**STALIN'S TEACHINGS FOR THE COMMUNISTS' CURRENT STRUGGLE**

1) Before analyzing the proposed agenda of this meeting, a necessary premise must be made. The first lesson that must be drawn from Stalin's USSR is that communists must dig deep to know this experience fully. It is necessary to take note that the establishment of socialism in a country is accompanied in other capitalist countries by a process of systematic denigration and demonization of that model and its protagonists, culminating in the construction of a veritable “liberal” totalitarianism which, thanks to its control of economical, political and cultural levers (including school and academic education), succeeds in maintaining hegemony over the majority of its proletariat. In capitalist countries, the cultural battle against historical revisionism and a systematic misinformation on international matters is thus the first step, necessary but not sufficient, to restore credibility to the communist question. Trying to save a communist or even a socialist option by accepting the condemnation of the USSR and its most prestigious and enduring leader, Stalin, means not only giving in to the false narrative of the class enemy, but also falling back into an abstract utopian socialism that will tend to the rejection of all the ideological achievements of Marxism-Leninism, decisively weakening the militant praxis and action of the revolutionary movement. We therefore reject the bourgeois-Trotskyist category of “Stalinism” by stating that anti-Stalinism is the gateway to anti-communism and to the ideological and political disarmament of the proletariat struggling for a better world. All of this is proved not only by the facts which followed the fall of the USSR, but also by the most serious recent historiography, which has largely refuted the “black legend” of an autocratic Stalin and bloodthirsty dictator who would had degenerate the USSR by murdering millions of communists. The problems of the international communist movement began precisely from the 20th Congress of the Soviet Union Communist Party and the shady maneuvers of Chrushev, who, by making the enemy's propaganda his own, led to decisive long-term setbacks in most socialist countries and in the so-called “Western Marxism.”

2) Regarding both the peoples who have succeeded in freeing themselves from the capitalist yoke and those still struggling against the respectiv e bourgeoisies, the fundamental assumption is that, regardless of the followed organizational model consequent to the particularities of local context, a stringent historical, philosophical and more generically political formation of its militants is fundamental. A formation that must start from Marxism-Leninism but without stopping at it, rediscovering the non-dogmatic and anti-positivist methodology of dialectical materialism in the light of the global historical experiences of the last century. In the context of the struggle against imperialism, the base from which communists must start is a party of well-trained ideologically cadres, which has the ambition and ability to open up as quickly as possible to a mass party, devoting themselves at the same time to building broader anti-imperialist fronts. The difficulty of the operation is obvious, and on this stumbling block the Soviet Union Communist Party stumbled, hit by the severe crisis of the 1930s, with the well-known infighting that brought an important although minority part of the Soviet leadership group to objectively counterrevolutionary positions, and especially in the 1980s with the gradual abandonment of Marxist categories that took place in the Gorbacev years. In Italy, too, the transition from a cadre party to a mass party, which took place in deference of a questionable interpretation of Gramsci's “war of positions,” was accompanied by a gradual ideological and political decline, with the introduction of an essentially social-democratic approach in the 1970s and finally a liberal one in the late 1980s. It is therefore necessary to systematically equip itself for a stringent training of its cadres, capable of developing the political consciousness of each individual militant and grassroots member, as well as bringing the perspective and vision of communists primarily to those sectors that have matured an awareness of imperialist oppression but have not yet arrived at the paradigm of scientific socialism.

3) In the original intentions of the Bolshevik leadership group, the October Revolution should have been the first of a series of revolutions that would simultaneously destroy capitalism across the globe, quickly enabling the construction of communism. That is why from the outset the view of building a socialist system was inextricably linked to the organization of a Communist International, which had the task of coordinating the revolutionary forces throughout the world.

