism, against the exploiters, against the oppressors and their violence.

If the suppression of the army means the suppression of the people's army in socialist Belgium, it would be treason. Socialist Belgium, like any socialist country, could not remain disarmed as long as imperialism remained. When we fight for communism, we fight for a society where wars will be suppressed, where general disarmament will be achieved, because classes will be suppressed and all the remnants of the division of society into classes will be suppressed. But until then, and precisely to achieve this goal, will remain as part of the dictatorship of the proletariat, an armed force, a popular armed force, which will only disappear with the withering away of the state.

SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CRITICISM OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The draft program of the UGS speaks of support for workers in countries with a socialist economic base, in their effort to build a society without exploitation of man by man. This support also implies independence of judgment from the Communist parties and socialist criticism of all bureaucratic distortions and the insufficient development of political democracy, as well as the lack of management of companies by producers in these countries.

Let's try to understand these two smoky sentences.

Again the essential question is ignored, is eluded: what is the class character of power, the state, the countries of which the UGS speaks? This is what determines whether a country is socialist or not.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, the UGS wants to ignore it because it does not want it.

Modern revisionism, its counter-revolutionary attempts to destroy the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist conquests in certain countries, its policy of class collaboration with American imperialism, its betrayals of the socialist camp and of the revolutionary struggles of the peoples: all this The UGS also wants to ignore it because in reality, it is akin to Khrushchevism.

It is no coincidence either that the UGS program speaks of "support for workers in countries ..." and not "solidarity with socialist countries threatened by imperialism or exposed to its aggressions".

The newspaper "The Left" has been explicit enough in recent years for us to know that the so-called "socialist criticism" of the UGS leaders does not target the bureaucratic and police methods of modern revisionists, so that we know that the Khrushchevite counter-revolutionary enterprises in socialist countries have their full support. And that this support also goes to the titist police regime which prevails in Yugoslavia, where capitalism was restored with American aid, and using in particular the methods of alleged self-management of companies.

With regard to the People's Republic of China, the UGS claims recognition and ... "its admission to the UN and to the Security Council if it so wishes". It is therefore not a question

for the SKU of the RESTITUTION to the PR of China of its seat at the UN and the Security Council, the restitution of its legitimate rights at the UN but of its "admission". It is the consecrated formula used by the supporters of the thesis of the imperialists and the revisionists concerning the alleged existence of "two Chinas", that is to say the thesis of the recognition of the puppet Tchang Kai-chek and of the military occupation of Chinese territory in Taiwan by American imperialism.

SIGNIFICANT "OUBLIS"

It is not enough to admit, in principle, the need for solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle, with the revolutionary national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Above all, the objectives of this solidarity must be clearly defined and put into practice.

However, if the UGS program remembers Spain, Portugal, South Africa, it contains a truly significant "oversight": Vietnam, where the aggression of the Nazi Yankees has continued for more than ten years. And yet, for several months, solidarity with the Vietnamese people must be at the forefront of the tasks of proletarian internationalism and this, with courage, without weakness, rejecting the shameful compromises with the revisionist admirers of Johnson. Total solidarity with the Vietnamese people is to organize this action under the watchword:

"OUTSIDE VIETNAM THE YANKEES NAZIS! But that the UGS program ignores it!

"BELGIAN" CONGO OR INDEPENDENT CONGO?

In the Congo, the criminal American-Belgian aggression continues against a people who raised their arms in hand for their liberation.

Plans are ready, prepared by the Harrimans, Spaak, the puppets Tshombe, Mobutu, and also Adoula, to further aggravate the dirty colonial war.

And again - and not by chance - we find another significant "oversight" of the leaders of the UGS: that of the concrete war currently waged against the Congolese people with the active participation of the Belgian colonialists and of the Lefèvre-Spaak government which deserved thousands of times the name of "government of the assassins".

For workers in Belgium, FAILING THE WAR AGAINST THE CONGOLESE PEOPLE is an essential task.

Now, in this conjuncture, what does the UGS program say? Continuing to want to ignore the class character of the Belgian state, he gives us a description of a pink library tale:

All the technical assistance that Belgium brings to Congo, Rwanda and Burundi should be:

- 1) free from any neo-colonialist interference in internal affairs;
- 2) in no case constitute a form of indirect or hidden subsidy to capitalist enterprises;
- 3) managed by a parastatal (!) Freed (!) From any neo-colonialist influence.

Any "technical assistance" in the military field must be totally excluded, whatever the pretext.

In short, capitalist Belgium, Société Générale, could be transformed into charitable societies!

These reveries take a creaky turn when the UGS program calls for "boycott or quarantine" by the "international organizations" of South Africa and Portugal, "as of any other country that would engage in armed neo-colonialist aggressions ", It must therefore be believed that for the UGS American imperialism and Belgian colonialism are not yet engaged in" armed neo-colonialist aggressions "!

FOR THE LEADERS OF THE UGS, THE PSB IS A WORKERS 'PARTY

Let us first note for the record the buffoonish analysis given in the UGS program, in which the revisionist party of Khrushchevite renegades is put on the same footing as our Marxist-Leninist party:

In the two communist parties, the UGS will criticize the lack of understanding of the realities of the class struggle in Belgium and the strategy of the anti-capitalist structural reforms it implies, the insufficient internal democracy due to the absence of law trend, and sometimes dogmatic alignments with the positions of communist parties in other countries ...

