

**INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST  
BULLETIN**

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

Extracts of the French and Spanish versions of Issue#2

**n° 2**

**August 8<sup>th</sup> 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.*

**Has the Proletarian Camp definitively gone bankrupt ?**.....1

## PROLETARIAN CAMP

### *Struggle against opportunism*

**The ICC and its new Policy of Fraternization with Anarchism :  
To team up with anarchism, is to betray the proletariat**.....4

Correspondance of the ICM (Montréal) with an ICC sympathizer

Correspondance of our Fraction with the ICM about the policy of "recovery" of the ICC

### *Struggle for the defence and the regroupment of the Proletarian Camp*

**Police pressure on the Communist groups : The whole Communist Left must stand up**.....8

**Communique : the CSIS (Canadian police) Visits the ICM**.....8

## TEXTS OF THE WORKERS MOVEMENT

**Lenin : Speech At The Unveiling Of A Memorial To Marx And Engels (November 7, 1918)**.....10

The function of trotskism (*Internationalisme* n° 26, 1947)

## Has the Proletarian Camp definitively gone bankrupt ?

There is a new fashion in the "revolutionary milieu" - indeed "pro-revolutionary" (sic !) -, particularly amongst those who have lately left the ICC<sup>1</sup>, which consists in declaring the bankruptcy of the Proletarian Camp, or what the ICC used to call the Proletarian Political Milieu. Basing on the immediate observation, but not less real, of division and sectarianism which strike the groups claiming themselves to the Communist Left, these elements breaking with their organization and seeking for "individual freedom" put up their rupture - not declared, not openly claimed - with the political orientations that they had defended, during decades for some of them, within their organization ; in this case within the ICC. They renounce to the struggle for the regroupment of the Communist Left ; it means that they refuse and even give up the confrontation of the real political positions which are expressed and defended by the older and more important groups, in particular in their press and intervention. These people prefer to chat on networks or worst on informal "structures" in which one enters and leaves when ever he wants and where every one proposes or takes back, according to his mood, his poor "production". Thus they renounce to the only possibility of real and practical political clarification by refusing the determined commitment to the political criticisms and polemics and to the fierce struggle against opportunist gangrene. By believing declaring the bankruptcy of the Camp, they pronounce their own bankruptcy and powerlessness, they give in in front of the sectarianism without fighting it back, preferring the internet networks, the fictitious unity, discussions with no goal, from which nothing comes out in terms of political struggle ; and it is not by chance if their present tendency leads them to join the "open and free debates" of the councilist milieu, especially around the group *Internationalist Perspective*.

We must acknowledge that this task of liquidation of the Camp is particularly helped by the action - or the inactivity - of the main groups and currents of this Communist Left. Useless here to recall the sectarian behaviour, of principle - it is openly claimed and this is its only merit - of the various International Communist Party of the so-called "bordiguist" current. On the other hand, the opportunist drift of the ICC whose sectarian approach is not

its least manifestation, gives an important argument for the "anti-partidists" : not only, it does not recognize the Proletarian Political Milieu<sup>2</sup>, but moreover it clearly turns its back (definitively ?) to this one by trying to replace it with a "regroupment" between marxism and anarchism under the pretext that the latter presents itself as "internationalist"<sup>3</sup>. It thus looks at making "particular links" with political fractions of the class enemy camp ! The correspondence we reproduce in this bulletin between our comrades of the *Internationalist Communists of Montreal* and an ICC sympathizer clearly responds to this drift and rises some of its contradictions.

Finally, in this situation of the Proletarian Camp in which the two first currents ("Bordiguism" and the ICC) are not any more able to face their historical responsibilities as pole of reference and regroupment, the Internationalist Communist Tendency (ex-IBRP), only organization which would be in real capacity of occupying and assuming this responsibility, tends to not grasp all its importance and all its historical significance, preferring to remain with its immediate certainties. Nevertheless, this organization succeeds sometime and in some occasions to impose itself as this pole up to directly regroup around itself - which we salute and support -, but it doesn't succeed to understand all the dimension of a resolute policy of "regroupment" since it precisely sees its aim only as an immediate adhesion within its own ranks. Thus, it tends to underestimate, indeed to ignore, the other currents of the Proletarian Camp and the indispensable political struggle against the opportunist drifts which develop within it up to just see it, too, as sterile polemics. Yet how many revolutionary elements who are searching for political clarification and coherence - they'll be even more numerous tomorrow with the crisis and the inescapable workers struggles in reaction - could so refer and could orientate themselves amongst the positions and the groups if the ICT would assume all the dimensions of

2. " At the same time, the fact that **the groups of the proletarian milieu are more and more disqualifying themselves from the process which leads to the formation of the class party** only highlights the crucial role which the ICC has been called upon to play within this process. It is increasingly clear that the party of the future will not be the result of the "democratic" addition of the different groups of the milieu, but that **the ICC already constitutes the skeleton of the future party**" (16<sup>th</sup> Congress of the ICC, Resolution on the International Situation, *International Review* 122, we underline).

3. See the article *The communist left and internationalist anarchism: What we have in common (!)* in *World Revolution* 336 or also *Réunion CNT-AIT de Toulouse du 15 avril 2010 : vers la constitution d'un creuset de réflexion dans le milieu internationaliste (!)* [*Meeting with the CNT-AIT (...): towards the setting up of reflection test in the internationalist Milieu*] published in *Révolution internationale* 414 de juillet 2010 et sur le site du CCI (<http://fr.internationalism.org/node/4256>).

