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Presentation

To the labourers, peasantry and workers of the service sector
To the unemployed and informal workers
To the migrant workers in all the regions of the world
To the indigenous peoples, nationalities, ethnicities and oppressed minorities
To the youth and to the working women

Introduction

In June 1926, the publishing in France of a document named "Organisational Platform of the Libertarian Communists" (signed by the group of Russian exiles Dielo Trouda), caused a deep impact and discomfort between anarcho-communists, anarcho-syndicalists and individualists, mostly in Europe.

Among those who signed the document was the peasant Nestor Makhno, main leader of the Ukrainian Irsungent Army, and Piotr Arshinov, a workman and guerrilla, both veteran of the Russian revolution and civil war (1917-1921). The document summoned the reorganization of the revolutionary anarchism, the ideological struggle against the disorganizing individualism and creation of an international anarchist organization.
Errico Malatesta, one of the main anarcho-communists of the time, declared himself clearly and categorically against the presuppositions established by the Platform: "Their organisation, being typically authoritarian, far from helping to bring about the victory of anarchist communism, to which they aspire, could only falsify the anarchist spirit and lead to consequences that go against their intentions." Voline, a Russian anarcho-communist exile in French wrote the following: "To conclude, the only original point in the Platform is its revisionism toward the Bolshevism, hidden by the authors..."

The Organisational Platform was a document that pointed out to three fundamental tasks: the development of an anarchist theory as basis of the international organization; the greater precision of the strategy and overall program to the socialist revolution from the criticism of the experience of bureaucratic degeneration of the Russian revolution of 1917; the critique of the function that the anarchists had played in the masses movement and the presentation of a revolutionary line of action.

Those tasks posed by the authors of the Organisational Platform were not performed. And in that lies in large part the reasons of the historical decline of anarchism, that as Makhno and Arshinov pointed out, would remain marginal in relation to the struggle of the peasants and workmen masses if not faced such tasks.

The platform also had its limitations. The reaction of the anarcho-communists, individualists and anarcho-syndicalists denounced the Platformists as something "foreign to anarchism". The platformists were accused of "deviating from the anarchism", of treading a dangerous border with the "Bolshevism" and with the "authoritarian" ideologies.

However, the Platformists, contrary to what their critics affirmed, were not "breaking" with the "anarchism in general". But with the revisionism (represented by the self-proclaimed "currents"). The platformists also thought that were creating a new proposal. Actually, they were just recovering, partly, the Bakuninist conception that originates from the First International, disowned by the anarcho-communism of Errico Malatesta and Piotr Kropotkin, and by the anarcho-syndicalism and its theorists as Rudolf Rocker.
The Organisational Platform was refused because it contains within a movement toward what the anarcho-communists, individualists and anarcho-syndicalists had denied: the Bakuninism. But the Platform only defined the tasks. Its authors did not have the historical conditions to perform them. They showed that it would be needed to build an international anarchist organization. That it should have theoretical unity, tactical unity, collective responsibility and federalism. But they, by force majeure, left that task incomplete.

The earlier experience of criticism and the heroic efforts of individuals and small groups who have made partial criticisms and reflections that precede the analysis presented here must be recognized. The platformist critique in the 1920s in Europe; the criticisms of small groups of "Bakuninists" in Brazil and the defense even confused of Makhnovshchina in Brazil by José Oiticica; the criticism and opposition of the group Antorcha to the capitulation of the anarcho-communists led by Santillan in Argentina. Also in the 1930s the criticism to the degeneration of the anarcho-syndicalism and Spanish communism by Makhno, Jaime Balius and Los Amigos de Durruti. The criticisms of Georges Fontenis in the 1950s and of the historical FAU in the 1960s are fundamental. But it also must be recognized that all these critiques were partial and incomplete. They has failed to be consolidated, because did not tread toward the Bakuninism.

This document intends exactly to assume responsibility of performing the tasks outlined by the Organisational Platform and the others comrades. To continue from where they paused: advancing to the unique possible direction to the platformism, the Bakuninism. In that sense, it tries to present the structural features of the anarchist theory – the Bakuninism – and summon the reconstruction of the Bakuninist international organization and of the workers international organization. That task is today central.

The degeneration of the national liberation and socialists revolutions, the integration of the trade unions of social-democratic and anarcho-syndicalist guidance within the capitalist system show that the proletariat has been taken to successive and very grave historical defeats. The anarcho-communists and anarcho-syndicalists capitulation is also an important feature of this history. It was in large part the result of the theoretical mistakes, of the empirism and opportunism which marked the formation of political organizations and organizations of workers' struggle.
So, here we intend to summon the construction of an international anarchist network (IAN) and of an internationalist-classist trend (ICT). These forms of organization aim to start the process of reconstruction of the Alliance and the IWA. But to outline more concretely the features of this political and mass organization is needed, before anything else, a presentation of the content of the Bakuninism and a deep criticism of the theory that was leader of the workers's struggle in the last century: the Marxism. One needs also a serious critique of the experiences of struggle of the workers and about how the deviations of theory were determinative to the workers' defeats.

The platform of organization of the revolutionary anarchism here presented intends to determine the theoretical and programmatic basis of such international construction. The first part of the document is an historical and theoretical criticism of the different theories and experiences of organization and struggle of the workers. The second part is an application of the Bakuninist conception of theory and revolution to the current stage of capitalist development. From that, we present a proposal of organization of the revolutionaries and workers to the struggle for the socialism.

The individuals and groups who wish to discuss the accession to this platform of construction of sections of the IAN and ICT in their countries must write to get engaged and develop the said process: the additional and detailed guidance shall be passed by the Construction Comission.

UNIPA – Brazil

OPAR – Mexico

May 1st, 2011.

1 – The theoretical and ideological struggle: general critique of the statist revolutionary conceptions and of revisionism of anarchism

1.1 Historical and universal foundations of Bakuninism

In the second half of the nineteenth century the proletariat creates the first organic expression of the international struggle for emancipation: the International Workingmen's Association (IWA), founded in 1864. In its bosom different currents that aimed the social emancipation of the proletariat were gathered. Is in this context that our current arose, founded by the thought and the practice of the Russian revolutionary Bakunin.

The Bakunin's thought is marked by the materialist method of analysis of the natural and social world, able to produce a critical analysis of the society and guide a revolutionary practice. Taking all the involved factors in the determination of the social life in order to completely destroy the bourgeois society and emancipate the entire humankind in a great process of social transformation, is constituted as one of the main philosofical worldview of the interpretation of reality that the proletariat has used and uses in its struggle for liberation.

The prevalent materialism in the thought of the revolutionaries of the nineteenth century is in direct opposition to the bourgeoisie idealism, continuing the existent antagonism in the social classes engendered by the capital in the fiel of the ideology. While the bourgeoisie seeks to disguise its class domination per religious ideas, the metaphysics and the general idealist thought, the proletariat, per its intelectuals and revolutionary thinkers, proclaim the materialist method of analysis of reality, considering the concrete relations, circumscribed and determinated material conditions of existence in time and space. The proletariat proclaims the end of the absolute and definitively molded systems, in opposition, proclaims a dialectical system that implies in the systematic knowledge of the natural and
social world in its entirety, perfectible in every moment, always subject to relentless criticisms and corrections based on the collective experience of humankind.

The proletarian materialism is in opposition to the bourgeois conception of the right of value and profit, considering the said right as an hypocritical argument of the capitalists to exploit the work of the collective forces of humankind. In opposition it proclaims that the single source of value is the collective work of humankind; proclaims the superiority of the collective work over the individual; proclaims its opposition to the individual payment under the capitalist form of salary, that only allows the reproduction of the proletarian lineage to continue the bourgeois exploitation; proclaims that uniquely under the socialization of the means of production is that the workers shall have dominion over their own activities and shall have access to product of their work.

The proletariat takes as its task to solve the contradictions between the collective production of wealth, social assets, and the exploitation ideally expressed on the right of profit that is foundation and result of the capitalist society, through a process of integral social revolution, beginning the action of extermination and abolition not only of the right of profit and exploitation, but also of the private property and State, that constitute the material foundations of the division of classes in society.

Inherited from generation to generation, the right to exploit the work of the working majority per an oppressor minority, is constituted as the ideological foundation of the class societies that justify the existence of private property and State, material basis of the domination of humankind the humankind, establishing a dialectical relation between the material domain and the ideal right that engenders an increasing misery and inequality to the broad working masses.

In the proletariat's bosom, the different currents, that converge in defense of the human emancipation as historical and universal goal, do not converge with regard to the means and the methods whereby the proletariat shall emancipate itself. Whereas the different currents committed the misjudgement of extrapolating the universal-historical tasks of the bourgeoisie to the proletariat, Bakunin, continuing the right criticisms of J. P.
Proudhon to the statism, points out that proletariat's historical task not only is not to imitate the bourgeoisie in the seizure of State to the development of Socialism, as demonstrates that the essential condition in order that the humankind emancipates itself from the government of the men upon the men is precisely the abolition, the revolutionary destruction of the States and their substitution per a great Universal Confederation of free men and international associations of workers that coordinate the production.

The main theoretical and political contribution of the Bakuninism as phenomenon of organization, was the understanding of the statism's place in history and the centrality of the problem of exploitation of the collective forces by capitalism in the modern society. The root of the Bakunin's conception is in the understanding of the interrelation between the evolution of statism and the aggravation of subordination of the collective forces.

The private property and the State are the bases on which the class societies raise up. The proletariat, being the historical class called to bury the exploitation, affirms that to transform the society, to advance from the kingdom of need to the kingdom of freedom it is mistaken to make use of programs and creations of other large scale social transformations and of other historical-universal tasks.

The Bakuninist concept of statism designates, in turn, a process: the extension of the State, and the emergence of a "reason of State" and of diverse doctrines of its legitimation (theory of the divine right of kings, contractualism, nationalism). The concept of statism assumes a historical analysis in which the Modern State precedes que capitalism formation, and the seizure of this State by bourgeoisie consolidates the capitalist economic change of the feudal society. On the other hand and dialectically, this Modern State arisen from the Protestant Reformation, State emancipated from Church and that subordinated it, was conditioned by economical and social changes, as the transformations of feudalism, the commercial expansion, that preceded and made possible the religious reform.

Considering the existent dialectic among the concrete social relationships, the State, while juridical and political stucture is the product of unequal relations between the classes, and also produces and reproduces unequal social relations. Thus, the State has an important structuring
dynamics responsible for production and reproduction of new relations of exploitation and oppression.

The dialectic between centralization/monopoly is consequence and expression of the bourgeois character of Modern State, which is not a mere phenomenon of the development of capitalist production, on the contrary, constitutes in an intrinsic condition and, indeed, in a fundamental political and economical agent for the emergence, expansion and consolidation of the capitalism around the world still these days.

Transformed by the bourgeois character, the capitalist State, its economy and the very international system of States, develops in an implacable competition for the hegemony, for the same supremacy that will always take the most vast State to control territories, seas, air and people. The centralization of powers in the State will also bring in the system of States to a centralization of bigger powers in the bigger States, that then will take the form of Empires, concept on which rests the true nature of the States that are military and geopolitical powers in certain historical moment.

This is the mistaken of extrapolating the historical-universal tasks of a class to another precisely when the last has as supreme goal the abolition of the class societies. The Bakuninism finds out and formulates this principle and constitutes it as its component element, from which we can infer the other principles and theories related to the proletariat emancipation all that is relative to the tactic and political revolutionaries.

1.2 Position of anarchists faced to Marx and Engels' thought

The proletariat brings, in its bosom, various thinkers that are constituted as its intellectual fractions. Independent of the political current which they defended, every honest revolutionary socialist must recognize to the authors their ideological contributions to the proletariat, must close ranks against the capitalist attacks on that authors and admit the critical-correction of the mistakes of these intellectuals as part of our internal tasks,
as part of the socialist movement of the worldwide proletariat, according to our scientific principles and introducing the respective emendation.

To the revolutionary anarchists, Karl Marx and Friederich Engels provided to the proletariat 2 discoveries worthy of being recognized:

a) The historical materialism, that allows the interpretation of history as a dialectical process of production-reproduction of social life based on the material life, formed per a reciprocal relationship between the manifestations of the intellectual, cultural, social and economical life of the human society.

b) The theory of surplus value, that unveils and demonstrates the process of capitalist accumulation based on the exploitation and oppression of the working masses.

To the anarchists, the materialism is a scientific method that can be applied to solve the distinct tasks that the revolution require. Every revolutionary proletarian must recognize the correct and current of materialism if considers since its important contributions to the scientific method to the observation, to the analysis and the solving of the tasks of the working masses.

Marx and Engels had a correct application of the method that they themselves had discovered and formulated about the analysis and interpretation they performed of the class struggle of the past, about the revolutionary criticism of the capitalist society and the indication of the need of its destruction by the revolutionary proletariat. In a masterly manner, they taught the proletariat the correct way of understanding the past and the immediate reality, formulating, for the first time in history, a theory able to establish a multiform reality, with relation of causality, thus creating the bases to a right critical-practical, we mean, of a concrete political militancy of the exploited and oppressed classes, conscious of the necessity of their emancipation. This is a contribution that no one is able to dispute with Marx and Engels and that shall keep them current until the total triumph over the bourgeois exploitation.

However, they conceived, developed and maintained many mistakes that cost many defeats to the proletariat over the twentieth century, whose consequences we suffer to the present. Although they have been great
thinkers that gave us great lessons on History and Political Economy, they also were authors of predeterminations anti-dialectics of the own method that correctly had formulated relative to the interpretation of the past and the present, presenting mechanical and unidimensional conductions to the new historical-universal tasks of the exploited masses. Grounded, in the field of theory, in a mistake of principle of the application of the Historical Materialism on the proletarian tasks concerning to what to do on the day following the wreck of the bourgeois society, we mean, on the tasks of the post-revolutionary period which are condensed in the theory of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat", maximum tactic of the revolutionary Marxism.

It is convenient to present here the criticism to the two sources of mistake and theoretical-political degeneration of Marxism. The first of them resides in one of the central cores of the historical materialism, it is a theoretical error. The second one resides in the center of the program and strategy, it is a political error. Both errors explain the defeats and degenerations of the Marxists.

In the interpretation of the historical materialism there is a fundamental component that is the idea of "economic's determination" ultimately. That concept reflected a theoretic underestimation both of the State role as of the class struggle itself, so that "the development of the productive forces " in abstract terms was considered thus as fundamental criterion. That primacy of the economic as determinant in the last instance quickly was transformed in a mechanistic pre-determination within the international social democracy.

At the same time that in theory the productive forces were considered "central", underestimating the actions of the classes and of the State, in politicy the State occupied the "central" place. Exactly because in theory the State was only "determined" by the economy (and not dialectically determinant of it), was considered that the State was neutral and that the proletariat could appropriate of it as an instrument (it is as if the techniques and tools were neutral, and the bourgeoisie and the proletariat could use any tools) to make progressive reforms and even revolutions.

The theory of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is constituted as an anti-historical and anti-dialectical extrapolation of the bourgeois program of
the pre-capitalist period to the proletarian program of the capitalist period, as a transposition of the historical tasks of the bourgeoisie in its struggle for its emancipation from feudalism to the historical tasks of the proletariat in struggle for the integral human emancipation and its own annihilation as exploited class. It is a tactical and strategical contraband of a collective experience from a class to another one.

