

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST BULLETIN

**Organ of the Fraction of the International Communist Left
(English version)**

Extracts of the French and Spanish versions of Issue#1

n° 1

May 5th 2010

To contact us :

e-mail address : **inter1925@yahoo.fr** ;

See our web site : <http://fractioncommuniste.org>

Contents

(The texts translated and available in English are in bold. The others aren't translated into English.

Warning : the translations into English we do, are made by comrades whose knowledge of this language is very relative. Thus, besides the lack of easiness for the reading, our English texts may present some mistakes and confusions which aren't political but "technical". One can refer to the French and Spanish versions.

**Call to the Proletarian Camp : The Communist Left must face up its responsibilities,
The situation and its perspectives requires it.....1**

Where the Fraction of the International Communist Left comes from ? Who are we ?.....2

INTERVENTION OF THE FRACTION

**International leaflet (Fraction of the ICL and Internationalist Communist of Montréal)
"The Working Class of Greece Shows the Way".....3**

Massacre of young people in Ciudad Juárez (Mexico) :
From militarization to State Terrorism

PROLETARIAN CAMP

Struggle for regroupment
Letters of the Internationalist Communists of Montréal.....

Correspondence with the *Sympathizers of the Communist Left* in Australia.....5

About the understanding of the present historical situation
Considerations on the present historical situation (Response to comrade GS).....

Struggle against opportunism
Correspondence with a comrade of the IWG/GIO.....9

STRUGGLE AGAINST THE NON-PROLETARIAN IDEOLOGIES

Response to the *Grupo Socialista Libertario* (Mexico).....10

TEXTS OF THE WORKERS MOVEMENT

The "Democracy" strengthens the power of the bourgeoisie and ruins the interests of the proletariat (Extracts of "Fascisme, démocratie, communisme", *Bilan* n° 13, December 1934).....

Call to the Proletarian Camp
THE COMMUNIST LEFT MUST FACE UP ITS RESPONSIBILITIES,
The situation and its perspectives requires it

Today, the historical situation is passing through a sudden acceleration with the considerable present worsening of capital's economical crisis, which is accompanied with no less considerable attacks against the international proletariat. We can see a true panic of the international bourgeoisie in front of its own inability to respond to the repayment of the State and private debt accumulation. After Island, Ireland, Dubai, Greece is now bankrupt ; Portugal, Spain, indeed even Italy and others, follow the same path. Behind these capitalist countries, emerge the series of bankruptcies of the world main imperialist powers.

The only response that the bourgeoisie unanimously is able to give is an open war declaration to the international proletariat. Already, this one pays for the expenses and it's up to it to support the exorbitant cost of the no bottom abyss of capital crisis. It will suffer the considerable fall of its living conditions in order to allow capital to survive.

The attacks were already huge against the whole world working class. But today, unbearable austerity plans are adopted the ones after the others in all countries. They are justified and claimed shamelessly by the bourgeois governments against their population : it's for saving the national capital that the workers must tighten their belt. Rarely as today, capitalism has so clearly shown its true face, its true nature and has shown the high degree of the dead-end it represents for humanity.

Today it is clear that the situation of the proletariat in Greece is the example to follow. It is so for the international proletariat, from the periphery to the central countries of capitalism. It is the example to follow today since it shows, to everyone, that it is not prepared to accept the attacks, that it refuses the barbaric and cynical logic of the bourgeoisie, of its government, of its bosses and bankers ; and for that purpose, since various weeks, it massively fights back, in all sectors, and with strength, a determination and a courage which are to be saluted.

The present situation of capitalism obviously needs that the workers fight back massively and everywhere in order to reject and make fail the plans and policies of the world bourgeoisie. But it requires too that the whole system, since it is clearly bankrupt, is explicitly questioned and that the revolutionary perspective be loudly and strongly defended and widely spread within the proletariat.

In this situation, the communist forces, even though weak today, have an enormous responsibility. Since they are the most conscious part of the proletariat and since they must be their more determined part, they have the task of doing all they can to take the "political" leadership of the workers struggles which are to come, at the local and immediate level as well as at the international and historical level. Already today, it seems to us necessary that the organizations of the Communist Left be able to intervene with one voice in an international and centralized manner by putting forward the historical stakes of the present situation. And it seems to us that it is urgent ! Considering the reality of the proletarian camp today, such an initiative should be assumed, according to us, with a decided and effective manner with at its core the Internationalist Communist Tendency. For our part, we are ready to engage to any initiative of this kind and to mobilize all our (weak) forces.

Meanwhile, we carry on diffusing our leaflet of late March 9th, *the proletariat in Greece shows the way !*, whose orientations appear to us, today, still totally adapted to the situation which is developing.

May 7th, 2010.

The Fraction of the International Communist Left.

This Call is sent to the Internationalist Communist Tendency (ex-IBRP), to the International Communist Current, to the various International Communist Party (so-called "bordiguists"), to the Internal Fraction of the ICC, to the CIM (Canada), to the ARS (Russia), to the *Sympathisers of Communist Left in Australia*, to the Instituto O. Damen, and to various isolated comrades and sympathisers of the Communist Left.

Where the Fraction of the International Communist Left comes from ?

Due to the existence, in its interior, of not settled political and organizational divergences, the Internal Fraction of the ICC that existed since 2001, has split up into 2 parts :

- the one who keeps the appellation of IFICC and who gives itself like task to undertake *"a job of "balance sheet" of the political and organizational crisis which knew the Fraction for more than a year"*, this crisis being seen as *"an expression of common and generalised crisis to groups demanding of the 'Left communist'"*;
- the other who comes under the appellation of ILCF today and it is the political heiress of the IFICC (from origins to schism) because it *"continues entirely defending the positions and fundamental political leanings of this one, especially and, beyond intervention that as communists we have to make towards our class, of :*
 - *the struggle against opportunism which, today, threats and even sometimes strongly weakens the 'Communist Left', as it is the case for the present ICC ;*
 - *the essential struggle for the regroupment -which is vital for the proletariat and its revolutionary perspective- of the 'Communist Left' forces."*

What we are today is the continuity of what we were until then; that's why we resume in our count the "Who are we?" from IFICC, that we reproduce below.