1. For instance, the comrades of *Controverses* who already draw a negative balance-sheet of the Communist Left just a few months after having left the ICC : "No doubt, it is midnight in the Century of the Communist Left since it is already 3 decades that this current passes through a deep political and organizational crisis" (translated by us from French). They seem to be joined by the comrades who too have left, "by themselves", *Battaglia comunista* to form the Instituto O. Damen in order "to re-build the Communist Left on completely new political and organizational basis" (also translated by us).

the role that History offers it today. What step forwards for the regroupment !

All these negative tendencies, the sectarianism of the organizations which withdraw into themselves, the opportunism of the organizations which turn themselves towards bourgeois organizations, the ICC today towards anarchism - how do you go to the Party with the Anarchists ? -, the renouncement of those who give in to sectarianism in stead of fighting it back and who turn towards councilism, indeed towards anarchism, lead one way or another, more or less directly, to the reinforcement of the anti-party tendencies - even those who pretend to struggle for the Party "strong and compact". The tendencies to sectarianism, what ever are their expressions, oppose to the process of development for the unity of the groups and so hamper the process towards the Party.

It has to be acknowledged, we are very few to openly defend the existence of a Proletarian Camp and to claim this struggle ; except our fraction and the comrades of the ICM, there is no political expression which posts such a need. Even the comrades who left us lately, the ones who officially kept the name of "Internal Fraction of the ICC", seem to have given up this ground and to have joined the *Controverses-Internationalist Perspective* sphere. Why should we defend a camp which doesn't recognize itself ? Because it objectively and historically exists and because it is essential. Nor the individual militants, even less the organizations can decide to give up the communist battle and "free" themselves of their own history. The organizations, which can whether disappear or betray and be lost for the proletariat, can well be led to change their position. Indeed they can even politically break with their past positions. But then the ones and the others are responsible to the proletariat, their class, of their past position and owe them a critical balance-sheet by the systematic study of their own historical thread. The ones and the others, above all the others, it means the organizations, have the obligation of assuming their responsibility in front of their class and the whole communist forces, it means to assume their political course for the individuals, their history for the organizations.

Until today, as long as the so-called "bordiguist" groups carry on living so-so, as long as the ICC has not passed in the bourgeoisie's camp - it comes close quickly as the reader can verify in this bulletin -, they carry on having much more in common than they admit it : in the historical barricade which separates the bourgeois camp from the proletarian one, they have always found themselves up to today on the same side than the rest of the proletarian camp, in particular than the Internationalist Communist Tendency, in the events which settle : imperialist war and classes struggle. Whether they want it or not, this camp does exist and the events which affect such or such part of

its components does affect inescapably, more or less directly, the other parts.

Groups as the ICT tend to think that it is proper that every one devotes its effort to intervene on its own, to develop its own organization and its influence within the class. And, finally, we'll see who is right ; the "theoretical and political debates" will be so settled. A little like "every one for himself and God will recognizes his own". This vision, which is very much like the councilist vision, underestimates seriously the role of the political vanguards of the proletariat as "political leadership" and in particular their tasks of theoretical and political development as the fight against the bourgeois ideology and its penetration within the proletariat ; in short, as a moment of... the classes struggle. Begone from us the idea of underestimating the intervention within the working class and the need for developing as much as we can the influence and the presence of the communist groups in the large masses of the proletariat as well as the experience of the practical, concrete, struggle against the political, union and others, forces of the bourgeois State. This is indispensable and it has to be set up daily. Nevertheless, the direct intervention within the working class is not the only ground, nor even is the ground par excellence, where the historical theoretical and political questions are debated, confronted and clarified, where they represent theoretical and political steps as well as essential moment of the regroupment process for the formation of the world party of the proletariat.

We already warned our readers and the forces of the Proletarian Camp on this question. Every day which goes by and which does not see a reversal of this dynamic of "everyone for himself", is a lost day which weakens the historical chances of the proletariat. Exaggeration ? All the contrary. We are even ourselves too timid and too hesitant in this struggle and the extreme numerical weakness which we suffer, can't be an excuse. Even more since all these negative tendencies within the Proletarian Camp, or within the Political Milieu if one prefers, happen at the time when massive classes confrontations are more than ever objectively announced - the economical crisis and capitalism's impasse force it -, at the time when, precisely with these classes confrontations in mind, the bourgeoisie unleashes as never before, more massive and totalitarian ideological campaigns. It is precisely at that time which is going to determine the conditions of the entrance into the massive classes confrontations, that the communist groups would have to work actively for the regroupment by affirming their willingness for unity<sup>1</sup> and by presenting openly through the political confrontation their

1. The occasions - it is a sign of the present times - add up lately. The visits that the police paid to the comrades of the GIO (the Canadian group of the ICT) and of the ICM (see their communiqué and our statement in this bulletin) are the last one.

disagreements - which would not be the expression of their division but on the opposite a moment of the process towards unity.

