

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10687

27 July 1982

Worldwide Report

TERRORISM

FOUO 8/82



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10687

27 July 1982

WORLDWIDE REPORT

TERRORISM

(FOUO 8/82)

CONTENTS

ASIA

JAPAN

Let Us Practice Internationalism: 9th Anniversary of Lydda Struggle (KOKUSAI SHUGI O JISTEN SHIYO, 30 May 81)	1
---	---

WEST EUROPE

ITALY

Communism and War (Antonio Negri; IL COMUNISMO E LA GUERRA, May 80)	20
--	----

SPAIN

ETA Communique to Basque People (ZUZEN, Jul 81)	88
--	----

- a -

[III - WW - 133 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JAPAN

LET US PRACTICE INTERNATIONALISM: 9TH ANNIVERSARY OF LYDDA STRUGGLE

Unknown KOKUSAI SHUGI O JISTEN SHIYO in Japanese 30 May 1981 pp 1-38

[Text] Introduction

Citizens, comrades and friends fighting against Japanese imperialism: On this 30th day of May, the ninth anniversary of the Lydda struggle, and ten years since fighting with the Arabs, we, the Japanese Red army, send heartfelt greetings of solidarity to citizens, comrades and friends fighting across the seas, fortified with clenched fists in the confident belief in certain victory and with the conviction of our own revolutionary duty.

Now, together with our Palestinian revolutionary comrades, with whom we are inseparably united as we were 10 years ago and are even more so now, and our world revolutionary comrades, we have nurtured solidarity, studied, encouraged and supported the mutual teachings that we should transform the heightening of world confrontation into revolutionary victories in various countries. We, the Japanese Red Army, while making the precept of world struggle homogeneous with the precept of Japanese class struggle, and securing step by step the actualization of revolution by uniting our strength, vow to carry out the duty of a Japanese revolution.

Japanese Red Army
30 May 1981

1. Provocation by the enemy has caused the Lebanese civil war.

With the change in the U.S. imperialist government and Reagan's appearance on the scene, Lebanon's civil war has once again begun to intensify. The balance in Lebanon which had been a divided rule by two powers since the 1976 civil war---the Lebanese progressive forces and Palestinian revolutionary forces which rule over the area ranging south from Beirut, the Lebanese capital, to the Israeli border, and the rightist, fascist Kataib forces based in the northern region---has begun to be destroyed by the provocation of the rightist faction. At present, Israeli cooperation which had formerly been carried out in secrecy has commenced with joint tactics based on an overt

alliance between Israel and the northern Kataib forces. The direct cause of the civil war originated when the rightists started construction on a military road tying the scattered rightist regions to the south; this is based on a pincer strategy with Israel. This signifies the rightists will sever the Syrian supply route to the Palestinian forces in the south and will encircle and isolate the south. Attempts to reunite Lebanon under the power of the rightists have started as an actual plan.

The Arab peace keeping forces have demanded a stop to construction of the road and withdrawal of the rightist troops; the struggle has intensified with the provocation and the war situation has expanded through the protection of Israeli fire, and has started to spread from one region to the entire area.

The Palestinian led forces continue to confront militarily the daily provocation and air attacks of the rightists and Israel; and holding the 15th Palestinian National Assembly on 11 April, they explicitly spelled out the anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist struggle as an anti-U.S., anti-Israel, anti-rightist confrontation.

Then, they made a resolution to strengthen their cooperation with the Lebanese progressive forces, Syria and the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, as for the revolutionary situation in Latin America, with the victory of the Nicaraguan revolution as the opportunity, the anti-U.S., anti-military dictatorship, Latin American, anti-imperialist forces of Central America, for whom the El Salvador struggle is the climax, have united and allying themselves with the Mideast and socialist countries have spread the anti-imperialist struggle.

In the midst of the intensification of worldwide tension, such as the Polish and Latin American situations, the enemy is intensifying the provocation, having made anti-communism and anti-Sovietism the demarcation line; the enemy's intervention in the Mideast has caused a linkage with the intensification of the Lebanese civil war.

2. The enemy has advanced a cheme of confrontation and provocation with anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as the key.

Since Reagan appeared on the scene, as can be seen in the anti-communist, anti-Soviet propaganda activity during Secretary of State Haig's visit to the Mideast in April, the enemy has strengthened its posture of confrontation with military power as the axis, against the worldwide advance of the anti-imperialist struggle and has reinforced its anti-revolutionary maneuvers in an offensive revamping of its anti-communist strategy.

With the revolutionary victory of Vietnam in the 70's as the demarcation line, the enemy pressed for a revamping of its anti-communist military alliance, and by means of its dangerous aggression against the progressive forces who aim at the people's liberation, democracy and socialism, that is, the

the strategy of power and military provocation of the 80's, a desperate rollback of capitalism has started, deepening the danger. Its distinctive feature is first of all, intervention in the socialist countries with an anti-Soviet strategy as the axis; secondly, its distinctive feature is to stave off the weakening of imperialism's political, economic and military control of the "third world;" they are promoting class differentiation with anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as the demarcation, and moving ahead with the capitalistic revamping of democracy. In the Mideast, joint Arab-Israeli control and, as the concept of the second Camp David, dismantling of anti-Zionism at the religious level by the nationalist rightists and the formation of an anti-Soviet encirclement net are being advanced. That is manifested in the intensification of the enemy's attacks---confrontation and internal destruction---against the progressive forces of Palestine and Syria and the anti-imperialist forces. Such scheming is tied to the present Lebanese civil war. Thirdly, they are trying to unify and regulate the contradictions within imperialism with anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as the axis.

These are life and death issues for imperialism and for their realization, first of all, they will establish a collective security system with military power as the axis on the basis of a superiority of power. Secondly, in order to press for a national reorganization suitable to this anti-communist, anti-Soviet system, they will build up nationalistic exclusivism as the anti-Soviet anti-communist ideology. And thirdly, with the reviving of human rights diplomacy, and the combining of military fascism and imperialism on a worldwide scale, the world lines have been drawn delineating whether anti-communist and anti-Soviet or not.

Reagan's policies have strengthened this bellicose tendency even further. In Asia, the intensification of the anti-communist, united strategy with Japanese imperialism, the militaristic revamping of Japanese imperialism manifested in the switch from multi-directional diplomacy to anti-Soviet diplomacy, and the alliance with Chun Doo Hwan are moving forward to an engulfment of China.

In order to suppress revolution in Central and South America, the "frontyard of the U.S.," they have begun strengthening the propping up of anti-communist military dictatorships and the direct intervention in suppressing the progressive forces, they have brought about the intensification of the anti-U.S. struggle in various countries where Cuba and Nicaragua are behind the revolution, and in the meantime, they are repeating their vigorous posture of urging the governing class in various countries toward an anti-communist, anti-Soviet decision.

With an anti-communist strategy linking Poland and Latin America, the enemy has created the danger of constant war in the Mideast.

Although the revamping of imperialist control by U.S. imperialism which makes this anti-communism and anti-Sovietism the demarcation line is supported and strengthened as a mutual strategic lifeline through European and Japanese

imperialism, and at the same time, contradictory to the scheme of colonial domination of various countries, its direction remains in the groping stage because of conflict.

The imperialist countries view an anti-communist, anti-Soviet, cooperative, anti-revolutionary alliance as a collective security system for prolonging the capitalist theory which demands the pursuit of profits because of the retreat of U.S. imperialism's centralized unity and the progress of the progressive forces. However, these countries are restricted in the face of their own imperialist pursuit of profits, are unable to resolve this and are deepening still more the contradictions and expanding their ferocity.

With the anti-communist strategy as the key, modern imperialism shows its basic character in being compelled to "restrict" the blind pursuit of profits and the rivalry among the imperialist countries by means of political power. The nature of imperialism has not changed; it is restricted by the struggle with the socialist forces born from capitalism, is unable to resolve the contradiction and demands the prolongation of capitalist production. And the socialist forces born from capitalism are also constantly restricted by the struggle with capitalist forces and are unable to actualize the building of socialism in one country as a pure culture, and then form the transition to a world socialist system which advances, overcoming the restrictions and errors.

We must stand firm in the struggle between imperialist forces which try to prolong this capitalist production relationship and, in opposition to them, the forces demanding advancement with socialism as the demarcation line of fighting people. This basic contradiction penetrates everything through and through just as no matter how much one cuts a magnet, plus and minus remain. Plus and minus exist in the individual, in the group, in capitalist countries, in socialist countries. It goes without saying that for this reason the actualization of revolution is required even more in the position of capitalist criticism, including self-criticism.

3. Let's fight the enemy's provocation which has anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as the demarcation line; and let's strengthen our anti-imperialist encirclement net.

At present, the enemy has set about revamping the system on a world scale with anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as the demarcation line.

The intensification of class contradiction between imperialism which is based on an anti-communist strategy and the forces wanting world socialism, including the people of our own imperialist country who oppose imperialism, has produced an aggravation of U.S.-Soviet confrontation as a consequence. Aside from whether the Soviet route is revisionist or not, the Soviet existence is organically connected to the struggle in our own imperialist country and the struggle of the third world which desires a people's liberation; objectively, it is in the position of being the material essence of the struggle and for that reason, the anti-Sovietism of imperialism has increased.

What is required is recognizing the world class struggle as a unity, understanding its distinctive feature as the essence of class and carrying on the struggle in each country for the liberation of the united worker class of the world.

Not looking at the essence of U.S.-Soviet confrontation, and, as a consequence of that, advocating from the viewpoint of one country an anti-socialist imperialist or anti-Stalin strategy or a "vodka-cola" theory will result in being unable to grasp the world class struggle as a united class contradiction; and not looking at the real world from the direction of the people's revolution in various countries or in the dynamic view of what the USSR did or did not do will end up distorting the world.

The reality in which the revolutionary forces, who seek socialism in the Middle East, Latin America, Africa and Asia, discerning the enemies of the people, stand up to fight against imperialism, and unite in recognition of the socialist countries as strategic friends and fight to dissolve the material of capitalism is behind the people's struggle against Japanese imperialism.

4. How shall we fight the struggle based on internationalism?

How should we fight in order to actualize the Japanese revolution in unity with the world revolution and to actualize the liberation of Japan's worker class and citizens as part of the world's citizens?

In the past, we looked at internationalism from the lofty sacrifice of Che Guevarra that internationalism is fighting for the actualization of a unified world progressive independence and the readiness to sacrifice willingly for other people. However, we were unable to grasp the struggle at our own feet as the realization of internationalism, and being unable to determine ourselves whether our own actual way of fighting is internationalism or not, built a Great Wall between internationalism and reality; we were fighting within the country while only looking afar. Real internationalism is shown in how one fights now in one's own place, not somewhere far away.

In order for the worker class and all people to liberate themselves from the yoke of capitalism, the world's workers must unite and throw off the control of capitalism. The worker class and oppressed people and races, who have been placed in a common destiny by imperialism with its anti-communism as the main point and who organized because of that, will continue fighting to "gain value as a person." (Marx) a mutual benefit crossing all borders. Being conscious of the class confrontation and linking together class consciousness by means of the value of the homogeneity of allies in the whole world is the fight which will gain value as a person. For that reason, it will be shown as a person's attitude toward people crossing over all people and borders. It is shown in whether one can or cannot consider the people of other countries who are placed in a common destiny as our own problem.

The worker class in their own imperialist countries, separated by national borders, understanding the mechanism of class confrontation and capitalism and discovering their own social existence, have power and self-awareness when confronting the enemy. Then when this is negatively linked to universal

value, through the discovery of social existence and the affirmative understanding of themselves, an attitude toward people placed in a common destiny is required as the substance of the nature of class. Similarly, when citizens who aim at the people's liberation grasp the real situation in which people are placed because of imperialist control and continue to disavow the exclusivist tendency through the steadfast struggle for the establishment of the people, and when this is linked to universal values, the attitude toward people with a common destiny is demanded as the substance of class. Internationalism is nurtured on the basis of this sympathy.

While the form which power takes is a one state power, "classness" is found in the ideology which considers other people with a common destiny and the people's struggle in one nation as one's own, and this is the basis of internationalism, that is, the commonality of attitude with comrades in neighboring countries.

We think that in the past we put great value on the form of "internationalism" and did not understand the substance.

The fight to actualize internationalism is manifested in the party's line, policy and tactics as its political position, based on the fundamental spirit of internationalism. The question is on the basis of what position shall we fight in order for the world's people to be united as a class.

How did Lenin carry out internationalism?

Lenin's position and consciousness of purpose was always in the form of a world united proletariat. When the overthrow of the czar is considered, upon reflection, the demand to resolve the people's problems appears because the unity with allies is kept in mind. When one verifies one's own position by the position of other people and other countries, one can grasp the link in the condition of homogeneity (that is, unity). The basis of Lenin's ideas is shown here.

When imperialism created a world system and became the enemy of the people through a series of joint oppression of the people, Lenin needed to conquer the nationalist tendency, which prevented class solidarity, and, transcending people and nations, the cosmopolitanistic tendency to say that people's problems do not exist. The development of inequality of people is the product of imperialist control, and so, it is necessary to create conditions of true equality and impartiality among nations, both ideologically and materially, through the mediation of the party's ideology of homogeneity which transcends people. The fractionalized nation is sublated and power leading a united people to a world socialism with class unity as the axis is fostered. The reason Lenin made a distinction between oppressor and oppressed was to conquer the obstacles to unity. Lenin hoisted self-determination of people as the precondition of free unity, not imperialism's compulsory "unity" (amalgamation) or "separation" (territorial separation); fighting against imperialism, oppressed people will liberate themselves spontaneously.

Likewise, he made it clear that since the Russian revolution, even though the struggle between the two values of socialism and capitalism is the fundamental contradiction, it is possible for "developing nations" to advance direct-

ly into socialism without going through capitalism; and the Soviet experience applies to feudal or semi-feudal agrarian relationships. The anti-imperialist struggle can be carried on without the need for the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie; thus he allowed the development of the party to the position of winning class unity among peoples, toward the value of socialism. In Lenin's presentation of the problem, the enemy was always clear and that was penetrated through and through with the consciousness of purpose of how to united with allies in order to triumph.

Lenin's ideological position was unable to be carried through into the struggle after the third international movement.

In referring to the conditions of that time, the 1928 general plan of international communism provided for the "significance of the USSR and its international revolutionary duty." It prescribed as the key point that "the USSR is performing the role of prototype of the brotherly mutual relationship of people in all countries gathered together into a world union of soviet socialist republics which is supposed to be set up before long and the prototype of economic unity of the workers of all countries for a single, socialist world economy." The basis of the theory of Soviet socialism as the prototype was expressed in this. Then after that, socialism was victorious and in the process of giving birth to several socialist countries after the time when there was only the USSR, international support was required for the formation of conditions of equality among nations and people. The new socialist countries were also required to perform the role of "prototype" and to bring forth the transition to a single, socialist world economy through the formation of conditions of equality on the basis of the people's self-supporting economy.

However, the Soviet Union, the precursor, could not help the new socialist countries build a people's self-supporting economy based on the rebirth by their own power, dependent on their own people for the purpose of overcoming the development of inequality, the legacy of former imperialist control. Conversely, because they froze the development of inequality, the legacy of former imperialist control, and moreover, built on the basis of the expansion of socialism, they formed the conditions wherein the socialist economies in various countries would set up a division of labor, and became the root cause leading to the present contradiction. At the same time, there is also the problem of autonomy for those receiving aid. The mutual relationship which was unable to create equality of the people caused a regression in the unity of socialist countries and gave birth to a history of confrontation and dependence.

What is the link which will defeat the enemy and unify allies?

We have learned from the present socialist countries that if we do not materialize the common struggle, making it the mutual value, it is impossible to sublimate the contradiction among people to the condition of true equality and class unity.

5. The main point of internationalism is anti-imperialism and rebirth through one's own power.

At present, it is required that internationalism unify allies on the basis of a "position of anti-imperialism and rebirth through one's own power." In a word, that means that on the basis of the "position of fighting against imperialism and fighting with dependence on the power of one's own people," the leaders of the people learned a mutual lesson and achieve the unification of allies for a world proletariat independence.

At present, in the situation where the value system of "socialism" differs in many ways, fighting on the basis of giving importance to what must be grasped as the link in the unification of allies and on the basis of how we can fight so that the struggle of various people and nations will become unified makes it possible to create conditions in which we can fight together the class struggle beyond the seas in the meaning of the value of oneness.

The present daily struggle confronts imperialism's class control and oppression of the people on the basis of the capitalist production relationship and thereby forms a socialist consciousness and on the basis of the socialist production relationship forms the relationship of persons with new persons. To the extent that the capitalist production relationship exists, socialist countries and socialist forces are not free and are constantly influenced by it. Therefore, they must work for unity for the liberation of the world worker class by unifying the party's consciousness of purpose on the basis of anti-imperialism and fight relying on the people of their own country who are the fountainhead of anti-imperialist power. In this point of view it is possible to view the single preparations as having a duality whereby establishment of Japanese socialism for the first time will perform the role of being an international base of operations on the basis of a people's self-supporting economy.

At present, without a world party, the more the socialist practice of party led forces is restricted to a single country, the more it is liable to bend to the interests of that one country. Rather, it is required that we understand the world situation as a unity and that we advance, firmly grasping the link of unity for the common objective.

We can see many lessons in the world struggle. One lesson is that we will certainly give birth to deviation if we cannot fight with anti-imperialism and rebirth through one's own power as the key points.

The Afghanistan People's Democratic Party seized power in a coup d'etat. Even though their position is anti-imperialist, they were unable to form the party role of relying on the people and helping the people. On account of that, the result was that they overcame the contradictions and confronted imperialism relying on Soviet power.

Furthermore, as for the problem of the party in Poland, to the extent it depended on Soviet power over a long period of time after the establishment of the socialist state and was unable to draw on the power of the people, the

fountainhead of power, it was unable to pull together the power of the people and was unable to make the desires and creativity of the people the power of the party.

The direction of future development is indicated in whether or not the revolution of the party which is desired by the independent labor union (Solidarity) can be made the power of the anti-imperialist struggle and the establishment of the state.

There is also the lesson of China's anti-socialist imperialist line.

The lesson is that if, after the one state seizure of power, the class contradiction in one's own country is not understood as united with the world class contradiction and if the world class confrontation is understood as a duality with the contradiction in one's own country as the nucleus, there will be a fall into a nationalist tendency.

Self-reliant birth (rebirth through one's own power) is power dependent on the people, and if this is not tied to the anti-imperialist struggle to liquidate capitalist production which is the fundamental contradiction of the world class struggle, the result will be a prolongation of imperialism and the destruction of the gains of our revolution.

There is also the lesson of Soviet assistance to anti-imperialist countries and people.

On the one hand, the Soviet Union followed an international line based on its two policies of relaxation of tensions with imperialism through detente and assistance to the "third world." Aid to forces taking on the anti-imperialist struggle is being given as backing for the revolutionary forces of the "third world."

Especially under the present world situation in which the anti-revolutionary governing class in various countries tries to crush the revolution in various countries with the backing of U.S. imperialism and by means of the power of an international, anti-revolutionary alliance, the revolutionary forces in various countries are requesting an alliance of regional and international anti-imperialist forces to confront this in each country. However, if the revolution in various countries is not carried on with the power of the people themselves in those countries, it will be unable to create the fountainhead of true anti-imperialist power and will be unable to continue the anti-imperialist fight.

If they are unable to organize the sympathies of the people and to carry on the people's struggle in a country independently, this will give birth to dependence and they will be unable to form the conditions for true equality.

The same is true for us. In the process of creating a brotherly union with our comrades and friends in the world, with the joint struggle of the Palestinian revolution as the departure point, we sublated our own mutual individual interests and created a mutual relationship of equality, fighting toward the

common objective of anti-imperialism from the position of carrying our responsibility by relying on the people of our own country.

In this process, from our own self-criticism, we have made lessons of the fight against the control-non-control tendency, the fight against the nationalist inclination and the fight against the tendency to make rebirth through our own power the total substance. In that, we have learned to grasp the conditions which unite the national inequality of class based on the party's equality as the sublation of contradiction.

We firmly believe that the process wherein, as the main points of internationalism, the revolutionary forces adhere to the position of anti-imperialism and rebirth through one's own power, and learning together, help each other and bring the lessons to life by means of the mutual party revolution which makes the revolution one, is the process which will overthrow the enemy and unite the fighting forces of the world.

Under present circumstances, the world appears complicated at a glance. Imperialist control is clever, and on the other hand, socialist countries are fighting each other and it seems that socialism which was the fortress of the people's hope is dissolving. Some people have lost hope in socialism, some people say it is the final days of Stalinism, and some people criticize the hegemony and big powerism; and some people explain that it has no relationship with socialism, but is a confrontation between nationalists.

However, the reality is that these facts have clearly given profitable material to the imperialists.

It is an unmistakable fact that this is not only a difficulty for the people of the country in question, but is the main factor hindering the fight of those fighting with the aim of actualizing socialism.

However, historically speaking, capitalism has a 200 year history, calculated from the industrial revolution; socialism only has the experience of some 60 years since the Russian revolution. Socialism which was born out of the filth of capitalism is in the process of creating, struggling and establishing a country, and in those restrictions is advancing by assaluting those many errors. We think that we who are late in establishing socialism must stand in the position of winning socialism in the right direction by means of the generalization of lessons, studying and overcoming the errors as our own problems. In the past, Lenin said "Marxism has done no more than place one cornerstone of science which must advance in every direction." The value of communism's struggle is in reforming reality; and in that reality, the main position of revolution is in correcting errors, linking them to victory. To condemn the USSR and give up hope for China and Vietnam as not being correct socialism indicates the lack of generalization to our own fight.

Conversely, it is required that understanding socialism more correctly and pulling lessons from reality, we temper the direction of today's struggle as steps toward the actualization of what kind of socialism shall we actualize

and how shall we form the Japanese revolution as an international base of operations.

And we would like to excel in carrying out this struggle with Japanese citizens, comrades and friends.

6. Let's grasp the proper role for the party in the lesson of Japan's class struggle.

Just as we were, the party, which must manifest leadership power in Japan's class struggle, has not correctly understood the role of the party. As a result, we think that we must decisively face the reality of being unable to fight on the basis of the key points of internationalism - the direction of Japan's class struggle in unity with the world revolution.

We frequently had the chance to recapture the value of the party and the role of the party, as we recaptured our defeat in the 70's and as we learned the lessons and experiences together with our world comrades and friends. In Japan's class struggle, we understood the value of the party within the movement and tactics of the reality of whether it is "a fighting party or not." On account of that, the main duty overseas was fighting to unify the "organization by means of the mutual armed struggle." In a word, it was to place the role of the party in the activity of such movements as the armed struggle, to escalate revolutionary tactics and try to form a non-compromise on the "fighting party." The Red Army's defeat and errors departed from these values and unable to sublimate, spread a blight on the revolution to the very foundation. In the translation tactics of 1974 and 1975 and in the defeat resulting in the arrest and confession of defendant Stoke, we verified that the movement's progress would not necessarily strengthen us, and reversing the way that "the main point of our party" should put value on "fighting," we recaptured the party's role from a position of making the worker class and the people the main point of the revolution. Going from the idea that we are central to the idea that the worker class and people are central, in short, on the basis of the principle of the people, we recaptured the way the new left should be as our own problem. At that time, we could not help but feel deeply what kind of formation process the Japanese class struggle was in and even in that, arrived at the present situation, unable to make the fundamental generalization.

Prior to the war, the Japan Communist Party, our precursors, did not face squarely the reality of not being able to fight as an organization; and were unable to grasp the lesson from the dissolution of the important leadership body 15 years prior to the war, and entrusted itself without generalization in the uplifting flow of democratization. The axis of party concentration consistently depended on COMINTERN and, not generalizing the lack of unity which should be the basis, started out after the war as well with this in tow.

Because of the non-generalization, sublation of the party's dissolution paid homage to the movement's breakthrough and armed struggle, and brought about defeat in 1975. So, generalization was basically required, but they still could not grasp the correct role of the party in the generalization of the problem of 1975 and coming to the present, they were unable to sublimate the

the singleness of the tendency of maximum planning and the tendency of action planning and this resulted in the realization of the new left, the Japan Communist Party. The fundamental question of Yamakawa-ism and Fukumoto-ism called into question prior to the war, is nothing more than the result of being unable to properly grasp the role of the party, that is, the proper conditions of the relationship between the party and the people, and also in the 1975 problem, they were unable to sublimate

We made a lesson out of our own defeat, as we studied the defeat of our predecessors; "we must carry out the revolution of the leadership forces as a struggle in oneness with the generalization of the Japanese communist movement, and the key point is to grasp the role of the party, learning from the 1975 problem.

We know that in that problem, our predecessors learned a lesson from pain and recaptured the organization, that is, the party's value. That was the "two-legged" line of establishment of the party and maneuvering of the masses, and this gained success in the sense of "organizational tactics;" and on the other hand, because the sect which stayed behind in the unchanged organization for the struggle of the masses added up non-generalizations, it was learned they could not bring about the party's rebirth.

However, we think that we must face squarely that the fact that with the 1975 problem we truly could not make a generalization on the role of the party is manifested in our present day insufficiency. First of all, that cannot be taken as self-criticism because, with Stalinism as the problem of Stalin, we put ourselves in the position of being the target for external overthrow or in the position of victim; and it was indicated in the fact that actually we are founded on the Stalinist view of the infallibility of the party even though we say we are anti-Stalinist.

We think that conquering the view of the infallibility of the party which is found in the position of party equals universality is the struggle which surpasses Stalinism and the struggle to conquer the system of party as center. The one-sided emphasis that "the experience of one person cannot be set up against the experience of the world party" brought about the death of the party.

If we consider ourselves the universality, the essence will become a non-self-awareness that we are part of the class and have restrictions on the natural growth and understanding which are geographically and historically ordained. If we are one-sidedly founded on this subjectivity, we would take it that the party cannot make errors because of its "universality," and errors are the responsibility of the individual or an external cause and we would deal with the formal logic of which is correct. Because of that, we would be unable to allow Marxism to develop for the victory of the revolution. And so, value is put on the universality of the party; that is conservative.

If there is no generalization realigning the partiality of the party, in struggling against that and always revolutionizing the party, "universality" will fall into being a dead dogma. From there, the united struggle toward the

seizure of power will not come forth and the united front will fall into being a subordinate organization of the party. Then secondly, as prescribed in the above statements, what should be done is not put value on whether or not reality was changed for the objective but put value on the correctness of what was said. We think that in the value criteria of the revolution which put value on actual change, if what was said materializes its subjectivity is correct, and if it does not materialize, the subjectivity is not correct because it did not correspond to the rule.

Thirdly, there is the question of responsibility.

The party which actualizes the revolution must advance, leading the generalizations and precepts as the part concerned with the entire class struggle as our problem. When the worker class and people are considered central, evil flows in the offense and defense between the enemy and the worker class and people, no matter what the defeat of other organizations. We think that the leadership which undertakes to overcome that can truly form the capability of the worker class and people. That is because the party is created and chosen by the worker class and people.

7. Let's practice internationalism by properly grasping the role of the party.

Generalization creates the foundation and forms the consciousness of purpose.

The consciousness of purpose is not something distant, it determines the present way of fighting and the capability to judge. In that sense, we learned the lesson that the key to the question of leadership of Japan's class struggle which has not been conquered is in the 1975 problem, and we learned from that conquest the actual lesson of our predecessors---the lesson of what is the role of the party.