March 2010

Who are we ? (IFICC)

Since 2001, a new and dramatical crisis is shaking up, indeed destroying, the ICC, one of the main organization of the international "proletarian political milieu". It expresses :

- through a liquidating policy, led by the new "leadership", particularly (if not only), on the organizational level : refusal of any debate and quelling of the political divergences by personal denigration, lies, as well as increasing disciplinary sanctions against those who express them, up to their expulsion (a tumbrel of around ten expulsions have been decided in spring 2002. This has never happened in the ICC before and most of the excluded militants are « old » members and sometimes « founders » members who had important responsibilities). This orientation is similar, for its very essence, to the disastrous « bolshevization » suffered by the International Communist and the Communist Parties in the second half of the years 1920 ;

- through the formation of our internal fraction, in October 2001, and the struggle it leads since then, in order to counter this liquidating orientation and to intend to stop the degenerating process in which is engaged this organization. The outcome of this process can't be but to the pure and simple loss of the ICC for the working class.

Our fraction led this struggle in particular through the publication of an "internal" bulletin (11 issues up to now) directed only to the ICC militants until our expulsion of the organization. Since then, the following issues were adressed and opened up to the political groups and individuals which are faithfull to communism and proletarian internationalism and which claim the tradition of the Communist Left of the 1920's and of the 1930's, particularly of the so-called "italian" Left.

Our bulletin wants to be a tool for reflection and for impelling the debate within the proletarian political milieu in order, of course, to draw the political balance-sheet of the crisis which affects the ICC today and to draw the maximum of lessons ; but also to bring out perspectives of regroupment of the revolutionary forces for the constitution of the future party of the proletariat.

The web site we open up here is an additional tool that we put at the disposal with the same spirit and the same goals.

Our fraction is the real continuator of the ICC because it keeps faithfull to its principles and fundamental positions which are today trampled and liquidated by the "official" ICC. It will carry on defending its platform and its statutes such as they existed since its foundation until the upsurge of this last crisis, as well as its fundamental analysis.

Thus as fraction, it has no intention to found a new political organization which couldn't but increase more the dispersal of the present revolutionary forces. All the contrary, its essential goal is to participate to the bringing closer of these forces, and even to their regroupment. Beyond the struggle against the degeneration of the ICC which might, for the least, enable us to make as much as possible the political balance-sheet, it's the task we want to give to our bulletin and to this web site.

July 7th, 2002.

Intervention of the Fraction

We publish here the international leaflet we keep on distributing at the moment with the comrades of the Internationalist Communist of Montreal. This leaflet has been realized by ourselves while the conditions of the split within the Internal Fraction of the ICC were not already decided. That's why we signed it in the name of the latter. Of course, we keep on distributing it as Fraction of the International Communist Left. For their part, the comrades who remain with the name of the IFICC have not, up until now, taken any statement of this leaflet and didn't join its distribution.

April 2010.

PS. At the time we are ending this bulletin, May 6-7th 2010, the evolution of the situation of the international crisis of capitalism and the proletarian response in Greece, and while various workers struggles, even though isolated, local, censored by the medias, are developping in all countries, our leaflet is still today of full actuality and responds to the needs of the proletariat's struggle : everywhere to reject the sacrifices and to develop and unify the struggles. We invite all our readers and sympathizers to reproduce it and to distribute it the most widely possible.

The working class of Greece shows the way!

Social movements have been mushrooming, one taking up where the other leaves off, uniting, building and gaining strength. This is the situation in Greece these past few weeks – a situation the bourgeois media throughout the world tries to hide, or worse, distort. The extent of censorship in the news media reveals the international capitalist class's greatest fear: that this situation will spread, and that the main player in this brewing Greek tragedy, the working class, will set an example for workers of other countries.

The Greek working class fights back in force

The latest plan the country's government announced was a powerful offensive as taxes went up by 21%, salaries slashed (reduction of 60% by the 14th month and of 30% by the 13th), public and private pensions frozen, with massive tax hikes (on alcohol, tobacco and fuel), with increases in other taxes (housing and property). These vicious attacks have a fundamental and direct impact on the working class. Capitalism intends to force the working class to pay for its crisis.

The country's overall bankruptcy and its current attacks on the working class are in their entirety the complete responsibility of the bourgeoisie – and not just in Greece. This is the real significance of the European Union's "recommendations", with the German bourgeoisie leading the way, along with the IMF who, with its "support" of Papandreou, the Greek First Minister, will oblige the Greek bourgeoisie by making its own working class pay.

Such attacks are currently underway in Spain as well as in Portugal. Similar attacks will hit the working class of other countries in the weeks to come.

Facing these attacks, struggles, strikes, street demonstrations, massive delegations and assemblies, are erupting and spreading throughout Greece, in opposition to this scandalous bourgeois plan. In all sectors, in all categories, the working class is mobilizing in its anger and refusal to endure circumstances whose sole responsibility lies with the capitalist system.

These workers are showing the way for their class brothers throughout the world

-On a mass scale, it's through struggle that their furious rejection of the anti-worker government and its bosses' policies are expressed – and not through the sterile means offered by bourgeois democracy (elections, referendums, social dialogue, union negotiations, etc.). They inspire us to do likewise and more.

- They demonstrate because these days they no longer have any choice – their unflinching determination pushing them into direct confrontation with any and all forces blocking their just struggle – escalating clashes with the forces of capitalist order sent by the "socialist" government of Papandreou; expelling all "false-friends" from their street demonstrations – particularly union pontiffs whose organizations are party to government policy. For workers the world over, the determination of the Greek working class should be welcomed and adopted.

Though still dispersed and still expressing themselves through the trap of corporatism (with union encouragement), they are clearly attempting to spread, to join and to unite their struggle with others, mutually expressing their solidarity, realizing that their concerns and their interests are the same. This is what we've seen in the willingness shown by workers in separate

demonstrations – to converge, to coalesce and to unify their forces, which the unions knowingly organized in separate locations.

For the working class to impose a balance of forces to force the bourgeoisie to retreat, understanding the unity of its struggle is indispensable and in fact vital. Such unity is achieved through the spread of active solidarity within each movement to other sectors and corporations, by dispatching mass delegations to factories and companies in each area. There is no worse or greater source of defeat than a fragmented and dispersed social front; it is just what the capitalists order and often get, thanks to the sabotage of the unions.

The confrontations unfolding in Greece show us that, if we are to develop our fight, spread our struggles, and unite them into a massive and powerful common front, then we must take things into our own hands. We must lead, control, and organize them ourselves. General Assemblies are a means to this end, for as many workers as possible must be gathered to decide the major objectives, directions and demands of our struggle, nominating elected delegates subject to immediate recall – delegates to represent us in the strike committees. We can't let our class "war" fall into the hands of so-called "specialists"!

Capitalism's crisis can only get worse. Let there be no illusions. We can no longer buy the lies of the government and the media in the pay of the capitalist class! Today, the states of certain countries at the heart of capitalism are already on the verge of bankruptcy – Spain, Italy and especially Great Britain – with all states deeply in debt.