As for us, let's leave aside the pretentious appreciation of the UGS on our "lack of understanding of the realities of the class struggle in Belgium", The leaders of the UGS who for years wanted to make believe in a recovery of the PSB thanks to their action, could be a little more modest and remember that it is our consequent denunciation of the PSB as a party of the bourgeoisie, as an anti-workers party, the main political support of American imperialism in Belgium, which has unmasked in the eyes of many workers.

On the other hand, let us guarantee to the UGS that there is no "lack of understanding of the 'strategy'" of the "anti-capitalist structural reforms" either on our part or on the part of the Khrushchevites. We reject this "strategy" because it is reformist and intended to deceive workers. The Khrushchevites approve of it with enthusiasm for the same reasons!

The functioning of our Party, unlike that of the UGS, is based on democratic centralism. We consider ourselves responsible both and only to the working class, the working masses of our country, and to the international communist and workers movement.

Furthermore, the absence of any other criticism of the UGS towards the Khrushchevite party, the absence of any fundamental criticism of its betrayal, are a sure criterion which already makes it possible to judge the UGS as an equally reformist formation. .

And the UGS persists, against all evidence, to consider the PSB as a workers' party! The facts show, however, to the full that the PSB of Spaak, Collard, Spinoy, Vermeylen, Major, Van Eynde and others, is a party of the bourgeoisie, and the main political supporter, in Belgium, of capitalism and more particularly of imperialism. American.

The influence that the PSB still retains - unfortunately - over part of the working class, which it deceives, does not change this fact.

It is the duty of the revolutionary working class party to denounce the PSB, as well as its Khrushchevite branch, to dishonour them in the eyes of the working class. There is no real anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist struggle which does not imply the intransigent denunciation of these portal instruments of the bourgeoisie.

The UGS not only failed in this task, but also tends to rehabilitate the PSB and the Khrushchevite party. As a result, it thus renounces, from its foundation, any real anti-capitalist struggle.

NO REVOLUTIONARY PRINCIPLES

The project of the UGS also defines what it calls "the fundamental objectives", These fundamental objectives, we believe to guess that it is either communism or socialism, without these words being elsewhere mentioned. And the definition of these fundamental objectives is immeasurably much further removed from the definitions and concepts of scientific socialism than was that of the "Gotha program" which was so severely criticized in its time by Marx and Engels.

Lenin (Speech at the 3rd Congress of the Communist International - July 1, 1921 - Complete Works volume 32, page 499) made this remark:

"I have sometimes managed to get along with them (anarchists) about goals, but never in terms of principles. Principles are not the goal, the program, the tactics, or the theory. Tactics and theory are not principles. What sets us apart from anarchists in terms of principles? The principles of communism consist in the institution of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the use by the State of the methods of coercion in period of transition. These are the principles of communism, but not its aim. "

Well, we must say that with the authors of the draft program of the SKU we cannot agree neither on the goal, nor on the principles.

Because for the authors of the UGS program, the state is not characterized by its class nature. The old myth of the liberals and the reformists, taken up by the revisionists of the state above or outside the classes, is also that of the UGS

For the latter, there is therefore no question of destroying the bourgeois state machine, nor, moreover, of instituting the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to be able to carry out the tasks of the socialist revolution carried out to the end, and the tasks from the development of society in its communist phase until the extinction of the state.

For the UGS, there would first be "a state still dominated by the bourgeoisie but against which workers are already putting in place a power of a diverse nature". There would therefore be two powers, that of the bourgeoisie dominating the state, the other, that of the workers. And then a situation would arise with "a state in which the power of big capital will be overthrown".

Despite the hazy nature of these conceptions of the SKU, one can nevertheless distinguish their intentions.

For the UGS, the state is not a class state.

He is neither bourgeois nor worker. The "power of the workers" would seize the state by overthrowing "the power of big capital".

It is to deny that the state is the organ of domination of a class and we understand very well that the false schemes of the UGS join the classical reformist and revisionist conceptions of the so-called gradual conquest of the State, of power, within the framework of bourgeois democracy.

Let us also see how the UGS program still expresses itself on this question of power. Any reformist or revisionist would certainly agree with such views:

“The development and strengthening of tendencies of opposition to capitalism among the workers must contribute to bring the latter to power. This is the condition which will allow these fundamental objectives to be achieved. This seizure of power implies a large regrouping including Christian, socialist, communist and unorganized workers. ”

So for the UGS, as for the PSB and the Khrushchevite party, capitalism will very wisely withdraw in the face of this “large grouping” as well as in front of “the strengthening of opposition tendencies”?

The recipe has long been given by reformers and modern revisionists have taken it up: the ballot paper, bourgeois democracy, will allow "opposition tendencies" to express themselves and thus "peacefully" conquer what Togliatti called "positions of power": municipalities, provincial councils ... probably waiting for the inauguration of a "workers' government" by Saragat, with the blessing of the Pope!

So really, the PSB has no lessons to receive from anyone. It has ministers in government, numerous bourgmestres, permanent provincial deputies, and senior civil servants, directors general, and secretaries general. He even recently conquered an important "structural reform": the Charbonnier Directory, which has immense "powers of investigation and control" and he put at the head of this "important position of power" a PSBist from the "Left tendency".

