

AWA INTERNAL INFORMATION DOCUMENT

FOR A REVOLUTIONARY ALTERNATIVE: FROM
ORA TO UTCL

An account of the politics of the split in the ORA France (now OCL) that resulted in the expulsion of the UTCL tendency at the Easter 1976 Conference.

Translated by TZ, NH and PG.

ORA-An evaluation

Nimes 1974-a promising national conference.

T ~~THE~~ ^{A)The} will to clarify theoretically and organisationally.
study of organisational texts of trade unions

The study of organisational texts of trade unions, strategy, contemporary capitalism has shown the collective will to state precisely the libertarian communist project.

On the other hand the setting up of an organisational plan, has finally proved our need for a structural and strong organisation, necessary for a really democratic functioning and for a quick and reliable intervention.

B)A will to act collectively.

The text "To polarise our forces in industry" unanimously adopted, offers a common basis for intervention in two new and separate areas.

the gathering of the whole new left on a very broad basis.
the presence of libertarian communists through creating libertarian communist industrial groups .

This strategy also asserts that the main point of the revolutionary struggle is placed in industry, clearly justified by the increase in workers struggles.

The strategy represents the tool which the ORA militants need to pass from dispersed activism to a convergent practice, with objectives and common means, necessary for qualitative progress of our struggle.

C)A perfect unanimity.

The national meeting at Nimes was also the occasion to affirm the new unity of ORA militants, after the departure of an ultra-left tendency whose last two representatives (Beauvais and the 15th district) were the only delegates to abstain during the vote on strategy.

(These groups shortly after left the ORA)

This unanimity led to the prediction of a considerable advance by the ORA, with a notable penetration, of libertarian concepts into the proletariat, accompanied by practical experience of large gatherings of the new left in industry. That hope was a deception, however.

ORA NOV 1974-75 A disappointing year.

Confronted with a period of bitter conflicts when the workers asked themselves more than once such questions as

what does the bourgeoisie want

why is there a crisis

how to fight

how to politically extend struggles.

the ORA showed itself incapable of elaborating a coherent political line which was close to reality, and which could be collectively defended.

One could ~~clearly~~ clearly see this at different levels and on several occasions.

A) A national campaign against the crisis

The proposal for a national campaign against the crisis without being refused, came up again and again, against a general apathy.

The campaign responded to two ORA preoccupations.

1. to raise a common debate amongst all militants open to a common analysis.
2. to be the occasion for a national appearance of an association of all these groups.

For various reasons, few groups have participated in the preparation of this campaign. The Sarcelles group is an exception whilst which one must mention, because they have come up with a film on the crisis.

So the campaign was a total failure. The few meetings there were (in the 13th, 18th, Sarcelles districts) did not create a national network, but have remained local initiatives.

B) The intervention in the struggle on a national scale.

When the situation and the failure of the reformists left the workers without a coherent programme for action, to cope with the effects of the crisis, and with the whole political extension of these struggles, the ORA found itself completely mute.

On 19th Nov, the leaflet which proposed a general one-day strike and which was distributed by militants presents at the inter-union demo was signed Postier Affranchi (rank and file post group) and not ORA!

Since then one could not read in either Front Libertaire nor in any other national leaflet a program of action dealing with concrete problems of struggle and collectively elaborated by ORA.

The few general articles, the editorials of FL have mostly been drafted individually or by restricted commission, without being the reflection of a national collective debate of the whole ORA. They show two main shortcomings

1. Firstly they are content with general affirmations, but which repeated in edition after edition in the manner of a litany, become bit by bit emptied of their content, through lack of political clarification and failure to make the new practice concrete. "The workers have to take these matters in their own hands" "let's unify our struggles" etc.

2. then they are inclined to a purely negative attitude: the critique of the union of the left and the "leftists" is not sustained by the contradicting propositions, concrete and credible, which can only validate and back up this critique.