The entire international capitalist class intends to make the working class to pay for its crisis in all sectors, public and private, active workers, unemployed and pensioned, in every country, on all continents, from capitalism's periphery to its center. None of us will escape. We can have no illusions!

Just as our class brothers in Greece are doing, we have to reject the fate that capitalism has in store for us. We must enter en masse in struggle, organizing a large, compact and powerful battlefield to drive back the bourgeoisie.

This is how our consciousness will develop, in our realization that capitalism is a deeply bankrupted system leading humanity to yet more misery and to its ultimate destruction through generalized war. It must be smashed. The only force capable of doing this is we, the international working class.

The world's bourgeoisie wants the working class of all countries to pay for its system's crisis.

Capitalism's bankruptcy has only one outcome: a deepening misery for all of the exploited before demanding their lives be sacrificed in a world war, as we've already seen in 1914 and 1939.

Today, workers everywhere must reject the enormous sacrifices the bourgeoisie is imposing on them, so that tomorrow they will have the strength to do away with this class and its system.

March 9th, 2010

The Internal Fraction of the International Communist Current.
The Internationalist Communists of Montréal (Canada)

The Fraction of the International Communist Left
Adresse e-mail de la FGCI : inter1925@yahoo.fr
Consultez notre site : <http://fractioncommuniste.org>
Adresse e-mail des CIM : cim_icm@yahoo.com
Consultez le blog des CIM : <http://klasbatalo.blogspot.com>

CORRESPONDANCE IN THE PROLETARIAN CAMP

These last months, our small organization has lived a consequent improvement of its contacts, whether through correspondence or directly. For us, in a context of acceleration without precedent that world capitalism's crisis is living, this phenomenon is a clear sign of the renewal of interest for the revolutionary positions which is developing today within the working class as well as a sign of the surge and mobilization of new forces which aim at rejoining the Communist Left.

In this section, we made the choice of publishing 4 exchanges of correspondences significant of this phenomenon :

- the two first - with the Internationalist Communists of Montreal and with comrades from Australia who, both, make a call to the groups and isolated individuals of the Communist Left - raise particularly the fundamental question of the necessary regroupment of the communist forces today, not only from the point of view of the political principles and criteria which have to be their basis, but also from the point of view of its practical realization [the ICM's letters are not translated into English] ;

- the third (with comrade GS) raises the question of the analysis that the communists must make of the present situation. This led us to come back widely on our conception and our method of analysis and of understanding of the situations, in particular of the evolution of the relation of forces between the classes. We think it can present some interest to our readers and to the whole proletarian camp [this text is not translated into English] ;

- finally, an exchange of mails with the comrade AS from the IWG/GIO (North-American organization which is part of the Internationalist Communist Tendency -ex-IBRP) raise the crucial question of the struggle that all the organizations of the Communist Left has the responsibility to lead against the opportunism which infects today, notably the ICC.

We call all the parts of the Communist Left to think and to debate all these questions. The answers we'll give already today, will decide of the role, its nature and its importance, that will play the Communist Left in the future fights of the working class.

Letter and Call of the Sympathisers of the Communist Left in Australia

Dear comrades,

We are a group of left communist sympathisers in Sydney and Adelaide. We are writing to you to inform you of our desire to begin a series of organised discussions between sympathisers of the Communist Left across Australia. We have personally addressed this appeal to individuals from across the country - Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Canberra and Adelaide – and have already heard back from several.

Because we recognise that we are not the possessors of the full and finally discovered communist programme and because as internationalists we recognise the importance of dialogue between revolutionary workers from all parts of the globe, we are also appealing to groups which draw an organic and programmatic heritage to the communist left. We thus formally invite you to contribute to our discussions. We also welcome any material or logistical support you may have to offer us. Given our rather limited means we encourage you to pass this appeal on to any contacts or members which you may have in Australia or the region. We also welcome you to help us distribute this appeal by publishing it in your virtual or physical press.

Please find the appeal reproduced below.

With comradely greetings,
N.

Call of the *Sympathisers of the Communist Left* in Australia

Comrades!

Today humanity faces the same ultimatum posed to it since the eve of the First World War, in the words of Rosa Luxemburg and Friedrich Engels before her - Socialism or Barbarism.

The world capitalist system has seen its worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, with the working class taking the brunt of the blow, everywhere facing wage-freezes, job-cuts and worsening working conditions. The threat of global environmental catastrophe looks more possible than ever before. Bloody and brutal conflicts rage on around the globe - from Iraq to Afghanistan, Somalia to Sudan, Colombia to Mexico.

In contrast to these emanations of a moribund society we also see the germs of a new world – without exploitation or oppression, without poverty or scarcity, without wars or national borders – in the class struggle of the international working class.

The Communist Left has its origins in the Left currents of the Communist International which came into being as a proletarian response to its opportunist slidings when faced with the retreat of the international revolutionary wave in the 1920s. Whilst the Communist Left had expressions in many countries its most prominent representatives were to be found in Germany, The Netherlands, Italy and Russia. In the period of counter-revolution which opened at the end of the 1920s, it was the Communist Left which proved to be the most intransigent defenders of proletarian internationalism and the most rigorous in drawing up the balance sheet of the revolutionary wave.

Whilst sympathisers of the Communist Left do exist in Australia, at this point they do so only as individuals suffering largely from political isolation. In order to effectively intervene in the class struggle, it is necessary that revolutionaries organise themselves into a political organisation, founded on the basis of shared positions and principles.

However, at the present hour the immediate formation of

such a group is not on the agenda in Australia. What is needed at present is the coming together of internationalists for discussion conducted with the goal of initiating and maintaining contact between comrades (particularly those who are geographically isolated) and collective political clarification of the positions which define the communist programme today.

Thus, we appeal for the initiation of organised discussions between all sympathisers of the Communist Left in Australia. It is proposed that the discussions are conducted under the name: ‘Internationalist Communist Affiliate Network’.

We propose the criteria for participation is agreement with the most elementary positions of left communism today:

- Imperialist war and national movements of all stripes have nothing to offer the working class but death and destruction. The working class must oppose all bourgeois camps. By calling on them to take the side of one or another faction, the bourgeoisie divide workers and lead them to massacre their class brothers and sisters.

- Parliament and bourgeois elections are a masquerade. Capitalist ‘democracy’ does not differ at root from any form of capitalist dictatorship. Any call to participate in the parliamentary circus can only reinforce the lie that elections offer any real choice for the exploited.