That is, first of all, to grasp the role of the party from the relationship between the party and the people, that is, the worker class and people themselves are the nucleus of the revolution, and the party carries out the role of assisting in its actualization. Secondly, in order to actualize the liberation of the world united worker class as part of the world revolution, the central role in which the party must assist is: 1. it must aim at making the revolution homogeneous to internationalism; 2. it must form the conditions for a seizure of power; 3. it must take on the responsibility of tying individual struggles to the battle formation of insurrection and of having an autonomous political and military capacity and a party organization. Thirdly, materialistically, the party is part of the worker class, and the essence of that part is to assist the worker class and people by having a party organization based on a plan for internationalism, seizure of power and revolt. The party must constantly unify (by study and generalization) the people's socialist practices. By means of this, self-criticism which revolutionizes us points out the practice of the party's consciousness of purpose as the party's judgment. We think that making unity the position by means of generalization, in short, when we give life to the revolution of the party via generalization, we can truly materialize the capability of the party on a continual basis.

Lenin submitted the role of the party as follows in his draft on the general principles of socialism written in 1896 while in Peterburg prison.

"The Russian social-democratic party declares as its own duty to develop the worker class consciousness, to help in their organization and to assist the struggle of the Russian worker class by means of pointing out the duty and objective of the struggle." ("Commentary and Treatise on the General Principles of the Social-democratic Party.")

On the point of "how must we tie the aim of socialism with the people's movement born from the life conditions of the ages old aim of trying to do away with the exploitation of man by man created in the large factories," Lenin stipulated that "the party's activity is to help the class struggle of the workers" and "to assist the workers in this struggle which they (the workers) have already begun themselves."

We think that when trying to carry out the party's role from the viewpoint of this assistance, we were able to grasp the direction of the struggle which is always tied to the consciousness of purpose and through the study of the movement's spontaneous generation and individuality, and to work out the strategy of the plan to seize political power.

The role of the party is not to cause the perception that "the party is universality," and is not party centrism (making the party central) which substantially united men around the party, but on the contrary, it is to point out the direction by means of increasing the cognitive ability to generalize the people's social practice, standing together with and as part of the class, toward the present objective of the revolution and the ultimate objective. Ordinarily, it is to assist in jointly unifying thought toward the objective, putting value on changing reality. It is to nurture the power which will allow every opportunity to materialize into a victorious transformation of the revolution, by means of preparing independently and underground the conditions for the materialization and for the seizure of power.

We think that the root of the weakness of the Japanese class struggle is the fact that it is not cut off from materialism. We think that we must question the values of Marxist-Leninism and the party role by looking squarely at the overall facts of social relations, seen from the actualization of the objectives, not the fact of actualization nor one-sided facts for ourselves.

It is not to insist on and verify the correctness but to allow each defeat to be changed to victory within the actualization of a "lose until we win" class struggle. Because of that, it is to collectively unify the individual struggles of the worker class and people, to grasp the direction of the struggle from the viewpoint of solving the strategic power question and international relations; and to assist the main struggle of the worker class and the people themselves by means of returning it again to the worker class and people. And we think that we must expedite the party's autonomous preparations suitable to the battle formation of insurrection, and we must make use of tactics for victory.

If we cannot grasp the role of the party which makes the workers and the people the nucleus, we will be unable to truly take on the role of making the struggle of the Japanese worker class and people homogeneous as one part of the world revolution and we will be unable to actualize the class homogeneity and unity of various peoples beyond nationalist exclusivism.

While there is equality, whether a large country or small country, in the class struggle, at the same time, historically oppressed and oppressor exist among the various races. The party urges internationalism to create conditions which will overcome the differences of people in order that the worker class and people of various races will fight together with the value of oneness and toward one objective.

We think that in the Japanese communist movement, the question of internationalism has not yet been resolved.

Certainly, the Japanese Communist Party began to derive the party's equality and the party's independence from the generalization of COMINTERN. However, because the Japan Communist Party is unable to grasp the role of the party of tenaciously making the people the nucleus of the revolution, there is the weakness for the Japan Communist Party of only having an independent line in its relations with the parties of other foreign countries. That is because in the Japanese class struggle they were unable to grasp as important how to fight at present toward making the Japanese people's struggle homogeneous with a single world worker class. On account of that, in the anti-imperialist struggle, we would not see the Japanese position in the real world of oppressing people and our struggle is restricted to a national, one-country situation, placing Japan in the position of independence from U.S. imperialism

To the extent it is a struggle of the people in imperialist countries, we must make the anti-imperialist struggle fully understood in a proletariat internationalism. However, from the viewpoint of considering the party's equality, we are unable to grasp the world position of the class struggle in Japan.

The question of strategy of the Japanese revolution has also brought about a one nation tendency because of that.

Internationalism cannot be actualized unless penetrated through and through with the viewpoint of being in union with allies and mutually supporting each other while fighting against one enemy in order that the people of the world will be victorious in a single human liberation and class liberation.

The reality in which, being unable to clarify the difference between enemy and ally, the attitude of criticizing neighboring leadership forces as our own basic position in order to prove that we are universality, whether subjectively or not, objectively gives a period of grace to imperialist control, cannot be overcome.

We think that the way to fight against national exclusivism is to confront our own country's imperialism and consciously unite as anti-imperialist forces one part of the international anti-imperialist struggle, no matter what the differences in their line, and through that, change the differences into a class homogeneity. It is required that we prepare to fight for seizure of power at the present time of the Japanese revolution as one part of the world revolution based on the understanding of world unity.

8. What is the current condition of the Japanese class struggle?

More and more it is required that we take on part of the world class struggle, based on internationalism as the nucleus. The actualization of internationalism occupies the important position of forming the conditions in which the oppressed people confront the common enemy via the anti-imperialist struggle and the struggle for the overthrow of imperialism in one's own country by the worker class and people of imperialist countries.

At present, in the retreat of U.S. imperialism and the anti-communist strategy by world imperialism, Japanese imperialism is advancing in the direction of achieving its own imperialist profit while carrying out the role as the political and military stronghold in Asia. The distinctive feature of the revamping of Japanese imperialism with anti-communism as the main point cannot be seen simply as a push by U.S. imperialism. Likewise, at the same time, it cannot be seen as the expansion of the contradiction between imperialism and U.S. imperialism nor as the ambition for independence. Imperialism can only be prolonged by the mutuality of anti-communist strategy world wide and cannot help but control rivalry between imperialists by means of political power. For that reason, Japanese imperialism has developed policies with a dualism of discovering its own interests in the prolongation of cooperative imperialism and desiring its own interests in that.

At present, they are in the stage of consolidating their own base within the country as they discover that view in the anti-communist, anti-Soviet collective security system. Weathering the crisis of the 70's which moved to a collapse of the "1980 System" with an absolute majority of conservatives in the double election, and on the basis of generalization of the 70's, we are planning qualitative changes in the 80's.

The enemy's clever attack is being expedited by the national consensus by means of the mobilization of the mass media, local governing bodies and various national organizations as the promotion of militarism and reactionism from below.

On the basis of anti-communist, anti-Soviet exclusivism, the enemy is now pushing for militarization on a daily basis, making 1983 the target date, as seen from the speech on constitutional reform by Minister of Justice Okuno, the resolution on national defense, the "constitutional revision resolution"

which made use of local governing bodies, and the exaggerated interpretation of the constitution to "statutory constitutional revisions." With the majority control as the background; the enemy controlling class, looking at now as the opportunity for militarization, is designing militarization in every field, such as the idea of a conference on comprehensive security, the dispatch of troops and the plan for conscription.

This way of acting deepens the confrontation for the worker class and people, and expands even further the chronic depression, the decline in real wages and rationalization, and makes the uncertainty and instability of life more serious. Making the international problem and anti-communist exclusivism public, and instigating confrontation among people, they are turning the worker class to the right and strengthening their control by division on the basis of national gain and national defense. In production, workplace control is being advanced in the industry's information with the alliance as the nucleus.

Regarding the fact the alliance is unified by the anti-communist ideology of "labor unionism" under the name of labor front unity, the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan has started to break up, unable to possess a line which will change that.

The Japan Communist Party has expanded the contradiction between the Japan Communist Party and the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan by systematically setting the unified labor union groups of the left against the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan. On the other hand, the monopolistic capital, the country and government have unified and are extending their total personal control to all people. The scheme for ideological and physical unified control over all areas of production, distribution and consumption is expressed as control of life as humans.

Likewise, while advancing a systematic dissolution and personal destruction toward the revolutionary forces from their ideology which has anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as the key points, they are planning the oppression of the people who are fighting indefatigably and the strengthening of public order and economic clamp-down.

Against such movements by the enemy, the revolutionary political party is unable to sufficiently institute a strategic direction from the generalizations and lessons of the 70's.

If we do not prepare for a fight which never loses sight of the enemy and the strategic fight by means of putting the party which is one part of the worker class into a social relationship and standing together with the worker class and people and firmly grasping the key points of the enemy's attacks, we will be unable to confront the plan for reactionism and militarization from the battle front. It is required that we stiffen the strategy and tactics of the people to constantly fight against party centrism which concentrates the worker class into the "position of the party."

Likewise, even in the anti-government political parties, we are unable to form the concept of combined political power with the power of the people as the basis, and because our political base is exclusivist, having entrusted the people's spontaneously developing and immediate desires to the unity of the enemy's exclusivism for national gain and national defense, we are unable to confront them.

The present situation is the result of the people, political parties and political factions advocating opposition from their own position, individually and in various classes and groups, and the link for strategic unity has not yet been grasped.

9. Fight against anti-communist, anti-Soviet exclusivism; create an anti-imperialist tide.

Standing on anti-imperialism and rebirth through one's own power, and strategically identifying the enemy, we would like to take on the Japanese revolution as part of the world revolution while persistently changing our environment and conditions in order to advance the fight to overcome the breakup of the strategic alliance of our allies.

Because of that, first, it is required that we weaken and dissolve one section of the international anti-revolutionary alliance by organizing the fight to overthrow our own imperialism with an anti-imperialist struggle.

At present, Japanese imperialism is based on the power of a handful of monopolistic capital with financial capital at the peak, and sovereignty is under the control of monopolistic capital. And the national authority forms the foundation of the irreconcilable confrontation with the life of the people, as the bureaucratic-political, military, police and judicial system. For that reason, it is necessary that the fight to overcome Japan's imperialism makes preparations for the seizure of power by the thoroughness of the anti-imperialist struggle, making anti-monopoly the key point.

Secondly, we have to form as the axis the political issue of fighting against a revamping of militarism by means of anti-communist, anti-Soviet exclusivism which is the core of present day Japanese imperialist control. The enemy is advancing a national revamping shown in the security treaty, dispatch of troops and conscription, as constitutional revision, strengthening of the Japan-ROK anti-revolutionary alliance and the rationalization of the national government. It is required that we confront these policies of the enemy, and form an anti-imperialist encirclement net, and with the union of anti-imperialist forces as the axis, to collaborate with and unite with the anti-Stalinist, anti-socialist-imperialist tide.

And thirdly, we are deepening the solidarity of the individual struggles of our allies toward the formation of an array of revolts based on the quantitative and qualitative power of the world worker class and people who are the fountainhead of power and wisdom. It is required that we tie up various sites

under one purpose by means of various tactics, while making an alliance the thinking of our actual judgment and tactics. That is because we can prepare conditions for the establishment of the party, based on the value of oneness and the great alliance and unified battle array of anti-imperialism through this fight.

The enemy's exclusivism is strengthening more and more the oppression toward the anti-imperialist forces in the country under the name of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. For that reason, the true value of leadership is required. We must win qualitative progress, fighting with the idea that "failure is the mother of success." It is required that we fulfill the role of the party in the consistency of the viewpoint of assisting the struggle which has the worker class and people as its nucleus and that we politically, militarily and materially strengthen the leadership ability of the party.

Not recognizing defeat as defeat, what is demanded is a fight which organizes defeat into victory as a lesson toward the seizure of power based on a strategic viewpoint, not tactics of a one-pattern formula nor a fight which makes the projection of the movement everything. We think that we must pour our strength into the formation of a truly collective order, forming the battle array of revolts from the fight which sets individual against exclusivism.

Conclusion

To all citizens, comrades and friends confronting and fighting against Japanese imperialism:

We, the Japanese Red Army, fight based on the position of anti-imperialism and rebirth through one's own power in the Japanese class struggle chained to the international class struggle.

In taking on our duty in concert with Japanese citizens, comrades and friends, we would like to grasp the conditions for the establishment of a single party which corresponds to the class unity of the people from an ingenious plan.

We will take on the part of the Japanese revolution by allowing the lessons of the revolution develop as a class response of the people from Palestine to Japan and Japan to the world, on the basis of internationalism which the fighters in the Lydda struggle constructed. Perhaps the armed struggle will be demonstrated as a more effective fight in that view and position.

We call upon you to take on together the fight for the formation of an anti-imperialist tide, by confronting the anti-communist, anti-Soviet exclusivism and relying on the worker class and people who are the fountainhead of power in the struggle.

First of all, let's practice internationalism for the formation of an anti-imperialist tide.

The Japanese Red Army
30 May 1981

9400
CSO: 6000/0013

ITALY

COMMUNISM AND WAR

Milan IL COMUNISMO E LA GUERRA in Italian May 80 pp 7-136

[Book by Antonio Negri, "Marxist Materials" series, edited by the Collettivo di Scienze politiche di Padova [Padova Political Science Collective], Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Editore, Milan, 136 pages]

[Text] Table of Contents

- Chapter 1. Self-criticism and new problems
 - 1. Prison, the market, truth,
 - 2. The territory of the movement,
 - 3. The making of the Proletariat and subjective organization,
 - 4. New problems, of method,

- Chapter 2. Crises of the Crisis-State
 - 1. We and the 1930's,
 - 2. Forms of the crisis: crisis of lack of proportion,
 - 3. Forms of the crisis: crisis of circulation,
 - 4. Forms of the crisis: crisis and violence
 - 5. Problems to Explore

- Chapter 3. Figures of capitalist utopia
 - 1. Control of the refusal to work?
 - 2. Control high levels of conflict?
 - 3. A parenthesis on the ghetto,
 - 4. Problems still open

- Chapter 4. The problem of war and the theory of value
 - 1. Between Adam Smith and Vladimir Ilich Lenin,
 - 2. Beyond the theory of value?
 - 3. The problem of reestablishment
 - 4. War. Between imagination and reason,
 - 5. To eliminate the problem
 - 6. Other (?) problems,

- Chapter 5. Communism and organization
 - 1. The form of self-valorization
 - 2. The form of self-determination
 - 3. The form of organization,
 - 4. Beyond war, for communism,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

To my comrades of 7 April and to the 61 of Fiat

Chapter 1: Self-criticism and new problems

many years ago his mother
used to sing this song
so she milled while she sang
the corn people have a song too
it is beautiful
I refuse to reveal it
(information of the Keresan
Indian tribe, received by
Franz Boas in 1920)

1. Prison, the market, truth

We need to get things straight. Not in a long essay, but going back from my present situation to a clear assessment of the movement. Starting again and going over that territory, starting from the subjective misery of our position. What is concrete now is prison, separation, being cut off from the movement. But this maximum of separation is not the maximum of alienation, constriction, being subjected to domination. That is the scandal. In this radical break between subjectivity and objectivity, between the ontological dimension of the revolutionary subjective and the institutional weight of exploitation and repression. No one knows how to judge this scandal, and all attempts to interpret it are like an incomplete crime, a frustrated desire, fraud without action. So the separation is not alienation. Alienation requires an upside down but effective relationship, a turning upside down and a wrenching from a pre-constituted or desired totality; so it is nostalgia for mediation, or suffering because of its nonexistence. But here and now, separation has nothing to do with mediation. It does not contain it or imagine it, neither like utopia nor like a phantom; it does not desire it. The sign of separation is discontinuous with respect to the turning upside down that is presupposed by alienation: discontinuity, a break of mediation from totality. The totality separation lives through is not homologous to that suffered by alienation. The struggle which arises in separation is not the fluctuation of a totality to be restored. It is rather the concrete truth, immediate and unmediated, unresolvable by mediation or by capitalist reason.

Opposed to this is the abstract operation of the enemy, of his totality, of mediation. We knew the market was completely overdetermined by capitalism. But we are learning that today the market, after losing all connection with the mediation of value, has become a political function for the reconstruction of capitalist domination. After losing all capitalist truth, the market has become the terrain of capitalist fiction. The overdetermination of truth no longer concerns the determination of value, added value, and profit, from the capitalist viewpoint. It just concerns the controlled play of social and political forces. Introducing them into a planned market, capitalism dominates them at will. Capitalism is mediation. The equivalence of moments, their exchange, dialectics and mediation are the substance of capitalist control of the market, of its preconstitution, of its dominating action. If monopoly

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

controlled the market (once) to make a profit from it, today it preconstitutes the market to determine truth. This is why this truth is always abstract, the product of mediation.

I am on the other side. I have meaning, and can be defined, only within the framework of capitalist mediation of the market: this is what they want. But I am im-mediate "irrational." Capitalist rationalism says I can be expressed only in so far as I am mediated. From its point of view, this is true: Surdum est quod affabile non est, as capitalist political science has repeated from the beginning, to justify the functional exclusion of sectors of society. So I am deaf, opaque, and can't be mediated. But do I really have no truth of my own? Do not prison, struggle, and separation give rise to their own internal truth? Only truth itself is a sign of truth: this has been said and is the seal of every rigorously materialistic position. Now, there is a truth of what is deaf, opaque, not susceptible to mediation. There is the truth of its tireless growth, of the continuous exploration of separation.

The immediacy of separation is not a break of circulation within the separate world. On the contrary. Here a new language is developing with the force of a new production, of an innovation of uncontrollable fall out. They hypothesis and its verification are ontological; materialism is always ontological. It is a formative movement of being that we are witnessing. This deafness of being and its ineffability have a life of their own. It is a profoundly atheist life: an animal which refuses to be dominated by any divinity or owner. The word does not create life but merely tries to dominate it. Here posterity's recognition of the word is whole. A new being which capitalism would like to bring under its mediation and which it is forced to recognize as limit and resistance--a new being has emerged seeking a language of separation. All this is given in principle: it is given from the moment in which separation is action, not alienation; it is not nostalgia for totality or endurance of detachment. Capitalist overdetermination of the truth of the market corresponds to the underdetermination of separation from the market, of the truth of the im-mediate and that which cannot be mediated. There is only a formal correspondence. In reality there is a break. After the break there is freedom for development. Every attempt to recover the content of the break--as a subject, as an effective cause--is mere rhetoric. The break liberates the subject and begins the separation.

All of this is fantastic, you will object! It is not. It is the content of the collective imagination of the proletariat, it is the real substance of its struggle. It is communism as a movement of the value of use in separation. But if all this were true, you would still object, this separation would be so profound as to specify an ontological state similar to war! It does. I am certainly not the first to describe war as an ontological state; a long philosophical tradition views war as a natural state which historical evolution is led to from time to time by a crisis. From Lucretius to Hobbes, from Spinoza to Gibbon, from Burckhardt to Foucault, where "progress" unravels you find war as the connotation of the basic social relationship.

Here the problem touches on the specificity of the definition, on the genesis of the present situation: the collapse of the market. This causes a state of war. So on the one hand the emergence of the value of youth as a mass movement records a state of war. On the other hand the capitalist artifice of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

a programmed fixing of the value of exchange as political command, as a determination of truth, also records a state of war. The great pacifist invention of the bourgeoisie, the great pacifist stimulation of war, the logic of egoisms revisited and brought to found rules, all that collapses; the market stops being a rule and becomes a place, a territory, a battlefield. Separation does not separate the market, it destroys it. It destroys it as mediation, as reforming logic. It destroys it as a possibility for determining equivalences and setting sequences of truth in motion. At the limit, separation can be imprisoned, delineated, excluded; but this, too, destroys the truth of the market. In fact it does not recognize overdetermination, at this point, which is not an act of war. Here the market is an abstract place to which is opposed the concreteness of separation. War is the ontological state which the breakdown of the market leads to.

But the problem is truth, extricating the truth of separation and pinning it down in its im-mediacy. The universal, this ancient form of mediation, does not mean anything to me; the linguistic totality, the communications horizon I am concerned with must be born of a break, born from within it. It is ontological totality that issues from a particular separation--this is what interests me. The state of war does not exclude a search for truth, it exalts it. The breakdown of the simulated truth of the market, the crisis of the capitalist example of overdetermining the process, leave me in the unique situation of having only one possibility and that is to remodel the language of truth. Truth as a movement of the value of use, as articulation of separation. So I break with all mediated totality, universal, intentional. On the otherhand I must subordinate totality as tension and trend to the formative process which starts from the particular of the value of use, of the reproduction of life, of the affirmation of freedom. This is a superficial action of mine in a terrain which is torn by war but animated by the irreducibility of proletarian existence. My language is inevitably vague. Nevertheless, in prison sensitivity to signs is highly accentuated. We send kites outside to the infinite sky.

2. The Movement's Territory

Dialectical residues litter the field. They are not so much the historical advances of the traditional workers' movement. Who still has the problem of voting for a party because it is the official representative of a class? Who still has the problem of wresting--in the struggle--a card from a sold-out trade union? The birthright has already been ceded. Millions of proletarians abstain from voting, thousands of autonomous struggles have shown this. Sociologists and journalists can have the privilege of demonstrating that these facts are irrelevant!

No, dialectical obstacles are not to be found in this dimension but rather within the territory of the communist movement. This territory is stratified and full of ravines. If you want to build you have to work on this ground and make it smooth so that you can build on it. First of all there is a need to do this through self-criticism of what exists. This self-criticism must take into account, together with a description of what exists, the strength of the adversary, his ability to insinuate himself destructively on the discontinuity of the political processes of the proletariat and exasperate this discontinuity, reducing it to the capitalist reason of repression.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Now the fundamental moment of crisis of the communist movement seems to be a progressive estrangement of the mass proletarian movement as regards needs and the movement as a counterweight. Only bad dialectics, pure politics, have tried to maintain a relationship between these tensions of the movement. Attempts to link things up are wasted. The means of politics, bad dialectics, have ended up sowing confusion about the very importance of the problem. When it was first raised, before 1977, it had the merit of giving theoretical relevance to a heavy dualistic situation which was then present in a movement, a situation which was more endured than desired, perhaps derived from the diversity of the times and of various forms of resistance to the strength of the capitalist counterattack and restructuring after 1968. So the problem was raised in order to urge people to overcome it, to anticipate the synthesis which the movement could not produce itself. Instead, division and estrangement were even accentuated in the phase of the movement's recovery. This is not the place for a historical reconstruction of that event or for the determination of specific responsibilities in the failure to produce moments of synthesis effectively enough or resist the enemy's fire, understood as determining defeat for any such attempt. However, the result was that the destabilizing movement of the enemy ran with suicidal, accelerating speed towards the end of guerrilla vanguard war; the destructuring movement became more and more closed on itself, touching on the isolation of the ghetto and conceding part of its wealth to the final determination of the capitalist market. The combattant party and the ghetto appeared as mirror images of each other, as an ambivalent and unique result, as a transformation of the theory of functions in duality of components of the movement. Where conditions governing the mass revolutionary process--perhaps for the first time, and certainly very intensively--were pushing in the opposite direction, they were pushing urgently towards recovery of functions of counterpower within the process of self-valorization of the masses. The counterweight, which was not associated with self-valorization, thus reappeared as a variable gone crazy. Self-valorization sought in small markets an alibi for defeat in the terrain of the invention of a new way of producing, in the vast soup of the "personal is political" alibi for the failure of practical struggle. In the middle, attempting an impossible syntheses, remained the most disqualified politician or the last of the 1968 prophets of mediation.

Here, however, the problem is that of political critique, so a critique of the residues of a pale dialectics and of its effects on the theory of the movement. Political critique means getting to the point right away: to the need to rearticulate not the self-valorization with the themes and practice of counterpower, but the new communist movement per se, from within, in the absolute immanence of its existence. In the indistinguishability of its expressions. In the fullness of its action. In the power it can express.

So in the separation it lives in. The development of coercive relationship between classes and the dissolution of the market as a norm of the hierarchical bonds of society, as a legitimizing source of the distribution of income, poses the separation of the proletariat not as residue and limit of the capitalist means of production but as a crisis of this means of production. Within this crisis, the power of proletarian separateness has already imposed formidable new mortgages on the articulations of the distribution of income;

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

it has already started up a reconstruction of the social working day which restores time and wealth to the proletariat. As always, on these slopes, workers' science has nothing to invent. It must merely contribute to the process of self-valorization of the proletariat in the self-determination of the mass communist movement. The problem is not power. It probably will be, but already the traditional image of power is radically contested, and its validity goes back to the masses' criticism of politics. The problem is, rather, the expression of proletarian might within the crisis of market capitalism and its falling apart. The political process is completely internal; it can neither conceive of nor foresee delegations or derogations from this present strategic program. The power of the proletariat does not need intensity along the vertical dimensions of the emanation of state power, but rather an extension and a broadening of wide horizons of the social reproduction of the crisis. Consolidating proletarian might is an objective internal to its conquest. We have no resistance to overcome, no more than we have space to occupy. We have no need for dialectics or philosophers or mediation or politicians. We need, first of all, to gather in and develop the proletarian program against the misery of linkages. Might should be developed within the workers' use of the crisis. It is to be identified in an expanding taking root of the trouble.

Thus we touch another limit of the movement's arguments: Its socialism, the concept of subject in sociological terms. In fact, no one--or very few people--has been able, in the movement, to understand the ontological scope, the totalizing meaning of the definition of the social worker as an axis carrying the new class composition. Unlike in other phases of the struggle and analysis, we were not faced with the result of a process--the mass-worker--which had to be recognized and imposed on the strategy and tactics of the communist movement, renewing its tradition. Instead, in this case it was a question of fixing the presupposed present development, which appears immediately as a break. We were not faced with a political requalification scheme of a section of the class composition, but with a long term proposal for reading the class struggle, in power relationships between classes, of the communist project. The sociological preliminaries are therefore not so much the object--however central--as the qualifying form, blending scientific analysis and political practice. It is the element of self-criticism which did not understand in time the importance of this determination. It is so complex it swallows and includes any preceding determination of composition. The mass worker is a partial element of the long term subjectivity of the social worker. There can be no political reasoning except about the complexity of the ontological and material versions of the social worker. Instead of understanding this significance of the category and of its theoretical and political implications--the relationship between production and reproduction, the transformation of intellectual work, the valorization of circulation--we kept on mincing words about the old dogmas; worker centrality or not? Without understanding the by now elementary truth that the social worker was also at the center of direct exploitation in the factory, both in national enterprises and multinational ones. But, God willing, this is not all. There is a total historical centrality, the militant opposite of the market crisis: this is the social worker, the movement of the value of use. And this becomes the communist movement.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

It is this "becoming" that is the center of the antagonistic analysis which should be proposed as the only subject for worker and proletarian discussion. It is a becoming which we catch in all its pregnancy and theoretical complexity and which leaves no room for other hypotheses. It is a long term composition which covers the whole historical period of the crisis of the market and therefore of the communist transition--that of the social worker. It is not by carrying out defining sociological operations or dialectical and political conjugating operations that we will solve this problem. It is only by penetrating the internal dynamics of this subject, of this becoming, that we will proceed to revolutionary knowledge. Articulations, sequences, and connections are not external to the reality of the social worker, but inside this reality. It is not a question of part of the collective worker but rather of the collective worker. It is within this unity that individual-individual collective sequences should be judged. The ground covered by subjectivity within this collective subjectivity. Which is however always, in any case, separation, antagonism. If we forget this we fall into the indecency of the pathetic and substitute Proudhon for Marx.

