16

1 November 2026

Political Courier

Internationalist Workers' Organisation

IW
تشکیلات کارگران انترناسیونالیست

Against War and Bargains between Powers; Class Struggle and the Reconstruction of Communist Politics



Contents

From Schools to Ports	2
War against Life; Negotiations over Power	4
Democracy on the Ruins	6
Manifesto of the Internationalist Workers' Organisation	8
Towards the Reconstruction of Proletarian Internationalism — Part Eight	10



From Schools to Ports; Europe against the Costs of Crisis and War

A wave of protests and the awakening of the working class's social power



From a secondary school in Créteil, a working-class suburb of Paris, to the streets of Marseille, Lyon, Berlin, Leipzig, Rome, Genoa, Madrid and Lisbon, widespread protests have unfolded across Europe. In France, a movement that grew through pupils', teachers' and families' protests against teacher shortages and dilapidated schools reached more than a thousand secondary schools in October. On 31 October, for the third consecutive weekend, hundreds of thousands demonstrated across France, with huge crowds also taking to the streets of Paris. School protests have merged with anger over rising living costs, social discrimination, pressure on public services and young people's uncertain future.

In Germany, young people demonstrated in more than thirty cities against cuts to social spending, rising living costs and militarism; thousands took to the streets in Leipzig. Italy's general strike on 30 October was accompanied by widespread workers' and students' protests in dozens of cities. In Genoa, thousands, including dockworkers, joined a common mobilisation. That same day, according to Reuters, workers in 113 ports across 22 countries held strikes, stoppages or rallies against arms shipments and the dangers of war. In Spain, housing protests on 3 October drew tens of thousands; in Portugal, demonstrations and sit-ins against the housing crisis took place at the end of the month. In Greece, pupils, teachers and public-sector employees participated in protests over education and livelihoods. These actions arose on different dates and under different conditions and should not be treated as a single mobilisation.

These movements neither take their orders from a common centre nor share a single starting point. Yet beyond their different demands and methods of struggle, a common discontent is evident: life has become harder for growing sections of the working class and other working people, while the younger generation sees no future ahead. The significance of this wave lies not only in the number of demonstrators, but in the way protest against deteriorating living conditions crosses the usual boundaries between school, neighbourhood, family and workplace.

In France, parents have stood alongside their children, sometimes forming human chains to protect them from police intervention. Pupils' assemblies and links between schools have spread; in October, the national pupils' coordination reported the participation of assembly delegates from 27 cities. Joint gatherings and solidarity funds emerged in some neighbourhoods. In Italy, dockworkers cooperated with students against the war economy, while local gatherings and forms of self-organisation also emerged in housing protests in Spain and Portugal.

These initiatives are more than outward forms of protest. Through them, people previously living and acting in separate settings find one another, share experiences and test their capacity for joint action. A pupil protesting against teacher shortages comes to understand, through encounters with others, that conditions at school are inseparable from their family's working and living conditions. A worker facing pressure over wages and work intensity experiences the same pressure in housing costs, education and their children's future. The working class does not live only

in factories and workplaces: neighbourhoods, families and schools are also sites of its life and social reproduction.

As the movement advances, it also transforms existing relations. Trade unions and political organisations face a situation that cannot simply be contained within predetermined programmes and timetables. Some try to turn protests into limited, controllable actions; others help organise the struggle and extend links between its forces. Yet these organisations' rank-and-file workers, young people and activists also change through struggle. Experiences of solidarity, encounters with repression, heated debates and the possibility of advancing generate collective confidence and a new understanding of social power. A living movement therefore cannot be explained by organisations' names or their earlier positions.

But what gives this dynamic its force? Why can a protest over conditions in one school become widespread social anger?

The answer lies in the material conditions of life. Capitalist crisis, eroding real wages, expensive housing and energy, weakened public services and insecure jobs have placed additional pressure on the reproduction of working-class family life. War and intensifying military competition between states have compounded this situation. Arms expenditure rises, disruptions to production and transport feed into the prices of necessities, and states seek to shift the costs of crisis onto the population through austerity and pressure on social budgets. Housing and education crises are not, in every country, direct products of the current war. But war and militarism add new dimensions to capitalism's accumulated contradictions.

A fundamental contradiction becomes visible here. A society that produces enormous wealth lacks resources for teachers, schools, housing and healthcare, yet mobilises vast resources for weapons, security apparatuses and military competition. This contradiction cannot be attributed simply to governments' mismanagement. Under capitalist relations, the needs of social life are subordinated to profitability, capital accumulation and the preservation of political and military power. Today's protests arise from the clash between these imperatives and the real needs of life.