- All unions are organs of the capitalist system and act in its service. The fundamental role of the unions is to police the working class and sabotage its struggles. In order to defend its immediate interests, and ultimately to make the revolution, the working class must struggle outside and against the unions.

All who may be interested in taking part are encouraged to write to InternationalistWorker@gmail.com. We also welcome any comments, questions and criticisms.

With fraternal communist greetings,

F, J, M, N, T

Our response to the Call of the comrades from Australia

Paris, April 25th 2010

The Fraction of the International Left Communist to the Sympathizers of the Communist Left in Australia, (copy to the Internationalist Communists of Montreal)

Dear comrades,

We want to respond to the letter you sent to the Internal Fraction of the ICC and to the Communist Internationalists of Montréal - we guess you mailed it to much more groups and comrades around the world. But first of all, we want to shortly present ourselves since you may not know our group and in order to leave aside any confusion.

Actually, the Internal Fraction of the ICC has separated in two groups. The "majority" of the comrades remains with the former name and the web site and we named our new group the "Fraction of the International Left Communist". We still claim the whole struggle of the Internal Fraction, its political positions and orientations, and of course its political programme. We opened a new web site : <http://fractioncommuniste.org> which takes back the whole bulletin of the Internal Fraction. And we'll publish the *International Communist Bulletin* - in French, Spanish, and we hope in English certainly in a shorter version. It's difficult to present publicly the political disagreements which ended up in the split since, according to us, they were not clearly expressed by the other comrades. Nevertheless, we can say they tended to reject the main orientations of our former Fraction towards what we call the Proletarian camp - we come back on this camp in the following. This disagreements appeared clearly when the comrades rejected the political content of the two last bulletins of the Fraction, issue 48 and 49, as well as the international leaflet about "*The proletariat in Greece shows the way*" that we are distributing with the ICM, the Montreal comrades.

Back to your letter : we want to salute the initiative you are taking and to support it as much as we can. We are ready to contribute to any discussion and debate which can initiate a process of political clarification and organizational regroupment in Australia. The political criterias you mention are clearly communist principles, what our ICC - since

we still claim its political legacy and platform - called "class positions", and whose political framework conditions political and fruitful debates and clarification. We particularly agree with, and support, the following passage : "*In order to effectively intervene in the class struggle, it is necessary that revolutionaries organise themselves into a political organisation, founded on the basis of shared positions and principles*". For us, this question is central and specifies what we call the Proletarian Camp. We won't develop now and we hope we'll have the opportunity to read you about this question and to discuss it.

Nevertheless, we want to express you our concern about the need for any communist regroupment today to situate itself at the international level. Thus, the already regroupment you form, may also aim at participating at the international regroupment process that the present international situation - you underline it in your proposal - requires urgently. For our part, we consider that the main political weakness the international proletariat suffers today is the dispersion, the isolation and the sectarianism of its political vanguards, of its "Proletarian Camp" - in the ICC we used the term "Proletarian Political Milieu".

Before presenting you some concrete means to participate to this international struggle for the political "regroupment" - **understood as a process of political discussions, confrontations and clarification of the various positions** -, let's try to express how we understand the situation of the communist forces today.

We fully agree with your political concern to refer to the Left Communist legacy as well as with the today "*groups which draw an organic and programmatic heritage to the communist left*". As you say "*we are not the possessors of the full and finally discovered communist programme and because as internationalists we recognise the importance of dialogue between revolutionary workers from all parts of the globe*". We agree to this particularly since it represents a **political method** to apply and to develop.

You correctly refer to the different Lefts coming from the International Communist, the German, Dutch, Russian and Italian ones - which were the main ones. Today, the main and effective communist groups which still have a kind of "organic" and theoretical

and political links with these "past" Lefts, are coming, directly or indirectly, from the Italian Left. We won't develop here the reason for such a continuation even though the understanding of the question of the Party by this historical current, have certainly played an important role. The political expressions of the other currents have disappeared since. This doesn't mean they don't have any political legacy, nor influence today. As you may know, we can consider that the Italian Left gave way to three different currents today : the so-called Bordiguist one whose political expression, The Internationalist Communist Party (Communist Program) exploded in the 1980's and which is represented today by various small groups all pretending to be the Party ; the today International Communist Tendency (ex-IBRP whose main political expressions are the Partito Comunista Internazionalista in Italy (whose publication is *Battaglia Comunista*) and the Communist Workers Organization whose publication is *Revolutionary Perspectives* (www.ibrp.org) ; and the International Communist Current (www.internationalism.org) we came from (see the text we join you) and that you may know.

For us, and despite the various, and sometimes deep, disagreements we have with these groups, they represent the main organizations of the Proletarian camp around which the new groups and individuals may gather and may discuss with in order to regroup and defend the present Communist Left as much as possible. Concretely, and it is for us a central political criteria, these groups defend the need for the setting up of a world Party and aims at assuming **political** leadership and struggle within the classes struggle. Unfortunately, the Bordiguist groups, for their open and claimed sectarianism are unable to tackle the task of being a real international pole of regroupment. At a different level, such is the situation for the present ICC because of its opportunist present drift (see the text we join you). Thus, and despite some political disagreements, we consider that today only the ICT can represent this pole of regroupment and that communists must refer, discuss, and regroup - in the political understanding of the term - around it.

According to us, this camp is not limited by these main organizations. Different groups and isolated individuals may be part of it. Such is the case for the Internationalist Communists of Montreal (<http://klasbatalo.blogspot.com/>) with whom we are in closed contact and collaboration. These comrades

have already proposed a Web site for the Left Communist (¹). Up to now, this proposal hasn't been positively answered by anyone but ourselves (except too the other comrades of the IFCCI who also rejected this initiative). Nevertheless, this Proposal is still there and remains at least as a perspective that, soon or later, will have to be set up. We invite you to discuss this question, to read the various responses to this Proposal, and to write your comments to the comrades in Montréal. As well, and in order to participate as much as we can to the process you are initiating, we open the pages of our bulletin to any text or contribution you may realize. Already, we will publish the Call you made with our comments in the next bulletin - which will be the first one of the "new serie".

Here are our first quick comments and suggestions to your letter. We hope for your comments, whether they are positive or critical. Forgive our English language which may be sometimes difficult to understand or "heavy" to read.

Communist Greetings.

The Fraction of the International Left Communist.

1. <http://fractioncommuniste.org/index.php?SEC=b48> in French (you can find in Spanish too if you rather read this language), you have in this issue of our bulletin the various response to this Proposal. It is also published in French on the web site of the ICM.