Observing the struggle of the bourgeoisie to implant the capitalist system of production, Marx rightly deduced the necessary conditions to implant any dominion of a class, which will evolve to the degree of being conformed in the general theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, even if after he has overlooked to approach what that dominion implicates for the classes in power and if them could be sustained without corrupting and turgidating. Still in the bosom of the feudal society capitalism developed its forces which culminated in the supremacy of the industrial production over the feudal agriculture, in the new divisions of labor, in the predominance of the town over the countryside, and in the overcoming of all forms of production and reproduction of life known hitherto (the supremacy of the production over consumption). These changes were understood and interpreted in their entirety by the method of historical and dialectical materialism, which deeply impressed Marx and Engels leading them to extrapolate the historical-universal tasks which the bourgeois class had performed to the class that the bourgeoisie itself had created and that was called to bury it: the proletariat; thus, incurring in the mistaken of principle that we spoke above.

Marx extrapolated such tasks to the proletariat based on his interpretations of the course of the bourgeois struggles and which were the required conditions to concretize and establish the class domain; and this one only could effect itself through the seizure of the State (at historical level) by a class, retaining the power in its hands and consolidating its social order, whose maximum and most developed expression we have, in the bourgeois class, the democratic republics inspired at the French model, in which, according to Marx, must unfold the final and decisive confrontation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Moreover, the France regarded by Marx as a model of evolution of the bourgeoisie represented more an exception than a rule: in England, Germany and other countries, the bourgeoisie made a number of
commitments with the Old Regime, incorporating or being incorporated to the old oligarchies as fragments of class inside the new mode of production that expanded.

And this seizure of the State, this conquest-retaining of the Power in the hands of a class (in this case, the proletariat), this principle, assimilated as guiding theoretical axis of all its general and particular applications to each and every areas of struggle of the proletariat, took so large contradictions in its bosom that, led to their ultimate consequences on theoretical field and faced with the historical experience (we mean, with its objective experimental verification) of the last centuries, we have no more than explain them and discard them because it contains the germs of its own annihilation as theoretical-practical method on the modern struggle for human social emancipation that requires (and required since before those german thinker were alive) new and innovator achievements.

In concrete reality, in the revolutionary action field, any consequent theory takes within itself political-practical implications, implications that the theory of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" did not leave having and which we firmly oppose not just because it brings in its bosom the germ of its annihilation as a theory with a minimum internal consistence, but also and mainly due the consequences of its concrete policies and the so poor results it led us regarding the human emancipation, its essential content, its elementar composition, being a embourgeoisement of the political-practical of the revolutionary proletariat, the reinforcement of the statism and the voluntary abandonment of the practical-experimental innovations of the masses in action. If we are the first to recognize the contributions of the Marxist thought, we are also the first to demonstrate the mistakes and begin the corrections faced with historical need of its formulators. We oppose the embourgeoisement of the Historical Materialism that the very Marx and Engels allowed and its conversion into a concealed "idealism".

Therefore, there are limits to the appropriation of the historical materialism of Marx and Engels and the need to interpret its contribution from the critical parameters – of theory and politics – established here. And the Bakuninist conception of the materialism – having many points of
agreement with the historical materialism of Marx, differentiates from this one at several important aspects.

1.3 Differences and contradictions between the statist and antistatist conceptions of Revolution

Between the statist conception of Revolution of Marx and Engels and the antistatist conception of Bakunin, exists an irreconcilable antagonism. Whilst Marx and Engels tolerated and participated in the embourgeoisement of the Historical Materialism, Bakunin incorporated and recognized the materialist method and its philosophical conception of the world. Whilst Marx and Engels mistakenly interpreted the historical-universal tasks of the proletariat based in the extrapolation of the collective experience of the bourgeoisie to the proletariat, admitting the need of the development of capitalism and adopting such need as a political banner, Bakunin founded and developed a theory that strengthened and extended the field of the interpretation of the history and allowed to develop broadly the nature of the historical-universal tasks of the proletariat in its struggle for the destruction of the exploitation relations, founded and developed the theory of the statism.

From the theory of Statism it is possible not merely broaden the interpretation of the history and enlighten the existent relationship between Capital and State on the oppression and exploitation of the working masses in the present time and in the immediate reality of an specific historic situation, as, furthermore, solve the question related to the proletarian historical-universal task, of what to do in the following day of the collapse of the bourgeois society, we mean, it concerns to the tasks of the post-revolutionary period that are condensed in the theory of the “Abolishment of the State”, tactics of the anarchist proletariat.

The contradictions between Bakunin's thought and that of Marx and Engels exceed the field of tactics and raise to general conceptions about the Revolution. Marx and Engels grounded their conceptions on a partial interpretation of the History, performed based just in an analysis of Capital, dropping into a mechanic and scarce economic determinism, do not estimating the State's role, reducing this machinery to a mere instrument that may well
serve both one as the other class to accomplish its historical-universal tasks. And an interpretation of this nature has as result the conception that simply is necessary employ the dominion of class to partially attack, per steps and stages, the bourgeois society, the private property, the family and the Capital, leaving untouched precisely the historic institution in which are founded and produced-reproduced the exploitation and the oppression of the working masses, leaving untouched the State.

The statist conception of the revolution, represented by the general theory of the “Permanent Revolution” defended by the revolutionary Marxism as the historical program of the proletariat, opens indefinities so prejudicial as the almost theory of the “transition period” that hides the reformist embourgeoisement of this conception, leaving for after the resolution of the question of the exploitation of masses, question that an authentic Social Revolution must solve if intends to be as such.

On the other hand, Bakunin demonstrated that contradiction since the days of the IWA, pointing out not just the correct manner of abolishing the State, but also elaborates a whole general theory on the integral character of the Social Revolution. That theory not only incorporates the requirement of the Marxism of destroying the Capital, but also will affirm that one of its conditions and consequences is precisely destroy the State and not just wait for its “extinction”, as consciously fighting for its abolishment.

Bakunin himself had the opportunity to witness a tactical capitulation of Marx when faced with a giant event for the social life, in which not merely was demonstrated the possibility of destroying the Bourgeois State, but also of progressively abolishing the State as a historical institution of the class society and replace it per organisms based in the fundamental principles of Bakunin’s thought, the Federalism and the Socialism, this happening that went down in History as the great Paris Comunne of 1871.

In contrast to the assumptions of the Permanent Revolution, the Integral Revolutions considers as a necessary condition for the destruction of Capitalism the destruction and abolishment of the State; which is not but the gradual decentralization (gradual regarding to the alive process and not to metaphysically defined stages), the replacement of the States per the Universal Confederation of the Freely Associated Workers, with the practical-political prologue of the violent destruction of the Bourgeois State. In no
manner this principle opposes to the necessary economic centralization that the socialism assumes.

The abolishment of the State as first effective step in the achievement of the Socialism, understood as practical principle, explains in the best way question so important as the relationship of the proletariat with the classes, and the beginning of an entirely new process in the history of the humankind in which the revolutionary proletarians of today little or nothing have to imitate the Jacobins of 1789. We have to invent and create everything.

This conception of Revolution only is possible because Bakunin realized that the materialist method cannot be reduced to an unidimensional interpretation of the historical evolution, and since the economic factor is determinant, this factor could only be determinant in a relative way, in contrast, a process of permanent movement: a dialectical relationship in which the politicy is also determinant related to the economy.

This practical questions compose the integralization of the Revolution, that comes from an integralization of the dialectic within the political strategy, that had been denied for the principle mistakes of Marx and Engels, induced by the establishment of an unidimensional scheme of evolution directed to the development of the Capitalism and the extrapolation of the historical-universal tasks of the bourgeoisie to the proletariat.

### 1.4 The revisionism of Anarchism

Since the need of the Socialism, its scientific and emancipator characters and its first practical tasks were consolidated, the bourgeoisie had to recognize it and undertake an ideological contamination struggle. The anarchism was not an exception. After Bakunin's retirement and death, the defeats of the proletariat in France, Spanish, Italy and Russia produced a bewilderment in the revolutionary anarchists of that time. As a consequence of it, many of them began a process of revision on the Bakunin's theories that, with the deficient dissemination and systematization of his thought, resulted in the historical birth of the revisionism, a genuinely bourgeois programmatic deviation of the revolutionary anarchism developed and defended by Bakunin.
The revisionism is a historical product of the bourgeois ideological influence in the lines of the proletarian socialist currents which overrides the individuals and constitutes a real bourgeois offensive in our own ranks. The revisionism acquires various aspects and presents different appearances, nevertheless, in the close its character is the same. The revisionism is nor merely a disagreement of opinions of the classic authors, it is not a "dogmatic whim" of the revolutionary socialist per a disagreement between this or that opinion, it is a revision, a denial of the historical-universal foundations of Socialism, therefore, it concerns a struggle of the proletarian against the bourgeoisie in its own ground, the struggle on the ideological and political independence of the proletariat in its class struggle against the bourgeoisie, a necessary, permanent and ruthless struggle.

The revisionism of the Revolutionary Anarchism assumes from the outset an eclectic character, i.e., that tries to conciliate historical and universal foundations, programs and tactics that are not just contradictory, but also antagonistic, sowing the confusion and desorganization in the ideologic ranks of the proletarians, being that feature a cause and a consequence of its historical disability in directing the proletariat in its struggle against the capitalist exploitation. It arises from an effort to mix the ideas of Bakunin and Marx, precisely in the plan in which they oppose, in the conception of the historical tasks, in the program, in the tactic and in the strategy.

These positions are the seeds of the forms of what we know as "anarcho-syndicalism" "anarcho-communism" that developed in the early 20th century. These revisionist positions constituted, most often in a poorly way made, new theories, hybrid by definition, that are the ideological support of several formless and deprived of a revolutionary perspective practices.

On the other hand, the "anarcho-communism", eclectic trend of a petty-bourgeois character, will deny exactly the contributions of the Marxist thought: the Historical Materialism and the criticism of the bourgeois economy. The main example is found in the thought of Errico Malatesta, who not only depreciates the class struggle in the ground of the ideology, but also, as a petty-bourgeois thinker, believes that the thoughts overrides the class struggle and that we can join any antagonistic thoughts based in the work of the "will". That is why he breaks with the Bakunism in name of the conciliation of the "anarchism" with the "communism".
The fundamental rupture established between the “anarcho-communist” revisionism and the Revolutionary Anarchism on the ground of the theory it its maximum expression in the criterion that the first has to analyse the history and the society which is not the work as basis of the Socialism, that is the materialist way of approaching the question, but in the criterion that not just abandon this programmatic basis as also magisterially buries it with its petty-bourgeois formula: “to each according to his needs”.

These programmatic deviation implies a tactical renounce, semiconsious, of the contradiction between the classes. The supremacy of the need is an affirmation of the supremacy of the individual against the supremacy of the collective forces of the work, that implies an untrue contradiction of anti-dialectical nature that supposes the opposition individual/society, giving birth to a false hostility, instead of solving the contradiction by the socialist way, wherein the existence of one supposes the relation and influence of another and vice versa.

In practice this disdain is expressed in the denial of a political organization of revolutionary anarchists, and of social organisms based in the political decentralization and in the federalism, based in a socialist economic centralization, civilly organized in relation to the rights derived from the work, thus creating a programmatic and organizational emptiness that will manifest in the great historical defeats in which the pseudo-anarchist revisionists took active participation.

Another manifestation of the pseudo-anarchist and petty-bourgeois revisionism is expressed in the phenomenon known as "individualism", that assumes a false and hostile contradiction between any organization and the individual, placing the abstract freedom of this in contradiction with the interests of that, suppressing the class struggle and the dialectic under the support of the bourgeois idealist individualism. It had great contradictory partisans in the pseudo-anarchist expressions known as synthesis, generated phenomena as the "propaganda by the deed" of the end of the 19th century, and intended to conciliate eclectically the contradictions derived from the abstract idealism into concrete practices that derived in the denial of every serious political responsibility. Nowadays, it seems to be a resurgence of these practices in the so-called "violent informality" and "emancipatory".
A current is superior to the previously mentioned concerning to the revisionism, it is the "anarcho-syndicalism", whose maximum expression was the Spanish *Confederación Nacional del Trabajo* (National Confederation of Labour, CNT), founded in 1910. This current is higher than the mentioned above in relation to the essence of its nature, which is its beginning and end, and the positive aspects that are derived from it. To the practical struggle, the "anarcho-syndicalist" revisionism gave great lessons of struggles of masses, in which the masses activities were placed in the center of the struggles, i.e., in the claiming struggles driven by this current against the bourgeois Capital and State. The lessons derived from these experiences constitute doubtless great lessons to the next struggles of the proletariat, because they taught, in a good manner, concrete forms of approaching the economic struggles under the activities that were oriented by the revolutionary trends of this current. However, this revisionist "economicism" led to a total liquidation or contempt of the revolutionary political organization, leading this denial to such point, that when the supreme time to direct the revolution arrived, delivered with full honor the power to the petty-bourgeoisie, leading the masses, in the Spanish case, to a great defeat of the proletariat that is worthy of more attention.

The main feature of this liquidationist current is in not getting rid of the bourgeois influence and do abstraction of the dialectic between the economic struggle and the political struggle of the proletariat, putting the first upon the second, dropping into a economicist reduction of the class struggle. The tactical consequences of this conception are expressed in the slogan of the "revolutionary General Strike" that is supposed that will defeat the Capital by itself, and in its post-revolutionary policy of the supremacy of the labor unions to the edification of the socialism.

That is why it is not possible to abdicate the ideological and theoretical struggle. Neither trying to prove superficial and eclectic conciliations. The analysis of the revolutionary experiences and of the class struggle will demonstrate how these two behaviors produced successive defeats and led to capitulations of the workers.
The criticism of the different projects, revolutionary and reformist, can only be the criticism of the experience of the workers' struggle of the last years. The different theoretical currents analyzed above were present in the main experiences of struggle of the workers in the first half of the 20th century. All of them led to defeats in the revolutionary process. This occurred due to the theoretical and ideological feebleness, to the eclecticist character of theirs programmatic goals and to the class nature of their alliances. In addition to tactical mistakes in the conducting of the struggle process.

To rebuild the syndicalism and the international Bakuninist revolutio-

2.1 The Russian revolution and the degeneration of the
Marxism

The Russian revolution shows the degeneration of the Marxism. But
also denounces, due to the marginal character occupied by the anarcho-
communism, its contradictions. Just in Ukraine, one of the countries subordi-
nates to the Russian Empire, a significative mass movement developed, and
thanks to the rupture with the postulates of the anarcho-communism and of
the anarcho-syndicalism.

The composition of the mass movement in Russia was given in the
following manner. There existed two great partisan organisations, the Rus-
sian Social Democratic Labour Party (affiliated to the II International) and the
Socialist Revolutionary Party. The anarcho-communist groups were repre-
sented per many small local groups. All the groups were subdivided into left- and right-wing currents (best exemplified by the historical division between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks), but also among the SR and the anarchists.

We can say that the Russian revolutionary process unfolded around two fundamental questions: the position regarding the overthrow of the monarchy and the position before the imperialist First World War. In the dynamics of the Russian revolution we can find the application of the theory of permanent revolution or per steps of the Marxism. And how it was successively showing its contradictions and allowing the systemic integration of the Marxism. It becomes explicit by the course of the own revolutionary struggle. The Marxist sector that succeeded becoming leader of the revolution was exactly the sector which broke with the Social-Democratic International due to its position before the war.

Lenin in the texts “Opportunism and the Collapse of the Second International” (1916) and “April Theses” (1917) makes clear how the Marxism of the previous period had degenerated. At the same time, explains how the Marxism developed by the Bolsheviks in the pre-revolutionary situation enabled that after the revolution of 1917 it were taken to play a counterrevolutionary role.