Nevertheless, crisis does not in itself produce revolutionary organisation. A limited protest may open the way for other forces to enter, or disperse under the pressure of repression and exhaustion. The expansion of organised strikes depends on experiences of solidarity, confidence and assessments of the possibility of advancing, without making defensive strikes conditional on the expectation of victory. Even before nationwide strikes, workers are present in the movement through families, neighbourhoods and social networks.

Links between schools and neighbourhoods, joint assemblies, support for those facing repression and cooperation across borders can strengthen the capacity to sustain the struggle. Coordinated dockworkers' action shows how resistance to war can reach the material arteries of capital's production and circulation, although these actions do not yet constitute a single internationalist organisation or movement.

Sustaining these struggles means more than repeating demonstrations. The question is how to preserve and extend the relations formed in protest: relations enabling the participants themselves to decide on demands, methods of action and the struggle's future. Defending education, housing, wages and public services, opposing repression and militarism and refusing the transfer of crisis costs onto working-class families can, through struggle, become linked to a broader, shared horizon.

Europe's current protest wave is more than a generational revolt against a future without prospects. It signals the emergence of deep social discontent with an order that perpetuates its crisis and war at the expense of those who produce wealth. This movement's future is not predetermined. Within it, however, workers, their children and other working people are experimenting with new forms of solidarity and collective action. The historical significance of this process lies in the possibility of extending the struggle from defence against the consequences of crisis to challenging the relations that reproduce it.

The internationalist response is neither to wait for the movement to mature nor to impose ideological formulas upon it, but to participate actively in struggle, learn from living experiences and strengthen workers' independent organisation. Workers must not pay for capital's crisis, nor must the younger generation sacrifice its future to war and the accumulation of wealth. The struggle for life, against war and against capital's domination begins in these real settings and opens new horizons as it develops.

News sources and related documents

Reuters, 30 October 2026, report on coordinated dockworkers' action; Associated Press and RFI, 31 October 2026, coverage of protests in France and differing participation estimates; Le Monde, October reports on secondary-school protests; French national pupils' coordination, October 2026 statement.

War against Life; Negotiations over Power

The Persian Gulf and a new phase in the crisis of war



The war that began with US and Israeli military aggression against Iran, extending the devastation of Gaza and Lebanon and plunging the entire region into crisis, has now entered a dangerous new phase. Blockaded ports, reciprocal attacks on oil installations, widening fronts and disrupted shipping threaten the living conditions of millions. While governments invoke national security, strategic interests and the necessity of defence, workers face crushing inflation, falling real wages, insecure jobs and the destruction of their conditions of life. For states, war is a contest over power; for workers, it is a matter of bread, work, housing, life and death.

At the end of October, following more than twelve hours of talks in Tehran, consultations between Qatari and Iranian representatives continued in Doha. Qatar proposed a seven-day confidence-building plan, which Iran considered inadequate. Lifting the blockade of ports, reopening the Strait of Hormuz, frozen assets and the nuclear issue remain matters of dispute. Media reports have raised the possibility of China and Russia acting as guarantors of an agreement, but their participation has not been officially confirmed (Reuters, 31 October 2026).

The intensification of negotiations should not, however, be taken as a sign that the danger of war has passed. Both Israel's attacks in June 2025 and the start of the joint US and Israeli war in February 2026 occurred while negotiations were under way. Today, too, threats of fresh military operations accompany efforts to reach agreement. Diplomacy, blockade and military threats can be simultaneous instruments in a struggle to impose favourable terms. Nevertheless, an end to bombing and the lifting of the blockade can be vital to millions of lives. Yet an agreement between states, even if it stops the war, does not in itself abolish the relations of power and exploitation that underlie these wars.

Israel's election of 27 October exposed another political crisis. According to the vote-count results announced on 30 October, the pro-Netanyahu bloc won 53 seats, the main opposition 48 and Arab parties 19; none of the existing coalitions reached the 61-seat majority. Arab parties may play a decisive role in forming a government, yet sections of Netanyahu's opponents reject cooperation with them. At the time of writing, Netanyahu remains prime minister and the state's military apparatus continues to function.

