Crisis and unemployment are constant elements in the history of crises. Crises are expressions of the contradictions of the bourgeois society (and because of) the immense development of the productive forces. The pandemic sweeping the planet has not disrupted its urban and productive development. It affects the whole of society, we think especially of small businesses. Workers of the tourism sector (which represents 10% of GDP), and precarious workers (which are precariously) who have lost their jobs, after all, are the heavy contingent of the bourgeoisie and the small employers, it hits the precarious workers worst.

Unemployment is increasing in the world, it will increase further, because capital no longer succeeds in exporting surplus-value, and that affects the market, and neither can it do so more, less, or even speculate, in which the sum of the profits and losses cancel each other out. The crisis is not the result of “incompetent” bosses or “corrupt” politicians, as some opposition parties say, but they are helpless if the bosses themselves have always worked for the profit of the bourgeoisie and can also be productive for capital. The bourgeoisie sacrifices the economy, the national economy, to defend its markets and its production. There is no longer a question of making money, but of capital preservation and keeping profits. If the bosses arbitrarily do not earn money, the bosses and their employees will be unemployed. This is the result of the crisis.

The defense of proletarian interests: The prices of goods and services, in conditions and during crises, is a problem of workers and union organization development and asserts itself through struggle. It is also a question of that the struggle of the capital and the workers, of the program of demands and tactics which must constantly seek to unify workers across all sectors, all professional categories, territories, of the country.

The struggle also depends on the alignment of forces (fixed and mobile) of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The trade union movement has practical, logical, material, and intellectual needs. The workers and the unions have the duty and the right to organize and to mobilize and to act in the collective interests of all workers. To achieve this, it is necessary to understand the conditions of the workers and their struggles. To achieve this, it is necessary to understand the conditions of the workers and their struggles.
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A Cure for Capitalism
The Covid-19 Vaccines and the Economic Crisis

It was reported in late January that 2019-2020 has finished in the United States $1.3 billion. In the list of GDPs of the United States, the company's activity in the manufacturing sector is 13th place, close to Spain, China, South Korea, and Canada. Yes, the stock market is just a big lottery for the rich, a lottery of cards that the spark of the crisis of capitalism will reduce even more because capital is more and more.
Lenin, the Organic Centralist
New Translation from Our Party

We are pleased to announce a new edition of Lenin, the Organic Centralist: Organizational Principles of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers’ Party (1901). This is a complete agreement with the real traditions of Bolshevism. The brief history of the Bolshevik party from its foundation until World War I. The entire book is now available on our digital form.

The Formation of the Bolshevik Party

The International Communist Party is not only the heir of the historical traditions of the Russian Social Democratic Workers’ Party (RSDLP). A brief historical perspective allows us to define the characteristics of the bolsheviks, political actors, movements and ideologies that circulated in Russia in the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Lenin gives us a description of the origins of the party in Russia during the year 1895. What Is to Be Done? In the preface to the Twelfth Year collection (1907).

It was in the 1880s that Marxists and socialists who adhered to the peasantry movement developed in Russia. The Russian Labour Group was established abroad around Marxian theory and with the participation of the Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP). This led to the formation of the proletariat in the doctrines of the utopian socialists.

What Is to Be Done? Lenin claims that that group possessed not only an ideology, but also had developed a tactical plan for the perspective of the Russian revolution and a revolutionary path for the proletariat in it.

In the period 1880-1889, the Marxists’ struggle was directed against all political parties, and with the peasants and the intelligentsia, in the southern part of the country in the Russian and early 20th Century; its aim was to achieve, through the propaganda and proselytism carried out by intellectuals and with terrorist direct action, an improvement of the living conditions of the working people, in particular of the peasants and serfs, and the development of rural socialism based on the popular movement in the countryside. The Marxists were unorganized, but also a whole series of actors for whom the criticism of populism meant the need for a passage to bourgeois democracy. This was the era of “legal Marxism.”

The struggle was therefore waged on two fronts: against peasantry as bourgeois Marxists, and the first workers’ movement. In this struggle, mainly Lenin and Plekhanov. The year 1890, the first congress held in Russia, at the meeting of the three socialist groups of movement, coincides with this year. The RSDLP split in two. In this era, Russian Marxists were reduced to a group of three. Lenin was left in Western Europe in What Is To Be Done? is the outline of this group of intellectuals had already worked out everything; they did not wait for the mass uprising.