3. Proletarian Formation and Subjective Organization

Starting from the concept of power and proletarian might, this means that the problem of the material formation of the proletariat and that of subjective organization are comparable; in other words, they can be reduced to a single fabric on which--in accordance with good manual art--we can trace the warp of the fabric and the flexibility of its material. Subjective organization is a moment of the proletariat becoming a subject, a form of its collective practice. The process of the formation of the proletariat follows from workers' science from within a formative phenomenology which determines the single passages and their continuity. I am not interested here in the method we should choose; I am not interested here in choosing among the variants of a theoretical intention; I am interested in emphasizing the centrality of the problem and the dimension of its development.

I am interested, above all, in excluding alternatives to this determination: In the first place, if not exclusively, that school of thought which stems from the third international tradition and the experience of so-called "real socialism." Because of the failure--or, if you prefer, with greater historical justice, the exhaustion--of the doctrine of the extraneousness of subjective organization to the formation of the proletariat, we find ourselves in a uniquely rich situation in which we can deal together with the immaturity of our tradition (with a series of our defeats) and with the gigantic historical example of the falling away of an illusion. New dialectical residues--physical masses of dialectical rhetoric, blocks and detritus of old and frustrated knowledge--have fallen on us. At the present level of its composition, in the wealth of its formation and its needs, the proletariat as a communist movement does not know what to do with the radiant future offered to it by subjects external to its movement; it does not know what to do with the "progress" that it is being led towards. Those sublime heights to be conquered dwell in the abyss of a distance corrupted by discontinuity with proletarian needs and by the time during which they were so mystified. It is only by destroying all distance, all stopping, all interruption between form and content of proletarian constitution and form and content of subjective organization

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

that we can allow ourselves to remodel a real autonomy of class politics. The critique of politics has only one subject: mediation, dialectics. This object is articulated in two points, one derived from the other: the bourgeois theory of representing the general interest and the socialist theory of revolutionary representation. The result of political criticism cannot be a restoration of a direct immediate passage between proletarian formation and subjective organization. Let us hear no more of Rousseau and Stalin! The history of political theory of our time is a constant bouncing back and forth from one to the other!

Let us hear no more of the universal, the market, utopia! Because the universal and the market are merely utopias, ineffective and painful, to cover up war. The absolute of conflict and violence which the failure of the mediation of the market has restored to us, this unresolvable situation which makes separation become more and more distinct. Within this horizon of need there is an emergence of the expression of a new rationality, a method of struggle which can rationally dominate war, which, destroying universal mystification, imposes the force of totality on the particular of proletarian formation. There is no subterfuge or shortcut, faced with this problem. Any universalist contamination which the Left of the working class reproduces is destined to self-destruction. There is no longer any possible realism! Does the generous masochism of "dirtying" one's hands with institutions pay? Has it ever paid? The spectacle of power cannot be demystified except by taking away from it rather than separating oneself.

But this separation is power, this taking away is wealth. Living and working in the formation of the proletarian promoting the communist mass movements, assuming communism as a present process is the only reality we can grasp. It is the only, and very rich, rational way we can dominate war. There is no civilization in the market: the only social contract which can be established is within the horizon of separation. The whole complex of relations of domination has shifted with Marxist geometry. The social contract of the market has been destroyed by the social composition of the proletariat. Social dualism, which all bourgeois political economy has tried to reduce to the unity of development, either through a controlled marginalization of the proletariat or through its recognition within mechanisms of programmed compatibility, and with infinite other effective excogitation--that dualism is in crisis. It was suffering from a dialectic sickness. Dialectics, however you conceive them, are in crisis as real power. Perhaps in another revolutionary phase it can be considered in a Kantian way according to the standards of science fiction. Separation therefore calls for its rich existence. It calls for the materiality of determinations within which it presents itself: behind it, an overturned world which no longer knows any truth except in the form of mystification, of the constant proposing of pacifist illusory utopias covering up the reality of war; in front of it, communism as the only possible way to end war, hatred, the market, lies, and abstractions. Communism is not a utopia, inasmuch as it is the only possible social contract. The social contract puts an end to war by transferring the control of society to the proletariat, recognizing the communist movement as the only ordering and composing tension to meet collective needs, as the only dimension in which the overturning of the market can occur today.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Thus we come back to the central theme of our argument: the making of proletarian and subjective organization. A terrain and a goal are set: the terrain of separation, and within this terrain the unified but divisible dynamics of its ends; the goal of the restoration of rationality as the immediate expression of proletarian needs and peace. To use philosophical terms, the formal cause and the final cause. But the effective cause? Enough scholastic jokes: how do you articulate subjectively this process leading from war to peace, from the dirty utopia of the market to the reality of communism? As we know, the various theories of the social contract have never been able to explain the driving force, the effective cause that makes this contract run. The reason is obvious: the theory recorded and made rationally plausible not the problematic datum but its overcoming. It was an apologetic theory because it was a bourgeois capitalist theory. We do not have this option because proletarian science is a science of the immediate, not of mediation. "Trouble" is therefore necessarily the point around which it concentrates. What is the point where formation is articulated into subjective organization? At what moment does normative and revolutionary expression emerge from the particular interests of the worker? The whole tract revolves around these questions, and there is certainly no point in shortening the argument to a few words here. But to make it easier and clearer to read, it is enough to say that the analysis must be carried out determining:

1. The complex condition of the crisis of the capitalist market and its superfections, recognizing in the crisis itself the decisive movement of the composition of the working class and proletariat;
2. The forms of capitalist utopia in the attempt to break the ontological solidity of the state of crisis and war;
3. Only then will it be possible to tackle the problem of the relationship: proletarian formation/subjective organization of its effective dynamics;
4. And determine historically defined points of attack, in relation to the situation at any given moment of the struggle and to the strategic dimension of the communist program.

But all this is possible only if we bear in mind the fact that the elements of self-criticism proposed so far, and the first thematic approximations, lead us to a fundamental premise: the ontological impossibility of discriminating between the form of the "social" composition of the proletariat and the crisis of the market and of the capitalist state; secondly, the political impossibility of dividing the making of the proletariat (which is given separately here) and the tension of subjective organization, the expression of proletarian might, both as a movement and as a communist program.

4. New Problems, Problems of Methods

Dear Comrades, if we were together I would propose to you this schematic outline so as to explore theory and practice, in search and in organization. But we are not together, and for this reason there are certain problems. The first is mine--it is the difficulty of being in prison trying to write a theoretical work; the second is directly inherent in the discussion of how an

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

activity is carried on by various people, in other words the fact that in the present situation it is not only difficult but perhaps impossible. Because the relationship between the separation of the movement and that of the person in prison is a double separation (furthermore it is mediated only by the language of power): on the one hand there is the logic of the workers' self-valorization, which occurs with a force that is difficult (except empirically) to even grasp; on the other hand the solitude of prison, the voice of the world of self-valorization. The de-territorialization, the abstractness of command is directly perceived, within the specialization of the process, of its actors, and within the specialization of bourgeois information. While to proceed theoretically in the identified territory we need real information, what is relevant to proletarian separation and what cannot be read--except by analogy and metaphor--in the press of the regime or in the massive repetition of the mass media. In fact, we are subjected to a one dimensional type of information. And all this in a phase in which communism presents, on the other hand, its novelty, the rationality of its project, in savage terms. Political prisoners once lived in a situation in which the positive party line could be received in the specificity of a coded language. Today this has no meaning anymore. The whole capitalist world runs like a wartime organization, a command structure; its language turns reality upside down to make it homogeneous with and adequate for the urgency of command. The employer's language does not translate reality, it is not a channel of communication for reality. But on the proletarian terrain there is no abstract production of truth, no language appropriate to unmasking mystification. Either you are inside or you are outside: this is the problem, laboriously, of the struggle of the social worker. Separation is real and its language is rigid. It is a language that covers reality but is nevertheless untranslatable, and cannot be communicated to the outside. Penetrating this compactness, then, becomes the objective of a search which I am making: this is a first objective to attain before reaching the one that is farther inside, which can perceive reality only in the band of light of the authority's information. This causes new problems. They are problems which are born not only of the intrinsic novelty of reality which we wish to explore, but also of the repressive situation we are living in.

Here in prison there is no information about the movement; it is important to be sure one is again on proletarian terrain. A posteriori, to achieve this end, I can only proceed to put together information which I can gather; I can only accumulate hypotheses approaching an understanding of reality. This difficulty of mine is a very great one. In fact, there are people who console me by saying that I am exaggerating. They are the theoreticians of *Offentlichkeit*, of the proletarian public's sphere. They say that this has become consolidated and that at any rate it is proceeding in its environment to construct meanings and significances. This is true, apparently, but it is false in substance--it is true because it is happening, it is false because this is a wild and discontinuous process, it is a process of separation, it is the invention of an untranslatable logic of universality and of bourgeois and capitalist rationality. There is no possibility of translation, no homology or continuity. The public sphere which is constituted within the making of the proletarian does not contain any teleological germs; it has no ends other than those of the affirmation of its own special nature. The growth of a workers' civilization has no prototypes, it only has limits. These limits are due to the strength of the adversary first of all, but also, and much more importantly, there are limits which are related to the nature of the process

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of self-valorization--ontological limits. Collective proletarian existence is all extended on the margin of the concrete position, the historical position of its own being--it is what collective practice has created. Nothing more. What collective practice has determined is the all of proletarian existence. Even a step beyond this reality is impossible. Any added meaning or definition going beyond the given of that existence is absurd. But this block of being is alive: without wanting to dip into the universal, it grows on itself and at all times has its own special nature and totality. So this world should be seen from within its own existence. Therefore its language is all within the present limits of its existence. Beyond the present determination of proletarian being there is only emptiness and dizziness.

From this is born the problem of a proletarian language which bridges the gap between proletarian self-valorization and the open space that it reveals at its limit, which ties together the components of self-valorization, bringing them to an expression of totality and normativity. This problem cannot be reduced to tradition; let us take just two examples, populist and Jacobin language, which are both impossible for us to take over. Because the populist one flattens innovation on tradition and the Jacobin one exasperates utopia in normative content; the first betrays the "truth of the movement" in its philological devotion to truth, the second exalts the movement as truth, it transfers its immediacy into words, denying the complexity of creation of a true language; it substitutes the word for the movement while seeming to express it. Both these linguistic forms are completely extraneous to the social workers' productive quality, to the creative nature and actual class composition. And it is here and only here, in this new class composition, that we must search.

If the problem is opened so intensely, it is inevitable for many approximations to be given. And those which are most fascinating are undoubtedly searches for an analytical and recomposing language which, starting with the subjects exploited, goes through the criticism of exploitation and constitutes, in the ontological situation denoted by war, the radical nature of the antagonistic project. Working on this terrain, we can proceed. Working with method within the "criticism-transformation" sequence, the "exploited subject-antagonist project." The only words which communicate are those which destroy the present, recognizing it, denoting it critically, and constructing hope, the practice of transformation. The truth of the movement of self-valorization as separation and a global alternative: this is the net in our new codes of communication, according to which we are only beginning to communicate with each other on the one hand; on the other hand, we are beginning to build in the vacuum which opens up before us and which we must occupy and build in. There is no truth unless one determines the relationship between criticism and transformation in the internal proletarian separation. In the totality of sequences which are put in motion by this motor.

A formal foundation? Perhaps. It is not less important if it is brought back to the generality of the movement of self-valorization and its quality. It is a flat language which assumes a rejection of work as a connotative basis--criticism and transformation--of the signs it uses; a language which never forgets its origin, the specific subjectivity it is the expression of. A language in which we hear the difference and the plurality of subjects which constitute that community of rebellion which is the process of self-valorization.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

But it is useless to proceed! Here in my special and double separation, as in the separation which counterposes the antagonistic base of the communist movement, the only indication is that of working on this terrain. We are learning to communicate, we are constructing these new codes of transmission--within war, against war.

Chapter 2: Crises of the Crisis-State

I just remember that she always wore a skirt with vertical stripes, so she looked like a big wooden gate with an ironed white blouse hanging on it.

Robert Musil, posthumous pages published during his life

1. We and the 1930's

What a bore, finding myself faced today with the same old exhumations and infinitum of the theory and practice of capitalism of the 1930's! It is as though the genesis of the state form which we saw developed before our eyes could still tell us something about the crisis, let alone how to overcome it! To eliminate all attempts to go backwards with an analysis that ought to be projected forward, let us therefore ask ourselves:

1. What can be read in the 1930's;
2. What they wanted to make us read in the 1930's;
3. Why what they wanted to make us read was false, and why does it not add anything to our knowledge today;
4. What is the basis on which we can open an analysis of the present?

The 1930's were marked by a ripening of a crisis which characterized, in a definitively consolidated way, new relationships among forces among the two classes in struggle. Social and economic crisis affects the institutional level. The crisis can be resolved only through a remodeling of the capitalist state which reorganizes production and reproduction, distribution and circulation, interiorizing the new quid of the situation, the dynamic relationship which the working class imposes on all aspects of the development of exploitation. A new proportion and a new compatibility are fixed to define the composition of productive factors: the state becomes an internal agent of their projects, of their planning. This modification of the place the state occupies with respect to the combination of factors of development radically modifies the institutional mechanism, which flattens itself on the relationships of production and is forced to imitate them, to simulate them in its material construction. This happened in the state's two great reform experiments of the 1930's: the New Deal and the Keynesian one, and the Nazi and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

corporative one. The level of antiworker terror which the different systems apply is commensurate with the urgency of renewed development and the complex dialectics of social relationships, internal and international, within which the project takes place. Reformism and terrorism are two complementary faces of the reform of the state born in the 1930's, the quality of synthesis--as the development of the model until the 1960's will show--is only determined by the need to make those quantities of consensus and violence that were adapted from time to time proportionate to the development of a mass production and redistribution of income which kept the fundamental relationship of domination intact.

The fact that today they want to point to the 1930's as fabulous years, the fact that the undoubted novelty of the capitalist project of that reform is claimed by the workers' movement, are only signs of cynical bestiality and indecent formalism. Because this type of interpretation shows that there is no understanding of the essential ambiguity of capitalist reform, of the capitalist nature of the project. Therefore it is not the indiscriminate form of the project that has to be taken into consideration, mixing good and bad--Weber and Lenin, Rathenau and Bucharin, Roosevelt and Stalin, Keynes and Schleicher--but rather its historical determination, which saw the New Deal in crisis already in 1937, submerged by the wave of new proletarian struggles, and Nazism obliged to adopt a forced enlargement of the happiness of work, and Keynes suggesting war as the only solution to the conflict between the two classes.

But as we have said, what they want to make us read from the 1930's is not only inadequate for the reality of that time and for the truth of its interpretation; it is not only false because it drains the tangible accentuation of mechanisms of exploitation in complacency over enthusiasm for the project. This image they propose to us does not help us, at any rate, with our attempt to interpret the present. Starting with the 1960's, in fact, the form of the crisis changed significantly. It changed because there was a change in the relationship between the state and the composition of the proletariat. We have said that the form of the internal relationship within the relationships between classes is not mediation, it is war. This is true because every overt determination of the market, every prospect for forced reaggregation of the factors of production within a proportionality which is progressive and in conformity with the rule of exploitation, is in crisis. It is a crisis of ontological turns; it is not born of the difficulty of setting proportions, but rather the impossibility of determining relationships; it does not emerge from the delay in the institutions of development but rather from the enormous distance of the state from the dynamic material of the proletarian struggle. In the 1930's, with more or less violence, the state tried to interiorize the struggle within development; today the state is navigating through an archipelago of separation, it must control an irrelevant existence. Proportions, compatibility: these words lose their meaning. Measure is an absolute term. There is no measure because there are no measurable elements. The instruments of overdetermination by force of the crisis, the fantastic aspects of the state's repressive activity (currency, inflation, etc.) no longer work. It started with the interiorization of of the working class, our crisis state of the 1930's. Today it has been sucked in and placed within a large proletarian dimension, and by putting it there it accentuates the distance and detachment. Like a mirage on an immense horizon.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The crisis of the law of value goes beyond the dimensions of the Marxist definition. In Marx the measure of exploitation yields to the need to overcome, in relation to the lack of proportion between the enormous growth of the productivity of labor and the poor organization of the working day. All this is here. But there is more: there is the social figure of production, there is the composition of the social worker and struggles. There is the invasive making of a proletarian sociality, which affects every relationship and dissolves it. It will certainly not be quantitative totalitarianism of automatic control that will be able--like a lucid insinuating project--to reduce the massive qualitative presence of the social proletariat. Now, it is on this foundation that we can open an analysis of the present and reconsider the waves of war going through it. Without any nostalgia or reminiscences about the fabulous years of death: the 1930's.

One last point about the meaning the reference to recovering the 1930's, within the framework of the traditional working class movement, has had and is desperately trying to keep: The teaching of the crisis and of theories of control of the crisis was translated into an ideology of transition. The dialectics between economic development and political violence, its proportioned calibration in a project of socialist transition, have been conceived as the only path to follow; the subject is the party--but strongly linked to the institution and the administration, the method is guided by functional goals, the reference to society is understood as a fabric woven of small conflicts, on which it is possible to carry out operations of synthesizing projects. The complexity of the political project and articulation of the administrative intervention, voluntary rigidity in the general framework and normative mobility of planning intervention; this is the dream of the 1930's of our reformist vanguard. Productivity as a result of development and violence wants to occupy the center of the transition project. What should we say about this? What should we say other than to emphasize once more the lack of symmetry between this project and the actual making of the working class and proletariat? And the effects which this lack of symmetry produces: an administrative rearticulation of divisions in the class where the social trend of self-valorization denies it? The attempts to interiorize the violence-development relationship within the movement of the class, to transfer the problem of proportions of development and exploitation directly to the inside of the class; and, on the other hand, as we know well, this too is a fruit of the 1930's. But it is of Eastern, not Western origin; it is typical of capitalist planning and socialism. So probably the moment will seem to have arrived to compare the bureaucratic and capitalist model of Stalin's party with the Western myth of the new reformist state. Only such an analysis and identification of the threads which join an updating of both these structures can enable us to shed light on all the mystifications planned for the "third way." the 1930's, planned capitalist state, Stalinist transition party, projection and third way: all this is part of a heritage which has been rightly rejected by the present class composition.

2. The Form of the Crisis: A Crisis of Mistaken Proportions

The corporate state, born in America of the crisis of the 1930's, lives on proportions. It regulates the proportions of income. It is a planned state inasmuch as it organizes national production according to plans of capitalist

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

reproduction. But at the same time it is a contractual state: representatives of big vested interests are incorporated through a continuous contractual dynamics. Institutions are conducive to the formation of contracts; the law is bent to the administration of contractual convergences. All this can work as long as the political framework--designed to maintain and reproduce the fundamental relationships--is somehow consonant with the goals inscribed in the material Constitution of the corporate state. The capitalist rule of development is that which constitutes the material Constitution of the corporate state. The control of enterprises is that which is imposed by the terms, the rhythms, the quantity of social accumulation and intended redistribution of income. Everything can work as long as the big proportions fixed by the material Constitution are not attacked. From this point of view, the corporate state represents a giant step forward with respect to the state of law. The latter guarantees that these "spontaneously" determined market relationships are gathered in a public project for which the state merely observes the ways in which it develops. In reality, it surreptitiously preforms them through the mechanisms of forming the political stratum. In the corporate state, the function of preforming is completely conscious and guaranteed institutionally. The conditions of reproduction must be contractual, mediated with the general consensus, brought back to the proportions of capitalist development inscribed in the material Constitution.

And when this mechanism breaks down? When the contractual mediation is interrupted which represents the point of transformation of values into institutions, of social productivity into planning and normative capacity of the state. This can happen for various reasons, all related to the terms the society's fundamental rules are based on, in other words to the material Constitution. Due to the dynamics of struggle, the social contract becomes possible again only if the terms of the fundamental proportions inscribed in the material Constitution are modified. Let us suppose that there is a lack of proportion. This lack of proportion can be corrected in only two ways: either by eliminating the terms of lack of proportion, thereby reestablishing the original conditions of the contract, or by modifying the basic proportion--the overall picture within which the proportions exist--thereby bringing the proportions back into balance. But in the present phase this can only be done badly within [accepted] margins of risk. The consequences are very grave: if the proportions are mobile (and therefore lack of proportion is always possible), but at the same time the framework within which the lack of proportion must be set and brought back into balance is rigid and unable to function as it should, the whole institutional apparatus breaks down. An institutional crisis begins, in a context in which social forces, aroused by the dynamism of the planned and contractual state, have difficulty accepting any impediment, and there is no adequate output corresponding to the input of demand.

As you can see, this is not a formal scheme. It is important to view it from the historical standpoint. In the present situation the material nature of the crisis is evident. It attacks not only the proportions which have been determined, but also the rules of proportions, the long term rules, the measuring criteria which these rules are founded on. In order to have a contract it is necessary to have at least a homogenous will on both sides. In order to recover the contract of the fundamental law it is necessary to have permanence and continuity, cooperation and loyalty to a scheme of reproduction of society.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

But all that is no longer present. In the factories the working classes are radically refusing to accept the redistribution of income on which the social determination is based. This means they refuse not only the monetary quantities rigidly fixed in the form of salaries, they also refuse the experiment of capitalist work as the content of contracted salaries.

In this connection, I like to refer to the opinion of a scholar who is above suspicion, James O'Connor: "The conditions for the accumulation of capitalist profit in the U.S. have been undermined by the present class struggle and by capitalist competition, which have effectively reduced the production of absolute and relative added values; they have therefore reduced the rate of exploitation, and therefore, in Marxist terms, the rate of profit and accumulation. To use an excessively simplified formula, industrial capitalism in the past faced the problem of the transformation of value and added value because the production of added value was a problem which had almost been solved. In recent decades, capitalism has been increasingly obliged to face the problem of the production of added value, because the transformation of value (including added value) is no longer a problem. This new imbalance (the destruction of the unity of production and circulation) is basically the result of a profound transformation of relationships between classes. To a certain extent, struggle of the working class for labor has been transformed into a struggle against work; the struggle for a salary based on productivity has been transformed into a struggle for a salary based on needs; needs defined as individual needs for goods have been increasingly transformed into social needs for equality between races and sexes, environmental protection, and other problems related to the quality of life" (critique of Law No 147).

Elements of rejection are piling up; the state's organs which are designed for mediation (like trade unions, parties, local agencies, social services, etc.) are thrown out of balance by radical alternatives: either reject this accumulation of refusals and in that case lose representation; or accept it, and in that case live on the sidelines of a lack of proportion which has been induced and which runs the risk of leading to a breakdown of the social contract. So the situation is as follows: a crisis fueled by a lack of proportion brought about in some way is open--and this is apparent in the description of elements of pressure and their subversive accumulation--not so much to a relegitimization of fundamental rules as to a shock wave against the fundamental rules themselves. This is disastrous for all the institutional sequences sustained by those rules, like dominoes knocking each other down.

But this is still part of the old picture. Analyzing this series of phenomena elsewhere (for example in "Proletarians and State" and in "domination and Sabotage"), we had given the state's answer. It seemed to me that I could read it in the setting in motion of instruments for intervening in the economic situation which we called "stop and go," or periods of expansion and stagnation appropriately regulated to correct any lack of proportion, to regain homogeneity in the whole cycle. Development and crisis seemed to us entities conducive to capitalist maneuverability, understood in terms of control and resetting fixed proportions during the class struggle. The state-plan became the state-crisis inasmuch as it became able to dominate the contradictory turns of the class struggle in the cycle. But this only applies to the past. The change

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

in the composition of the working class and the diffusion of productive labor in society impose modifications on the state's control apparatus related to modifications in the way the class struggle is used. What is possible (although it is wearying) to dominate in the working cycle and enterprises--is hard to dominate in the social productive cycle. In fact, when salaries--by means of infinite ways--destroy their own model and become increasingly confused with shares of income, all this not only dissolves the proportional relationship which the capitalist factory is presumed to determine; it goes beyond this blurring permeating society, and transforms it into a diffuse political awareness of the impossibility of containing the extent of worker reproduction within proportions fixed by the state for the reproduction of capitalism. And in that case it is not only the proportional reproduction scheme that breaks down; social groups interested in establishing effective contractual forms are also drawn into this crisis. Not only do the general proportions break down, but there is an accumulation of mechanisms and dynamics, irreversible or difficult to reverse, which push the lack of proportion through the whole state. sequence of control through consensus on the basis of the material Constitution.

Salaries, social proletarian income, social conditions of reproduction of the proletariat: it is around these fundamental terms that the constitutional rules of capitalist production/reproduction are entering a crisis. Of course capitalists can divide the proletarian thrust and try to break it by separating its specific impact from its cumulative sequence. This can happen directly, engineered by the state, or through delegation of power to the big trade union confederations. But this is not a lasting remedy. In fact, as we recall, the "social" composition of the proletariat has been so consolidated by now that the circulation of struggles cannot help but be immune from all attempts to divide it into compartments. Furthermore, the offensive encirclement of the most consolidated corporate positions--that aspect of the attack of the social proletariat--is also a trend of the proletariat's struggle which cannot be held back. Thus beyond and before any given forecast of breakdown, what we must emphasize is that the causes of constant lack of proportion in the terms of domination, in the quantity of exploitation, are enormously magnified by the social dimension of the composition of the proletariat. The accumulation of elements of lack of proportion, and their being pushed to the limit of the fundamental constitutional law, thus becomes quantitative and qualitative tension: quantitative because it is in fact the sum of quantities of breakdown; qualitative because the social dimension on which it is constructed and on which the process grows is such that it is difficult to control as it is extremely mobile and unpredictable.

As a consequence, from the point of view of institutions, the existence and accentuation of an unbridgeable gap arises. Because the institutions of the corporate state are founded on the representation of homogenous interests; they are designed for organization based on division, they function for a contract between parties. The rule of proportion between profit and salary, between exploitation and work, between production and reproduction is always seen from the special angle of particular interests which only the state administration of the law of proportion brings to general mediation. But no longer. The particular appears as totality. In fact the only possible control, faced with the totality of the interest of the social worker, seems to be that

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

which is exercised through the fictitious totality of currency. But this disturbs and destroys the whole social articulation of representation, it destroys the laborious interiorization which special representations have made of the fundamental law of proportion for exploitation and development.

Today in Italy--but those concerned with things Italian can console themselves, it is happening in all developed capitalist countries--these problems are very relevant. The crisis is due to the fact that the planned capitalist state has been submerged in a chemical solution which had dissolved the differences in the proletariat. Thus all the criteria break down, all the measurements, the functions of the reagents with which, in accordance with predetermined proportions, the experiment was to take place and have certain results. Capitalism can no longer be sure of anything. The conditions of class confrontation have been enormously advanced. It would take a radical reform of the state, as intense as that determined in the 1930's. But this is a dream! Under these circumstances of subversion, reform can only have a sign opposite to that conceived by capitalism. For this reason, this reign of lack of proportion has become a battlefield. Everyone is waiting for a new contract, but between what parties? For Whom? There is only one force here which can go forward, and it is that of the socially productive worker. But why should it be in his interests to move outside of himself? He has all the productive force, and therefore he alone can fix new proportions, or no proportions.

