

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST BULLETIN

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

Extracts of the French and Spanish versions of Issue#3

n° 3

November 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.

Towards decisive confrontations between the proletariat and the capitalist forces.....1

TEXT OF THE WORKERS MOVEMENT

Rosa Luxemburg : the Mass Strike (extract).....4

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Everywhere the bourgeoisie prepares its State apparatus to oppose the proletariat in struggle

Plomb, mitraille, prison, ainsi répond le Front populaire aux ouvriers de Barcelone osant résister à l'attaque capitaliste (Bilan 41, 1937, extracts)

PROLETARIAN CAMP

Political Platform of the Internationalist Communists-Klasbatalo (ex-)

Critical Comments of the ICP (*Le Prolétaire*) on the Klasbatalo Platform

STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

The need for the political struggle against the present opportunism.....

The 19th of the ICC section in France : Political abandonments which drive towards the bourgeoisie camp

Open Letter to the ICC militants :

The enthusiasm of the present ICC towards the CNT-AIT leads to the abandonment of its political Platform and to the "revision" of marxism.....10

Letter to the CWO in regards with openness policy of the ICC towards anarcho-unionist organizations

Towards decisive confrontations between the proletariat and the capitalist forces

The classes struggle comes back with strength to assert itself as the obvious "motor of history" for everyone despite its "death" has been declared so many times by the bourgeois ideologists and propagandists. All the continents are affected by the proletariat's struggles : the Americas - Brasil, Chile, Mexico, United-States -, Asia - China, Vietnam, Thailand, Turkey -, Africa - South Africa, Egypt -, the former Eastern imperialist bloc countries - Russia, Bulgaria, Ukraine, the Baltic countries -, and now simultaneously almost all the Western European countries - Greece, Spain, Portugal, France, Great-Britain, Belgium, Germany, etc... The entire world proletariat, and particularly of its historical core, Western Europe, resumes the path of the class fight. These struggles develop in response to the massive attacks that capitalism in acute crisis is obliged to unleash against the exploited class. The so-called economical recovery is not but an illusion, an additional lie, that the daily reality - and very often too the very datas of the bourgeoisie - comes to refute. It is the same for the false good economical health of the so-called "emerging" countries¹. China - and with it Brasil - which is so often put forwards as an example, experiences an increasing "contradictory" economical situation from the capitalist point of view and a wretched one for the working class. At any moment, this country can explode at the economical as well as social level, and the massive and violent workers struggles are growing on number².

This simultaneous development of the workers struggles at the international level raises the question of the perspective for the "internationalization" of these struggles. It signifies that we have entered in the process which leads to generalized and historically crucial classes confrontations.

This process is confronting today to the obstacles that the State apparatus puts on its course. Firstly, the manouvres and the sabotages of the unions which are more and more forced to utilize a false internal division between the leaderships and the more radical "rank and file" [the "bases"]. The first ones organize Day of action, strikes and national street demonstrations, which aim at occupying the ground, at limiting as much as they can the break out of open fights and at supressing any direct self-organization by the workers of these ones and particularly of their spreading and unification against the State. As the growing worker pressure and combative spirit can't be contained by these Days of action, "base" unionism "accompagnies" (when it does not organize them itself) the "overrunnings", the more radical actions, the wildcat strikes - it means those which, rightly, don't respect the bourgeois law which set the so-call "right" of strike - ; the demonstrations which don't want to be harmless unions walks and which take over the streets, the strikes picket lines and blockage of the enterprises, etc. It too "accompagnies" all these social movements by muzzleing the General Assemblies which aim at being independant from the unions with "committees" and other "coordinations" that it controls - the "interprofessional General Assemblies" ["AG interprofesionnelles"] which rose in France lately, sometimes on the workers' initiative themselves, more often on the leftists and base unionists' initiative - to finally seek to derail them from their function and their goal. Despite these obstacles, the combative spirit and the workers struggles keep on searching for their way through various means and in an apparent "disorder" which is not but the very process of the classes struggle, and more particularly the one of the *Mass Strike* as described by Rosa Luxemburg in her time.

"It flows now like a broad billow over the [Russian] whole kingdom, and now divides into a gigantic network of narrow streams; now it bubbles forth from under the ground like a fresh spring and now is completely lost under the earth. Political and economic strikes, mass strikes and partial strikes, demonstrative strikes and fighting strikes, general strikes of individual branches of industry and general strikes in individual towns, peaceful wage struggles and street massacres, barricade fighting – all these run through one another, run side by side, cross one another, flow in and over one another – it is a ceaselessly moving, changing sea of phenomena". Even though the social movements are not yet at the level of those of 1905 in Russia, it is still the proces of the *Mass Strike* which presently develops at the international scale, particularly in Western Europe, and which will arise at its term the questions of the generalization and unification of the workers fights. If this process is today still far for expressing itself through a movement which openly questions capitalism, nevertheless it is true, as said Rosa Luxemburg, that *"the mass strike is rather the indication, the rallying idea, of a whole period of the class struggle lasting for years, perhaps for decades"*.

But we can already affirm that, rarely in history, we have known a situation such as the one which is approaching today and which gather so many objective and subjective conditions for the development of this process : the inexorable march with no

1. Other example amongst others of an ex-"Asian Tiger" so much vaunted : Singapour GNP has reduced by 19% the last quarter. Source : IILS, 09/2010.

2. Source : yahoofinances, 14/10/2010.

return of the economical crisis (which signs the definitive historical bankruptcy of the capitalist system) is accompanied by an inevitable slide of the world proletariat in the worse misery and by the development of the warlike capitalist barbary which announces and allows the preparation by the ruling class of a new generalized holocaust ; but nevertheless these unbearable conditions ensure the working class everywhere to increasingly affirm its anger and its refusal of the bourgeois policies and it favor the development of its own experiences of struggle and of its class consciousness which have suffered so much since two decades.

Moreover the bourgeoisie does not make mistake on this and does not stop preparing itself at the international level. It voluntarily organise and develop the same strategies everywhere to confront the proletarian danger. It gives itself all the means (more particularly thanks to its unions and its medias) to delay, to disperse, to sabotage the workers ripostes and above all to prevent their conscious generalization and unification beyond the sectors ["corporatist"] divisions and even the national ones ; it means it makes all it can, from today on, to make abort the process which is initiated.

Now, for instance, almost everywhere (above all in Europe and North-América) and through the utilization of exactly the same means, it adapts its political apparatus to the classes contradictions worsening. Thus, through the publicity it makes of the "extremist oppositions" of the Left and the Right, it specifically arms itself against the working class : with the first "opposition", it aims at covering its social flank, the one of the struggles ; as for the second one, it serves as a scarecrow in order to derail the attention of the workers towards the supposed cause of the "Democracy in danger" and, through this, to chain up them behind the defence of the democratic State. We come back in this bulletin on this phenomenon in our article [Partout la bourgeoisie prépare son appareil d'Etat pour contrer le prolétariat en lutte](#) [Everywhere the bourgeoisie prepares its State apparatus to oppose the proletariat in struggle, only in French and Spanish¹].