It is true that every day reformists of all kinds still make great "inventions" in this way!

Our ineffable Khrushchevites from Belgium have not recently added to it the "great discovery of the century", the "popular initiative referendum" ... as in Switzerland!

Frédéric Engels, in a letter to Bebel in March 1875, 90 years ago, in the "Critique of the Gotha program" already said in this connection that this program appeared:

“A whole rather confused series of purely democratic demands, part of which is only a matter of fashion, such as the 'direct legislation' which exists in Switzerland and has done more harm than good there, if it does anything thing. ”

THE “TRANSITIONAL OBJECTIVES” OF THE SKU: ALWAYS REFORMIST OBJECTIVES

The "transitional objectives" of the UGS program are these famous objectives that would not be achievable under the capitalist regime (but while society would still be capitalist and the state a capitalist state).

And according to Mandel, it is because we ignore these "transitory objectives" that we would be "reformists", whereas he who discovered or rediscovered them, would be a "revolutionary".

These are the famous "anti-capitalist structural reforms". We do not want to deprive our readers of the pleasure of reading this program in 13 points, for their edification.

In reality, as our readers will see, the realization of this program is perfectly compatible with the existence of the capitalist regime. The achievement of several points of this program could even be desired by trusts and monopolies.

Contrary to the assertions of the preamble and Mandel, the program of "transitional objectives" explicitly recognizes that capitalist structures, that capitalism itself, subsist in this "transition phase".

And let's also say straight away that in this program are mixed four typically reformist mystifications: it is a deception to speak of "anti-capitalist structural reforms", of "workers' government", of "workers' control" and of "socialization" in the framework of the capitalist system, with a bourgeois state.

Here is the text of the UGS program relating to these "transitional objectives":

"Until the conditions which allow the realization of this maximum program are met, and in order to hasten its ripening, the PST (Socialist Workers Party) will put forward a series of transitional objectives. Their realization supposes the establishment within the framework of a federal Belgium of a workers' government which will bring, during a transition phase of necessarily limited duration, anti-capitalist structural reforms to the economic regime:

1. Planning of economic development and regional conversion by adopting investment and production plans legally binding.
2. Workers' control without co-management, which would imply integration into capitalism, exercised over capitalist enterprises by a body democratically elected by the personnel; this control will involve accounting standardization and the removal of commercial and banking secrecy, to the extent necessary to make the control effective.
3. In order to carry out such a policy and impose on the capitalist forces, whose structures have not been destroyed, the objectives of economic development, regional reconversion and social progress drawn up by the workers' government, it will be essential for the stability of this government that it can prevent certain financial manoeuvres. It is therefore necessary to socialize banking and insurance operations.
4. Nationalization of energy, including the wholesale distribution of fuels.
5. Public industrial initiative, supported by a network of public research and applied research laboratories, which will make it possible to create a sector of public enterprises specializing in new manufacturing.
6. Suppression of land speculation by the socialization of land use for the benefit in particular of land use planning and social housing.
7. Socialization and rationalization of housing construction; systematic habitat renewal.
8. Reform of agriculture with a view to raising farmers' incomes and freeing them from capitalist constraints, by abolishing the right of the non-operating landowner to choose their tenant, and the cooperative reorganization of the marketing and development circuits farm products.
9. Reorganization of the retail trade network. Fixed prices (for consumption sectors to be determined) and fixing of a maximum percentage of profit margins.

10. In terms of economic equality, a great step forward can be taken from this transitional phase by expanding free social consumption of the most important services from the point of view of promoting the masses: education for all levels; Health care ; culture ; sports and vacations; lunch at work or at school; free urban transport. All of these services will be provided free of charge to the entire population through tax revenue, which will considerably reduce the inequalities in living standards resulting from those of income.

11. The tax base must be reformed in the following sense: introduction of a selective and progressive tax on property; increased income tax escalation; increase in inheritance tax; vigorous fight against fraud and tax evasion.

12. In order to mobilize the capital necessary for the execution of the plan, it is in particular necessary to drain towards the State the savings of the self-employed and managers. In addition, the plan which involves the conventions concluded between the government and the companies at branch level, will regulate the use of depreciation provisions and companies' self-financing reserves. This whole policy presupposes a constant confrontation between the capitalist forces and the workers' government. This can only survive through the permanent mobilization of workers and their vigilant participation in the control of companies and public authorities.

13. Subject it to adequate forms of public control, the holding of companies' holdings in other companies (holding companies), so as to prevent financial manoeuvres directed against the implementation of the plan.

Thus, the transitional phase of the fight for socialism will be the school of economic democracy which will prepare workers for the management of businesses in a fully collectivized economy, which constitutes the next stage and objective. "

This is the UGS "structural reform" program

What will be the nature of the state during this "transitional phase"? Which State will it be?

The state is the organ of class domination. What class will it be?

The SKU project does not answer these questions. He doesn't even ask them.

Essential, yet fundamental questions. The leaders of the UGS do not respond to it because they are entirely reformist, even if they put a "left" package to this reformism.

A "workers' government" leaning on or "using" the bourgeois state apparatus will only be one more misleading label, even if a Servais, Christian Democrat, PSB Spaak, PSB Major participate in it and the FGTB, even if Mandel of the UGS or Khrushchev Jean Blume participate.