ABOUT THE STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM Comrade's AS Letter

We reproduce here with his permission the exchange of letters that we had with comrade AS of the IWG/GIO of North-America.

Chers camarades,

Congratulations on your new web page. I was reading the article from Bulletin Communiste 49, Le CCI dit "Adieu au marxisme".

In the US a form of Evangelical Protestant Christianity is almost on the level of an official religion, despite its lack of a structure or hierarchy it is the dominant theological force. The officer corps of the US Air Force is a fundamentalist Christian bastion as is most of the ruling class. This is despite the fact that Roman Catholics are a majority in the US. It affects all of US culture, down to its folk music. It is easy for comrades here, perhaps young comrades, to confuse this bourgeois humanist perspective for their own revolutionary perspective. For them perhaps it is a reaction from being constantly bombarded by religious fundamentalist ideology. In US among the bourgeoisie two cultural things are a constant: the game of Golf, and evangelical protestant fanaticism. It would be good to encourage these younger comrades to not let these bourgeois ideologies distract them.

AS (of the IWG/GIO)
Please forgive my lack of French.

Our response to comrade AS

Paris, April 5th 2010

The Fraction of the ICL to comrade AS

Dear comrade,

Thank you for your message and your congratulations for our new web page. We would like to send you back some short comments about your political remarks. It's obvious that the media propaganda and uses of "obscurantist ideologies", as well as their real extent in part of the population, can't but affect workers and young comrades. In particular those who rejecting these ideologies, oftenly fall into any kind of bourgeois humanism or rationalism. But it is all the more dangerous when it happens that a communist organization suffers such ideological "disease" as it is the obvious case for the present ICC. Even though not at the same "level", this influence of bourgeois ideology amongst workers as well as amongst communist organizations expresses the pressure of bourgeois ideology. Thus, fighting it back, means fighting back precisely and firstly its political expressions within the proletarian camp. And this political and theoretical struggle against what represents political opportunism within the communist forces, can't but participate to "*encourage (...) youngsters comrades to not let these bourgeois ideologies distract them*" and give them theoretical and political weapons through the open presentation, the "offer" could we say, of an alternative to the Left bourgeois ideologies. That's why we think that the struggle against opportunism in the proletarian camp today, whose main present expression is the "official" ICC, is a central one - as it has always been in the workers movement history, most of its theoretical and political advances were made through polemics and fight against opportunist tendencies. And that's why we call the whole proletarian camp and, firstly the Internationalist Communist Tendency (ex-IBRP), to firmly lead this essential battle.

We hope your comments and response.

Fraternally,
Fraction of the International Communist Left.

STRUGGLE AGAINST THE NON-PROLETARIAN IDEOLOGIES

We publish here a correspondence we had recently with a member of the Grupo Socialista Libertario (GSL) from Mexico. This organization openly claims its anarchism and has developed, these late years, political links (up to common actions) with the "official" ICC. In our response, we affirm that anarchism has been for the least an ideology "foreign" to the proletariat and that, since more than a century, has put itself clearly at the service of the ruling class while increasingly opposing openly to our class's interests. For us, there can't be synthesis between Marxism which is the proletariat's theory and anarchism. There can only be between both a struggle to death. By looking for opening the door of the "proletarian camp" to the GSL, the present ICC shows thus clearly that it sinks more and more into the crassest opportunism, making so, one more time, a dirty strike against our class.

Regarding the honest individuals who are today got trapped by anarchism, we believe necessary to tell them that the only way they must take to join and participate to the proletariat's fight, passes by their clear break with this ideology.

Letter of the Grupo Socialista Libertario to the Internal Fraction of the ICC

Dear comrades,

Visiting your web pages, I have seen that you had written a text called "Struggle against opportunism, anarchism looks to infiltrate the proletarian camp, the present ICC opens the door to it". I have read, at least in its great lines, this document. It appears that it refers to some words I had previously written (knowing that my cursory reading is due to the fact I am fully stranger to the understanding of French).

I consider that you have not understood the meaning of my previous letters. The GSL is an officially anarchist organization. Nevertheless, we have developed internal discussions and overcome this ideological corpus which we consider as incomplete. This doesn't mean that we claim Marxism but simply that we are revolutionaries or communists.

In a previous letter, I put forward a general characterization regarding the questions of political ideologies and I mentioned the priority of a proletarian program. I repeat, this one doesn't belong to an ideological corpus (Marxism or anarchism according to the case) but to the class as a whole through the development of its existence within the framework of capital's evolution.

I also proposed a fraternal discussion between organizations in order to precise this kind of questions. There have been no concrete response on this from your part. The few elements I sent you and about which I was waiting for your comments (yourself had said you'll send ones) have not been passed through the direct criticism.

If we had developed a clearer debate as organizations, as I proposed, you would have understood the dynamic of our positions, thus avoiding and leaving aside the misunderstandings or the simple speculations about our positions from the fact our organization calls itself officially "anarchist".

Is there any possibility to develop this so necessary debate within the proletariat ? The perspective of developing a debate between those amongst us who claim the revolutionary willingness and which get to overcome the same superfluous quarrels is not so great ?

I wanted to ask you if there is a translation into Spanish of this text in order I can have a deeper reading.

S. for the GSL

Our response to the Grupo Socialista Libertario

Dear comrade,

We answer to your letter dated the beginning of this year. If we do so with delay, it is not by lack of willingness, nor by lack of interest for the questions raised, but it is due to the fact we had to resolve various urgent questions (political, practical and even "technical") linked to the split that, as you may already know, we have lived recently. Actually, today we don't do it in the name of the Internal Fraction of the ICC - whose name has been retained by the comrades whom we separated with -, but in the name of the Fraction of the International Communist Left (FICL).

So let's go back to the main point of the political questions and position that you express in this January letter.

The GSL (Grupo Socialista Libertario¹) puts forward the *"the priority of a proletarian program"*. Nevertheless, it considers that this one must be set up from two different ideologies, two ideologies which would have developed "in parallel" within the working class and which would be insufficient by themselves alone : for one part, anarchism that it considers as "incomplete" and on the other Marxism which - as the anarchists claim it - would have aspects which would oppose to the working class itself. It's from this vision that the GSL proposes a "synthesis" or, even better, an "overcome" of what it calls the *"ideological nomenclatures"* (in a previous letter) for, by this manner, getting to a kind of "pure" or superior proletarian program without the insufficiencies or the mistakes of the previous ones.