But, in the perspective of the inevitable massive confrontations which already mature, the bourgeoisie can't just impede the development of the workers struggles and of the class consciousness amongst the great workers masses. It also directly attack the political vanguard of the proletariat, it means to the communist forces, at the political and ideological level. These ones are already affected by dispersion and sectarianism which today handicap the workers reaction and the historical relation of forces between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The pressure of the bourgeois ideology within the political proletarian camp is permanent which justifies the permanent fight that has to be led against the various manifestations of political opportunism. The present ICC, in its crazy run on this path, apparently without any brake, presently attempts a true strike ["coup de force"] in order to introduce anarchism as a full component of the revolutionary camp, even indeed as the *alter-ego* of the Communist Left ! As well as this cannot but precipitate the liquidation, already well begun, of this organization and its definitive lost as a communist organization, the passive acceptance and the silence of the other forces of the proletarian camp about the theoretical and political revisions by the ICC will also represent a considerable handicap for the proletariat in its perspective to massive classes confrontations.

As particular moment of this fight, the reader will find in this bulletin the open letter we are sending to the whole militants of the ICC. And we call all the communist groups and all the sympathizers of the Communist Left, and firstly of the ICC itself, to intervene and to get involved in this struggle².

Obviously, even though it is fundamental for us, we don't limit the action of the communist groups to this single dimension. Their intervention is as well important in the development of the workers struggles and in the process of *Mass Strike* in which we have entered. Up to today, their dispersion and their political hesitations did not allow that this intervention be at the level, not of the necessity in regards to the class, but of their political and militant forces. Though, from the history and the political positions they do share, they have the means and the possibility to speak with a single voice in the struggles of today and of tomorrow. Their existence has no other significance.

October 31st; 2010.

1. See : [Por todas partes la burguesía prepara su aparato de Estado para enfrentar al proletariado en lucha](#)

2. We are ready to reproduce on our web site and in our bulletin any contribution or intervention of group or individual.

Rosa Luxemburg, *The Mass Strike*
(Chapter IV. *The Interaction of the Political and the Economic Struggle*)

We have attempted in the foregoing to sketch the history of the mass strike in Russia in a few strokes. Even a fleeting glance at this history shows us a picture which in no way resembles that usually formed by discussions in Germany on the mass strike. Instead of the rigid and hollow scheme of an arid political action carried out by the decision of the highest committees and furnished with a plan and panorama, we see a bit of pulsating like of flesh and blood, which cannot be cut out of the large frame of the revolution but is connected with all parts of the revolution by a thousand veins.

The mass strike, as the Russian Revolution shows it to us, is such a changeable phenomenon that it reflects all the phases of the political and economic struggle, all stages and factors of the revolution. Its adaptability, its efficiency, the factors of its origin are constantly changing. It suddenly opens new and wide perspectives of the revolution when it appears to have already arrived in a narrow pass and where it is impossible for anyone to reckon upon it with any degree of certainty. It flows now like a broad billow over the whole kingdom, and now divides into a gigantic network of narrow streams; now it bubbles forth from under the ground like a fresh spring and now is completely lost under the earth. Political and economic strikes, mass strikes and partial strikes, demonstrative strikes and fighting strikes, general strikes of individual branches of industry and general strikes in individual towns, peaceful wage struggles and street massacres, barricade fighting – all these run through one another, run side by side, cross one another, flow in and over one another – it is a ceaselessly moving, changing sea of phenomena. And the law of motion of these phenomena is clear: it does not lie in the mass strike itself nor in its technical details, but in the political and social proportions of the forces of the revolution.

The mass strike is merely the form of the revolutionary struggle and every disarrangement of the relations of the contending powers, in party development and in class division, in the position of counter-revolution – all this immediately influences the action of the strike in a thousand invisible and scarcely controllable ways. But strike action itself does not cease for a single moment. It merely alters its forms, its dimensions, its effect. It is the living pulse-beat of the revolution and at the same time its most powerful driving wheel. In a word, the mass strike, as shown to us in the Russian Revolution, is not a crafty method discovered by subtle reasoning for the purpose of making the proletarian struggle more effective, *but the*

method of motion of the proletarian mass, the phenomenal form of the proletarian struggle in the revolution.

Some general aspects may now be examined which may assist us in forming a correct estimate of the problem of the mass strike:

1. It is absurd to think of the mass strike as one act, one isolated action. The mass strike is rather the indication, the rallying idea, of a whole period of the class struggle lasting for years, perhaps for decades. Of the innumerable and highly varied mass strikes which have taken place in Russia during the last four years, the scheme of the mass strike was a purely political movement, begun and ended after a cut and dried plan, a short single act of one variety only and, at that, a subordinate variety – pure demonstration strike. In the whole course of the five-year period we see in Russia only a few demonstration strikes, which be it noted, were generally confined to single towns. Thus the annual May Day general strike in Warsaw and Lodz. In Russia proper on the first of May has not yet been celebrated to any appreciable extent by abstention from work; the mass strike in Warsaw on September 11, 1905, as a memorial service in honour of the executed Martin Kasprzak; that of November 1905 in Petersburg as protest demonstrations against the declaration of the state of siege in Poland and Livonia; that of January 22, 1906 in Warsaw, Lodz, Czestochow and in Dombrowa coal basin, as well as, in part those in a few Russian towns as anniversary celebrations of the Petersburg bloodbath; in addition, in July 1906 a general strike in Tiflis as demonstration of sympathy with soldiers sentenced by court-martial on account of the military revolt; and finally from the same cause, in September 1906, during the deliberations of the court-martial in Reval. All the above great and partial mass strikes and general strikes were not demonstration strikes but fighting strikes, and as such they originated, for the most part, spontaneously, in every case from specific local accidental causes, without plan or design, and grew with elemental power into great movements, and then they did not begin an “orderly retreat,” but turned now into economic struggles, now into street fighting, and now collapsed of themselves.

In this general picture the purely political demonstration strike plays quite a subordinate role – isolated small points in the midst of a mighty expanse. Thereby, temporarily considered, the following characteristic discloses itself: the demonstration strikes which, in contradistinction to the fighting strikes, exhibit the greatest mass of party discipline, conscious direction and political thought, and therefore must appear as the highest and most mature form

of the mass strike, play in reality the greatest part in the *beginnings* of the movement. Thus, for example, the absolute cessation of work on May 1, 1905, in Warsaw, as the first instance of a decision of the social democrats carried throughout in such an astonishing fashion, was an experience of great importance for the proletarian movement in Poland. In the same way the sympathetic strike of the same year in Petersburg made a great impression as the first experiment of conscious systematic mass action in Russia. Similarly the "trial mass strike" of the Hamburg comrades on January 17, 1906, will play a prominent part in the history of the future German mass strike as the first vigorous attempt with the much disputed weapon, and also a very successful and convincingly striking test of the fighting temper and the lust for battle of the Hamburg working class. And just as surely will the period of the mass strike in Germany, when it has once begun in real earnest, lead of itself to a real, general cessation of work on May first. The May Day festival may naturally be raised to a position of honour as the first great demonstration under the aegis of the mass struggle. In this sense the "lame horse," as the May Day festival was termed at the trade-union congress at Cologne, has still a great future before it and an important party to play, in the proletarian class struggle in Germany.

