

## CLASS STRUGGLE AND "BOSSES' OFFENSIVES" (FOLLOWING THE THREAD OF TIME XXVII)

(Battaglia Comunista, no. 39, October 19-26, 1949)

### YESTERDAY

The errors in the practice of the proletarian struggle and the ruinous deviations from it, which have historically characterized the epoch of the WWI and in the WWII the war and post-war epoch, are closely linked to the loss of the critical foundations of the Marxist method.

Marx coordinated the foresight of the revolutionary insurrection of the workers with the economic laws of capitalist development.

The revisionists of Marxism have wanted to find the system defective, strengthened by the delay of a century in which *our* revolution would find itself, while Marx, due to the changing conditions of the means of connection and world communication, foresaw a faster march than that of the bourgeois revolution, and pretend that these laws were erroneous and that the more modern evolution of the bourgeois regime would have disproved the central thesis: more and more wealth at one pole, more and more misery at the other.

And for fifty years statistics have been cited about the increased wage rate, the increased radius and rate of consumption of the industrial worker, the results of the vast machinery of social reforms tending to save from falling into absolute hunger the workers driven out of the cycle of wage-earning activity by accident, sickness, old age and unemployment. And, on the other hand, it was pretended that the extension of the functions of the central state machine, its supposed control over high yields and the excessive peaks of capitalist speculation, its distribution of benefits and social and collective services to all, had a value as a substitute for socialist demands.

All this in the revisionist vision tended to design the "progressive" possibility of an ever-better distribution of the fruits of production among those who had participated in it, the powerful socialist aspiration falling more and more into the morbid baseness of unctuous philanthropists' campaign for the silly word of "social justice", theoretical and literary baggage prior to Marx's work and mercilessly exterminated by the latter.

Capitalism was carried from the idyllic poemlet to the horrors of the tragedy of the mad monopolist and imperialist race that had a first outcome in the war of 1914; and the evidence that, when it persists, lives and grows, at the same time misery, suffering and massacre grow and spread, was reflected in a vigorous return of the workers' parties to radical positions and to the battle that aims at the destruction, not the amendment of the bourgeois social system.

After the theoretically even more decisive confirmation of the Second War, the years that followed pose the serious problem of a lack of revolutionary reaction of the methods of proletarian action in the world.

The general law of capitalist accumulation was outlined by Marx in Book I of *Capital* in Chapter XXIII. The first paragraph starts from the premise that the progress of accumulation tends to raise the rate of wages. The spread of large-scale capitalist production, as in the English example from the beginning of the

fifteenth century to the middle of the eighteenth century, and as otherwise throughout the modern world in the second half of the latter, with the demand of a greater number of wage earners causes "an increase in wages to take place". It is in vain, therefore, to want to disprove Marx with the fact that the wages of the slaves of capital have not fallen. For immediately after the quoted words, Marx wrote the others: *"The more or less favourable circumstances in which the wage-working class supports and multiplies itself, in no way alter the fundamental character of capitalist production"*.

And this fundamental character, the general law in question, was not fixed by Marx in the worker-employer relation alone, but in the relation of the two classes as a whole. The composition of the two classes varies continuously. In the bourgeois class the accumulated wealth is concentrated and divided into fewer and fewer hands and above all into fewer and fewer large enterprises. At the point of arrival of this perspective is expressly the "society the limit would be reached only when the entire social capital was united in the hands of *either a single capitalist or a single capitalist company*". Engels commented in 1890 that this 1864 forecast was verified by the "brand new American and English trusts". The then radical Marxist Kautsky reiterated twenty years later that the phenomenon had spread throughout the capitalist world. Lenin developed, in 1915, the complete theory of imperialism.

The Marxist school has the materials to complete the classic text with the words: *"... or even in the nationalizing capitalist State, whether it is headed by Hitler, Attlee or Stalin"*.

On the other side of the social trench, Marx follows in this central analysis, as in all his work, not the oscillation of compensation, but the composition of the non-possessing population and its variable distribution in the industrial reserve army. And he constructs his general law to the effect that, with the expansion and accumulation of capitalism, whatever happens to the rate of remuneration of wage earners temporarily employed in the enterprises, the absolute and relative number of all those who are in reserve without even having the income from the labor of the arms themselves grows. In the fourth paragraph of the same chapter, he arrives at the statement of the law in question, which bears the name of the law of increasing misery: *«The relative mass of the industrial reserve army increases therefore with the potential energy of wealth. But the greater this reserve army in proportion to the active labour army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated surplus population, whose misery is in inverse ratio to its torment of labour. The more extensive, finally, the lazarus-layers of the working class, and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism»*.

Misery and pauperism for the philistine economist are not having enough to eat. According to the Catholic monk quoted by Marx, it is taken care of by charity, according to today's conquerors of America, the UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1943-1947). Misery for Marx is that by which the proletarian Lazarus, by the incessant "expansion and contraction" of the bourgeois enterprise, enters and rises from the tomb of the daily lack of means, and this

misery grows because it grows disproportionately the number of those who are locked in the barriers of these two alternatives: to kill themselves to work for capital or starve to death.