If the bankrupt declaration of the Communist Left, announced today by a certain numbers of "deserters", ended up being confirmed by history - the only one which can declare it -, the perspective which would present for our class would be the one of a "German" kind of situation ; a situation where the proletariat would be without real party, without political leadership, as in Germany in 1918-1919 and the years which followed ; a situation where it would be in front of a myriad of small groups more or less communist, some "historical" but ignoring each other and, at the best, running after the events, incapable of taking the lead of these events, which would not even succeed to distinguish themselves from... the Anarchist and Leftist groups with their radical and "leftist" language. It would be a catastrophe. Nobody can doubt it.

How can we defend and affirm the unity of a Camp which denies to consider itself as such ? How can we attempt at going towards the regroupment and the Party ? By taking

back Lenin's method, the method of fraction, the one utilized from 1902 up to 1917, the one which advocates political confrontation and virulent, frontal, polemics, the very one which does not fear to be intransigent in the polemics, the one which condemns without concession the opportunist drifts and opens its doors to the currents and the individuals which tend to come close and to regroup. This method does not offer any guarantee but the one of permanent and frontal struggle. But it is the only one which can avoid us a Berlin 1919 and open us the door of an October 1917. What ever is the proletariat's strength, its energy in the massive confrontations, its influence upon the communist minorities, it cannot substitute to the conscious and determined effort of the communists in order to decide of its capacity to insurrection and to the setting up of the its own class dictatorship.

Proletarian Camp or no Proletarian Camp ? Berlin or Petrograd ?

August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010.  
The FICL.

### **Lenin on the spontaneity of the masses and the political vanguard**

Only a gross failure to understand Marxism (or an "understanding" of it in the spirit of "Struveism") could prompt the opinion that the rise of a mass, spontaneous working-class movement relieves us of the duty of creating as good an organisation of revolutionaries as the Zemlya i Volya had, or, indeed, an incomparably better one. On the contrary, this movement imposes the duty upon us; for the spontaneous struggle of the proletariat will not become its genuine "class struggle" until this struggle is led by a strong organisation of revolutionaries (...).

Not only are revolutionaries in general lagging behind the spontaneous awakening of the masses, but even worker-revolutionaries are lagging behind the spontaneous awakening of the working-class masses. This fact confirms with clear evidence, from the "practical" point of view, too, not only the absurdity but even the politically reactionary nature of the "pedagogics" to which we are so often treated in the discussion of our duties to the workers. This fact proves that our very first and most pressing duty is to help to train working-class revolutionaries who will be on the same level in regard to Party activity as the revolutionaries from amongst the intellectuals (we emphasise the words "in regard to Party activity", for, although necessary, it is neither so easy nor so pressingly necessary to bring the workers up to the level of intellectuals in other respects). Attention, therefore, must be devoted principally to raising the workers to the level of revolutionaries; it is not at all our task to descend to the level of the "working masses" as the Economists wish to do.

*(What is to be done, 1902)*

## PROLETARIAT CAMP STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

### The ICC and its new Policy of Fraternalization with Anarchism To team up with anarchism, is to betray the proletariat

Disgust, nausea, here is what we felt at first when we read the last innovations of the opportunist ICC with regards to anarchism. Let's just judge from the titles of two of its articles published in *World Revolution* 336 and in *Révolution internationale* 414 : ***The communist left and internationalist anarchism: What we have in common*** ; and ***Réunion CNT-AIT de Toulouse du 15 avril 2010 : vers un creuset de la réflexion internationaliste*** [Meeting of the CNT-AIT, April 15th, 2010 : towards the setting up of reflection network in the internationalist Milieu]. Two titles which come - oh so much ! - verify the soundness of the warning we issued in the bulletin 48 of the Internal Fraction of the ICC : *Anarchism seeks to infiltrate the Proletarian Camp and the present ICC opens it the door* (in French and Spanish only<sup>1</sup>).

Disgust, nausea, but also now anger and rage ! There is no question to let without reaction, without fighting, the fatal outcome that this new step announces, fatal outcome which is on the way to be achieved "quietly". If sincere members and sympathizers of the ICC still remain and seeks to resist and save what still can be saved, it belongs to us to help them as much as we can as well as it belongs to us to save the communist honour and the political legacy of the ICC.

We had already denounced what seemed to be dangerous skids of the present ICC towards anarchism<sup>2</sup>. It has distributed a common leaflet with two openly Anarchist groups in Mexico. But now, with its "fraternal" opening towards anarchism, the ICC initiates its break with the proletariat's camp, with marxism, with the workers movement's history, in particular with the Communist Left's one, thus with its own history ! It is an important step towards the foreseeable disappearance of this organization as a proletariat's organization which emerges through the break with its own political platform, through the loss, or worst the dissolution, of its last militant communist forces under the flood of leftist elements ; in other terms in its theoretical-political as well as militant disintegration ! Is there still time to save something from this organization ? Is there still time that members end up, finally, to react and organize consequently within it, in order to fight against the

"forecast death", on the way to be realized, of the ICC as a proletariat's political organization ? Because that is where we are now ! Isn't it fraternizing openly with anarchism, current that the Communist Left has definitively categorized as counter-revolutionary and that the true ICC did not stop to denounce as a component of the extreme-Left of Capital ?