But with the development of the earnest revolutionary struggle the importance of such demonstrations diminishes rapidly. It is precisely those factors which objectively facilitate the realisation of the demonstration strike after a preconceived plan and at the party's word of command – namely, the growth of political consciousness and the training of the proletariat – make this kind of mass strike impossible; today the proletariat in Russia, the most capable vanguard of the masses, does not want to know about mass strikes; the workers are no longer in a mood for jesting and will now think only of a serious struggle with all its consequences. And when, in the first great mass strike in January 1905, the demonstrative element, not indeed in an intentional, but more in an instinctive, spontaneous form, still played a great part, on the other hand, the attempt of the Central Committee of the Russian social democrats to call a mass strike in August as a demonstration for the dissolved Duma was shattered by, among other things, the positive disinclination of the educated proletariat to engage in weak half-actions and mere demonstrations.

2. When, however, we have in view the less important strike of the demonstrative kind, instead of the fighting strike as it represents in Russia today the actual vehicle of proletarian action, we see still more clearly that it is impossible to separate the economic factors from one another. Here also the reality deviates from the theoretical scheme, and the pedantic representation in which the pure

political mass strike is logically derived from the trade-union general strike as the ripest and highest stage, but at the same time is kept distinct from it, is shown to be absolutely false. This is expressed not merely in the fact that the mass strike from that first great wage struggle of the Petersburg textile workers in 1896-97 to the last great mass strike in December 1905, passed imperceptibly from the economic field to the political, so that it is almost impossible to draw a dividing line between them.

Again, every one of the great mass strikes repeats, so to speak, on a small scale, the entire history of the Russian mass strike, and begins with a pure economic, or at all events, a partial trade-union conflict, and runs through all the stages to the political demonstration. The great thunderstorm of mass strikes in South Russia in 1902 and 1903 originated, as we have seen, in Baku from a conflict arising from the disciplinary punishment of the unemployed, in Rostov from disputes about wages in the railway workshops, in Tiflis from a struggle of the commercial employees for reduction of working hours, in Odessa from a wage dispute in a single small factory. The January mass strike of 1905 developed from an internal conflict in the Putilov works, the October strike from the struggle of the railway workers for a pension fund, and finally the December strike from the struggle of the postal and telegraph employees for the right of combination. The progress of the movement on the whole is not expressed in the circumstances that the economic initial stage is omitted, but much more in the rapidity with which all the stages to the political demonstration are run through and in the extremity of the point to which the strike moves forward.

But the movement on the whole does not proceed from the economic to the political struggle, nor even the reverse. Every great political mass action, after it has attained its political highest point, breaks up into a mass of economic strikes. And that applies not only to each of the great mass strikes, but also to the revolution as a whole. With the spreading, clarifying and involution of the political struggle, the economic struggle not only does not recede, but extends, organises and becomes involved in equal measure. Between the two there is the most complete reciprocal action.

Every new onset and every fresh victory of the political struggle is transformed into a powerful impetus for the economic struggle, extending at the same time its external possibilities and intensifying the inner urge of the workers to better their position and their desire to struggle. After every foaming wave of political action a fructifying deposit remains behind from which a thousand stalks of economic struggle shoot forth. And conversely. The workers' condition of ceaseless economic struggle with the capitalists keeps their fighting energy alive in every

political interval; it forms, so to speak, the permanent fresh reservoir of the strength of the proletarian classes, from which the political fight ever renews its strength, and at the same time leads the indefatigable economic sappers of the proletariat at all times, now here and now there, to isolated sharp conflicts, out of which public conflicts on a large scale unexpectedly explode.

In a word: the economic struggle is the transmitter from one political centre to another; the political struggle is the periodic fertilisation of the soil for the economic struggle. Cause and effect here continually change places; and thus the economic and the political factor in the period of the mass strike, now widely removed, completely separated or even mutually exclusive, as the theoretical plan would have them, merely form the two interlacing sides of the proletarian class struggle in Russia. And *their unity* is precisely the mass strike. If the sophisticated theory proposes to make a clever logical dissection of the mass strike for the purpose of getting at the “purely political mass strike,” it will by this dissection, as with any other, not perceive the phenomenon in its living essence, but will kill it altogether.

3. Finally, the events in Russia show us that the mass strike is inseparable from the revolution. The history of the Russian mass strike is the history of the Russian Revolution. When, to be sure, the representatives of our German opportunism hear of “revolution,” they immediately think of bloodshed, street fighting or powder and shot, and the logical conclusion thereof is: the mass strike leads inevitably to the revolution, therefore we dare not have it. In actual fact we see in Russia that almost every mass strike in the long run leads to an encounter with the armed guardians of czarist order, and therein the so-called political strikes exactly resemble the larger economic struggle. The revolution, however, is something other and something more than bloodshed. In contradiction to the police interpretation, which views the revolution exclusively from the standpoint of street disturbances and rioting, that is, from the standpoint of “disorder,” the interpretation of scientific socialism sees in the revolution above all a thorough-going internal reversal of social class relations. And from this standpoint an altogether different connection exists between revolution and mass strike in Russia from that contained in the commonplace conception that the mass strike generally ends in bloodshed.

We have seen above the inner mechanism of the Russian mass strike which depends upon the ceaseless reciprocal action of the political and economic struggles. But this reciprocal action is conditioned during the revolutionary period. Only in the sultry air of the period of revolution can any partial little conflict between labour and capital grow

into a general explosion. In Germany the most violent, most brutal collisions between the workers and employers take place every year and every day without the struggle overleaping the bounds of the individual departments or individual towns concerned, or even those of the individual factories. Punishment of organised workers in Petersburg and unemployment as in Baku, wage struggles as in Odessa, struggles for the right of combination as in Moscow are the order of the day in Germany. No single one of these cases however changes suddenly into a common class action. And when they grow into isolated mass strikes, which have without question a political colouring, they do not bring about a general storm. The general strike of Dutch railwaymen, which died away in spite of the warmest sympathy, in the midst of the complete impassivity of the proletariat of the country, affords a striking proof of this. And conversely, only in the period of revolution, when the social foundations and the walls of the class society are shaken and subjected to a constant process of disarrangement, any political class action of the proletariat can arouse from their passive condition in a few hours whole sections of the working class who have hitherto remained unaffected, and this is immediately and naturally expressed in a stormy economic struggle. The worker, suddenly aroused to activity by the electric shock of political action, immediately seizes the weapon lying nearest his hand for the fight against his condition of economic slavery: the stormy gesture of the political struggle causes him to feel with unexpected intensity the weight and the pressure of his economic chains. And while, for example, the most violent political struggle in Germany – the electoral struggle or the parliamentary struggle on the customs tariff – exercised a scarcely perceptible direct influence upon the course and the intensity of the wage struggles being conducted at the same time in Germany, every political action of the proletariat in Russia immediately expresses itself in the extension of the area and the deepening of the intensity of the economic struggle.

The revolution thus first creates the social conditions in which this sudden change of the economic struggle into the political and of the political struggle into the economic is possible, a change which finds its expression in the mass strike. And if the vulgar scheme sees the connection between mass strike and revolution only in bloody street encounters with which the mass strikes conclude, a somewhat deeper look into the Russian events shows an exactly opposite connection: in reality the mass strike does not produce the revolution but the revolution produces the mass strike.

Rosa Luxemburg, 1906.

STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

The need for the political struggle against the present opportunism

As we underline it in the "leading article" of this bulletin, there are two dimensions of the present historical situation which intervene in the development and the establishment of the relation of forces between the classes : the development of the massive struggles in response to the crisis ;and the ability of the proletarian camp, of the communist political groups, to be equal to their task in front of the development of the situation, at the immediate point of view - the intervention towards the working class - as well as at the historical point of view - the regroupment of their forces and the constitution of the world party of the proletariat. We know that many have doubts, even deny, that the state of the proletarian camp today can already participate to the relation of forces between the classes. It is true that, for the essential, the weakness of the communist forces doesn't still enable them to be a determining factor in the dynamic which leads to the massive confrontations - this doesn't mean they can't play this role, even today, in some particular situations. Though the development of the workers struggles can't but favor the emergence of new generations of workers and militants searching for revolutionary coherence and their regroupment, at least in terms of audience, reference, reflection, theoretical and political clarification, indeed of concrete orientations and immediate slogans, around the positions of the Communist Left groups. One stake of the present situation is that significant minorities gather around the proletarian camp and pronounce themselves on the historical perspectives of communism. It is an element of the relation of forces between the classes. One element of the present situation, a fundamental element in favor of the proletariat, of the relation of forces in the classes struggle, is that the communist positions be presented, be put forwards, thus actually be present, and defended the most widely and the most unified possible.

For such, the proletarian camp has to be equal to its task, has to be in condition to crystallize its revolutionary energies around marxist communist political positions, around the proletariat's class positions.

Unfortunately, the state of the proletarian camp today doesn't allow it to be up to the historical stake. The International Communist Party (Le Prolétaire, Il Comunista, Proletarian...) is today too much weak and prisoner of its basic positions (see its critical comments on the Communist Internationalists-Klabastalo [ex-ICM]'s Platform in this issue) which are characterized by dogmatism and sectarianism. The ICT (ex-IBRP) still remains, according to us, too timorous and cautious, unable to fully take up its responsibility and to assume the central place that history assigned to it for today in the process which should drive to political regroupment and to the setting up of the party. As for the ICC... it has become the Trojan horse which enables no-proletarian positions, for the least, (the anarchism's ones) to infiltrate within the communist camp !

Here is why we maintain that the struggle against opportunism (which strikes today more particularly this late organization) represents a priority for the communist forces. To defend the proletariat's theory, marxism, against its distortions and against revision or betrayal, to defend the tradition of the Communist Left today directly attacked, is not the only responsibility of the militants and sympathizers of the ICC. It is also the one of all the components of the proletarian camp. Tomorrow, opportunism will come back striking under a form or another and the experience of the theoretical and political fight that we lead, will serve again as the past fights of Marx, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg and the Left fractions of the International Communist. If the opportunist drift of the ICC is a negative factor for the establishment of the relation of forces between the classes, we are convinced that the struggle against this opportunist drift is and will be an element, an active factor, of this relation of forces in favor of the proletariat.

Thus we come back here, as we are used to, on the last congress of the ICC section in France (not translated into English) and on the balance-sheet this organization makes in its press. And above all, given the incredible openness to anarchism which is being imposed, obviously without any real debate in its ranks, we publish an open letter to the militants of this organization to prompt them to get out of their lethargy, to react to this accelerated drift and, at least, to remain faithful to this political Platform that we share.

We join it behind the mail¹ we sent to the Communist Worker Organization (ICT group in Great-Britain) to call them to intervene in this process of accelerated degeneration (not translated into English).

The FICL

1. Not available in English

Open Letter to the ICC militants

The enthusiasm of the present ICC towards the CNT-AIT leads to the abandonment of its political Platform and to the "revision" of marxism

Comrades,

Despite we have never stopped to keep watching closely and to denounce the opportunist drift of our organization, we are today filled with consternation by **the process of accelerated rapprochement towards anarchism that the ICC has entered into** with the abandonment of the principles of the organization and, in general, of marxism which ensues from it.

In our two previous bulletins, we have already alerted to this "fatal trend"¹. Unfortunately we note that, since then, the turn of the ICC towards anarchism goes on and even manifests itself publicly. It does so with such a determination that it seems that now it does not encounter any internal resistance from the militants (if there has been any) even though the arguments utilized in order to justify this turn are so contradictory and so stupid - we don't find other words to qualify them - and even though they are so openly and so clearly opposed to the platform and the principles of the ICC itself.

Do revolutionary unions exist today ?

Reading the report about the late 19th Congress of *Révolution internationale* (in English only on the "online" pages²), we see that the ICC has established "*fraternal and mutually confident*" political relations with the anarchist organization CNT-AIT that it defines as being part of the "revolutionary internationalist milieu". Moreover, it seems that this does not raise the least rejection, the least reticence or dissent ; that there is not the least internal debate on the relations of the ICC with this organization. How odd, is not it ? Though we find in the report-balance-sheet made of this congress a strong statement on the obstacles the working class is now confronted with in order to develop its struggle. It notably says that "*The discussion also allowed us to better discern the present impact of the corraling of the working class by the unions. Although the workers are not yet near to getting out of the union grip and the union ideology in order to take their struggles in hand*

1. Bulletin n° 1 of the FICL, [Response to the Grupo Socialista Libertario \(Mexico\)](#) et bulletin n° 2, [The ICC and its new Policy of Fraternization with Anarchism : To team up with anarchism, is to betray the proletariat](#) (see our web site : <http://www.fractioncommuniste.org>).

2. <http://en.internationalism.org/icconline/2010/09/ri-congress-report>. Erroneously, the English version speaks of the 18th Congress instead of the 19th while the first one was held in 2008.

themselves, the debate brought out the existence, in the workers' ranks, of few illusions on the role and effectiveness of the struggles advocated by the unions. If, despite this disillusionment, the working class is not yet ready today to mobilise itself outside and against the unions, it's essentially because of the difficulty of again finding confidence in its own strength. The working class more and more feels the need to fight against the attacks of the government and the bosses, but doesn't know how to struggle without going through the unions. (...) The union question thus constitutes a major stake in the future dynamic towards massive class confrontations" (we underline).

Thus, according to the presentation of the Congress, the *union question*, the *union ideology*, the *unions* carry on being one of the main obstacles that the bourgeoisie utilizes against the proletariat to ward off or, at least, to impede the development of its struggles. But just a few lines further, with no explanation, we can read a salute to the new **fraternal collaboration of the ICC... with a union organization** ! Is not unionism the basic, the principle and the goal of the CNT-AIT ? For this organization, union is not only a form of organization of the working class, it is **the unique form of organization for the past as well as for the present ; and as well for the future up to the point where, according to its political principles, the unions will be the form of organization of the future anarchist society : "The union, today grouping of resistance, will be in the future the grouping of production and distribution, base of the social reorganization, (...). The Congress declares that unionism, as natural and concrete expression of the producers, contains at latent and organic state all the activities of execution and direction for ensure a new life"** (CNT-AIT, *La Chartre du syndicalisme révolutionnaire*³, Constituent Congress of the CNT, 1946, we translate from French).

Should we recall to the ICC members what is the position of our organization about the unions such as it is set out in our political Platform ?

