

INTERNATIONAL C O M M U N I S T
B U L L E T I N

Organ of the Fraction of the International Left Communist

n° 7

27/ 12/ 2 0 1 1

To contact us :
e-mail Adress : 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.

Agreement with the ICT

The time of gathering around the "Communist Programme" comes and prepares itself.....1

International Situation

Leaflet of our Fraction (October 8th, 2011)

Let's follow the path that the proletarian class shows us in Greece !.....4

Statement of the ICT about the protection of the Greek Parliament and the anti-workers repression by the Stalinists :

Greek General Strike - The Stalinists line up with the State.....6

Correspondence

Debate with a comrade defending councilist positions on the Bolshevik Party.....7

Struggle against Opportunism

About a book published by the Smolny Editions :

The defence of the proletarian character of the October Revolution is still a class frontier !.....8

The 19th ICC Congress or the Bankruptcy Declaration of the Policy led since 2001.....9

New Statement about the Hidden Resolution of the ICC 16th Congress (2005)

The Liquidators of the ICC and their Shameful and Destructive Practices : They do Persist !....12

Text of the workers movement

B. Souvarine (1920), about the setting up of the French Communist Party

Nécessité d'une scission (Necessity for a split).....

Agreement with the ICT

The time of gathering around the "Communist Programme" comes and prepares itself

Almost a year ago, in January 2011, the comrades of the Internationalist Communist Tendency in Germany, of the Gruppe Internationaler SozialistInnen (GIS), wrote an article, [*Marxism or Idealism - Our Differences with the ICC*](#)¹, whose aim is to present the main disagreements of the ICT with the ICC. This text is a serious and praiseworthy effort to pose the terms of the differences between our two political currents. As such, it is an important moment of the process of political clarification and regroupment within the camp of the communist forces which is essential for clearing the perspective of the future proletarian party. Moreover, it expresses the ability of the ICT to play and take the central role that the historical situation has assigned to it. Indeed, in addition to the fact it favours the debate and the confrontation of the positions between our two "historical" political currents, this kind of document cannot but help the new comrades, isolated militants and political groups or circles, in their search for political coherence and communist militant commitment as well as in their indispensable re-appropriation of the debates and the positions of the Communist Left. The GIS text is thus a reference, a marker for those who are looking for political clarification.

We too welcome wholeheartedly this text and with enthusiasm for its political content as well as the spirit which drives it :

"We are often asked what exactly our differences with the ICC (International Communist Current) consist of, as this is an organisation which claims to stand in the tradition of the Communist Left. After long consideration, we have therefore decided to sketch out the most important differences. As our divergences with the ICC are really comprehensive, we have endeavoured to be as brief as possible and to especially select the questions which are of immediate importance for the activity of revolutionaries. Some may consider this to be a petty squabble between revolutionary groups. But such an attitude underestimates the need for debate. Without sharp discussions, that political clarification which enables us to develop a workable programme for the overthrow of capitalism will not be possible" (*Marxism or Idealism - Our Differences with the ICC*, underlined in the article).

Here it matters to regret the delay with which we state publicly on this text. It is the responsibility of our fraction to assume the debate in the name of the "historical" ICC and the historical current it represents. And, only our fraction can actually do it ².

1 . See *Revolutionary Perspectives* 57, review of the CWO, the ICT group in Great-Britain.

2 . Our fraction is the only organized form which, today, defends the theoretical, political and even organisational legacy of the original ICC against the betrayals and the liquidations that the "official" ICC of now realizes and multiplies at a ceaselessly accelerated rate. We are the only collective organized force which assumes and claims openly the whole history of the ICC, its strengths and weaknesses, its lessons and its mistakes, from its very beginning up to the 2001 organisational crisis. It so "materializes" the tradition of this current whose disappearance would represent a harsh lack, what ever is the political assessment one can make of it ; since inescapably, the questions raised would reappear but