The nationalization of enterprises carried out by the bourgeois state, remains a nationalization within the framework of the capitalist system, will always be a bourgeois nationalization. Consequently, it will always correspond to a reinforcement of monopoly bourgeois state capitalism, that is to say to the reinforced fusion of capitalism and the State into a single mechanism of exploitation and oppression.

Certainly,

"State monopoly capitalism is the most complete material preparation of socialism, the antechamber of socialism, the stage of history that no other intermediate stage separates from socialism" (Lenin: "The imminent catastrophe and the means to ward it off", September 1917).

But these bourgeois nationalizations in no way mark stages on the path of the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society. It is therefore a deception to speak in these conditions of socialization.

The most widespread error is the bourgeois reformist assertion claiming that monopoly capitalism or state monopoly capitalism is no longer capitalism, that it can therefore be described as "state socialism". (Lenin: "The State and the Revolution", 1917.)

That is to say, the development of monopoly state capitalism must serve us to demonstrate the necessity of the socialist revolution, and not to deny the necessity of this revolution, or to celebrate the so-called progress of capitalism as it employ the reformists and allies of the UGS, the neo-reformists and revisionists.

In trying to sow confusion between bourgeois nationalizations and socialist nationalizations, the reformists and the neo-reformists tend to discredit socialist nationalizations and hence socialism itself. They are trying to make the bourgeois nationalizations and the strengthening of state monopoly capitalism accept by the masses as a transformation of capitalist society into socialist society in order to divert the working class, the working masses, from the indispensable task of the destruction of the bourgeois state machine and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the first fundamental act of the socialist revolution.

And what should we also think of "workers' control" when power remains in the hands of capitalism, when the state is a bourgeois state? For "The Left" (January 16, 1965), "workers' control" is one of the main keys to anti-capitalist structural reforms.

Control what and for what purpose? The UGS program is very discreet in this regard. We find there that this "workers' control" would take place "without co-management that would imply integration into capitalism". Good. But then "this workers' government" which would manage the bourgeois state and capitalism, is it not - and it is that - integration into capitalism?

The "workers' control" of the UGS program, under these conditions, would not be and could not be anything other than control of the application of bourgeois legislation, bourgeois taxation, decisions of the bourgeois state, control of capitalist management (without taking part in it, says the UGS, and we note it), all within the framework of the economic laws of capitalism.

At most, the achievement of this "control" will give the (bourgeois) "right" to obtain a certain amount of information on the functioning of the capitalist enterprise.

There is no shadow of socialism in such provisions, no trace of the slightest passage from capitalism to socialism.

Such "control" would not be qualitatively different from that of the Central Council of the Economy on which the union bonzes sit: it would be of the same nature as that exercised by the "Works Councils" at present: all organizations which never have and will never be able to

attack capitalist power, the economic laws of capitalism in any way, or transform capitalism into socialism.

Mandel, in "La Gauche" on April 17, called for Louis de Brouckère to the rescue, transformed for the cause into a "Marxist theorist",

This is an allusion to a text by Louis de Brouckère intended for a trade union congress, held in 1924.

It is a typically reformist relationship where Louis de Brouckère refers for example with admiration to the Imperialist Treaty of Versailles (!) Art. 327/1:

“Work should not be viewed simply as a commodity or an article of commerce. ”

These gentlemen should not be expected to use the scientific terminology of Marxism: it was the strength of the work that they wanted to talk about. In this text, as in countless similar declarations, the capitalists simply want to camouflage reality.

For almost half a century, this clause has existed, has labor power ceased to be a commodity under the capitalist regime?

Has this clause had any influence on the economic laws of capitalism on the value and price of labor power?

For Louis de Brouckère, it was essentially a question of organizing “the right of scrutiny” of the employees during the establishment of collective agreements.

In joint negotiations, said de Brouckère, "workers will not always tolerate cheating when they are invited to play."

This is what this is about in de Brouckère's report, and nothing else: it is about the rules of the capitalist game.

And, under a capitalist regime, "workers' control" will always be limited to the rules of the capitalist game and, moreover, the possessing class will always cheat there.

At most, there remains of this “main key of the anti-capitalist structural reforms” the possibility for the working class to be better “informed” (but how?) Of its degree of exploitation.

But class oppression will not be changed in any way. The manoeuvres of the reformist agents of capital will nevertheless continue: they will not fail to use this information to deceive the working class with their "theories": "we must not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs" in periods of high economic conditions; or "the capitalists cannot do more" in other cases.

Moreover, each year are published balance sheets of anonymous companies, faked certainly, and which nevertheless reveal fabulous profits.

These figures, which are already available, can be used in the agitation of an avant-garde party or the trade union organization of class struggle.

But ultimately, in the struggle between Capital (for maximum profit) and Labor (workers for their wages),

"The thing is reduced to the question of the respective forces of the combatants".
(Karl Marx: "Salaries, Prices and Profits".)

Without losing sight for a moment that:

"The system of wage labor is ... a system of slavery ... whatever the wages, good or bad, that the worker receives. " (Karl Marx," Critique of the Gotha Program. ")

Finally, the planning of which the UGS program speaks, since it is carried out within the framework of the capitalist system and the maintenance of the bourgeois capitalist state, is, it must be said, capitalist "planning". This is the kind of "planning" already practiced by trusts and monopolies. This is the kind of "planning" that the bourgeois state engages in, monopoly state capitalism in particular, under the name of "economic programming".