The differences between Israel's political factions are real and can affect war policy. But the military apparatus, the structure of power and policies of domination over Palestinians are not confined to Netanyahu personally. Elections may change a government's composition without transforming the relations of power themselves. We examine this issue in this edition's separate article on democracy and war.

The spread of war to Yemen and Saudi Arabia has imposed further contradictions on regional relations. Intensified Houthi attacks on Saudi oil installations and military and economic targets, alongside ground fighting in Yemen, have created new threats to the security of energy production and transport. Saudi Arabia, while expanding military cooperation with Turkey and Pakistan to confront these threats, also travels to Tehran alongside representatives of those

countries to prevent the war from spreading. This apparently contradictory behaviour reflects the interests of states that participate in regional rivalries but also fear the destruction of their ports, productive infrastructure and investments. Moreover, the presence of armed forces with their own interests and decision-making makes the spread of war harder to control.

China and Russia are not outside these relations. China depends on secure energy flows and world trade; Russia, embroiled in the war in Ukraine, has its own economic and strategic interests in developments in the Persian Gulf. The possibility of their participation in guaranteeing an agreement raises a new question about the place of world powers in shaping regional security relations. But these states are neither saviours of the people nor alternatives to the world capitalist system. Each seeks to preserve and expand its own position in the competition between powers.

Behind these conflicts operates a fundamental contradiction: states resort to war to preserve or alter power relations, yet war itself destroys the conditions for capital's production, circulation and reproduction. Arms-industry profits coexist with disrupted production, rising energy costs, destroyed infrastructure and collapsing living conditions. Different capitals and states are not affected in the same way, but the main burden of devastation and crisis falls on the producers of social wealth: the same workers who are under capital's command at work and denied decision-making power over war and peace.

The working class is not only a victim of war. Europe's wave of protests against rising living costs and militarism, and coordinated action by workers in 113 ports across 22 countries on 30 October, demonstrate the capacity for cooperation against the use of ports to transport weapons and against the dangers war poses to seafarers. Actions took different forms: strikes, temporary stoppages and protest rallies accompanied demands over wages and safety. These initiatives do not yet constitute a unified movement, but they reveal the possibility of linking workers' struggle to resistance against the war machine's material supply routes (Reuters, 30 October 2026).

Opposition to US and Israeli attacks on Iran does not mean defending the Islamic Republic. Alongside the pressures of war and blockade, Iranian workers live under domestic exploitation and repression. Workers and the peoples of Palestine, Israel, Lebanon, Yemen and Saudi Arabia likewise have interests independent of their states. Proletarian internationalism neither conceals the responsibility of those who initiate aggression nor justifies domestic repression beneath the banner of national defence.

The working class's independent response lies neither in choosing between rival states nor in pinning its hopes on agreements among those in power. It lies in linking the struggle against war to the struggle against exploitation and repression, and in extending internationalist solidarity. Stopping the slaughter and devastation is an immediate necessity. But a peace that merely readjusts the balance of power between states brings no social emancipation. Emancipation requires transforming the relations that turn our common wealth into an instrument of destruction and subordinate human life to capital accumulation and interstate rivalry.

Democracy on the Ruins

The dictatorship of capital, from the workplace to the battlefield



The ruins of Gaza, the bombed cities of Lebanon and the consequences of the US and Israeli war against Iran bear witness to more than the destructive power of weapons. Behind them stand states, parliaments, legally approved budgets, arms contracts and military apparatuses. Israel, with its competitive elections, and the United States, claiming to defend freedom, help organise these wars. The issue is not merely democracy's inability to prevent war: democratic capitalist states themselves organise war, slaughter and devastation.

This contradiction cannot be reduced to the belligerence of a few politicians or the corruption of parties. Its roots lie in the nature of the state and society's class relations. Bourgeois democracy is not the opposite of class domination; it is one of its historical forms of organisation.

In bourgeois political thought, democracy and dictatorship appear as opposing poles, as though human freedom amounted to choosing between democratic and despotic government. Marxist criticism begins with a more fundamental question: which class commands production, social wealth and the organised force of the state? Who decides whether the wealth produced will serve human welfare or the manufacture of bombs, missiles and killing machines?

Parliamentary democracy and overt dictatorship, despite their real differences in political rights and freedoms, are two different forms of capital's class rule. Elections, party competition and the rule of law do not abolish that domination. The army, police and security institutions also protect relations of power and property, and can intervene more openly in times of crisis and war.