This attitude finds its justification in the editorial of No 43 of FL which besides its opposition to the strategy of ORA, affirmed that the "libertarian communists haven't got a programme to defend",

So we have to state that the presence of comrades in some of the hardest struggles this year has not been assumed by ORA. They have not received a militant aid

consequently, and the gains of their struggles have not been capitalised on.

c) the absence of any cohesion in our industrial activity

The strategy of "polarising our forces in industry" has remained a dead slogan, nothing has changed since.

Autonomous groupings

Did anything new happen. No. The work started in the post offices, reinforced by the experience gained during the conflict in Oct-Nov 1974 follows the a rhythm determined by the militant post office workers; slow but deep and it will emerge as fact in the constitution of a true revolutionary and openly inter-union tendency open to un-unionised.

The Rail Enchaîné remains according to them, entangled between an essentially libertarian militant composition and much larger pretensions, which damage the grouping of the new left on the railways as much as the presence of libertarian communist railway workers.

The "Gauche Ouvrière" of Mans has all the characteristics of a large group? In any case it has the advantage of leaving the corporate framework of one single factory but remains an isolated initiative in ORA.

The work done in PMRT (For a Revolutionary Movement Of Workers) which wanted a structure for itself allowing the emergence and appearance of autonomous groups, has, in fact, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ been only the gathering of individuals of various political outlooks, because it only has a vague project to propose and has not got the means to put it into practice) how has it brought proof of inefficiency of that premature structure which is not based on any experience of large groupings of the new left in the factories,

Specific work

The work begun by the Postier Affranchi has been increased though the through the publication in several depots of regular bulletins distributed to all workers. Yet this practice compared with the strategy of the organisation seems completely isolated.

We will make two exceptions

the Metallo Libertaire of Peugeot published by CRAsympathisers at Belfort.

The Petit Libertaire of Sarcelles has come out regularly for two years every week in spite of criticisms that certain comrades have made. This pilot scheme shows how such work can pay off.

The publications like the Tranchant (Banks) the Clef (Metalworkers) Voix Libertaire des Bouches de Rhone, the Libertaire of Pau, the Combat of Nîmes, Portugal Libertario and the coordinations of high school students seem to have been cut short without any political explanation.

Thus the presence and action of libertarian communists are nearly non-existent in the struggles of the proletariat.

Even more serious, the militants who do not apply the CRA strategy and those who have never really fought and defended it in the debate within the organisation.

It's astonishing that the only published text on debate on ORA strategy, a text that criticises and openly condemns the slogan "polarise our forces in industry" comes from the Communist Group of Beauvais (I.B. Jan 75)

What can we understand from this?

Whether everyone is in agreement with the ORA strategy-then the militants are contradicting themselves, and that's a pity-

Whether the ORA opponents of the text are in agreement with the councilo-Bordigists and reckon that they have nothing new to add, and that's sad.-

-whether they have no real argument to oppose to the case, except gossip in corridors, and treating us as leninists, bolsheviks, anarcho-syndicalists or dogmatists and that's dramatic-

or do they actually possess the arguments but do not think that the debate is necessary-and that's very serious.

The blocked vote which has profoundly divided the Paris region at its general assembly where practical methods for applying the strategy should have been decided upon, has brought to light the stubborn opposition of certain militants to the appearance of libertarian communists in industry,

This appearance as opposed to the constitution of autonomous groups, opposition whose demagogic character was shown by the following events, the absence of real work to form these groups.

The only comrades who worked to build these autonomous groups are the same ones who animated libertarian communist groups in industry.

One can distinguish 3 attitudes.

Some very isolated comrades apply a coherent and converging strategy in industry. Doubly penalised on the financial level (to publish 2, 3 or 4 leaflets each month out of one's own pocket is very expensive) and on the militant level (several dozens of hours sacrificed every week to base work) they do not get any ~~WORK~~ support material or militant from the organisation.

Then those comrades on the defensive who call on the 'great work' and the differences in the factories or PMRT in order not to have to leave their union work (if they have any)

the many silent comrades, not very active in their factories, always entangled in sterile dilemmas: to defend a revolutionary programme, isn't that bolshevik? to militate in a union, isn't that reformist. Doesn't a large group correspond to workers needs? etc.