First of all, it is important to note that the text is marking a scission of the Bolsheviks with the II International, With the party of Marx (the KPD). The reason was the capitulation of the II International before the nationalist policy and its support to the imperialist war. The opportunists, he said, denied the opposition to the War before the “war”. It means, the II International possessed a correct theoretical characterization, but in the decision time forgot its theory per lacking of revolutionary ideology, political will. “The relatively “peaceful” character of the period between 1871 and 1914 served to foster opportunism first as a mood, then as a trend, until finally it formed a group or stratum among the labour bureaucracy and petty-bourgeois fellow-travellers”.

The opportunism would tend in the political ground to be reduced to the legalism and to the parliamentarism and in the ground of the masses to the narrowest and nationalist economicism.

If on the international scenario, the Social-democratic parties already manifested their capitulation, in the Russian context this would happen in
1917. The April Theses of Lenin are written in 1917 after the February Revolution. In this context, the two sides of the Russian Social-Democracy, Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, began to converge to the support of a form of bourgeois-democratic revolution. Lenin, on the contrary, returns to Russia defending another programmatic line. It would be necessary to pass from the democratic tasks (overthrow of the monarchy) to the socialist tasks. He asserts that the time interval between one stage to another is short and not undefined. Lenin begins to defend the Suppression of the Army, of the Police and of the Bureaucracy, the equivalence of the salaries in a “Commune Type” State. The proposals of Lenin were accused by the own Bolsheviks of “Bakuninism”. Lenin realizes that it would be need to broke with the presuppositions of the very international Marxism and of the own Bolshevism: presenting a new program and a new interpretation of the stages of the permanent revolution.

But it would be in the State and Revolution that he would assert that “passed the quick stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution, it would inaugurate a historic step of long term and transition from the socialism to the communism”. Therefore, Lenin breaks with the II International by accepting the tactics of clandestine struggle and denying the parliamentarism and nationalist reduction, but does not broke with the theory of the permanent revolution and with the transposition of the historical-universal tasks of the bourgeoisie to the proletariat.

And in this defense of the legitimate role of the State in the revolution and of the long duration between the steps (just as had happened to the II International) leaves room for the formation of a new type of opportunism, that will generate a new dominant class within the revolutionary State. But the particularity of Lenin's perspective is that this degeneration could only be manifested in the post-revolutionary situation, because he substantially modified the Marxist theory of permanent revolution.

The degeneration process of the revolution and of the Bolshevism is approached by Trotsky over the years 1920 and 1930. And he is already able to indentify that the Bolshevism was turning into a theory of the "socialism in a single country", in which, once more, the State, the nationalism and the accommodation to capitalism were prevailing within the Marxism.
Trotsky directs his criticism to the direction of the CPSU, that he denominates "old Bolsheviks" (Stalin, Bukharin, Zinoviev and Kamenev). The discussion takes place around two theories: the theory of permanent revolution and after the theory of the socialism in a single country. First of all, Trotsky unmask the revolutionary myth of the Bolshevism by showing the contradiction between the aura of "revolutionary" of the so-called "old Bolsheviks" and their conduct in the decisive moment, the year of 1917. In this period the "old Bolsheviks" had a bourgeois-democratic position identical to the Mensheviks (in other words, they postulated just a democratic revolution, that would replace the monarchy by the democracy, and not the socialist revolution). Only with the return of Lenin is that the Bolshevik Party takes a turn to the left. Trotsky indicates that not a single one of the old Bolsheviks "showed himself capable of applying independently the theoretical and practical experiences of the party at a most important and most critical historical moment".

That is, the opportunism that Lenin had denounced as mood, a trend and stratum among the labour bureaucracy, that would have taken the political direction of the II International has also developed within the Bolshevik party, making it tend to a way of bourgeois-democratic revolution. The victory of the line defended by Lenin and Trotsky in October was the result of the alliance of the minority revolutionary line of the Direction of the Party with the more advanced popular bases (since, for instance, the insurgency could only be approved at a expanded meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks with the participation of the labour basis, and yet, having to be submitted to vote twice, because the directors of the party voted against the proposal). Trotsky points out that in the theoretical conceptions and in the mood of the "vulgar marxism", prevailing at the II International (including Russia), existed a giant historic lapse, of decades, between the democratic stage (i. e., between the bourgeois-democratic revolution) and the socialist stage. This conception predominated only among the Mensheviks, but also in the majority of the Bolshevik directors. The troubles of the socialist revolution were still "the obscure prelude of a very distant future".

Thus, the history of the Marxism in the 20th century was the rupture with the bureaucracy of the Social-democrat International and its resurgence inside the III International and variants of Marxism that originated from its theoretical basis (Maoism, Gramscianism) and even the Trotskyism, which
does not broke with the stageism of the theory of permanent revolution. Therefore, this Marxism dilemma would manifest at an eternal oscillation between the right-wing policies (parliamentarism, legalism with different historic expressions, as the Bernsteinianism, the Stalinism), left-wing policies (Maoism, Trotskyism) and ultra-left policies (councilism, focalism). These variants allowed at the same time a frequent integration of Marxism in the capitalist system and the renewal of its breath in the national liberation and masses struggles. When Marxism succeeded performing a revolutionary and important role in the pre-revolutionary situation, in the post-revolutionary situation was doomed to the bureaucratization and counterrevolution.

It is not possible to talk about the Russian Revolution without talking about the revolution in Ukraine. If Marxism in 1917 had developed by the rupture with the bases of the International Social-democracy that was predominant in Russia, the revolutionary anarchism is developed by the denial of the theoretical basis of the international anarcho-communism represented in Russia by the conservative and literary individualism of Tolstoi and by the educationism of Kropotkin. Such discussion is expressed by Makhno in his diary that sustained “We must immediately begin organizing a Union of the Peasants of our group. This fact presents dual interest: we will prevent, around there, that the hostile element to our political ideal be established (...) The comrade Kalinitchenko severely condemned my point, intending that our role of anarchists, in the course of the current revolution, should be limited to divulging our ideas…”

The history of revolution in Ukraine is conditioned by three forces: 1) Petliurovstchina – nationalist movement, whose official name was Rada, composed by the national bourgeoisie and that obtained an adhesion of sectors of the working fractions; Bolshevism – The Party/State; 3) Makhnovshchina – mass movement, of peasant basis and anarchist orientation. It happened then a long civil war process full of advances and retreats, wherein the anarchist revolutionary force has succeeded in advancing in the release of the territories. The defeat of the revolution in Ukraine happened due the combination of several factors. As the own Makhno in his diaries and Archinov in his book “The Insurgency of the Peasants of Ukraine” make clear, the repression and the military factor were only one. Another very important factor was the organizative, theoretical and programmatic feebleness of the very movement. Succeeding in performing an important role between 1918
and 1920, the peasant insurgency of Ukraine would serve as historical base to the formulations of the Organisational Platform in 1926. The defeat of the Russian revolution is also explained by the inability of the anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism present themselves as revolutionary alternatives.

### 2.2 The Spanish civil war and the degeneration of anarcho-syndicalism and anarcho-communism

The anarcho-syndicalism is a phenomenon of the 20th century and it is part of the development of the great labour union confederations. The creation of the CNT in 1910 based on the french *Confédération générale du travail* (General Confederation of Labour, CGT) inaugurates a process of struggle that less than three decades after would result in the civil war. The anarcho-communism will develop partly inside and partly on the edge and/or against the anarcho-syndicalism. The process of class struggle in Spain, as in Russia, has developed based on the struggle against the monarchy essentially until 1923, and from that year until 1930, against the dictatorship, which was ruled by general Primo Rivera. Then Rivera is deposed and the republic is proclaimed with the calling of elections. Until 1933 the government will be composed by the leftist and socialist republican parties, when the right begins to advance. In February of 1936 election were called in a context of veiled civil war, with terrorism of the right and the labour movement in arms.

It is in that moment that the contradictions of the Spanish anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism, both expressed within the CNT-FAI (*Federación Anarquista Ibérica*, Iberian Anarchist Federation), would be demonstrated in a blatant manner. If in the case of revolutionary Marxism the contradictions appear clearly only in the post-revolutionary situation, in the case of the anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism (as in the social-democracy) they would appear because of their capitulation in the pre-revolutionary situation. The following excerpt, from a resolution of plenary of the CNT/FAI well illustrates these theoretical contradictions and their practical effects, of the *Informe del Comité Peninsular de la Federación Anarquista Ibérica al Movimiento Libertario Internacional* (September 1937) signed by
Santillán, Germinal de Souza, Pedro Herrera and Federica Montseny: "We were indeed the owners of the situation. But immediately, we formulated the following questions: the fascism is still not fallen throughout Spain. Out of Catalonia we are not the prevailing force. We must share the responsibilities and the rights with the other anti-fascist forces (...) there is no need to proclaim the libertarian communism. Seeking to maintain the hegemony in the committee of anti-fascist militias and remove any totalitarian achievement from our ideas".

The "stalinist" tactic of the III International represented the application of the theory of permanent revolution already from the perspective of the new Russian dominant class, the nomenklatura. From this viewpoint, the revolutions should be subordinated to the bourgeois-democratic steps as a part of the international policy of the USSR, i.e., they should not extrapolate the construction of bourgeois republics. That line was applied in Spain by placing the task of the anti-fascist fight (which was merely a adequacy of the priority of the anti-monarchal struggle at a new context). The center of that step would be the alliance with the democratic bourgeoisie. At the Popular Front should be the labour movement and the national bourgeoisie, which would make an alliance against Franco. Thus, despite the anti-Marxist dogmatism, the Spanish anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism were integrated in the policy derived from the Marxist theory of permanent revolution and also were objectively integrated in the Bourgeois State structures.

This process fundamentally derived from the theoretical and ideological disabilities of the movement, which were perceived and combated, albeit belatedly, by the oppositional grouping of the CNT-FAI Los Amigos de Durruti (Friends of Durruti). Such opposition denounces the capitulation of the direction of the CNT-FAI and the degeneration of these organizations, materialized at the phenomenon of "ministerialism". Los Amigos de Durruti by means of the paper People's Friend (El amigo del pueblo) did an opposition to such process "what actually contributed, it means, significantly decided the loss of a revolution that could only escape from the hands of the incapable ones, is the lacking of guideline that would indicate, in an unmistakable manner, the pathway to go. (...) The revolutions with no theory do not go ahead". The total absence of a serious theorisation in the years that preceded the Spanish civil war, particularly in the years 1920, was not an exclusive problem of the Spanish anarcho-syndicalism. It was a structural feature of international an-
archo-communism and anarcho-syndicalism, what was clearly manifested in the resistance to the platformism led by Makhno and Arshinov.

The contradictions derived from the theoretical eclecticism were not expressed just during the Spanish Civil War, but also over the entire decade of 1920 and the beginning of 1930. The adhesion to the policy of "popular front", formulated by the USSR, already had been essayed before, with the acritical adhesion of the anarcho-syndicalist union confederations to the Red International of Labour Unions (Profintern) directed by the Communist Party of the USSR in the decade of 1920. In practice, this has led to an entire policy of class collaboration, which made people like Federica Montseny, Diego Abad Santillan, Garcia Oliver and others, being integrated in the structure of the Spanish Government, first by the committee of anti-fascist militias, and after as ministers of several state councils. The ministerialism was the historical most concrete and grave form of degeneration of anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism.

That capitulation before the capitalism would be openly confessed by Santillan at the end of his life. In "Strategy and Tactics: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow", Santillan presents the final lines of the evolution of his thought and policy: "First: [...] the capitalism is not an uniform and petrified dough, it is a set of attitudes and categories that not always demonstrates solidarity even before the common enemies; there is a capitalism that we could qualify as comprehensive and progressive, that observes the compelled evolution of the current economy; [...] Second: the great revolution of nowadays is the reform; the barricade already accomplished its mission, if it is true it had a mission, and in the current conditions it is much more a pathway to the counterrevolution than to an achievement of an effective process and of an authentic release; propagate and resort to it precisely those who do not aspire to freedom nor democracy, but to the establishment of new despotisms. Third: summing up, we believe that today it imports much more the fight against the totalitarianism of States than against the capitalist system, that already shows enough fissures in order that the spirit of initiative and the creative desire could practice forms of non-capitalist economic life". These positions clearly show the final evolution and degeneration of the revisionist, eclectic and synthesist conception: Santillan elaborates in a clear and open manner what the historical experience of the years 1920/30 had practiced in a ashamed manner: the possibility of coexisting and accepting the capitalism,
and to practice the libertarian socialism as a marginal experience within the capitalism.

That contradiction already had been analyzed by Nestor Makhno, years before the Civil War, who warned of the presence of bourgeois and counterrevolutionary ideological elements in the Spanish anarchism. In his letter to the Spanish anarchists during the crisis of 1931, he warns: “Dear comrades Carbó and Pestana: transmit to our Spanish friends and comrades and, through them, to all the workers, (...) the Spanish proletariat (workmen, peasants and intellectual workers) must unite to impose the larger revolutionary energy to give rise to a situation in which the bourgeoisie will not have the opportunity to oppose to the conquest of the land, of the factories and of the complete freedoms; situation that increasingly will be more broad and irreversible (...) in my opinion, the anarchist federation and the National Confederation of Labour must consider this question seriously. (...) Likewise, you do not have to fear taking on in your hands the strategical, theoretical and organizative direction of the popular movement. Obviously, you must avoid uniting with the political parties in general and with the Bolsheviks in particular, since I imagine that the Spanish Bolsheviks will be skilled imitators of their Russian colleagues. They will follow the steps of the jesuit Lenin or even of Stalin, (...) the silencing of all the revolutionary trends and the end of the independence of the organizations of workers”.

Actually, we can sum up this conception of the libertarian reformism (i.e., a reformism of anarcho-communist or anarcho-syndicalist basis) with some fundamental features: A) The theoretical conception and of the revolution: the idea of the revolution is never associated with the revolutionary war, on the contrary, this is denied. The revolution is seen as moral transformation; B) Cooperativist and economicist political strategy: resuming elements of the ancient social-democracy and announcing the elements of the post-modern conception of “peaceful revolution” within the capitalism, is glimpsed the idea of the formation of cooperatives of workers that would have the role of education and shared management of the capitalist institutions, creating supposedly self-isolated communities within the capitalism and that would be the expression of “libertarian” organisms; C) Identification with the liberalism: the criticism of the State is reduced to the criticism of the excess of government and supervision of the individual activities and initiatives.
In his text, “On the History of the Spanish Revolution and the part played by the left- and Right-wing Socialists and the Anarchists”, Makhno deepens even more his criticisms: “What has stopped anarchists from putting their beliefs into practice, so as to turn a bourgeois republican revolution into a social revolution? In the first place, the absence of a specific and detailed program has prevented them from achieving unity of action, the unity that determines the expansion of the movement (...) Secondly, our Spanish comrades, like many comrades elsewhere, regard anarchism as an itinerant church of freedom. (...) This has thwarted them, on this occasion, from accomplishing the historical task that devolves upon anarchism in time of revolution. For all the prestige they enjoyed in the eyes of the workers in the country, Spanish libertarian communists and anarcho-syndicalists have failed to tilt in the direction of revolution the minds of masses dithering between their sympathy with revolution and a petit-bourgeois outlook”.