We need not even visit a battlefield to see this class dictatorship. It is enough to pass through the gates of a factory, warehouse, workshop or large service enterprise. As a citizen, the worker has the right to vote; at work, the worker is subject to capital's command. Employers and capitalist management control hiring and dismissal, the pace of production, the division of tasks, work intensity and investment decisions. Workers must sell their labour power to live, yet neither the product of their labour nor the economic power it generates is theirs to command.

In Volume I of Capital, in his examination of the factory system, Marx describes the capitalist as a private legislator who draws up factory regulations to impose autocratic rule over workers. This everyday dictatorship hides behind the apparently free contract between worker and employer. Intensified work, insecure employment, physical and mental exhaustion and the appropriation of the product of surplus labour are the reality of capitalist exploitation. Rights and laws won through workers' long struggles can limit this autocracy, but do not abolish its foundations.

What an extraordinary democracy! The producers of social wealth have no decisive say over the organisation of work or the fate of its products.

At the ballot box, worker and capitalist each have one vote. Yet this legal equality rests on class inequality. Competition between parties to administer the state does not free society from capital's rule. Electing parliamentary representatives does not in itself enable workers to control production and social life.

In The Civil War in France, Marx described the state as the "national power of capital over labour" and an

"engine of class despotism". The separation between the citizen who possesses political rights and the producer who remains subordinate to capital exposes the limits of purely political emancipation.

History shows that a transition to overt dictatorship can begin within legal mechanisms. In 1922, Mussolini became prime minister through appointment under a constitutional monarchy, backed by fascist violence; in 1933, Hitler too became chancellor through legal appointment and agreement among conservatives. Once in power, both destroyed democratic institutions and workers' organisations. The real differences between democracy and fascism must not be denied. But electoral mechanisms alone provide no reliable barrier against authoritarianism.

The growth of the far right and racism in the United States and Europe is also part of struggles within the electoral system. Presenting migrants and minorities as threats reinforces national and ethnic hierarchies, divides workers and prepares the ground for harsher exploitation and the justification of wartime violence.

Gaza is a devastating example of these relations. Neighbourhoods, hospitals, schools and the infrastructure of life have been destroyed before the eyes of a world whose powerful states constantly invoke human rights and democratic values. While claiming electoral legitimacy and the requirements of security, the Israeli state exercises military power over the fate of millions of Palestinians who have no part in determining its composition. Even the ceasefire has not ended killing, blockade or the widespread denial of normal conditions of life.

The same contradiction is evident in Lebanon and in the US and Israeli war against Iran. The bombing of cities, destruction of infrastructure, displacement of people and disruption of the region's economic life result from decisions taken by apparatuses acting in the name of national security and strategic interests. The people of Iran, already facing exploitation and repression under the Islamic Republic, must also bear the consequences of war and its economic pressures. Their emancipation lies neither in the continued domination of their own government nor in bombing and military intervention by foreign powers.

These wars are organised through capitalist state mechanisms: governments decide, parliaments allocate resources, arms industries produce and armies carry out operations. In such circumstances, electoral competition itself largely becomes a contest over the more effective management of the war machine.

In the United States, changes of administration have not dismantled the military and security apparatus. Congress authorised the use of military force against Iraq in 2002, and the invasion began in 2003. Arms support for Israel has likewise outlasted changes of administration: according to SIPRI data, the United States supplied 68 per cent of Israel's imports of major arms in 2021–2025.

War conceals class antagonisms beneath the banner of "national unity". Workers, subordinate to capital at work, are called upon to identify their interests with the national state and bear the costs of war. While they struggle for wages, housing and public services, enormous resources go into armaments. The producers of wealth both sustain and fall victim to the war machine of an order that commands their labour.

Marxist criticism of bourgeois democracy therefore cannot stop at defending democracy against dictatorship. Freedom of expression, organisation and strike action, and political rights, are real achievements of workers' historical struggles. Yet human emancipation is not confined to these rights. Human freedom is not a simple, gradual extension of bourgeois democracy: it requires the emancipation of labour from capital's domination and the producers' acquisition of the power to administer the economy and society.

The Paris Commune and workers' councils demonstrated the historical possibility of another form of social power: the producers' own organisation, with elected, accountable and recallable delegates. The issue is more than another election. It is to reduce the separation between those who govern and those who are governed, and reclaim social power from institutions separated from society.

From the workplace to the battlefield, the fundamental contradiction persists: those who produce and reproduce life have no control over its fate. The devastation of Gaza, Lebanon and Iran shows that political freedoms under capitalism coexist with capital's domination and the destructive power of militarised states.