Absence of an analysis of international struggles

The year 74-75 was marked by 3 very important events on the international level.

The departure of US forces from Indochina, opening a new phase for SE Asia, has not had the honour of an in depth article in F.L.

The progress of the Portuguese revolution has only been the subject of an article a year after the beginning of the process.

fixed with the execution of five anti-Franco militants what did the ORA do nationally.

It's taken a similar stand to the extreme left without proposing concrete initiatives to mobilise workers. We have noted a doubled disinterest of unqualified sectarianism of many militants.

The struggle of ORA militants seems to be localised, with the occasional support of martyrs (if possible anarchist). This attitude reveals a dangerous blindness facing the present situation, where organising internationally is more urgent than ever. The malfunctioning of the Secretariat of International Relations and absence of accountability there has favoured this situation.

The struggle on fronts outside industry: the struggle against the Naby reform - no clear and concrete programme for action from our militants in schools and colleges. The anti-military struggle - inadequate support, no national coordination. The same applies to other struggles (Larzac committees, abortion, women, housing)

The absence of real democracy: Is our organisation really democratic?

The disappearance of the IB - and the bad organising of votes by correspondence reveal and imply a general apathy of groups and militants. The political line is left to the edcoll.

ORA! Why this crisis: to defend working class autonomy, to support the development of the practice of self-organisation, and to put forward a revolutionary and coherent programme, politically extending workers struggles. Such is the historical task of the ORA. It is far from fulfilling this task today. The weakness of forces to the left of the CP here, & internationally. Anachronistic survival of Leninism, empty politics weakening the workers forces. A probable success of reformism and therefore the interests of the bourgeoisie over proletariat.

We must discern historic and present causes of our failures, in order to move forward.

The creation of ORA was a historically decisive advance, a spectacular break with trad anarchism. The will to intervene in workers struggles, integration of interesting analysis of marxist origin, plan to construct a revolutionary organisation based on unity of theory and practice. Nevertheless the heavy historical heritage of the anarchist movement, its theoretical weakness, made the ORA vulnerable to leninist influences and trad anarch ones.

The fusion of ORA and the Cercles Fronte Libertaire ~~was~~^{after} a bitter fight between the base (Cercles militants) and the allpowerful bureaucracy (ORA) gathered a 1,000 militants dropping in two years to 150.

Today ORA is torn between 3 attitudes - an ultra left opposing libcom intervention in industry, a trad anarch position, & a libertarian communist position calling for the polarisation of our forces in industry.

1st cause of crisis in ORA: absence of coherent l.c. programme. allowing co-existence in same organisation of different ideas. Clarification of role of ORA specific organisation. would entail either ORA's dissolution or its recomposition around a coherent axis. Today the lack of objectives of a precise revolutionary strategy explains apathy of certain militants.

2nd cause: weakness in industry, numerous comrades who actively participate in class struggle will make a clean sweep of vague statements of ultraleft. But shortage of workers is cause of inability to respond to workers problems, as well, as consequence of this basic failure.

3rd cause is absence of political growth of militants from time they join. The demagogic statement by certain intellectual comrades, that this political growth is acquired by practice, is daily refuted by the facts. No, a militant worker doesn't find in the shadow of a hydraulic press the principles of dialectical materialism, and does not learn in the canteen the principal and secondary contradictions of the bourgeoisie, he does not retrace alone the development of the working class without being acquainted with its historical experiences.

On the contrary the organisation owes to its members a collective minimum political growth, to prevent the formation of a hierarchy of intellectuals.

The following is the text that was put to the vote at the Easter 1976 conference. It had already been published in a previous version in the document 'For a revolutionary alternative'. It takes up the principal points of the debates withingthe ORA.