In addition, this programming is generally accompanied by attempts to supervise and tie up the working class and its organizations (notably the unions) by means of class collaboration agreements. This is the case with the "agreements" that the bourgeoisie tries to impose under the name of "economic and social programming", by claiming to subordinate workers' demands to the vicissitudes of the capitalist economy.

Capitalist "planning" does not change the nature of the regime, does not correct its flaws, does not allow it to resolve its contradictions.

Only socialist planning will allow a harmonious development of production, an unparalleled development of the productive forces.

Now that we have finally explained the content of these famous "structural reforms" as well as the perspectives of "political democracy" exposed by the leadership of the UGS, we can see that it is a variant of the old reformist scheme .

Before the First World War and until the early 1930s, the reformism of the Belgian Workers' Party (POB) claimed to nibble on the economic power of capitalism thanks to cooperatives and other enterprises qualified as socialists.

On the other hand, the political power of the bourgeoisie would have been nibbled thanks to universal suffrage by the ballot.

The great economic crisis of capitalism of 1930-33, by bringing about the collapse of the Belgian Labour Bank in 1934, was going to strike a mortal blow to the reformist illusions on the nibbling of the economic power of capitalism by "socialist" enterprises.

It was then that Henri De Man intervened. Let us quote some passages from the "Pontigny theses", presented by Henri De Man in September 1934. As we can see, De Man, like his predecessors and successors, did not back down from certain radical language to try to justify what was still and still reformism, but under certain "new" appearances:

"... The reformism which has practically dominated the workers' movement so far has become impossible. Distributional reforms have become impracticable, unless structural reforms are radical enough to influence the course of the evolution outlined in 1 ° (the evolution of capitalism which after being progressive entered a regressive stage) ... "

"The solution ... is a mixed economy regime (nationalized sector and private sector) which can be considered as an intermediary between the capitalist economy and the socialist economy ..."

As we can see, De Man was doing reformism in the name of anti-reformism.

He insidiously condemned already the daily struggle of the working class (described as "distribution reforms") in the name of a criticism of "old" reformism ... in order to refresh reformism to make it more capable of rescuing capitalism under the new concrete conditions.

The structural reforms - the reformism of the structures - were going to be worth to the POB to return again to the government, and to the working class they "brought" the banking commission, the policy of Munich of neutrality favourable to Hitler, the participation in the strangulation of the Spanish Republic under the guise of "non-intervention" and the recognition of Franco!

Today, the PSB crisis, reflecting the deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist regime, is increasing. Inexorably the bankruptcy of reformism must accompany the bankruptcy of capitalism.

It is very unfortunate that the leaders of the UGS, instead of breaking with reformism, simply want to give it new colours, but always according to the same old deceptive scheme: pretending to nibble on the economic power of capitalism through reforms now qualified of "anti-capitalist structural reforms" and pretending to nibble on the capitalist state power within the framework of bourgeois democracy.

From Anseele to Collard, via De Man, it is basically the same reformism which has brought nothing but setbacks and betrayals to the working class of Belgium. For reformism - which in fact renounces to achieve the final goal of the struggle of the working class, socialism through socialist revolution, communism - reformism is theory and practice of class collaboration.

The comrades of the UGS who really want to break with reformism cannot fail to be struck by the fact that today the PSB of Spaak, the Khrushchevite party of Blume-Moulin and the leadership of the UGS use the same word order of structural reforms. And it is not the adjectives of anti-capitalists or anti-monopolists that modify anything to the content which is, in the three cases, the same in its essence.

THE MARXIST-LENINIST REVOLUTIONARY WAY

Our Communist Party, for its part, is developing its revolutionary activity in accordance with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, which the fundamental experience of all revolutions, to date, has confirmed.

Marxism-Leninism, we intend to apply it to the concrete conditions of the country and of our time.

Our Party, built on the principles of democratic centralism, practices criticism and self-criticism in order to be able to correct its possible errors.

It intends to deploy, and is already deploying, mass activity on all fronts of struggle: economic, assertive, political and ideological.

He practices active proletarian internationalism. It intends to educate, to raise the consciousness of its members and of the popular masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. He pursues a policy intended to unite the workers around the proletariat, in the daily struggle against capitalism, against imperialism, in a united popular front.

He advocates and organizes the struggle for reforms favourable to the working class, which therefore have an anti-opportunist, anti-reformist character.

The denunciation of reformism, of revisionism in all its forms, with a view to eliminating these agencies of the enemy within the working class, constitutes an absolute necessity of the anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist struggle.

The Communist Party constantly emphasizes that no reform of a democratic character can transform the bourgeois state into a workers' state.

In the daily struggle against Capital, our Party, the vanguard of the working class, will always aim to achieve the final goal.

With a view to overthrowing capitalism and building a new society, he thus forged the Party, including organizationally, raised the consciousness of the working class, of the working masses, prepared for the formation of a revolutionary united front.

Globally, our era is one of transition from capitalism to socialism. Our epoch is that of the struggle of the two opposed social systems, of victorious socialist revolutions and revolutions of national liberation, integral parts, objectively, of the world proletarian revolution.

Our era is one of the general crisis of capitalism, of the triumph of socialism on a world scale.