To sum up: The fundamental difference between the crisis of proportions of the 1930's and today's crisis regards the state's capacity to intervene and regulate, and it consists mainly of the fact that while in the 1930's institutional dynamics retained relative autonomy of functioning vis-a-vis the social antagonists, today the immersion of the capitalist project in the continuity of social production makes it difficult if not impossible to adequately articulate political and administrative autonomy for the capitalist project. The capitalist constitutional norm therefore becomes, in an extreme attempt to function, more and more rigid, while the mobility of social factors, of social productive work, increases. The paradox is not a fleeting one; there is a clash between logics based on alternative values, often openly antagonistic. So we have a situation in which a progressive institutionalization of society into state rules is paralleled by destructuring, mobility, the dynamics of differentiation produced by the new composition of the working force, of the proletariat. This indeterminateness, this progression of contradictions, seems to constitute the specific nature of the crisis of lack of proportion today.

3. Forms of Crisis: Crisis of Circulation

The crisis caused by the fact that the proportions of the relationship of development (production versus reproduction within the rule of profit) have altered, precisely and/or according to general sequences, are accompanied by horizontal crises of circulation. Capitalist control is a circular function: it must follow the realization of profit. The value produced must return to those who ordered the production, after ordering society itself, going through society. The process of control and the process of valorization run parallel to each other, cross over, are juxtaposed, homologous, in each of these forms, and they form one path, one circulation, returning always to the point of departure. But all this is deontological. Capitalism is a relationship and this

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

relationship can be broken (we have seen this in connection with lack of proportion). But this relationship can be broken all the more easily in circulation, where lack of equality and discrepancies inherent in the productive process are apparent. Capitalism: its collective brain has naturally been applied to these difficulties; it has tried to guarantee by force the continuity of circulation and realization. In doing this it has juxtaposed a political determination over the economic determination of circulation; it has proposed both as tendencies towards unity. But this over-determination, if on the one hand it has given new guarantees for development, on the other hand has given new opportunities for breaks. Circulation of capital is a relationship that can be broken, the circulation of control can be blocked. Both can be shattered either separately or together, or temporarily interrupted, or made viscous. The form this circulation takes can be broken or the times of circulation can be drawn out enormously or rendered uncontrollable and precarious, the content of circulation can be contested. Certainly to the extent that capital must expose itself so absolutely (following its own law) on the terrain--politically and coercively overdetermined--of circulation, it attempts a jump forward to recover the productive value of circulation itself. But this attempt to suck synergy on the terrain of circulation is subject to the law of productive relationships; when capitalism broadens the terrain of exploitation, it also broadens that of resistance and possibilities for breaking. But this is not what interests us above all. What interests us is that on this vast horizon, where productive functions and command functions must march together to make value and control circulate and be realized, on this terrain blocks and opportunities for breaks occur in incredible abundance. In other words the more production/reproduction, production/circulation, and production/reproduction/control relationships are extended, until they constitute the specific concept of the productive circulation of a planned state--the more these phenomena occur, the more exposed they are on the side of social worker. Our hypothesis of a progressive inevitable immersion (and consequent isolation) of the mature state form in the great sea, ontologically determined, of the social composition of the class, is exemplified in a formidable way by the new structure of productive circulation. Hence the might of the block, of the crisis of circulation, which are determined by the situation itself, by its simple material intensity and compactness.

While this general modification of the relationship develops, capitalism tries to dominate it. We have already seen this: capitalism tries to extract value from circulation. Rationalizing it, abbreviating its tempos, guaranteeing fluxes--but above all organizing production in the dimension of circulation. When circulation is consolidated over the enormous expanse we have seen, capitalism seems to be submerged in it. And in this way it agrees to act: reorganizing itself while submerged, trying to find in the autonomous articulations of the social worker points of recomposition of the relationship of exploitation. This is the submerged economy. But it is not only this: it is a simultaneous presence of elements of exploitation and self-valorization. Faced with the capitalist initiative of trying once again to bite the body of the working class, there is above all another aspect: the proletariat's capacity for resistance and independence. Now what should be considered, regarding the problem that interests us (the crisis of circulation), is the sign which these contradictory relationships will assume. And it seems to me that the situation is characterized by a series of mechanisms which help and extend,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

even in the case of the submerged initiative of capitalism, the break, or at least the exhaustion of the state's capacity to control circulation. This means that the multiplying mechanisms of proletarian self-valorization are stronger and more rapid than those of intensification of control; in other words, in the given situation, the expansion and strengthening of the social composition of the working class is a fundamental element of crisis of the unified process of circulation of profit and command.

Saying this we must however immediately raise another problem. If the circulation of capital is interrupted, in an ontologically determined situation, by the emergence of the workers' self-valorization, we are not only faced with a negative: the interruption of the circular control and realization of capital. We are also faced with a positive factor: the emergence of infinite points of resistance and breakage in the proletariat, a reopening which is in no way homologous to processes of independent circulation, all on the part of the proletariat. Circulation of struggles, circulation of experience, circulation of languages; the independence of these processes has laws of its own: we will see some later. For now we should stress that of the lack of correspondence between capitalist crises and worker insurgence. This connection has always been sought by capitalist economic science, in order to dominate it; from the point of the traditional workers' movement this connection has been interiorized to such an extent that it has become an obstacle impeding the reading of any class autonomy. It is time to unload these archaic relics of a pseudo-workers' science, relying on the originality of the blending between the crisis of circulation of capital and autonomy, independence of the self-valorizing circulation of proletarian initiative.

This is not meant by any means to evoke an image of the development of struggles, of composition, of worker science, that simulate capitalist ones; on the contrary. Where the mechanism of capitalist circulation breaks, we cannot in any case see the precise and specific action of the working class. We can and must see it as a moment constructed and accumulated from a rich conglomeration of behavior and struggles which have been expressed within the process of self-valorization. When we consider the cycle/crisis/worker-struggles relationship we are struck by the always relative--and often extremely high--unpredictability of the moment of the break. Who could have foreseen May 1968? This lack of predictability is the basis for all insurrectional idealisms and ideologies of revolutionary irrationality. And these will continue to occur until we learn to follow the material complexity of formative paths of the class, and exclude mechanical correspondences between crisis of capitalist circulation and the specificity of circulation of worker struggles. The break, the insurrection is always a result of a given accumulation, not just the explosion of a situation that has been held down. Of course the viscosity of institutions, the corruption of a political stratum, the crisis determined around a certain passage can be fundamental, but not decisive. The only thing that is decisive is the process of accumulation of struggles, the independent maturing of the physiological processes of self-valorization. We can finally allow ourselves to assume, as far as the revolution is concerned, a point of view like that of Tocqueville.

Throughout the space, throughout the area where the processes of self-valorization are occurring. When these material dimensions are defined, limits are also established which are determined by the interweaving of an independent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

expansion of class initiative and the emergence of new components of the process of self-valorization. Let us consider, for example, the case of the so-called oil crisis. In this case, the revolutionary interests of the working class of advanced countries, all centered on the independence of their self-valorization, can be extended to be included in an accumulative mechanism with the emerging struggles in the oil producing countries; but when these struggles become workers' struggles, when they become trends toward proletarian self-valorization, independent themselves (and this is what is happening more and more, ever since the beginning of the 1970's). The process of the accumulation of struggles, its dimension can therefore not be considered an expression of organic and linear development. It must be considered rather a real material accumulation. Hence the possibility of continuous contradictions, dislevels, lack of proportion, clashes. But this sets up a process which, whatever difficulties there may be, represents an insoluble moment which cannot be mediated by the complex of the capitalist relationship. The lack of homogeneity of breaking points in the capitalist cycle and in the cycle of worker recomposition is extended in these dimensions--I would say that it constitutes them.

Thus we come to the definition of an intermediate but very important point in the theory of the forms of the crisis. If we take the crisis--of lack of proportion or of circulation--as an interruption of development, of proportions or of the circularity constituting it in/within the political form of capitalist control--the economic and political being fused--and if we assume the development of the social composition of the proletariat as independence, if we therefore eliminate every automatic or mechanical independence from both--the form of the relationship between development/crisis and class struggle can only take the form of war. This means that every strategy, on both sides, assumes not the reconstruction of a unitarian project but the destruction of the adversary. This means that the initial position of the two sides is not defined in any way by relationships of interdependence, but by relationships of antagonism. It means that every action, on both sides, is born and develops within independent and antagonistic relationships. This situation is what capitalist development leaves, for itself and for the class. Not a desire, no one's desire, but a need, the necessary result of capitalist development. The economic science of capitalism recognizes this when after transforming itself from the triumphant calculator of development into a modest administrator of state operations, today it has relinquished every task that is not a tactical one. Because here there is another paradox--after having lain under the same cover for so long, economics and politics separate again, but this time--since it is due to a situation of war--politics dominates.

4. Forms of the Crisis: Violent Crisis

The social and economic crisis is completely transferred to the political-institutional terrain. The state as the center of overall imputation of development within the compatibility of capitalist control is shaken by it. The democratic specificity of the state, its capacity to transform economic inequality into political equality as a basis for dialectics between consensus and command, between organization and violence: all this falls away. Because real antagonism has finally recognized in the form of equality the strait jacket it needs to free itself of. So a linear mechanism (inasmuch as the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

institution is a channel for prices) of breakage, discontinuous but progressive, is set in motion which, to the extent to which it breaks the circularity of the processes of reproduction of capitalism, affects and strikes and destroys the links of obedience, it dissolves those of authority--it reconstructs the various and alternative classes of value.

We shall come back later, within the framework of the analysis of the process of the proletariat's self-determination, to the content and definition of these alternative classes of values. Here we shall simply emphasize the radicalness and totality of the interruptions which are determined (clearly, in this connection, I refer the reader to the specific works which are so abundant at last in this field: the analyses of Klaus Offe, James O'Conner, their whole entourage, and also to the studies contained in my "The Form-State").

Every state institution--in general, but all the more in a refined form of organization like the democratic form--has a certain relationship between functional effectiveness of command and validity (legal or consensus legitimizing) of its rules, either in the content pacifying conflicts or as a function of a promised satisfaction. Production of goods and services, values and reproduction of society according to a traditional scheme, goals and limits of material constitution--all these functions are reformed in every act of the administration and all the more within the figure of the administrative body, the specific institution. Now, the transferral of a crisis which is not due to the economic situation, but is ontological, within the state machine--and of a state in which the institutional reflection of productive capitalist processes is so far advanced--creates an expansion of the crisis in which the phases of contagion become cumulative according to geometric rhythms. The management of the crisis becomes almost the government's only activity. As in the case of any epidemic, the only way to interrupt multiplication would be to strike at the causes by going back through the channels of contagion. But the sources of contagion reside within the capitalist structure of the democratic state, in the synthesis of organization and violence, of functionality and legitimization that the state requires in materially determined terms. Does this mean that the democratic state is a structurally weak form of the state which is unable to serve complex ends? No. The interaction of the reference to the experience of "irresoluteness" of the Weimar Republic, so well known in the literature, does not help us: What has changed is the class relationship, and it is a good rule not to compare different things if you do not want to produce sophisms. Speaking of "Weakness" and crisis of the state: this simply means that today the democratic state has outlived its usefulness--in the form in which we saw it evolve historically, from the state of law to the planned state--for managing capitalist development and for a capitalist solution to the crisis. But for capitalism, for its ideology, the democratic state must nevertheless be considered the instrument of domination. And now we see the democratic capitalist state modified under the capitalist thrust. And since it is the pores of contagion of the crisis that should be stopped up first of all, we see an intervention which blocks the relationship between consensus and command in all the passages of administrative organization, tending--as is the case in any emergency regime--to consolidate a unanimistic synthesis of command and consensus--and at the highest level of state structure. The corporate

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

state transforms itself into a mass authoritarian state defining administrative bodies as separate bodies of the state--thus recognizing paradoxically, the independence of the proletariat and eliminating all the connections it has defined to recover its pressure at every level--for the development of capitalism. Every connection between form of administrative command and its legitimization is interrupted--and restored only beyond any possibility that the administrative machine, suffering from a specific impact of the crisis will communicate it to its own totality. It is an emerging.

We are not interested here either in individual abuses or deviations, we are interested in the whole process. Under what circumstances therefore, we must ask ourselves, is this modification possible? It seems to me that there are two fundamental conditions: the first is derived from the quality of the subjective forces jointly leading to the emerging, the second from the specificity of the device that they can put in motion.

Now, as regards the quality of subjective forces we should stress that they--the parties--must be organized as popular forces. They must produce the simulation of emerging within themselves, on large popular masses, to be able to relive it at the level of that state. The result of this process is purely functional: it reproduces repressive motivations of the crisis, broadening them, leading to a domino-style falling of responsibilities, creating coresponsibility in a generic way and according to class lines, pushing towards the emptiness of political autonomy, toward state totalitarianism, every element of consensus and participation. As for the device put in action, starting with the state centrality of the emerging program, it consists in cooperation which the whole state and capitalist machine sets in motion to sustain the action of special administrative bodies. These can act--in this situation all the state administrations act tendentially--like special bodies (and other structures, previously contractual, are reduced to the regime of special bodies--the trade unions for example); so they can act according to these sequences only to the extent that there is a very strong central mechanism, rhythmically expressing the general motivating force, "down to every specific moment, to every particular point where there is a breaking or weakening of the relationship between command and consensus. Through a general emergency mechanism, the state replaces a certain synthesis which every administrative act requires of a democratic regime. The mechanism of command of the mass authoritarian state therefore imposes on every branch of the administration a defined autonomy within an extremely rigid framework of necessary coercion, completely functional for the mere transmission of emergency commands--like a command based on the need to block every circuit in a crisis.

At this point, however, it is necessary to step back and consider the pathogenic factors which this type of institutional transformation sets in motion. It is clear that all the spaces taken from the political consensus in a situation in which participation in the common social work is required, in which the salary relationship is socially distended and is identified merely as quantity of income distributed on the production-reproduction connection--these are spaces left open to attacks against the system. Not automatically, it is clear, this potentiality is transformed into actuality and the presence of violence. But gradually, even on this terrain, the elements of crisis become explicit

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

in their specificity: the capitalist operation of closing the spaces of contractuality vis-a-vis the administration, of defining frameworks of conflict within economic and political limits that are clearly delineated from the point of view of administration and salary, and finally the conscious pushing aside of consistent parts of the labor force--all this introduces elements of violent crisis which soon becomes subjectively relevant for large sectors of the proletariat. When the block of purely objective relevance of any movement of proletarian autonomy becomes a vital necessity of the system, this block introduces into the system a purely political--and therefore subjective--valence of crisis: a crisis of violence inflicted and/or endured--on both sides. When the rigidity of the state machine, the viscosity of its operation, the drastic permanence of its command become constitutional, and such that from the constitutional emergency the state's intervention is extended in every direction, making the ordinary extraordinary, exceptional--everything is exalted to a level of unheard of violence, the terrain of violence seems to be the only effective one, after every form of political expression has been reduced to a mere spectacle in the form of unanimity of the constitutional emergency; after every form and every articulation must affect and break the solid independence of the processes of self-valorization of the proletariat. Wherever the proletariat, because of its own ontological rigor, induces a crisis of lack of proportion and of circulation, the state cannot help but respond with potential compensating violence at these critical points. The effect is only partially repairing. When this potential for violence intervenes, it is faced with more than the need to reorder the situation; it is faced with a series of structures of proletarian autonomy that must be brought under control, so they must be divided and reduced piece by piece on the various sections of the complex organization of circulation. A clash is inevitably induced by the state. The rules of war being to be an inseparable part of the rules of administration. The ordering power which the planned state wanted to include in its own definition (but predisposing it to a homogeneous relationship, on development, with the proletarian force) becomes instead here a blade which cuts all the more deeply, the more rigid it is, into the resistance of class composition.

We are facing a new paradox here. It is this: the state, as a pathogenic element, as the promotor of exceptional and exemplary violence, in reality in this context the only terrorist agent. The state is forced to intervene on the interrupted nerves of its design for domination, integration, production, in a precise way, effectively from the point of view of terrorist exemplification. But these central points of state intervention, and of its logic of war, are not what is of most interest to the proletariat if our initial assumption is true about the lack of homogeneity of the capitalist crisis and of proletarian development and, in any case, the lack of homology of breaking points on the two fronts. So--and this is the paradox--while the state's action is relatively innocent only as regards the effectiveness of the destructurization of the proletariat (put in practice based on the logic of self-valorization and on the timing and forms of its independence), it is very invasive regarding the characteristics of the violent crisis. Drawn into this large proletarian body, the state becomes the carrier of crisis and probably of the hardest and most decisive crisis, even if it has knowingly advanced the structure of many levels of authority, in order to specifically

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFI

react to the specificity of the elements of crisis already produced on the terrain of complex circulation of profit and command. The proletarian reaction, on the other hand, follows its own channels of autonomy.

What can we conclude at this point, other than that the crisis condition is changed by capitalism into a state of war, inevitably and as the result of the simple clash with this class composition? This is what we have been repeating from the start, namely that today the situation is defined by a making of the working class and proletariat which is so socially invasive it impedes all capitalist reproduction which is not posed in terms of war. Thus if we follow the transformation of the working class and define the consolidation of its social situation, we are inevitably led to pose the problem of overcoming war, and this is the same as the problem of overcoming capitalism as a form of organization and control of society. A utopia? A utopia ceases to be utopian when the existing order is atrocious and when the utopian subject has become more real than the existing order.

5. Problems to Explore

Comrades, as I said and want to repeat, these are notes of subjects. They pose many more problems than they solve. We have to work on these subjects. On what in particular? On the fundamental difference of the state-crisis, on the specificity of the class composition which is forming within this crisis. This is an epic making passage. In past years, in the last two decades, when we have stressed so much the emergence of the working masses--thus effectively combining theory and revolutionary practice--in reality we were only marking one stage of the development of class composition, an anticipation of the crucial and decisive moment: the emergence of the social worker and the definitive break between capitalist development and the development of class composition.

Now, if this is true, as I believe, as the experience of our struggles is beginning to show so widely, so arduously, and if worker freedom is finally beginning to express itself so forcefully--if this is true, therefore, we have initially four problems to face, which we already raised in a disorderly way in Chapter 2. The first is that of defining the movement of social capital. The second is the problem of the definition of self-valorization in all the dimensions which are characteristic of the subject/social worker. The third is that of a modification of the configuration of the state and, in general, the definition of forms of sanctions. The fourth concerns, the global worldwide dimensions, of the relationship between the extension of worker self-valorization and the restructuring of command at the multinational level. These are directions for research opened up by this simple approach to an analysis of the crisis; many other problems, above all those related to an analysis of the articulation of the practice of the collective proletarian subject, are still to be raised.

All I could do here is list the problems to be faced in the framework of this strategy of the social worker.

I. The concept of social capital is the first point. In Marx, this concept is barely touched upon, although it is solidly rooted, in the internal articulations to be shown. The relationship production/reproduction, inasmuch as it is mediated by the administrative structure of the state, is the first

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

point of the analysis. This means that all the categories of social capital, and in particular those of profit and income, should be studied separately as to their mechanism of formation, and productive circulation which materially form these categories. One should probably take as a point of departure the crisis of bourgeois political economy, in its extreme theories, dissolving the very horizon of global analysis. The central problem will undoubtedly be that of identifying the social relationship between (social) exploitation and (class) self-valorization in discontinuous and dishomogeneous terms, where the experience of struggle shows that the problem arises. So there is no claim to global dialectics, but simply to a totality of specific categorial behaviors. The fact that these problems are not posed and cannot be--by definition--posed in relation to homology (direct or inverted) does not mean that these terms do not define relationships among themselves, relationships forming structures which are sometimes resistant both to a logical analysis and to significantly long periods of history. It is probably only the design of this empirical picture which can, within broad and solid investigation, enable us to redefine categorial sequences at the level of the problematics of social capital. The concept of social capital cannot in any way be considered, therefore, a simple expansion of the very general category of anarchy and competition as defined by Marx. The fourth or fifth book of the "Capital" that we are preparing to write is born of an effective shift in the documentary base of the analysis. The absolute antagonism of relationships we see today is a powerful driving force for shifting the analysis; and this is something that can be done only by putting oneself inside the antagonism and the tension of dislocation. In theory, too, the point of view of war must be assumed, i.e., the independence of factors, of their contribution in working together to destroy every preconstituted relationship, in projecting separation.

II. Self-valorization of the social worker. As regards method, there is no doubt that the history of the "other workers' movement" has offered us rich instruments of analysis. But it is clear that the level at which our hypothesis is placed requires more thorough exploration. When we speak of the social worker we are in fact speaking of a network of behaviors and a circulation of values, ontologically consolidated, which are tendentially controlling elements in the society of capitalist crisis. The crisis itself, and the social phenomena it causes, are dominated by the redundancy of the self-valorization of the worker. A few corrections have to be made in the traditional written history of the "other workers' movement," firstly to cancel the minoritarian blot which too often corrupts it and secondly, and as a consequence, to articulate the complex of discontinuous but effective relationships which the massive social determination of the class imposes on the adversary and on the motions of its crisis. Thus in a purely introductory way we have a dual level for our analysis: on the one hand we have an analysis within self-valorization that begins with written history and moves to the making of the class; on the other hand, for now without any certain contacts, we have an analysis outside class composition which feels its effects (albeit discontinuously and erratically)--effective and dramatic again--in determining the capitalist crisis. It is useless to dwell, above all in this second case, on how fundamental techniques and accentuations of thought are in war. As far as I'm concerned, I have already developed allusions to self-criticism as regards mechanical methodology which in past years has led us to conduct an analysis of the crisis and an analysis of self-valorization in almost complimentary terms. But then

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

we risk liberating, in unjustified terms, elements of pure destabilization, almost as though we were saving the originality of the communist movement which the complementarity of the aspects of the crisis, or of development, ran the risk of suffocating. But if this self-criticism is correct and should be deepened, the most important thing is not yielding to the opposite temptation: the linearity, the organic nature, the spontaneity of the process of self-valorization. This is lethal.

III. A third problem regards the specifics of the state. We must review the criticism of the administration and the Constitution. It is probably the problem of the process of individual branches of the administration forming "special bodies", and placing themselves within the framework of administrative authority, and the flux of decisions and specific sanctions, which we are most interested in. In other words, in this case, too, it is not so much the globality of the criticism of the Constitution, its material and qualifying elements, which is central; it is rather the discontinuity of the devices of power to be brought into play, so as to criticize them precisely and identify their evolutionary and destructurizing dynamics. The relationship which relates these modifications in the state structure to the emerging crisis, the effects of break and repression, all this should be studied separately, with attention to specific techniques.

IV. This brings us to what is increasingly perhaps the most central point to raise: the doubt that any analysis does not start from a preliminary analysis is vain. This is the problem of a multinational formation of capital, it is the problem of the multinational dimensions of class composition. What shall we say? Here we can only stress the urgency of a program, of an accumulation of initiatives in this connection. Starting, as we do, from the definition of the social composition of the working class, this urgency becomes even greater, if possible. The fact is that the making of the social worker, is contained from the start within the multinational dimension. The recomposing processes of the social worker, and their extraordinary acceleration at present, have resulted from the multinational dimension. The effects of the new composition are also reflected in the multinational dimension. Now, it is true that the high points of development permit a more articulated reading of the low points; it is also true that this methodological assumption, which is valid for the history of the development of capitalism, is useful in defining the category of social worker and therefore applicable to the analysis of multinational recomposition, but with some reservations. The more we explore in depth the intensity of these concepts, and the more they become operative essences, as the transforming activity of revolutionary thought requires, the more the analysis must adhere to the concreteness of proletarian independence. Never before has it been so important as it is today--when the old third international theories and Third World imperialism are leaking copiously--to concentrate intellectual and political work on this group of problems.

Also because, as we have said, from this point of view other elements of the analysis can be clarified. Let us consider briefly the results of a study of the crisis and of the management of the crisis; both on the production side (salary relationships) and on the reproduction side (consumption-valorization relationships), symmetries, proportions, and compatibility have disappeared. One last tangential mediation seems to arise, only on the terrain of the world government of money and, through this, on the terrain of the world government

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of the productivity of leading industrial sectors. Lack of proportion and incompatibility, which are so very effective on the national terrain, would be projected and dissolved in the distance and complexity of the multinational arena. It is a question of understanding whether this is just an optical illusion or if multinational mediation of capitalist development has already gone so far as to resolve the destructive potential of the processes of self-valorization on this terrain. We are faced with a classical Leninist problem, and this is certainly not the place to go into its merits. It is useful to merely stress how far the capitalist initiative has gone in anticipation. But we should not forget, either, the fact that, even if only at a regional level, and still only partially, the first great experiences of the workers' struggle, identifying the interests of the average proletariat between historical composition and diverse complexity, have begun to develop in the struggle. From the point of view of the worker, this new horizon, this overall Vergleichung of values of single national worker classes, this worker continental drift, should be confronted centrally, both in theory and in looking forward to the struggle. This will certainly not be the first time that a capitalist anticipation is shattered by worker initiative!

Chapter 3: Figures of Capitalist Utopia

In the night of barbarianism and feudalism, real relationships among men could be destroyed, whole nations thrown into turmoil, justice completely corrupted; but when the light began to shine it became necessary for gothic absurdities to evaporate and take flight, for the rest of the old ferocity to disappear. This is certain. Will we merely substitute one evil for another, or will the social order, in all its beauty, replace the ancient disorder? Abee Sieyes, "Qu'est-ce que le Tiers Etat," [What is the third state], Chapter 4, Paragraph 3.

1. Control of the Refusal To Work?

In the field of economics and production for profit, capitalism, in its constant attempts to organize for exploitation, in its constant but never decisive restructuring of the crises it goes through, puts forward some proposals. Two of these proposals seem to us worth analyzing: the attempt to control the specific nature of crises and therefore restructure itself; and the attempt to reorganize development by controlling (and preparing instruments of control for) high levels of conflict. Let us consider these proposals separately and judge to what extent they are realistic or utopian. Evidently more utopia than realism, if it is true that the emphatic apologia of the "third estate," according to Sieyes, continues to dominate the scene, and it does this all the more so that harder it is to reduce reality to empire.

Let us look therefore at the first proposal. It is widely supported in the political stratum of capitalist society, not just in Italy. We can call it the neoliberalist line; it has a strong restorationist connotation and its aim is to control the specific nature of crises, crises in the form of labor's refusal to work and the relative independence of the processes of self-valorization. Its theoretical and practical pillars are as follows: control government expenditures in ways aimed at a general constriction of labor and therefore a global mobilization--diffuse and liberalist--of the labor force on diversified markets; rely mainly on monetary control of development (both in

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR (

terms of controlling the money supply, and therefore inflation-deflation cycles, and in terms of credit policy); flexible planning based mainly on a reduction of social costs and a predetermination of instruments for constant control (automatic, telematic) of all compatibilities; finally, a growing integration of the national economic system in the multinational system, and adaptation of that market and of control. The highly restorationist content of this political-economic line lies in the fact that it requires, as a premise, the dissolving of the relationships based on force which have become consolidated in the struggle between the two classes. It requires that, in the enterprise, all the constraints which the trade unions had introduced be eliminated, that the enterprise's risk be rewarded fiscally and by favorable market conditions, that the economy be restored according to a liberalist statute, and that the monocratic freedom of the entrepreneur be recognized; in other words, that the whole system of the state-plan be suspended and the mechanisms of market defense set up again.

