

# **RE-APPROACHING THE QUESTION OF COMMUNIST PARTICIPATION IN BOURGEOISIE ELECTIONS**

The issue of Communist parties participating in elections in bourgeoisie democracies is not nowadays a hot issue. For Marxist-Leninists especially, the issue seems to be quite "cleared", and like a good proportion of Marxist-Leninists who seem to be not that much different than good *christians* regarding their reading of Marxist revolutionaries (i.e, Marxism-Leninism is for them not a tool for their national and class liberation, not a tool to guide our war, but mostly a *substitution* of religion, with communism as its Eden), and here, the marxist text taking the place of the Fatwa is Lenin's "Left-Wing communism an infantile disorder".

Some Communists say: to not take part into elections is to be falling into leftist adventurism. It is not using one of the best weapons the bourgeoisie were forced to concede to the masses. It is one of our best chances to use this opportunity to make our demands loud and clear.

If they dont say this, they say mostly something along these lines, and the book of Lenin is used as a theoretical justification. But what does Vladimir Illich really writes? We cant quote the whole book, and we recommend to the reader to read it if they dont have already, but the argument of Lenin is that to think of boycotting elections in general is not correct, and that some times, elections should be boycotted (namely, he mentions the boycott of the 1905 elections, citing as a reason the fact that the proletariat was about to revolt). In another argument, answering to the german communists if parliaments are obsolete, Lenin wrote that as far as even a minority of the proletariat is still influenced by the reactionary classes, and thus is still supporting them in the parliament, it is worthy for us to take part as to try to

wrestle influence from them.

Everyone mentions these quotations, quite rightly so. Of course, 99% of people who mention these quotations, they dont mention that Lenin is writing all the time that the Communist Party *should not limit* itself at all into legal ways of struggle (for example participation in parliaments), but in fact also struggle into *illegal ways* of struggle (i.e, forming militias and preparing the *actual revolution*, which is nothing more than an *armed uprising and a civil war*), and combining these two ways of struggle to win the revolution. In short, the "political", "legal" components of the party, are used to mostly *subsidize and support the illegal* (actually revolutionary) *part*. Quite obviously, one cannot do a revolution without an *army*, and for an army you need men. For men, you need to have public and legal ways to draw them in, i.e, mass work.

Nonetheless, *nothing* of these (or if not nothing, pretty much nothing) is being mentioned by our communists.

They in short, selectively quote Lenin, and the "illegal work" part goes for a walk. Besides of that, is Lenin correct in his writings? We can say with confidence, that in principle, he is. There is virtually no reason, in principle, for the Communists to refuse to participate in parliament in general. Like anything, this participation should be based on the specific conditions of the time and place, some times it must be done, some times it must be boycotted.

This is one thing.

The second thing is the the question of practicality: how useful is this participation compared to the *resources available*. If we are to participate in the parliament, and focus extensively on legal forms of struggle, with said

struggles *weighting down* to the illegal forms of struggle, i.e, wasting more resources on legal ways of struggle against illegal ways of struggle, then in fact, such participation (or such attendance) should be opposed by anyone viewing the revolution in a serious manner. The men in head of the logistics of the organization should be exposed, and deductions on what we can spend on the elections without damaging our extra-parliamentary activities should be made.

It is precisely because the Communist Party is in the parliament to expose ideologically the bourgeoisie, and spread its word to the masses who care to participate in the parliament, that the resources going to this should not weight down of the resources going to the illegal, actual forms of struggle of a real revolutionary party. It is precisely of this reason that the Communist Party is not in the parliament to try to become the *administrator of the bourgeoisie republic*, it is this reason that participation in the election is overall *secondary* to the issue of the proletarian party, because the conscious proletariat knows that the bourgeoisie will never give peacefully their power to the proletariat. To think opposite, is to be no different than a Social-Democrat.  
But to *even act opposite*, is in practice the same thing.

The only thing that could be said against is regarding the participation of the masses in the elections. If the whole mass of the nation is participating, perhaps it would be worth it to spend more resources which would otherwise not be spent - *even in weight of the illegal forms* - to the elections.

But how true is this for the european nations for example, where day in day out, the masses who participate in the elections are about half and some times, not even that? We dont live in older times, where the masses were excited about the bourgeoisie

parliament and the elections had an average turnout of 70%, no. We live in a time where the masses are well aware that the revolution cannot be won in parliaments, we live in a time where in many nations, the masses of people have in fact *rejected* the bourgeoisie parliament.

Lets take some European states and see their turnouts in parliamentary elections for the last 20-30 years.

First, we will go with post-communist states.

Albania: 1991 - 98%, 1992 - 90%, 1996 - 89%, 1997 - 72%, 2001 - 53%, 2005 - 49%, 2009 - 50%, 2013 - 53%, 2017 - 46%, 2021 - 46%.

Armenia: 1990 - 60%, 1995 - 54%, 1999 - 51%, 2003 - 52%, 2007 - 59%, 2012 - 61%, 2017 - 60%, 2018 - 48%, 2021 - 49%.