Human emancipation lies not merely in choosing rulers, but in transforming the relations that divide society into rulers and ruled: the producers' own power to consciously administer production, politics and social life.

Manifesto of the Internationalist Workers' Organisation

From the historical critique of capitalism to the reconstruction of proletarian internationalism



The publication of the Manifesto of the Internationalist Workers' Organisation in October 2026 marks a new stage in the political and theoretical formulation of a current with more than four decades of struggle, organisation and research within the workers' movement. This document does not announce a new organisation. It offers a critical assessment of a historical trajectory and sets out the foundations for reconstructing proletarian internationalism under present conditions.

The Manifesto comprises eight sections and 58 theses and begins with a fundamental question: why does a society that has attained the highest historical level of productive capacity, knowledge and means to meet human needs simultaneously face spreading war, insecurity, exploitation and the destruction of nature? Its answer must be sought in the contradiction between the social character of production and capital's domination over the product of collective labour. From this starting point, the text examines the emergence of the working class, the formation of communism, the defeats of world revolution, the historical crisis of capital and, finally, the conditions for reconstructing internationalist politics.

The Manifesto's first central theme is to restore communism to the real history of the workers' movement. Its first two sections examine capitalism as a historical relationship based on wage labour and capital accumulation. Communism, too, arose from social struggles, workers' associations and revolutionary organisations before Marx. Marx and Engels did not invent this movement. Through their critique of philosophy and political economy and participation in real struggle, they developed its knowledge into the science of class struggle and advanced its political programme. This understanding underpins the critique of the theory that socialist consciousness is brought to the class from outside.

Section Three re-examines communism's historical revolutions and defeats on a world scale. The collapse of the Second International in the face of the First World War, the October Revolution, the defeat of the German Revolution and the isolation of the Russian Revolution are treated as interconnected moments of a historical process. Criticising Eurocentrism, the Manifesto does not confine the history of world revolution to Russia and the industrial countries of Western Europe. It considers Asia's revolutionary movements, including Iranian communism and Avetis Sultan-Zade's theoretical struggles within the Communist International, part of the worldwide development of communist knowledge and strategy.

The second central theme is the theory of the historical crisis of capital's overall reproduction. Section Four moves from reconstruction after the Second World War and the crisis of the 1970s to contemporary capitalism. Crisis cannot be reduced to recession, declining profitability or financial turmoil: production, credit, the state, the world order and the conditions for reproducing labour power are in crisis as an interconnected whole. To sustain accumulation, capital continually restructures these relations. Yet the

mechanisms for containing crisis themselves become channels for its transmission and reproduction. War, militarism and state intervention belong within this same totality.

Section Five extends this analysis to relations of work and life. Among its subjects are the transition from Fordism to lean production, the dispersal of production units alongside concentrated control, the digitalisation of work, migration and internal divisions within the labour force. The Manifesto also examines reproductive labour, the domination of women, structural racism and the destruction of nature in relation to capital's reproduction. Capitalist crisis thus manifests itself not merely in factories or financial markets: living conditions, the family, the environment and social institutions are also its arenas.

The third central theme is the historical critique of existing communism and the reconstruction of the relationship between science, movement and political organisation. Section Six addresses Social Democracy, Stalinism, Maoism, Trotskyism, currents of the communist left and academic Marxism, without reducing these different traditions to a single fate and function. The common problem examined is the various forms of separation of theory, programme and organisation from the working class's independent practice: from the integration of workers' organisations into the administration of capital and the transformation of party into state, to ideological sectarianism and the rejection of political organisation's necessity in the name of spontaneity.

Section Seven formulates the Manifesto's theoretical response. The working class is not only the producer of social wealth, but also an active force in producing knowledge of capitalist relations. Class consciousness develops through struggle, collective experience, research, criticism and organisation. Nevertheless, immediate experience does not replace scientific knowledge, nor can science retain its revolutionary role independently of the class's historical movement. In this conception, communist political organisation owns neither the class's programme nor its consciousness. It is part of the process of concentrating experience, developing strategy and extending workers' capacity for conscious action.

Finally, Section Eight discusses communism as a real movement to negate capitalist relations. Emancipation from wage slavery is not identical with state ownership, national industrialisation or party rule. Its content is the transformation of production relations and the extension of producers' conscious power over work and social life. Since capitalism is a world system, this transformation cannot be fully realised within national borders. Opposition to war, nationalism and rival capitalist blocs forms part of this internationalist orientation.