"Having lost all possibility of fulfilling their initial function

3. Reproduced on the forum of the web site of the CNT-AIT de Caen : <http://cnt.ait.caen.free.fr/forum/viewtopic.php?f=8&t=4564&start=20>

of defending working class interests [in capitalist decadent phase], and confronted with an historic situation in which only the abolition of wage labour and with it, the disappearance of trade unions, was on the agenda, the trade unions became true defenders of capitalism, agencies of the bourgeois state within the working class. (...) The capitalist function of these organs also applies to all those 'new' organisations which play a similar role, no matter what their initial intentions. This is the case with the 'revolutionary unions' and 'shop stewards' as well as those organs (workers' committees, worker's commissions...) which stay in existence after a struggle - even in opposition to the unions - and try to set themselves up as 'authentic' poles for the defence of the workers' immediate interests. On this basis, these organisations cannot escape from being integrated into the apparatus of the bourgeois state even in an unofficial or illegal manner. (...) After more than fifty years of experience of the anti-working class character of these organisations, any position advocating such strategies is fundamentally non-proletarian" (ICC Platform, point 7 on the unions - all the underlinings of the quotations of the ICC Platform in this text are ours).

As if it was not enough, the CNT-AIT is characterized too by its claim of the "union production control" of the enterprises "as long as capitalism survives :

"Considering that in the pre-revolutionary periods, the role of unionism is to put up a constant opposition to capitalist forces, to weaken bosses' power while increasing the unions' one, the Congress considers that these results can't be obtained but through the introduction of the union control in the capitalist enterprises, through the set-up of committees and councils of workshop, factories, offices, (...). While the documentation job, the technical and professional education with the view of social reorganization will be completed, the class training for the production control will be finally realized" (CNT-AIT, Charte du syndicalisme révolutionnaire, op. Cité, we underline and translate).

Should we recall to the ICC members what is the position of our organization about the "*workers management of the enterprises in capitalism*" such as it is set-out in our political platform ?

"This is why 'self-management' (the management of enterprises by the workers in a society which remains capitalist), a petty bourgeois utopia last century when it was advocated by Proudhonist tendencies, is today nothing but a capitalist mystification. It is an economic weapon of capital in that it tries to get the workers to take up responsibility for enterprises hit by the crisis by making

them organise their own exploitation. It is a political weapon of the counter-revolution in that it: divides the working class by imprisoning it and isolating it factory by factory, neighbourhood by neighbourhood, sector by sector ; burdens the workers with the concerns of the capitalist economy when their only task is to destroy it ; diverts the proletariat from the fundamental task which determines the possibility of its emancipation: the destruction of the political apparatus of capital and the establishment of its class dictatorship on a world scale.

Any political position which (even in the name of 'working class experience' or of 'establishing new relations among workers') defends self management is, in fact, objectively participating in the preservation of capitalist relations of production. (point 11 of the ICC Platform).

"This mystification, which reached its culminating point with the experience of 'self-management' and the defeat of the workers at LIP in France in 1974-5, is today exhausted. However, it cannot be excluded that it will go through a certain revival in the future with the renewal of anarchism. In the struggles in Spain in 1936, it was the anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist currents who were the flag-bearers for the myth of self-management, presented as a 'revolutionary' economic measure" (Additional note of this point of the Platform).

Thus the ICC Platform establishes that the "workers management within capitalism" is a mystification, a capitalist trickery, a weapon of the counter-revolution ; and the organizations which defend it, such as the anarchist and anarcho-unionist ones, are objective defenders of capitalist order.

Though the present ICC, in obvious contradiction with this position of principle, declares that an organization of that type is today... revolutionary !

Should we too recall to the ICC members that, still according to the Platform, the specific role of the "non-official", "revolutionary" or "rank and file" unions is precisely to be the last beater of the workers towards unionism and the unions which are organs of the bourgeois State in the proletarian milieu, and this in order the workers regain confidence in these same unions ? The present ICC, in full contradiction with its principles and its policy as well with its practice of the previous decades, claims to having met today union organizations, such as the CNT-AIT, which are not "necessarily on the counter-revolution ground" ; this organizations would even been "*authentic part of the proletarian camp*" (WR 336).

History of anarchism been "reviewed and corrected"

In our previous bulletin (see [The ICC and its new Policy of Fraternization with Anarchism : To team up with anarchism, is to betray the proletariat](#)), we have denounced the main aspects of the so-called "theoretical" line of argument with which the today ICC pretends to justify its collaboration with anarchist unionism. In this article, we have only recall the principles which establish the very existence of the ICC and to denounce the betrayal which these principles suffer every time more openly. We refer our readers and the ICC militants to this bulletin.

But, in order to assess the degree of aberration and stupid remark that the ICC militant presently give their support to through their silence, let's see the "new history" of anarchism devised by the present ICC.

Lately, the ICC has published some articles¹ on anarchism in which, little by little, it has introduced a new interpretation of the history of this current ; an invented history precisely for justifying its collaboration with anarchism. According to it, it would exist all along history two dissimilar currents in anarchism : one would be reactionary or reformist and the other revolutionary and internationalist ; the latter consistently striving for collaborating and getting closer to marxist communism. Once the "thesis" been established, in the pure speculative style - that we already had noticed in other "theoretical" rantings of the liquidationist faction of the ICC since 2001 -, our "unmaker" of history ventures to seek "examples" to "prove" its thesis... The "trick" of this new history of anarchism is very simple : making abstraction of the fact that, if some elements or anarchist groups came closer to marxist communism, they did it insofar as **they gave up their own anarchist conceptions** ; and this giving up has not been but the result of the influence of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat inspired by marxism, notably during the 1917-1923 revolutionary wave.

But let's accept for a moment the point of view of this "new history of anarchism" with the "two currents" worked out by the ICC in order to see where it leads : *"Today, in France for example, the same name 'CNT' covers two anarchist organisations, one which defends authentically revolutionary positions (CNT-AIT) and another which is purely 'reformist' and reactionary (the CNT 'Vignoles')"* (WR 336, we underline).

Have the ICC militants wondered on which foundations this so marked distinction between the two « CNT » : is based ?

1. See the serie *The Communist Left and internationalist anarchism, what we have in common* (WR 336, 337 and 338)

Is it because the history of each one is so different ? No, since both come (and claim) from the Spanish CNT which, in 1936, led the proletariat in the inter-bourgeois war between democracy and fascism. Is it on their program and principles ? Nor since both CNTs carry on claiming the same *Charte syndicale [Union Chart]* of foundation in 1946. Is it because the CNT-AIT tends to come closer to the marxist communist positions ? The so-called *Charte* immediatly rejects any political party (included the proletariats) as well as the dictatorship of the workers councils (on the contrary, at this level, it defends a federative organization of unions). Let's see now what this organization thinks about marxism :

"The International Working Men's Association ["AIT" in French] was set up in 1864. (...) Since the beginning, the movement has been torn up between two tendencies : the authoritarian socialists regrouped around Karl Marx and the anti-authoritarians - or federalists - around Michel Bakunin. For the anti-authoritarian, it is the power, the domination, the authority which are the very foundations of this society and nothing will be really changed if the movement which claims to revolutionarize the world, organizes itself in an hierarchical, centralizing, authoritarian manner. We know now to which monstrousness the authoritarian socialism has led and still leads to. The « libertarians » of that time had also perceived very well the possible dangers and the bloody drifts of this doctrine (...). The marxist-leninist method has failed making running much blood up to the point where the very idea of revolution has become extremely suspicious to many and closely linked to the idea of terror" (CNT-AIT. *L'anarcho-syndicalisme, c'est quoi?*, translated by us).