Makhno foresaw the great deviations and limitations, theoretical and organizational, of the Spanish anarchism. Makhno, that had been called Bolshevik, warned about the danger instilled in the alliances with the communist party and with the socialist party. This would be conducted in the policy of popular front in which the CNT/FAI was incorporated years after. The defeat of the revolutionary syndicalism of the period interwar (1914-1945) allowed the strengthening of the right-wing policy of Marxism, consubstantiated in the model of the Popular Front, which was adopted and exported to various places and contexts, especially to the outskirts of the capitalism, in continents like the Latin America, and enabled the feebleness and the deterioration of the anarcho-syndicalism and of the revolutionary currents of Marxism. The defeat of the Spanish proletariat, as Makhno warned, constitutes a defeat of the revolutionary sector worldwide, that would be hard to surpass. Thus, his criticism is important. At the same time, the class struggle in the periphery of capitalism, notably in Latin America, would demonstrate the limitations of such currents. Now we will discuss those events:

2.3 The crisis of the revolutionary syndicalism in Latin-America and the successive capitulations of anarcho-communists, communists and nationalists
The history of the labour and socialist movement in Latin America is also complex. And it is representative of the socialist currents in the outskirts of capitalism. Some factors were fundamental in this history: a) the first is situated between 1870 and 1890, is the context of repression against the IWA at the period right after the Paris Commune, in which the international socialists had an eclectic spectrum, derived from the process of revision and denial of the Bakuninism and influenced by the individual terrorism and the petty-bourgeois individualism, that will arrive in the Latin America and will influence the proletariat in its earliest forms of organization; b) the second is developed between 1890/1930, in which we have as mark the Russian revolution. In this period the Communist Parties aligned to the III International begin to be formed; a third context is formed by the emergence of the bourgeois statist nationalism after the crisis of 1929 and that will evolve in several different forms until 1980; c) the third begins in the decade of 1980 and is extended to nowadays by the confluence of many elements originated from these previous processes.

We can say that in the first context the searching for the countries of Latin America by the remaining internationalists of IWA, was largely influenced by the conception of Bakunin that the revolution would begin in the countries of the outskirts of capitalism, then going to the center. In this first moment, militants arrive, including the own Malatesta, that will act in countries like Argentina and Uruguay, creating labour unions similar to the parameters of the I International. Socialists inspired by the Marxism would be incipient, exactly because the orientation of the Social-democrat II International was prioritizing the industried countries of the center of the capitalism. At this first step of the formation of the labour movement in Latin America, the elements of revolutionary syndicalism would arrive in a diffuse manner and at different levels throughout Latin America, especially in countries like Brazil, Argentina and Mexico that are emblematic of the later evolution.

But it will be in the second period, between 1890 and 1930, that the most important events will occur. The debility of the presence of Marxism will be surpassed, since the guideline of the III International will define that it is need to act in the “delayed” countries of the capitalism. And the bourgeoisies and the States will develop instruments of repression, control and cooptation of workers. Until the crisis of 1929, the revolutionary syndicalism was
an important force and some variants as the anarcho-syndicalism in Argentina, came to have an outstanding presence in the direction of labour and peasant movement. The experience of the Mexican revolution (1910-1917) demonstrated simultaneously all the potentiality of the labour, popular and peasant movements, which led to important egalitarian measures, being their main legacy the Land Reform. On the other hand, it revealed strong debilities, which led it to the defeat still during the revolution. Furthermore, the Mexican revolutionary process also demonstrated the faint lines in which had been organized political and ideologically the popular revolutionary sector of the country, whereas this lost the dispute to the constitutionalist sector, bound to the radical bourgeoisie. Here it is interesting to register the revolutionary role performed by the peasantry, that has placed itself as subject of the revolutionary struggle, thus dissolving the Marxist and anarcho-syndicalist fetish of the figure of the industrial worker as the revolutionary subject “a priori”. This will also help to understand the counterrevolutionary and conciliator role played by the Casa del Obrero Mundial (House of the World Worker), Mexican representative of the anarcho-syndicalism and eclecticism. Inside the Mexican labour and popular movements there was the influence of the eclecticist anarchism (anarcho-communism, anarcho-syndicalism), although there existed a section of the IWA influenced by Bakuninists and proudhonists in the 19th century. The fact is that the Mexican eclectic anarchism (basically the anarcho-communism) was fundamentally present in the acting of Ricardo Flores Magon in the Mexican Liberal Party (Partido Liberal Mexicano), and earlier, at the Casa del Obrero, fundamentally between the years 1906 and 1910, developing an anarcho-syndicalism. Moreover, it will act in the coordination of strikes and indigenous and peasant upheavals. On the other hand, the popular forces of the Mexican revolution were linked to Emiliano Zapata and Pancho Villa. They both organized armies that went to the south and to the north of the country, Zapata leading the Liberation Army of the South and Villa leading the Division of the North. Thus, they had become fundamental to the achievement of the Mexican Revolution, since it was necessary combating of the bourgeois forces, culminating in the murders of the two popular leaders. In turn, the Casa del Obrero, anarcho-syndicalist, supported the constitutionalists and was beside the most conservative forces of the revolution, combating the Popular Armies of Villa and Zapata, and after these were murdered, it passed to be pursued by the New Government. This demonstrates once more that the eclectic anarchism, without a defined
program or ideology, serves as an arm of right-wing and of reformist sectors of the labour movement. It was so in the Mexican Civil War and in the capitulation of the Italian anarcho-syndicalism faced with the fascist government of Mussolini. The deaths of the two main Mexican revolutionary leaders marked the consolidation of the power in the hands of the capitalist and bourgeois forces. The main legacy of the Revolution was the land reform, which remained almost untouched until the arrival of neoliberal groups to power, in the decade of 90.

We can say that, in this period, exist three distinct experiences that show the internal contradictions of the labour movement and also of the currents, as in the case of the anarcho-syndicalism, active within the revolutionary syndicalism. We have the Mexican revolution experience (1910-1917) in which the labour and peasant movements adopted revolutionary trends and led to the formation of a “revolutionary government”, of a revolution that effectively assumed a “bourgeois” form because of the lacking of a political project; the Argentinian experience with the creation of union confederations which reunited workmen and peasants and that was configured in the dispute FORA X CGT (or anarcho-syndicalism X pure syndicalism influenced by the French unionism); and we had, in the case of Brazil, the formation of a revolutionary syndicalism of regional basis, without greater presence at the field and with no formation of an important union confederation and or of a mass movement of national reach.

In the first three decades we had the formation of important organizations of the Latin-American proletariat in the three countries: in Mexico, the Casa del Obrero, under the influence of the PL (Partido Liberal, Liberal Party) of anarcho-communist orientation, which maintained a tense and contradictory relationship with the peasant movement and preceded many of the contradictions of the revolutionary syndicalism; in Argentina, the FORA (Federación Obrera Regional Argentina, Argentine Regional Workers’ Federation), and soon after the formation of several union confederations that would conform a dispute over the direction of the Argentinian labour and peasant movements, until the formation of the CGT (Confederación General del Trabajo, General Confederation of Labor) in the years 1930, that became the Argentinian main union confederation; and in Brazil, the attempt of formation of the COB (Confederação Operária Brasileira, Brazilian Workers Confederation, which did not succeed in being effectively constituted as a natio-
nal labour union confederation), wherein the joint was made from the regional labour federations. After the overcoming of the crisis of 1929, it was clear that the revolutionary syndicalism had perished because of its own contradictions. On the other hand, the hegemonic and alternative models of unionism converged in various aspects: the national-corporatist unionism and the social-democrat unionism, which was updated by the communist parties, had developed in a limited and contradictory manner, subordinated to the first of them.

In the case of the communist parties, they presented, albeit with national particularities of representativity and political force, a similar evolution. They tended to be integrated in the nationalist bourgeois policy, always managed by the concept of Popular Front or Broad Front with the national bourgeoisie. The scission and critiques of this policy would be made especially after the Cuban revolution. Thenceforth, many attempts of denouncement and rupture with the right-wing policy of the CPs would occur, but it would not represent a rupture with the Marxist theory and program of permanent revolution. The major reaction to this degeneration of the Communist Parties was the focalism, a wide and heterogeneous movement that had some common elements, as the defense of armed struggle, without advancing in the theoretical criticism. Between 1960-1980, the focalism gave examples of heroic resistance and of sad deformations, not succeeding in presenting itself as an alternative for the masses.

Between 1980 and 2000, we have the resurgence of the mass movements in Latin-America, already in the post-dictatorship period. This motion will be characterized by two processes: the partial denial of “Stalinism" and the staunch criticism of the armed struggle. This motion, that in the Brazilian case is represented by the formation of PT (Partido dos Trabalhadores, Workers' Party) and of CUT (Central Única dos Trabalhadores, Unified Workers' Central), will have varied expressions in Latin-America, but it presents the general trend of emptying the socialist program by means of the generic idea of "democracy", which will be combined with anti-neoliberal defensive measures. In this contemporary frame, a hybrid socialism of the same type of the Brazilian PT, of the Bolivian MAS, coexists with remnants of the conservative nationalism and of the Stalinism, having as a agreement point the convergence around the defense of the national capitalist development and of the
bourgeois democracy (typical tasks of the first step of the theory of permanent revolution).

In that sense we are able to explain the contradictory evolution of the Latin-American and international proletariat and the situation of systemic integration in which it is found by some factors: a) Firstly, by means of the labour union confederations, or by means of the pulverized professional unions, the evolution of the syndical organizations was national, which favored its systemic integration and its bureaucratic degeneration, since the corporatism would arise within the model of revolutionary syndicalism, as well as within the reformist one.

The labour unions and the other organizations of the workers had adequate not just to the statist ideology, but also to the very national political structure – which limited its banners and forms of struggle, channeling them to the policies of "national salvation" when faced with moments of crisis; b) even when bound to "international" organizations, these were created or supported by States and answered to the goals of the external policy of them. Thus, the "nationalism" pervaded the entire structure and organization of the unionism. That feature reinforced and was reinforced by the corporatism, which arises spontaneously from the capitalist division of labour, and was incentivated by the monopolist capitalism of State. Therefore, there existed voluntary motions of adhesion to the government and of linking to the central power (presidentialism and personalist centrality of the executive power).

c) Thirdly, we can say that an objective factor and a subjective factor created the self-limitation of the development of the proletariat. On the one side, the contradictory character of the union activity that combines the resistance to the capitalism with the reproduction of the capitalist production relations; on the other side, the economist pragmatism that often allows the suiting of the workers. This objective situation of resistance places fundamental questions. On the other hand, the proletariat experienced over a century (1900-2000) the variants of the great models of unionism (the social-democrat and the revolutionary ones) and also a national-corporatist unionism of State. But these models always suffered local adaptations and always degenerated into forms that facilitated their own crisis; d) the pure syndicalism and the anarcho-syndicalism did not have the organisational, theoretical and ideological instruments to confront the capitalism and surpass the crisis.
of the own proletariat. They were devastated by the combination of repression, economic restructurint, self-isolation and hegemony of the unionism of State.

The socialist and communist currents also were coopted by the policies of national unity and popular front, and failed under the dictatorships when it was clear that the project of "peaceful road to socialism" would not be available. Thus, the subjective development of the proletariat never was seated on theories, strategies and forms of organization that could guarantee its independent development to the socialism. The refusal of the policy, the neutralism or the economicism of the variant currents of the revolutionary syndicalism, as well as the fetishism of State led to the same place: the adhesion to the nationalist governments (Cardenist, Peronist or Varguist) and the systemic integration of the unions and other workers' organizations in the State apparatus.

The 1929 crisis led to a economic restructurint in Latin-America, which is broadly recognized, but it also led to the formation of a new relationship standard of the States with the working classes of theirs respective countries, and to the development of the statism as a force within the working class (which until then had not occurred in Latin-America). The very States created a new model of unionism, national-corporatist, centered in the idea of the dialogue and of the collaboration with the Governments and in the fetishism of the protector-State, that were materialized in the figure of populist parties or leaderships. This model allowed the construction of commitments, of short duration in terms of the intergration of the workers in the structures of the governmental decisions, but lasting in terms of control of the State upon unions and workers. This commitment was fundamental to the economic development and to the formation of a semi-periphery in Latin-America, because it assured the reproduction of the necessary conditions to the overexploitation of the labor force of the region, since the problem was transformed into a "national" question, which should be solved by the regulation of the State.

2.4 On the historical failures of the communism/social-democracy and of the anarcho-communism/anarcho-syndicalism and their current conditions
A historical assessment of these currents confirms that they failed. It is not because they have not had mass power or expression. But because they did not accomplish the goals that they announced: to abolish the class society and the State. And they failed precisely because of the reasons that we exposed above. We can also say that this failure does not mean that they simply ceased of existing or of having expression. They continue existing and presenting themselves as barrier to the independent development of the international proletariat. The Marxism presents itself tied to the dilemma of the theory of permanent revolution and the anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism are tied to the dilemma of the absence of theories of revolution of their own (which was converted in the acritical use of the Marxist theory and, in its degenerated phase, in the denial of the revolution itself). In its set, these currents are bound to historical cycles of systemic integrations and decomposition.

But almost all currents present, after a crisis process, attempts of international reorganization. With the exception of the revisionists of anarchism. So, a critical evaluation of the organizations and trends of nowadays is necessary.

The Stalinist resumption (International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties): the CPs, bound in their respective countries to the reformist and para-pro-government directions of the unions, support their acting on an eclectic mixture of regionalism and Stalinist rhetoric, in which they are noticed by their absence of sociological analyzes or characterizations, and it predominates the continuous and poorly reflected repetition of slogans, many of them are centered at a process of regional integration, as in Latin-America, where they have as an axis the endorsement to Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and other similar conjunctures.

This process of regional integration has as same reformist face the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América, ALBA) in which the CPs find the most progressive element of the democratic, popular and anti-imperialist struggle.

The 11th International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties was carried out in New Delhi, India, and expresses the attempt of reorganization of the Stalinists. It presents great debilities and is far from constituting a world party: is dispersed, without tactical and theoretical unity, being summed up to generalist resolutions of reformist and social-democrat parties of the current time. Although they postulate the centrality of the systemic crisis
of capitalism (different from the 2nd International), such parties, in its great majority, believe in the centrality of the acting through institutional ways. The world strategy of the Cps goes through the legal reinforcements: World Peace Council, World Federation of Trade Unions, World Federation of Democratic Youth, Women's International Democratic Federation, International Alliance of Inhabitants the continental Forums and the World Social Forum. In a certain meaning, it expresses the Stalinist policy of popular governments of the distinct countries.

Three faces of the innate reformism of Trotskyism (IWL-FI, TF-FI, CRFI): In the current Latin-American conjuncture, behind the majority presence of the traditional CPs, various groups that claim to be revolutionary intervene in the workers' class struggle. In this analysis we detach the three most representative expressions among the great number of currents and trends of the Trotskyism in our continent. The IWL-FI (founded in 1982) dates back to the Argentinian Trotskyist group created by Nahuel Moreno in 1953, called GOM (Grupo Operario Marxista, Marxist Workers Group). Nowadays, it has about 24 affiliated parties, and its main force is in Latin-America, especially in Brazil. For IWL, this is a symptom of the current period of explicit decadence of the capitalism. Thus, its program defines as the central goal of the moment the Anti-Imperialist Struggle and the necessity of a “Second Independence” driven by the working class. The IWL-FI/USWP sustains the stageist view that the main instrument of colonial domination is the “external debt” of the countries of the periphery in relation to the countries of the center. Intending to be different from Stalinism, it operates with the same program of anti-imperialist struggle, reducing the anti-imperialism to a super-structural struggle. What becomes clear is that it still works with the categories of the III Communist International and with the perspective of a stageist theory of revolution. The idea of a “constituent assembly” and of the policy of “unity of action” merely shows the ambiguous and wobbly character of the policy of the IWL, that moves assisted by rudiments of the Stalinists theory: the idea of a anti-colonial struggle, focused mainly on the external debt, and the policies of collaboration with the governments of popular front of the Latin-America.

