



# THESES OF RECONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY



## *The proletariat, revolutionary class*

Almost at the same time of the appearance of classes in the society, that division that implies that some men live thanks to the exploitation of other men, in the social conscience emerged the need of emancipation, the need of the suppression of that exploitation and the oppression it implied. Spartacus, in times of slavery, or Münzer, in feudal times, leded movements whose target was the liberation of slaves and servants. Both movements symbolize the conscience of the emancipation of the oppressed in times previous to capitalism; both of them knew how to penetrate the antagonistic nature of the social relations present at that time and how to reduce to the maximum their irreconcilable character: the confrontation between possessors and dispossessed, between rich and poor, regardless of the forms that confrontation could show in each historic time.

But, at the same time in which the material conditions of the society permitted to open the men consciousness to the idea of emancipation, they also imposed a limit accordingly with the insufficient development of the productive forces. This limit was underlined not only by the mystic-religious language which was used to express that program of liberation (above all in the case of the majority of the antifeudal peasants' revolts), but mainly in the program itself, which did not give any other alternative to the slave than escaping, and to the servant no other than becoming the individual and private owner of the land he tilled (which, therefore, promoted the perpetuation of the classes).

Only when the capitalism arrives, the production mode that develops the productive forces at a never seen speed, the production begins to acquire a social character that involves all his components in the economy and begins to integrate them through economic ties of interdependence; a new exploited class arrives, which is legally free, which creates all the richness but possesses nothing, the proletariat; It is only then, when the objective conditions are created for the real emancipation of the entire mankind; it is only then, when its program of justice and freedom can be scientifically formulated.

Nor the slave, neither the servant are liberated from their misery by their permanent, and at some times heroic, struggle against their lord and owner. The problem of surpassing the old ways of exploitation is solved by the disintegration of the slavery regime together with the importation of new social relations in the antique world; in the case of feudalism, by the entrance of a new social class which had been developing in secondary spheres of the society (the bourgeoisie). The problem of the social exploitation is not directly solved by the class struggle between the producers, who carry on their shoulders the creation of richness, and the ones who expropriate it; it only solves the forms of the exploitation. Therefore, the history of mankind before the arrival of the proletariat is summarized by the simple change of exploitation forms, by the simple relief of some classes by others (both of exploiters and exploited), of some production modes by others in the society. And that is how it is expressed, from a politic point of view, the contradiction which is shared by all precapitalist socio-economic formations; due to that contradiction, the suppression of their social relations of exploitation (of which the oppressed begin to be conscious) is not achieved by them

or the class struggle, but by the arrival of other social forces different from the ones that constituted the central axis of those formations (the relation lord-slave or the one between the servant and the owner).

This contradiction, however, this separation made by the social development between the conscience of the exploited and his program of emancipation, by one side, and the tools and means to suppress that exploitation and fulfill the liberator program (basically the class struggle), by the other side, was surpassed when the feudalism let the capitalism enter, and the owner became a bourgeois and the servant a proletarian.

Actually, capitalism begins to remove, step by step, all the old ways of production, or begins to assimilate and take them under its command; doing so, it begins to convert all the producers in wage earners, or to subject them to the inflexible laws of the capitalist market. The general law of capitalist accumulation transforms progressively all the social relations in capitalist ones, and divide radically the producers in owners who monopolize the means of production -who are day by day fewer and stronger- and not-owner people, who only have their force of work. The capital socializes the production, divides to the maximum the steps needed to produce merchandise, and involves an increasing number of people in this process, displacing the direct and individual producer at the same time. The social division of work gets deeper at the same time as the organization of all the social production gets concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. The satisfaction of the personal needs stops being an individual question and becomes a social matter. The contradiction between the progressive socialization of the production and its private form of appropriation develops and gets acuter, impregnating all the spheres of the society. The problems related to the exploitation and oppression, characteristic of all class societies, acquire a new content, and at the same time demand a new solution.

The work carried out by the slaves sustained a parasitic society of nobles, who did not consider the work as an integrating part of their politic life. The liberation of the slave was the manumission (that is to say, becoming a parasite), the escape or the death by exhaustion. The servant paid the leisure time and the warrior raids of the feudal armed retinues for centuries, while the peasants fought to get rid of their menial condition and tried to emancipate as a class (becoming free owners of the land). But this emancipation was the one of a class which aspired to become an independent class. That did not mean the suppression of the classes. The capital surged from the peasant emancipation, and created the proletariat. The aim of this new class could only be guided by the emancipation of its own condition as a class -and, doing so, liberating the entire mankind from the class division-, and by the suppression of all classes and the suppression of all the opprobrium and misery they imply. The capital proletarianizes the entire mankind, and at the same time, expropriates them from their means of life. The proletariat only needs to expropriate their expropriators in order to allow all men to be the owners of both themselves and their fate. For the first time in history, the special position of a class permits that the appropriation of their means of life may lead to the disappearance of the private property and the classes; doing so, the society will be organized not by the rule of necessity, but by the free association of their members, who stop depending from their means and product of their work to become their own sovereigns and full subjects of their lives.

But this task sets new requirements and problems related to the tools and the means which the proletariat may use to fulfill this historic mission. The first and most

important is the class struggle. The proletariat, unlike the rest of the exploited classes throughout the history, can set a positive correlation between the implementation of its class struggle and the program of auto-emancipation and emancipation of the mankind to free them from exploitation and oppression; that is to say, the proletariat can set a direct path from its struggle as a class and the destruction of all classes. In order to do so, however, it needs to destroy the political power of the capital (political revolution), and establish its own to build a new society upon different bases (Communism). But before becoming a political force, the proletariat needs to become a political party.

One of the historic peculiarities of the proletariat class is that its condition as a class goes in parallel and simultaneously with its condition as a political party. The proletariat really does not appear as a class in history when the bourgeoisie begins to produce in a capitalist way and expropriate and convert the producers in wage earners; not even when the mass industrialization of the economy converts the vast majority of producers in wage earners; the working class emerges in history when those wage earners or their most advanced representatives become conscious that they constitute a separate class with their own interests, opposed to the ones of the rest of classes in the society. Then, they organize themselves as a class: they try to struggle for the same demands, try to unify those struggles, create their unitary organizations for the defense of their interests, etc. These struggles and this unitary will for the defense of their common interests is the motor of the workers' movement. In this sense, the proletariat is a class because, in their movement, become conscious of itself as a class, of its social and economic peculiarity; but it is not yet conscious of their historic role as a class. The proletariat, at this stage, sees what it is, but does not see yet what it has to be; it becomes conscious of its class, but it has not become yet conscious of itself as a revolutionary class.

