

The Party-guerrilla coordination

Extract from the *Report* presented by comrade M.P.M. (Arenas) to the Plenum of the C.C., January 1989

The problem of the unity of the revolutionary and people's forces has much to do with the plan of organization of the revolution. We have discussed very much on this issue within the Party all throughout these years, trying at any moment to link the discussion and the theoretical elaboration to the practical labour. In spite of this, even today in our ranks we can find some ideas that do not correspond at all with the conception and the practice that we have been developing. This is mainly referred to the relationship that must exist in the coordination of the organization of the Party, the mass movement and the people's guerrilla. Not long ago, we had to criticise a comrade who had dangerously deviated in his interpretation of the politic line of the Party. We will not stop here to refute, anew and in detail, all the arguments and little ideas that some are defending as if they were the latest word of the revolutionary creed; and we won't do it because they are well known. What is important to highlight is that, curiously, once again is repeated the phenomenon (which was described by Lenin and that we have also detected on several occasions within our movement) of the identification of the spontaneous ideas and practices with those of a militancy that tends to deny both the revolutionary struggle of the masses and the leading role of the Party in all the revolutionary process.

This phenomenon is the result of the petty-bourgeois impatience that wants to see fulfilled, in a few days, and only by a handful of "chosen", what can only be the work of the masses and of a long and a thousand times complex politic labour. Hence, the lurches to the "left" and "right" that we see them make very often looking for the magic solution that spares them having to work hard and patiently. Hence also, that they march after the spontaneous movement of the masses, worship its rear (the economic struggle) and reject, as "useless" or incapable, the working-class vanguard militants who, due to whatever circumstances (and many times they are due to the leftist nonsense and positions), do not seem ready to follow them in their adventurism. And this when they do not try to mix everything and make absurd plans to "militarize" the Party.

We have not the least doubt concerning the organizational division that must exist between the Party and the military organization. Our 15-year experience of struggle proves so. But, apart from this, there is another extremely important subject related to the problems of organization and to the different levels of conscience that exist within the movement. Not everybody can be communist, nor can he develop as such in a single day; we are not born, as one may say, communist and "pure".

The communist develops himself in the practice of the struggle, as his consciousness grows, and together with it, his degree of compromise with the working-class and people's cause. In order to be a communist militant it is not necessary to have a special preparation nor being able to carry out any kind of labour within the Party. Within the politic and ideological positions of the Party we find -in an outstanding place- the recognition and the support to the armed struggle as a legitimate and necessary means of struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie. This does not mean that the Party must carry it out; for this reason it is mistaken and very harmful to make of the practice of the armed struggle a question of principles or a condition to militate in the Party. This conduct would impede the incorporation to the Party of all those workers who, even if they are and feel themselves as communists and admit the role of the armed struggle, are only ready to develop a politic labour.

We have to take into account that, as the economic crisis deepens and the contradictions of the capitalist system sharpen, there will be a greater number of people ready to participate, in one way or another, in the revolutionary struggle. The increase of the worker and people's struggles in the last years in our country, their greater radicalization and spreading, have shaped an important mass movement which escapes from the control of the reformist parties and trade unions. Within this mass movement there are very different degrees and levels of consciousness and politic compromise. It is easy to imagine that, at least at the beginning, the majority of the people included in that movement are not ready to take up arms, but this does not mean in any way that they refuse to do other activities. Moreover, if the Party carries out a labour of politic orientation of those struggles and proves in practice that its alternatives are just, it is sure that the most advanced people from that movement, those who identify with our positions, will be ready to organize themselves in the Party and to carry out some tasks as, for instance, handing in leaflets, distributing

propaganda, collecting funds and, more generally, to take part actively, following the instructions and orientations of the Party, in strikes, assemblies and mass demonstrations. It is the mission of the Party to educate those people so that they increase their consciousness and political compromise, at the same time that it carries out its tasks of clarification of the proletariat, points out its long and short-term objectives and organizes the firmest and more resolute among them. Therefore, if we conceived the Party as a politico-military organization, the Party itself would cut the way of its development, would isolate itself from the masses and would be impeded to fulfil the politic and organizational tasks that correspond to it.