Exaggeration from our part ? Let's judge :

*"Concretely, our organisation, which is marxist, considers that it is fighting for the proletariat **on the same side** [underlined in the French version of this article] as the internationalist anarchist militants and **against** the « Communist » and Maoist parties which also claim to be marxist. Why?*

*Within capitalist society, there are two basic camps : the camp of the bourgeoisie and the camp of the working class. We denounce and combat all the political organisations which belong to the former. We discuss, often in a sharp but always a fraternal manner, and seek to cooperate with, all the members of the second. But under the same label of « marxist » there are genuinely bourgeois and reactionary organisations. The same goes for the « anarchist » label".*

How can the ICC comrades who still keep some small memory and communist conviction swallow such a lie according to which anarchist **organizations** can today belong to the camp of the working class ? They do accept thus to betray and to break with the class positions with our platform ! The betrayal comes with, some lines below, a class collaboration which is openly claimed : *"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 »)".*

Have these comrades of the ICC who still keep a little bit of communist reflexes, gone to have a look to the CNT-AIT web site and to its documents ? Do they know this organization carries on claiming openly to anarcho-unionism ? Self-management ["autogestion" in French and Spanish] ? The policy of the CNT during the Spanish war (thus of Federica Monseny and her owns who actively participated to the Popular Front, so fatal for our class) and the anti-fascist struggle ? Decades of political fight of the ICC against the anarchist danger are thrown through the window with no debate, with not any political

1. [http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/ficci\\_fra/b48/b48\\_8.php](http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/ficci_fra/b48/b48_8.php) and [http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/ficci\\_esp/b48/b48\\_7.php](http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/ficci_esp/b48/b48_7.php)

2. idem and see also the *International Communist Bulletin* n°1 of our Fraction, *letter to the Grupo Socialista Libertario*, in English : [http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/eng/bci01/bci01\\_7.php](http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/eng/bci01/bci01_7.php)

confrontation... with no reluctance, nor opposition<sup>1</sup> ?

Can the comrades of the ICC who still keep some "class notions", accept that it be pronounced in their name this sentences so closed to touted leftism : *"Communist militants are still very thin on the ground today and there is nothing more harmful than isolation. We therefore have to fight against the tendency to stand up for your own « chapel », your own « family » (whether marxist or anarchist), against the shop-keeper's spirit which has nothing to do with the politics of the working class"*. The historical struggle of marxism against the petit-bourgeois anarchist ideology is so reduced to a rivalry between shopkeepers ! We do choke with rage in front of such words !

Well then what can we say, what do you say comrades of the ICC, about the article written in Spanish ¿ *Cuál es nuestra actitud ante compañeros que se reclaman del anarquismo ? (What is our attitude towards comrades who claim to anarchism ?)*. This article attempts to respond to the indignant reactions of sympathizers - and obviously to "internal reluctances" of members -<sup>2</sup> and to justify the new position. It has the cheek to pretend that the ICC position in regards to anarchism *"has not changed"*<sup>3</sup>. Even worse, this last article even comes to say that *"the anarchist ideology [expresses] a willingness of struggle against exploitation and oppression and, so, it is part with no doubt on the ground of the struggle against capitalism. Clearly sharing this ground, the disagreements we have, are at the level of method"* (translated by us from Spanish). The Spanish language comrades of the ICC have always got the "skill" to charge into the new orientations, above all the most confuse and opportunist, and to become their extreme speakers at the expense sometimes of big disillusiones. Thus, comrades of the ICC, of **our** ICC (if it remains something of it), between marxism and the *"anarchist ideology"*, there

1. Here we can verify the reality of the lie about the "culture of debate" the ICC publicized so much the last years.

2. The liquidators of the ICC acknowledge it reluctantly when they say that *"However, our intentions were not always well perceived. For a while this series met with a frosty reception in some quarters. On the one hand, some anarchists saw the articles as an outright attack on their movement. On the other hand, some sympathisers of the communist left and of the ICC did not understand our efforts to find a « rapprochement with the anarchists »"* (CL and internationalist anarchism : what we have in common, ICC).

3. *"The first question we want to deal with and which seems to be one of your concerns, is the « new » attitude of the ICC towards anarchism. Our position on this is that it has not changed"* ["La primera cuestión que queremos abordar y que parece ser una de tus preocupaciones es la "nueva" actitud de la CCI hacia el anarquismo. **Nuestra posición al respecto no ha cambiado**"] (we underline).

is only a difference of method according to those who represent you. Comrade MC whose icon you like to brandish, must be turning in his grave !

And to end up with this nauseating literature, "cherry on the cake" as it is said in French, if we can use this word for such leftist shit, the article *What we have in common* concludes proclaiming loudly and brandishing its Declaration like a banner, that *"the ICC belongs to the same camp as these internationalist anarchists who really defend working class autonomy. Yes, we consider them as comrades with whom we want to debate and cooperate. Yes, we also think that these anarchist militants have more in common with the communist left than with those who, under the label of anarchism, actually defend nationalist and reformist positions and are thus really defenders of capitalism"*.