The frame of the bourgeois society can really tolerate, without feeling subverted, the existence of the political organization of a part of the society. In fact, the bourgeoisie does not deny, nor can deny, the existence of social classes, nor the existence of different social interests, nor the political organization for the defense of these interests. And in fact, as Marx said, the emergence of the proletariat as a class from the centralization of their struggles in a national struggle, that is to say, in a class struggle, also means the birth of the proletariat as a political party, for "every class struggle is a political struggle". But the character of this political struggle corresponds to the character of the consciousness and organization of the class; it corresponds to the level of development related to its recent formation as a social class. In other words, it is related to the level of consciousness and organization as a class conscious "of itself", and not yet "for itself". That is why the political content of the programs and activities of the worker organizations, in this stage of development, is basically economic and claimer, reformist. This political content corresponds, from the point of view of the society in general, to the still ascending development of the capitalism; from the point of view of the proletariat class in particular, it corresponds to the period of quantitative accumulation (or "strength accumulation"), previous to the qualitative leap, in parallel with the entrance of the capitalism in its imperialist stage or its general crisis stage, which favors the Proletarian Revolution. In this period, the spontaneous consciousness and the economicist or tradeunionist organization of the old, reformist, worker party (social democrat) can no longer fulfill the necessities of the worker class: in this period, it is required the political organization of a new type of the proletariat.

This political organization of new type is the Communist Party (C.P.), which begins to emerge when the proletariat, mainly through their most advanced sector, obtains a revolutionary consciousness. In fact, the CP is the consequence of that historic step and, at the same time and once created, is also its cause: that is to say, the CP emerges because the class has begun to understand its revolutionary role, and surges as an instrument that the class gives to itself in order to assume and completely fulfill this role. *Vanguard and Class*

The revolutionary consciousness is the revolutionary ideology, the body of ideas that expresses its superior auto-consciousness as a class and expounds its program of targets to meet. The ideology of the proletariat is the Communism, being this the synthesis of the experience of its struggle as a class, along with the most advanced progresses of the universal wisdom. The Communism, as revolutionary ideology, was created by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin and the ulterior experience of the construction of Socialism. All this theoretical knowledge must be taken to the worker class in order to make its movement or class struggle a revolutionary movement or struggle. The proletariat is the vanguard class of the modern society because history has entrusted it with an emancipatory mission that nobody could undertake until this moment. The proletariat needs, hence, a vanguard ideology, and that is what the Marxism-leninism is, because it is the only theory that is able to reveal the proletariat both the role it must play and assume and its scientific basis. The marxism-leninism, or scientific socialism, is, therefore, the ideology of the proletariat, the Communism, and not any of those radical theories of the petty bourgeoisie that compete with it (for example, the “libertarian communism”) to deviate the proletariat from its revolutionary horizon. Because the real revolutionary theory can only refer to one class, to the only really revolutionary class. Those who poison the communism with false illusions, those who elude the knowledge of the social development and the duty to use these laws to impulse its progress and substitute it for false utopias, those who deny the main role of the proletariat in that progress, substituting it for vague spontaneist or reformist recipes, those are the first enemies of the communism, for they dissolve and eliminate what it is essential in it: its class nature.

The communism as consciousness of the proletarian class is elaborated outside the class, outside its movement. The ideology of vanguard of the proletariat must be assimilated by the vanguard sector of the proletariat and then taken to the rest of the worker masses. Only this way, when the revolutionary consciousness is taken to the proletarian movement, this consciousness will be able to turn that movement into a revolutionary one.

The CP is, therefore, the unity of the proletarian vanguard with the worker mass movement when this movement reaches a new state of consciousness, the one of the revolutionary ideology, the Communism. But the communist consciousness is not acquired by the proletariat with its spontaneous movement, the one that converted it in class, which helped it to acquire consciousness of its particular economic interests. This new state of consciousness can only be reached from outside of the spontaneous struggle that is undertaken as a class. This new consciousness can only be given by its vanguard, that sector of the class which has been able to assimilate the most advanced world conception, the world conception which is able to comprise all the achievements

of the human thought and knowledge. With its spontaneous movement, the worker class can not surpass the frame of the bourgeois ideology; it can only achieve the qualitative leap towards the communist ideology through its vanguard.

But, in order to do so, the first step for the vanguard is to become part of the class. Because of the intellectual characteristics of the communist theory, which is based upon deep scientific knowledge, the medium worker, due to his disadvantaged material situation in the capitalist society, finds himself nearly disabled to acquire, by his own means, this knowledge, or even the chance to deeply understand the general vision of the communist ideology. This peculiarity makes obvious that, in most cases, those who are in conditions of acquiring this knowledge and understanding the communism belong to other classes. One of the greatest achievements of the struggle of the worker class was the one of forcing the bourgeoisie to allow the general education for the proletariat's children, which reaches an important formation level (middle education); this allowed the future proletarian to acquire wider, more general knowledge, and in turn, they could be in a better position to understand Communism. At the present, however, the bourgeoisie is gaining terrain in this field, through the reform of the educational legislation, which makes the education each time more technical, specialized and partial, and taking away from educational programs the integrated visions of the reality, above all Marxism.

Anyway, the knowledge of the communist ideology requires an intellectual activity somewhat permanent, whatever the origin of the person, which, in a classist society with a deep division of labour, makes inevitable that the question about the contradiction between manual and intellectual work may be posed. Taking into account that the intellectual job is practically monopolized by the dominant class, the bourgeoisie, this contradiction is posed, objectively, as a contradiction between two classes.

For this reason, the revolutionary intellectual, worker or not, must be part of the class in order to become its vanguard. Proclaiming oneself revolutionary, showing one's solidarity with the exploited and oppressed, and giving them a program of emancipation is not enough; the will to emancipate the proletarian class does not suffice. History has posed many examples, all of them failed, about this method of class liberation. The utopian socialism is the most remarkable of all of them. The definitive difference between the utopian and scientific socialism, i.e. Marxism, is that Marxism understood that class emancipation can not come from outside, but it must be the result of the auto-emancipation of the proletariat itself. And that can only be possible if those who give the worker class the ideology able to open the doors for its liberation are members of that class, whatever their social origin. Only this way will they be able to be the proletariat vanguard -and, therefore, part of this class-; only this way will they be able to act as real revolutionaries and not as well-intended reformers.

The vanguard turns into part of the class when it approaches to it and melts with it in the CP. This way, the antagonistic contradictions of classist nature are overcome: at first between the vanguard and the class, and afterwards inside the Party. The differentiations and divisions of labour inside the Party due to either the necessary centralization of the political leadership or the specialization of the work, adopt, this way, an exclusively functional character, in no way hierarchical or social.

In summary, the first challenges which are to be faced by the most politically advanced elements of the modern society, its revolutionary elements, are the ones of studying, formulating and assimilating the theory of vanguard in all its developments; they must manage to make this theory part of the proletarian class movement.

These challenges are summarized with one only task: the constitution of the CP.

## *Party and class*

The integration of the vanguard in the class is politically expressed as the Communist Party, and historically as the class movement towards the political position of the vanguard, the political position of Communism.