Even more unfortunate could be our lack of immediate reaction since it could have "discourage" the ICT comrades to pursue on this path. Fortunately it did not happen and we must salute the fact that the ICT comrades carry on in this political orientation which, of course, goes far beyond the debate with our only current. This one has just been expressed with strength in the editorial of *Revolutionary Perspectives* 59 (Autumn 2011) , [*The Difficult Path to the Revival of Working Class Struggle*](#). Basing itself on a correct understanding of the acceleration of the world situation and particularly of the sharpening of the classes' contradictions at international scale because of the Capital's economical crisis, the article puts forwards that *"serious revolutionaries have a real battle on their hands to dismiss both the illusions of the "anti-capitalists" and the manipulations of the old Left. We need to create a movement which unites all those who can see the problems we are talking about here. This movement (or party) has to have at its head a clear vision of the society we want. We would call it a communist programme. It has to be based on the autonomous struggles of the working class as they increasingly break free from the shackles a hundred years of reaction has imposed on us. Its goal has to be that we abolish the exploitation of wage labour and money, as well as the state, standing armies and national frontiers. We have to reassert the original view of Marx that we are fighting for a society of "freely associated producers" where the principle is "from each according to his ability and to each according to his need.*

At the moment there are many groups and individuals around the world who recognise this but we are either too scattered, or too divided, to take a lead in forming such a united movement. Some object to it on principle declaring that the spontaneous movement will take care of itself. We wish we could share their confidence. We think responsible revolutionaries should re-examine their differences, asking ourselves if the things that we thought divided us now do so in the light of this new period in working class struggle. We should emphasise not the little we disagree on but the much that we agree on. We should seek to work together in common struggles not simply to recruit this or that individual to our own organisation, but to widen the consciousness of what a real working class struggle means. In the face of the obstacles we have outlined above it would be suicidal not to" (*Revolutionary Perspectives* 59, we underline).

We fully support the orientation put forward by the ICT in this text and we intend to help the ICT to realize it.

Thus this editorial obliges us. We are accountable to our class - and to the communist forces - for responding at best, with all our forces, to this orientation that we called for since our setting up as Internal Fraction of the ICC. Even though we are well conscious that this orientation is not only aimed at our political current, nevertheless the ICT directly calls us out and we must answer it. This goes through the strengthening of our links - practical collaboration, meetings, intervention, etc... -

then in emergency and the midst of confusion because it'll be in the situation of the historical events which approach.

and through the clarification of our differences in the spirit and the continuity of what the GIS comrades did.

Reality of the divergences

The GIS text, *Our differences with the ICC*, points well at the main divergences with the “historical” positions of the ICC : the question of the historical course ; the analysis of the Capital's crisis ; the method of analysis of the workers struggles considered as idealist and using conspiratorial theories ; the class consciousness and the party ; the transitional period between capitalism and communism ; and finally the conception of the revolutionary organization in term of setting up and functioning. The text exposes correctly the “traditional” differences and criticisms that the ICT makes to our current's positions, with a serious effort to present them to the readers. There are many to be debated and they won't be resolved in one day. On the other hand, we can already attempt to precise the reality of these divergences since we think that some are real, but also that others express misunderstandings and others false divergences.

Let's begin with the *false* divergences such as they appear in the text. They concern mainly the question of *Class consciousness and the role of the party* for one part and the question of the constitution of the PCInt in 1943. During our past meetings, in particular in November 2005, the debate we had with the IBRP had enabled to precise our agreement on the two questions and thus to precise our conceptions and our understandings. For our fraction anyway, there is not real and fundamental differences today in these points and we refer the comrades to the balance-sheet we made of this past meetings - for instance the [Report of the Discussion \(Fraction\)](#) with the IBRP - in the bulletin 33 of the Internal Fraction of the ICC. In this report, we expressed our agreement with the introduction text presented by the IBRP delegation about consciousness and about the constitution of the PCInt in 1943.