So for the CNT-AIT, marxism is authoritarian, dangerous and could not but drive and still drives to terrible and bloody monstrousnesses.

In the end, is it the split within the CNT in 1993 (which opened up the set-up of the CNT-AIT and the CNT-Vignolles) which would have miraculously given birth to an *"authentically revolutionary"* current as the ICC claims ? Let the CNT protagonists themselves speak :

"Two lines nevertheless took shape which still became apparent in the following : for one side, a hard dogmatic line radically opposing to the [official] elections of the employees' union delegates and thus to the strategy of development of the local union organizations, actually withdrawing on an anarchist-anarchounionist propagandist line ; on the other side, a line put forward by our organization (oftenly called CNT-Vignolles) looking for developing a unionism of struggle, accepting selective participation to elections in order to protect its local union

organizations, refusing the unique ideological reference of anarchism. These distinctions are to be relativized : it occurred in the following that the CNT-AIT unions participated themselves to elections of unions' official delegates and made excellent union work ; in addition, those of the CNT participate selectively to elections. Finally let's note that, locally, when the individuals old rivalries are absent, excellent relations do exist as well as a fruitful common work" (CNT-F. Petite histoire de la CNT-F - <http://www.cnt-f.org/spip.php?article712>).

The CNT members themselves acknowledge not only that the split was based on secondary disagreements (personal or relative) and not on principles, but that both parties make still today the same kind of "*excellent union work*", that they are used to have "*excellent relations*" beyond the personal rivalries and even a "*fruitful common work*". As we can see, the distinction between an "*authentically revolutionary*" CNT and an other one "*reactionary*" is not but a falsification of reality. Comrades of the ICC, do you realize where you walking to ? What do yo think, comrades, of the "**fraternal alliance**" that the ICC is forging with a union and selfmanagement organization which does not represent but the last car of the bourgeoisie campaigns against communism and, more globally, against the proletariat' class consciousness ?

Breaking off with the ICC positions of principles

The **opportunist** process of coming closer and fraternization with anarchism is accompanied by an obvious and accelerated process of theoretical "involution" by this organization. It clearly appears that this coming closer is not due to the fact that the anarchists have joined the marxist positions, but to the fact that the present ICC moves away from marxism and that it increasingly gives up its positions of principles.

In that sense, the ICC has lately published a serie of three articles *Communist Left and Internationalist Anarchism*¹. The serie is signed : ICC. It means it is not simply a militant's opinion, nor of a territorial section's one. It is an **official statement of the organization**. It confirms that there is no internal debate, nor on the fraternization with anarchism, nor on the "new theoretical" argumentation which attempts to justify it. The three articles give us an idea much more complete and precise of the **step the ICC has taken in the revision of its basic principles as well as marxism in general**. Here is why it is our duty to warn

1. *The Communist Left and internationalist anarchism : (1st part) what we have in common ; (2nd part) : On the difficulties of debating and the ways to overcome them ; (3rd part) : The approach needed for this debate.* We can read them in the ICC press and also on its web site in different languages (www.world.internationalism.org).

you, comrades, about what you are supporting through your silence : the scuttling of the ICC as a proletariat's revolutionary organization. You may ignore or smile at our warning. The anarchists - and finally the bourgeoisie - will applaud you.

Comrades of the ICC, do you realize that this new serie on anarchism is above all an **open and official break** with all the statements on anarchism that the ICC had defended during more than 30 years, since its foundation in 1975 up to the beginning of the years 2000 ? The old ICC, our ICC, had the following position on the anarchist and anarcho-unionist **political current** :

"A political current, the anarcho-unionism, which always wallowed in the dirty waters of the counter-revolution, despite its « horror » for dictatorship, for all State and all government. The irresponsibility, the historical incoherence of anarcho-unionism has remained manifest in this tragic game of seesaw in the permanent duplicity of the « authorities », of the « anti-authoritarian » CNT which revealed a criminal lack of historical vision and of clear revolutionary theory that cost the life of much of its militants committed to the cause of their class... The CNT-FAI, for its-political ideology and its misunderstanding of the class nature of the State which prevented it to exert any kind of action for its destruction, has been the last defence of capitalism against the working class" (ICC, *España 1936*, 1977, underlined and translated by us²).

Conscious of the danger that the anarchist current as a whole and its ideology represent for the new generation of workers and revolutionaries, the "old" ICC never stopped denouncing the historically and objectively counter-revolutionary character.

As we already underlined it in various occasions, still in the years 2000, the ICC was conscious of the direct link which existed between the world bourgeoisie's campaign about "communism death" and the revival of anarchism :

"In the years 1990, we have witnessed at the same time to an anti-communism campaign which followed the fall of the Berlin Wall in which communism has been denigrated through its assimilation to stalinism (while the historical reality shows us that it was the gravedigger of the October 1917 revolution) and to a promotion of anarchism as true revolutionary movement in front of the bolsheviks and Lenin who would have only been simple conspirators who set up their dictatorship by a « coup d'Etat ». To present anarchism as « vanguard » of revolutionary impulsion and Spain 1936 as « model » of social revolution, does not represent any contradiction with the anti-communist campaign. Actually, it is its continuation and its reinforcement. (...) Capitalism is very

2. http://es.internationalism.org/libros/1936/intro/2_BILAN

*conscious that such celestial musics [« the triumph of democracy and capitalism »] need the critical counterpoint of ideologies and models which apparently are very radical but at bottom defend the capitalist order by other ways" (Introduction to the 3rd edition of the ICC booklet *España 1936* in Spanish, translated by us).*

It means that **the development of anarchism** was analyzed and understood by the "old" ICC as a **complement and a logical reinforcement of the ideological offensive of the bourgeoisie against marxism and communism**. Actually anarchism is characterized precisely by its permanent battle against marxist communism, assimilating it voluntarily to stalinism, to a frightening and bloody dictatorship, that the proletariat should reject. Two decades after the fall of the Russian imperialist bloc and of stalinism, anarchism carries on utilizing the campaign on the "death of communism". It is what we can practically see in all anarchist web pages and publications when they constantly "recall" the "marxist bolsheviks' atrocities".

What does today the "new" ICC say about it ? *"The attitude of the majority of the Bolshevik party in the years 1918-24 (the indiscriminate banning of the anarchist press, the armed confrontation with Makhno's army, the bloody suppression of the Kronstadt uprising, etc) opened up a huge gulf between revolutionary Marxists and anarchists"* (Communist Left and internationalist anarchism, part 3, WR 338, October 2010).