The C.P. does not emerge, then, from the masses or the spontaneous movement of the proletarian masses, but it does, necessarily, from the proletarian class. A conceptual distinction must be made between the ideas of masses and class. The masses are part of the class, but they are not all of it. The vanguard is one of its essential components. The C.P. emerges when the vanguard, which bears the vanguard ideology, integrates with the Class and unites with the mass movement. That is why we say that this party is product of the proletarian class, but not of its spontaneous movement of the masses. That is why we say that there is no Communist Party without this synthesis between vanguard and masses inside the Class, although the vanguard can previously be present -as it happens nowadays, which can be confirmed from the great number of marxist-leninist circles today organized, product of the disintegration of the revisionism- disconnected from the worker movement, and, therefore, without being an organic part of the class. In fact, this situation is a necessary stage, prior to the creation of the C.P.: it is the stage in which the Party is reconstituted, and it is characterized by the vanguard trying to be an integrant part of the class, which can only be accomplished by constituting the C.P.

The proletariat is a unity between conscience and movement. As stated before, in its appearance stage, the proletariat was not yet a class. Those were the times of the disintegration of feudalism, of the peak of commercial capital and the incipient manufacture. The proletarians exist separated, they are a subproduct of the dissolution of the feudal relationships, and they tend constantly to go back to the old forms of familiar or guild production. But when the capitalism appropriates more and more the productive spheres of the economy and begins to domain all the social production and, moreover, when the capital introduces machines in the production, the trend towards the proletarianization of the producers becomes dominant, and the resistance of the wage-earning people, more or less organized, begins. At the beginning, this struggle is local or individual, but it spreads and organizes at a national scale. The proletarians begin to become conscious that they are a class with special interests and that they are opposed to another class, the one of the employers. The clash becomes more and more a confrontation between classes and, more and more, this clash adopts political dimensions. In this stage of the movement, the proletariat constitutes and organizes politically as a class (trade unions, worker parties). This grade of development of the movement corresponds to certain type of organization and political conscience. The

proletariat is at that moment a fully configured class, and their actions obey to a determined independent political conscience. It acts, therefore, as a political party. However, this conscience and this political organization point out that the proletarian movement is still within the bourgeois frame, as they still presuppose the capitalist social relationships as unquestionable; the movement of the proletariat based on the “class against class” struggle is still limited to the reproduction of the conditions of this struggle, with no other exit but its infinite development. Because of that, the political struggle of the proletarian class focuses only on acquiring advantages for this struggle, focuses on reforms and makes use of strikes or the parliamentary legality in order to obtain or endorse these reforms. The proletarian movement can only give a new qualitative leap and obtain a new course, in tune with the possibilities of its political action and its historical goal, when the revolutionary conscience becomes part of its movement and adds new and real political targets, and when this crystallizes in a new type of political organization of the worker class; in short, when the proletarian movement directs towards the Communism, when the worker class that acts as a bourgeois political party tends to turn into a communist political organization, when the class, as a political movement of resistance, turns into a revolutionary movement, at first in an incipient way (CP), then in a way that comprises the whole Class (communist society).

In its class struggle against the bourgeoisie, the proletariat strives constantly to get this new type of organization, which goes together with the gradual awareness of its revolutionary role. In this struggle, the permanence of the reformist organization type expresses that, in the first place, the process of conscious elevation of the masses towards the place of the communist vanguard is necessarily gradual; it is not achieved instantly, through an unique political act for the whole class (the constitution of the CP, for instance) but through several historical events (the constitution of the CP, plus the revolutionary conquest of power, plus the fulfillment of the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat). In the second place, it expresses that the bourgeoisie, with the support to these organizations, tries to contain and break the transformation and the change of both the conscience and the organization of the workers from its reformist stage to the revolutionary one. This means that the old worker organization turns, objectively, into its opposite, for it stops defending the strategic interests of the worker class and begins defending the ones of the bourgeoisie, carrying out the historical betrayal of the social democracy to the proletariat through its revisionist and political leaderships. Because of this, and regardless of the tactical manoeuvres which every revolutionary process may demand in particular circumstances, the social democracy and the revisionism have turned into the main enemy of the revolution, both in its first stage or the constitution of the CP, because they try to distort the vanguard ideology and to make difficult the demarcation of fields with the bourgeois ideology, and in the stage in which the masses have to be won and the power has to be conquered, because they represent the link with the bourgeoisie within the worker class, and because they try to neutralize the transformation and the revolutionary organization of the masses.

While the conversion of the proletariat into class and worker party takes place through the “class against class” dialectics or struggle, through the struggle against the bourgeoisie for the defense of the proletariat’s immediate demands, the conversion of the proletariat into a revolutionary class and CP takes place through the dialectics between the vanguard and the masses within the class; for the vanguard is the one who



transforms and the only one who is able to turn the general class struggle of the proletariat into revolutionary conscience and organization.

In other words, if the motor of the proletarian movement in its stage of formation as a class was the direct confrontation with the other class (the bourgeoisie), which allows the delimitation of the social or political fields between both classes and the unity of the proletariat as an economic subject, in the stage of transformation of the worker movement into a revolutionary movement (Proletarian movement), the reciprocal action between the vanguard –already integrated in the class- and the masses of the proletariat becomes the motor; in summary, the CP becomes the motor of the elevation of the Class towards the Communism.

The CP is not something placed apart from the class, and it is not something given to the class from outside of it, or something that directs to the class from outside of it. The CP is the relation that exists between the vanguard and the masses of the class in the Revolution, a relation that finds a unity and a different organic crystallization in each one of the stages of the Revolution. The concepts of class and party can not be understood in separate ways, with a relation of exclusion, in a metaphysic way, but as two aspects of a dialectical unity, two aspects of a concrete historical entity, the proletariat. Its historical role takes part with the movement of that dialectical unity: First, when, in the historical phase of the preparation of the revolution –until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century-, the proletariat becomes a class, and, therefore, this organic condition becomes the main aspect, for we are dealing with its organization as a social unity, while the political aspect plays a secondary role; that is so because worker parties are only parties which brings together the class and defends its economic and social identity as the mentioned class. Second, when in the era of the Revolution –until the Communism- the proletariat must turn itself in CP, which implies that this elevation to this new political condition is the main thing, for it must accomplish its historical mission of eliminating the class society; doing so, and once achieved the communism, the proletariat overcomes its social and economic condition of class and the contradiction Party-Class, which defines the proletariat, disappears in a new synthesis.

In the era of the Proletarian Revolution, the movement of the class towards its party is expressed through the contradiction between the vanguard and the masses of the class. It is not then a matter of consolidating in a quantitative way the proletariat as a particular class, nor of defending its moral identity as an independent political class, that is to say, of politically and socially defining and separating itself from the bourgeoisie; the matter is about overcoming, precisely, the conditions that determine the proletariat as a political class. This transformation of the tasks of the proletariat explains why its vanguard organization is not, and can not be, a mass organization, whose vocation would be the one of comprising the whole class, as it happens with the reformist party or tradeunion, because it would mean that the organization would rest lethargic at the economic or tradeunionist level in its political development; the vanguard organization must have the vocation of elevating and taking the class towards the Communism. The organization which takes the responsibility of fulfilling the task of elevation of the proletariat till this new state of civilization must be a organization which has a qualitatively superior ideology, a vanguard ideology (the Communism), because it is about going beyond the material determination as a class; it is about, in some way, denying the present empiric condition of exploited social class, in order to transform oneself and emancipate in the Communism, transforming and emancipating, at the same

time, the whole humanity and elevating it towards a new state of civilization. Those who proclaim they are communist, and, at the same time, are against the leninism, adducing that, in the present society, in the capitalism, there is a “socio-cultural barrier” that can not be exceeded, are renouncing to what essentially defines the Communism as ideology, are exercising the most shameless electioneering opportunism, are showing the most evident and recalcitrant anti-communism.