Having as its major reference the Socialist Worker's Party, the Trotskyist Fraction – Fourth International is a international Trotskyist organization with presence in 9 countries of American and European continents. Founded in the beginning of the years 90, after its leaving of the IWL-FI, it maintains a certain presence in labour union groupings, mostly in Argentina. On its turn, the Coordinating Committee for the Refoundation of the Fourth
International, founded in 2004, and which has as its main reference the Worker's Party of Argentina, maintains nowadays presence in America, Europe and Middle East. Although of making criticisms on the pro-government practices of the IWL-FI and on the abandonment of the claiming of the proletarian revolution by groups like the french ex-Revolutionary Communist League, the TF-FI and the CRFI show themselves unable to develop a genuinely revolutionary policy, even though they indeed maintain a revolutionary speech. To these two international currents, whose differences are minors than its similarities, it is necessary that the proletarian opposition be developed around the reformist directions, and not outright against them. On the other side, its programmatic inability, which is inherent to the own origin of Trotskyism, of breaking with the perspective of "using" the bourgeois democratic representative system, necessarily obliges them, when they succeed in consolidating a force of masses, to abandon the straight struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the workplaces, in order to fight for the distribution of crumbs that the electoral systems of the capitalist States offer. The perspective of CRFI, particularly, is sustained by a set of theses that analyze the current world systemic conjuncture as straightly and almost uniquely derived from the disintegration of the the USSR and of other deformed workers States, voluntarily disregarding the true economic role played by the USSR after the Second World War, and setting aside the very evolution of the capitalist production. A practice determined by the bourgeois democratic system and a incorrect characterization of the reality summarize the development of these three representative and majority currents of Trotskyism in Latin-America.

The ruin of Maoism (the RIM and the ILPS). The Revolutionary Internationalist Movement is a worldwide network of Maoist Parties created in the years 80 and which aims to construct a new Communist International. The International League of People's Struggle (ILPS) is a international organization of masses driven by the RIM, and whose platform is to organize the "democratic, popular and anti-imperialist" struggle. its organizer and director frameworks are the Maoist Parties, as the RCP of the United States, the Communist Party of Peru (Maoist), the Communist Party of India (Maoist), the Communist Party of the Philippines (Maoist) etc. The analysis that they sustain is that capitalism is in its "final and agonizing life stage", and that the imperialism and the world economic crisis are expressions of that fact. Both factors have generated the unrestrained rapine of the exploited nations (Middle East, Asia, Latin-America), in which they diagnose the immediate need of conforming the "Anti-Imperialist United Front, uniting all the anti-imperialist classes and social sectors". To achieve the "democratic revolution"
in the "semi-feudal" countries the Maoists of RIM characterize the need of developing the guerrilla war in the current moment. The contemporary examples demonstrate that the presupposition has been put into practice, as can be seen for instance: the People's Liberation Guerrilla Army (PLGA) in India, the People's Liberation Army in Peru, the New People's Army in Philippines, etc, directed by the respective Maoist Parties. Although its radicalized tactics, the events of Nepal put in check the policy of the Maoists, a long march of guerrilla wars finished with the adhesion of the CPN (Maoist) to the bourgeois parliament of the country. The stageist theory betrays the workers once more. Thus, the perspective of the anti-imperialist struggle and of the national-democratic revolution remains being the major feature of this strategy, with variations in what regards to the interpretation of specific tactics. But the general frames of the theory of the III International remain (centrality of the industrial proletariat, and of the central countries), as well as the interpretation that, in the countries of the periphery, the main tasks are "anti-imperialist" ones, given their belated and/or semi-feudal characters, which qualify their economy and their class structure.

Luxemburgism, left-wing Marxism and autonomism: from the renounce of the dialectical perspective to the renounce of the class struggle. In a lesser extent than the previous currents, but with growing impact in the youth, given the proven failure of the Stalinism and the pro-government bonds of the Trotskyism, in the last years, in a particular manner, it is increasing the presence of several expressions, some of them opposed to each other, but which tends to identify themselves within the left-wing Communism or Marxism. Inspired majorly in Marxist references of the beggining and middle of the last century which opposed to the counterrevolutionary involution of the Bolsheviks in Russia, are highlighted the International Communist Current, the Internationalist Communist Group and the International Bureau for the Revolutionary Party. Albeit it is impossible to determine an unique axis of the groups that are aligned to this trend, do exist central points that mark their acting. The first one would be the partial interpretation of the thought and work of Marx, which they sometimes cite in a diffuse manner, if not contradictory, presenting a Marx contrary to his own statist approaches. The second point in common would be the renounce of the dialectical perspective of the revolutionary process in its set. This implies not understand the present and the needs that are imposed by a stage marked by the capitalist offensive against the workers of the world, discarding any premise of permanent claiming organization of class for considering it reformist. The speech is turned into the central strategy and even into the practice itself, making
those trends attractive in their appearance and in what regards to their forms, but totally empty in what concerns to their goals.

The anarchist revisionism and its present international form (International Libertarian Solidarity, SIL, American Continental Association of Workers, ACAT/IWA and etc.): the revisionism remains unable to perform a historical assessment from the class perspective, differing, ultimately, what has contributed from what has prejudiced, regarding to all that is claimed as anarchist. Today, do still exist some remaining forms of the old anarcho-syndicalism and anarcho-communism, but almost with no expression. In that sense, the anarcho-syndicalism, in its orthodox (IWA) and heterodox (CGT, CNT/FAI, FAU-Germany) variants, has an incorrect orientation, since the economic-claiming struggle of the masses is subordinated to the political-ideological struggle of its militants, in which the belongingness to a pre-determined political program is assumed as principle of association.

The anarcho-syndicalism and anarcho-communism, in their right-wing form, are presented today in the "cooperative" and restricted forms of "movements" – without structure, strategy or durability, or in the form of fragmented collectives. They are presented by currents as the ACAT/IWA.

A currently stagnant attempt of construction of the International Libertarian Solidarity/SIL was conducted by eclecticist organizations, but it did not advance due to the debility of its orientation. These currents deny the reality of the class struggle and/or ignore the conditions of the organizative and ideological struggle within the working class. In the left-wing form, it is presented as "insurrectionism" – oriented by mistaken fragments of "primitivist" theory which lead to systematic mistakes. The insurrectionism promotes sometimes heroic confrontations, great mass manifestations, but it does not succeed in being a significative social force to change a society.

Placing the tactics and the methods of the proletarian struggle as a principle and a goal in themselves, those groups, often with an eclectic base and program, end making criticisms of almost any claiming intervention, considering them as "parts of the system", as if they were not products of the class itself, of the production and of the own social life of the human beings. The Social Revolution will be to overcome the capitalism in particular, and all the previous social forms in general, necessarily. At the present time, we shall perform the struggle for it inserted in the current productive system as proletarians, as members ruled by the State, and, in a global manner, inserted in the world system of the ultramonopolist capitalism. We do not abandon these conditions to combat the capitalism, on the contrary, as conscious pro-
Letarians, we are part of the class whose historical mission is burying the capitalism and destroying the State. Far from placing as central the question of method, deviating the perspective, we Principist Bakuninists put as central our class and the requirements that its revolutionary and combative development imposes. Faced to the bet of the revisionism (in the dogmatic anarcho-syndicalist form, autonomist, insurrectionist) of not considering the forms and methods of the bourgeois domination on the organized labour movement itself, we develop the class struggle in order to construct and reappropriate the tools of union defense and offensive of our class. This same critique is applied to the insurrectionism, because in its case they centralize the acting in a necessary tool, the violence, understanding this as an end in itself, or in the less worse case, as a mean in a simplistic "insurrectional" strategy, with no theoretical/programmatic support. Having as axis of their intervention the violent action, these groups and individuals intend to drag behind their actions a social upheaval, as if the example of their deeds were able by itself to break the existent tension between the classes. In other words, it annuls the protagonism of the revolutionary action of the proletariat and egocentrically self-attributes it to their actions and to themselves.

The right-wing Marxism and its several variants tend to the systemic integration in the capitalism by means of the parliamentarist reformism and of the economicist and nationalist unionism. The left-wing Marxism (Trotskyist and Maoist especially) recurrently differs from the right-wing one just by denouncing it, but reproduces the same theory and program, and the systemic integration even before of succeeding in becoming revolutionary. The left-wing and right-wing Marxisms get stuck to the recurrent cycle of bureaucratic degeneration in the pre-revolutionary situation. The extreme-left Marxism, in its main form, the focusism, usually tended to be desintegrated, because of the repression or of the lacking of theoretical unity and consistency. At another form, the council communism, tended to desintegrate within the pure syndicalism or to be marginal, not succeeding in deepening the theoretical criticism. The opportunist deviations of left-wing and right-wing and the voluntarist deviations of extreme-left in Marxism produced always the same results and explain the current stagnation: systemic integration or cyclic disintegration.

The anarcho-syndicalism and anarcho-communism which were developed as forms of denial to the Bakuninism had a similar evolution. The right-wing policy was expressed in the formation of a libertarian reformism, which is integrated in the capitalist system by means of a strategy that is equally
economist, but of an educationist content. It is like if it were possible to create self-managed "islands" and prefabricated libertarian communities within the capitalism. This occurred by the statement of the postulate of diffusion of the groups of "education" or even by the integration in "Governments", as in the case of Spain – which has other historical correlates. The anarcho-syndicalism, when has not been integrated by the right-wing policy or by the pure syndicalism, is isolated in the disorganizer dogmatism. In its left-wing variant, the anarcho-communists and syndicalists are capable of, at most, postulating the union organization of the workers and recognizing the need of an anarchist organisation. But they stop there. They cannot and do not succeed in advancing in the theory of the revolution without denying themselves. They so remain subject to marginality, just questioning the Marxism and making pontual criticisms to the right-wing policy (individualism and educationism) and feed only of that in their few theoretical formulations. The extreme-left policy has been manifested by the individual terrorism, by the insurrectionism of uncoordinated small groups, which has shown their ineffectiveness, although its heroism, in Spain and Latin-America (especially in Argentina and Uruguay of the years 1920-30), and that still exists to these days in Europe.

In such manner, the frame of the international anarchism is dominated by revisionist and eclecticist variants. And this is the cause of its stagnation. But is important to declare that do exist several groups that call themselves platformists. This position shall be led to the ultimate consequences. The true platformist must moves towards the Bakuninism. There is no more room for indecision or uncertainties. The crisis and the offensive of the capitalism require a clear position regarding to the questions exposed here. The task of the platformists – which shall move towards Bakuninism or capitulate in the synthesism, denying the legacy of Makhno – is to develop the theoretical and ideological struggle, and boost the class struggle. Therefore, it is now up to advance. The same can be said to the sincere (and not opportunist) comrades in the insurrectionalist, anarcho-syndicalist and eclecticist organizations. Presenting the general theses of the theory of integral revolution applied to the class struggle in the conditions of the 21st century, as well as a concrete proposal of organization and struggle. That is the constructive section of the platform of the revolutionary anarchism.
A critical assessment of the revolutionary movement and of the working class history will only be complete with the presenting of an alternative. In that sense, we can say that in the 20th century we had two great lines: 1) the revolutionary-insurrectional line, which characterized, for instance, in Spain, in the first phase of the Communist International and that developed in the national liberation struggles; 2) the legalist-reformist line of the the Social-democrat International and of the second phase of the Communist International, of peaceful conquest of the State and promotion of reforms by means of the popular front policy (anti-fascist or anti-imperialist).

All the currents of Marxism and of nationalism (Maoism, Trotskyism, Stalinism, Gramscianism, Castroism, Sandinism) developed from the program and strategy established by these lines. These currents did not succeed in breaking the vicious circle to which they lead, of systemic integration and cyclic disintegration. A fundamental component of this policy was the alliance with the bourgeoisie, materialized in the tactic of the popular or anti-imperialist front. The discussion about the anti-imperialist front allows us to place some important points of the construction of the revolutionary anarchism as an internationally organized current.

Firstly, the tactic of the anti-imperialist front was part of a policy: the alliance with the national bourgeoisie or sectors of it, supposedly in contradiction to the imperialism, to achieve the national development or independence.

Secondly, this policy was derived from a theory, the theory of permanent revolution or by steps, in which these structural reforms (or national democratic revolution) were the obligatory first step of the socialist revolution. The socialist phase – which implies the dictatorship of the proletariat – would be, in its turn, one more long transition phase to the communism (classless and stateless society).
The tactic of the anti-imperialist front necessarily supposes a social-democrat or state model of unionism, which is adequate to its strategic goals. In turn, this theory will always place the problem of the destruction of the State and of the classes in an indefinite and unachievable future. The theory of permanent revolution is condemned to make that the groups degenerate in the pre-revolutionary phase under the form of reformist collaborationism and systemic integration, or else in the post-revolutionary moment by means of the "Stalinism" which is just a longer way to such integration in the world capitalism (as Russia and China show today without doubt).

In that sense, the Bakuninist theory of integral revolution starts from totally different presuppositions. In the first place, the Bakuninism has as its programmatic goal the socialism. In the theory of integral revolution, the socialism is not a previous stage to communism. The socialism is the classless and stateless society. It is not correct that the "communism" as defined by Marx is synonymous with "anarchism" and "socialism" as defined by Proudhon and Bakunin. This is incorrect, does exist a theoretical difference between the definition of "socialism" in Bakunin and the definition of "Communism" in Marx. The communism is a central programmatic-theoretical concept in Marx, and is related to his conception of history, i. e., to the theory of permanent revolution.

The socialism of the revolutionary anarchism is a social system derived from a global movement of collectivisation of the private property and of reorganization of power based in the democratic federations of the type of the Commune/1871 – Soviet/1917. The collectivisation and federalisation as economic and political model implies in the self-organization, and self-direction of the society by the workers, i. e., the self-government. That is why that, according to the conception of the revolutionary anarchism, it is need to combine several forms of struggle, different forms of organization, to achieve this goal. The two main forms of organization are the organization of the revolutionaries and the organization of the masses.

The revolutionary organisation, as general task, has to initiate, prepare and direct the revolutionary struggle, combating the reformist and conservative lines; and the task of the masses organisation of revolutionary-unionist type is to organize the proletariat to its immediate claiming struggles and advance its level of class consciousness and experience, thus becoming the
own core of power of the revolution and embryo of the post-revolutionary socialist institutions.

To achieve the goal of the socialism there is one only way, the way of revolution. And to achieve the revolution, the 20th century taught just three victorious models or ways: 1) The General Insurgency Countryside-Town (As in Russia of 1917); 2) The Protracted People's War (as in China and in Vietnam); 3) The Guerrilla War of Short Term (as in Cuba and Algeria).

Therefore, the essential elements of Bakuninism are exactly those which depart from the theory of integral revolution, taking the socialism as general program, and the revolution as permanent strategy, from which the revolutionary organisation and the organisation of the working masses are necessary subjects.

But these are preliminary considerations just to define the fundamental questions. What are the tasks of the anarchists today? What tactics and forms of organization and struggle we must develop? How the workers can organize, without falling into the historical mistakes of the past and without degenerating into reformism and opportunism.

3.1 The class structure and the global division of labour in the XXI century

To determine a national and an international political line to the revolutionary anarchism it is necessary to develop an assessment of the economic policy of the world imperialist system. The analysis of its contradictions and of the impact of these contradictions on the international working class. Long as we understand these contradictions, we can delimitate some concrete tasks to the revolutionary and masses organization, presenting proposals of struggle and a program of immediate claimings that is bound to the historical socialist program, and further, that contributes in part to the deepening of the classes' antagonism which is need to the outbreak of a revolutionary situation.