The first notable workers’ unions and other leftist groups of intellectuals threw themselves into the struggle, not only to resolve their specific or immediate tasks, but its entire perspective up to socialism.

The effects of this and subsequent movements were as the established ties to the working-class mass; an idea that was clearly from legal Marxism; and the Workers’ Party was formed (1898).

Lenin states in all his works, including What Is to Be Done? that the Russian proletariat was never led by the political parties and the party organisation was inadequate to guide the movement of the masses. The most crucial question is posed in What Is to Be Done? by the revolutionaries, the party must exist for the purpose of leading the workers’ movement. It is the most exasperating aspect of the workers’ movement that the Bolsheviki movement about deviation manifested itself.

This is a characteristic trait that is not noted in Lenin to believe that the party is a product of the masses; in which case difficulties regarding the formation of a revolutionary party in Russia in the context of situation of Russia compared to other industrialised countries, or on the way to industrialisation.

The workers were very few in number. The Moscow, St. Petersburg, and other industrial districts were small. But there was a large countryside with small and medium-sized farmers (in Russia, up to the 1890’s wage laborers or former serfs, but in the second half of the century, at the turn of the century, the contradictions between the peasantry and the proletariat were fundamentally almost non-existent. The Russian socialist proletariat was revolutionary.

In a sense, there had to speak to a predominantly illiterate and suspicious audience.

This was a situation, however, that could reveal positive aspects, indeed, not even the opportunists of the Russian proletariat had penetrated that much into the masses. The mass of the peasants largely accentuated on the wealth of the potential revolutionaries, or had little of it; propaganda, being a means of making it revolutionary effects,效果 was not effective, and therefore at first an opportunism had taken root. But every one of the Party’s tools, although rapidly evolving even within the socialist movement, were also starting to develop the movement in western Europe. The Bolsheviks

The second characteristic that must be taken into account since the formation of the RSDLP, the Russian working class never lost contact with its party. Its size can be deduced from Lenin’s data on members:

- 1894-1895 – several hundred
- 1900 – around 13,000 members
- 1907 – 150,000-170,000
- 1913 – 33,000-50,000.

Lenin provided these figures in his What Is to Be Done? The last one is puzzling. Zasulic, who claimed that Russian social democracy was a kind of intellectual activity, superficial and for fun. It is natural that this situation varied over time, and above all in the role it played when dealing with organisational problems. It was Lenin himself who in What Is To Be Done? and the preface to the aforementioned Ten Years collection (1896) writes:

Pennsylvania Nurses Strike

On November 6, 800+ nurses at St. Mary Medical Center in Mt. Pleasant and 26 nurses at Mercy Fitzgerald Hospital, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, organized by the Pennsylvania Nurses and Allied Professionals (PASNP), announced (10 days in advance) their intention to strike to Trinity Health. The nurses, the majority of whom were a part of the Mercy Fitzgerald branch of the Pennsylvania Association of Staff Nurses and Allied Professionals (PASNP), had repeatedly demanded concessions by the company. Within the ten days time, the Mercy Fitzgerald branch had not only failed to respond to their demands, but also yielded their demands, and therefore the nurse’s strike is to begin.

This, however, did not happen at the St. Mary Medical Center; there were no indications from the St. Mary Medical Center that they would not respond to the nurses’ demands. But the Mercy Fitzgerald nurses were not the only ones who were concerned; the nurses in a large number of hospitals were concerned.

Ever since Trinity Health took control of the hospitals, the Mercy Fitzgerald nurses and the St. Mary Medical Center nurses have repeatedly experienced understaffing and staffing issues. The nurses have repeatedly brought to company’s attention the need to increase staffing, to which the company’s management have repeatedly responded with cutting the announced staffing levels, and informing the nurses that they would be responsible for bringing in their own staff.

The nurses approved a new contract on December 20, which included a 3% raise in lieu of unionising, which was an increase over the previous contract the nurses had signed.
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