Because of that, the ideology is the main characteristic which defines the new vanguard organization, because that thinking is what promotes the proletarian movement and what projects its being towards a revolutionary horizon; it is what opens up the proletariat’s conscience and removes the prostration of its economic determination as a class which produces added value and other people’s richness. Because of that, the proletarian vanguard must approach to the rest of the class from the ideology: this is its first step and its premise as vanguard, and this is the first step and the first premise of the movement of the proletarian class towards its Party, of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

The Party is the revolutionary movement of the class "for itself" The class which transforms itself from exploited class to emancipated humanity is the Party as the expression of the movement of the class in that transformation. This has different solutions, depending on the current stage of the movement. When, in a first moment, a part of the society obtains the communist conscience, but invests the majority of its efforts in adopting it completely and in organizing the way to take it to the worker class, there is not Party yet, and, in consequence, nor the revolutionary movement, because it is about the ideological vanguard becoming part of the class. Let us say at this point that, in order to become part of the modern revolutionary class, sharing its material situation and its position in the productive process is not a demanding requirement; one can be part of the class by sharing its ideology – which is, in the essential, revolutionary-. This is the first trail which must be traveled by the (ideological) vanguard in order to be part of the class, and, therefore, to fulfill its (revolutionary) vanguard role. As long as this task is not finished, there will not be a real, practical vanguard, there is no revolutionary orientation for the class, nor, therefore, movement towards the Communism, nor CP.

In a second moment, when the vanguard has adopted the ideology and has come into contact with the masses of the class, having created an incipient movement towards that thinking, the conditions for the existence of the CP as a specific political organization are fulfilled, for the class, once having integrated the vanguard in its bosom, can begin to turn its spontaneous movement into a conscious (revolutionary) movement towards the ideological and political position of the thinking and the program of that Party, the Communism. In that moment and in that sense, the CP is born as the **vanguard organization plus the movement of the masses towards it.**

After that, that movement must extend to the whole masses of the class, and the vanguard must use each and every political instrument that the development of that process may demand and allow: mass organizations to strengthen the revolutionary

movement and the political position of the vanguard, i.e. strengthen the CP; Proletariat Dictatorship, in order to sweep every obstacle that the old society may oppose to the extension of the movement; construction of the new social relationships, in order to accelerate the elevation of the class towards the Communism, etc.

## *Party and vanguard*

Until now, we have seen the historic premises for the organic construction of the revolutionary party of the proletariat. First of all, the proletariat, as a class, must exist previously and have an independent political activity, i.e. acting as a party. Second, on this base, the revolutionary ideology must be applied by the vanguard, which is vanguard because it owns the vanguard ideology and, in second place, because it tends to become an integral part of the class in order to become its real vanguard. Third, when the vanguard has finally become part of the class, transforming itself in CP, the movement of the proletariat undergoes a qualitative leap, which consists in becoming a revolutionary movement. This movement is defined because the class wants to elevate to reach the communist program and thinking of its Party, in order to fulfill its mission as a revolutionary class.

But these are historical premises, because they are conquests already achieved by the international proletariat, which it still relatively conserves. In fact, the main meaning of these conquests is that the revolutionary movement of the proletariat is underway; not in the political field, for we face a period of stagnation and withdrawal, but in its historical sense. October inaugurated the revolutionary movement of the class, that is, its elevation process towards the Communism. Now it is about defining the political premises to make this movement to gain new pulse.

From the historical point of view, we can define the CP in its unity with the Class, because its revolutionary vanguard stamps a conscious character to its movement towards the Communism, i.e. as a dialectical unity in which the class, already formed as a class, is turning into the CP. But, from the political point of view, this is not enough. Certainly, the historical point of view only tells us that the struggle between those two rivals, between the CP and the Class, is expressed as a revolutionary movement, which makes this definition of the CP too lax and ambiguous, for it does not make clear what is the CP itself in a given moment of that revolutionary process, and what it is not. In other words, it does not solve the main political question of the Party in terms of its Reconstitution, that is, the question of its organization.

Because, if at a historical level, the dialectics between the Party and the Class is shown by the revolutionary movement of elevation towards the Communism, at the concrete political level the revolutionary movement is expressed through the dialectics

between the vanguard and the masses of the class. As mentioned above, the CP, understood as a specific political organization, is, at the same time, attribute and subject of that movement. It is created by the movement, and, once created, the Party reproduces it at an each time wider scale. Therefore, the CP, as a political organization, must be conceived as the *relation between the vanguard and the masses*. The CP, conceived this way, is a social relationship, within the Class, between its masses and its vanguard, and this social relation crystallizes in a political organization, not in an absolute form, but depending on the moment in which the development of that dialectic relation takes place.

The CP is not only the vanguard, nor even the organized vanguard, though the criteria for that organization may be oriented by the Marxism-leninism. Conceive that way the Party organization implies dogmatism, because, from that approach, only one aspect of that “social relation” is considered, the vanguard, apart from the other inherent element of the class, the masses. That means understanding the CP separated from the Class, and the Class from an exclusively economic conception, without political content, not as the unity of both movement and conscience; therefore, the idea of the Class acting as a political party is denied. Not only the idea of the class acting “for itself” is denied, but also the idea of the class having conscience “as itself”, and in consequence, also the idea of the proletariat being a socially mature class and politically independent – i.e. with an own program, with a specific, revolutionary, historical mission as a class -.

The CP defined as the relation between the vanguard and the masses is a much more concrete formulation than the one which describes it as the revolutionary movement of the Class towards the Communism, but this definition is not yet complete. Until here, it takes into account its dialectical elements, its two “opposites”, and set a general link between them, a “social relation”; but it does not specify anything yet about the concrete character of that relation, about this relation as a “unity of opposites”; it does not tell us anything yet about the intern link required for that relation to be verified as a dialectical unity. Until here we have the vanguard on one side, which tries to integrate in the Class, which is still vanguard only because of the vanguard ideology, and which is not yet a political vanguard, because it does not form an organic unity with the Class, because it is not CP yet; on the other side, we have the masses, whose movement attempts to overcome the limit imposed by its economic determination, the limit of its spontaneous conscience, in order to reach the auto-conscience of its historical mission, but it does not achieve it because the revolutionary ideology does not form an organic unity with its movement. These two elements find their unity when the vanguard is really part of the class, when the vanguard unites with the masses and manages to organize the revolutionary movement, when the vanguard stops being only an organized group around the ideology and manages to translate this ideology in politics for the masses and in organization for the revolutionary masses. The CP arises, then, as the unity between the organized vanguard and its masses, as the link of the vanguard with the masses, as the vanguard and its means of transmission with the masses; in summary, as *the vanguard plus its masses policy*. The vanguard’s mass line

is, in short, the unity element which configures the CP on the constitutive elements of the Class: vanguard and masses.