We can say that the capitalist development, because of its combined and unequal character, already recognized by many authors, created a struc-
tural differentiation between center and periphery, as well as an internal stratification in the own center (between powers like USA and countries like Switzerland or Netherlands) and in the periphery, creating the conditions to a differentiation into semi-peripheral countries (in other words, countries that succeeded in developing the national capitalism, approaching to the center in terms of global industrial and economic capacity, but without the social features or the same power than the countries of the center, as is the case of Mexico and Brazil in Latin-America, typical semi-peripheral countries).

3.2 The class contradictions and the subjects of the revolution

All these historical and structural processes require a correct comprehension of the class contradictions and of another social contradictions. The class contradictions are the main, not because they are above the others, but because they are the unique that permeate all the others contradictions and because in them lie the bases of the powers of the State and of the capital – and consequently, the point on which all the actions that intend to solve all the structural issues have to concentrate.

In that sense, we shall understand that the workers, likewise the bourgeoisie, are internally diversified and that, to determine a international political line, it is need to comprehend these differences that will present, in the different countries, and that will determine the place of certain tactics and certain axes of the claiming program.

The societies remain divided into classes and such division was always complex. The development of capitalism just transforms the complexity of the division, does not exist a classes' structure that be "simple" or "dual" in history, even less in the history of capitalism. The Social Classes are structural categories of capitalism, which are derived not only from the labour division, but from the relations of production and of property that stratify and maintain a deep differentiation related to the control of the capital.

Are the relations of property and production, in a broad sense, that define them, even if in the viewpoint of the class struggle they do not present
always in a dual form as the own structural organization of capitalism defines it. The bourgeoisie is the owning class of the capital, and the proletariat is, by exclusion, the class that is not owner of the capital. It is important to emphasize that what defines the capitalist is not an abstract property "in itself", nor the worker is the abstract property of a mean of production "per se". Even if during a short period of time it may have been true in a few places, the structural element is the capital, i. e., the property of the production factor that succeeds in making the accumulation cycle to turn.

A worker who has a tool or a house is not a capitalist, because to be a capitalist it is need some accumulation that allows that his activity be determined by the very process of accumulation of capital, and consequently, that allows him to assume the pole of exploiter in the relation of exploitation.

The confusion derived from a abstract conceptualization of classes which does not mention the process of accumulation can only generate mistakes of theory and of political tactic. It hinders us to achieve determining clearly the class relations and the inter and intra-class contradictions.

The social classes also differ by class fractions or sub-classes. These are equally structural differentiations, but variable according to the very specificity of the activities of labor and capital accumulation, derived from the sectors of economy (commerce, service, industry) and by its greater or smaller control of capital (great, middle and petty-bourgeoisie).

In that sense, the bourgeoisie tends to differentiate into an industrial, a commercial, a financial, and an agrarian fraction, for instance. The proletariat also is differentiated into fractions, as the industrial proletariat, the commercial, the rural proletariat and the peasantry. Each country according to its position into the global division of labour and to its own historical evolution may or may not present certain fractions.

The classes and fractions or sub-classes objectively differentiate, in turn, into occupational categories: concrete activities of occupation in the process of labour and in the society, extremely variable in time, space and in the different branches of economy. These are, actually, the true immediate agents of the struggle, since the fractions and the classes do not manifest in an automatic manner in the plane of the economic and political actions.
These occupations are themselves differentiated and stratified by the nature of the labour process (manual or intellectual) and its concrete combination is extremely complex. In addition to this general occupational differentiation, also exists a differentiation between occupied and unoccupied – which may represent the unemployed as well as the workers in formation process or the temporary.

And still, due to the expansion of the education systems, the occupational category of student has been highlighted – as a category more and more important, that is placed at a relatively intermediate position between the various occupations and the non occupation condition. But it is a occupational category present in almost all the contexts, by workers in formation process or in working sectors that will become unoccupied. Also the bourgeoisie (great, middle and petty-) passes through the formation by means of this transitory occupational category, but it is a minority.

In that sense, the steel worker, the student, the teacher, are occupational categories, and the way they relate to the class differentiation is complex, but the major part of the occupational categories integrates the side of the working class in the division of classes. It is important not to confuse the occupational differences of any kind with the class differences.

The classes, fractions and occupational categories are also differentiated into ethnic and/or national groups. The ethnic and national differences (sometimes adopted by the racist speech) are derived from the differences of origin/ancestrality of the groups and individuals, which begin to be identified by some cultural (language, religion, custom) or biological trait (skin color, body type and etc.). Combined with these differences do exist gender and generation differences, which regards to the concepts of the places of women, youth, and elderly in the society, normally derived from the dominant ideologies and from the own objective accumulation processess of capital and its greater willingness to incorporate, expel or exploit these sectors.

This issue is not secondary. On the contrary, in the ultramonopolist phase of capitalism these differentiations has acquired a renewed sense, and the capital and the State use such differentiations as contradictions to advance the process of exploitation and domination. In the other hand, some theories end up taking these contradictions in themselves – and in doing so, not
only lose sight of their real meaning, as well as are added to the speech of the capital of emptying the idea of class struggle.

Actually, the dual market – especially the lower sphere – has been expanded by the ultramonopolist capital, which occurs through the toyotist techniques of precariousness which use the ethnic, national, gender and generation differentiations as tools of discrimination and exploitation. For combating the overexploitation one cannot ignore the differentiation of classes, in which it originates, nor the concrete manner whereby it is accomplished, the (ethnic, national, gender and generation) discrimination.

And finally, the classes, fractions, occupational categories and strata, still are differentiated by the position that the countries occupy in the global division of labour (center, periphery, semi-periphery) – indicating an internal stratification in the own classes, thus enabling the intra-class domination at international scale, the contradictions between the occupations and hampering the unified organization of the class in the national ground and the internationalism.

The fundamental in the class contradictions is that they are manifested in the society through the objective multiplicity of the occupations and social strata, that hampers the subjective perception of the workers of the structural unity of their condition. And the bond between the objective multiplicity and the subjective unity can only be done by the class action and struggle. However, the bourgeoisie also tends to the internal differentiation, which is expressed in the fights for the state power, for economic policies and, in the international ground, in the imperialist wars. In economics, the internal disputes of the bourgeoisie are solved by means of the competition, that leads to the monopoly, in the political ground by war and class violence.

The fractions of the proletariat (its occupational categories and strata) that tend to become the main forces of the revolution in each concrete country, will vary according to its strategic structural position (for instance, importance of each sector of activity to the GPD of each country), to its participation in the set of the labor force (majority, expressive portion or minority), historical experience of action and organization (relation of collaboration or antagonism with the State and the bosses), and finally, to the level of systemic integration (i.e., accommodation to the capitalism) – which tends to
be determinant factor to its mobilization in the revolutionary process, that is a result of the combination of the previous factors.

It is incorrect to consider that a single fraction of the proletariat in special will be able to direct or to accomplish a socialist revolutionary process by itself. Do exist fractions that will be indispensable to the revolutionary process, not as "direction", but as subjects of the process, and these will vary from country to country, according to the historical and economic differences and to the combination of the various factors indicated above.

However, what is determinant is the mobilization of expressive portions of all the existent fractions of the working class, by means of the different occupational categories and social strata. All these differentiations do not show that the class contradictions lost their importance, on the contrary, they pass through all these differences. What is inevitable is that an internationalist policy of the revolutionary syndicalism requires that the marginalised of the proletariat in the center and in the periphery, members of the lower sphere of the labor market, are an essential part of any revolutionary process.

And for succeeding in creating the class polarization that is able to create the duality of power of the pre-revolutionary situation, it is need a strategy, a program and a line of action that solve the class contradictions and differentiations and enable its international unification. This also requires the comprehension of the nature of the contemporary capitalism and its contradictions.
4 – The conjuncture: The Capital, The State and The Class Struggle in the presente

The development of the capitalist accumulation on a global scale can be periodized in four great stages, characterised by different forms of global division of labour, of production relations and of roles of the State. The phase of the competitive capitalism (1760-1870), the phase of the monopolist capitalism (1870-1920), the phase of the state monopolist capitalism (1920-1980) and the one we can call ultramonopolist capitalism (1980 to these days). The capitalist development process in its first phase was marked by a formation of a dependence relation between the countries of Europe, which occupied the center, and the other colonial and peripheral countries. The capitalist accumulation was carried out by the exploitation of the colonial countries by the empires. The first industrial revolution developed in this moment. This moment was soon succeeded by the process of capital concentration in the great companies and corporations and by the development of the financial capital, which were accompanied by the processes of State centralization, especially in Germany.

The imperialism is essentially a system of capital exportation from the countries of the center to the periphery. Such changes in the capitalism structure were a product of the ascent of the class struggle in Europe as well as of the capital crisis. In the early XX century the world saw the productivity and profit rates decline. Therefore, in the outset of the capital exportation from the center to the periphery, there was the possibility and the need of increasing the profit rates by means of the labor overexploitation, imposed abroad.

The imperialism was also the monopolist capitalism (of the big banks and companies) which invested in the overexploitation of the labour force of the periphery, of salaried as well as of non-capitalist forms. The dual labour market is one of the main institutions of imperialism. What is this dual market? It is a market that has two levels, a lower and an upper one. The dual market enabled a segmentation of the proletariat per socio-economic condi-
tion, creating a relatively protected and well paid labour market which corresponded in a general manner to the division between countries of the center and of the periphery (including here the semi-periphery), or within the center and the periphery, a market of well paid and qualified occupations, with juridical guarantee and socially valued, and other occupations devoid of it. This fragmentation process has been intensified by the ultramonopolist capitalism.

Faced with the grave crisis of the years 1920, the bourgeoisie opted for policies of State interventionism in order to ensure the maintaining and reproduction of the capitalist system. Thus, the war between empires which was expressed in the Cold War was marked by a straight model of State intervention in the economy. It is about the keynesian-fordist model, which was forged by the organic elite of the international bourgeoisie and had as starting point the United Statian New Deal, being consolidated with the Social Welfare State of the Western Europe. It is important to highlight that the real socialism also followed the model of State intervention in the economy. In the outskirts, the State strengthening was characterised by the different forms of national-developmentalism (Peronism, Cardenism, Varguism, etc.).

The State monopolist capitalism represented the systematic development of the intervention of the State in economy, in the countries of the center, with the keynesian-fordist model, based in a microeconomic policy of wage increases and creation of indirect salaries, implied that, in international terms, the upper sphere of the labour market comprehended a few countries of the center. The policy of the Welfare State had the decisive support of the European and United Statian reformist labour unions which promoted a policy of collaboration of classes.

Inside the capitalist countries, this same segmentation logic of the market has been produced, corresponding sometimes to ethnic cleavages (for example, the migrants in Europe and USA), and other times to different social cleavages (migrants of the countryside in Brazil, or even the black people) which has as a certain destination the occupation in professions with low wages and without guarantees. The dual market guaranteed thus the concrete mechanisms of accentuation of the labour exploitation, the increase of the rates of absolute surplus value and, consequently, of the rate of social inequality between center and periphery, and within the center and the periphery, between integrated and non-integrated proletarians. This feature
was the main trait of the capitalist development, even under the conditions of the state monopolist capitalism, in its keynesian-fordist form, in the Social Welfare State and in the national-developmentalism in the periphery. The issue is that exists a relation between the development under a fordist form and the nationalist underdevelopment in the periphery, since both were part of the same world structure of accumulation.

In the process of world development of the capitalist accumulation, is proven the correction of the Bakunin's thesis about the dialectic between imperialism (monopolist capitalism) and statism, in which the development of the state was ordinarily parallel and, in several moments, precondition to the imperialism. The role of State was accentuated in the capitalist accumulation, demonstrating that it is not a mere reflection of the production relations.

In the new ultramonomopolist phase of the world capitalism, we are able to see some changes in the structure of imperialism: the priority exportation of capital to Asia, combined with the diffusion of a Toyotist microeconomic model (Japanese) and forms of primary accumulation (especially based in the Chinese model), which leads to the overexploitation, precariousness and slavery. This model has enabled a larger regional economic growth in Asia, has boosted the reform processes of the States of the center (Europe, USA) and periphery, and allowed the development of neoliberalism. However, the main trait of the ultramonomopolist period of capitalism is that it extends mechanisms which were present in the imperialism structure in the epoch of the state monopolist capitalism, particularly the dual market of labor that is one of the main mechanisms of action of imperialism.

The 1970 crisis expressed large macroeconomic problems (hyperinflation, external debt) for world capitalist system. The conducted leap from the State capitalism (characterised by the social intervention of State, mostly in the field of economy) to the ultramonomopolist capitalism meant the overcoming of the Fordist model of production by the Toyotist model, based in the increase of the bourgeois exploitation over the world proletariat. All this period is characterised by the emergence of giant multinational corporations, by the renewed multicolonialism, by the constant and permanent technological advance, by the geographical reorientation of the imperialist investments and a new process of Global Division of Labour (GDL) expressed in the constant deregulation of the financial market, by the monetary dollarisation, by
the new process of imperialist accumulation (privatization) and by the sequential dismantlement of the Social Welfare State.

The new global division of labour implied in the emergence of semi-peripheral countries which are characterised by several processes of international capitalist integration. In 1990, the Eastern Europe was incorporated to the international system of semi-peripheral countries, composed by distinct countries of Latin-America, Asia and Africa. All over the world, including the Western Europe and the United States, are registered increases in the rates of inequality and poverty.

The fundamentals of accumulation during the ultramonopolist period are the capacity of worldwide introduction of technological innovations among and within the production branches and the decentralization of the productive processes from the central and industrialized countries to the peripheral and semi-peripheral countries, in which is found the overexploited labour that raises the productivity and the intensity, we mean, that increases the capitalist exploitation, producing in the branches and in the countries differences between the value and the labor force, engendering contemporary capitalist phenomena as the precariousness, the broadening of the informal market and new subhuman forms of labour. The Latin-America, for instance, suffered a integration period in the world system that comprises since the late 18th century until the decade of 1930. In this period, it was accomplish a first GDL in the continent, under which the central countries looted raw material and farm products from the continent which were intended to the new necessities that were engendered by the industrial development of this period, always oriented by the central countries. To the Latin-America, this process meant rates of inequality of commerce and domination by means of the forced contribution to the accumulation of the relative surplus value by a raise in the rate of capitalist exploitation of the working masses of the region.

In the years after 1930, a new process of production and reproduction of new forms of capital accumulation, after a big general crisis of the international capitalism, ends at the industrialization of the periphery, at the nascent of the semi-periphery, and at the appearance of the State Capitalism, which oriented such process in the peripheral countries. In this period, it is carried out a second GDL, which implies the emergence and the industrial integration of the semi-periphery. Mexico, Argentina and Brazil are the most
representative countries of this process in Latin-America, semi-peripheral countries which have as features the reinvestment of the agro-exporter Capital in non-durable and semi-durable industries; the State intervention that orientates the development of infrastructure, transport, comunication, energy; and the base industry, steel, ore and oil.

The political feature of this process is the broadening of the force of statism, by means of the State intervention in the political and ideological national-developmentalist orientation in the international range of the keynesian-fordist model. Therefore, the governments of Getúlio Vargas in Brazil (1930-1945, 1951-1954); Juan Perón in Argentina (1946-1955, 1973-1974) and Lázaro Cárdenas in Mexico (1934-1940) were responsible for creating the necessary conditions to the industrial growth of 1950-1960. The conditions to the second Global Division of Labour occur after the Second World War (1939-1945) on account of the implantation of the industrial plants of the center to the semi-peripheral countries of the Lantin-America.