The struggles of the working class, of the working masses in our country are an integral part of the world revolutionary process, of the world proletarian revolution.

The ruin, the bankruptcy of capitalism are inevitable.

Its internal and external contradictions lead it to its inevitable loss.

The Communist Party performs the tasks of forming the subjective factors of the revolution.

So when, in our country, the objective conditions for the revolutionary situation are met, the proletariat, united with the other strata of the working population will engage in the revolutionary struggle for power with the Communist Party as guide and organizer.

To be victorious, this fight can only end with the destruction of the bourgeois state oppression apparatus and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is only with the dictatorship of the proletariat that it will be possible to have a workers' government, revolutionary government, workers' government.

It is only then that nationalizations will be socialist and that it will be possible to proceed to socialist planning. It is only then, with the proletarian state, that workers' control can and should be developed, that is to say workers' control of the workers' state, especially over those branches of administration which carry out the work of statistics and recording, in order, among other things, to establish national accounts, national control of production and distribution of products.

With the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat begins a period of transition, of revolutionary transformation of society, covering a whole historical phase, that of the construction of socialist society.

The struggle of the working class and its allies will continue, prolonged, relentless, heroic, against the exploiting enemy from outside and from inside, against their plots, their aggressions, their ideology, against the danger of recovery or renaissance of capitalism.

By consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the alliance of the proletariat and other strata of the working population under the leadership of the working class, the Communist Party will have to ensure that the socialist revolution is carried out on the economic, political and ideological.

When the tasks of the socialist revolution have been accomplished, the conditions will then be fulfilled to move on to the communist phase of the revolution.

THERE IS NO THIRD WAY

Mandel, in his article of "The Left" of April 17, also takes as references to defend his thesis - without citing texts however - Rosa Luxembourg and Lenin.

Rosa Luxembourg certainly made mistakes, but she was nevertheless a great revolutionary.

We therefore allow ourselves to quote it. Who will not see how much his criticism of reformism and revisionism has remained current:

“Bernstein began his review of the social democratic program by denying the theory of bankruptcy of the capitalist regime. But since the fall of bourgeois society is the cornerstone of scientific socialism, the removal of this cornerstone logically leads to the ruin of the whole socialist conception of Bernstein. During the debates, the desire to defend his first assertion pushed him to yield one after the other the positions of socialism.

(...)

Representing legislative reforms as a long-lasting revolution and the revolution as a condensed reform is erroneous and antihistoric. Social upheaval and legislative reform are different not by their duration, but by their nature. The whole secret of the historic upheavals accomplished by political power consists precisely in transforming simple quantitative changes into a new quality, moving from one historical period, from one social regime to another.

Thus, whoever decides for the legal path of reforms instead of the conquest of political power and social revolution, in fact chooses not a quieter, safer and slower path to the same goal, but a goal entirely quite different: instead of the creation of a new social regime, insignificant changes from the old regime. The political conceptions of revisionism come back to the same conclusion as its economic theory: it is therefore not the establishment of the socialist regime that he wants, but only the transformation of the capitalist regime, it does not aim at the annihilation of the wage system, but only to a greater or lesser exploitation; in short, it aspires to the annihilation of the excrescences of capitalism and not of capitalism itself.

(...)

The theory of the gradual establishment of socialism boils down to the gradual reform, in the socialist spirit, of capitalist property and the state. Now, by virtue of the objective conditions of the life of modern society, they develop precisely in the opposite direction. The production process is becoming more and more social, and the intervention of the State, its control exercised over this process is widening; but at the same time private property becomes a form of manifest capitalist exploitation of the labour of others, and state control is increasingly imbued with class interests. Thus, the State, that is to say the political organization, and the property relations, that is to say the legal organization of capitalism,

The idea that Fourier had had of transforming all the sea water of the terrestrial globe into lemonade by means of the phalanx system was chimerical; but Bernstein's idea of converting the sea of capitalist bitterness into the sea of socialist sweetness by pouring from time to time a bottle of social-reformist lemonade is no less chimerical and more absurd.

The production relations of capitalist society are getting closer and closer to socialist society, but on the other hand its political and legal relations raise an ever higher wall between these two societies. Social reforms and the development of democracy will not breach them. On the contrary, they will make this wall even higher and more solid. Only the blow of the revolution, that is to say the seizure of political power by the proletariat, is capable of destroying it. "

(Rosa Luxemburg: " Reform or Revolution ".)

But perhaps Mandel will try to explain to us that his way is original, that it is a third way.

We will constantly remind him of a fundamental truth, expressed in an extremely concise form: "Power is at the end of the gun!" "

And about the third way, we will give the floor to Lenin:

"In this state of affairs, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only entirely legitimate as a means of overthrowing the exploiters and of breaking their resistance, but also absolutely essential for the entire working class as the only defense against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie which led to the war and which prepares new wars.

The essential point which the socialists do not understand, and which explains their theoretical myopia, which makes them remain prisoners of bourgeois prejudices, which constitute their political betrayal towards the proletariat, is that in capitalist society, from that the class struggle which is the foundation is accentuated in a somewhat serious manner, there can be no middle term between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Everything reigns of who knows what third way is a reactionary lament of petty bourgeois. Witness the experience of a development of more than a century of bourgeois democracy and the workers' movement in all advanced countries, in particular the experience of the past five years. This is also established by the science of political economy, the content of Marxism which explains the necessity in any market economy of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie which can only be replaced by the developed, multiplied, cemented class, reinforced by the very evolution of capitalism, that is to say the class of proletarians. "

(Lenin: "Theses on bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat" - 1st Congress of the Communist International - March 1919.)