In the history of the International Communist Movement there has been a lot of dogmatism in this point related to the definition of the CP. Most of the time, the organization of the vanguard has been considered the organization of the Party; the vanguard has been seen as the only element of the CP, but it is only one of them. This has meant that, in the long term, the vanguard has gradually divorced from the masses, and the Party, understood only as organization, was wasted away, and a heavy bureaucratic-administrative machine remained as the residue of its previous existence, as the dry skeleton of a in times alive and healthy body; that is what we can observe in the so-called "former communist" parties in East Europe, organizations which are not what they say they are, organizations which defend the interests of the enemies of the ones they say to defend.

Obviously, that dogmatism, which is still today alive in those who state they are Marxist-leninist and say they have broken relations with the revisionism, has a certain explanation and a certain historical logic. Most of the communist parties were created thanks to the revolutionary offensive that the international proletariat began with the October Revolution, and their foundation was sponsored by the CI through unique constituent acts, in which the required processes for the fulfilling of the objective requisites for the existence of the Party were considered obvious or synthesized. That was correct taking into account that it was necessary in order to continue and strengthen the offensive of the World Proletarian Revolution, which was at its very peak. But, once it slowed down, the consequences of the deficient fulfilling of those requisites at the national level were ascertained. First of all, because the communist parties fell in opportunism with a surprising easiness when they had to face the conquest of power; and, secondly, once these communist parties were definitely liquidated by the opportunism, the first model of constitution was, with the same surprising easiness, reproduced in the minds of the vanguard elements who want to recover the Party; that happened because this model has not been tackled in a critical way, nor have they attempted to understand its real political background.

This is clearly shown when we relate the creation of the Party in the Revolution. From the leninist point of view, the Revolution is a process with successive stages: 1°, constitute the CP; 2°, attract the masses to conquest the power; 3°, conquest the power and found the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to create the social relations which may open the way to Communism. Another essential principle of Marxism-leninism is that "the masses make history", and, in consequence, they must be the protagonists of the Revolution in all the stages.

What happens with the dogmatic vision of the Party? As it tries to fulfill with the first stage of the Revolution through a political act of organization, because it conceives the CP only as a vanguard organization, it wants, once this political act is considered done and fulfilled, to deal immediately with the second stage, the one of preparing the big masses to conquest the power, or even the one of taking the power in a straight way. This vision of the Revolution has two fundamental mistakes:

First. The tasks of the first two stages of the Revolution are confused, and, therefore, the two stages are understood as only one, when in fact, the Reconstitution demands the fulfilling of political tasks which are very different from the ones of preparing the masses to take the power. The political essence of the first stage of the Revolution consists in "attract the vanguard" towards the Communism, unlike the second, when the masses must be "attracted" to the Communism. But formalize that conquest through a constituent act, through the unification of the vanguard in an organization, means to presuppose the ideology as assumed, means to believe that the vanguard is already won for the Communism, and, therefore, it means to deny the necessity of the first stage of the Revolution. Then, if it is not necessary a period in which the ideology conquers the vanguard, because it pre-exists as revolutionary vanguard (with the communist ideology), the liquidation of the communist movement is only seen as the organizational dispersion of its members, not as the liquidation of the ideological and political ideology of the communist parties; and because the real revolutionary ideology survives in the minds of the dispersed communists, the CP can be reconstituted through a new constituent act. The ideology, then, stops being the agent element of the Reconstitution of the CP and allows the entrance to the voluntarism of those wise people, trustees of the revolutionary truth.

Second. From the previous we can deduce that, if the vanguard, understood as the group of individuals who auto proclaim themselves as Marxist-leninist, can reconstitute the CP through its organization simply as a political party, the solution of the problem of the integration of the vanguard in the class is set apart, and, therefore, also the question of its link with the masses of the class, the question of the vanguard's mass line with the rest of the class. The vanguard –the CP understood as the unity of the vanguard or exclusively as the organization of the vanguard-, then, applies and can only apply a conspiring political line, and not a mass line. It is a conspiring political line in the sense of acting from outside the class. And if the vanguard acts this way in the first stage, if it does not take the masses into account in any way, we have no reasons to think that it will do the contrary in the second stage, which undoubtedly will end in parliamentarism or terrorism. The application of a conspiring line instead of a mass line in order to fulfill the tasks and the stages of the Revolution can begin honestly with conspiring in favor of the class, but in the long term it will end, undoubtedly, in conspiring against the class.

## *Vanguard and masses*

As we have seen, the problem of the link or unity between the vanguard and the masses of the class - which is, in essence, the problem of the Reconstitution of the Communist Party - can not be solved presupposing the vanguard. Until this moment, we have done so because it was necessary in order to define the qualitative change of the proletarian movement once fulfilled its formation as a social class and as a political party, and to explain the new conditions in which the unity Party-Class develops; it was necessary because it had to do with making an attempt of defining the movement of the class towards the Communism, which implied that we had to begin with an existing vanguard. However, we made clear the point when we set the condition of the vanguard being part of the class, and that this fact configured the CP and, in consequence, set the historical conditions for the revolutionary movement of the Class towards the Communism.

From the political point of view, we have defined the CP as a unity between the vanguard and the masses, as its link; and this link, as it is the concrete expression of the relation of unity between those two elements, shall become the fundamental part of the CP. This is not, therefore, only the organized vanguard, because the relation between the vanguard and the masses includes different balances, different forms of unity, depending on the different stages of the Revolution and depending on the tasks that each of them demand. *The vanguard*, therefore, *organizes in order to fulfill those political tasks*, from where we deduce that the organization is not the fundamental thing here, but the politics. And if the first political task of the Revolution is the Reconstitution of the CP, how does the vanguard organize itself to fulfill that task? Which is the content of that task? Which is the mass line that will let the vanguard be linked to the masses, and doing so, making the qualitative leap to reach the CP?

To be able to answer this, we must define the vanguard and its defining elements in each moment; and the same goes for the concept of masses. In this sense, there are two clearly differentiated phases: when the CP exists and when it is not yet constituted. There is not need on mentioning that, when the CP exists, it is the vanguard. The problem arises when the CP does not exist.

Our start point must be the ideology, but not as something previously defined, but as something that must be formulated and assumed before it is taken to the great number of masses of the class. The proletarian ideology, no doubt, is something that exists and, at the same time, something that is in permanent development. We can not start by thinking that the ideology is already developed at its most extent, and even less nowadays, in a moment of recoil in the World Proletarian Revolution; nor can we start by thinking that the ideology is already defined, because we have not evaluated its achievements in that first world revolutionary wave. It would be absurd trying to face the present tasks of the Revolution only from the Marxism, i.e. with the experience of the revolutionary proletariat until the 90s of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; it also would be absurd not taking into account the contributions to the Marxism-leninism brought mainly from the building of socialism in the USSR and China, as well as the teachings from the class

struggle in socialism and the struggle between two lines within the communist parties which led States with Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

The ideology is something objective: it is there in form of a set of synthesized or yet to synthesize experiences in a theoretical way. Without this previous synthesis the Reconstitution can not be tackled, because then, the ideology would not be the one directing it, but diverse interpretations of the ideology, more or less biased, or the ideology conceived in an incomplete way, which means that the fulfilling of the requirements of the Revolution would not be met.