We have not thought it useful to republish the last part of the article concerning the structure of the organisation, even though this has been the subject of animated debates. Moreover this problem is tackled in 'Reply to Boulogne'

STRATEGIC PROPOSITIONS

A. A Strategy relating to the needs of the working class

1) Revolutionary aspirations of the proletariat.

The superexploitation of which workers are the victims - the increasing fragmentation of work, the deterioration of the conditions of work, the development of hierarchy, the intransigence of the bourgeoisie - have stimulated the proletariat and encouraged the emergence of forms of struggle and anti-hierarchical aspirations that more than 50 years of reformist hegemony have suppressed.

These forms of struggle and these aspirations bring completely into question the capitalist form of the organisation of work and the organisation of society.

Libertarian communist militants must support these forms of struggle, spread concrete experiences, defend everywhere workers' unity by the practice of workers' democracy.

2) Reformist hegemony

Nevertheless, the reformist parties totally direct most of the struggles of the working class. The reformist plan appears to be the only credible political extension of workers' struggles. Reformist hegemony is assured by the role and the hierarchical and corporatist structure that they impose on trade union organisations.

The credibility of the reformists is nevertheless undermined in France; notably after 1974/5, marked by a succession of resounding defeats (PTT, Renault, Parisien Libere) where the nature of the reformist leaderships was revealed by a PC-PS polemic that demonstrated the abyss separating the leaderships from the rank and file, and by the Portuguese experience where the pcp and psp showed their inability to serve the workers.

The 22nd Congress of the PCF, sanctioning the line of alliance with the bourgeoisie (UPF) and denying the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, will continue to distance the workers from the reformists.

The shrinking credibility of the reformists is not to the gain of the revolutionary left. The proletariat has entered the year 1976 immersed in a profound malaise, characterised by a single fact: the struggles of the working class are without political perspective.

It is necessary, taking into account the relative set-back of the reformists and the need for the struggles of the working class to enter into a political project leading to a direct confrontation with the bourgeoisie, to advance from today a revolutionary programme that is coherent and credible to all the workers.

This programme opens today a revolutionary perspective to struggles in putting forward three successive themes:

- the unification and democratisation of struggles
- unlimited general strike
- the building of rank and file power

3) The international dimension of struggles

Whereas today Capital has an international reality, workers' struggles generally remain enclosed in a national framework

The reformists are incapable of putting forward international political perspectives to the working class, but the technocratic leaderships of the international trades unions permits the reformists to control international struggles.

Nevertheless the situation of confrontation in Spain, as in Portugal, makes the Iberian peninsula a revolutionary tinder-box.

It is for this reason that the development of solidarity between French and Spanish workers is a priority.

Libertarian communists in France must give an international dimension to their activities, leading as quickly as possible to an international libertarian communist organisation, upholding everywhere a revolutionary programme.

B. THE PRINCIPAL ARENA OF THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE: THE WORKPLACE

1) The principal arena of the class struggle

The bourgeoisie derives its wealth from surplus value produced by labour, the value of which is realised on the market. Workers that don't directly participate in the production of commodities (Transport, telecommunications, commerce, etc.) but who produce the services used by the bourgeoisie to facilitate the production of surplus-value and the realisation of its value, are exploited by the bourgeoisie in the same way as production workers.

The exploitation of the labour of the working class necessitates their ideological alienation by the bourgeoisie. This ideological alienation finds its best expression in the organisation of work (hierarchy) and continues outside of work: the form of the education system, the family, the state and the moral order.

The state is the political extension of the exploitation of human labour. The electoral illusion that affirms that the workers can change their lot without modifying the economic infrastructures is the perfected form of statist alienation.

The working class are utilised as a market in the framework of the 'consumer society'.

Thus the class struggle of the proletariat against the exploitation of its labour cannot take place without the the struggle against ideological alienation, against the state and against the mirages of the 'consumer society'. But it is the success of the struggle against the infrastructures of capitalist society that will permit the total and definitive destruction of these ideological superstructures.

In other words it is in expropriating the bourgeoisie that the working class takes power. In a revolutionary strategy it is the struggles on the workplace that permits the working class to:

- understand the cause of their everyday alienation: the exploitation of labour.