On the other hand, in our country there is also a certain number of people who, due to the repression, the exploitation, the unemployment, the poverty, the national oppression, etc., have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to change the society in which we live and to end up with capitalism and the bourgeoisie. And they consider that the best way to achieve this is the armed struggle. Some of these people, not to say their majority, do not define themselves as communists nor are they ready to accept the militancy and the Party activity; they are only ready to struggle with arms in their hands. For this reason, the Party has the duty of giving them an organizational way out, helping them to contact the guerrilla, as long as they prove to be serious enough and to want to struggle methodically, with discipline and for clear objectives. If we did not act in this way, we would be wasting a very important revolutionary potential that, for not being communist or not identifying with our ideology, would be relegated to the barricade struggle or to spontaneity with the subsequent waste of forces.

The fundamental mission of the Party, we have explained it hundreds of times, consists in organizing and leading, heading it, the whole of the people's resistance movement. And this is something that an organization of a military type will never be able to do under the conditions of a country such as ours. This general mission includes, as it is logical, the politic orientation of the guerrilla through the militants of the Party who are posted in it, at the same time that we create a favourable atmosphere for the incorporation, in an increasing number, of the advanced elements of the masses to the ranks of the guerrilla. As it can be understood this is a task that cannot be done with great gestures, shouting or launching slogans but it requires a solid, patient, very meticulous and most of the times silent, conspiratory, anonymous and really "grey" politic, ideological and organizational task. But this labour on its own is not enough. It is indispensable that the guerrilla itself, with its well-chosen and exemplarily carried-out armed actions, summons continually the youth to join its ranks. It is not necessary to say that without the latter, the Party won't be able to do anything in this field.

Therefore, broadly speaking, since the revolution is a task of all the oppressed and the exploited and since there are different levels of conscience, compromise and readiness for the struggle among the proletariat and the different people's layers, we cannot pretend to put all of them at the same level of struggle. On the contrary, the Party must be able to place each person in the post that better suits his circumstances, taking advantage for that of each and every of the multiple forms of organization that the masses themselves are creating so that the influence and the leadership of the communists can be assured in them. This would hardly be achieved if we constructed a politico-military organization.

Contrary to what the bourgeoisie and its lackeys affirm, the Party has not invented the armed struggle, as we have neither invented the syndical struggle of the working class nor all the other manifestations and forms that adopts the class struggle. What the Party has done and will continue to do is to try to channel all the stream of the people's struggle into the achievement of the socialist objectives. We know that the working-class movement, considered as a whole, "tends" to socialism. But in order to transform that tendency into a conscious movement and to allow it to achieve its goals the organization and the orientation of the Party are required. Otherwise, the people's movement will always fail in its confrontations with the State or either it will be deviated from its path. This happens many times with the armed struggle. Hence, the fact that the Party puts so much interest in leading it, so that it serves to the objectives of the working class and does not degenerate into militarism. To integrate the armed struggle within the revolutionary strategy, to make it play the role that corresponds to it in each stage of the struggle and to try that the military organization itself becomes the embryo of the future people's army that will overthrow capitalism, all this compels us to incorporate to the guerrilla well-prepared and tempered comrades and cadres of the Party in order to secure with their influence and example that necessary politic leadership. This is something that we have not invented either; we have not stimulated it in an artificial way. It appeared as a necessity of the class struggle at a given moment of the politic evolution of our country and, from then on, this necessity not only has not disappeared but -as we have seen- it has been strengthened and it will have to continue doing so in the future. For these reasons, the alternative is not nor can ever be, at least for us, armed struggle yes or armed struggle not; we don't question the necessity nor the importance of the armed struggle within the revolutionary process that is taking place in our country. We simply advocate for a kind of armed struggle and organization in accordance with the objectives of the people's struggle and that does not "go subjectively beyond" the state of the organized revolutionary forces, that serves to their development and helps them to prepare the general conditions for the incorporation of the ample masses to the struggle for power, at the same time that this military organization prepares itself to fulfil its tasks

better each day.

The bourgeoisie confounds the people consciously, accusing us of wanting to make of the means a goal in itself. Others say that we justify the means according to the goal we pursue. But nobody says that our means or methods of struggle are always determined by the objectives we have intended to reach. Our goal is to make revolution and to serve the people. For that reason, we will never be able to make anything that may impede or damage the achievement of those objectives. We don't have a militarist conception about the class struggle nor do we let ourselves be guided by the blind hatred towards the exploiter and oppressor class. We are communists and, as such, we have a politic and ideological line that determines our behaviour, no matter where we develop our labour nor the tasks that the Party has entrusted us with.