And again, in polemics with Emile Vandervelde and Kautsky, Lenin wrote:

“Claims that are too absolute could risk becoming inaccurate. Between the capitalist state, founded on the exclusive domination of a class and the proletarian state pursuing the abolition of classes, there are many intermediaries ”
(Vandervelde:“ Socialism against the State ”, p. 156) .

This is Vandervelde's "way", a manner which differs but very little from that of Kautsky, and which, in substance, is identical to him. The dialectic denies absolute truths, explaining how the transition from one opposite to another takes place and showing the role of crises in history. The eclectic does not want "too absolute" assertions, in order to slip behind its petty-bourgeois, Philistine desire, to replace the revolution with "intermediaries".

That the intermediary between the state organ of class domination of the capitalists, and the state organ of domination of the proletariat, is precisely the revolution which consists in overthrowing the bourgeoisie and breaking up, demolishing its state machine, that Kautsky and the Vanderveldes shut him up.

That the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie must be replaced by the dictatorship of a single class, the proletariat; that after the "intermediaries" of the revolution come the "intermediaries" of the gradual withering away of the proletarian state, on this the Kautsky and the Vandervelde throw the veil.

This is what their political denial consists of. (" The proletarian revolution and the renegade Kautsky ", ann. 2:" A new book by Vandervelde on the state ".)

ELIMINATE REFORMISM IN ALL ITS FORMS

The leaders of the UGS therefore stand on entirely reformist ideological positions, notably under the influence of the theories of the Trotskyist variant of reformism. They deny the prospect of the revolutionary situation. They therefore embellish capitalism and want to ignore the general crisis of it, as they do not want to take into account the proletarian revolution in progress on a world scale.

Instead of achieving the final goal and the revolutionary objectives which ensue from it, they advance the smoky reformist theories of the "transitory" objectives of structural reforms, requesting workers' collaboration to strengthen monopoly bourgeois state capitalism.

The disgusted PSB socialist workers, refusing to be complicit in the crimes of Spaak's party any longer, certainly did not want, and certainly do not want, to constitute an allegedly "left" wing of reformism.

By turning away from Spaakist reformism, they began a process which, by the experience of their participation in the class struggle on the demand front, political and ideological, will bring most of them on the revolutionary positions of Marxism- Leninism.

The attempt of the Trotskyist leaders of the UGS to channel their revolutionary will towards the swamps of revisionism will also fail before the evidence of the facts and by their ideological defeat.

PSB reformists openly oppose the daily struggle of workers against the attacks of Capital.

Reformers in the UGS leadership also oppose it with left-wing phraseology, trying to discredit this so-called "reformist" struggle.

But this "headlong rush" already unmasks them. On the occasion of the Battery strike or by their scandalous and provocative sabotage of solidarity with the Vietnamese people, the leaders of "The Left" have already demonstrated their harmful activity in current practice.

And there they are, practicing parliamentary cretinism by joining forces in a bourgeois electoralist-style cartel with the party of Khrushchevite traitors. Khrushchevites practicing international collaboration with American imperialism are treacherous agents of subjugation to American imperialism. They ignominiously betray proletarian internationalism. They attack and basely slander socialist countries such as socialist China and Albania.

They praised Johnson's speech claiming to dictate the conditions of the "Pax Americana" in Vietnam and they advocate a negotiation of treason against the people of South Vietnam. They have constantly betrayed the revolutionary national liberation movement in the Congo. They participate in Yankee nuclear blackmail.

They glorify bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy.

They would like salaried and paid workers to bow to the betrayals of the reformist union monks.

They court a Spaak!

They hope to join the PSB in the hope of a ministerial folding seat.

These are the sad characters, the vile counter-revolutionaries with whom the leaders of the UGS have rallied, thus showing what degree of political decomposition they are in.

The frail skiff of the UGS - and this is also the case of the PWT - Hainaut - barely launched, already sinking in the muddy waters of Khrushchevite revisionism.

Let the socialist workers, including those who had placed their trust in the UGS or the PWT - Hainaut, learn from the events of the past few weeks. These constitute a hard but excellent school. It is not disappointment that must result for these comrades but, on the contrary, a conviction and a reinforced revolutionary combativeness. And also the will to clear up, to firmly reject any ideology, any reformist practice, in whatever form.

Thus is accelerated for these workers, some of whom are already joining us, the process of awareness which leads them to the consequent revolutionary positions of Marxism-Leninism.

J. GRIPPA.

AN ARTICLE BY ERNEST MANDEL OR AN UNFAIR POLICY

Ernest Mandel published in the newspaper "La Gauche" of April 17, under the title "Displaced polemics", an article which was a vile attack on our Party.

As we have already done previously for particularly significant texts by political opponents, we publish in full hereafter, in the same title, that of Ernest Mandel.

Thus our readers will be able to judge for themselves how baseless a cartel with the Khrushchevites brings down a man on whom, moreover, there was no reason to be deluded.

We are conducting a detailed critique of the political positions of Mandel and the UGS elsewhere.