To call to a "synthesis" between anarchism and Marxism, is to call to class collaboration

This method to try to define a "proletarian program" is, from our point of view and for various reasons, fully inadequate, fully incorrect. The fundamental error is the willingness of making a synthetis and elaborating this program from two theories - anarchism and Marxism - which correspond to **class interests which are not only different but even which are opposed** : on one side, the ones of the petit-bourgeoisie and on the other the ones of Anarchism and Marxism are not two theories or ideological currents which developed in parallel, in a kind of "competition", both defending the proletariat's class interests and from which we should today recuperate "the best" in order to set up a superior proletarian program.

Since its theoreticians of origin - Stirner, Proudhon... -, anarchism expresses fundamentally the class interests of the petit-bourgeoisie. This class has always looked for opposing to its crushing by the conquering steamroller of

capitalism in the 19th Century (through competition, the great industry rolled the small producers, the great banks suffocates them through thousand debts, and the capitalist State imposed them more and more taxes...).

Certainly, this ideological current has been more particularly the expression of these petit-bourgeois sectors which were **on process of proletarianisation** ; it is why it participated, for instance, to the formation and the life of the 1st International of the proletariat (the International Workingmen Association). Nevertheless, these sectors which were joining the revolutionary class, brought with them the ideology of their class origin. This is this aspect which explains and justifies the struggle that Marxism had to lead in order to preserve the still youthful and inexperienced proletariat from this ideology which was foreign and harmful.

It is so that, for instance, with Bakunin, anarchism has known some successes amongst the artisans and the proletarianized peasants of South Europe (Spain, South Italy), who had been recently dispossessed of their properties and who had the illusion of owning one again and to come back to their former condition of independent workers.

Certainly too, anarchism has always presented itself as being radically opposed to capitalism and to its State ; nevertheless, this opposition is not the same as the proletariat's one, it means to destroy capitalism and to replace it by a communist society. But it is conservative, for the maintaining and the extension of the small property, of federalism, of "individualism", etc.

At the time of the 1st International, the struggle between anarchism and Marxism was not simply a struggle between personalities, between Marx and Bakunin, for the leadership of this organization ; nor even a struggle between two methods or conceptions within the workers movement ; but a struggle between different class interests. It was a chapter of the permanent struggle that Marxism leads against the influence of bourgeois ideology and against the petit-bourgeois one within the workers movement. In the ascendant period of capitalism, the struggle against the latter took the form of a struggle against the conservative and reactionary theories which advocated the struggle against capitalism's development but through the economical preservation of the small property and the political federalist "autonomy".

Since that time, when anarchism had got the opportunity of being at the lead of a working class struggle, it revealed its impotence as revolutionary doctrine and its true conservative petit-bourgeois character. Thus, during the Paris Commune, what appeared to be the nature of the government set up by the workers, it means the dictatorship of the proletariat, as well as the practical measures that this one finally adopted in its short existence, were a denial to all the Proudhonist predicates.

Later, during the Spanish proletariat uprising in 1873, the

¹See the web site of the Grupo Socialista Libertario : <http://webgsl.wordpress.com/>.

"ultra-radicals", "anti-authoritarians" and "abolitionists" Bakuninists who were at the head of the movement, advocated with fervour the formation of small States to end up participating to the capitalist State behind a bourgeois fraction.

Since one century, anarchism rushes to the bourgeoisie' aid...

The 1st imperialist World War and the proletarian revolutionary wave in the beginnings of the 20th century (whose height was the Russian revolution of 1917), both events which mark the definitive entry of capitalism into its phase of decadence, have brought the polarisation of society between the two fundamental classes engaged in a fight to death : the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In this new context, the "intermediate classes" - in particular the petit-bourgeoisie as urban as well as rural - which are without viable historical project (whether capitalism's maintaining or the establishment of a new society), have no other solution but to place themselves beside the proletariat or beside the bourgeoisie. It is in these conditions that the historical bankruptcy of anarchism has been revealed as expression of the "autonomous" interests of the petit-bourgeoisie. So, we have seen how, on one side, the main anarchist current of that time (Kropotkin's) has defected beside the bourgeoisie and has supported imperialist war. Then, with the Russian revolution, while part of the anarchists opposed ferociously to this one, others sympathized and had defended the "bolshhevik revolution" - up to some like Flores Magon from the distant Mexico -, or have tried to negotiate with it (like the Makhno's peasants).

Here we must underline two aspects. The first one is that the first victorious insurrection of the proletariat had Marxism, its method, its organization (the leading political party, the centralized organization of the class in workers councils...), its goals (the dictatorship of the proletariat) as theoretical and political foundations. It was the direct antithesis of all the old anarchist predicates (first the "immediate abolition of State", "federalism", "autonomy", individual "direct action", etc.). The second aspect is that **the anarchist who participated beside the proletarian revolution, did it only since they gave up their own anarchist doctrine** - which revealed to be powerless to present a viable solution to the proletariat's struggle - and that they acknowledged Marxism's validity.

Since that moment, the historical bankruptcy of anarchism has been even recognized by the anarchists the most faithful to their current. We get away with reproducing large extracts of an article from the late 1920's which shows this total impotence and this historical bankruptcy of anarchism. The article is even more significant since it has not been written by a Marxist but by a sincere and famous anarchist ; Piotr Arshinov, who was debating with an other anarchist, not less famous and important, Malatesta :

"(...) Comrade Errico Malatesta has published a critical article on the project of the Organisational platform edited by the Group of Russian Anarchists Abroad.

*This article has provoked perplexity and regret in us. We very much expected, and we still expect, that the idea of organised anarchism would meet an obstinate resistance among the partisans of chaos, so numerous in the anarchist milieu, because that idea obliges all anarchists who participate in the movement to be responsible and poses the notions of duty and constancy. **For up to now the favourite principle in which most anarchists are educated can be explained by the following axiom: "I do what I want, I take account of nothing". It is very natural that anarchists of this species, impregnated by such principles, are violently hostile to all ideas of organised anarchism and of collective responsibility.***

*Comrade Malatesta is foreign to this principle, and it is for this reason that his text provokes this reaction in us. Perplexity (...). Regret, because, **to be faithful to the dogma inherent in the cult of individuality**, he has put himself against (let us hope this is only temporary) the work which appears as an indispensable stage in the extension and external development of the anarchist movement.*

*Right at the start of his article, Malatesta says that he shares a number of theses of the Platform or even backs them up by the ideas he expounds. He would agree in noting that the anarchists did not and do not have influence on social and political events, **because of a lack of serious and active organisation.***