The communists in the same camp as the anarchists ? But how can the last militants of the true ICC who have still kept a minimum of memory and concern for coherence with the programmatical positions of this organization, accept this ? What are the two arguments put forwards for such a revision, such a betrayal ? **Sincerity** of the "good" anarchist militants (in opposition to the "bad") and their supposed **internationalism**. It is a long time since the ICC, our ICC, had rejected to the garbage the argument of the militants' sincerity :

*"When we question the class nature of a political organization which claim to be « worker one » or « revolutionary », one responds us with the argument of the « militants' sincerity » (above all the one of the rank and file). The absurdity of this argument lies on a metaphysical separation between the organization and its members, between « the good militants » and the « bad leaders » (...). One way or another : whether we reason in terms of class and we found the political nature of an organization on **class** criterion ; and then the only revolutionary attitude in front of the illusions which inescapably emerge amongst the individuals in rupture with the present society, is the open denunciation of their illusions and of the role that the latter make them objectively to play. Or rather one gets stuck in the individualist ground where he flounders inevitably in the moralistic metaphysics of the « individual motivations ». One begins to affirm the « right to mistake » and one always ends up mixing up the respect for the **individual** who is mistaken with the respect for its **mistake** (...). All this « no-sectarian » attitude has its roots in the confusion and cannot but serve confusion ; it denies itself beforehand all the means to tackle this question of the class nature of a political organization since it gives up since the beginning the class problematic.*

*Such a way to consider the problem would be a simple confusion (...) **if this confusion was not a counter-***

*revolutionary force, if its concrete result would not be, one more time, to allow the defence of bourgeois organizations within the workers movement"* (The last part is underlined by us, *Sommes-nous sectaires ? [Are we sectarian ?] Révolution internationale* n°8, 1974, signed RV, translated by us).

For the supposed internationalism of some anarchists, it will suffice to refer to our article of the bulletin 48 of the Internal Fraction of the ICC, in particular when it says : *"We can see here in what consists the « true internationalism » of Marx and Engels : in the uncompromising defence of the International as « real and militant organization of the working class in all countries » which fights for the overthrow of all the capitalist States and the institution of the political power of the working class (the dictatorship of the proletariat), in opposition to the « creators of sects », firstly the anarchists, who tend to reduce it. It means that, for revolutionary marxism, the proletarian internationalism has never been an abstract principle, nor even a simple declaration of being « against all the States, nations and imperialist wars ». For marxism, internationalism implies a concrete effort of the working class to organize itself at international scale, to act in a unified and centralized way too at international scale, at aiming to world communist revolution. These two concrete expressions of proletarian internationalism - working class's centralized organization and struggle for world communist revolution - through the setting up of the proletarian dictatorship - are antagonistic, are opposed, to anarchism basis (that is why the ICC, trying to seek collaboration with the anarchists, must reduce internationalism to the simple attitude in front of war)".* Maybe should we recall briefly to the last ICC members who keep discreetly, without exposing themselves within their organization - secretly and hidden ? Shamefully ? - some political remains of the past, that the anarchists who became real internationalists, in particular during the 1<sup>st</sup> World war, succeeded to do so by supporting the Russian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, communism and by becoming bolshevik militants ; it means when **they broke with their anarchism of origin**. The most famous case being Victor Serge's. But there are much others.

Thus, anarchism and communism in the same camp ? The liquidationist faction who took control of the ICC in 2001 and which was "obliged" to erase us and to exclude us in order to be able to make its dirty work of liquidation of our organization is getting to its ends. The "official" ICC is on the way to self-destroy by teaming up with class enemies, by rejecting marxism's struggle against anarchism. There is not a single moment of the workers movement history where the struggle against anarchism has not been present. Marx, obviously the first, who in *Poverty of the Philosophy*, already settles the question of the relation of anarchism

with communism by settling its distinguished "theoretician" : Mr Proudhon *"wants to soar as the man of science above the bourgeois and proletarians; he is merely the petty bourgeois, continually tossed back and forth between capital and labour; political economy and communism (...).To sum up, M. Proudhon has not gone further than the petty-bourgeois ideal"*.

Since then, marxism has always fought the anarchist ideology as foreign to the proletariat and particularly dangerous for this latter. Quotations of marxist revolutionaries criticizing and even denouncing anarchism as alien to the proletariat are legion - we have reproduced some in our articles of the bulletin 48 of the Internal Fraction and the first issue of this *International Communist Bulletin*. If at first, in the beginnings of capitalism, the anarchist petit-bourgeois ideology could still represent an independent ideology from capital, in our days, capitalism having become the universal mode of production, this ideology cannot even claim any "autonomy" and is utilized by capital as a direct weapon against the proletariat and its revolutionary theory. Marx and Engels's fight within the 1<sup>st</sup> International against Bakunin has marked important moments and fundamental theoretical and political steps, in particular on the political dimension of the proletariat's struggle and on the question of the State. This fight against the anarchist ideology had gone on within the 2<sup>nd</sup> International - for instance with Plekhanov's book *Anarchism and Socialism* : *"The Anarchists are Utopians. Their point of view has nothing in common with that of modern scientific Socialism"*.

Lenin, despite it is in his most "positive" book towards anarchists if so we can say, *The State and the Revolution*, comes back with no ambiguity about the relationship between anarchism and communism : *"Against, the most remarkable thing in this argument of Engels' [he says referring to Engels's text on Authority (1872)] is the way he states his case against the anarchists. Social-Democrats, claiming to be disciples of Engels, have argued on this subject against the anarchists millions of times since 1873, but they have not argued as Marxists could and should. The anarchist idea of abolition of the state is muddled and non-revolutionary - that is how Engels put it. It is precisely the revolution in its rise and development, with its specific tasks in relation to violence, authority, power, the state, that the anarchists refuse to see"* (Lenin underlines)..