Let us recall that comrade Lefèbvre had written in our weekly "La Voix du Peuple" an article rightly criticizing the electoral alliance of the PWT - Hainaut with the Khrushchevites and pointing out that the UGS, hardly born, was, it seemed, on the same path of total degeneration.

This is what Ernest Mandel calls "inappropriate polemics". Let us limit ourselves in this presentation, to take up in a few words certain ignominations contained in Mandel's article.

Comrade Lefèbvre did not have to "look for his arguments in the trash cans of the 'Socialist Voice'" as Mandel claims. He simply quoted very embarrassing texts for the SKU of Mandel's current friends and allies.

According to Mandel, the editors of the "Voice of the People" would form the "united front of the bureaucrats (Marxist-Leninists and Social Democrats), who fear workers' democracy because it makes them lose their privileges", If democracy worker had to identify with Ernest Mandel who does not tolerate our criticism of the PSB which he considers a great workers' party (!), the bureaucrats of social democracy would not have much to fear.

As for the Party comrades, their privilege is their boundless devotion to the revolutionary struggle.

Mandel considers that we are using sterile and stupid polemical methods when we signal that there is an electoral agreement PWT - Hainaut and UGS with the Khrushchevites: is this cartel a myth, is it a slander to say it?

Mandel claims that Comrade Lefèbvre would have written (the quotes are in Mandel's text): "If the PWT - Hainaut and the UGS are making a cartel with the Khrushchevites, it is because they are, like them, reformists, revisionists and traitors. The proof is that we begged them until the last minute to make ... cartel with ourselves! "

Mandel is a liar: There is no trace in Comrade Lefèbvre's article of such a text, nor indeed of such an "argument" of "proof".

But let the reader judge, appreciate for himself the prose of Mandel, "free", as he will see, from insults and invective!

Ernest Mandel's article, DISPLACED POLITICS

The last issue of "*La Voix du Peuple*" contains a series of attacks on our PWT and UGS comrades that we would not want to pass up without response.

Let us first of all point out to Comrade Lefèvre, from Mons, that it is bizarre, to say the least, for a thoroughbred "Marxist-Leninist" to go and seek his arguments against the UGS in the trash cans of the "Socialist Voice". If we used the same polemical methods as the editors of "*La Voix du Peuple*", it would be easy for us to retaliate: this is the united front of the bureaucrats, who fear workers' democracy because it makes them lose their privileges. But what is the use of such polemical methods, if not to prevent political clarification, which can only result from a calm discussion of possible differences?

The argument that the "perpetrators" of the cartel PWT - PC and UGS - PC are "reformists" and "revisionists" who mingle with "those of Stalingrad Avenue" [headquarters of the revisionist PC at the era editor's note] because basically agree with them, is the same ilk polemical and stupid processes. The editors of "*La Voix du Peuple*" seem to believe that conviction is measured by the number of insults that are used, and that the "revolutionary" degree of prose is in direct proportion to the invective. They will learn the hard way that insults and invective mostly produce isolation, and reinforce the impression that their perpetrators do not feel very sure of their cause ...

Comrade Lefèvre does not seem to realize the ridiculous contradiction to which his argument leads: "If the PWT - Hainaut and the UGS make a cartel with the Khrushchevites, it is because they are, like them, reformists, revisionists and traitors. The proof is that we begged them until the last minute to make ... cartel with ourselves! ", Does Lefèvre take his readers so naive to believe that the " pure Marxist-Leninists "would burn with desire to conclude a cartel with us, if we were really" revisionists and reformists "?

As for the controversial background of the argument; de Lefèvre, it deserves a more serious debate. We are ready for a public debate when he wishes, he and his friends, to demonstrate that the watchword of anti-capitalist structural reforms, far from being "reformist" or "revisionist", and far from having ancestors "Bernstein and De Man" constitutes an authentic class program, which must facilitate the rupture of the workers with a practice of the claiming struggle, limiting itself to fighting for perfectly achievable objectives within the framework of the capitalist regime, which, for this reason, does not in no way question the existence of this scheme. It is in this practice that lies the root of reformism, and the ten points of the electoral program of Lefèvre's party come dangerously close ...

The true ancestors of the anti-capitalist structural reform program were all the theorists of the socialist Marxist left before the First World War, among whom we should not only classify de Brouckère and Rosa Luxembourg, but also Lenin. Instead of recklessly ridiculing the slogan of the opening of the books of accounts and workers' control, the editors of "The Voice of the People" had better reread the brochures of Lenin where these slogans are found repeated and detailed. They also ignore, no doubt, that the texts which best analyze the meaning of workers' control are, on the one hand, a text by Louis de Brouckère, and on the other hand ... a resolution of the Communist International at I era of Lenin.

It is true that it is easier to insinuate and insult than to verify sources and analyse documents ...

It is a pity, because within the PWT as within the UGS, there was and there is a lot of sympathy for the courageous struggle waged by comrades of "*La Voix du Peuple*" in defense of the colonial revolution. For this reason, as indeed because of hostility in principle to any discrimination against any current of the workers' movement, we have always insisted, in all negotiations of cartel or unity of action, on whatever level that is, so that these comrades are associated with them as equals. But some of their leaders wonderfully practice the art of making enemies and isolating themselves from everyone ...

EM

("La Gauche" from 17-4.)