*The principles taken up by comrade Malatesta correspond to the principal positions of the Platform. One would have expected that he would have as equally examined, understood and accepted a number of other principles developed in our project, because there is a link of coherence and logic between all the theses of the Platform. However, Malatesta goes on to explain in a trenchant manner his difference of opinion with the Platform. He asks whether the General Union of Anarchists projected by the Platform can resolve the problem of the education of the working masses. He replies in the negative. **He gives as reason the pretended authoritarian character of the Union, which according to him, would develop the idea of submission to directors and leaders.***

*On what basis can such a serious accusation repose? It is in the idea of collective responsibility, recommended by the Platform, that he sees the principal reason for formulating such an accusation. He cannot admit the principle that the entire Union would be responsible for every member, and that inversely each member would be responsible for the political line of all the Union. This signifies that **Malatesta does not precisely accept the principle of organisation which appears to us to be the most essential, in order that the anarchist movement can continue to develop.***

Nowhere up to here has the anarchist movement attained

the stage of a popular organised movement as such. Not in the least does the cause of this reside in objective conditions, for example because the working masses do not understand anarchism or are not interested in it outside of revolutionary periods ; no, the cause of the weakness of the anarchist movement resides essentially in the anarchists themselves. Not one time yet have they attempted to carry on in an organised manner either the propaganda of their ideas or their practical activity among the working masses.

If that appears strange to comrade Malatesta, we strongly affirm that the activity of the most active anarchists-which includes himself-assume, by necessity, an individualist character; even if this activity is distinguished by a high personal responsibility, it concerns only an individual and not an organisation. (...)

The question for anarchists of all countries is the following: can our movement content itself with subsisting on the base of old forms of organisation, of local groups having no organic link between them, and each acting on their side according to its particular ideology and particular practice? Or, just fancy, must our movement have recourse to new forms of organisation which will help it develop and root it amongst the broad masses of workers?

The experience of the last 20 years, and more particularly that of the two Russian revolutions-1905 and 1917-19-suggests to us the reply to this question better than all the "theoretical considerations".

*During the Russian Revolution, the working masses were won to anarchist ideas; nevertheless **anarchism, as an organised movement suffered a complete setback** whilst from the beginning of the revolution, we were at the most advanced positions of struggle, from the beginning of the constructive phase we found ourselves irremediably apart from the said constructive phase, and consequently outside the masses. This was not pure chance: **such an attitude inevitably flowed from our own impotence, as much from an organisational point of view as from our ideological confusion.***

This setback was caused by the fact that, throughout the revolution, the anarchists did not know how to put over their social and political programme and only approached the masses with a fragmented and contradictory propaganda; we had no stable organisation. Our movement was represented by organisations of encounter, springing up here, springing up there, not seeking what they wanted in a firm fashion, and which most often vanished at the end of a little time without leaving a trace. It would be desperately naive and stupid to believe that workers could support and participate in such "organisations", from the moment of the social struggle and communist construction.

We have taken the habit of attributing the defeat of the anarchist movement of 1917-19 in Russia to the statist

*repression of the Bolshevik Party; this is a big mistake. The Bolshevik repression impeded the extension of the anarchist movement during the revolution but it wasn't the only obstacle. **It's rather the internal impotence of the movement itself which was one of the principal causes of this defeat, an impotence proceeding from the vagueness and indecision which characterised different political affirmations concerning organisation and tactics.***

Anarchism had no firm and concrete opinion on the essential problems of the social revolution; an opinion indispensable to satisfy the seeking after of the masses who created the revolution. The anarchists praised the communist principle of: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" but they never concerned themselves with applying this principle to reality, although they allowed certain suspect elements to transform this great principle into a caricature of anarchism - just remember how many con-men benefitted by seizing for their personal profit the assets of the collectivity. The anarchists talked a lot about revolutionary activity of the workers, but they could not help them, even in indicating approximately the forms that this activity should take; they did not know how to sort out the reciprocal relations between the masses and their centre of ideological inspiration. They pushed the workers to shake off the yoke of Authority, but they did not indicate the means of consolidating and defending the conquests of the Revolution. They lacked clear and precise conceptions, of a programme of action on many other problems. It was this that distanced them from the activity of the masses and condemned them to social and historical impotence. It is in this that we must seek the primordial cause of their defeat in the Russian revolution.

And we do not doubt that, if the revolution broke out in several European countries, anarchists would suffer the same defeat because they are no less-if not even more so-divided on the plan of ideas and organisation" (Piotr Arshinov, The Old and New in Anarchism, Dielo Trouda n°30, May 1928¹, we underline).

It is sure that historical bankruptcy of anarchism has not signified its complete disappearance. But at the epoch of capitalism decadence, at the epoch of the historical alternative "capitalist barbarism or proletarian revolution" being at stake, the tendency to totalitarianism of the capitalist State includes the most complete submission of the "intermediate" classes, while beforehand they could still pretend to some class "independence". In relation to anarchism, this means that this ideological and political current is fully at the service of the bourgeois class and its interests. From the defeat of the revolutionary wave of the 1920's and from the degeneration of the Russian revolution (to become with stalinism a kind of State capitalism), the principles of anarchism had served since to the bourgeoisie

¹http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/platform/arshinov_old_new.html

as auxiliary weapons for its propagandistic campaigns in order to banish from the proletariat's consciousness the memory of the triumph of the revolution, the memory of the possibility and the capacity of the working class to destroy capitalism.

Thus, the criticism of anarchism against the "Marxist authoritarianism" has served as a support to the bourgeoisie in order to back up the mystification of the supposed "continuity" between Marx, Lenin and Stalin. The attacks of anarchism against the notion of political party of the proletariat, against the dictatorship of the proletariat, have supported the bourgeoisie's efforts to make the proletariat "rejecting" its own historical revolutionary experience, political as well as organizational, to make it believing necessary to reject the experience of the bolshevik party and of the October revolution, to make it identifying them to the bloody capitalist regime of Stalin.