Having said that, who plays the role of "vanguard" and who, as a counterpart, plays the role of "masses" in the stage of the Reconstitution?; if the relation vanguard-masses defines the CP in its development, which is the nature of this relation in the stage of its formation?

The vanguard, in the first moment, exists splitted in two poles: On one side, the most advanced and conscious members within the masses of the class, who only stand out because lead or are at the head of their economic struggles and because they are conscious of the antagonic nature of these struggles; that is to say, they do not have yet a revolutionary conscience, but they stand out from the opportunism and reconciliationism because they prove to have a consistent class conscience. On the other side, there is the opposite pole: the ones who understand the necessity of providing the class with its revolutionary ideology, who organize themselves to study and assume it, and at the same time, apply it, as they keep conceiving it, among the masses

These two opposite poles determine the nature of the vanguard-masses contradiction in the stage of the Reconstitution. In this phase, the revolutionary politics is limited exclusively to the most advanced sector of the masses, so that, following the principle which says that the ideology must be at the head of the process, the sector which sets it as the guide plays the role of vanguard at this stage, while the other, which acts as the spontaneous leader, as the loyal representant of the class "as itself", faces the first as masses. The question here is that this advanced sector, with conscience of class, but without revolutionary conscience, has to transform its ideology and has to be won for the Communism. The CP arises from the synthesis with the other advanced sector. Then a new stage will appear, in which the ideology will have to win the big masses of the class to conquest the power and found the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. In this new stage, the vanguard is the CP as a political organization and the masses are the rest of the class. The relation vanguard-masses will change, therefore, its nature, as will also do the mass line to be applied by the vanguard, adopting the form of Proletarian Unique Front.



In the stage of Reconstitution, the masses are not, in short, the majority of the class, their most extensive and deep sectors, but their most advanced sector, for it is the exponent of the class struggle against the bourgeoisie, the struggle which the class develops as a class. In order to reconstitute the Party, the ideology, through the ones who bear it -in this case, the ones who act as vanguard- must make the masses undergo a shift in their state of consciousness. This way, the synthesis in CP is achieved, for, in one hand, the ideological vanguard becomes part of the class -and, therefore, the revolutionary ideology becomes a constituent part of the class-, and in the other hand, the most advanced sector of the masses turns its consciousness into a revolutionary one.

The mass line of the revolutionary politics in the stage of the Reconstitution consists of focusing in that sector of the proletariat to "attract it for the Communism" and in organizing the form of making the way towards it and conquering it. The mass line for the Reconstitution implies that the ideological vanguard must know how to link to the rest of the vanguard in order to create the CP.

### ***The mass line for the Reconstitution of the CP***

The start point is the vanguard, as we have defined it here in the first stage of the Revolution, or stage of Reconstitution. Its first duty -as long as it is what defines itself as vanguard in the first moment- is the one of defend and bear the ideology. In this sense, as we have mentioned, the ideology must be apprehended in all its developments; but it must also be understood that it is not another world conception, but the most advanced world view, for it does not try to "interpret the world" in a new way, but to transform it. The ideological vanguard, then, must keep learning the principles of the ideology -otherwise, it would not make any difference with the most advanced masses of the class, and the vanguard itself would turn into mass-, but it also must keep joining these principles with the target of the revolutionary ideology, must keep translating the ideological principles into a revolutionary ***Political Line***, must know to apply the premises and targets of the revolutionary practice to the practical reality of the Revolution, must know to give response to the particular tasks and practices imposed by the Revolution, must know to find the adequate strategy and tactics to reach those targets, must know to gauge the state of the necessary premises, etc.

The political Line is the "first step for the practice" of the ideology and, in this sense, it is the first big element of the mass line of the politics of the vanguard, because it turns the real conditions in which the masses of the class generally are into a political-revolutionary discourse. If the member of the vanguard, when being trained and educated in the ideology, is trained as a propagandist and, as Lenin said, as a "popular tribune" to defend it, being this the base or embryo of every future politics for the masses (mass line), the Line is the first step forward for the mass line of the politics of the vanguard, for it is the best means through which the vanguard can reach the

advanced masses, who can see that, really, the Communism shows the deep roots of the problems which they worry about and gives a solution for them.

But it is not yet enough. The experience of the International Communist Movement shows that to proclaim a fair politics does not suffice; it is required to be understood by the masses. In order to do so, the political Line must be translated into a **Program**, containing not only the general explanation and solution for the burning problems of the masses, but also the method and way to solve them through the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Socialism.

This presupposes that the vanguard has melt with the masses of the class in such a point, that it has managed to translate their immediate claims into revolutionary claims. At this moment, the revolutionary mass line reaches its maximum development in the Reconstitution; at this moment, the Reconstitution itself culminates.

The form adopted by the Line and the Program is the one of political Thesis; but this is only its form. Its content is the mass line applied and developed by the vanguard as the fundamental unity element with the masses. In fact, the Line and the Program express two different stages in the development of the political mass line. The Line shows the first approach of the ideology to the state of the masses of the class, its diffusion as propaganda, its first contact with the advanced masses. The Program, on the other hand, means the assimilation of the Line by certain sectors of these advanced masses; it means the agitation, through them and within the big masses, directed by the vanguard; that is to say, the daily work, side by side, of the vanguard within the masses in order to finally attract its most advanced sector and translate the revolutionary ideology and politics to the needs of the masses.

The fusion of the vanguard, understood and organized as the ideological vanguard, with the advanced masses of the class, is translated into the CP, i.e. into an organized, revolutionary movement with capacity of influencing the big masses of the class. At this point, it is open the possibility of having the whole or the majority of the masses organized in a revolutionary way and with their Party. It has come the moment of opening a new stage in the Revolution.

The Program means the culmination of the Reconstitution because, with it, the ideology is linked to the masses in the most tight and concrete way, and because, in order to achieve it, the vanguard has had to find a language through which express the immediate claims of the masses; the vanguard has had to create solid links with them and organize these links; the vanguard has had to, in short, create the CP.

The CP, reconstituted this way, exists as a unity between the vanguard and the masses of the class through the CP Program, at the political level, and as a multitude of organisms that serve as the means of transmission of the vanguard towards the masses, at the organizative level. The CP, reconstituted this way, exists as an organization able to address the masses and lead them, and, therefore, as their real vanguard. Then, the CP can undertake the task of taking the whole class towards the Communism, and can face, with safety in its success, the difficulties and obstacles that will hinder this tortuous, but necessary and unavoidable way.