Claiming these agreements does not mean it cannot exist - we are convinced of the opposite - nuances, diverse understandings or approaches, on these questions. But this belongs to the very life of the proletariat and to its historical fight ; this cannot but pass through any organisation and no doubt too through the party of tomorrow. And this can only be overcome by the debate and the political fight within the same camp.

There are also *misunderstandings*, have we said. For instance, we don't have doubt about the GIS comrades' sincerity when they affirm that the ICC conception about the *Historical Course* is to be rejected since it would correspond at “*playing Nostradamus and building its politics on abstract predictions*”. Then let's aside the notion of *Course* and let's quote a passage of the comrades' text which we are sure to share the content and the political implication for the revolutionary organisation :

“We find ourselves in the imperialist epoch of capitalism, the epoch of wars and revolutions. In this, the end of the accumulation cycle brings two distinct but interconnected alternatives with itself: war or revolution. Whether it comes to war or revolution depends on the relation of forces

between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The precise understanding of this relation of forces is essential for the activity of revolutionaries” (we underline).

As well, the text on *Our differences with the ICC* puts forwards that “*the task of revolutionaries is to actively participate in all class struggles insofar as our organisation strength allows this. The ICC rejects this active intervention and sees their tasks as pure propaganda*”. There are other passages in the text which take back this idea about the ICC. For our part, we claim the whole experience of the ICC in the years 1970 and 1980 acquired in the active intervention and in which we intended to assume the tasks of a genuine political vanguard, of a genuine political leadership of the proletariat in the very struggles, in the assemblies, in the strikes, in the demonstrations, etc. In that sense, we are in agreement with the need of the active intervention in the struggles and we claim to be the guardians of all this militant experience which is today liquidated by the present ICC. There, for us there is a misunderstanding, real this time, no doubt sincere and honest, by the GIS comrades about what really was the policy and the intervention of the ICC.

On the other hand, there are true disagreements between the two currents which, far from “separating” two chapels and which would justify the negation, the sectarian rejection or exclusion of the other, are part of the very life of the proletariat. We even think it is better, highly, that these divergences have their organized expression and that they be claimed by communists rather than be denied or rejected with no discussion, with no “confrontation”. Indeed, it is through the confrontation and the debates being assumed that the communists will be able to arm themselves and to prepare for the **inevitable** appearance, or springing up, of these differences in the very course of the struggle and in the moments the more critical and the more difficult for the proletariat. In that sense, actually we think that there are disagreements between our two currents, **but also within each current**, on the questions of analysis and intervention in the workers struggles. It is so at least since the latter - the intervention - requires a permanent vigilance and a permanent struggle because it is never acquired for ever and because it needs the conviction and the willingness - even the courage - of its interest and its necessity. It is always the source of a struggle within the communist organizations and will always be, included within the most homogeneous of the Parties.

There are other real divergences and more important that the GIS text points out. The main ones concern the theoretical explanation of capitalism's crisis. For us, these divergences - to be specified and even defined - are not class frontiers, nor even obstacles to fight together today.

For what concerns the Period of transition, it is a question that our fraction, and “our” ICC, has not discussed since the beginning of the years 1980 and we consider it as “open”, it means that it does not constitute an obstacle for fighting in the same organization. What is for us already essential is the fact we share with the ICT the position according to which the Party does not seize power in the name of the class, that it does not coincide with the State of the Period of transition. In a certain way, the Thesis which accompany the publication of the Platform of the PCInt of 1952 mention the problem by

putting the emphasis on the fact that "*the proletariat does not stop at any moment and for any reason to exercise its antagonistic function* ; it does not delegate to others its historical mission nor it delivers general proxy, not event to its political Party" (2nd Congress of the PCInt, Milano, 1952, translated and underlined by us).

One of the last differences raised by the GIS text concerns the conception of the building up and the functioning of the organisation. According to us, there are above all on this question misunderstandings in regards to the reality of the ICC - on the reality of its nucleus and territorial sections - that we leave aside³ in this article.