Unless one believes that the questions of class violence, of power and State, are not but questions of "method" and not question of principle, of class, it is clear that it is a class gulf which separates anarchism from marxism. It is precisely one contribution of the Italian Communist Left which brought to the fore the character, not tactical, nor of simple "method", but of class principle in regards to these questions. It is with this conception that it never stopped to denounce anarchism : *"Anarchism opposes deeply to the communist conceptions"* (Theses of the Communist



Abstentionist Fraction of the Italian Socialist Party, May 1920, translated by us). *"The party (...) condemns (...) anarchism which denies the historical need for the State and the proletarian dictatorship in order to transform the social organization and to suppress the division of society in class"* (Project of Theses presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of Italy, Lyon 1926, translated by us). Afterwards, *Bilan*, the review of the Left Fraction of the CP of Italy, is particularly clear on the class nature of anarchism and doesn't stop denouncing it in Spain : *"May 4<sup>th</sup> 1937, this same proletarians, provided with arms, left much more victims in the streets than in July [1936] when they had to repel Franco and it is the anti-fascist government - composed with anarchists and which the POUM indirectly shows solidarity with - which unleashes the rabble of the repressive forces against the workers. (...) In order to realize its counter-revolutionary plan, the bourgeoisie can also call to the Centrists, the Socialists, the CNT, the FAI, to the POUM, which, all of them, make the workers believe that the nature of the State changes when the personnel who manages it, changes of color. (...) The last events of Barcelone lugubriously confirm our initial thesis and they discover that it is with cruelty equal to Franco's that the Popular Front, flanked by the anarchists and the POUM, throws itself against the insurgent workers of May 4<sup>th</sup>"* (*Bilan* 41, May-June 1937, translated by us).

But it is not only with the whole history of the workers movement that the present ICC is on the way to break with, but also with its own history which did not but fit in with marxism continuity in its struggle against anarchism. We have recalled it, here too in the texts of our precedent bulletins already mentionned above, several quotations of our written works of the ICC. Still in the years 1990, and contrary to what it declares now, it defended clearly that the anarchist ideology *"represented the penetration of alien class viewpoints into the ranks of the proletariat"* (*Communism is not just a nice idea... Anarchism or Communism, International Review* 79, 1994).

If it does not rise up a determined and strong political reaction within our organization, sufficiently strong to put a stop to the present catastrophic dynamic, it won't last long to explode because the accumulation of political and class contradictions which pile up and to disappear for the proletariat.

The points 7, *The Trade Unions, yesterday organs of the proletariat, today instruments of the capital*, 9, *Frontism : a strategy for derailing the proletariat*, 11, *Self-management : workers self-exploitation*, 12, *« Partial » struggles : a reactionary dead-end*, of our platform, the political and principle platform of the ICC, we limit our quotations to these points, oppose directly to anarchism.

They all end in almost the same terms : *"Any political position which (even in the name of « working class experience » or of « establishing new relations among workers ») defends self management [or unionism, or frontism] is, in fact, objectively participating in the preservation of capitalist relations of production [... and is] directly serving the interests of the bourgeoisie"*.

These successive points of our political platform allow this one to conclude and to draw a political lesson of extreme importance which is in contradiction with what the "official" ICC now develops :

*"All the so-called 'revolutionary' currents – such as Maoism which is simply a variant of parties which had definitively gone over to the bourgeoisie, or Trotskyism which, after constituting a proletarian reaction against the betrayal of the Communist Parties was caught up in a similar process of degeneration, or traditional anarchism, which today places itself in the framework of an identical approach by defending a certain number of positions of the SPs and CPs, such as « anti-fascist alliances » – belong to the same camp : the camp of capital. Their lesser influence or their more radical language changes nothing as to the bourgeois basis of their programme, but makes them useful touts or supplements of these parties"*.

Our organization, the International Communist Current, and its "sincere" members find themselves in front of a dramatical contradiction ; dramatical for its political consequences, and even more dramatical since it won't be possible to postpone the political deadline and the final settling of scores of all these last ten years of escape from the fight against opportunism. The organization CNT-AIT which is presented by the liquidators of the ICC as *"authentically revolutionary"* has for a long time proved its anti-proletarian nature and we all know it ! Whether the platform of the ICC is to be thrown out or whether it is still valid and then the political dynamic - and the liquidationist faction which has been its main factor and which seems to be itself gone beyond by the bastard it has given birth to - which has led our organization where it is today, it means up to defend as proletarian an organization enemy to the proletariat, is to be fought and to be eliminated from the ICC !

Fight again and again ; and in your case, "sincere" militants of the ICC, it means to fight finally despite all the affront you have swallowed and the humiliations you have suffered, it means taking back the banner of the ICC, its positions, its past struggles ; here is the only mean to regain conviction and communist energy. Rise up and fight !

August 2<sup>nd</sup> 2010.

The Fraction of the International Communist Left.

## ***POLICE PRESSURE AGAINST THE ICM (Internationalist Communists of Montréal)***

### **THE WHOLE COMMUNIST LEFT MUST STAND UP**

The communiqué we join here, has been sent to us by the *Internationalist Communists of Montreal*. The comrades also put it on line on the indymedia web site of Quebec (CMAQ) since July 21<sup>st</sup> and on their blog (<http://klasbatalo.blogspot.com/>). After the bomb attack against the barracks of the Canadian army which has been claimed by a mysterious group whose name is *Résistance internationaliste (Internationalist Resistance)*, our comrades have received the "visit", as they say, of the security and intelligence services of the Canadian police. Under the pretext of getting information, it aimed at intimidating and compromising them. This event needs a clear reaction of solidarity and support to the ICM from the true communists, in particular from the groups of the Communist Left.