The Manifesto's distinctive feature is its linking of three problems: capital's historical crisis, the rupture of the communist movement and the need to reconstruct science and political organisation within the workers' movement. This document does not claim to provide final answers to every question of party, strategy and power. Research and historical testing must develop these discussions further.

The Manifesto should be read alongside the IWO's Political Platform and the theoretical and research achievements of our current. The Platform formulates political positions and orientations; the Manifesto explains their historical foundation and internationalist horizon; theoretical research elaborates these foundations and tests them against experience and historical reality.

The Manifesto's central question is how Marxism can be restored from a specialised doctrine, state ideology or group identity to a living part of the working class's knowledge and organisation. In this understanding, reconstructing proletarian internationalism is a process of reconnecting class struggle, critical science, programme and communist organisation on a world scale.

Towards the Reconstruction of Proletarian Internationalism

Part Eight: The historical reproduction of communism; from rupture to the reconstruction of the working class's political movement



In earlier parts, we examined the historical rupture between the workers' movement, the science of class struggle, theory and political organisation. Part Seven showed that class consciousness is neither delivered to workers from outside nor generated spontaneously by everyday experience: experience, research, criticism and organisation all contribute to its development. A new question now arises: why, despite the continuity of class struggle and the survival of communist organisations and theories, has the reproduction of communism as the working class's political movement entered a historical crisis?

We must distinguish between an organisation's survival and a movement's reproduction. A party can preserve its name, programme and apparatus, and a theory can live on in books and universities, without reproducing communism's living relationship with workers' organisation. "Rupture" refers to the historical severing of that relationship; the "crisis of reproduction" asks why the class's new experiences, despite persistent struggles, have so rarely produced a lasting connection between scientific knowledge, historical memory, programme and communist politics. This distinction defines the new problem addressed here.

How was communism reproduced within the workers' movement?

Communism existed before Marx and Engels in associations of workers and artisans and in revolutionary networks. In his history of the Communist League, Engels shows how the League of the Just and circles of German emigrants developed through struggle and criticism of earlier theories. Marx and Engels joined a movement that already possessed its own organisation and political thought. Within this relationship, their critique of philosophy and political economy raised its knowledge to a scientific level (Engels, 1885).

The Communist Manifesto presents communists not as a sect separate from workers, but as a part of their movement that brings the class's general and international interests to the fore in struggle (Marx and Engels, 1848, Section II). This definition places programme and organisation within the class's historical movement, rather than above it.

The First International was another outstanding example of this relationship. In his 1866 instructions to delegates of the General Council, Marx stressed the need to connect and generalise the scattered efforts of workers in different countries. He proposed that workers themselves investigate working and living conditions and that their findings be brought together and generalised internationally (Marx, 1866). In this conception, internationalist organisation was more than a means of circulating a programme: it was a field of cooperation in struggle, knowledge production and the concentration of class experience beyond national borders.

These experiences were never free of contradictions. Yet they show that communism's continuity cannot be reduced to the survival of an organisation. Organisation and programme emerge and change within living relations between struggle, research, criticism and the transmission of experience.

When the organisation reproduces itself, but its historical relationship does not

The Second International and Social Democracy extended the organisation of millions of workers, but

also consolidated a division of labour between trade unions, parliamentary parties and a specialised apparatus for producing theory. In her analysis of the mass strikes of 1905, Luxemburg showed how economic and political struggle cross institutional boundaries in the actual movement, and how organisation itself changes through struggle (Luxemburg, 1906).

The German Social Democratic parliamentary group's support for war credits in August 1914 exposed the contradiction between organisational strength and internationalist independence. The defeat of the German Revolution, the isolation of the Russian Revolution and the Communist International's growing dependence on the Soviet state deepened this rupture. The issue was no longer simply political defeat: the conditions for transmitting experience and independently developing communist politics had themselves changed.

Nevertheless, history should not be reduced to a confrontation between degenerate organisations and an invariably authentic movement. An organisation born in struggle can, under the pressure of historical circumstances, become an institution governed by its own logic of survival. Preserving its apparatus and leadership's authority then takes precedence over revising the programme and learning from new struggles.