The text of the GIS points out a last difference on the *Chaos and Decomposition*. We already wrote in order to criticize and to denounce the theory of Decomposition such as it is put forwards today by the official ICC. Nevertheless, it remains that we assume our responsibility for having taken our share in the development of this theory. It has been a fundamental political error which enabled firstly to justify a policy of erroneous internal functioning - as well as dramatical for members since the organisational crisis of 1995 - and afterwards which provides the "theoretical framework" for the betrayal and the liquidation of the fundamental positions of the ICC and of marxism - for instance the abandonment by the ICC of the historical alternative *War or Revolution* up to consider that any threat of generalized imperialist war, it means of 3rd World War, have disappeared. In that sense, and without joining the critical arguments of the GIS comrades⁴, we don't accept the position defended today by the ICC and we even reject it. We would have a lot of thinks to add and to precise on the subject : we refer our readers to the bulletin of the Internal Fraction of the ICC - for example to the article of its issue 30 [*Historical and theoretical impasse. The theory of the social decomposition phase*](#) (March 2005).

Here thus is a quick attempt to define where are the differences between our two historical currents. We could not content ourselves with the granting with strength the editorial of *Revolutionary Perspectives* and the text of the GIS comrades without beginning to respond and to advance in the confrontation and the clarification of the respective positions. In this process - already opened during the years 2000 between the IBRP and the Internal Fraction of the ICC - we have no doubt that differences will be overcome and that various questions will be clarified. Above all, we have no doubt that these discussions, as well as others, will serve as reference and will favour the wide and international regroupment around the pole constituted by the ICT. It is around this organisation, in reference to it, that the debates and the political clarifications must organize. It is around it that the process of political regroupment - as well as organisational - must be based and develop.

For our part, and since our constitution in 2001 as Internal

3 . All the more so as the new opportunist policy of the "ICC of the Liquidators" has come to fuel and justify these criticisms and misunderstandings.

4 . We already mention the fact that some critical arguments brought by the comrades are based on misunderstandings of what really the "old" ICC stated. We can't come back here and we refer the reader, for the Decomposition, to the reading - see our web site - of the article of the Internal Fraction of the ICC.

Fraction of the ICC, we have been able to draw the consequences of the process of opportunist drift which was taking over our own organisation and we have then concluded and established our orientation of regroupment around and with the IBRP of then - the ICT today. The decade of relations more or less close, always fraternal, often fruitful in terms of debate and political clarification, that we had with this organisation, has come to confirm our orientation of origin and confirm our conviction. Today, given the present historical situation, the ICT takes huge responsibilities, its responsibilities, the very ones that History has allocated it. We will do our best to help it and to support it on this path.

The Fraction of the International Communist Left,
December 2011.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION



Manifestation massive à Athènes devant le Parlement.

We publish in the following the leaflet we have distributed since the beginning of October 2011 at a moment when the strength of the working class's mobilisation in Greece really began to break the censorship of the international media. Some days after, these ones could not silence the courageous resistance of the proletarians, since more than two years now, against the succession with no end of austerity plans every time more brutal. The strength of this movement responded also to the bourgeoisie's campaigns aiming at presenting us the "movements of the Indignous" as example to follow while, from the proletariat's point of view, they are dead-end and even traps. During the strikes and demonstrations of October 18 and 19, the strength of the proletariat in Greece clearly expressed itself through the dynamic towards the political confrontation with the State up to the point that the Greek bourgeoisie had to utilize the stalinist party militia against the workers mobilisation – we reproduce after our leaflet the denunciation that the Internationalist Communist Tendency has

made at that time and that we make ours. Actually, while the working class was looking for preventing the Deputies to enter the Parliament which was going to vote another austerity plan, this one could act without being disturbed thanks to the violent repression exerted by the scrappers of the Stalinist party. Some days later, during the Greek National Day, numerous national manifestations, amongst them military parades, had to be interrupted, sometimes cancelled, because of the demonstrators' opposition up to the point where several politicians and representatives – even the President of Greece – had to escape from the "official ceremonies".