This is an old and reactionary picture! And yet, in this proposal there is an aspect that should not be underestimated as to its political effectiveness: the fact that the neoliberalist line includes and distorts the productive figure of the social worker. In other words, the crisis of the state-plan, in all the aspects it has shown, is properly appreciated here. So collective capitalism insists that it is necessary to restore a large network of exploitation, break the rigidity inherent in the institutionalization of the workers' struggle, pursue the refusal to work to the point where it becomes a need for reproduction (if only autonomized) again, play on the productive recomposition of the working class and proletariat by pursuing its mobility and specific behavior. It is necessary, says collective capitalism, to reactivate the overall productivity of the system, accepting that it be shifted from the factory to the social complex of reproduction. The working class of great mass struggles managed to form a flow of income from the factory to society, from production to reproduction; now the problem is to frame this flow in productive terms, pushing production's capacity to absorb and control to the limits. Constriction of labor and refusal in the factory should be recomposed in society. On the connection between production and reproduction. The political objective is not to negate the social worker but to restructure everything around him; it is not to negate self-valorization, but to work beside it, to reduce its substance and independence, and deny it the possibility of becoming class self-determination. This is undoubtedly the maximum of capitalist intelligence in the crisis and exploitation. It is the present form of the "reaction."

How real is this project? It is undoubtedly difficult to measure it in a transitional phase, when it is faced with all the political difficulties which usually mark the beginning of such operations. But it is not impossible if we stick to the big problems which the design raises and defines.

The first problem is inherent in the very substance of the project: what level of control and productivity can effectively be guaranteed in a relationship with the social worker? Here the bold optimism of capitalist organizers of "black work", of widespread exploitation, of a submerged economy seem to have reached the limit. In fact, this is a mined terrain where the forced

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

separation of labor markets and a first attempt to govern by undersystems have been sustained only through the benign neglect of job security by the big corporations. But how long will this be possible? How long can circulation and equalization (within the class) of behavior, needs and struggles be interrupted? When will this project be relegated to the sidelines again instead of being taken as a solid foundation for capitalist recovery? These questions can be raised legitimately if we bear in mind a few other conditions of the capitalist production game in society and of the working class in its environment. The first observation we can make bears on the fact that beside the diversification of labor markets, there is an intensive development of a unification of the connections between production and reproduction, and consequently pressure on public expenditures, on a further, progressive socialization of services and on all the conditions of reproduction of the labor force. Given this situation, productive labor, separated from the market, tends to reform tirelessly. It understands that average value is reconstituted within the set of relationships which link production and reproduction. But to say this is to reaffirm the unity of the worker project of self-valorization and consider how it tends tirelessly to subjectively take over its own determinations. Recognizing this is saying that, in this social and global association of production and reproduction, the push toward a reformation of the proletariat is highly accelerated. Whatever overdeterminations of control capitalism tries to impose on the process.

Among these overdeterminations, one traditional one should be considered first, and that is the administrative one. We know that the neoliberalist project has a solid administrative basis born of the administration of the state-crisis. It would be a serious mistake to confuse this project--which is one that restores up to the limits of political reaction--with the old liberal design. Here the accent is always placed on the administrative horizon. It is the administration which must guarantee the flow of a system which is so decentralized, and assure that--in real time--they can be verified and constrained within the framework of compatibility. But administrative flows, too, are ambiguous at this level of the crisis, and do not lend themselves to unilateral monocratic management. If they did, the consequence would be a blocking of information, a blocking of the capitalist theft of the workers' knowledge, all the more important, even essential, in view of the massive mechanisms of self-valorization. On the other hand, if stress is placed above all on the "indicator" (on its real consistence, on its participation in social productive work and the latter's antagonisms), one runs the risk of blocking the administrative mechanism or, still worse, of making it a means of proletarian reformation.

The second important overdetermination of the neoliberalist project is the multinational one. This is the mechanism through which values, tempos, quantities and quality of production and reproduction are transferred from outside to inside the national economic system, with a qualification and control which are overdetermined by the hierarchy of the multinational division of labor. It is no use dwelling on the degree of pressure which is imposed by this overdetermination. But in this case, too, ambiguity is at a maximum. On the one hand, the large quantities ordered by the multinational division of labor are effective elements constraining labor; on the other hand, however,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the very external imperative nature of this control risks being, and is, contradictory to capitalism's attempt to pursue and control more and more the socialist worker and his movements. Multinational over-determination dramatizes relationships and quantities, and induces--within the great transformations being made on the multinational horizon, and also in a revolutionary sense--hysteria and new conflicts and tensions. Often capitalism accepts a deterioration concerning the placing of a given country in the multinational hierarchy of the division of labor so as to avoid bringing international over-determinations directly into play. To block processes of circulation of struggles induced by the multinational level.

If this is the picture, we see, therefore, that the level of realism that can be attributed to the neoliberalist project is very low, if not irrelevant. So in this connection we should speak not of reality but of utopia. The neoliberalist project is based on utopia, a utopian and nostalgic restoration of the enterprise and of its freedom and risk. Like all merchandise of this type, the utopia is validated by the state through administrative over-determination. In reality, the strength of the neoliberalist project lies merely in seconding the workers' refusal to work and proposing a mystification for the constraining of labor that is more appropriate than the present ones. This utopia is very dangerous. During the brief period it has been tested, on the small terrain which the social worker allows it to be tested, it has accumulated a level of violence and greed for profit that we have not seen for a long time in the direct capitalist stratum and in the political stratum of capitalism. Because it touches the density of the processes of self-valorization and is organized on their supposed marginality, hypothesizing the impossibility of worker reformation (which, however, it does consider from close up and foresees as near)--because of this, the violence and the repression introduced by utopia are at a maximum. Utopia becomes dirty. As a consequence of its own precariousness, it tends to redefine itself in the general scheme of social organization of exploitation. Maximum decentralization must be guaranteed by maximum hierarchical structures and by maximum control. The dream of a "second" Republic goes through the heads of these "utopians" more and more frequently and intensively. They have come close to a world whose hatred they feel; they thought they could administer it and over-determine it; they have accepted--to the extent that they have been pushed towards it--the logic of war. All they can do is actively include it in their utopia. This becomes a matter of survival for them. All they can do is fix it on the institutional terrain as a guarantee for the safety of their commerce. They started by trying to destroy the constraints which the state-plan imposed on them to limit their freedom; to guarantee their profit, they are obliged to invent a state which is much heavier and much crueler, administratively and politically.

2. Control High Levels of Conflict?

The neoliberalist line therefore begins by trying to pursue the movements of the social worker, building on them a new structure of productivity and exploitation. It ends up by resorting to a new strengthening of the state, of its capacity to intervene and divide the proletariat front, as the only weapon that can prevent it from being completely swept away before the processes of self-valorization. We should, however, not forget or underestimate the capitalist intelligence expressed in this vain project of restructuring of exploitation.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

We say however, that this is an alternative of the Right. It is supported by entrepreneur circles, the capitalist brain as such, the new technocracy of automation. These people are hard, and deaf to everything but direct capitalist interests. On the Left, once the mad illusion of a historical compromise has dropped away, once the mystification of "autonomy of the political" has been revealed, once light has been shed on the trick of a concept which is still productionist, how do you respond to the challenge which has been raised by the social worker, to the crisis determined by class might?

The path before the Left is probably very uncertain, but two points it probably must pass should be mentioned. The first is a renewed contact with the new class composition; the second is a radical revision of the technical and political instruments which "autonomy of the political" has set in motion to determine a recovery of productivity. But we should be careful to remember that the objective of a recovery of productivity remains fundamental for the Left, because what it asks for is not so much a revolutionary inversion of the line but simply a correction (in depth?) of the line carried forward in preceding periods, a line which ended up being confused with the "neoliberalist" line. But is it possible to be receptive on the one hand, to a new relationship with the social reality of the productive worker and at the same time emphasize the problems of productivity and growth of productivity? This matter is the narrow door for the Left which, faithful to its tradition, maintains the "great values" of "work" at the center of its ideology. On the other hand, it must somehow be receptive if it does not want to cease to exist as a great historical force and be reduced to merely representing corporative interests of bands of the working class covered by guarantees (as has happened in the case of American trade unions, or, partially, the French Communist party!). What should this receptiveness or opening be? Is there a way other than that of taking the exclusive central nature of the interests of the social worker, in production and reproduction, as a nucleus of class strategy?

Before we come back to considering the problem as a whole, let us look at one or two points which constitute the present impasse of the official workers' movement. The first problem, which has become a central one, is that of renewing contacts with the new class composition. This problem is posed in the following terms: is it possible to filter the new composition through the party structure and bring it back to the channel of a democratic-constitutional contract? This is a fundamental question, doubly fundamental because it involves both the goal and the form of the operation. It seems to me that both are impugned by a series of inadequate structural elements because from the point of view of the goal, there is still a goal-oriented coefficient, perceived as exaltation of work and its productivity, which is not only rejected in general, in the immediacy of the imagination and of collective behavior; it is even in contradiction with the political form of the new class composition. This phenomenon arises not so much as sociological dispersion as political separation: physical separation from the goals of capitalist development, political independence from any mechanism mediating for profit. The project of social diffusion of the form-party, so that through it the process of exploitation can be reorganized, so that in it provision can be made for participation in the capitalist economic system--all this is not only the ultimate deception, it is also a belated and ineffectual solution of an

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

unsolvable problem! Unsolvable because, I repeat, the form of this formidable new social class composition is not only that of diffusion but rather than of a refusal to work, of self-valorization, of political independence. An attempt is made here to carry out an astute operation, but it is only a dirty one.

These characteristics of marginality remain, and for a certain period of time the operation could become effective--and grant the official workers' movement some breathing space--if the general conditions of development were different. Thus we come to the second problem: that of the modification of the Left's political economy line. The Left has never before been so much in need of controlling the renewal of its relationship with the working class, in a situation marked by margins of development and high levels of conflict. The Left's utopia is the idea of being able to pay prices without changing its program, containing without having to take on a completely new form consonant with the new structure of the working class. The utopia of the Left is that of "controlling" a high level of conflict. But this line has been completely removed. The construction of a situation of high conflict and radical mass, democratic political decentralization runs up against unsolvable rigidities. Not only those--however fundamental--posed by capitalism: conditions which, as we have already seen, arise from the multinational control of productivity, from structures of the international division of labor, and go down to the capitalist consolidation of labor markets, to capitalism's increasing lack of tolerance for the political structure and administrative remains of the state-plan. Not just against these: the Left's project also, and above all, runs up against the nature and structure of the class movement. It can no longer be reduced to mediation by the state. Radically, forcefully. It is a communist movement, consolidated around itself. It does not accept any dynamics that do not start within it and return to it.

And yet, let us say so clearly, we are now in a situation in which one can perhaps speak again of "proletarian and worker use" of institutions. I'll explain. In the 1960's and later, around 1968, the revisionist spirit of the movement spoke at length of "worker use" and of "a long march through institutions." These mottos were derived from radically democratic positions at the time, sometimes from radically reformist positions. Because the former postulated the uninterrupted continuity of social democracy, the latter the uninterrupted continuity of socialism-capitalism. But the situation has changed today. If we start with a consolidation of the trend toward proletarian independence, if we consider again the metaphor according to which the capitalist order, due to crisis, is immersed in a rich complex of the social composition of the class, then "worker use of institutions" no longer comes into play, in any way, as a treacherous transfiguration of capitalist mediation of the workers' interest. It no longer appears as a basis for illusory continuities; on the contrary, it emerges as a possible way of unhinging the whole capitalist system and its institutions even more, as an initiative which is worthy of strategic evaluation (in relation to circulation of struggles and in relation to processes of proletarian reappropriation). When controversies are opened about government spending, affecting the territorial structure of the state, when there is struggle against the juridical structure of the state in anti-repression battles, and one wins income in the former case and freedom in the latter; when, in the context of the terrible

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

subsumption of the state with respect to the administration, it is discovered that the administration, too, is affected by class struggle, and in this case it is a question of directly political achievements--this is the "use of institutions" that the force of the working class and proletariat can afford today.

It is clear how different this is from any dream of control of high levels of conflict, of governing through democratic decentralization. Levels of utopia and realism are measured only in relationship to class strength, dynamics, and structure, and it is this massive proletarian force which today allows us to undertake an initiative entailing the communist use of institutions, while liquidating any concept of "control of high levels of conflict" for profit as utopian and alien to the communist movement.

But let us dwell a little longer on the points we have raised, above all because with them we begin to get into the merits of the debate opened in the progressive fractions of the communist movement or--more simply--in its vital forces. Stressing this point, one thing is immediately clear and that is what we have already partially defined and which is situation at the moment of insertion of the process of self-valorization into the capitalist mechanism of development. This moment of insertion is a moment of crisis for capitalism. At the present level of the power relationship between classes there is no homology, as we have seen, to be determined at that moment. It is a paradoxical "bite and fle" that self-valorization, with its ontological dimensions, determines here. But this situation is not eternal. In the trend towards a transition from self-valorization to class self-determination, the relationship with institutions should be considered with the overturning effects it produces. Produce institutional crisis by using institutions, reappropriate normative power for the working class by emptying institutions. Not a "party of government and struggle," not a "control of high levels of conflict": this is the party of communist transition, the communist movement in its most determined figure.

But we will come back to all this at length. What we want to demonstrate here is rather the other pole of the argument: the utopia, the falseness, the mystification inherent in talk of controlling high levels of conflict. But this argument reduces and minimizes a need which, at this point of the development of self-valorization, is beginning to appear in the communist movement: the need for worker use--a destructive use--of the institutions of capitalism. And the power to achieve this. So we must come back to this and dwell on it.

3. A Parenthesis on the Ghetto

The ghetto is a utopia. It is the parallel of the capitalist utopia of neoliberalism, the projection of this ideology on the side of worker society. It is a block, attempted from within self-valorization, against the self-valorization and independence of the proletariat.

It is not that the ghetto is not and has not been a physical and logical place in the history of the "other workers' movement." From this point of view it is as important as the factory is in the history of the struggles of workers

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

and the proletariat, and it is all the more so the more, during the 1960's, first in the U.S. and then in Western capitalist countries, the center of worker struggle and class composition has been at the intersection between production and reproduction. Also from another point of view, this crucible of the new class composition becomes fundamental because from the ghetto, in the complex of contradictions which mark it, the two principal terms of the logic of war (independence of the subject and separation from the adversary) become defining elements. In the ghetto the extreme dialectics of needs, the radicalness of poverty and degradation with respect to dignity and the force of insurrection, give a first crucial connotation to the logic of antagonism. Thus gradually all the paths of dialectics and the internal needs of the ghetto converge on anti-capitalist antagonism. The ghetto as the logic of war, as independence and separation, vis-a-vis the outside; the ghetto as the logic of war, as a polemic and continuous synthesis of all movements of insubordination and their reordering in an aggressive way, directed inward. The ghetto as a red base.

This is the American ghetto of the 1930's, the 1950's, the 1960's, of the great seasons of struggle and liberation. But in the history of the working class the ghetto is diluted and disappears as the main place for the formation of the communist consciousness of class struggle, when the figure of the social worker becomes dominant globally. Ghettos proliferate: it is no longer just Harlem, but half of Manhattan that is a ghetto, a conglomeration of ghettos. So it is no longer a ghetto but a new residence for a complex subject over which capitalism throws the net of exploitation in a new way, but which resists and occupies space: the city as the territory of self-valorization. Proletarian pressure on public spending, capitalist cutting of spending, blackout, plural and diffuse insurgence, flight of the bourgeoisie from the city, and then a new sequence: an attempt to heal, a new proletarian insurgence. The ghetto no longer exists. There is a social relationship of the proletariat with the city, with the territory, which marks the territory as the arena of struggle: police cars do not observe and crawl spying, they flee through this proletarian territory. The ghetto no longer exists. The figures of worker self-valorization expand everywhere. All the great problems of the transition from self-valorization to self-determination are posed openly on this great stage, which neoliberalist attempts to penetrate barely touch.

But if this is the ghetto, separate and cut off from the problems of transition--of the proletarian government of territory and the transition to self-determination--if, therefore, within these historical determinants, the ghetto no longer exists, why do we still talk of ghettos, why do we consider the ghetto a pernicious utopia? Because wherever the ghetto reforms as such, as a place for the physical separation of strata of the proletariat from the rest of the workers' and proletariat territory, pernicious ideologies exist; it is on these points that capitalism develops pressure to reestablish the foundations of the internal division of the proletariat. The expansive force of the proletariat and the social worker must be isolated in its separateness. It must not be a platform from which to proceed forward, but rather a sack that it is closed up in, on which capitalism tries the blackmail of imposing survival through constraints on labor. It is on this residual concept of the ghetto that capitalist mimicry if the new characteristics of the workers' productive labor is brought to bear: it is on these sacks of degradation of the social

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

worker pressing on class unity that the submerged economy, and diffuse exploitation, operate. Then there's ideology. There is the ideology of defeat and of resistance; there is a continuous becoming more barbarous of the conditions of reproduction--theorized in this residual ghetto through the exaltation of its marginality, the use of heavy drugs, the search for an individual poetry of life, religion and magic. It is not that there are no elements of affirmation of needs and values of use in all this. It is not that, with the workers' understanding, it is not possible or desirable to twist this insistence on the originality of conceiving life, in the project of liberation. But here the enemy wins despite all good intentions. The enemy wins because the values of use, dipped in the bitterness of defeat and the isolation of privation, find no other way to express themselves than through the mediation of the values of exchange. Complete commercialization of proletarian life overturning of the associate thrust in evasive organization, reclassification of free time as spectacle. The ghetto wants suicide. I search for isolation among my family, determination as marginality, I dip it in the vast soup of a public opinion compleely reconstructed by capitalist mass media, I am exhausted in contempt, in the awareness of the usurping of the most intimate movements and motives of my desire for liberation, my very will to live. Thus the German ghetto is born and operates after 1968, as a sign and symbol of the defeat of a generation of revolutionaries. Thus in many Western and Eastern European countries, after great struggles, an experiment ends!

What a difference! On the one hand we have a worker becoming socialized and winning who destroys the ghetto, turning the city into ghetto. On the other hand we have a worker who refuses his own socialization, and recover it only under the sign of defeat, reforming a ghetto. The difference lies in the fact that on the one hand the point of departure is a political projecting of the value of use, whereas on the other this projection is rejected and one dreams of the disappearance of the political as a category. As though man could become a wild animal again and thus lose that characteristic of social productivity which absolutely guarantees his liberation--as if man could turn himself into a worm!

The final transition is from the "German" to the "Polish" ghetto, to the K.Z. From the "autonomous" dissolution of the heritage of the struggles and the interiorization of defeat to an "autonomous" predisposition to exploitation and self-destruction--anything to conserve the illusion of independence. This final transition, which denatures all passion and denounces the nature of the marginalized ghetto beyond any ideological mystification, this final place of poverty without hope, is also the internal trend of the development of the ghetto. We could say that from this standpoint there are also some positive points to be gleaned from this matter using the instruments of old dialectics, by noting that the self-destructive precipitation of the ghetto's ideology anticipates and precipitates the tempos of its functional utilization for the liberal utopia of exploitation and an adequate reclassification of the labor market as a function of diffuse exploitation. This self-destructive precipitation constitutes an important moment in the critique of the utopia of the ghetto as a desperate facade of the dirty neoliberalist ideology of production.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

F4

Let us come back to our central theme. The capitalist project, however it is posed, can only be situated before the fundamental transition which the proletarian constitution is forced to propose today because of its internal dynamics: the transition from self-valorization to self-determination. This transition rests on a secure foundation: the social worker's tendency to affirm his independence. Therefore to determine the emptying of every relationship homologous with development. Therefore to set in motion and keep in action a very deep antagonistic causality which is effective against capitalist development. Of course every time proletarian self-valorization moves in the area of intersection of capitalist valorization, while it determines a crisis, it offers another opportunity for capitalist intervention: opportunities for provocation, attempts to utilize and reabsorb marginal fringes of the process of proletarian self-valorization. But this sucking in, this mimicry do not constitute continuity, they can have no continuity. With an end to homology there is also an end to all illusion of continuity. On the workers' side, the progression of independence has passed beyond the threshold of the relationship. On the capitalist side every development is only implosion: mimicry, being moved by the struggle, are nostalgic reminiscences for capitalism. The separation is radical and deep. Given this separation, even the problem of revolution is no longer important; what is important is transition, the development of independence and of separation. The logic of war should be applied completely to thinking about the transition. Capitalist utopia has already assumed the logic of war as the axis of its argument: an argument which intends to wrest small tactical victories from the self-valorization of the worker. But this is a small logic, a utopia that does not even know how to nourish itself with mystification or exalt the functional efficiency of programmed mystification.

The logic of war which reigns on the workers' side has a very different scope. It is a game that develops in terms of conquest of territories. It relies on the expansion of its own strength more than on the weakness of the enemy. By now the capitalist crisis is just a tactical victory in the development of proletarian strategy. Capitalism is still in crisis. But according to the logic of war, of separation, it does not even know how to nourish itself through the crisis. Failure to recognize the causes of the crisis (and the consequent adequate mystification) once enabled capitalism to overcome it and develop again, incorporating new needs, new forms of association, new behaviors of the labor of the worker and proletarian composition. This is no longer the case today. Here the development of the proletariat is the destruction of the adversary, immediately. His emptying, a destructive use of him timetable. The capitalist project of recovery, however it takes shape, is always utopia and emptiness. The worker project is independence and full power.

4. Problems Still Open

There are at least three major unresolved problems around which an extremely relevant body of thought has already collected, three major problems for which we have identified some possibilities of solution, some hypotheses of labor, but they naturally remain completely open to investigation.

The first problem is that of new typologies of social and political control. Control is always something acting on something else, force is on one side, but the qualification is a relationship, an organizational relationship,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

this was the scheme which once defined the subject of control. But now the situation has changed. From the point of view of capitalism the problem of control can no longer be hypothesized in terms of global containment of a determined situation, of observation, information and domination of a definite picture. The problem of control is simply indefinite now. It is necessary to control, but the other end of the control does not exist except as a limit. So then one can invent a methodology of successive exemplifications, of approaches bordering on reality, on the capitalist constitution of a relationship of control. But all this is more a representation of power than functional control. Control requires a relationship, but when social relationships are dominated by the logic of war, what relationships can there be? The subject of control becomes more and more a question of the indicator, still swept away, however, by this paradox: the heaviness of control can only be based on the fluidity and flexibility of the indicator. Every element which must fix rigidity is mobile. So all attention, from the capitalist standpoint, should be turned to the mobility of the indicator. How carefully it is nurtured, how it is approached cautiously and with a certain functional delicacy! It looks like a hunting scene! Which takes into account the savage nature of the target! And yet this target is only a marginal apex of the body of social subversion organized as the proletariat. It emerges at the limit of intersection--never determined by precise relations homologous to a totality--of power with self-valorization. The point of intersection is as obscure as it is uncertain. For capitalism a science of the working class no longer exists, if it ever did. Sociology has replaced political economy in the teaching of the capitalist theory of knowledge; this substitution marked a not insignificant crisis, the criteria of knowledge were distributed over a categorial fabric which had as its foundation not laws but indications of credibility. Today sociology, too, seems to have difficulty raising its price enough to be considered a factor of production--that is, a factor of knowledge for production. Control becomes more and more an art. In other words, almost nothing. In practical terms control is just a provocation now, a prevention. We must become familiar with and study its dynamics, and strongly attack all attempts to make it "scientific," to try to restore to it any dignity beyond that--which is important and significant even though distorted--of being simply an irrational hypothesis of power.

The second problem concerns the fundamental terms of political economy today. It has certainly become a second-class science. That means that it refers more to administration than to power. Power is reduced to a mere exercise of force, political economy is strongly sucked in by it but does not have the ability to insert itself in it, for a single but weighty reason: its supposedly scientific status. If the capitalist command is denied a science of the working class, the science of economics must pretend to be this science. Thus it pursues, in administrative sequences, a last flicker of concreteness and reality. The history of economic science is strange; it was born, when the weakness of the social presence of the working class made it impossible to measure value, between the 17th and 18th century, as an administrative science (Polizeiwissenschaft), and was then changed (both its internal form and its external power) simultaneously with the development of the working class and a balanced relationship between the working class and society; it returned to a position subordinated to public administration when the enormous development of the working class prevented it from exercising a function of mediation. It

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

continues to imagine itself a science of value; in this area it can even imagine socialism as the utopia of equality of value; it has been practically reduced to a science of compatibility, to a balanced administration of subjects which it no longer possesses and which it can no longer possess cognitively. Criticism of political economy should therefore be clearly pushed to the exclusion of the category of working class sciences, or sciences which can be used by the communist project, to the point where political economy is placed in the class of employer sciences for control, a class which includes theology, various philosophies, philosophical specializations, etc. This does not mean a denial of the importance of political economy for power; who would deny that theology has equal importance? The fact is that the ontological content of political economy has disappeared: it no longer addresses itself to the mystification of value or power relationships between classes. It is nourished by power, directed and protected by power, like a goat by a shepherd. It is no accident that the most revolutionary among those who still call themselves economists are socialists! Value, equality, socialism: Proudhon deserves the place which opportunism has given him in history, and it would be hard for the revolutionary economist to be more than Proudhonian. The destiny of economists who accept the workers' terrain, and operate on it, is different; for them the issue is undoubtedly a critique of the state. It becomes that of the militant revolutionary, of those who participate in the self-valorization of proletarian knowledge. But where to go, what to do? This, too, is a problem which is still open; the only thing that is important is to walk on this path.

There is a third problem relating to the subjects which have been raised so far. This is a different problem but it is no less relevant for the subject matter of control. This is the problem of control, as it were, reversed, considered not from the point of view of its effectiveness but from the standpoint of the subjective ground it has covered, in the view of proletarian subjectivity. Approached this way, the problem explodes as a crisis of participation but above all of a critique of politics. The real foundation of the critique of politics and of the crisis of participation is proletarian independence, a separation of the paths of self-valorization. It is the heaviness of ontological determination. It is of fundamental importance to rediscover it and bring it back to this foundation from the infinite subjective individual expressions of proletarian action. But there are many difficulties, because in this area we are touching on the effectiveness of capitalist provocation for control, on those mechanisms which absorb the marginal materialness of certain proletarian behaviors and attempt to transform them into laws and transfer them into concrete proposals that can be acted upon. Here capitalism acts in only one way: eliminate antagonism, determine the linear continuity of partial behaviors, exemplify them attributing significant force to them. Of course the lack of a real substrate--of values--makes this operation a sham; the lack of determination, effective however marginal, makes these operations temporarily irrelevant. So they tend to turn more and more inward, and be more and more moralistic: "the personal is political" in the distorted acceptance of those who use it not so much to achieve their ends but rather to exalt its strategic importance. But this is not what counts. What should be clarified is the mystifying role all these theories have in this area of the "pathways of subjectivity", all the roles, all the philosophies which accentuate the nonantagonistic

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

aspects of the process. Every position, every subjective pathway which is prevented in the plane of linear phenomenology is false. Every objectivity that does not rid itself of fidelity to itself, to its own continuity, is mystifying. If the situation, from which subjective pathways may lead away, is in the area where the force of proletarian self-valorization crosses the horizon of capitalist power, every subjective pathway is marked by the logic of war which dominates that transition. A critique of politics is possible only as an application of the logic of war. Any irenicism is as pathetic as he is false. The isolation of the individual is as abstract as possible, it is as unrelated as possible vis-a-vis the collective organized in self-valorization. Self-valorization expresses itself only as collectivity. Individual abstraction ends in individual catastrophe when it denies that its own emergence occurs at the limit of the crisis, crisis as the determination of an effect of proletarian might on a capitalist power structure.