Georgia: 1992-74%, 1995-68%, 1999-67%, 2003-60%, 2004-63%, 2008-52%, 2012-59%, 2016-51%, 2020-56%.

Azerbaijan: 1995-86%, 2000-60%, 2005-46%, 2010-45%, 2015-55%, 2020-46%.

Belarus: 1995-65%, 2000-61%, 2004-90%, 2008-76%, 2012-74%, 2016-74%, 2019-77%

Estonia: 1992-67%, 1995-69%, 1999-57%, 2003-58%, 2007-61%, 2011-63%, 2015-64%, 2019-69%

Latvia: 1993-91%, 1995-72%, 1998-71%, 2002-77%, 2006-77%, 2010-63%, 2011-59%, 2014-59%, 2018-54%

Lithuania: 1992-75%, 1996-52%, 2000-58%, 2004-46%, 2008-48%, 2012-52%, 2016-50%, 2020-47%

Moldova: 1994-79%, 1998-69%, 2001-67%, 2005-68%,

2009-57%, 2010-61%, 2014-55%, 49%, 2021-48%

Russia: 1993-54%, 1995-64%, 1999-61%, 2003-55%,  
2007-63%, 2011-60%, 2016-47%, 2021-51%

Ukraine: 1994-75%, 1998-70%, 2002-69%, 2006-67%,  
2007-63%, 2012-57%, 2014-51%, 2019-49%

Serbia: 1992-69%, 1997-57%, 2002-55%, 2003-38%,  
2004-50%, 2008-61%, 2012-57%, 2017-54%, 2022-58%

Montenegro: 1992-60%, 1997-67%, 2002-45%,  
2003-43%, 2008-68%, 2013-63%, 2018-63%

Czechia: 1990-96%, 1992-85%, 1995-76%, 1998-73%,  
2002-57%, 2006-64%, 2010-62%, 2013-59%, 2017-60%,  
2021-65%

Slovakia: 1990-95%, 1992-84%, 1994-75%, 1998-84%,  
2002-70%, 2006-54%, 2010-58%, 2012-59%, 2016-59%,  
2020-65%

Hungary: 1990-65%, 1994-68%, 1998-56%, 2002-70%,  
2006-67%, 2010, 64%, 2014-61%, 2018-69%, 2022-69%

Romania: 1990-86%, 1992-76%, 1996-76%, 2000-65%,  
2004-58%, 2009-54%, 2014-53%, 2019-51%,

Bulgaria: 1990-90%, 1991-83%, 1994-75%, 1997-58%,  
2001-66%, 2005-55%, 2009-60%, 2013-52%, 2014-49%,  
2017-52%, 2021-49%, 38%, 30%.

Poland: 1991-43%, 1993-52%, 1997-47%, 2001-46%,  
2005-40%, 2007-53%, 2011-48%, 2015-50%, 2019-60%

Croatia: 1992-75%, 1995-68%, 2000-70%, 2003-61%,  
2007-59%, 2011-56%, 2015-63%, 2006-54%, 2020-46%

Bosnia: 1996-79%, 1998-68%, 2000-64%, 2002-55%,  
2006-53%, 2010-56%, 2014-54%, 2018-53%

Kosovo: 1992-89%, 2001-64%, 2004-49%, 2007-40%,  
2010-44%, 2014-42%, 2017-41%, 2019-44%, 2021-48%

Macedonia: 1990-76%, 1994-70%, 1998-72%, 2002-73%,  
2006-55%, 2008-57%, 2011-63%, 2014-62%, 2019-41%

Slovenia: 1990-83%, 1992-85%, 1996-73%, 2000-73%,  
2004-60%, 2008-63%, 2011-65%, 2014-50%, 2018-52%,  
2022-70%

Now lets look the bourgeoisie states that never had  
communism:

Denmark: 1990-84%, 1994-83%, 1998-85%, 2001-87%,  
2005-84%, 2009-86%, 2011-87%, 2015-85%, 2019-84%

Norway: 1993-75%, 1997-78%, 2001-75%, 2005-75%,  
2009-76%, 2013-78%, 2017-78%, 2021-77%

Finland: 1991-68%, 1995-68%, 1999-65%, 2003-66%,  
2007-65%, 2011-70%, 2015-70%, 2019-72%

Sweden: 1991-86%, 1994-86%, 1998-81%, 2002-80%,  
2006-81%, 2010-84%, 2014-85%, 2018-87%

Iceland: 1991-87%, 1995-87%, 1999-84%, 2003-87%,  
2007-83%, 2009-85%, 2013-81%, 2016-79%, 2017-81%,  
2021-80%

Germany: 1994-79%, 1998-82%, 2002-79%, 2005-77%,  
2009-70%, 2013-71%, 2017-76%, 2021-76%

France: 1993-68%, 1997-68%, 2002-64%, 2007-60%,  
2012-57%, 2017-48%

Italy: 1992-87%, 1994-86%, 1996-82%, 2001-81%,  
2006-83%, 2008-80%, 2013-75%, 2018-72%