This process of confrontation with the State and the political power – real dynamic of "masses strike" - constitutes a beginning of "politization" of the classes struggle which is, of course, only at its beginnings and is still largely insufficient to make withdraw, even temporarily, the attacks of the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, and contrary to the a-politicism and the demand of "more democracy" put forwards by the various movement of Indignous, the working class in Greece clearly shows to the proletarians of all countries, the path to follow – thus also confirming fully the orientation of our leaflet : class struggle and political confrontation with the State.

Let's follow the path that the proletarian class shows us in Greece !

"I don't give a damn if we become bankrupted, we are already bankrupted !", that is what a Greek worker on struggle thinks today and that many of his class brothers do share. And all are hammering out in chorus : **"No to unemployment, no to redundancies, no to misery !"**, slogan which is echoed by their children who are student (and whose future is totally blocked) : **"We want books, teachers, schools"**.

There is three years since the working class in Greece refuses to pay for the capitalist crisis, three years that it resists against the succession of austerity and misery plans every time more violent, three years it struggles and that the international medias censor all information about the daily fight of our class brothers ; and when these thoroughgoing liars are obliged to mention, in their press, the greatest street demonstrations and the strikes in Athens or Salonica – in particular the ones which affect the transportation on which it is difficult to be fully silent -, it is for distorting their meaning and their content.

There is three years that the workers mobilization lasts and doesn't fade : yet recently, an other day of strike and massive demonstration occurred and others will take over ; three years that there are street demonstrations in all cities on various occasions, three years that strikes break out in such or such sector, then fade, and start again with more vigour than ever ; three years that the country economy is partially or fully paralyzed ; three years that the main cities of the country are regularly blocked by strikes and demonstrations ; three years that every Greek worker joins his pensionned parents, his salaried brothers and sisters (of the private or public sector), or those more and more numerous who are unemployed, without talking about his children who are student and thrown out on the street ; three years that the proletarians refuse to submit to the revolting and arrogant policy of capitalism in crisis ; actually, three years it refuses its logic of misery and death.

"Government and troïka out !", that is what the Greek demonstrators shout out in the streets.

There is also almost three years that the whole Greek proletariat rises against the willingness of the Socialist Party government (PASOK) and the international organizations of the bourgeoisie – IMF, European Union, European Central Bank - to make them pay for the crisis of their exploitation system ; three years that the working class and, behind it, all the no-exploiting classes - taxis, small artesans, liberal professions... -, confronts to the whole world bourgeoisie ; three years that this latter, in accord and united, strives relentlessly to make pay the "first" bill of its crisis by the workers and the Greek population. "First" bill ? Yes, because it knows, as we all know, that after the proletariat in Greece, it'll be every working class of each country, the one after the other, that the world bourgeoisie will want to make pay the bill of its own crisis. Isn't it what has already begun every where

International Communist Bulletin #7 – FICL

in the world and on all continents ? Isn't Obama and the American bourgeoisie who call the European governments to make order in their economical affairs, while the latter do the same in return ? Isn't the ruling class in Germany, supported by all its European counterparts, in command of the European Union and the ECB, which dictates to all the States of the old continent the policy to follow ?

The bourgeoisie has declared war to the death on us, in all countries and in all continents. And it can't withdraw. There is no illusion to have ! The crisis which strikes it and that it wants we pay, is irreversible and signs the historical bankruptcy of capitalism. Accepting the sacrifices would be suicidal for us ! Have not we been asked for sacrifices for decades ? For what results if not the generalized bankruptcy and the dramatical misery for all that the bourgeoisie doesn't even try to hide us. Those - the Left parties and the unions - which defend *"that there is money in the riches' pocket and that it matters to make them pay"*, it means that they want us to believe the debts of the States have to be paid off, try to drag us and to confine us on the capitalist's ground and logic, behind the defence of national economy against the so-called foreign speculators, behind the capitalist State. As the workers of Athens who *"don't give a damn about capitalist bankruptcy"*, we must reject this ground. It is a trap ; and the very ones, Left parties, Leftists, unions, which didn't cease to sabotage our struggles during all these past years, still attempt to impose on us the logic of Capital and its sacrifices. We must reject this logic and refuse sacrifices. *"The State owes us money"* shout the Greek proletarians. It is their voice we must listen to and, like them, we must refuse the false blackmails about the pay-off of the debts or about the general bankruptcy.