## *The Thesis of Reconstitution of the CP*

The Thesis of Reconstitution of the CP is the political answer of the revolutionary proletariat to the problem of the creation, or recovery, of the main revolutionary instrument of the worker class in the Spanish State; This answer consists of solving, theoretically and politically, the nature of the objective conditions - ideological, political and organizative - that may allow the existence of that party instrument. It does not have to do, therefore, with the "objective conditions" of the Revolution in its most narrow sense, that is to say, the Revolution understood as the conquer of power by the proletariat and the preparation of that conquest; it has to do with the carrying out of the most important "subjective condition" of the Revolution understood in its superior form, when the masses achieve and hold the power, i.e. the carrying out of the existence of the CP as the main "subjective" factor of that Revolution.

In short, the Thesis of Reconstitution is part of the revolutionary process as a historical and general process, but, at the same time, it dissociate itself from the process, for the Thesis centers in one stage of it - the first stage - and solves the political tasks of that particular stage of the Revolution. It has to do, to sum up, with creating the "subjective factor" of the Revolution, understanding that this implies to study and solve objective problems -not only ideological, but also political and organizative problems- and understanding that this task already belongs to the general process of the Revolution - in its widest sense, i.e., comprehending that the Revolution is every process that begins with the task of constituting the CP and only ends with Communism-.

In the first place, therefore, the Thesis of Reconstitution is about the minimum objective *requisites* that are to achieve in order to consider that the existence of the CP is fulfilled. Until now we have expounded the nature of these requisites.

In second place, the Thesis of Reconstitution is about the concrete political *conditions* that serve as a context for those requisites, which have to be fulfilled within those conditions. This means that the formulation of the Thesis of Reconstitution does not refer to the universal and absolute principles of the marxism-leninism about the Party; The Thesis tries to, starting from them, apply those principles to the historical and political concrete conditions of a given country and time. Because of that, the Thesis of Reconstitution must explore, first of all, the current state of the World Proletarian Revolution and the stage of the Revolution in which that country is as a component of that World Revolution, for it is about describing the concrete political context, at least in its general trends, in which the tasks of the Reconstitution must be established and fulfilled depending on that national and international context.

In this sense, it is essential to mention that the World Proletarian Revolution is in a phase of circumstantial recoil, due to the end of the revolutionary cycle opened by the October Revolution and the counteroffensive started by the imperialism, taking advantage from this circumstance. The first cycle of the World Proletarian Revolution starts in 1917, with the soviet revolution in Russia. This happened after the previous stage of preparation, which begins in 1848 with the publication of the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels, and the role played by the French proletariat in the bourgeoisie revolution in that same year; that role is deeply important, because, for the first time in history, the worker class acts politically in an independent way. The World Proletarian Revolution takes an ascendant way with the beginning of the construction of Socialism in the USSR in the 30's decade, and the victory over fascism and the triumph of the Chinese CP in the 40s; it becomes slower between 1956 and 1976, when the USSR, with Khrushchev, becomes part of Imperialism, which is relatively compensated by a new, but brief and localized, proletarian offensive in the Chinese Cultural Revolution. Finally, the triumph of Den Xiaoping in China, and the consolidation of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in the USSR and its revisionist influence in most of the Communist Parties of the world, indicated the descending trend and the fall or critical phase of that first revolutionary cycle from the second half of the 70s. The reestructurations that, at every level, have taken place in the 80s and beginnings of the 90s in the so-called "socialist field", do not express nothing but the final point of the cycle.

The triumph of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat in the socialist countries has had its projection all over the world in the form of a new offensive of the capital, an offensive which is shown by the fact that a new distribution of the world has begun, which is creating the conditions for a new imperialist war, in one hand, and by the progressive loss of rights and conquests of the workers in almost every country, in the other hand.

The Spanish State is one of those countries. Carrillo's party, which was stripped of every revolutionary content, wasted away all the chances of a revolutionary means in the so-called "democratic transition"; but, unlike the capitulating positions of the party

which said to represent the workers, these conquered in the streets certain concessions to a bourgeoisie that knew that it had won the main battle and was willing to give in some scraps while it centered in drawing the master lines of the new political structure of its domination, on the condition that the worker class did not try to interfere in this new design. In that design, however, it was defined a structure of classist representation for the bourgeoisie. The trade unions and the worker parties had to act as the means of transmission of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Then, when the bourgeoisie had consolidated a new State and when the proletarian revolutionary cycle ended definitely at world level, the Spanish bourgeoisie joined the offensive of the international capital against the worker class, using the legal means of its Constitution, mainly the tradeunionist structures in force. The proletariat of the Spanish State, without a party, sold its political capacity, its right to take part as an independent class, for scraps, for partial economical and social improvements. Now, under new circumstances, the bourgeoisie, through the trade unions and the political legalism of the "left parties", denies the proletariat even the right to those scraps. The industrial restructurings, the liberalization of the job market, the policies of economical adjustments that freeze the wages, are clear signs of the impunity achieved by the bourgeoisie in its supremacy over the proletariat, with its "right" to exploit and oppress the worker class.

The proletariat of the Spanish State is, therefore, on the defensive, and the worker movement in recoil. This is the background which the communists in the Spanish State have to work with, in order to tackle the most burning question of our Revolution, the question of the recovery of the Spanish Communist Party; and that background is the one which determines, in the first place, the conditions and, therefore, the nature, of that process of recovery of our vanguard party.

The International Communist Movement, as a practical reality, is born with the October Revolution, with the foundation of communist parties all over the world. The foundation of these parties, which was sponsored by the CI and the Bolshevik Party, represents one of the models of party building given by history. The other model, mainly, is, precisely, the one of the Bolshevik party. About this last model, if we compare the situation of the class struggle and the worker movement in Russia at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century with the one of the Spanish State nowadays, we can check that they are essentially different. If nowadays we see a recoil and a defensive attitude in the worker class, in Russia the worker movement was rising and the proletariat adopted a more and more offensive position each and every year. This forced Lenin and his supporters to use the tactics of the unity of action with all the marxists in order to create the proletarian party. And not only unity of political action, but even unity of organic action. No doubt, to maintain dogmatic attitudes would have been a political suicide, which would have only ended in isolationism, and would have allowed the movement to overcome the proletarian vanguard.

The specific necessities of the proletarian movement in Russia were another of the peculiarities of the RSDLP foundation that explain the tactic of constitution of the Russian vanguard proletarian organization. We have already seen that one of the first tasks that must be tackled and fulfilled by the proletariat is the one of becoming a class through the unity of all its struggles at the national level, and we've also seen that the organic form which adopts the foundation as a class is shown by the national trade unions or the worker parties. In Russia, at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, this task was not yet fulfilled, which implied that, because the development of capitalism at world level and particularly in Russia had reached its monopolist or imperialist stage - a stage that demands the organization of the revolutionary party of the proletarian vanguard - the foundation tasks of the Russian worker party are interconnected in a peculiar and original way with the ones of the foundation of this vanguard party. This also explains the richness of the debates within the Russian marxist movement of that time, the nature of two-line struggle inside the movement, and also the fact of Russia being the native land of the development of marxism, the native land of leninism, because in this country the revolutionary theory found the spot of the Revolution and found the answers to its future development. However, this also explains, to a great extent, the tactic adopted by the revolutionary vanguard to found the party of a new type, a tactic which remained on the unity of action of the marxists to create the worker party as the base to found the vanguard party. This experience, on the other hand, was subsequently translated to the rest of the countries for the foundation of the Communist Parties in form of a split of the worker parties' left wing as the first step for their foundation.