In other words, **the ICC of today participates to the bourgeois campaign supported by anarchism about the "crimes and the horrors of the communist bolsheviks" !** We could mention other examples which show that this "new" serie of articles of the ICC on anarchism breaks with its position on anarchism, that it says exactly the contrary of what it had supported since its foundation. It is enough to note that, in this serie, there is no reference, no quotation, of old texts of the ICC on anarchism to support the new affirmations. On the contrary, here the ICC goes back on its previous positions up "to apologize" for having criticized and denounced anarchism, up "to acknowledge exaggerations and previous mistakes" in what it used to say on this current. Finally, in a footnote, the essential design of this serie of article is expressed with clarity :

"This being said, during the debate that has taken place recently, anarchist comrades have rightly protested against certain exaggerated formulae which appear to pronounce a definitive and unjustified sentence on anarchism [here stops the English version of this footnote, we think important to make known the whole original version in French,¹ may be the English translator saw the open

1. See the French version which has been censored by the English

rejection of the past positions too obvious. Thus we translate it]. Going back again in some of our former texts, we have also found passages that we would not write today. For instance :

- « workers individuals can think they adhere to revolution from anarchism, but to adhere to a revolutionary programme one must break with anarchism » (International Review102) [this quotation is not too available in the English pages of the ICC web site, we thus translate it] ;

- « that is why the proletariat must resolutely turns away from these illusionmongers that are the anarchists » (<http://fr.internationalism.org/ri321/anarchisme.htm>) (...) " (WR 338, 2010, Communist Left and internationalist anarchism,

<http://en.internationalism.org/wr/338/internationalist-anarchism-part-3>.

So, in a footnote, the present ICC has found "*passages*" of its old publications *"that he would not write today"*. Comrades of the ICC, are you ashamed today of having called during three decades the workers to get rid of the counter-revolutionary traps of anarchism ? **Should not we call anymore the proletariat and the elements searching for revolutionary coherence to get rid of its utopian and reactionary madnesses ? Is there no more need for the proletariat for resolutely break off with anarchism ?**

Let's imagine for a while - sorry for the digression - that the present ICC is in Spain in 1936 and that it defends in front of the working class, its "new" slogan : **workers, you must not break with the CNT-AIT because this one is "authentically revolutionary" !** Do you realize that you would oppose to the "majority" of *Bilan*, that you would be besides the POUM and the anarchists and that, finally, the ICC at its level would participate to the defeat of the proletariat in Spain and then to its massacre in the world imperialist butchery ?

Increasing open break with the ICC Platform

The new serie of articles considered as a whole, gives us a much clearer overview of the tendency of the present ICC to let aside, to globally bury, its own political Platform.

According to it, **"fundamental points of agreement** [do exist] *between the internationalist anarchists and the communist left. For the ICC, without denying that important differences exist, the crucial thing is that we are all determined defenders of workers' autonomy, since we refuse to give our support « even in a 'critical' or 'tactical' way, or in the name of the 'lesser evil', to a sector of the bourgeoisie - whether the 'democratic' bourgeoisie against*

translation : [Gauche communiste et anarchisme internationaliste \(3\) : quel état d'esprit doit animer le débat ?](http://fr.internationalism.org/ri321/anarchisme.htm)

the 'fascist' bourgeoisie [let's forget the role of the CNT in 1936 !], or the left against the right, or the Palestinian bourgeoisie against the Israeli bourgeoisie, etc. Such an approach has two concrete implications:

1. Rejecting any electoral support or cooperation with parties which manage the capitalist system or defend this or that form of this system (social democracy, Stalinism, 'Chavismo', etc)

2. Above all, during any war, it means maintaining an intransigent internationalism, refusing to choose between this or that imperialist camp.» ('The Communist Left and Internationalist Anarchism', Part one, WR 336).

All those who defend these essential positions in theory and practice need to be aware that they belong to the same camp : the camp of the working class and the revolution" (Communist Left and internationalist anarchism, part 2, WR 337, we underline).

All in all, for the "new" ICC, it is enough to shout "*workers autonomy*", "*rejecting electoral support*" and "*an « intransigent » (?) internationalism*" to find favour with it. Actually, this ICC draws these "basic points" not from its political Platform but from the "principle gruel" of various groups and individuals marked with dilettantism, verbal radicalism, confusion and who claim themselves as "anti-bolsheviks", "autonomists", "anarcho-councilists", "situationists", "pro-revolutionaries", etc. Let's have a look to the positions of a group of this kind which names itself **Círculo internacional de comunistas antibolcheviques** [International Circle of Anti-bolshevik Communists] :

"1) Communism is not a philosophy nor a political programme to which the thought and the action of the working class can be adjusted. It is the action of the working class itself (...) [or as says the present ICC, "marxism is not but only a label"] ;

2) we defend the development of the autonomy of the proletarians in struggle (...) ;

3) we are for the consequent revolutionary internationalism (...) [intransigent ! Would add the present ICC] ;

4) we struggle for the radical and full self-liberation of the proletarians ;

5) we defend the proletariat's central place as revolutionary class, (...) the proletariat's central place as revolutionary class means moreover that the proletarians' emancipation does not depend but only on their own efforts!" (we translate from Spanish).

1. Círculo Internacional de Comunistas Antibolcheviques. The complete text can be consulted on <http://caj.xtreemhost.com/orientacion.htm> ; on the web site of this "circle". We can find too a list of web links with pages of closed groups and individuals amongts which we find the **GSL of**

As we can easily notice it, it does not exist any difference with the points that the ICC considers as "**fundamental**". With these approximate generalities, the ICC puts aside thus its **marxist political programme**.

The very list of "important disagreements" that the present ICC says it has with anarchism, is significant of its "new" policy :

"And there are indeed important divergences between them :

- Centralism/federalism

- Materialism/idealism

- Period of transition or 'immediate abolition of the state'

- Recognition or denunciation of the October 1917 revolution and of the Bolshevik party" (Communist Left and the internationalist anarchism, part 1, WR 336).

The affirmation of some divergences (certainly important) enables it to avoid carefully questions as the union one, which can only lead to an uncompromising confrontation with the practical policy of the anarchists and other anarcho-unionists (with whom it fraternizes today). It does the same in regards with two other basic questions which have marked the antagonism between marxism and anarchism :

- the need for the proletariat's political party : for marxism, "the existence and activity of the party are an indispensable condition for the final victory of the proletariat" (point 16 of the ICC Platform), while for anarchism, the political party is the worst evil that the working class can suffer from. Marxist communism so struggles for the settting up of the party, for the proletariat's vanguard organization, while anarchism (of which the CNT is one of the finest pieces) makes all it can to prevent the working class to set up one ;

- the questions of the proletariat's dictatorship which clearly reveals to which point the present ICC gives up non only its own political Platform but also marxism in general.

Thus, this new serie of articles of the ICC about anarchism is significant non only for what it says but also for what it forgets to say. It is notable that the fundamental axis of the opposition between marxism and anarchism, it means the **dictatorship of the proletariat, is not even mentionned** in the three articles dedicated to the exposition of "the points of agreement and disagreement" between the two currents ! The present ICC has "forgotten" this fundamental concept of revolutionary marxism, historically key and verified in the practice of our class (the Paris Commune and above all the Russian Revolution in 1917) ; this concept is though clearly posed and defended in its own

México, one of the anarchist groups which the ICC collaborates with presently..

Platform, but it prefers today to speak about it with modesty, maybe for not hurting the sensitive ears of the anarchist "friends".