"When we'll really protest, you will realize" yelled the more determined of the demonstrators in Athens. They are right. Rejecting, through massive struggle, the sacrifices is indispensable. Certainly we can make the bourgeoisie draws back momentarily. It is already something we gain. But today there is no illusion to have : the ruling class will renew as soon as it can its attacks against us. Capitalism in crisis has no more means to spare any part of the international proletariat and as long as it has the power, it means the State power – whether "democratic" or no -, it won't cease to multiply its attacks on our living conditions.

Workers, proletarians, for our anger and our refusal make draw back the exploiters and their infernal logic, we must not only express it massively but above all we must take in our own hands the leadership of our struggles. It means : don't leave it to the unions and the advocates of the "make pay the wealthies". We must organize ourselves the spreading and the unification of our fight. We must organize through the means of our sovereign general assemblies, of our delegates elected and removable at any moment, through the means of our massive delegations to seek active solidarity to other workers sectors, through the stoppage of production in the work places with strike and the occupation of the street by demonstrations. Thus as the Greek proletarians, we'll block this society that the bourgeoisie is so much attached to, which doesn't serve but only its interests and in no way ours. That is the path that the proletariat in Greece has begun to take. The path that it shows us. The path that we must take up in all countries.

But to make draw back the exploiters won't be enough. We must take them off the exercise of power and destroy their State. It is the historical responsibility of the proletariat. The crisis and the general bankruptcy of capitalism replaces the former at the core of the historical situation, at the center of humanity's future.

Workers, proletarians, our class does not only need to defend its immediate economical and material interests. It also have the responsibility to save the whole humanity from misery and generalized war that the Capital's crisis inescapably brings. Thus there is no other solution than the one of bringing down this system in order to build up an other society, without classes, without any exploitation of man by man and without war. Our class brothers in Greece indicate us the beginning of the path. So, if we paraphrase the great revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg in 1918, we can say today that *"in Greece the problem could only been posed... and in that sense the future belongs everywhere to the revolutionary proletariat"*.

October 8th 2011
The Fraction of the International Communist Left

[This text has been translated into English from French by a no-English language comrade. Thus we apologize for any political mistake and we refer our reader to the French and Spanish version. Any help is welcome]

Greek General Strike - The Stalinists line up with the State
(Internationalist Communist Tendency)

On 19 October in tune with the 48 hours general strike huge anti-austerity protests organised by the two major trade unions GESEE and ADEDY took place in Greece. In Athens alone perhaps as many as a million people marched towards Syntagma Square expressing anger against the vote on austerity measures in Parliament. More than 10,000 police officers were deployed on the streets of Athens in order to oppress the demonstration and the demonstrators were attacked several times by riot police. On October 20 MPs were expected to finally vote for a bill which aimed to further reduce the living standards of millions of Greek workers. But on this occasion protestors were confronted with a new development. The Stalinists of PAME, who normally hold separate demonstrations in other places, were already in Syntagma Square. Many reports claim that they lined up holding sticks (some with red flags attached). They prevented other demonstrators from getting onto the pavement in front of parliament. These reports also suggest that people had to show their KKE (Greek Communist Party) or PAME (the KKE trades union) membership card to get by. At this point there was no visible police presence (they were still in vans in sidestreets). The Stalinists were about to play the role of the police, in a move which was clearly aimed to make them appear the “responsible opposition”. When some demonstrators from the liberal ‘Den Plirono’ (I don’t pay) movement realised what was going on they began to protest and moved against the PAME cordon. A Greek source tells us what happened next...