But here, too, we are speaking of problems which are still open. They are open and will remain so until we have excavated the whole terrain and understood how to reintroduce them not only into the compact picture of self-valorization (this is always possible, including positively and excluding negatively), but in the horizon of the articulations of worker independence, which is rich--because it is communism--in individual pathways.

Chapter 4: The Problem of War and the Theory of Value

The mind strives to imagine that which excludes the existence of things which diminish or hinder the body's power to act; in other words, it strives to imagine that which excludes the existence of things it hates. For this reason, the image of the thing which excludes the existence of that which the Mind hates seconds this effort made by the Mind, namely it makes the Mind Feel Happiness. Those who imagine that what they hate has been destroyed will rejoice. Spinoza, Ethica, 3, 20.

1. Between Adam Smith and Vladimir Ilich Lenin

The critique of the classical theory of value, the identification--in the Marxist theory of added value--of the root of a radical demystification and therefore paradoxical rediscovery, in the theory of Adam Smith and in the practice of socialism, of the imperative content of the theory of value, seem to be elements which have a solid place in the thinking of the communist movement. Having said that, we have said very little, however, because, opposed to the theory of value-command, to the lucid perception of the political and organizational consequences of the crisis of the law of value, the theory of needs is also alive in the movement. The insertion of this latter theory into, and its intersection with, the theory of value as command have determined a radical impasse in the analysis. This intersection has led to a series of disastrous effects. Either the moment of insurrection was a privileged one, in other words the immediate shortcircuiting of the contents of one theory with behaviors brought out by the other; or a line of continuity has appeared which accepted as effectual but ineffective the transformation of the nature of capitalist command while relying on the linear development of behavior alluded to by the theory of needs. We should bear in mind that in denouncing this

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

sterilization of the analysis there is certainly no nostalgia for a resolving (with words) dialectics on my part. And it also seems to me that I have been clear enough in radically excluding every deduction, flatly adequate to the dualism defined, of a theory of the two functions of organization, one destabilizing and the other destructuring. On the contrary, it is at odds with the dialectic residues of other phases of the movement preceding it. So? So it is time to tackle this argument head on and point out the only way out of the impasse in an analysis based on the intersection of this relationship which makes use of the rich logic, the rational and practical wealth of this intersection.

Of course, the paradoxical nature of the project I am presenting is due to the fact that this intersection is between something full and something empty: the fullness of proletarian behavior and the emptiness of the rationality of power. In the second place, and consequently, this relationship cannot contain a homologous link, let alone a dialectical one. So intersection is the wrong word, it is not a proper index for an action which no geometrical figure can describe. Because here among these forces (and note that the emptiness of the rationality of power has a high level of existence, as is true in general of mystification, which is no less effective because it is mystification), the intersection is savage in its objectivity, and it is only directed and conscious from the viewpoint of the genesis of the forces that constitute it, from the viewpoint of their subjectivity. This is a clear explicit expression of the logic of war, and only this can enable us to access the figure of intersection.

Now, looking from the viewpoint of the proletarian class, we know our problem is that of giving expansive rationality and strong extension to the particular, outside of the possibility of mediation and presumption of the universal, until a horizon of totality is reconstructed. (And we also know that this totality does not dialectically contain any concept of universality.) And we know that this rationality, this expansion, this power emerge from the making of the class, from the process of its independent consolidation, from the development of self-valorization. When this development of self-valorization comes into contact with the power structure, this contact cannot occur a global dimension which involves the totality of the process of the making of the proletariat, because the latter has by now given itself a law of motion which lies in its own independence, because the dialectic connection between capitalist development and class valorization is broken. The contact exists only on marginal terrain, in logical terms, marginal to the norms of the development of class, not marginal, however and important, from the point of view of the historic vicissitudes of the movement of capital and class. Because these intersections dramatize the whole development and accentuate its crisis and violence, as we have seen.

But there is another element which needs to be taken into account: the fact that within the relationship described by the logic of war there is lack of proportion. This consists of the fact that capital is forced, because of its own definition, to insist on class composition because without this approach it cannot produce valorization. And this happens while the processes of the formation of the working class become more and more independent. In the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

second place, capitalist attack can never go beyond a certain limit. This means that it does not have a destructive device to use on the proletariat; it cannot determine the proletariat's catastrophe. Whereas the proletariat, in the development of its totalizing independence, must determine the catastrophe of capitalism.

At this point we must go back over the terrain of war from the point of view of the worker and the proletariat, from the point of view of the power of formation. The two most realistic syntheses, which bourgeois thought has given us with Adam Smith and socialist thought with Vladimir Ilich Lenin, that of value as command and that of command as value, that of value as autonomy and that of the autonomy of politics, are no longer realistic. For this reason it is not a question of going beyond these definitions, but of completely shifting the analysis. And capitalist control and worker proletarian self-valorization are to be seen as ends of the logic of war.

2. Beyond the Theory of Value?

However you approach it, the theory of value is a dialectical theory. It can be emptied, reduced to a skeleton or to pure form and it will be the form of a dialectical process. By now there is no economist or critic of political economy--from the marginalist discipline or the experience of conflictualism, working in the terrain of neo-marginalism of the liberalist proposal or that of the theory of compatibility--who has not come to grips in a definitive way with the theory of value; and yet they are all sucked in by dialectics. The theory of value, destroyed, rejected as to its normative content, is restored in its formal value as dialectical normativity. All that has been predicated against the theory of value is dug up again in the sense of dialectics. Why? Because the economist cannot break the homology between capitalist control and the sequences of development. His science is the affirmation of this homology, not of the quality of the relationship but of the relationship itself. So the breaking of the relationship of value as the substance of capitalism, and the formal assumption of the relationship of control, does not affect the relationship of capitalism except in the sense of transferring the model of scientific consideration from the plane of synthesis to that of analysis; thus synthesis will come afterward, but it will come. In fact it will be constantly contrived in and by analysis. The irrationality of the content of value-command is thus predisposed to overcome itself: the planned sequence--point of view of the analysis--reforms itself into synthesis. The state, the overall reproduction of capitalism--whatever it is called--the dialectical conclusion of the sequence reforms value. It reforms the illusion of the homology of the parts, of the factors of capitalist development. So far, nothing has been given beyond the theory of value.

This is true of our search, too. In fact, the dissolution of the rational content of capitalist command postulated functions of worker science which were reversed by corresponded. Capitalism as organization was opposed by the point of view of destructuring, and capitalism as control--all the more so the more this was irrational--was opposed by the point of view of destabilization. The correspondence was there, reversed but real. Foucault is right when he sees in these relationships--however inverted and rebellious they may be--a betrayal of the analysis of reality, of its totality--when a device is

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

seen which is tyrannical. And it is the dialectic law of value in its infinite movements which creates and recreates this device.. Destroying it, however, is not an act of the mind. It begins to be one when reality shows separation as a real mass experience. Only then, only today, consonant with the growth of a subjective class and mass movement, does the possibility begin to exist of a revolutionary theory which goes beyond the theory of value and the dialectical valence of its critique.

The general dislocation of revolutionary analysis is a deeply felt requirement. And it should be said that some theoretical experiments have tried to proceed forcefully to this innovation. With what results? To answer this question we should trace what I consider the most significant experiences. They can all be gathered around a few fundamental points which can be briefly rendered as follows:

1. The dissolution of the links of the organization of capitalist value between state-plan and state-crisis involves an accentuation of the links of the state's coercive organization for the reproduction of relationships of domination;
2. This accentuation of the links of coercive organization of the state is a structural whole which includes all of society and shapes it in a coercive and functional way;
3. Valorization occurs in these new dimensions set by social initiative, and in particular is achieved through the capacity of the state to reorganize the mobility of social labor, to suck in again the social synergy of labor.

Now that we have posed the problem in these terms, it seems that an effective attempt at dislocation has been made. But is this dislocation real? I do not think so. In fact, for its basis a unitarian image of the relationship between state, society, and valorization is constantly proposed. The coercive links and organizational links, although they go beyond the traditional terrain of legitimization, nevertheless rest on the ends of the valorization of social labor. The law of value is made to function as a law of social capital, even when political mediation of command has become essential to the formation of the concept of capital. This is what I do not accept: the fact that the insertion of political overdetermination maintains the possibility of a concept of capital. Of course capital continues to exist as structure and subject, but not as a mediated and always unified relationship. Insertion of political overdetermination dissolve the concept of capital as a relationship between the two classes. It reduces capitalism to one pole, and only one, of the relationship. It reduces it to a subject. Now, the law of value is not just dialectic when it brings the quantities of the analytical process of valorization to unity; it is dialectics above all when it negates the independent nature of the poles of the process. When it denies the subjective quality of both poles in order to deny the subjective emergence of the "working class and proletariat" pole, i.e., the communist movement. If the theory reestablishes the capitalist link, however, it restores the law of value; but in this case it can do so only desperately, interiorizing the political dimension, command, is not in the concept of capital, as the scientific experience allows us to know it today, but on the contrary: it is because the political, making

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

making capitalism subjective, destroys it as potentiality and actuality of social synthesis. In other words, the transformation of the law of value into a structural law of command cannot help but surreptitiously restore the dialectic rules of the relationship, and it cannot propose a new level of capitalist development starting with a strengthening of the concept of capital. On the contrary, it shows the subjective nature of capitalism within the logic of war. It shows it involved by now not in dialectics but in an antagonism.

Attempts to dislocate revolutionary analysis through the concept of the political as an attribute of capitalism merely express the need (implicit, unconscious, not expressed) to radically redefine the dislocation operation. The same can be said for those theories which, leaving the law of value out of consideration, attack the problem immediately from a political point of view. This is that school of thought which is labeled "autonomy of the political" (in original terms, in other words without presupposing any classical ascendancies). Now what is there to be said about this? First, that silence is not enough to avoid the problem of class analysis. Second, that a projecting theory of politics can be removed from the alternative of a break in the relationship of capital still less than every theory of value-command, because political projecting, once the capitalist relationship has been subjectively polarized, is on one side or the other. The indeterminate nature of the project cannot win over the determinate nature of the break. The theory of "autonomy of the political" is suspended in the evanescence of an unexplicit implicit, of an untouched indeterminate. Whereas in this situation the radical nature of the break, material, of class, is the fundamental element. Far from dislocating the analysis, the theory of autonomy in politics blurs its boundaries.

There is only one point of view, in recent revolutionary scientific research, which helps us go beyond the residue of dialectics which the theory of value-command entails and proceed on the path of a real problematical dislocation. This point of view is that of the history of the "other" workers' movement. Let us be clear. In this case too there is a lot of dialectical dross, but to what extent, since the potential of real dislocation has exploded only within the historical vicissitudes of the working masses? But if this is true, it is also true that the point of view of the "other" workers' movement, more than a historical approach, is historical mimicry, an apologetic exemplification of communism in past history. Having said this it is nevertheless a fact that the history of the "other" workers' movement is important above all in its specificity of global history: in other words when it does not just take as its subject labor as a force, nor does it simply take struggle; instead it makes a figure expressing the overall physiology of the working class out of both of these. It should be added that without the history of the "other" working class movement, of the making of the working class, the very idea of self-valorization would have had difficulty becoming that complex concept, that vital articulation, that synthesis which does not flatten but rather exalts the differences of the movement. It is this richness, it is this emergence of the movement of value of use and its struggles which goes against the abstract violence of the value of exchange and the resistible power of the law of value. On the basis of the richness which it manages to reach, the history of the "other" workers' movement does not explain the past so much as it shows us

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the future. It is an ideology which works. Perhaps the only one today. At any rate it is the only one that allows us to consolidate the project of dislocation of the terrain of analysis beyond the effective aporia of the law of value, really opening up our problematical point of view.

Thus we see clearly that the problem of dislocation cannot be delayed, in the potentiality of its project, it cannot be further blocked on the terrain of theoretical analysis, or on that complex and elusive one of the theoretical analysis of the law of value, of its crisis, of the sequences, of the effects, of the figures of its crisis. The analysis must again touch the real fabric. How is this reality made, which with its very existence goes beyond the concept of dialectics? How does the making of proletarian independence take place? How does this self-valorizing separateness intersect with the articulations of capitalist valorization? And finally, again, given this picture, how can we describe this fabric of conflicting relations which--within the logic of war--conserve and develop the revolutionary potential of the communist movement of reality?

3. The Problem of Reestablishment

The crisis of the law of value leaves us before the massive emergence and unresolvable presence of the movement of the value of use. The destructive nature of the movement of the value of use is certainly not derived from an analysis of its essence: it has always nurtured the synthesis of capitalism as such. Its destructive nature is existential, ontological: it consists of its historical separation, its independence, its determined refusal vis-a-vis the synthesis of capitalism. Hence the destructive effects determined by the movement of the value of use: immediately, against any approach of capitalism, throughout the working day, to recompose the process of valorization, mediating, against the permanence and the stability of the social structure of capitalist valorization, in which worker power can be described, depending on one's point of view, as an octopus, a cancer which erodes its connections and values, or a depth which capitalism cannot reach, in which freedom lives differentiated from self-valorization. But these two images are threshold ones, extreme prospects of the occasional urgency of one or the other sides in the game in describing its own existence. Just as from the point of view of the workers and the proletariat, the distinction between the two functions of stabilization and destructuring is abstract and at a limit. This distinction, from the point of view of analysis, should be criticized.

If you start with the ontological consistence of the communist movement, from the assumption of its autonomy and independence, you immediately discover the conceptual poverty of these two categories: they are defined in negative terms, in fact, as elements of a relationship. But the relationship, this type of relationship at least, implies homology; but, as we have seen, the fundamental requirement of searching, in going back to the plane of reality, is rather that of denying any possibility of homology.

So the use of the categories of destabilization and destructuring is at least misleading. It is possible that they can be reinstated. But at the present stage of the search, they should be put aside. The analysis should be placed

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

outside of the terrain of the relationship between the working class and capitalism, and intervene directly from the ontological substrate which is defined by the independence of the communist movement of the value of use.

Saying this means tackling once more, always more closely and more rigorously, the problem of the making of the proletariat. This means tackling three subjects:

1. Quantity and quality of the value of use;
2. Dynamics of the movement of the value of use;
3. Structural logic of the making of the working class and the proletariat.

The first subject entails an evaluation of form, of the figure in which the value of use is expressed with reference to global dimensions, so the problem can be brought down to criteria of measurement. Naturally this reference to globality runs the risk of being indefinite. So we should fix a series of dimensions which are adequate for our heuristic intention. These dimensions are the working day and its phases. We think these are significant in the logic of the investigation. By working day we mean the average social working time extorted from the working class by capitalism, from the free time saved by the class, i.e., the average of the added value extorted socially and the social work necessary for the reproduction of the working class and the proletariat. In this picture, before the social working day, the movement of the use of value is the movement of reappropriation of wealth which the working and proletarian subject develop. It is not difficult to quantify this: the proportion of added value extorted must bend before the growth of the quantity of necessary work. And since all this can be measured in working time, we can say that the measurement of the value of use is a favorable proportion of the working time which is refused with respect to time worked. We know well that these relationships are not guaranteed, in themselves, from falling into the dialectics of the homology of the functions of value: that in the abstract the value of exchange could very well cover these relationships. But only in the abstract. In fact, the new formula becomes valid only when a certain threshold has been passed: when this destabilization of relationships of exploitation has reached a structural level (of destructuring of the control of the value of exchange) so as to render the relationship subjectively effective and irreversible.

Thus from a new point of view the division between the two functions, destabilization and destructuring, is shown to be erroneous; on the contrary it is only their symbiosis which enables us to approximate the category of the making of the working class and the proletariat. By making of the working class and proletariat we mean, in the first place, that movement of the value of use which, throughout the social working day, is formed as liberation of time subtracted from capitalism, and therefore open to the happiness of not being exploited. This time could, in purely abstract terms, be poverty; but historically it is wealth. In fact the working class and the proletariat turns here, with increasing appropriation and satisfaction, to a world where wealth is consolidated, where unlimited resources replace--definition--the process of enrichment based on the exploitation of man. It is no accident that capitalism

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

complains increasingly about the limits of supply side factors of production! This complaint is simply blackmail, it is an attempt to block the socially given sense of wealth. Blindly, before the expansion of free time, capitalism deepens exploitation and proposes an appropriate restructuring of the working day; as though there were no longer unlimited wealth and the human power to make this wealth! It must not exist, says the employer, because in reality capitalism would not exist anymore within this continuity of pressure!

Let us go on to the second point of the definition of the movement of the value of use: its dynamics. Now, the process of making does not just occupy a space, as we see when we define it from the perspective of the working day and reappropriation of time. This space must be qualified, endowed with its own internal dynamic determination. The subjectivity of the making of the class begins to emerge only from this first synthesis. In reality, in this case, too, the problem posed in the abstract runs the risk of just confusing the concept. Because what would be the meaning of "freed" time if it were not a determined qualification of the process of making? When we say liberation we are speaking about a quality and a dynamics, insofar as we say movement of quality. To be free means to constitute oneself freely. It means attributing to the individual proletarian the consecration of difference and multiplicity. It means bringing the "irrationality" of the break of capitalist synthesis (the break, in the logic of capitalism, can only be irrational) to bear on the task of rebuilding a liberated worker's rationality.

It does not bother me that the problem of the making of the proletariat presents itself at this point as an ethical problem too. Political economy presented itself as a solution of an ethical problem, too, originally: that of the maximum happiness for the greatest number of people. But the liberal solution of classical economics is false. The problem remains: as an ethical problem, as a problem of civilization and happiness. Communism, therefore, proposes a condition of liberation from work that, as such, approximates the solution of the problem of happiness for men as they are.

But we are still midway in our path. The dynamics of liberation bring ethics into the world of production. It is here that the problem of making verifies its real independence. Because we have making in the full sense only when the process of liberation brings the hegemony of the value of use inside the process of production and reproduction. Only when the force-labor, which has become the working class and the proletariat, conquers all of production and reproduction, placing itself, liberated, within this connection. Production is an ontological dimension of making. But what production? The meaning of a possible resolving argument is marked on the one hand by the present development of the productive force of the proletariat, and blocked on the other hand by the relationships of force between classes. On the one hand it is formed from the enormous accumulation of inventive force, the transforming intellectual force which the domination of capitalism tries to reduce to itself or destroy; on the other hand, in fact this is the block which is determined. So the process of the independent making of the working class and proletariat has an urge to manifest itself. What production therefore? Certainly not an abstractly alternative production. Do not think of a different absoluteness. Instead, production organized so as to free the maximum intellectual energy, making the value of use of life the basis of production.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The value of use is radically different from, and antagonistic to, the value of exchange, from work reduced to the value of exchange, but not from production. It is the synthesis between the value of use and production that the constitutive process prepares, proceeding in its own autonomy. It is the value of use restored to its central position and removed from the value of exchange that communism wants as the dynamic center of production. When the value of use of work is freed from the immediate mercification which it is subjected to and enters the productive process, a different synthesis is formed: that of the value of use as a source of wealth, as a free matrix of production. All this occurs at the level of the productive force of labor which the revolution of the factors of production of capitalism has produced: the force-labor presents itself, therefore, as an intellectual force, as a force which is repressed in its most intimate and formidable nature. The process of the making of the proletariat occurs to this rhythm. The potential of the intellectual force that is produced deterring the dynamics of liberation and moments of struggle.

After insisting on the independence and separateness of the constitutive process we must bear in mind its potentiality, its nature. The connection of quantity, quality, and dynamics of the making of the working class and proletariat thus begins to appear as the basis for overbearing subjectivity. The analysis must therefore approach this last qualification. The logical structure of the making of the working class and the proletariat is based on all these connections.

4. War. Between Imagination and Reason

At this point the uncoupling of the theory of value is attained. This means that we are faced with a situation in which two poles are separated and radically opposed as independence. We also know that the connection between these two entities exists in an indistinct, almost adiabatic zone: the zone of intersection of valorization as a synthesis of residues, as marginality with respect to the development of proletarian self-valorization. We also know that in this zone of intersection a logic of war, of crisis, of incursion dominates, to organize the residue of capitalist valorization. Capitalism has shrunk, and on that its state has reshaped itself into an organizer of war, a sanction of an unresolvable state of war.

What should be avoided now is opposing to the crisis of capitalism and the definition of valorization as the valorization of the crisis, a world of the making of the working class and the proletariat which is depicted as a beautiful alternative, a ready-made utopia. If, in the preceding paragraph, we tried to define the formal concept of the making of the working class, and in the formal concept we included a dynamic provision, now we must clarify this better so that the real tension of the constitutive process is not abstractly conceived or hypostasized.

The notion is not irrelevant, because it touches on a fundamental point: the concept of war. Now, this concept has appeared as an almost exclusively negative essence so far. In other words, it has seemed to characterize the logic of the crisis, the logic of the intersection between the spheres of capitalist valorization and worker self-valorization, therefore defining

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

an essentially antagonistic space. But this condition does not define the statute of the concept of war: on the contrary, it impoverishes it, it strips it of its overtones. It prevents it from applying itself, as a logical scheme, to the problem of constitution. So it is this that we must see: the positive essence of the concept of war, and we must see it in such a way as to enable us to consider it within the overall complexity of its attributions and modalities. So first of all the positive essence, and then how it develops with multiple valences.

Let us descend to the concrete in the process of self-valorization. It appears as difference, as diversity of places. But it is also a process of making. From multiplicity to unity? From the particular to the universal? A typical dialectical process? Definitely not. There is a constitutive practice which by definition refuses to lend itself to the universal or to any form of mediation. the Constitutive process is from the particular to the particular, to globality of the particular. No active function traces this phenomenological link. The horizon of the constitutive process is completely materialistic. So how does this process occur? Why do we want to use the concept of war within it, too, as an exclusive key to its reading? I think our common experience enables us to come close to a solution to the problem. The common experience is experience of conflict and solidarity, of socialization and organization. The particular develops in increasingly complex forms through its socializing accumulation. When we say that war, that the logic of war governs this process which is occurring within the collective process of formation of the particular, we say this analyzing the complex of strategies, tensions, and developments inherent in this picture. There are a million projected essences confronting each other, confronting their particularity in different projects. The mechanism of selection is that of the disarticulation of interests as divided particularities, of the articulation of interests in a composite particularity with various valences. The mechanism of selection therefore becomes a mechanism of addition, determination in overdetermination. Another dialectical residue? No, not if you bear in mind the fact that this complex of functions operates according to complex interconnections and measures which formal analysis of the concept of making has shown us. It operates bringing to the movement of every proletarian essence the sense of rejection of capitalistic work, the dimension of productivity understood as the destruction of work and the liberation of inventive power. The logic of war has this essential aspect: it organizes not only the globality, but the whole, compact and articulate, of subjects in the globality in the direction of the destruction of the enemy. It is this direction, developed in the class body, that determines that superior form of productivity of labor which alone can destroy capitalist labor. In the process of the making of the proletariat, in the constitutive practice developed here, the logic of war exercises a function which is in no way productive. The process put into action, according to the logic of war, is coercive but linear. It is linear but not organic, because conflicts are not resolved according to mechanisms of subsumption and hypostasis, but according to physical mechanisms of exclusion, differentiation, projecting and accumulation. The measures are quantitative, the motives are interests, the end is happiness--namely, escape from capitalist labor and reappropriation of the world of the production of wealth.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Thus we touch another characteristic of the logic of war. If the movement of value of use reaches a high level of constitution according to these processes, it appears as absolute rationality. The logic of war is the only rational horizon that can be traveled along. But this rationality is not merely formal. It is also the negation of all irrational behavior. Not just, and not so much, on the tactical terrain where war presents itself, on the spaces of intersection with capitalist valorization, as plain irrationality, as irrationality of the crisis which is necessarily induced by capitalism because of its own reproduction. But above all on the strategic terrain of the development of the constitutive process: because here the reconstituting process destroys the irrationalism which remains in every conception of reason as non-collective initiative, as self-justifying and self-legitimizing autonomy--in every conception of reason, of politics, of projecting as the detached essence of the process of collective practice. This in the first place. But in the second place, the absolute rationalism of the logic of war also destroys the irrationalism of any conception of need which does not know how to and cannot--in the irresoluteness of the metaphysical detachment it presupposes--lead back to the collective project of the destruction of capitalist labor and therefore of liberation.

Having said this, we have come to the heart of the matter. The logic of war operates within the process of the making of the working class and the proletariat as logic of dislocation. As rationality of continuous dislocation of the particular to higher levels of materialization of a selective solidarity, and against the domination of capitalist labor. This process of dislocation occurs between reason and the collective imagination: the image of communism. Something imaginary like the projected isolation of the present struggle, of the immediacy of the particular project, of its global relevance. Revolutionary logic opens on the abyss of a reality whose future is unknown, except as an impulse to be overcome, to destroy exploitation. But in the process of making this horrible past is not merely hatred and desire for destruction, although it is that, too, all the way. But above all, and more and more, it is an increase in the particular productivity of the revolutionary subject and therefore an imagined project of this productivity. The abyss of the unknown future is prefigured in the present wealth of the subject's productivity. Reason imagines a future consonant with its own productive force. This is not a utopia but a scientific and rational imagining. It is projection. It is constant dislocation of an intellectual force which has been consolidating itself in the making of the proletariat.

But here again, between reason and imagination, the logic of war arises. Again as the negation of all dialectics. Because the transition from the real to the imaginary to the real, although founded on productivity, on the rich complexity of projected dimensions of the subject, must once again find its own comparison to the space and force of destruction before it, as capitalist domination. The independence of the making of the proletariat clashes with the material solidity of the structure of capital at the level of collective class imagination. This does not deny the independence of the making of the proletariat. It just opens it up to a new set of problems, those of the transition. But we will speak of this shortly. Here we are merely summing up what we have said. The process of the making of the proletariat, which we saw developing formally in the independence of the movement of the value of use,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

according to the modality and measure of the destruction of work, with the potentiality of a new production consonant with the revolutionary productivity of human labor, interiorizes the logic of war inasmuch as only this is able to describe the material process of accumulation of proletarian particularities. Because it is able to capture the articulations and movements towards a more complex determination of the particular, in that it is subversive. Because it is able to organize this process rationally, against every abstract autonomization of its parts. But this is not enough. The logic of war also shows some structural characteristics of the process of constitution: it accentuates the characteristics of the collective projection of the proletarian subject and inclines subversive reason toward the imagination of communism. It shows communism as a future project while it organizes the logic of its present becoming. It fixes it in a project and extends it to the future. Once again the logic of this transition, to the extent to which it becomes real, to the extent to which the transition becomes a process, and therefore logic of war. Between critical reason and imagination there is a new reality: the logic of war. Not for a new order but for a new being.

5. To Eliminate the Problem

What is the headache of the transition? It lies in the fact that what was given as a process of erupting spontaneity in the tradition of the classics (almost the opposite of the market) has never presented itself historically or been theoretically motivated in any form except that of overdetermination. Socialist overdetermination which oppose--in a situation of exhaustion and crisis of the market--capitalist overdetermination of the state-plan. So the transition seems to become dispersed, as the object of the analysis, and become **confused in a** mechanism more or less homologous to the socialist restructuring of the market and its planned organization, similar to the reformulation of the capitalist project of the state-project, of imperative socialist mediation. At this point, rigorously, if we want to avoid ruining the problem in an overdetermination, the transition became a headache insofar as from the spontaneity of the process of self-valorization one was not able to derive the source of new rules. But the same intense headache is found throughout the development of the subject of organization; always the relationship between real movement and party, between movement of the value of use and the vanguard process, between destructuring force and destabilizing force, between trade union functions and autonomy of the political, between proletarian might and worker dictatorship, so always all that has been given on valences that tend to separate the unified essence of the problem and hypostatize it into an unsolvable alternative. Of course the headache has its appropriate mystification: dialectics, forced mediation--this anticommunit philosophy of command, this antimaterialist practice of the solution. Now, is it possible, on the basis of the logic of war, to overcome this headache and repose the problem of the transition? Is it possible to get rid of the headache of the transition on the basis of the logic of separation?