It also requires a clear denunciation of this kind of terrorist action which has nothing to do with the proletariat. If in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, a still no-mature proletariat which was still in formation, could sometime use and above all lose its way in a minority manner in this kind of suicidal action, History has quickly shown that such methods essentially belonged to social stratum with no perspective and expressed the action of despaired individuals. Then, since the first years of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century which marked capitalism's entry into its phase of historical decline, with the 1<sup>st</sup> World War and the revolutionary wave of 1917-1923, the minority actions, in particular the terrorist ones, have been definitively rejected in the garbage cans of history with the example of the Russian revolution and of the mass action of the revolutionary class. Terrorism then became an arm of the bourgeoisie that it increasingly utilized in order to defend its interests, whether by provoking its action through petit-bourgeois social stratum in revolt or by directly organizing it itself - the States becoming more and more the only and unique principal of these actions. Today, besides the provocative actions for national "internal" use for the bourgeois order maintenance and serving in particular as justification for repression against the workers in struggle, terrorism has become one of the favoured means used in the imperialist conflicts and even to prepare the world imperialist war.

Proletarian internationalism, the only one which is worth, the only one possible, marxism, the interests and the methods of struggle of the proletariat have nothing to do with terrorism and they are even opposed. Here is why we have denounced this kind of "struggle", to oppose altogether to the utilization that the bourgeois States make in order to defend their imperialist interests and, against the proletariat, to provoke, to intimidate and to look at silencing its political vanguard.

July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

The Fraction of the International Communist Left.

### **The Canadian police (CSIS) Visits the ICM**

In the wee hours of Thursday morning July 1, 2010, a bomb blasted a Canadian Forces recruitment center in Trois-Rivières. The attack, claimed by an obscure group calling themselves *Résistance Internationaliste*, followed two others perpetrated in the same manner over a period of six years, the first on a Hydro Quebec pylon in 2004; the second in 2006 blew up the car of a petroleum industry spokesman.

There are indeed few groups in Canada claiming proletarian internationalism, and even fewer carrying the "internationalist" epithet, from orthodox Marxism, as part of their name. As international communists we are therefore part of the second group – it's a no-brainer.

And so, on July 9<sup>th</sup>, the International Communists (Montreal), alias Klasbatalo, got a visit from two agents from the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) – Canada's version of the American CIA. The two men came specially to see one of our members to elicit information concerning the attacks carried out by *Résistance Internationaliste*.

#### **How to behave under these circumstances ?**

After combing through the files of the Tsarist secret police (the Okhrana) following the Russian Revolution of 1917, Victor Serge published his little volume, "*What every revolutionary should know about repression*". The book was intended as a general assessment of the methods employed by police to tail, detain, put on file, interrogate, and intimidate, any revolutionary militant deemed a potential threat to the established order "for the defense of capitalism everywhere uses the same tools; and moreover all police forces work together and are similar to each other." (V. Serge). And so he put at the disposal of revolutionaries a guide to countering police tactics.

Our comrade managed to act with due caution in this situation: don't open any doors to them, don't get drawn into conversation, and feign the most crass ignorance. The two CSIS agents wanted both information on the terrorist group *Résistance Internationaliste*, and co-operation from our comrade in the identification of "violent and non-violent groups".

What, a housecleaning for Canadian leftism ?

Our comrade therefore didn't invite them in, leaving them standing in the doorway (an important psychological barrier). To let them in is to open the door to discussion and to risk putting a foot in your mouth. Keep in mind that investigators from this sort of police agency are better trained than most revolutionaries at subtly leading a conversation. So after simply asking if they had a file on him, he told them quite plainly that he had nothing to say, and shut the door in their faces.

Even if it's a group worthy of denunciation, with which he has nothing in common, a downright enemy (a group from the extreme right, for instance), a revolutionary militant should not collaborate with the police. It's more than a question of principle, but his personal security that's at stake – for anything he might say is subject to interpretation and could be quickly turned against him. The golden rule here is always silence.

Moreover as recently as during the G20 protests, several young militants were victims of police intimidation. When in the hands of police, it is important for a militant to realize that one of their methods is to threaten rape, physical abuse, and murder (sic)! Quite probably some of your personal possessions will be confiscated, ending up in some detective's bookcase never to be seen again! The golden rule remains the same in these circumstances: if you are permitted, contact your lawyer immediately and say nothing. As little interaction possible – as little expression possible – facing the police squarely will likely get you out of there faster than the militant who babbles, cries and seems frightened.

Every militant has to be ready for this sort of thing and know how to behave under such circumstances, for the revolutionary path is no game, it's a long-term commitment of which one should be conscious.

### **Concerning *Résistance Internationaliste* and terrorism in general**

First, let's put things into perspective: internationalism is a proper designation of the revolutionary worker's movement descending from Marxism. Internationalism is one of the cornerstones of Marxist theory that rests essentially on **class unity** and **solidarity without borders**... Against the national and corporate divisions that entangle the proletariat. Also, faced with bourgeois conceptions of the State and of the Nation, he counterposes his international class party and its internationalist program whose objective is revolution. Against national wars, he advocates revolutionary defeatism and class war.