- to organise at the workplace; that is to say, to prepare for revolutionary confrontation.

The workplace is the principal place where the bourgeoisie attacks the proletariat. It is also the place where the proletariat will topple their power. For this reason libertarian communists that the working class, and they alone, can accomplish the revolution must prioritise the workplace.

2) Do not neglect other fronts

If the principal arena of the class struggle is the workplace, this does not signify that its only characteristic must be economic. All the problems of everyday life, of culture, of society, must be tackled in the workplace.

On this basis a struggle must be waged outside the walls of the workplace uniting in the district or the town workers of all sectors, their families and radicalised elements of the middle classes and the petty bourgeoisie.

The final, ie revolutionary, solution to the problems of all popular layers lies in the actions of the workers and they alone. They must assure themselves of control of struggles outside the workplace, struggles that are today too often made up of militants from the middle class.

Faced with the taking up of these tasks solely by elements of the petty bourgeoisie or middle class, libertarian communists must not be satisfied with the situation. On the contrary, they must demonstrate to the working class how much these are as important as the economic struggle and ensure that these problems are discussed and taken up by the workers themselves.

C. FOR THE UNITY OF ALL WORKERS AROUND DIRECT WORKERS DEMOCRACY

1) The organisation of struggles

Libertarian communists fight in the workplace for workers to adopt and practice the principles of workers' democracy. Thus they declare themselves in favour of:

-for the general assembly to be the sole decision-making body for all the important decisions of a conflict

-for the strike committee to be constituted of delegates elected and revocable by the general assembly of workers, that submit themselves strictly to the imperative mandate laid down by these general assemblies

- for the setting up of commissions, controllable by the general assembly, to deal with matters such as publicity, finance, etc.

-since certain strikes, notably in the public services, seem to hinder workers, and since the support of the population is necessary, libertarian communists are in favour of the setting up of a support committee under the sole direction of the workers in struggle.

Libertarian communists support the widest possible unity of workers, and for this reason favour the creation of strike committees controlled by the general assemblies. When these principles are not applied the setting up of an Action Committee (as at LIP) may be necessary; this can only be understood as a compromise to the principle of the widest democracy possible in the organisation of the strike.

It is direct workers democracy alone that can assure total unity between workers of all unions and non-unionised workers, and between workers of diverse political currents. Faced with the ruling class and the state, the workers learn through bitter experience the need for this unity.

2) Trade union organisations

The analysis according to which the unions are counter-revolutionary traps revolutionaries in an insoluble dilemma.

The anarcho-syndicalist analysis according to which the unions will be the instrument by which the working class will make the revolution leads the working class into an impasse.

Neither analysis takes into account that a trade union organisation is a defensive organisation of workers that develops in the framework of the capitalist system.

The class struggle today is directed against the immediate effects of capitalism (unemployment, rising prices, etc) and is thus split by a fundamental contradiction between its anti-capitalist nature and the limits of reformist demands.

We must break out of the dilemma of 'reformist demands or revolutionary demands'. It is the forms of struggle that are adopted, the force of confrontations, that will advance revolutionary ideas in the proletariat. The dynamic of demands gives rise to the conditions for its own depassement.

It is thus not a question of abandoning the terrain of demands to the reformists (it is in fact one of the elements of a revolutionary programme). In a given social context, the question of this or that demand can involve opposing dynamics (for example, 2% increase or £30 for all).

It is in this context that trades unions have developed and thus suffer from the two terms of the contradiction (organisation of struggle and integrationist aspect) which still co-exist. Nevertheless the integrationist aspect can become more important: concluding agreements with the bosses (that is to say, to consecrate a relationship of forces within the framework of the capitalist system) is an inevitable step for the workers today, and the effects of this dynamic favour the integration of the trade union organisation into the system (regulation of the class struggle by 'reasonable' shop stewards, representativity, reasonable demands). The distinction can be made between the French unions which are, despite everything, on a class basis, and the Anglo-Saxon unions of the AFL-CIO type that are clearly integrationist (although in relation to the present crisis the integrationist element may cease to be the determinant element).