The industrial growth was conditioned to the entry of large volumes of imperialist resources (Foreign Direct Investment) which had concrete influence in the progressive indebtedness of the semi-peripheries with the World Bank and with the International Monetary Fund, with the imperialist international capitalism. The difference to the central countries in their industrialization process is that in the semi-periphery this process is characterised by the domination relations between central and semi-peripheral nations expressed in the chains of the national dependence, of the industrialization directed by the external policy of the central countries. This feature and this process of origin and expansion of the international bourgeoisie, which engenders the block of the imperialist bourgeoisie with the dependent bourgeoisie of the semi-peripheries which, strengthening ties, give birth to an international and associated bourgeoisie.

For the proletariat, this process means the overexploitation trough the wage compression, the labour intensification, the raise of the working hours, and a novelty in this process, the technological advance (and with it the increase of the reserve army of labour), in addition to the segmentation of the work in lower and upper strata of the proletariat, grounded on national, ethnic and racial and differences and of occupational categories.
In this period the Capital and the State generated class contradictions to the level of nations, contradictions among countries which are expressed in the dependent underdevelopment of the semi-peripheries by the central countries, an expansion in the relations of exploitation of the world proletariat by the bourgeoisie, allowed by the expansion and circulation of Capital and guaranteed, reproduced and reinforced by the State. At historical-universal level, this process was concretely expressed by the impossibility of the reformist pact of the center under the fordist model be applied in the periphery, by the total denial of any renegotiation of the dependence or of the decrease of exploitation and the minimum guarantee of social welfare of the proletariat, in other words, of any claiming struggle, legal and peaceful, for work and thanks to the strongest reaction of the bourgeois military dictatorship in Latin-America.

After the leap from the State Capitalism to the ultramonopolist Capitalism, characterised by the constant deregulation of the financial market, by the monetary dollarisation, by new imperialist processes of accumulation (privatizations) and sequentially by the dismantlement of the Social Welfare State, the exploitation relations operate a new transformation, which implied in the agro-exporter retrocession in the semi-periphery and in the class struggle intensification. The precariousness of labour, the overexploitation, and the rise of the agrarian and ethnic conflicts put the old model in crisis and provoke the struggle for the guarantee of the rights. The relative stagnancy leaves room for the formation of "anti-neoliberal Popular Fronts", that demonstrate the crisis of the proletariat inside its own battlefield (expressed in the reformist and bourgeois directions that guide its struggles) and in its struggle against the world bourgeoisie and its ultramonopolist model of exploitation and misery.

The development of this period occurs parallel to the development of the "Latin-American Neo-populism", emerged from the continuance of the proletariat's crisis and from the development of the class struggle, after the crisis and struggles carried out between 1997 and 2003, whose key point of integration lies in the contradiction level of its policies, in the interests of the exploited masses and in the ultramonopolist model of Capital/Imperialism. In this period we contemplate a new distension of the forms of Capital accumulation by the "flexible accumulation" and the change of the semi-peripheral epicenter in expansion from the Latin-America to Asia. The Asian semi-
peripheral model continues the orientation of imperialism, based on a platform of exportations, maintaining the relations of capitalist domination through the satisfaction of the needs and of the external demands of the global central-bourgeois economy. This geographical change transforms the relations among the countries and between the classes and creates an entire new universe of contradictions to the world proletariat.

The current crisis of the world capitalism represents a break with the long cycle of Capital accumulation initiated in 1960, which is expressed in a new configuration of the bourgeois economy that is characterised by the the fight between two economic models (national-developmentalism and neoliberalism) and by the inter-imperialist international geopolitical confrontation for the world hegemony of the States.

The historical particularity of the present context does not lie in a simple contradiction of the credit and the finances, or in a classical crisis of overproduction, but in the transformations provoked by the current scenario of the bourgeois society. For the Latin-America, this period is characterised by the stagnancy operated since the decade of 1980, which reverses the continuous growth trend of capital accumulation, independently of the expansive policy in the continent under the new GDL, in which the Asia assumes the key position. Within the same cycle of growth and expansion on a global scale, certain regions register regressive conditions if compared to the previous period, although these recessions do not imply a structural crisis, but effects of restructuring and hierarchy of the Capital on a world scale. At the same time, in this new GDL the conditions of development of the crises are very differentiated, being reserved for the Latin-America discrepant contradictions, between Brazil, Mexico and Argentina, as well as between these countries and the other countries of the Southern Cone and of the Central America and the Caribbean.

Presently, in 2008, the bourgeoisie responded to the crisis with anti-cyclical measures proposed by the IMF and by the ECLAC, in which we witnessed the opening of a new conjuncture, wherein the financial organisms of the imperialism adopt statist measures for the regularization of the financial policies of the capitalist economy. The current conjuncture being an underway process, we can theoretically develop different possible scenarios that may vary in relation to the class struggle and activity. The presence or absence of some of the factors may show the acting of the trends and/or counter-
trends of aggravation of the capitalist crisis and its current standard of accumulation. Our current situation, at a historical-universal level, is characterised by the following social elements:

**a)** The immaturity of the inter-imperialist contradictions, between the blocks of Russia/China and USA/EU.

**b)** The international capitalist action through the banking coordination and the business action expressed in the State aids of the central banks.

**c)** Synchronous, inequal and combined character of the current crisis, with effects of recovery that are slow and subordinated to the struggle of and between the classes.

**d)** Capital accumulation based in the speculative exchanges and in the economic symbiosis among the countries (financial systems between USA/EU, commercial and fiscal interests USA/China).

**e)** The proletarian movement is immersed in a great crisis of orientation, direction and organization.

The historical-universal situation presents a complex scenario, however, the conflict between the classes is the decisive factor to the result of the contradictions. The proletariat must enter in the historical praxis if it do not want to see the historical becoming pass over its head once more.
5 – The class struggle today: the creation of an autonomous opposition in the mass movement

Faced with this framework, it is appropriate to reaffirm a determinate policy. We can say that, today, we have some permanent general tasks, if we want to take seriously the struggle for the socialism and for the emancipation of the international working class.

A. The socialism as program/goal implies in the destruction of the capitalist system, in the general collectivisation and in the federalism, in the destruction of the inequalities of class and of the State, and of the entire imperialist system, in other words, in the self-government of the workers according to the Commune-Soviet model.

B. The strategy to the building of a socialist society is a revolution, not progressive reforms, nor the bourgeois-democratic or anti-imperialist revolution, nor a revolution with partial program (a step of transition mediated by a State and a Dictatorship toward a communism in an indefinite future). The revolution is socialist and has as goal the integral accomplishment of the socialism in the immediate post-revolutionary period.

C. The tactic or precondition of this revolution are: International Organization of the revolutionaries under the Anarchist program and Internationalist Organization of the Workers, as well as the base units of the revolutionary syndicalism in the different countries. These organisations will link the claiming program of masses, based in the denial of the ultramonopolist capitalism and of the (developmentalist) statism, with the socialist programmatic goals. In the center, it implies in the defense and broadening of the rights and equal wages for all the occupations (manual and non-manual, strata of the proletariat and its minorities). In the peripheries, implies in the struggle for the equality of direct and indirect salaries in relation to the countries of the center, freedom of organization and of propaganda to the workers and autonomy. For presenting our political line, we have to mark the difference in relation to the line that predominated in the 20th century, the communist theory of permanent revolution. In the ground of the political organization, this theory was crys-
tallized in the policy of the anti-imperialist front. In its revolutionary version, resulted in the national liberation movements in some countries of the periphery (most instances, bu the rupture with the dominant orientation coming from the USSR). In the reformist version, the most widespread, the conquest of the State by means of elections and the performing of structural reforms were advocated. In the field of organization of masses, it implied in the unionism of social-democrat type, which subordinated the goals of the unions to the goals of the very front, and restricted the economic struggle to the economicism – that was inserted from "outside" the class by the reformist political line. This economicism implied the acceptance and the strengthening of the contradictions and differentiations within the class; in the center, in the acceptance of the social welfare state, sacrificing the workers of the periphery in their set; in the periphery, certain occupational categories admitted certain commitments, sacrificing the other which composed the great masses of workers. The political and economic struggles of the workers were restricted to the economicism, i.e., to the economic goals that were adequate to the tactic of the anti-imperialist front and to the strategy and theory of permanent revolution.

It is important to indicate that the socialism, in the anarchist theory of revolution, is a set of concrete measures (economic, political and social), and it is related to the class struggle and to the historical development of the revolutionary process. This program is part of the revolutionary anarchist organisation and defines its function. At the same time, it relates to the claiming program, applied in the local and immediate struggles of the workers, and that also is sustained by the anarchist organisation, through the creation of mass organisations that maintain their relation to the revolutionary and socialist goal not by decree or formal ideological declaration, but because the measures of the claiming program and the struggle that it engenders and strengthens are part of the necessary conditions to the development of the own revolutionary process. Thus, the socialism is a program to be integrally applied in the post-revolutionary situation, and the claiming program not just has in germ the elements of the socialist society, as also helps to prepare the collective forces of the proletariat to accomplish the socialist revolution. That is why the political organisation (of alliance-type) maintains a dialectical relation with the organisation of masses (IWA-type), because these organisations allows at the same time the intransigent defense of the anarchist revolution-
ary policy and theory, and the non-sectarian expansion of the mass movement, by eliminating the issues of ideological, religious or moral nature and etc. of the prerequisites to the organisation of the workers, strengthening the class unity. The socialist program, i.e., this set of concrete measures to be applied after a victorious revolution are:

1) The liquidation of all the devices of State (parliament, executive power, armed forces, bureaucracy, diplomacy);

2) Suppression of the Monarchal, Dictatorial or Republican State administration; general and universal arming of the people and its transformation in people-revolutionary-army;

3) Institution of Soviet Communes as base organs of management of the society (the local communes will elect representatives to the Regional Soviet-Communes and these to the National Congress that will constitute the Socialist Federation) as form of Self-Government of the Workers;

4) Direct election and imperative mandates for all the instances of such federation and the evenness of the salaries of the elected representatives with the base-salary of the workers;

5) Collectivisation of the foreign and multinational companies in each country;

6) Collectivisation of the land and natural resources of the countries;

7) Creation of local commissions of economic management, to ensure the control of the proletariat upon the different branches of the economy and society, in the workplaces and in the places of production, which guarantee its direct and democratic management.

8) Disclosure of all the treaties and measures of the Revolutionary Government and of the previous bourgeois governments, as well as of the economic institutions;

9) Promotion of the freedom of propaganda, organization and of cultural and religious beliefs.

10) Recognition of the right of self-determination of the peoples, through an international policy of struggle against imperialism and internally by means of the recognition of the right of secession and sovereignty of the peoples.
The policy derived from the theory of permanent revolution annihilated the internationalism and the classism. The workers abdicated the international solidarity on behalf of national pacts. The ones of the center sacrificed those of the periphery in their set. The ones of the periphery sacrificed certain occupational categories. The ultramonopolist capital now devours this pact and with it the own workers and their illusions. Our political line places the centrality not in the conquest of the State. That is why the economic and political struggles acquire another meaning and place. The view of the anti-imperialist struggle must take necessarily to a critical approach of the concept of imperialism from the Bakuninist perspective. In that sense, for making a Bakuninist definition of imperialism it is first need to indentify what Bakunin had defined statism and collective forces which define in a summarized manner the role of the State in history and in the capitalism. What characterizes the capitalism to Bakunin is the exploitation of the collective forces of proletariat, in which the State plays a fundamental role of guarantor of the social necessary conditions through violence.

There are differences in the theory of imperialism. Does exist a theoretical prevalence of the Stalinist-Maoist line based in the theory of peaceful coexistence, but also exists a dispute in the characterisation of the concept of imperialism that has grave consequences. On one side exists the characterisation of the imperialism as phenomenon of inequal exchanges in which the capital transference is the main core. In other words, the problem is placed from the bourgeois perspective, of the higher or lower local capital accumulation, whence is glimpsed the need of a strong State to combat the external exploitation, thus, the idea of the alliance with the national bourgeoisie is central. This view places all the problems of the labour exploitation as secondary, as if the imperialism were the exploitation of a nation in its set. On the other side, we have the theory of imperialism that understands that the center of imperialism is in the exploitation and overexploitation of the labour and in the forms of its organization in order to increase the profit rates, i.e., in the control of the collective forces of the proletariat, being the transference of capital to other countries based exactly in the higher or lower possibility of controlling the collective and productive forces, which often requires a repressive State.

The particular form assumed by this general relation of overexploitation has to be indentified by the Bakuninist materialist analysis, so that we
can trace the line of masses and the political line of intervention in the different countries. For instance, the wage reduction through Toyotist mechanisms is an international element. It is certain that the Toyotism degrades the economic relations of the workers and increases the flexibility of the labour relations – this is a general or international character. The particular is which sector of the society will be discriminate and marginalised, undergone to specific relations of overexploitation, which dimension assumed by the class fractions, categories, strata, within an economic system (which conditions the form of approach and the protagonism of the different social sectors). In that sense, we understand that we must make a more complex approach, exactly making that the anti-imperialist struggle be comprised in the struggle against the exploitation in the workplaces. Precisely because the imperialism is an economic and political phenomenon, of infrastructure, the anti-imperialist struggle, from the Bakuninist point of view, cannot reproduce the strategy of the superstructural struggle (opposing national control X foreign control of companies and strategic resources through the State).

Therefore, understanding that one of the main mechanisms of the imperialism lies in the centrality and particularity that the exploitation will assume, guaranteeing higher profit rates and capital transferences to the central countries, we must have another line of action. Actually, what we want to pose is that in the struggle of the labour movement inside the great industrial companies and multinational banks, within the agro-exporter sector and etc. is that lies effective room to the anti-imperialist struggle in the Bakuninist view. The very economic struggle must be resignified. The struggle for the salary raise must be politicised as a struggle against the very essence of imperialist that is the international inequality of wages and the greater exploitation (and the annihilation of social and political rights) of the workers of the periphery.

Actually, the anti-imperialist struggle must recognize the centrality of the exploitation (and this is the defense of Bakunin) of the capitalist society. From the Bakuninist viewpoint, the anti-imperialist struggle cannot be the struggle for a larger local capitalist accumulation resulting in a better distribution of income (which is the real content of the Chavism and populist Bolivarianism in the Latin-America), but instead the struggle against the exploitation and overexploitation which are the particular forms that the imperialism assumes in the peripheral countries. Besides, the very Toyotist productive
restructuring broadens the overexploitation in the center (over migrants and minorities), creating the objective conditions to the internationalist organization of the workers. This implies in the struggle against the mechanisms and economic-political effects of the productive restructuring (unemployment, outsourcing and precariousness of the labour and etc.). It also implies in the direct action against the great monopolist and agro-exporter companies, in the banner of the workers' control on the production in the strategic sectors of economy (as oil, hydrocarbons, gas), because this control is what guarantees the rupture with the world imperialist chain. And the workers' control is not the state co-management or the cooperative management, it is the control through the associative pressure power of the own process of production. Thus, we must approach the nationalization issue from this point of view, instead of opposing the anti-imperialist struggle for nationalization to the economic struggles (some as “political” and others as “economic”), we must note that within a certain policy, these struggles are at the same time political and economical.