All this explains *the form* which adopted the foundation of the Bolshevik Party. But, this way, it is necessary to get to the bottom, to *the essence* of the process. That is why we consider that the correct is to understand the essence of the Party foundation process and to find the appropriate political form for the concrete conditions in which the vanguard moves; that is why we consider that the historical ways can not be copied without taking into account the context in which those were given and without paying any attention to its real political background, exactly as the ones proclaiming the "communist unity" or the ones for the thesis of reconstruction of the CP do; that is why we consider that the future political party of a new type of the proletariat in the Spanish State can only be achieved by tackling the problem that poses its recovery in terms of Reconstitution, because the Thesis of Reconstitution pays attention, primarily, to the nature of the creation process of the Party, to the political essence of that process, and after that, looks for the way of politically shaping that process depending on the concrete objective conditions.

The Reconstitution of the SCP, therefore, can not be achieved by following, one by one, the steps given by the Bolsheviks; nor can it be achieved by following the model of the first foundation of the SCP, in 1920. In that year, every worker could clearly see the failure of the social democracy, the soviet Revolution had succeeded and the world proletarian movement had created the Communist International. That is to say, the World Proletarian Revolution started an ascendant movement. This, along with the maturity of the proletariat in the Spanish State, which had been shaped as a class

during half a century of struggles, allowed the CP to be created through a split and a constituent act or congress. But nowadays, neither the World Proletarian Revolution is in an offensive act, as it was above stated, nor is there a CI that can sponsor, endorse or guide a SCP that could be founded in a "unity of all the marxist-leninists" congress.

In general terms, the vision of the recovery of the CP from the perspective of the "unity of the communists" or the Party "Reconstruction" is a dogmatic one, for it only takes into account the form of the historical models of foundation, without paying attention to its requisites or the external political conditions which permitted those experiences. This dogmatic vision is a product of the mechanical extrapolation, without any criticism, of the 3rd International thesis and their application, outside any time and place, to any political situation and independently from any historical circumstance. The thesis of the CI related to the party foundation are the synthesis of the Soviet Revolution experience and, though they are pretty much general laws, they also contribute a lot from the elements related to a time, elements that we can not introduce in those laws, which can not prevent us from being able to penetrate the essence of the processes of foundation of the Communist Parties in the first half of the century, independently from the historical circumstances surrounding them, in order to apply, coherently and correctly, those laws to the conditions in which the class struggle of the proletariat is currently developing.

It is about overcoming a static and absolute conception about the organization of the Party and understanding that its development is a permanent process, a process both for its Constitution or Reconstitution and for its subsequent edification once reconstituted; it also deals with the fact that the Party is not created from an intellectual construction predefined: it is the organization of the vanguard for the fulfilling of the political tasks that the Revolution demands in its different stages, following the general ideological principles that the marxism-leninism has established for the creation of the proletarian party of a new type.

If we pay attention to what we have stated so far, and we compare it with the plans of those who reject the Thesis of Reconstitution, we can not only check that they do not understand it, but also that they are guided by models and methods of party foundation that correspond to conditions of national and international class struggles that are not the current ones, and, therefore, they deny themselves the opportunity of understanding the meaning of the Reconstitution. For example - and this is deeply important -, they presuppose the ideological guide. They do not realize that, in 1920, the CI played the role of the organic trustee of the ideology and political orientation, and that meant that the foundation of the national parties didn't have to demand this requisite at the local level as a sine qua non condition, for its relative absence could be replaced by the CI. They do not see either that, in 1903, when the first revolutionary marxist party was created, the question of the ideology and the political maturity was relatively guaranteed by 10 years of political experience of the Russian marxists and by the deep knowledge of the doctrine by the founders of the RSDLP; most of them were eminent

intellectuals who had spent many years of their lives studying the works by Marx and Engels. They do not see, therefore, that a marxist-leninist party can not be created without the base of the marxist-leninist ideology; they do not see that, nowadays, there is not any acknowledged trustee of this theory that can endorse the creation of Communist Parties. They do not either see that the current revolutionary vanguard is composed of workers that, although are sincerely determined communists, have not acquired, on the whole, a deep knowledge of the scientific theory of socialism, and most of them have not updated the latest developments of that theory after the Lenin and Stalin times. The CP must be founded from the ideology and, in order to do so, the ideology must guide our whole work of Reconstitution. Presuppose that the marxism-leninism is defined to its most extents does not suffice, as those who talk about "unity" or "reconstruction" do, because, at the present, there is not any clear ideological-political reference that could be used the same way the Russian marxists at the beginning of the 20th century or the communists in the Spanish State in 1920 did. Therefore, the first requisite for the Reconstitution, in the current conditions of the international and national class struggle, consists of recovering and reassuming the revolutionary ideology, formulating and defining it once again up to the full synthesizing of all its progresses. We must emulate the Bolsheviks and the fathers of the Communism of the Spanish State and fulfill the same requisites which permitted them to initiate the way of the international and national communist movement, but we can not copy the forms in a mechanical way, only its deep meaning and its real revolutionary spirit.

On the other side, the frame of mind of the masses - from the end of the 19th century in Russia, and from 1918 in almost the whole Europe, as a consequence of the October Revolution and the social crisis caused by the war -, which was in commotion and in a rising agitation, created a suitable breeding ground for the mass work of the vanguard, what made the vanguard able to give the masses a not necessarily very elaborated program (most of the time basic political thesis) and address them in an agitative way with the hope of obtaining results. Nowadays, on the contrary, the symbiosis between the communist program and the masses can not be done in a so direct way, for the frame of mind of the masses is not so inclined to the revolutionary agitation; quite the contrary, they are more inclined to prostration and calm and a horrifying conservatism. The communist program, in these conditions, must work immediately, must get ahead, step by step, approaching first the most advanced elements of the masses, and, after and through them, the rest of the class. Those who believe that the foundation consists only of a willing act of organization and, once done so, the masses will have their heart and understanding fully open to the direction and the program of the communist vanguard, are making the serious mistake of not understanding what is all about: activate the revolutionary movement that, some decades ago, was almost presupposed to be able to follow the action of the vanguard; they are making the mistake of not seeing that this movement is the product and can only be the product of a mass program of the vanguard (mass line) and that this movement can only be understood as CP, as the previous condition to its *transmission* to the rest of the class (Proletarian Revolution)



In short, the social and political reality does not offer to the Reconstitution of the CP the same conditions as at the beginning of the century, but it demands the fulfilling of the same requisites. The communists must be able to understand these requisites and create the political conditions which may allow the requisites to be carried out. This question can only be tackled from the point of view of the *Thesis of Reconstitution*.