We believe, then, that the trade union organisations CGT, CFDT, FO, AND FEM are closest to the conception of class organisation corresponding to a defensive period of the struggle against the bourgeoisie. The offensive organisation is characterised by workers councils where decision-making general assemblies/elected, revocable and mandated committee become the permanent form of organisation. In this revolutionary framework the trade unions will be faced with a choice: to stand aside and dissolve themselves into the structures adopted by the workers, or to occupy a counter-revolutionary role.

The offensive organisation is characterised by worker's councils where decision-making general assemblies/elected, revocable and mandated committee become the permanent form of organisation. In this revolutionary framework the unions will be confronted with a choice: to stand aside and dissolve themselves into the structures adopted by the workers or to occupy a counter-revolutionary role.

The reformist orientation of the trades unions is explained by:

-by the hierarchic and corporatist forms of organisation that the reformists have imposed on the unions, without which they could not keep themselves in power for long.

The coming of the reformists to power, in the event of the Union of the Left winning a majority, is considered as the last but one card of capitalism to break out of the crisis, and is only used by the bourgeoisie with the assurance that the working class will be solidly anchored to the trade union organisations, themselves more and more integrated.

To mount class struggles whose aim is the coming to power of a left government does not take into account the situations of confrontation. There is thus a contradiction between the development of combativity and the will to social truce in a period where the reformist leaderships will do anything to accentuate the integration of the workers into the capitalist system.

To ensure taking the class struggle beyond the trade union framework and reformist demands is not to confront the trades union organisations but to struggle:

i) for the democratisations of the unions (this struggle being seen not as an end in itself but solely as a means).

ii) for the autonomy of self-managed struggles.

iii) for the development of a revolutionary programme and its taking up by all the workers.

This analysis does not lead us to a strategy of replacing the reformist union leaderships by 'revolutionary' ones. On the contrary, struggling in the long term for the self-emancipation of the workers this is carried on in this period in the permanent structures of the workers most conscious of their exploitation, by an apprenticeship to workers direct democracy and self-organisation.

The reformists are incapable of defending the interests of the workers to the end (fragmentation of struggles, inappropriate forms of struggle and demands, giving up gains, etc). It is thus in intervening alongside workers in the struggle to win demands and in the trade union organisations that libertarian communists will contribute to the development of revolutionary ideas in the proletariat and the consequent defeat of reformism.

3) To bring together the new left around a practice of direct workers democracy. By 'new left' we understand all those workers who find themselves breaking from the practice of the reformists in struggles, and of whom practical unity can be realised on two points:

-for a hardening of struggles

-for the self-organisation of struggles

This reassemblment will be made on the basis of this principle and not on the artificial unity of organisation of the extreme left, even if some of these militants can join the project.

This New Left, to realise its objectives, must itself, gather its forces in the workplace in the form of broad committees.

This practical unity is indispensable to the success of workers democracy.

These broad committees struggle on two terrains:

a) in the union organisations

b) alongside other workers, unionised or not

These committees intervene in the union 'sections' (branches) to propagate their opinions on the hardening of struggles and their self-organisation, but their function is to address themselves to all workers. The importance of T.U. intervention may vary from workplace to workplace, but to a whole sector of activity, the committees will take the form of an inter-union tendency uniting unionised and non-unionised,

It is no longer the question to prioritise the CFDT, as we have done up until now. It is necessary to work in all the workers unions, for the unity of all workers around the practice of direct workers democracy.

Each broad committee will seek to open its union sub-committees to militants and revolutionaries of the two unions of the working class (CGT & CFDT). At times the existence of these commissions or revolutionary trade union tendencies will precede their unification into a broad committee open to the non-unionised.