If in the West, i.e., in the heartland of the imperialist powers, this meant working for socialist revolution, in the rest of the world, reduced to a colonial condition, this has translated since the Second Comintern Congress (1920) into working first and foremost for the defeat of imperialism, giving rise to the conquest of national and popular sovereignty. A distinction must therefore be made between socialist revolution and anti-imperialist revolution, although the former, correctly understood and applied, automatically includes the latter. Anti-imperialism per se does not automatically lead to socialism, but it can lead a people to regain sovereignty by offering a wider field of possibilities and freedoms to the working classes, in the context of a “new democracy.” Such an outcome, while still constituting an objective advance in that it weakens the main enemy, may in the long run reverse itself in its results. Rejecting all determinism, we must point out that by leaving political power in the hands of local elites, whether bourgeois or feudal in nature, the achievements made remain very precarious and always reversible. Since World War II, imperialism has compacted around U.S. hegemony into a more cohesive bloc to face the Bolshevik threat. An anti-communist anti-imperialism results in a capitalist country that in its economic development leads to the strengthening of a local bourgeoisie, and thus potentially, but not inevitably, to the rise of a new imperialist country, to which two possibilities open: either the co-option of the local elites of the country emancipated only politically, but not economically, which leads it back to a neo-colonial condition of “ally” and minor partner of international reaction, and thus to a condition of limited sovereignty and abandonment of any struggle against imperialist globalization - note that this was a widespread outcome in the latter 20th century. Or the maintenance of the struggle against the old hegemonic imperialism, while not initiating new social relations of production and life - and this is what has happened more or less silently in recent decades in a variety of countries around the world, which have gathered around the BRICS. In Stalin's time, and generally throughout the existence of the USSR, proletarian internationalism was concretized not only by direct support for communist parties around the world, but also by supporting objectively anti-imperialist national struggles, even when these were supported by “Afghan emirs” and aristocratic-bourgeois sectors. This support, and the consequent building in 1930s Europe of popular fronts allied with social democracy and progressive liberals, was, however, always subordinated to the primary condition of ensuring the survival and strengthening of the main “red base” of the time: that USSR pivot of the international communist and anti-imperialist movement. In short, anti-imperialism devoid of a communist leadership, both internationally and locally, easily risks degenerating into bourgeois geopolitics and praxis. Instead, anti-imperialism supported by a communist leadership leads to an effective and long-term weakening of imperialism, fostering the accumulation of forces that are not always subjectively, but objectively revolutionary with respect to the existing order. This happened in the time of Stalin, who was able to devise different tactics depending on the context, in deference to the Leninist principles of concrete situation analysis and to the political art of compromise, legitimized theoretically and practically by Lenin with great skill.

The result of this thirty-year strategy was that upon his death the balance of power between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had significantly changed with a growth in weight, although still insufficient, of the latter, which gained political power and started socialist paths in Eastern Europe, China and Korea, as well as gaining strength in many other parts of the world, including Italy, where it was still in opposition.

Today the struggle for multipolarism is an objectively anti-imperialist struggle and it is clear to all how the Resistance Front, which also includes capitalist countries that defend their national sovereignty, is supported thanks to the action and political and economic weight of the People's Republic of China, that is, a country led by a Communist Party which, despite not having yet built a fully socialist model, is working in that direction, thinking from a long-term perspective and starting from a material base that is far more developed than the USSR – Suffice it to say that China now produces about 60 percent of the globe's industrial and manufacturing goods, and has for years surpassed the U.S. in GDP supremacy.

With its policy of peaceful and equal economic cooperation, China allows all neo-colonial countries to escape the impositions of imperialism, which come in the form of diktats from multinational corporations or bodies such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. China's is in fact a modern and intelligent version of proletarian internationalism that does much more harm to the Western bourgeoisie by offering it no justification to justify any armed interventions against what in the 1900s was called the “communist conspiracy”.

A common task for communists around the world is therefore to support this axis of anti-imperialist Resistance, first of all defending China and the socialist countries that survived the period of the "second restoration" from Western attacks and maneuvers, but also actively supporting its objective allies that today are in front row in the ongoing third world war: Russia, the Palestinian people and their various organizations, the Venezuelan government, and any other country that places itself on a basis objectively contrary to US and Western hegemony and actively collaborates with the BRICS.

4) Faced with the threat of a direct assault leading to their own disappearance as an organized class, the bourgeoisies have reacted against the Soviet regime by using war and repression, actively legitimizing and supporting military invasions, internal destabilizations, and finally the transition from liberal to fascist regimes. The latter maneuver, however, has opened the field to contradictions within the ruling classes themselves, which since the 19th century have learned to follow social-imperialist policies by which to co-opt into their social blocs the so-called “middle classes,” i.e., that working-class aristocracy that constitutes the more affluent and middle-educated sector of the proletariat.