On the basis of what we have said so far, it seems to me that the solution to the problem can be theoretically approximated, although it remains true that the level of an adequate practice does not seem to be very near yet. But theoretically, it seems that the synthesis between work and politics--between

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the movement of the value of use and the making of the working class, between the tendency toward the refusal to work and the process of the extinction of the state--should not develop within the radical differences which the tradition of the classics and real experience of socialism left. Because it is time to see communist normativity develop in a way that is precisely linked to the particularity of the movement of the proletarian subject. The development from the particular to the general of command must occur within the process of self-valorization, it must be considered a constitutive process. Proletarian control is an aspect of that logic of war which constitutes the reality of the subject. Normativity is not a separate element, distinct from proletarian institutionality. Nor is it a question, at this point of solving the problem by leveling its many aspects to unity--flattening it almost as though the two functions were not really different. The problem is not one of denying their difference but rather of squeezing this difference into unity in a process which leaves no alternative. The problem can be said to be solved when normativity is constructed as behavior of the sociality of living work, to the extent that this arises, and forms and shapes itself as a subject, as independence, as separation. The logic of war should be stressed as a recomposing and immediately normative logic. The split which has always been inherent in bourgeois dialectics, and which by definition is fixed between the emergence of subjects and their recomposing ability, and between this and their normative capacity, should be rejected as an infinite bad: the infinite bad of powerful mystification.

In the reality of self-valorization, of constitution, there is no such separation. There are just quantities according to which the normative immediacy arises: quantities of a divided unconnected reality of the social labor force which, as such, is subsumed in capital to nourish it with productivity; or quantities of subjective force that, in becoming independent, develop an alternative--it, too, immediately normative--to capitalist development. Quantity becomes quality in crossing a certain threshold of internal division within the class. This threshold of division is not crossed through an operation of mediation within the class, but rather through a mechanism of accumulation, of development of subjective particularities. At this level, normativity matures as an adequate expression of the crossing of the threshold of subjectivity, as a form of existence. The normativity is the operation of the existence of collective subjectivity. It is one of the figures the logic of war takes on within the process of the making of the class, or before becoming a model of its expansiveness. So then we have this cell of the process of transition; we have before our eyes, in the unified form which the existence of the subject and its operativity cannot help but have, in the productive form which communism offers for the synthesis between work and politics.

It is clear, from this point of departure, that the headache of the transition is born directly in its negative form, from the position of the problem of revolution as a problem of stages of development. The transition is described by the classics as a transition to socialism. Levels of capitalist development arise, in a different way and according to a progressive line, in going from one level to the next. The problem of the state is posed in the same way: as an envelope containing this development, having a positive sign according to a progressive rhythm, from the fading of the functions of the socialist quasistate to the extinction of the state in communism. We know

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

what the monstrous consequences of this doctrine have been! And we know how much the masses have suffered due to the paradox of a state which, contrary to expectations, became a heavier and heavier exploiter. They suffered not only materially but also politically, as every revolutionary prospect was dimmed. Was all this necessary? Unfortunately, historical necessity cannot be problematized, and what has been done cannot be undone, even by a moral interrogative. But all this is unnecessary now! This is important to emphasize. It is unnecessary because the communist movement has freed its own reproduction from an inevitable link with capitalist development, because the communist movement has created a capacity for production which must destroy the capitalist organization of society as it is now; as a crisis tending towards barbarity. Because, finally and above all, the process of the making of self-valorization already contains the synthesis of work and politics, in other words of communist existence and revolutionary normativity. It is based on this unified cell, and on this process of transition now occurring, that the headache will finally be liquidated. From the point of view of collective revolutionary practice, the process of transition appears as immediacy. No overdetermination is thinkable anymore, no homology with capitalist transitions is presented anymore. No compromise, no mediation, no dialectics. In his progressive sociality, the worker subject makes the transition to a maturity within which the break with capitalist development guarantees him the ability to express his own existence as adequate normativity.

As we said in the beginning, the headache of the transition reverberates directly in the problematics of communist organization. It is an insufficient appreciation of unity and of the level of development of the constitutive process which leads, in the classical tradition, to a division of organizational functions, to a distinction between tactical and strategic moments, to a disarticulation of phases of the struggle. The separate bureaucratic structure of the party is what remains of this tradition, with its disastrous consequences. Was all this necessary? In this case the history of the resistance of the "other" workers' movement to this party-form seems to give a negative answer. Negative and tragic: because the weight of the party's successive defeats led more and more to division, disarticulation, destruction, within the class. Today the mere memory of these experiences is avoided. And in this we may perhaps find the basis of a full and articulated reformulation of the theory of the party--starting with the use of the logic of war, of particularity, within the constitutive process, and of the logic of separation within the process of transition. But more of this later.

For now it is enough to emphasize the transition depicted in this paragraph. It consists in making the premises explicit, and, as it were, reconquering the productivity of materialism. Of a materialism which assumes the ontological horizon of the making of the proletariat as an exclusive one, and bases communist projecting on this alone. This basis for reasoning, this whole assumption of the critical methodology of materialism, this ability to call things only by their real names, refusing dialectics and all other similar infiltrations of the capitalist state into class theory: these are elements which are difficult to reconquer. Many of the errors committed, both theoretically and practically, were the result of the pernicious influence of dialectics. Selfcriticism is not enough to free oneself from its unless it is accompanied by a rigorous definition of a new analytical fabric, a new theoretical point of view. But

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

this, too, can be evanescent if it is not based in its turn on a new reality. And this reality, again, is simply the proletarian process of building communism. A sort of mental regeneration intervenes in contact with this reality, in the articulation of this subjectivity. Because with this one liquidates not only the headache of the transition. This is, in fact, a real headache, and it was based on a tragic rhythm which involved not only revolutionary thought but revolutionary practice as well and the revolutions of the composition of the class. Also eliminated are all squalid paradoxes which the theory of the organization of the traditional workers' movement has presented to us and imposed on us. Because the functional (?) division between organization and command, within the party-form, and of party-form and the movement as a whole, outside, is merely a paradox which repeats the tragic nature of the headache, but with petty functions of pure sociology of power. Our image of communism, therefore, cannot help but be a formidable weapon for the destruction of every ideology of the organization which is not alive in the immediate experience of communism.

6. Other (?) Problems

If we go back to the thought process which was behind the arguments in this chapter, we must stress the fact that there are some passages in it which we must return to, because these are theoretical elements of great importance which were only touched on insofar as they were involved in the arguments being presented. But it is also equally clear that these "other" problems, given their complexity, cannot be dealt with adequately by one author; only their central position at the heart of the collective interests of the comrades can make it possible to proceed with the analysis. This is why I just want to bring them up here; just as I have perceived some problems, and I have used some theoretical themes, I pass them on to the movement.

Often--and I think this is the first problem--there has been talk of the need to shift the formation of the categories of capitalism to the social level, in other words of the need to describe and found the category of social capitalism not as the result and limit of the market movement but as its subject. But, as we have seen in this chapter, once the analysis has proceeded to this point, the subjectivity of capitalism no longer appears as a relationship; the category of capitalism no longer presents itself as an inclusive tension but rather as an exclusive tension. This means that the analysis of the state-crisis implicitly contains a redefinition of capitalism, whose potential of presenting itself as a relationship is being gradually eroded. This erosion of the concept of capital as a relationship is behind the crisis of political economy. So it is no longer a question of a critique of political economy, but of moving the analysis from the terrain of economics to that of politics. And this further confirms the disillusion of the concept of capitalism as a relationship, because when political control becomes the fundamental key of the process of valorization, all the categories of relationship are gone, not only in their spontaneity (as is logical, given the crisis of the market) but in their adequacy (as appears evident in the loss of the meaning of the law of value).

From the theoretical point of view, this hypothesis seems widespread now. From the developments of Keynesism through the results of the Frankfurt school, to the most recent successes of the search for currents which I would call

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Foucaultian, this affirmation of a single voice of capitalism as command, this exclusiveness of its power, seems to me to have become almost commonplace, a fundamental topos of the theory of our time. What I think has been only partially solved, however, is the correlated problem of the consequences of this assumption. In other words, faced with the subjective nature of capitalism and the extinction of its image as a relationship, and therefore its dialectical nature, the "rest" has difficulty becoming a cohesive element and determined existence. One does not know where to put the "rest" if not within capitalism. While one criticizes the ability of the the God-capital to "create" the world, as though in a final bad version of some gnostic theory, the rest appears as residue, as chaos, as something fallen from stellar heights. The consequence of antagonism is not drawn from the goal of the dialectics. Why? Because it seems, I think, that the determination of a precise antagonism determines an excessive homology, and thus a sort of inverse reproduction of that capitalist world one wants to destroy. The terrible dream of the mystification of real socialism follows critical philosophy here. But it seems to me that the opposite is true: only a materialist definition of the proletarian subject makes it possible to definitively liquidate the concept of capitalism as a relationship. Because it is only the alternative of the founding and identification of individual laws for the making of the proletarian subject that can finally win against the state-plan, the general crisis of the scientific and practical horizon the domination of capitalism. As I have tried to explain, the laws of the making of the antagonistic subject can be founded on absolute and radical independence. I would ask those who wish to criticize me to do so by insisting on the inadequacy of this separation, not is unreality. It should be done by researching the matrixes of the formative practice, their original legislation. It should be done, as I tried to do it, by radicalizing the initial separation in a real epoche. I do not believe in the theory of the beginning, I do not believe in the effectiveness of a radicalization of the break with the past of the theory, with its viscosity of connections and tensions. I think that all this can happen, materialistically only through a real recasting of the subject. The residuals that the capitalist command determines, the "rest" vis-a-vis the compactness of the imposed relationship, is alive. This practical vitality is a conglomeration of retroactively operative strategies whose constitutive devices of subjectivity are being constructed. And these paths have the collective intensity which the radical nature of the project requires and the logical dimension which the development of history as the history of class struggle has determined. The insertion of the subjectivity of the worker in the global historic dimension is not an exploit of faithfulness and continuity of tradition, of Marxism and the workers' movement; it is rather an affirmation of the real correspondence of the crisis in its theoretical, practical, critical and historical aspects. It is the need to rework not the totality of mediation but the particularity of the project.

So we go from the crisis of the theory of value to the crisis of the theory of capitalism to the crisis of the theory of the working class. But at the same time there is a recasting of this latter category within the process, and according to the materialistic methodology of formation. Here the theme of war comes into play in its entirety and with great theoretical relevance. It is only the subject of war which makes it possible to grasp the ontological solidity of the limit and, beyond the limit requalify the relationship--every relationship--outside of every dialectical reminiscence. This means that the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

logic of war transforms the logic of antagonism into a logic of particularity. The logic of war destroys every illusion of mediation at the outset, every idealistic and universalistic mystification. The logic of war brings together the horizon of antagonism and that of particularity, making it possible to go back to the foundation of every process to identify its physical nature, its unresolvable particularity. It is a new horizon that is opening, a horizon on which understanding the crisis does not mean having to come to terms with dialectical ideologies; understanding the pathways of the particular does not mean yielding to organic thought, to idealistic fictions. Nothing acts for anything on the critical terrain we have chosen. Nothing is juxtaposed over the particular except the physical and material process of recasting. Subjectivity is born within this process as a function of struggle, preordained by the quantitative dimensions of operating, of antagonism against the figures one is freeing oneself from. These are, in the case of the proletarian subject, those of capitalist exploitation and the internal division of the proletariat.

With that, in this context, the fundamental theory is therefore opened which I have raised in these pages. That is the question of the dimensions of collective operations, of the normative tension which is forming in them. Again there is another fundamental objective of materialistic criticism to be reached here: that of the negation of the division between existence and its practical overdetermination, between being and having to be. But it is clear that only starting from a consolidated concept of collective subjectivity is this possible. The problems are interwoven, each with its own special subject matter, like in an atonal music. The discontinuity of the process of thought is appropriate for the dramatic nature of the reality the thought is describing. But nevertheless this disorder in seeking, this necessary disorder,, these laborious approximations, nevertheless try to offer a point of reference for the collective enterprise of seeking. Thus the subjects I have dealt with in my search appear for what they are, and if my research is not conclusive--and it is not--these subjects too, remain open for study and further exploration of the sequences of problems they generate.

Chapter 5: Communism and Organization

One needs no special sharpness of wit to understand that starting, for example, from free labor or salaried labor, derived from the dissolution of the slavery of serfs, machines can be born only in antithesis to living work, as the property of someone else and a hostile power opposed to living work; in other words, they should be opposed like capitalism. But it is equally easy to understand that machines will not cease to be the agents of social production when, for example, they become the property of the associated workers. In the first case, however, their distribution, the fact that they do not belong to the worker, is a condition of the manner of production based on salaried labor. In the second case, a modified distribution would be based on a modified, new production which would have emerged from the historical process. K Marx, Grundrisse, II.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1. The form of self-valorization

On the territory of the proletariat. There is a point from which we must begin, not hypothetically but as from a real premise: from inside the processes of self-valorization. The whole spectacle of power is outside of and opposed to this internal point of view of the worker. So let us radicalize this perception, let us build on this solid foundation. This operation concerns the class in its separateness. It is unthinkable that the problems of communism, of organization and the problem of their realization, could initially be posed outside of this independent connection. Obviously it is necessary to observe that the relationship--and never the utopian identity--of communism and organization is the fundamental subject we wish to explore. But having said this, the point of departure remains firmly grounded in its independence, and can never dissolve in the relationship. If proletarian independence formed--intentionally--outside the relationship of capitalism, there is no reason to confuse it with any other relationship. If there is a relationship between communism and organization, it cannot be other than within communism.

Self-valorization is destructuring of the enemy power as a whole. Self-valorization is the process through which the class removes itself from the relationship of capitalist valorization, the process within which the very concept of capitalism as a relationship of exploitation is negated. The proletariat covers the whole fabric of capitalist valorization; the mechanism of destructuring is thus extended against the whole articulation of capitalist command. Of course there are certain ambiguities, zones of chiaroscuro, all the more so the more capitalism tries to maneuver, to modernize its command of society: when it tries to enter the arena of self-valorization, recalibrating the subject of command either in neoliberalist terms--thus perhaps following the articulation of proletarian self-valorization--or in terms of governing a high level of conflict--thus trying to make the articulated heaviness of the proletarian attack "compatible." But proletarian self-valorization has already taken over this capitalist approach and has it adequately under control. This ambiguity determined by capitalist initiative must be destroyed. Self-valorization recomposes class unity as an unstoppable trend above and beyond, and also within, the scenarios capitalism is constantly producing, but in an increasingly inefficient and illusory way. The operation of destructuring is thus a complex articulated process, many-sided--it, too, has its scenarios, its variations, and when the wind changes we must be good sailors and adjust the sails.

But are we not admitting, this way, that the processes of self-valorization are subject to the form of the process of capitalist valorization? With this does not the independence of the class disappear, just when it must prove itself independent? Is not the class's independence really only thinkable as a limit? Outside of the relationship? Does not destructuring necessarily lead to a homology with the structure of capitalism? These are reasonable objections, but they lose sight of the fact that this threshold of homology has been crossed by the present class composition. This is given by definition. But this does not mean that the class acts blindly, it does not mean that proletarian initiative is any less destructuring. In fact, the class organizes itself recognizing, in destructuring of the enemy's power, the key for the destruction of its own internal separations. Indeed, by destroying its own internal separations the class destructures the enemy. Just moving around the problem of its own independence, concentrating on its own recognition,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

just developing this positiveness, the proletariat not only attacks and destroys capitalism's structural project, it also strikes it in its specific articulations. The threshold of proletarian independence is the other side of the class's interest--it is the purely negative relationship (negative in absolute terms, not dialectical terms) which the proletariat fixes with the structure of the domination of capitalism. So politically it is a question of moving through collective subjects and impressing maximum circulation on the objectives of destructuring, within the proletariat and its stratifications, of the articulations of command which are still present within the proletariat.

What we are saying seems very philosophical. In fact it is just an abstract simulation of the experience of the proletariat's daily struggle. Let us look at the situation of the new worker, the social worker, between factory and society. What independent prospects does his struggle have? How is self-valorization born? It is born through the destruction of the coercion that imposes a certain determined organizational scheme on the working day: 8 hours in the factory, if not 10; 4 hours traveling time to and from the factory; and 4 stupefying hours in front of the television. He finds these things within him and it is by working on his body that he destroys these constraints on his work: 8 hours in a factory? No. And, No to all the rest. Self-valorization is therefore not what has been subtracted from the working day imposed by capitalism. Self-valorization is the logic which the social worker assumes for himself. It is a logic for; only secondarily is it a logic against. And it is because it is "secondary" that it is so strongly aggressive vis-a-vis capitalism, because it is a fact by now, a material composition of behavior, a threshold that has been crossed. The social worker will thus move, individually and collectively (but the two figures are homogeneous) between the factory and welfare, trying to and succeeding in building a new rhythm for the working day, based on not working and the undertaking to free his own inventive force, his own happiness.

And one could continue giving example, taking a look at all the important social figures which are emerging: women, young people, etc. And we will always have this situation: attention to destroying the immediacy of the relationship of subjugation as a rational and logical example of liberation. These subjects cannot have the general nature of the relationship which coerces them and which they free themselves from; but by this liberation, the general power of the enemy is struck. The relationship is not posed by the proletariat. The proletariat frees itself from it. But the process of the proletariat's liberation is the same process of their destruction.

But we have also mentioned a new ambiguity induced on the class territory of the adversary's initiative and we have stressed the specificity of the effects of self-valorization. Now, it is clear that faced with the New Deal policies of capitalism--where these exist--the destructuring action of self-valorization presses on, and exasperates, the terms of the dynamic control of capitalism. Faced with neoliberalist policy--where this exists--on the other hand, the destructuring initiative mainly affects compartmentalization, against the productive segmentation of society imposed by capitalism. The specificity of capitalist control is not indifferent. In any case, however, self-valorization is determined at a first homogeneous level having special class interests:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

interest in unity, interest in freedom to set the dimensions of the working day, interest in controlling--from the class point of view--the circulation of shares of labor expropriated and shares of labor freed.

So emphasis on the form of working class and proletarian self-valorization is emphasis on a first elementary but fundamental quality of worker subjectivity. It is discovering a break in the relationship of the domination of capitalism and fixing its effect at a first level of independent expression of revolutionary initiative. Only starting from this first level from the materially and collectively rooted urge to destroy the working day in its spatial compartments and in its temporal segments--does it become possible to speak of organization, communist organization, as such. In fact it is only based on this liberation that subjective organization, as a continuity of power, can express itself. Organizational subjectivity is mass subjectivity. The old third internationalist concept recognized this subjectivity in the masses only at times of insurrection. The rest of the time, it delegated power to itself as a substitute of subjectivity. Here, on the other hand, mass subjectivity is a subject in itself. Self-valorization characterizes it as not reducible to capitalist dialectics, as unbreakable and irreversible before the more astute tactics of division and formalization. These tactics, furthermore, may be complex, but they are inefficient and unable to penetrate an overly rigid fabric. The subjective communist organization of the proletariat, mass organization for communism begins here. It opens on the whole social gamma of exploitation, but it reaches this totality only negatively, for now, simply insisting on itself. Each moment of self-valorization wins extension only by working in intensity. The stratifications of the proletariat are dominated by means of the intensive destruction of their segmentation and/or compartmentalization. The first form of organized subjectivity, the form of self-valorization, is the threshold, minimum but defined, of communist organization.

Summing up: in the new situation determined by the growth and definitive consolidation of the self-valorization of the proletariat, destructuring is a sure and negative effect of the initiative the proletariat undertakes to free itself from the bonds of work. This initiative is deeply creative and rationally adequate. This initiative is continuous and penetrating, and characterized essentially by the intensity of its action. On this terrain and with these characteristics, on this basis, on this threshold which has been crossed, the problem of communist organization as a problem of the development of a mass collective subjectivity is beginning to be determined. The fundamental conditions of the problem and of its solution in communist terms have been noted: from the outset, the form of self-valorization is radically destructuring. But it is also something more: it is behind the logic of power, it is the expression of a first irreducible level of unity. A unity that is the key to the circulation of the practice of self-valorization within the proletariat. And there is no homology with the structure of capitalist domination of society. No homology, but rather independence and liberation.

2. The Form of Self-determination

In speaking of autonomy at length, besides the functions of destructuring, we have seen those which can be called destabilizing. It is theoretically correct to always bear in mind this scheme, which shows the autonomy of capitalist

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

politics, the irrationality of power, and requires adequate functions to combat it on the part of the proletariat. But it is also true--and this should be emphasized here--that the more the processes of self-valorization and independence of the proletarian masses affirm themselves, the more these destabilizing functions become central to the class itself, and become more and more part of the process of self-valorization. This is the knot to be untangled, a knot which a long past of approximations and attempts has tangled excessively, but which it may be possible to undo today. At this level of the process of self-valorization of the working class and proletariat, it is perhaps possible to begin to consider the function of the destabilization of the power of the enemy as a moment within the mass movement when a higher grade of homogeneity and centralization of the process of self-valorization are consolidated.

We call this level class self-determination.

What is self-determination? From the viewpoint of its maturation within the complex processes of the making of the proletariat, self-determination has normative form. It is a moment, elementary but fundamental, of expression of control. We have seen the power of the process of self-valorization act to the point where it determines a presupposed unity, the emerging figure of the proletarian subject. Here the subject begins to express himself, to give conscious continuity to his life as part of the masses: on the edges of the process of valorization, where the long shadows of capitalist command extend aggressively in opposition to class autonomy; but also, and above all, within the class the subject begins to appear as legislation, as the conscious expression of a trend, as normativity of the communist movement. The function of destabilizing the adversary finds power and calmness at the same time. There is an end to the erratic presence within the level of homology with the state, which sees it indefinitely sucked back in by the nature of the power of the state; but at the same time the function of destabilizing accentuates its destructive characteristics because it has a massive effect on the capitalist relationship as such, on the heart of the category of capitalism. Destabilizing is no longer a fetish of globality: on the contrary, it is a refusal of all mediation, a constant and continuous force which nullifies every capitalist sounding in the class to extract value from it. A defensive function? I would not say so, because this rejection of capitalism means control; it is normative expression, it is giving a definitively victorious shape to the struggle against work and the state.

Self-determination is an open and conscious passage to the transition phase to communism. The proletariat here knows itself and knows itself independent. It destructures capitalism because it exists in the form of self-valorization; it destabilizes it in a fundamental way because it takes the form of self-determination. Self-determination becomes the force which, depriving capitalism of the possibility of expressing power, as power in the proper sense of the word and as valorization--in this project it presses on every capitalist attempt to reach equilibrium.

Whenever capitalism thinks it has come out of the crisis, at that time an even deeper crisis opens before it, commanded and imposed by a new attack produced by the class. Because the fullness of class constantly occupies the emptiness

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of capitalist power. Because self-determination means the ability to fix class composition at a higher level of attack, the level due to tension, to the quality of the clash, to the quantity of power that can be expressed. Self-determination therefore represents a moment when the working class becomes a subjective organization. The subjective organization is a collective unity in the interest of the proletariat which becomes a normative ability, internal and external. External normative ability: as increasingly heavy and implacable emptying of power of the capitalist structures. Internal normative capacity: as the ability to consciously and collectively unify, at the highest level, the power of self-valorization.

At the high points of the struggle, self-determination of the working class and the proletariat has the ability to exemplify itself. Let us consider what is happening in the energy crisis. Energy is the basis of capitalist production. As Marx would say, it is basic to it more as a tone than as a substance. Energy is the envelope which, dominates development. To dominate energy is to dominate. So in the general need to restore balance to the partnerships of world controls, metropolitan capitalist strata are forced to yield to other capitalists part of their control of energy sources. That is the world crisis. Capitalism, as always in such cases, becomes populist: austerity; everyone must sacrifice, in fact energy is everything, it is a envelope containing everything, it is a global moment in the function of ruling for valorization. But the proletariat says No: it says No to sacrifices and austerity because it wants to and must maintain its own self-valorization; but above all it immediately adds a No to the quality of that control. Because the proletariat demystifies the totalizing quality of the energy dimension; it looks to see what it is. And then we see a scenario of destruction, death and fascism arising. The nuclear state! Austerity and sacrifices: it says No! But that is not enough; capitalism wants austerity and sacrifices, it wants to push back the frontiers of the independence of the working class and proletariat and transform class austerity and sacrifices into a basis for its further process of accumulation, of restructuring of control, of production of war. At this point a process of class self-determination necessarily begins. This means that a refusal to make the transition to the nuclear state becomes the expression of a global alternative, of struggle and power, of quality of life and legitimization of command. It is not just a question of denying a determined mediation, it is a question of denying every possibility of mediation. The working class and proletarian force which is unleashed in antinuclear campaigns is not defense but attack, it is not resistance but an alternative. The result of such a struggle, beyond all delays and compromises, does not appear except in terms of war. Not wanting to die is a material determination of the process of self-valorization which takes the form of an alternative, in command against capital, in a process of transition which is taking place.

But this happens not only around the cardinal questions of life and death. It also happens within the experience of self-valorization, as a constant. This means that the tendency to self-determination is constant. There is no worker and proletarian struggle that is not going towards an alternative of development, towards a recasting of the distribution of wealth, towards an attack on the distribution of income which is an act of power in itself. To live this trend as a subjective tension of the struggle is to appreciate the nature of the passage from self-valorization to self-determination. In the generalized

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

crisis of the processes of legitimization of capital, it seems that only emptiness exists beside self-valorization. But this is not true; there is an evolution of anticapitalist trends rising from the level of class reproduction in strong terms. Some authors have thought they could read in it the development of a radical and offensive democracy of the masses against capitalism, above all in the United States. I do not think this is the case, and in fact there is such scorn for politics, it would be difficult for even democratic politics to be accepted. In reality, these symptomatic movements are preliminary enormous normative thrusts which emanate from proletarian independence on the trend to self-valorization. They are mass impulses which go through the masses and occupy the holes of the legitimization of capitalism in an aggressive way in alternative terms. And they dig other holes. The normative nature of these movements is, although not clear, indicatively very significant. It marks the maturation of the masses and their passage from a making of the working class and proletariat based on the defense and deepening of the processes of self-valorization to the expression of normative behavior.