Spain: 1993-76%, 1996-77%, 2000-68%, 2004-75%,  
2008-73%, 2011-68%, 2015-69%, 2016-66%, 2019-71%,  
66%

Portugal: 1991-67%, 1995-66%, 1999-61%, 2002-61%,  
2005-64%, 2009-59%, 2011-58%, 2015-55%, 2019-48%,  
2022-51%

UK: 1992-77%, 1997-71%, 2001-59%, 2005-61%,  
2010-65%, 2015-66%, 2017-68%, 2019-67%

Austria: 1994-80%, 1995-86%, 1999-80%, 2002-84%,  
2006-78%, 2008-78%, 2013-74%, 2017-80%, 2019-75%

Belgium: 1995-91%, 1999-90%, 2003-91%, 2007-91%,  
2010-89%, 2014-89%, 2019-90%

Netherlands: 1994-78%, 1998-73%, 2002-79%,  
2003-80%, 2006-80%, 2010-75%, 2012-74%, 2017-81%,  
2021-78%

Ireland: 1992-68%, 1997-65%, 2002-62%, 2007-67%,  
2011-69%, 2016-65%, 2020-62%

We can see something very clear here regarding the post-communist nations; the less a labour aristocracy a nation has, (i.e, the less it is benefiting from imperialism, and the more it is exploited from it), the more the rejection of the bourgeoisie parliament is obvious and clear as day. The poorest countries (that also produce more compared to their size), have the lowest turnouts. The same is the case with the other capitalist countries that did not have communism.

Besides of this, in most of these states, *no one even cares* to go vote for the communist parties. Simply put, the ones who vote are mostly the ones who are bribed or inter-connected with the traditional party bureaucracies (in post-communist nations of europe, besides Russia and Belarus, it is common knowledge that plenty of votes are in fact, won in this way by the X and Y party of power). What does this mean for the party which wishes to emancipate the proletariat? What is the reason to spend even 10% of our resources for elections that for 3 decades almost no one has even bothered to vote for us, or even worse, elections that in general, for the last decade, dont even manage to gather half of the population to participate?

Do the leaders of the parties think that they can do everything? They will be surprised to find out that the issue of resources is in fact, simple mathematics: if a party has 10 members, and the money they have is 100 euros, and the maximum hours these members can spend for party activity (provided that Allah pays everyone so no one needs to work) is  $16 \times 10 = 160$  hours per day, then any hour and cent (the resources) spent for parliamentary work, is in fact, taken away from non-parliamentary work.

The actual situation, for anyone who has ever worked in a communist party, is that neither the money, neither the members are more than what they were some decades ago, in most cases. And the more poorer the people become, and the more things can simply leak to the internet, the more the working class wont even bother to buy the usual accessories that communist parties sell in an overpriced manner to fund the party, or the overpriced collected works of Lenin. They can find the same book in 1/5 the price they sell it in every second hand bookstore anywhere. The proletariat will also not trust the Communist party, which overprices its products, just to

take part in parliaments that it already fails to do much in; they will soon come to consider them a bunch of fraudsters.

What we wish to say, is that the issue of money and time is not trivial as many communists wishfully think: it is in fact, number one in the priorities we need to have. We can have the best theories, but if we cant do management of our resources, these best theories remain in the shelves.

And since our communist parties have limited resources, we need to focus on how to replenish them and *enlarge* them. And since we dont get enlarged from parliamentary elections, as the latest decades have proved, we better start weighting far more on non-parliamentary ways to recruit, enforce, and militarize. In Imperialist nations, plenty of things and tricks could be used to gather money, and the harder thing is to gather people. What must be done here is to use these money as efficiently as possible, and try to recruit the "anomalies" who are wiling to potentially sacrifice themselves for the cause (while they could live materially comfortable), so the basis of the party for when the inevitable proletarianization comes is created and further enlarged. In the imperialized nations, what we miss is money, but the potential recruits here are far more. Here, the organization, after it creates a solid basis, they need to find a backer, even by deceite, or create themselves their funding generators. In all the above, any discussion about putting any serious weight into parliaments is in fact, doing nothing more than wasting time, and money.

Our participation on the parliament should be done when we have the ability to sacrifice resources on this, without weighting down on our actual activity, and it is quite true, that in most nations, we dont even have any considerable resources to begin with. In other countries,

the party has resources, and uses the majority of them on parliament and on legal ways of struggle. Is this correct or not? We leave it to the reader to judge.

\*\*\*

The end point is, that the parliament should not be our top priority, but in fact, one of the lesser significant tools we have (if not in general, for the specific time and space we are right now). To take Lenin's words and try to make them a justification for doing exactly the opposite of what we said above, is to essentially both a religious zealot, but also a wrong one at that, since you would be a religious zealot to a scripture which commands otherwise.

F. U. Kuqe 29-5-2022



If a MAC line is expressed, then it will be clarified. If not, the reader should consider the work expressing the views of the writer