This sector, often tending toward idealism, does not readily accept the loss of freedoms and civil rights. This contradiction constantly recurs in the presence of socialist models capable of challenging capitalist hegemony. The superiority of the socialist model, variously understood, is evident from the fact that both in models based on the total socialization of the economy (Soviet case) and in those attributable to so-called “market socialism” (Chinese case after the 1978 breakthrough), the combination of planning and the will of the political vanguard of the proletariat, has enabled the productive forces to develop more than in the capitalist West, incisively improving the welfare of the popular masses with a model that is sustainable and non-predatory towards other countries.

The great difference between any capitalist system and any socialist system lies precisely in this relative sustainability and internal self-sufficiency of socialist countries, which is fully realized by developing peaceful international cooperation. The growing affirmation of socialist systems takes land and profit possibilities away from the bourgeoisie, which for a variety of reasons is led to support policies that lead to imperialism, and thus to the establishment of monopolies, the primacy of speculative finance, war and the enslavement of other peoples as well as to the relative impoverishment of its own national proletariat, whose condition in the weak links of the imperialist chain may also worsen in absolute terms (the Italian case of the last 40 years), as well as the condition of the small and middle bourgeois classes.

Especially the latter consequence opens up the possibility of building broader social alliances with the proposal to build a “new democracy.” However, this shift is possible only by building minimal programs that risk alienating the sympathies and consensus of one's militant base and the more radical proletariat. The problem can be solved only by maintaining the organizational and political unity of the working class and by working on educating and informing it.

5) Stalin and the Bolshevik leadership group were able to lead the USSR to victory in World War II also by playing on the other contradiction inherent in the capitalist system: the bourgeoisie knows well that it cannot rule with a stick alone, and has for centuries made the ideological banner of liberalism its own, firstly placing the issue of civil rights, and secondly forcibly accepting a certain amount of social rights in the form of a more or less developed welfare state, with the aim of nipping in the bud a mass spread of overly radical and contesting claims to the capitalist order.

However, when imperialism goes into crisis and the mechanism of capital's reproductive cycle is jammed, the bourgeoisie responds to the fall in its profit rates by cutting the proletariat's share of direct and “social” wages, thus inevitably reducing some of the latter's “freedoms.”

The crisis sooner or later leads to the advent of authoritarian forms of social control, which culminate in the transition from a “soft” totalitarianism such as the “liberal” one to an openly “despotic” and illiberal one such as fascism, which in general terms is configured as the violent dictatorship of big capital that is characterized by the suppression of civil rights and the attempt to destroy from the foundation all forms of political opposition, whether organized or merely theoretical.

All historical forms of fascism have been configured in domestic politics as repressive of the labor movement and in foreign politics as enemies to the USSR and the international communist movement. If, however, in the period of World War II a communist movement in a colonial country could find itself having to choose between the anti-fascist struggle and the anti-imperialist struggle (think of the case of communists acting in the colonial territories of the British imperialists, “allies” in the fight against Nazi-fascism from 1941 to '45) the situation is less equivocal today. Forms of fascism, more or less varied, have manifested themselves in the last century not only in Europe, but in much of the world subjected to Western imperialism, always configuring themselves since World War II as closely allied and subordinate to U.S. directions.

Communists today, especially in the West, have the task of exploiting the widespread anti-fascist sentiments by strongly welding them to the anti-imperialist struggle, denouncing the current capitalist regimes as modern forms of totalitarianism capable of rapidly evolving into increasingly repressive and illiberal systems, in the face of a growing popular struggle movement. Communists must act in the conflicts that arise in this phase of crisis of bourgeois systems, finding a further argument to expand their social block.

Only from the interweaving of these and other fundamental struggles (primarily those of the workers) can communist parties rapidly grow in numbers, acquiring the status of a mass party that at that point will have to have the integrity to maintain always and clearly the fundamental political goal: the seizure of political power and the initiation of a revolutionary phase for a new social and political order. Predetermining the outcome the latter would be absurd and utopian.

What is certain is that the final goal must be the achievement of a socialist society in which the bourgeoisie as an organized class disappears; however nothing prevents this from coming after a long a period of “new democracy,” that is, a form of popular democracy, in which - on the Chinese model - political and macro-economic control prevails, leaving more or less room for action to a middle-petty bourgeoisie participating in an anti-fascist and anti-imperialist struggle; a middle-petty bourgeoisie capable - in the Italian case - of identifying our country's exit from the imperialist structures of NATO and the European Union as the essential point of the struggle.

Once this inescapable task has been accomplished, the concrete conditions will indicate the stages and times that will lead to the establishment of socialism.
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