Secondly, note straight away that orthodox Marxism has always rejected terrorism and political intrigue, which have absolutely nothing to do with revolutionary defeatism and class war. Whatever the propaganda by revolutionary unionists of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, anarchistic banditry, or the Bakunian manipulations within the First International, for Marxists, and thus the internationalists, the revolution is not an affair of a handful of individuals with cryptic methods who as a consequence take revolutionary license in the name of the class, through an adventurism rife with intrigue and political maneuvering. It is the affair of **a majority class guided by the watchwords of its revolutionary party**. The internationalists, a group of individuals belonging to the proletariat whose class-consciousness is more advanced, reject ipso facto the methods of terrorist action.

So, *Résistance Internationaliste*, who are internationalists in name only, use methods alien to the proletariat. **Terrorism is, and will always be, an expression of the bourgeoisie**<sup>1</sup>. The terrorist hijacks as many fractions of the bourgeoisie who oppose it than the proletariat in its entirety. Its weapon is always terror, no matter the victims left behind, leaving all classes confused.

Incidentally, *Résistance Internationaliste* uses two mutually opposing terms: resistance and internationalist. Resistance is not an act of the revolutionary proletariat, which in fact, has no interest in keeping the system in place. They have never resisted since they've never had a clue about communism (this system historically never having seen the light of day). Also, what communist regime would it have to defend in opposing its so-called resistance to the capitalist order? Nada.

Moreover, resistance and terrorism have always made good bedfellows within bourgeois fractions and the déclassé, who seek to preserve their assets, their property, wealth, and their capital. It is a weapon of imperialist rivalry. The attacks of *Résistance Internationaliste* do nothing in advancing proletarian class-consciousness toward a revolutionary outcome. To the contrary! It sows programmatic confusion in our class; it sows fear. And it threatens our lives by dubious acts.

*Résistance Internationaliste* simply plays the game of the police and of state repression. Terrorist acts lead only to a dead end.

Proletarian comrades, build your class party internationalist !

July 21<sup>st</sup> 2010

International Communists, Montreal.

---

1. On state terrorism, read the excellent article from the Internal Fraction Communist Current International (August 2005) **Terrorism, anti-terrorism : Weapon of the bourgeoisie in its Path towards War**, especially the part **Terrorism, a War Weapon of the Bourgeoisie** ([http://fractioncommuniste.org/ficci\\_eng/b32/index-2.html](http://fractioncommuniste.org/ficci_eng/b32/index-2.html)).

### ***Text of the workers movement***

**Lenin**

#### **Speech At The Unveiling Of A Memorial To Marx And Engels (November 7, 1918)**

*We publish here a Lenin's discourse at an "Unveiling of a memorial to Marx and Engels" which seems to us of particular importance on the revolutionary role of the proletariat. Though this bulletin focuses mainly on the question of the Proletarian Camp and of the struggle against opportunism within it (it is a deliberate and well-considered political choice), we don't forget that the situation of sharp economical crisis the capitalist world is passing through, imposes to the ruling class to accentuate even more, and increasingly, its "economical" attacks against the living and working conditions of the international proletariat, as well as its "political" attacks against the inescapable tendency of the latter to strike back to the attacks and to develop significantly its struggles of resistance.*

*If there is something that the bourgeoisie's campaigns, in particular the ones it has unleashed since the end and the collapse of the imperialist Eastern bloc, didn't stop to do, it is to hammer that "communism is dead" and that bourgeois democracy has triumphed ; the impossibility of another society would sign thus the disappearance of the proletariat as revolutionary class. Lenin's discourse, by reaffirming the validity of the revolutionary perspective of the proletarian struggle put forwards by Marx and Engels, refutes all these false campaigns of the ruling class and therefore its all the more topical.*

#### **Lenin's speech**

We are unveiling a memorial to Marx and Engels, the leaders of the world workers' revolution.

Humanity has for ages suffered and languished under the oppression of a tiny handful of exploiters who maltreated millions of labourers. But whereas the exploiters of an earlier period, the landowners, robbed and maltreated the peasant serfs, who were disunited, scattered and ignorant, the exploiters of the new period, the capitalists, came face to face with the vanguard of the downtrodden people, the urban, factory, industrial workers. They were united by the factory, they were enlightened by urban life, they were steeled by the common strike struggle and by revolutionary action.

It is to the great historic merit of Marx and Engels that they proved by scientific analysis the inevitability of capitalism's collapse and its transition to communism, under which there will be no more exploitation of man by man.

It is to the great historic merit of Marx and Engels that they indicated to the workers of the world their role, their task, their mission, namely, to be the first to rise in the revolutionary struggle against capital and to rally around themselves in this struggle all working and exploited people.

We are living at a wonderful time, when this prophecy of the great socialists is beginning to be realised. We all see the dawn of the world socialist revolution of the proletariat breaking in several countries. The unspeakable horrors of the imperialist butchery of nations are everywhere evoking a heroic upsurge of the oppressed and multiplying their strength in the struggle for emancipation.

Let this memorial to Marx and Engels again and again remind the millions of workers and peasants that we are not alone in our struggle. Side by side with us the workers of more advanced countries are rising. Hard battles still lie ahead of them and us. In common struggle capitalist oppression will be broken, and socialism finally won !