So here every ideology residual of a mere refusal, or resistance begins to fail. Certain high functions of class struggle, functions of attack, of destabilizing the enemy power, become figures, and blood and flesh, of the mass movement. The intelligence and innovation which participate in the movement of the value of use begin to move vertically. The destructuring of the enemy power is consolidated in normative terms. It is therefore from a critique of politics and from its negation around the determinations of the making of the class in the self-valorization phase--it is therefore from here and only from here that a concept of "political" worker can arise. Only when every autonomy of the political is dissolved, down to its deepest roots, only when every concept of legitimization has been reduced to a critique of valorization--only when politics has been radically criticized, does the worker and the proletarian project reappear. In its new material foundation. So it is no longer the party that asks for independence from the class, it is proletarian independence, matured to formidable levels, which expresses innovative contents, radically different, in a normative form. A worker and proletarian politics is this time a totalitarian function, but it is built on the full complexity of the articulations of self-valorization and on the cautious and progressive tendency toward self-determination. A politics as a mass construction of the communist alternative. A politics as the subject of a transition to be built in collective terms globally. It is at this point that another magic work of the communist movement can be brought into play: the plan. But we bring this word into play only to deprive it of its magic. Within the density of the processes which we have been describing, the problem of organization and the problem of the plan are not different elements, they are at one with the problem of constitution and production. They represent different levels of this process, but this diversity of levels is reached through and within the mass movement. Organization and plan are put at different logical levels of a continuous ontological process. From self-valorization to self-determination: the form of this final expression of class movement frees itself in the project which is continually making itself. Giving to self-valorization, to its compact reality, measure form limit way of expression. But it is the same subject thus maturing and refining its own intelligence. It is within the tensions internal and external to self-valorization that a new rationality brings forth a new connection between constitution and production.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

We have come to the heart of the problem of transition. It becomes solvable only to the extent that it is completely projected by a subject which understands the before and after.

On the edges of this transformation there is war. The constant guerrilla warfare capitalism tries to wage in order to block a rich process which has already matured with a qualitative jump. Self-determination is the seal of this passage, it is the final form of the massified subjectivity of the proletariat.

3. The Form of the Organization

If the problem of communism and the problem of organization are parallel, there is a basis--perhaps not an exclusive one, but an important one--for the problem of organization. It is a question of making explicit what the communist theory of organization has always understood as its implicit utopia. It is a question of passing, on the terrain of the theory of organization, from utopia to science. Obviously because, according to the canons of historical materialism, the conditions of knowledge have matured to a point where this possibility has become real.

In the communist tradition of the theory of organization, utopia is inherent in the concept of class consciousness. In fact, it is this category that mediates organization within the class and translates it into the delegated form of organization outside of the class. But this is a utopian category. Utopian because it sets an imaginary place as the point of synthesis of contradictions within the class. As in every utopia, contradictions are not perceived as such but overcome by transferral toward that ideal place which can be called party. In fact, the party is a utopian place only insofar as it is an effective place: but the relationship between effectiveness and utopia is always doubtful, often antagonistic undoubtedly, and in any case mystified. Because only the rules of force makes utopia true. Only the historically given party determines the internal function and the specificity of articulation of the proletarian consciousness. In the theory of organization founded on class consciousness there is no paradox in the maxim: "There is a contradiction between party and class: let the class change!" The theory of class consciousness therefore founds the theory of organization only in the form of expropriation and transfer, of delegation and mystification.

We can go beyond the theory of class consciousness only by going deeper into the subject matter of class composition. Utopia, however, generous and attractive it may have been, should be broken up and reinvented here, materially refound, as behavior, as a tendency, within the concrete history of class struggle. The theory of organization is no other than the analysis of the communist behavior of the masses. It is not the organization which imposes communism on the masses, on the contrary it is the communist behavior of the masses which organize. Of course many poetic aspects of communist imagination will thus be punished and constrained by a lesson of history; but have we not already been punished enough by a century of victories and achievements of socialism? So to reduce consciousness to material class composition is theoretically necessary and politically correct.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The reader will object that the problem of organization is not just a problem of identification of the relationship between class and formal organization (and its guide), it is above all a problem of efficiency, of operation. Of centralization. Now, on the basis of the restoration of the problem on the basis of class composition, how can the problems of centralization and efficiency be solved? To answer this question we must bear in mind a long series of achievements which the theory of composition has expressed so far, and in particular the definition of class independence and of the progressive articulation of class self-valorization and self-determination in it. Because centralization and efficiency occur above all within internal class processes, grafted onto them and occurring with them. In the state of war brought forth by the crisis of the capitalist theory of value and the processes of valorization, class separation becomes the main element, and the class's attention to itself is the main link. The form of organization is therefore the form in which a working class and a proletariat which have reached a high level of composition centralize and articulate this composition within the class. The form taken by organization is a fundamental determination of the making of the class. It can be its simulation, but not in the sense of a simulated language that becomes more and more remote and formalized with respect to reality, but rather in the sense of a faithful reduction to procedures and reconstruction to procedures.

And this is the point. Organization is the democracy of communism. There is no communism without democracy: organization is the determination, within the class, of the procedures of reforming, of the constant development of proletarian and worker unity, of centralization. The working class destroys bourgeois law to the extent that it regulates the processes of selfdetermination for itself and within itself. The subjective organization of the working class is the continuity and the guarantee and the strengthening of the continuity and development of the processes of class self-valorization and self-determination. All this is within proletarian independence: because if there is no communism without democracy, there is certainly no continuity, and still less democratic continuity, between capitalism and communism. But the problems are different and cannot be resolved except by means of the logic of separation.

Let us be careful: here we should not take up anyone's flag or proclaim that communist democracy will be the highest and the most perfect. We know well, in fact, that here homologies do not apply, nor does a linear concept of progress. And the ideology has never had a history. We know well that we are forced to speak in improper and only allusive terms, to move on this plane with merely indicative linguistic instruments. Having said this, we come back to the substance: and the substance is that communist liberty organizes itself within the constitutive process and seeks its political form, always more really homogeneous and substantively unified, through the guarantee of maximum pluralism and articulation. In the communist class composition, in the movement of the value of use, in the process which matures self-valorization into fully unfurled self-determination.

However, we know that this organizational growth of the proletarian social individual occurs within a framework dominated by the irrationality of the action of capitalist war. Stretching the question of organization on the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

long wave of class composition seems to be avoiding the specificity and determinateness of the organizational problems which arise on the margins of the process of class self-valorization. Above all when the ferocity of capitalist war intensifies its attempts to reconquer conditions of valorization. Above all when the repetition and deepening of economic cycles forces capitalism to attack laboriously. But this direction is secondary too. Accepting it would mean, if only in a negative way, accepting that a homologous connection, a parallelism, an albeit formal correlation can exist between the two poles of the relations between the classes. But this relationship has been broken down by definition. The critique of the law of value must produce its most extreme effects where. There is no theoretical or practical possibility of fixing any correlation. The split is radical. But then what: a state of war? What does this mean? Even war provides for a relationship, however negative, one may object. But we should answer that this ontological situation becomes historically real only when the relationships of war are seen to revolve around the functions of valorization. And here there certainly is war: there is the daily war of the struggle in factories in its visible and invisible forms; there is the permanent clash in the social relationships of reproduction; there is the totality of the capitalist offensive force on the margins of the process of self-valorization. This war exists and it must be fought. But in the perspective of a process which wants to and must fix itself on the transition, so within the proletariat, so with an absolute privilege of the maturation of proletarian self-determination. This war is ferocious and obscure; it is the war of the every day and in the every day. It is the war fought by an enormous people against a clique of despots. It is really a "Chinese" war where the infinite power of the proletariat extends to the point where it takes all space away from the adversary, quietly and continuously. Is there a hypothesis of a desperate and destructive deadly and open war waged by capitalism against the class? Is there at this point, within this consolidation of power relationships, an extreme ferocious capitalist initiative counterattacking? We can look in this direction and perhaps foresee a solution along these lines. But, once again, within this last limit, too, what can be expected other than the resumption and deepening of a class organization initiative which can express the whole power of constitution?

What has been said so far should in any case determine the basis of any talk about organization. Of course, what we have said here is not exhaustive, and there will be infinite specific forms that organization will assume historically. But it can call itself organization only to the extent that it accepts their terrain of constitution as the complex fabric it clothes itself in. Only within these material processes can it be determined as organization. So on this basis we have the discriminant between what is communist and what is not communist, between what is outside and what is inside the class. Organization for communism outside the state, inside the class.

4. Beyond War, for Communism

A time will come when the logic of separation will reach its maximum power. This totality of action, from the point of view of class, means overcoming every obstacle to the development of proletarian fullness. In the crisis of capitalism, structure and command for valorization now appear only as obstacles and barriers; in the development of self-valorization, communism appears as

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the extinction of the barrier and the obstacle. Of this barrier and this obstacle. Utopia? Why? Who knows what will be the new contradictions, but they will be different, and certainly not harder to overcome than the present ones. In fact, with communism man is beginning to walk in an erect position. He may stumble, of course, and the terrain will remain rough and full of pitfalls; but now he is walking erect, he has overcome the stage of the ape, he has progressed. He has entered history, that history in which the real dominates, without being expropriated. He has gone beyond the contradictions he could not overcome until recently. He has conquered the reasons for his present unhappiness. He has gone beyond that horizon of war where capitalism in its crisis forced him to walk painfully.

In the fullness of the process of transition, worker self-determination appears as control of the making of the proletariat. Making, organization, plan are all one and normative. Material consciousness is directly mass control. Communist constitution is thus increasingly deep struggle against work. It is a struggle against work as the exasperated refusal of every value of exchange, and maximum dilation of the appropriation of the value of use. Production bows to this necessity. Communist society produces wealth in abundance, but consciously directed to the satisfaction of basic needs: the basic, elementary needs of a social individual who has grown up spiritually and is so alien to the suspicion of poverty and sacrifice that the very concept of distribution fails here. One does not distribute, one appropriates. There can be a phase in which we will still witness a struggle about distribution (above all regarding the relationship between directly productive consumption and not directly productive consumption), but soon even this type of problem will have to be overcome, because reproductive accumulation becomes a problem which is as easily solved as the putting aside of seeds by ancient civilizations which cultivated grain. The problem of production/reproduction/distribution gives way to the fundamental law which begins to reign: the law of not working, the general refusal of the constraint of work. In the phase that leads to the generalization of this law and to its ascendancy, everyone's work is reduced to a minimum. To reproduce this shitty world it is possible to work a couple of hours if everybody works. But this is a miserable basis, because the problem is not just imposing a minimum time, it's not just a question of proceeding to the immediate reduction of time spent working, it is rather articulating the general reorganization of the working day on the basis of refusing to work and of the liberation of labor-force in the plane of innovation, of the discovery of a peaceful collective existence, happy and creative. The working day includes increasingly short (even if gradually imposed) fractions of compulsory work; it includes larger and larger segments dedicated to study, to the development of science, to the building of inventions and automation, to the enjoyment of superior pleasures. And to the administration of the commune. Everyone studying, everybody in the administration. Within a general and immediate collectivization of all goods, production, innovation and administration are interwoven to such a point it is difficult to identify individual places for the management of one or the other. These in fact-- production, innovation, administration--become the powers of communist society. And they cannot subsist except as an interwoven whole which acts on the organization of the working day of every proletarian. And they cannot be legitimized except as the expression of the power of the proletariat in its totality.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In this picture we can think of an incredible technical and scientific expansion because it is no longer founded on capitalism and its operations: it rests, rather, on the organization of all of society and it sees the wealth and happiness of everyone as its own product, directly. The communist reorganization of the working day sees scientific work as the axis of the activity of the communist. Politically motivated scientific work, immediately linked to the production of happiness for all; values of use in abundance, time to compulsory labor reduced more and more massively, approaching zero. The making of conditions for the liberation of the maximum innovative potential of the proletarian masses is a fundamental passage. But we should stress that the times of the transition are extraordinarily shortened by the massive intensity with which the enormous potentialities have been accumulated by this time, and with which the process will therefore develop. We can think realistically about the process of transition as characterized by a very pronounced initial acceleration, because it is like freeing a prisoner in the beginning! Nor can one think of side slipping or errors, except those that could be derived by not considering the refusal to work as the fundamental imperative measure of the process. It is not a question of being optimistic or pessimistic, but rather of acting bearing in mind what the process of self-valorization is at this historic level of power and at the connections between production, organization/administration and innovation, which the social worker already possesses in the crisis of capitalism. Naturally there are priorities which must be imposed in this passage. They, too, are determined by the logic of the refusal to work, therefore by the logic of the maximum recuperation of the productive force of the proletariat. The weakest people, those who have been made so by capitalist development, children, women, old people, the sick, people on the margins of society, outcasts: those who have will give more, all these will be restored to social productivity, to productive control for non-work. These are priorities founded on the economy of liberation and equality, on the refusal of work and inequality, sickness and unhappiness. There is a total dignity of work that is to be liberated, and this can happen only as a regime of freedom, only as a proposal made to everyone's intelligence, to innovate, to be equal to others, to participate in the administration of the commune. The priority of the refusal of inequality naturally or historically imposed is perfectly consistent with the logic of liberation from work. But these priorities are internal to the complex and ordinary flow of communist administration: the administration here is none other than the great options relative to the self-valorization of the masses. The administration is the mass procedural yielding of proletarian self-determination. In this picture another priority goal of the communist plan appears: the law of the liquidation of any continuity of exploitation of man by man, or between sexes or races, or in the mind. It is the guarantee of all freedoms. But we stress the fact that all this can only happen with an interweaving of administration, production, and innovation, all this happens within the expression of an articulate mass power, which carefully guarantees all its most elementary subjects and is unitarian and systematic. The making of the proletariat, legitimized by the unity of functions it develops, applies all possible procedures to guarantee individual and group happiness within the mass administration by the proletariat. Hence the destruction of any separate power figure, the disappearance from the scene (and if possible from the historical memory of mankind) of all the special organs of capitalist repression. After the communist destruction of the Bastille there will be no more prisons ever,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

not one! Nor will there be a specialized power that is not subordinate to the collective knowledge and the egalitarian circulation of the values of use. Shall we call this society radically democratic? Let us call it that, but let us not forget that democracy implies a plurality of classes and mediation of classes. Here, however, the main and decisive element is the overcoming of classes and of the idea of command, of legitimization as mediation. Of course there will still be mediation and diversity to mediate, but on the basis of a unity of class substrate which, alone, makes possible and realistic, and not utopian, the management of society by the masses.

A dream? No. In the contemporary world there is only one utopia in circulation and that is the capitalist one which claims control in a situation of war which capitalism, with its unresolvable crisis, has created. This savage situation imposed by capitalism has, however, reached a limit of monstrous imbecility. It must be destroyed: the utopia together with war. The communist subject is present with all his power in this situation. And this subject, and all the conditions within which he has been produced, and which he can reappropriate for himself, are preparing to overturn capitalism. The relationship between the social worker and social production has no other mystification than that of command: a command which only organizes command. This mystification, this incredibly empty legitimacy of capitalism in command, cannot help but be destroyed. Shown up for what it is, a useless impediment to the development of the productive force of the proletariat. A proletariat which in its social existence, in the ontological wealth of its qualifications, is by now able to lead society. It has in its blood the revolutionary passion of science and innovation; it has in its body the ability to produce, and therefore hatred for work; it has in the social complexity of its relationships the intelligence and subverting understanding of the working day. It is only a step away: link production, innovation, and administration, in the logic of liberation from work. In hope, in a happiness which is near. It is only a step away: let us take that step.

COPYRIGHT: Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Editore Milano 1980

9855
CSO: 6100/0002

SPAIN

ETA COMMUNIQUE TO BASQUE PEOPLE

Unknown ZUZEN in Spanish Jul 81 pp 1-10

[Text] Introduction

We have recently marked 4 years since the holding of the elections of 15 June 1977, the first held with universal suffrage in the Spanish State since 1936.

The date has passed with more sadness than glory, virtually without celebrations of any kind, and with the parliamentary political parties fearful of calling for "festivity." This distressed mood is in contrast to the one which prevailed at the celebration of the preceding years. Nevertheless, it is not difficult to find the reason for the difference: Between this 15 June and the previous ones, 23 February occurred. Those who still believed that there was democracy ("without adjectives," as they liked to proclaim) in the Spanish State had to resign themselves to acknowledging the existence of a "guarded democracy," or at least a "democracy on guard." The adjective in this case is actually an accessory, because it is difficult to imagine the existence of a democracy when the president of the government (Suarez) is forced to resign under the direct threat of pistols by four lieutenant generals in collusion with the king (significantly, the self-styled democratic and liberal news media which apply their harshest descriptions to less serious actions, in this instance referred to the incident through the silence of an accomplice); or when the entire parliamentary political group, headed by the reformist left, feels that its action has been hampered because of fear of inciting the military.

With the euphoria of 15 June 1977 gone, the waters have returned to their channel: The military have admitted the possibility of a civilian government (the one headed by Calvo Sotelo) as a final attempt before the formation of a government led by a member of the military whose priority goal would be to solve the so-called "Basque problem."

Strangely enough, it is among certain sectors of the Basque people that disappointment has replaced the triumphalism shown by leader of EE [Basque Left] and PNV [Basque Nationalist Party] after the approval of the Statute of Autonomy for the Basque Country (October 1979), giving way to an increasing marked disenchantment. The statements by the PNV's high-ranking leaders were euphoric when their action was taking place in the realm of words; when it was necessary to proceed to deeds, negotiating the transfers, the representatives of the Basque government and their

followers have perceived the slight value of these transfers, and their limited scope, as well as the difficulty, or more appropriately, the virtual impossibility of making room for Navarra in the Basque Statute. And they have said that they feel deceived, and that there have been frequent sudden halts in the transfer of authority, citing the grudgingness and changeableness of the Madrid government. Their comments are filled with unadulterated pessimism, in sharp contrast to the triumphalism of the recent past. It is possible that PNV and EE have been deceived by Madrid, but the fact is that the greatest deception comes from their own political blindness, which prevented them (we do not think that it does any longer) from seeing beyond the pseudo-democratic veil placed over their eyes, and from realizing that the reins were and continue to be in the hands of the Francoist Army, which has always controlled the reform process, forcing all those who were willing to participate in the game started on 15 June to accept all of its terms. Today, the image shown by the PNV leaders, and even more so by those of EE, is ridiculous, attempting to justify the acceptance of the Spanish Constitution which they considered anti-Basque in 1978, and which precluded the attainment of a minimal level of self-government, allowing a "satisfactory self-government" in October 1979 (they will explain how, if no change has been made in the constitutional text), which will soon be sworn in, with great solemnity, to its elected offices, in an act that will be the culmination of one of the greatest frauds committed against the Basque people.

In contrast to this faltering policy of the cliques heading PNV and EE, there is our alternative of a rupture, accepted increasingly by broader sectors of PTV [Basque Working People]. [Words missing from text] It was just another step toward the consolidation of the military power, through a change of mask, that was essential for them owing to the loss of prestige reached by the Franco regime both internally and externally, and the fact that the establishment of democracy in the state would occur only through a process of rupture with the dictatorial regime that would make the achievement of the points contained in the KAS [Patriotic Socialist Coordination] tactical alternative possible. Those who at the time predicted its political demise and gladly accepted the crumbs from the fascist military have failed or refused to understand that the latter, as they have proven repeatedly, are incompatible with and opposing with all the means at their disposal the establishment of a true democracy which, among other things, would enable PTV to become endowed with the levels of self-government that it freely decides upon, on the path toward the social and national liberation of Euskadi.

Euskadi, June 1981.

Communique From ETA [Basque Fatherland and Liberty Group] to the Basque People

ETA, the Basque Revolutionary Socialist Organization for National Liberation, takes credit for the explosion of the high-tension tower located on the grounds of the San Miguel de Aralar School (former seminary), carried out on 16 June in Iruina.

Our armed action is related to the context of the people's struggle waged after the death of the child Agustin Ocana, who was electrocuted at that same tower on 27 May of this year, while playing with other companions.

Students, parents and teachers from the aforementioned school, as well as representatives of other educational centers in Iruina, have been holding assemblies and meetings to discuss the case in question and the overall problem represented by the presence of these high-tension towers in recreational areas and traffic zones easily accessible to children. In these meetings, there was a denunciation of Iberduero, Inc, as the one responsible for the death of the child Agustin Ocana; and a demand for the immediate adoption of security measures and a change in the transfer of electrical conduction lines.

In view of the seriousness of the matter, and realizing the disdainful attitude that Iberduero, Inc, has been assuming toward the people's complaints, ETA has proceeded to intervene with armed struggle, to prevent further possible misfortunes, and as an act of intimidation toward the monopolistic company, with respect to the group of measures requested by the combined educational centers' movement.

Gora Euskadi Askatuta!

Gora Euskadi Sozialista!

Euskadi, 18 June 1981.

Euskadi Ta Askatasuna

ETA.

Communique From ETA to the Basque People

ETA, the Basque Revolutionary Socialist Organization for National Liberation, takes credit for the blowing up, with explosive charges, of a large portion of the basements and lower rooms of the OPUS University, carried out on 24 June in Iruina.

On one occasion, just as it did approximately a year ago, ETA has chosen as a target of its attack in Nafarroa the OPUS University; because, after all, it is the location of this "sacrosanct" sanctuary of the reactionary, anti-Basque ideology on the basis of which the OPUS technocratic, centralist class empowers its plans for differences among the Basques and its anti-privilege policy.

At the present time, Nafarroa is experiencing a strategic situation related to the reconstruction of its specific historical personality in the general context represented by the Basque people. In their time, Martin Villa and Del Burgo invented a legal and political formula for institutionalizing the territorial and political dismemberment between the Navarra people and the rest of Southern Euskadi: the improvement of the privilege. It is a formula which is still continuing today, the definitive negotiation of which between UCD [Democratic Center Union]-UPN[Union of the People of Navarra] and UCD of Madrid will result in the establishment of a new differentiated regionalist entity. However, the seriousness of the situation reaches extreme limits when one notes the reality of a law aimed at completely abrogating the final regulation itself, as well as turning the historical privileged institutions into mere tentacles adhering to Spanish centralism.

It is this game of economic and political interests that we must denounce and oppose with all our strength and with all our means. Our slogan must be, "There is no Basque people without Nafarroa; Euskadi Nafarroa da!" With this objective, ETA will continue its armed intervention in Nafarroa, favoring the people's aspirations and combating those who seek our disappearance as a people.

Gora Euskadi Askatuta!

Gora Euskadi Sozialista!

Euskadi, 26 June 1981.

Euskadi Ta Askatasuna

ETA.

Communique From ETA to the Basque People

ETA, the Basque Revolutionary Socialist Organization for National Liberation, assumes responsibility for the armed occupation carried out on 12 July at the Central Building of the OPUS University in Navarra, and the subsequent destruction, by explosive charges, of part of its premises, noteworthy among which are the data processing center and the Great Hall.

ETA considers this armed action to be one of the most significant blows against those in Nafarroa who constitute the mainstay of the oppressive domination: Opus Dei, a secret, reactionary, despotic sect dedicated to the service of financial and landholding capital, under the concealing cloak of a false philosophical humanism and religious apostolate. OPUS, a combination of select tentacles infiltrated on the cultural, political, economic and military level within the society, might well be described as a state within the State itself. And, as a culminating achievement of this omnipotent political power group, the University of Navarra, an institution established in Iruina thanks to Felix Huarte, a supernumerary associate of OPUS and vice-president of the privileged chamber of deputies, with the cooperation of traitors who occupied the town hall, and savings institutions, through the expropriation of farmers and municipal terms. Carrero Blanco, extremely willing, signed the decree for its founding.

Since then, the OPUS University in Navarra has become set up as the spiritual-political and spiritual-economic center from which the deception concerning our history has been fostered, from which the knowledge of our language, culture and customs has been concealed, and from which the memory of our most fundamental traditions and our privileged realities has been insulted. Its goal is to undermine, destroy or, at least, hide everything that the recognition of the struggle of our ancestors and the present participation in the national liberation struggle could provide to the Navarrans and all of us Basques in Southern Euskadi.

For this reason, we have struck at the sacrosanct heart of OPUS, not as an attack upon "culture" and "reason," but as a defensive act against the counter-culture and injustice to which all of us Basques, and especially Nafarroa, have been subjected by this sect of political bosses, bankers and fanatics, for years.

Today, OPUS, through its powerful resources and through tricks to which this obscurantist organization has accustomed us, is striving assiduously to prevent Nafarroa from recovering its own personality in the social group that comprises Basque society in Southern Euskadi. Navarrism, false privileged status and the defense of regional economic interests are the arguments that it has been using to separate the Navarran people from their own Basque national and historical essence. The only truth is that the Navarran people, like the Gipuzkoana, Bizkaino and Alaves people, outside of the territorial, political and economic framework that makes up Southern Euskadi, will never be able to achieve their real development as such a people, nor to attain the goal of liberation in keeping with their sociopolitical aspirations.

ETA is of the opinion that the four historical regions comprising Southern Euskadi should proceed together, and on equal terms, toward the pursuit of the democratic and autonomous framework that will retrieve the immediate national liberties and rights manifested in the present struggle of PTV.

Therefore, ETA will, insofar as it is able, favor making the defense of these minimal rights and demands a consistent task of a common policy on the national level for the four historical regions of Southern Euskadi, in the form of a rupture-oriented struggle against the reform, wherein the organization and self-organization of the people based on an entity with counteracting power, such as Euskal Herriko Batzarre Nazionala, will be the focal point for participation and leadership in our people's movement of resistance and reconstruction. Hence, ETA will also back with armed struggle initiatives such as these, and will fight relentlessly those who, like OPUS, engage in activity as a declared enemy of democracy and the Basque liberties.

Gora Euskadi Askatuta!

Gora Euskadi Sozialista!

Euskadi, 16 July 1980.

Euskadi Ta Askatasuna

ETA

OPUS Kanpora

Communique From ETA to the Basque People

ETA, the Basque Revolutionary Socialist Organization for National Liberation, takes credit for the execution of Luis de la Parra Urbaneja, an infantry colonel belonging to the War Disabled Corps, which took place on 22 June in Irun.

Among the data that should be cited to explain the reasons which prompted us to intervene against Col Luis de la Parra, his affiliation on the infrastructural level with the military intelligence services operating in Southern Euskadi and his activist link with parallel groups of ultrafascist ideology are noteworthy.

His anti-Basque hatred was reflected in demented acts which ranged from the destruction of posters with Abertzale [patriotic] slogans on the street to the destruction of tires on cars, for the simple reason that they bore the "E" of Euskadi with the ikurrina. As a final detail showing his actual status as an agent of oppression, there is the meeting which he held on 23 February with several Army and Civil Guard officers, preparing lists of members of the Abertzale Movement and a program of repressive intervention in the event that orders should arrive from the military headquarters to take action against the Basque population.

In view of the negative effect represented by Colonel De la Parra's active presence, ETA did not hesitate for an instant to take action; and, henceforth, it will continue to apply revolutionary justice, with all stringency, against anyone who, in either an official or a covert manner, is associated with the oppressive and repressive strategy of the Spanish State toward the PTV.

Our organization has always demonstrated an obvious desire to achieve a political framework and one of normalization of the citizenry that will make further bloodshed unnecessary, and for this purpose it has repeatedly formulated a solution of compromise to prevent the taking of measures against the legion of confidantes, infiltrated persons, torturers and hired assassins of the repression who invade Southern Euskadi: Let them leave!

If they place before their personal security the extra pay or the meager guarantees of survival offered them by the regime of the oligarchy, it should come as no surprise when ETA undertakes the "punishment of the guilty," which the people's outcry demands. Euskadi has clearly proven that it is filled with undesirable elements and that it is willing to fight in one way or another until it succeeds in driving them out.

Finally, ETA takes the opportunity afforded by this communique to assume, as well, the responsibility for the armed confrontation which occurred on 16 June in Zarautz, between members of our organization and many police forces, resulting in the death of the inspector of the General Police Corps, Maria Jose Garcia Sanchez, a member of the Central Intelligence Brigade especially assigned to Southern Euskadi to perform tasks related to the anti-guerrilla battle.

Gora Euskadi Askatuta !

Gora Euskadi Sozialista!

Euskadi, 23 June 1981.

Euskadi Ta Askatasuna

ETA.

2909
CSO: 6000/0027

END