In the end the rhythm of the establishment of these broad committees will be a function of the consciousness of the New Left workers. All voluntarism that, at the drop of a hat, leaves a large number of comrades and makes a disguised groupuscule out of a committee (a debaptised libertarian group, for example) must be rejected. The establishment of a committee can thus be preceded by work on several levels (in each union, or on a focus of struggle, such as Portugal) and proceeds at a very slow pace.

The local existence of these committees is not in itself sufficient. Links must be weaved, leading ~~xx~~ little by little to a national reassemblment of the New Left.

The national reassemblment of the broad committees will take place at a pace in accord with the development of the consciousness of the New Left of the need to unite, first of all the workers in the same sector or the same locality, in a word to be the work of all the workers of the New Left themselves.

This national reassemblment needs, to exist, a definitive action programme and the forms of action and organisation of workers democracy, and the proposals for struggle contained in the following conceptions:

- a) for the unity of struggles
- b) for the general strike
- c) for the establishment of a rank and file power as a prelude to a real socialist society.

PMRT and PQFS(??) structures have revealed themselves to be equally incapable of uniting the New Left. The steps taken by these two structures explains their failure. They offer in effect a parachuted national co-ordination that precedes the establishment, at the base, of the broad committees. These two premature initiatives open the way to recuperation and forbid an autonomous and democratic unity of the New Left.

That is why it would be criminal to engage once more in an adventure of this type, and it would be counter-revolutionary to self-proclaim autonomous groups that contained no more than three libertarian sympathisers. On the contrary we must devote ourselves to the base to the establishment of broad committees of revolutionary workers, this being the only means of fulfilling the goal determined by PQFS.

D. FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAMME

By a revolutionary programme we mean a political whole containing three elements that are in fact indivisible:

- a) an analysis of capitalist society and the balance of class forces. An analysis of the historic experiences of the workers movement and its most recent actions.
- b) an action programme responding to the most immediate problems of workers in struggle, and proposing lines of struggle and forms of organisation practicable today, but which open the way for a revolutionary perspective.
- c) a revolutionary project tackling the problems of the transition to communism.

The revolutionary programme is radically different from, for example, the programme of the Union of the Left in the sense that it is not a series of promises but a series of propositions. It is the workers that will decide to modify, accept or reject these propositions, and it is they who will put them into practice, if they are accepted.

The revolutionary programme needs to be at the same time comprehensive and not final:

comprehensive because it must find a response to all questions that face the workers, as much as for struggle today as for the revolutionary period tomorrow.

not final because the evolution of the situation on one hand, and the evolution of the consciousness of the working class on the other hand, makes it impossible to establish 'eternal principles'.

To recognise the necessity of a revolutionary programme is to recognise the necessity of a vanguard organisation to elaborate and defend it.

The libertarian communist vanguard defines itself thus:

-first, it does not pretend to be the whole of the vanguard

-second, it does not propose to the most advanced elements of the proletariat to direct the class, but to lead it to organise itself by a series of constructive propositions.

Opposed to the Leninist conceptions according to which revolutionary consciousness can only come from outside the proletariat, we affirm that it can only come from the heart. We do want an external vanguard where bourgeois or marginal intellectuals veneer class realities with erroneous schemas.

The revolutionary programme must be elaborated and defended by a vanguard inside with the working class.

The revolutionary programme of the libertarian communist vanguard rests on several elements:

a) the analytical method of dialectical materialism

b) the recognition of the class struggle

c) the affirmation of a single solution - violent revolution

d) the dictatorship of the proletariat during the revolutionary period

e) the non-statist, non-hierarchical, self-managed form of power

f) integral or libertarian communism as final aim, with full harmony

between individual liberty and social organisation.

Finally it is clear that the libertarian communist revolutionary programme is a function of the struggle of the proletariat, of its level of consciousness, of objective questions posed to workers, the reality of the relationship of forces in the heart of the proletariat, of problems met in the struggle for workers democracy.

To understand these problems and judge the replies to them, it is necessary to be placed on the same rungs as the proletariat and to confront directly the reality and the difficulties of the class struggle.

It is necessary to militate in a workplace.