Finally, these last decades and from the collapse of the Russian imperialist bloc, the campaign that the bourgeoisie has launched about "**Marxism bankruptcy**" and the "**death of communism**" - which have provoked a withdrawn of the class consciousness amongst the workers as well as in the proletariat's struggles - has found in the anarchist ideology an important auxiliary up to the point where we can say that the "renewal" of the anarchist groups is based on the success of this bourgeois campaign. As was saying the "old ICC" in 2000 :

*"Anarchism today has the wind in its sails. Anarchist ideas, in the form both of the emergence and strengthening of anarcho-syndicalism, and of the appearance of numerous small libertarian groups, are getting off the ground in several countries (...). This is perfectly explicable imperfectly explicable in the present historic period. **The collapse of the Stalinist regimes at the end of the 1980s allowed the bourgeoisie to unleash unprecedented campaigns proclaiming the « death of communism ».** (...) According to the bourgeoisie's campaigns, the bankruptcy of what has been presented as « socialism » or even « communism » marks the bankruptcy of Marx's ideas, which the Stalinist regimes had transformed into an official ideology (...). Marx, Lenin, Stalin - all the same enemy: this is the theme rehashed for years by every fraction of the ruling class. **The anarchist current has defended exactly the same theme ever since the creation in the USSR of one of the most barbaric regimes that decadent capitalism has produced.** The anarchists have always considered Marxism as "authoritarian" by nature, and for them the Stalinist dictatorship was the inevitable result of the application of Marx's ideas. In this sense, **the present success of the anarchist and libertarian currents is essentially a fall-out from the bourgeoisie's campaigns, a sign of their impact on those elements who refuse to accept capitalism, but who are trapped by all the lies that have inundated us during the last ten years. The current***

that presents itself as the most radical opponent of bourgeois order thus owes a large part of its progress to the concessions which it makes, and has always made, to the classic ideological themes of the bourgeoisie" (Spain 1936 and the Friends of Durruti - in French : Anarchisme et communisme -, *International Review* 102, ICC, 2000).

... the GSL too !

Yourselves, the GSL, **you have joined blithely - it does not matter if it is knowingly or not - to this ideological campaign of the bourgeoisie about "Marxism and communism's bankruptcy" in order to suppress the proletariat's revolutionary consciousness.** An example ? Let's just have a look to one of your article on your web site :

"The Zapatista program of the Sixth Declaration does not represent a revolutionary break with the system. On the contrary, it perfectly survive in the framework of the its very old (and not « so different ») marxist-stalinist-guevarist tradition (...) of the EZLN¹ even before its public appearance, indeed in the democratic and liberal framework (position it defends since its public appearance in front of a discredited Marxism which have just failed with the Berlin Wall). (...) What ever it is the case, nor the old State Marxism, nor the Welfare State which presents itself under the name of « revolutionary nationalism » don't represent the emancipation of the workers in relation to Capital.

*Today, while a majority of those who declare themselves « anti-capitalist » lines up with the sirenes' song of the old « revolutionary nationalism » or with the **obsolete Marxism-leninism**, we, the revolutionary anarchists of the Grupo Socialista Libertario, denounce openly and radically the erroneous path on which the zapatista leadership drives them" (Grupo Socialista Libertario, August 2007, translated from Spanish by us).*

We have here, condensed in a few lines, an attack in order against the consciousness, the theory and the revolutionary perspectives of the proletariat, all this under the apparently innocent « criticism of the EZLN ».

First of all, the GSL says that "**discredited Marxism has fallen with the Berlin Wall**" which means that, for this group, the barbarous stalinist and State capitalist regimes were not but the product of Marxism ; as the other anarchists, it so echoes the ideological campaign launched by the bourgeoisie in 1989. Later, the GSL speaks of "**obsolete Marxism-leninism**" and of "**revolutionary nationalism**" as ways of same nature and "**radically erroneous**". It means it puts the bolsheviks - the only revolutionary party which has been able to lead the working class up to the seize of power - at the same level as the bourgeois nationalists, presenting them as a dangerous option for the proletariat.

1. It is the name of the zapatista "army" of Marcos in Mexico.

Thus what better favour the bourgeoisie could expect !

But the most important to underline here is how the anarchist ideology has regained vigour thanks to the bourgeois ideological campaigns : it presents what the bourgeoisie itself affirms as "obvious historical facts", as a proof of Marxism failure ; similarly, anarchism has become today, on the basis of its fundamental principles, a sound box of the present ideological campaigns of the bourgeoisie ! And this, independently of the consciousness of the militants themselves.

As you can see, our total rejection of the "method" which aims at mixing or at seeking to make a synthesis between Marxism and anarchism in order to set up a "proletarian program" does not come from a so-called "sectarian" behaviour which would be ours, but from the class analysis and of the historical evolution of anarchism. In that sense,

the discussion we can propose you, is aiming at contributing that you lead up to the end the criticism that you have begun on "anarchism insufficiencies" up to understand its true class nature, its trajectory and its present function, in order to ideologically and politically break with this current which has nothing to do with the working class. At the same time, you must tackle revolutionary Marxism, not through the glasses that propose the organizations of Capital Left, nor through the bourgeois campaigns, but through the organizations of Communist Left which, despite their present weakness, are the only ones which maintain the thread of the revolutionary class's positions.

Communist Greetings.

The Fraction of the International Communist Left.

May 2010

"In and of itself, this self-justification that "we did not seize power not because we were unable but because we did not wish to, because we were against every kind of dictatorship," and the like, contains an irrevocable condemnation of anarchism as an utterly anti-revolutionary doctrine. To renounce the conquest of power is voluntarily to leave the power with those who wield it, the exploiters. The essence of every revolution consisted and consists in putting a new class in power, thus enabling it to realize its own program in life. It is impossible to wage war and to reject victory. It is impossible to lead the masses towards insurrection without preparing for the conquest power.

No one could have prevented the Anarchists after the conquest of power from establishing the sort of regime they deem necessary, assuming, of course, that their program is realizable. But the Anarchist leaders themselves lost faith in it. They hid from power not because they are against "every kind of dictatorship" – in actuality, grumbling and whining, they supported and still support the dictatorship of Stalin-Negrin – but because they completely lost their principles and courage, if they ever had any. They were afraid of everything: "isolation," "involvement," "fascism." They were afraid of France and England. More than anything these phrasemongers feared the revolutionary masses.

The renunciation of the conquest of power inevitably throws every workers' organization into the swamp of reformism and turns it into a toy of the bourgeoisie; it cannot be otherwise in view of the class structure of society. In opposing the goal, the conquest of power, the Anarchists could not in the end fail to oppose the means, the revolution. The leaders of the CNT and FAI not only helped the bourgeoisie hold on to the shadow of power in July 1936; they also helped it to reestablish bit by bit what it had lost at one stroke. In May 1937, they sabotaged the uprising of the workers and thereby saved the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Thus anarchism, which wished merely to be anti-political, proved in reality to be anti-revolutionary and in the more critical moments – counter-revolutionary.

The Anarchist theoreticians, who after the great test of 1931-37 continue to repeat the old reactionary nonsense about Kronstadt, and who affirm that "Stalinism is the inevitable result of Marxism and Bolshevism," simply demonstrate by this they are forever dead for the revolution".

(Trotsky, December 1937).