In the sectarian form, too, preserving a theoretical tradition or claiming ownership of the programme can become the main objective. The group explains its separation from struggles by invoking workers' "backward consciousness", and uses new experiences to confirm theory rather than test it. Here, the organisation's reproduction can accompany a weakening of the reproduction of communist politics within the movement.

The new question is therefore not which organisation survived defeat, but which relations enable experience, knowledge, programme and political organisation to reconnect across different struggles and generations.

The crisis of capital and changing historical conditions of organisation

This rupture cannot be explained solely through the history of parties. Capitalism's transformation has also changed the composition of the working class and the material conditions of its organisation. In certain periods, industrial concentration and working-class neighbourhoods provided particular conditions for associations, lasting links among militants and the transmission of experience between generations. Contemporary capitalism has transformed many of these relations through dispersed production, subcontracting, lean management, platform work, large-scale migration and increased workplace control.

In the theory of the historical crisis of capital's overall reproduction, the state, credit, war and the conditions for reproducing labour power are inseparable from the movement of capital. Crisis pressures can make organisation harder and further erode existing institutions. But the political outcome of crisis is not predetermined.

At the same time, globalised production, logistics and communication networks make dispersed workers interdependent within a single material process. This interdependence opens new possibilities for cooperation and resistance without automatically generating political unity or communist consciousness.

Reconstructing communism; rebuilding the movement's historical capacity

Reconstructing communism is not synonymous with proclaiming a party, publishing a new platform or formally uniting existing groups. Such actions acquire significance when they help develop the class's own political, theoretical and organisational capacities.

In Part Seven, we distinguished three levels of knowledge: experience and knowledge arising from struggle; political theory and strategy; and scientific knowledge of capitalist relations. Reconstruction concerns the living, revisable relationship between these levels. Experience must be recorded, compared and criticised; research must reveal underlying contradictions; theoretical conclusions must be tested

again in struggle. No single level can replace the entire process.

In their 1872 preface to the Manifesto, Marx and Engels retained its general principles while explicitly acknowledging that the experience of revolutions and the Paris Commune had rendered some practical measures of the 1848 programme obsolete. In this conception, the programme is not a truth immune to history, but a concentration of knowledge that new experience can correct (Marx and Engels, 1872).

The concept of organic centralisation gains meaning within the same horizon: the concentration of experience, memory, knowledge and the capacity for joint action, rather than an apparatus's ownership of truth or the substitution of the party for the class. Political organisation is one of the bearers of this process. Its authority derives from its actual role in the movement's development, rather than its name or theoretical lineage.

Since capital is produced and reproduced globally, understanding it and organising against it cannot stop at national borders. Internationalism is neither the mere addition of national organisations nor the export of theory from centre to periphery. It is the linking of workers' experiences, research and capacity for joint action across different countries.

The reconstruction of proletarian internationalism is not the revival of past organisations. It is the rebuilding of the world working-class movement's capacity to produce and develop its own knowledge, programme and political organisation. This process will arise neither from one group's will nor automatically from capital's crisis, but through class struggle, criticism of defeats, scientific research and communists' organised participation in the movement's development. Programmes and organisations must also be judged by their capacity to learn, correct themselves and advance this struggle.

Sources and references

Engels, F. (1885). On the History of the Communist League.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1848). Manifesto of the Communist Party, Section II.

Marx, K. (1866). Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council, International Working Men's Association.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1872). Preface to the German Edition of the Communist Manifesto.

Luxemburg, R. (1906). The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions.

German Reichstag (1914). Proceedings of 4 August 1914, debate on war credits and the Social Democratic parliamentary position.

Internationalist Workers' Organisation (2026). Political Platform and Manifesto; "Towards the Reconstruction of Proletarian Internationalism", Parts Six and Seven, Political Courier, Nos. 14 and 15; and the research series Marxism, Science and Revolution.

Political Courier — Basic Positions

1 **Capitalism is engulfed in a historical crisis; war, poverty and authoritarianism are among its consequences.**

2 **The working class is no auxiliary force for any state, faction of capital or national project.**

3 **Our response is the worldwide solidarity of the working class against war, nationalism and all capitalist blocs.**

4 **Emancipation can arise only through independent organisation, direct struggle and the collective power of workers.**

5 **We fight for socialism: for an end to exploitation, domination and wage slavery.**

6 **Reconstructing the working class's internationalist politics is the historical condition for turning worldwide protest into worldwide emancipation.**

Political Courier

Internationalist Workers' Organisation

No. 16 | 1 November 2026

Internationalistworkers.com

IWO