The *chiodo* (TN: nail in Italian, meaning a fixed idea) of Marx's revisionists was that Marx had begun to revise himself in 1848, when he wrote *Capital*. The proof that they had never understood a Kolarov is in the fact that Marx himself in this passage quotes in a note his writing prior to the *Manifesto* itself: *The Poverty of Philosophy* written against Proudhon's *The Philosophy of Poverty* in 1847. The reference to the note is placed immediately after the words: "*This antagonistic character of capitalist production*". The self-cited passage in the note says that the current relations of production "*that these relations produce bourgeois wealth, i. e., the wealth of the bourgeois class, only by continually annihilating the wealth of the individual members of this class and by producing an ever-growing proletariat*".

This point, therefore, is central to Marxism, in fact the cornerstone of Marxism, *which is EVER MORE IN STANDING*, in the historical race 1847-1874-1949.

The proletariat is the wretch, that is to say, the propertyless, the reserveless, not the underpaid. The word was found by Marx in a text of 1774, according to which the more proletarians a country has, the richer it is. "*Our "proletarian"*", Marx defines, *is economically none other than the wage labourer, who produces and increases capital, and is thrown out on the streets, as soon as he is superfluous for the needs of aggrandisement of "Monsieur capital"*". With infinite insight Marx mocks the other author who speaks of the "*proletarian of the primitive forest*". The inhabitant of this is its proprietor, not a proletarian: "*This would only be the case, if the primitive forest exploited him, instead of being exploited by him*".

The atmosphere of the worst barbarism is this modern forest that makes use of us, a forest of chimneys and bayonets, of machines and weapons, of strange inanimate beasts that prey on human flesh.

## TODAY

The situation of all the reserveless, reduced to such a state because they are dialectically themselves a reserve, has been frighteningly aggravated by the war experience. The hereditary nature of belonging to the economic classes makes being reserveless a more serious thing than being lifeless. After the passage of the flames of war, after the systematic bombardment, the components of the working class, no less than after any other disaster, not only lose with maximum probability the contingent occupation, but see destroyed also the minimum stock of chattels which in every habitation is composed of rudimentary furniture. The possessor's titles survive in part any material destruction, because they are social rights sanctioned for the exploitation of others. And to write still in flaming characters the Marxist Law of Antagonism comes the other observation within everyone's reach that the industries of war and destruction are the ones that lead to maximum profits and maximum concentrations of wealth in restricted hands. The industry of Reconstruction is not far behind, and the forest of business and Marshall and ERP (*European Recovery Program*) plans elects the Great Jackal Officer as its worthy Managing Delegate.

The wars have thus unequivocally thrown millions and millions of other men into the ranks of those who have nothing more to lose. They have delivered the *knock-out blow* to the face of revisionism. The slogan of radical Marxism was to resonate tremendously: *The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains*.

The revolutionary class is the one that has nothing to defend and can no longer believe in the *conquests* with which it was deceived in the interwar period.

Everything was compromised by the infamous "Bourgeois Offensive" theory.

The war was to give rise to the initiative and the offensive of those who have nothing against the class that has and dominates everything, and was on the contrary labeled as the launching pad for actions of the ruling class aimed at withdrawing from the proletariat non-existent benefits, advantages and conquests of past times.

The praxis of the revolutionary party was changed into a praxis of defense of tutelage and of claiming economic and political "guarantees" that it was pretended had been acquired by the proletariat class, there where they were precisely the bourgeois guarantees and conquests.

Not only in the final sentence had the Manifesto sculpted that central point, the result of an analysis of the whole social complex that years of experience and struggle had developed, but in another of what Lenin defined as the forgotten passages of Marxism: "*The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property*".

It was the end, in the Italian example, for the revolutionary movement when, by order of the still living Zinoviev, who at a dear price paid for these hopeless oversights, all forces were thrown to defend "guarantees" such as parliamentary freedom and constitutional compliance.

The character of the action of the communists is the initiative, not the reply to the so-called provocations. The class offensive, not the defensive. The destruction of guarantees, not their preservation. In the great historical sense it is the revolutionary class that threatens, it is it that provokes; and for this the communist party must prepare it, not for the plugging here and there of supposed leaks in the barge of the bourgeois order, which we must sink.

The problem of the return of the workers in each country on the line of the class struggle is in this revived connection between the critique of capitalism and the methods of the revolutionary battle.

Until all the experience of the disastrous mistakes of the past is utilized, the working class will not escape the exorbitant protection of its boastful saviors from offensive threats and provocations which *may* arise tomorrow, and which appear intolerable to them.

At least for a century, the proletariat has had in front and above what it cannot tolerate, and the more time goes by, the more intolerable it will become, according to Marx's law.