In opposition to this basic principle of marxism, **the anarchist current defends as a basic principle "the immediate abolition of the State"**. It is the reason why, consequently, it violently rejects the proletariat's struggle for political power, it means that it rejects and fights against the proletariat's dictatorship. This basic opposition, of principle, is as clear for the communists as for the anarchists, and this since Marx and Bakunin themselves. For instance, let's see how the greatest figure of anarchism- **that up to today no consequent anarchist disowns** - presents it :

"The Difference Between Authoritarian and Libertarian Revolution. It is this point which mainly divides the Socialists or revolutionary collectivists from the authoritarian Communists, the partisans of the absolute initiative of the State (...) Only the Communists imagine that they can attain through development and organization of the political power of the working classes, and chiefly of the city proletariat (...) whereas the revolutionary Socialists, the enemies of all ambiguous alliances, believe, on the contrary, that this common goal can be attained not through the political but through the social (and therefore anti-political) organization and power of the working masses of the cities (...). Hence the two different methods. The Communists believe that it is necessary to organize the forces of the workers in order to take possession of the political might of the State. The revolutionary Socialists organize with the view of destroying, or if you prefer a more refined expression, of liquidating the State. The Communists are the partisans of the principle and practice of authority, while revolutionary Socialists place their faith only in freedom" (M. Bakunin, Stateless socialism : anarchism).

On the contrary, for communism - since Marx -, **the destruction of the bourgeois State and the instauration of the dictatorship of the proletariat is, no more no less, the immediate historical goal of the proletarian revolution**. It is what gives a true class meaning (totally different to the one anarchism gives to it) to "workers' autonomy", to "intransigent internationalism" and to all the proletariat's fight against capitalism ; it is the point of departure of the communist revolution, of the struggle for the abolition of the salaried exploitation and the division of society in classes. Is it necessary to recall to the ICC comrades the abc of Marx's theory ?

"Long before me, bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this struggle between the classes, as had bourgeois economists their economic anatomy. My

own contribution was 1. to show that the existence of classes is merely bound up with certain historical phases in the development of production; 2. that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; 3. that this dictatorship itself constitutes no more than a transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society" (Marx's letter to Weydemeyer, March 5th, 1852).

"In these circumstances, proletarian dictatorship is not only an absolutely legitimate means of overthrowing exploiters and suppressing the resistance, but also absolutely necessary to the entire mass of working people, being their only defense against the bourgeois dictatorship which led to the war and is preparing new wars. (...) In capitalist society, whenever there is any serious aggravation of the class struggle intrinsic to that society, there can be no alternative but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dreams of some third way are reactionary, petty-bourgeois limitations. That is borne out by more than a century of development of bourgeois democracy in the working-class movement in all the advanced countries, and notably by the experience of the past five years" (Lenin, Thesis and Report on Bourgeois Democracy and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, March 1919, 1st Congress of the Communist International).

As well, the ICC Platform affirms that : **"The seizure of political power by the proletariat on a world scale, the precondition for and the first stage in the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society, means in the first place the total destruction of the apparatus of the bourgeois state. (...) As the lever of economic transformation of society, the dictatorship of the proletariat (i.e. the exclusive exercise of political power by the working class) will have the fundamental task of expropriating the exploiting class by socialising the means of production. (...) On the basis of its political power, the proletariat will have to attack the political economy of the bourgeoisie by carrying forward an economic policy leading to the abolition of wage labour and commodity production and to the satisfaction of the needs of humanity (ICC Platform, point 15).**

It is this **fundamental opposition (and not a simple "disagreement") between marxism and anarchism** that the ICC of today voluntarily forgets. Here is why, finally, all the supposed "basic agreements" that it presents in its serie of articles, aren't but pure quackery, a smoke-screen to attempt to hide a major political fact, it means that the ICC fraternizes with anarchism by abandoning its own Platform of political principles and marxism in general. Is not there

the purest expression of political opportunism ? Unfortunately, this fundamental opposition is not only "theoretical" : **history has already resolved and enabled to see where the struggle leads to when it is based on one or the other principle ; in the first case, to Russia 1917, in the second to Spain 1936** ; in the first case to the triumph of the proletarian revolution, in the second to the proletariat's bloody defeat and to its enlistment behind a bourgeois fraction. As says Lenin : "there can be no alternative".

Comrades of the ICC, do you remember the *Internationalisme* formula from which the ICC claims to be the heir ? "**Without revolutionary theory, there is no revolutionary movement**". Is it necessary to recall you the first point of our political Platform about the theory of the communist revolution ?

"Marxism is the fundamental theoretical acquisition of the proletarian struggle. It is on the basis of marxism that all the lessons of the proletarian struggle can be integrated into a coherent whole. By explaining the unfolding of history through the development of the class struggle, that is to say struggle based on the defence of economic interests within a framework laid down by the development of the productive forces, and by recognising the proletariat as the subject of the revolution which will abolish capitalism, marxism is the only conception of the world which really expresses the viewpoint of that class. Thus, far from being an abstract speculation about the world, it is first and foremost a weapon of struggle for the working class. And because the working class is the first and only class whose emancipation necessarily entails the emancipation of the whole of humanity, a class whose domination over society will not lead to a new form of exploitation but to the abolition of all exploitation, only marxism is capable of grasping social reality in an objective and scientific manner, without any prejudices or mystifications of any sort. Consequently, although it is not a fixed doctrine, but on the contrary undergoes constant elaboration in a direct and living relationship with the class struggle, and although it benefited from prior theoretical achievements of the working class, marxism has been from its very inception the only framework from which and within which revolutionary theory can develop."

Comrades of the ICC, we demand and require a clear response : is "marxism the fundamental theoretical acquisition of the proletarian struggle" ? Yes or no ? Yes or no, is it "the only conception of the world which really expresses the viewpoint of that class" ? Is marxism the indispensable weapon of the working class struggle ? Yes or

no ? Is it "the only framework from which and within which revolutionary theory can develop" ? Yes or no ? Or rather... "should we go beyond the labels of marxism and anarchism"¹ ?

We demand and require a clear response. Is there within the present ICC a single militant who still defends marxism and opposes to anarchist and anarcho-unionist ideology ? **If so, then he must rise up and fight** before revisionism ends up suffocating the ICC for good, before he becomes accomplice of the ICC liquidation as Communist Left organization, as marxist organization, as organization of the proletariat !

October 2010.

Last minute : In this end of October 2010, it appears that the process of "internal liquidation" of the ICC is living a strong speed up. After having politically open the door of the Proletarian Camp to anarchism, now the ICC opens its own press : two articles of the CNT (*How to struggle ? By mean of an autonomous popular resistance* and *What is a general assembly ?*) with a strong "libertarian" tonality, have found their place on its web site ; and it seems to just be the beginning.

As militants excluded (by force) from the ICC, we have the right to wonder if all the members of this organization - which is still, normally, marxist - have been "informed beforehand", if they have had the possibility to debate and decide collectively of this incredible initiative, or if they have simply been put in front of the fact already done ? What ever it is, where are they going to let the ICC drift goes to ? Up to its death for the proletariat ?

October 2010
Fraction of the International Communist Left

1. As now the ICC presents also the relation between marxism and anarchism : "But under the same label of 'marxist' there are genuinely bourgeois and reactionary organisations. The same goes for the 'anarchist' label" (WR 336, 1st article of the serie on Communist Left and Anarchism).