For breaking up the imperialist building is necessary breaking up the capitalist links in the peripheries and semi-peripheries of the capitalism, which would provoke a crisis of the economic bases that sustains another face of imperialism, the economic cooptation of sectors of the proletariat which are integrated in the interests of the national bourgeoisie in the center (enabled precisely by the extra rate of capital accumulation originated from the overexploitation of the periphery and of the marginalised workers in the center). The international socialist revolution tends to be from the periphery to the center, in the sense in which, for the imperialism be destroyed, is indispensable destroying the relations of dependence and overexploitation, and in that process, the own worker of the periphery are the protagonists. However, this trend does not mean that the revolution in the periphery occur in an endogenous manner, on the contrary, it is necessarily a combined process of class struggle that develops in the countries of the center and of the periphery, wherein may occur advances in the class struggle and even revolutions in the center, feeding the class struggle and the revolution in the periphery. But the fundamental issue is that no international revolution will be socialist if it has not the periphery not just as a support point, but with the dialectic protagonism that is combined with the class struggle in the center. In that sense, the workers must have an internationalist strategy of breaking the imperialist production bound, decreasing the profit rate in the periphery
and thus helping to agonize the very crisis of capitalism at international level, because making the overexploitation unfeasible in the periphery creates room for the unfeasibility of the economic concessions and cooptation of the labour unions and of the working class in the center. In other words, is created room for the advance of the proletarian revolution in the center from the crisis of the system provoked by the class struggle in the periphery. The thesis of the “Revolution from the Periphery to the Center” is also applicable on an international scale to the political economy of the world system.

Is in this sense that we visualize our thesis about the international revolution, which must occur from the periphery to the center and from bottom up, in the economic sense as well as in the political one. In this point, the Bakuninist sociological and economic analysis shows itself as differentiated, not superstructural, nor infrastructural, but dialectic, because it points out the political elements of the economic struggles and the economic content of the political struggle. Without this differentiated theoretical approach, there is no tactic, nor strategy that be different from the bourgeois nationalist and reformist communist strategies, and the workers will be lost with no immediate program and no revolutionary program. That is why the theory is central, as Bakunin and revolutionaries like Nestor Makhno and Jaime Balius affirmed. The economic and political struggles are carried out through legal and illegal forms, public and clandestine, ideological and theoretical. It is need to understand and combine these forms of struggle, which do not correspond to a division between “union and political” organizations (both labor unions and revolutionary political organisations perform legal and illegal struggle, public and clandestine, and there are forms of legal struggle that are not state-owned, as the theoretical struggle of the intellectuals). There is no absolute division among these forms of struggle, but complex combinations that are historically determined.
5.1 The problem of the crises of capitalism, of the proletariat's crisis of organization and of the international line of masses

Another fundamental component of the reformist political and mass line is its dependence of the “crisis of capital”. The idea of the crisis of capital is fundamental for legitimizing the reformist policy, because it is legitimized by having a program to overcome the crisis (or stagnation) of capital through structural reforms. Thereunto, it deepens the economicism and the nationalism among the workers, creating the conditions to the proletariat's crisis, undermining, contradictorily, the bases of its very power in the medium term, - the mobilization of the masses.

The cyclic and structural crises of capitalism never solve the crises of the proletariat, which, in this historical moment, is far from being a mere crisis of direction, but is a crisis of the models of organization. In that sense, the subjective conditions are obstacles to the autonomous action that focuses over the crisis of capitalism and transform it from a cyclic crisis (solved by the bourgeois intervention and competition) to a revolutionary crisis (solved through the struggle and economic and political organization of the proletariat). In this manner, confronted to the different crises of capitalism, we will not be able to break the vicious circle of systemic integration or cyclic disintegration, unless we break with the tactics, theory and program of the permanent revolution.

The fundamental issue is that the reconstruction of an syndicalism of revolutionary type implies in combating, in the center, the social-democrat models of labor unions (its forms of organization, tactics and action), and in the periphery, the hybrid models (social-democrat, fascist-corporatist like the existent in Brazil and Mexico). These models of reformist and state unionism are seated on the unionist bureaucracy and working aristocracy (understood as a layer of better-paid workers that are coopted by the system). In this manner, we can say that the anarchists and the workers have two sets of immediate tasks: the ones of organization and the ones of struggle and claim, which are deeply related between themselves. For implementing other claims, it will be need to combat the existent organizations and its directions, and for organizing the workers to that are needed immediate claims.
In this sense, we can say that the struggle against the unionist bureaucracy (of Cardenist-Peronist-Varguist type in countries of the periphery) and social-democrat, communist and reformist ones in the countries of the center is an essential task and dimension of the class struggle, precondition to the development of the consciousness and unity of class, feature of the international line of masses of the revolutionary syndicalism. The formation of these party and unionist bureaucracies is one of the effects of the development of statism in its state monopolist phase, and so, the task of the Bakuninist struggle of masses is conducting the struggle for the rupture with their social and ideological bases. As part of the development of the statism and capitalism there is a fundamental effect: the systematic pulverization and fragmentation of the working class (in the Latin-America through the different models of development of the state monopolist capitalism, like the "Peronism in Argentina", the "PRIism" in Mexico and the "Varguism" in Brazil). Thus, the struggle against the bureaucratism and the bureaucracy is an essential task of the struggle against the "statism", pillar of the capitalist-imperialist system.

The struggle against the effects of the economic crisis must be combined to the struggle against the proletariat's crisis of organization and direction, and thereunto we need a clear line, political and of masses. The immediate claims are an essential component of this international political line, not just because they aim to mobilize the workers, but because they aim to generate and deepen the antagonism of the workers to the Capital and to the State and combat the hegemony of the reformist and conservative currents, which help in the operation and reproduction of the own system. At the same time, this program is composed by elements which aim to present proposals to the immediate struggle of the workers. In its economical and political dimension and their labour and life conditions (including environmental ones).

Our immediate claiming program is subdivided into six general axes, which must be applied to the different countries from a specific analysis of its class structure, history, main conflicts and etc. And must be added specific national programs.
**Program of General Economic Claims (rural and urban)**

- Six-hour working days without wage reduction in all the continents;
- Equal wage floor to the workers of multinational companies in its countries of origin and in the countries where they operate in any part of the world;
- Regional minimum wage for all the workers based in the calculation of the cost of living of the region (continent or economic block) and fixed in U.S. dollars;
- Sliding scale of salary readjustment for combating effects of crises, inflation and other wage losses.

**Program of Indirect Economic Claims (Education, Health, Habitation and etc.)**

- Unemployment benefits for two years by the value of the regional minimum wage;
- Expansion of the public and gratuitous systems of education at all the levels to attend the demand of the population;
- Expansion of the gratuitous systems of health until reaching the demand of the population;
- Obligatoriness of the private system of health performing essential and emergency care to the people of low income;
- Indexation of the rents in a maximum value of 15% of the current minimum wage in each country;
- Indexation of the monthly value of the public transportation so that it does not extrapolate 10% of the current minimum wage in each country.
Program of General Political Claims

- Freedom of organization, meeting and propaganda; fight against the bureaucracies, the state-owned and employer tutelages; autonomy of the organisations;
- Workers' control over the production and over the nationalizations;
- Liberation of the workers in situation of slavery;
- Annulment of all legislation that restricts the autonomy and the freedom of political and unionist organization of the workers;
- Amnesty for all the criminalised and penalised workers due to them;
- Freedom to political prisoners by reason of defense of the rights of the workers and of the oppressed minorities;
- Freedom of organization and meeting in the workplace and of access to the same of the representatives legitimately recognized by the workers;
- Freedom of propaganda at all the levels, guaranteeing the access to the mass media (which is a public concession);
- Nationalization, under workers' control, of the strategic sector of the economy, especially of the public servicing;
- Abrogation of the patents of public interest (medicines and etc.);
- Withdrawal of the foreign troops of all the occupied countries;
- Withdrawal of the the troops of internal occupation of the rural interior of the different countries.

Program of Agrarian Claims

- Land distribution for the rural workers and peasants;
- Elimination of the planting of transgenic cultivars and of the use of agro-toxics;
• Subsidies for the production of the peasants;
• Abrogation of the agricultural patents.

**Program of Anti-discriminatory Economic-Political Claims**

• Protection of the indigenous territory and native peoples;
• Economic subsidies for the production of the indigenous and native populations;
• Guaranteeing their effective access to the public health and education systems;
• Right of the immigrants to establish residence with their families in the countries wherein they work;
• Concession of citizenship to the immigrants which were employed in illegal conditions as compensation for the overexploitation;
• Freedom and equality of rights of cultural and religious manifestation;
• Wage floor equal to that of the men for the women in all the occupations;
• Equal wage floor for blacks, indigenes, foreigners and etc. in the same occupation than whites, nationals and etc.;
• Paid maternity leave of nine months.

**Environmental Program**

• Creation of systems of treatment of the solid and lique waste under the responsibility of the polluter institutions and companies;
• Removal of all the waste deposits from the residential areas of the workers and poor populations;
• Creation of a broad public system of collection and treatment of waste, financed by a tax over the guilties of environmental crimes;
• Inclusion of the environmental education in the schools;
• Punishment to the responsible for environmental crimes through the integral confiscation of their environmentally degrading investments.

All these claims are immediate, in other words, for organization and agitation among the workers. In contrast to the nationalist and reformist line which restricts the economic claims to the minimum to attempt solving the questions through the conquest of the State, this program leads the claims to another level. This platform of claims aims to create the bases for the reconstruction of the International Workingmen's Association, i.e., its goal is not the conquest of the power of the State, but the strengthening of the associative and mobilization power of the own workers. In the workplace and internationally.

The internationalism is not only a vague world of support to the external causes. It must be expressed in the claims, struggle and organization of the workers in all the countries. In the peripheries, by the capacity of organization of the workers, by the extension of the salaries and their equalization to those of the workers of the center. In the center, the discrimination is presented as racism against the minorities, and in the periphery, by the discrimination of the masses of indigenous and half-breed origin (great part of Latin-America) and black and half-breed (case of Brazil). For speaking about internationalism is need to combat the racism and the discrimination, as well as the bourgeois ideologies which lead the workers of the center to sacrifice those of the periphery and semi-periphery, and in the peripheries leas the "integrated/structured" sector of the occupations to "differentiate" from the workers that are integrated in the lower sphere of the labor market, feeding the ideological illusion of proximity with the "bourgeoisie".

This immediate struggle and claiming program of masses do not present a relation of historical disjunction (like the Marxism has postulated, an opposition between the historical and the immediate) with the socialist program, on the contrary. This program aims to prepare part, we do say, part, of
the objective and subjective conditions of the socialist revolution, and without this organized and conscious preparation none revolution can occur. The conquest and achievement on an international scale – even at an unequal rhythm – will create not just material bases to the new relations of production and power, but also seeds of the new forms of political management of society. Therefore, today we propose:

The method of reconstruction of the Alliance and of the IWA. The made diagnosis of the proletariat's forces in the current conjuncture indicates that it is not possible to recreate immediately the the Anarchist Alliance and nor the IWA. But the historical experience also shows that is need to have a policy of small groups that starts the construction from bottom up, in other words, from the local to the national and international. In this sense, the construction method will be instituting an International Anarchist Network (IAN), with a executive coordination; this is provisionally composed by the founder organisations (UNIPA and OPAR); and those which come to adhere to the Bakuninism; the sections of the Network that will be created by their own initiative. The sections must create fronts of masses within the struggles of the workers of their respective countries and act in these fronts under the general designation of Internationalan and Classist Trend (ICT).

The sections of the Network will be responsible for initiating and directing political and economic struggles of the workers and developing the theoretical and ideological struggle, being prepared as revolutionary organisation. The theoretical and ideological unity occurs on the base of the platform, the tactical unity occurs through the concrete coordination and practical application of the program, strategy and coordination by the IAN; this unity is presented by the adhesion to the international slogans of the IAN and ICT.

The local sections of the IAN are composed by at least 3 Bakuninist militants. The role of the organisation is to direct the struggles, coordinate them on the base of the claiming socialist program and develop the theoretical struggle (which imples deepening the Bakuninist theory) in the local plane.

The following step is the multiplication of the sections in each country and the construction of a NPG (National Anarchist Political Group), which will be a section of the future International Organisation.
It is a task of every section to organize and intervene in the struggles of the occupational categories of the workers, trying to organize oppositions of revolutionary-syndicalism type. The construction of the ICT will occur through the construction of nucleuses of workers that are willing to fight for the claims that were presented in this platform under the form of internationalist classist oppositions (inside each occupational category) and must assume the fight against the bureaucracy and the forms of state unionism in the peripheries and semi-peripheries (in the Latin-America, like the existent in Brazil, Mexico and Argentina, of labour unions subordinated to the State) and of mafia and social-democrat unionism in the countries of the center (like the existent in Europe and USA). These oppositions must take the claiming program here presented to the workers and organize them for struggling for its accomplishment.

Creating oppositions to the labour unions and organizing the oppositions based upon the organization by workplace of inter-profissional character (unitary). It implies in ignoring the differences of category and discriminations generated by the capital, and organizing all the workers into commissions in the workplaces.

The structure of the opposition must be flexible, having a central core of militants that are organized on a permanent basis and forms of temporary base organizations (base commissions). These commissions must be created and undone according to the struggle of the oppositions to handle the specific needs of the class struggle.

Organizing the categories of the students, deepening the relation of this occupational category which is a transition category between the domestic environment and the working environment. Differentiating the class origins, the goal is guaranteeing the organization of the students of the working class.

Federalizing the oppositions of the different occupational categories, always creating a great front around the struggle program and strategy (combating on nationalism, bureaucracy, statism and urban-rural segmentation, among the occupational categories, amongst the proletariat of the different countries). The advance towards large organisations (Confederations) of revolutionary-unionist type will depend on the evolution of the class struggle and on the very ability of the Bakuninist organisations.
Unity of action in the class struggle (strikes and other mobilizations, but without abdicating the revolutionary and claiming (immediate) programs). The alliances with the other political forces and workers' organisations must be defined through a careful principist analysis and balancing of these issues.

The General Strike – understood as the stoppage of all the economic sectors – is the main instrument of struggle and organization of the ICT. This does not mean not resorting to other forms of proletarian direct action, but that this form is the main form. The IAN is considered the embryonic form of the future Alliance, as well as the ICT is the embryonic form of the future IWA. The changeover between the current stage and the next wherein the construction of these organisations will be placed on the agenda will depend on the development of the class struggle in each region and on the dialectic between the growths of the IAN and of the ICT.

Comrads. We have to advance in the historical tasks that the great revolutionaries like Bakunin, Durruti, Makhno and Balius pointed out. This is a need of the working class. The emancipation of the workers must be conquered by the workers themselves! Therefore, we reinforce our summons, to all the revolutionary anarchists, to all the conscious workers for joining to the effort presented here.

Anarchism is Struggle!

Patriots of All the Oppressed Homelands!

Down with the domination of man through the concentration of powers!

Down with the domination of man through the concentration of capitals!

Reconstructing the historical Alliance and IWA!
“Whereas the different currents [in the proletariat's bosom] committed the misjudgement of extrapolating the universal-historical tasks of the bourgeoisie to the proletariat, Bakunin (...) points out that proletariat's historical task not only is not to imitate the bourgeoisie in the seizure of State to the development of Socialism, as demonstrates that the essential condition in order that the humankind emancipates itself from the government of the men upon the men is precisely the abolition, the revolutionary destruction of the States and their substitution per a great Universal Confederation of free men and international associations of workers that coordinate the production.”

OPAR
www.anarquismorevolucionario.wordpress.com

UNIPA
www.uniaoanarquista.wordpress.com