"Then blocks of anti-authoritarians arrived, as well as the Anarchists' Assembly for Social Self-determination. Clashes erupted as protesters tried to reach the Parliament. An anarchist block attacked Stalinist lines. They confronted each other by the Great Britain Hotel in Syntagma. Police fired tear gas. The clashes were severe; flares were shot straight into the crowd. Generalized clashes between hundreds of anarchists and Stalinists in Syntagma took place; stones, bottles and flares were thrown. Protesters tried to break through PAME lines to reach the Parliament. The communists attempted a counter attack and beat up several – not only black bloc – protesters. They even “arrested” some youths and gave them to the police. Their co-operation with the state was obvious ... " (eagainst.com)

This was clearly a premeditated plan by the KKE as it was repeated in less dramatic form elsewhere in Greece. In Ioannina, PAME threatened and beat up protesters who were opposed to them and who had to reach government buildings. On Crete, members of KNE (the youth wing of the Communist Party) threatened protesters with sticks, outside the city hall. In the course of the demonstration a PAME member, Dimitris Kotzaridis, died due apparently to inhaling police teargas (he had a history of respiratory problems). This did not stop the KKE from claiming he had died as a result of a blow to the head from a rival demonstrator. Indeed their own press release about the incident is chillingly reminiscent of the sort of Stalinist propaganda that accompanied the Show Trials and the way the Stalinists operated in Spain in the 1930s.

Statement of the Press Office [of the KKE — ed.] concerning the organized murderous assault against PAME's rally in Syntagma and the death of the Trade Unionist of PAME Dimitris Kotzaridis. On this occasion organized groups with specific orders and anarcho-fascists unleashed an attack with Molotov cocktails, teargas, stun grenades and stones, in attempt to disperse the majestic rally of workers and people in Syntagma Square and especially in the area where PAME was concentrated. ... The hatred of the hooded ones against the labour and popular movement and PAME expresses the fury of the forces which serve the system and bourgeois power. The government has massive responsibilities for this.

“Anarcho-fascists” has chilling echoes of Vyshinsky’s demands for “Death to the Trotskyist-fascists” in the Show Trials. A couple of years ago the KKE got some kudos for putting up a banner “Peoples of Europe Rise Up” on the Acropolis (why not “workers of Europe rise up”? we asked) and have sent missions round Europe to put their case. The evidence demonstrates that this case is the reactionary one. Defending the bourgeois state comes as a norm for these Stalinists who are communist in name only. On the other hand the individualistic and anonymous antics of the black bloc play into the hands of the state’s “democratic game” [which includes the KKE] just as they did in Rome on October 15 (see page 7). It is not the way to widen class consciousness. In the meantime the internecine warfare amongst the protestors provoked by the KKE has enormously strengthened the austerity drive of the Greek state ...

The Internationalist Communist Tendency

Correspondence with a comrade defending *councilist* positions about the Bolshevik Party

Comrade Bjorn's Letter of September 29th, 2011

You wrote in the presentation of your positions: "Stalinism was not the product of the Russian revolution, but its gravedigger." The October revolution is not the same as the Bolshevik party which had an aim of building a party state and subordinate the soviets to a state apparatus. As long as you don't understand this will you too continue on the path of political elitism as ICC and Leftcom, former IBRP.

Have you read the analysis of Maurice Brinton in his "The Bolsheviks and workers' control: the state and counter-revolution" where it can be proven Lenin and Trotsky not only integrated the soviets into a party state but also established a party dictatorship with the point of no return in March 1921 when the Kronstadt soviet was crushed. The end of this counter-revolution was that the party elite became collective state-capitalist owners of the means of production in Soviet Union and established state-capitalism: - <http://libcom.org/library/the-bolsheviks-and-workers-control-solidarity-group>

I had a relationship of debate with ICC in Stockholm but concluded after some years the organization is sectarian and with a subjective analysis of capitalism. I have also had a period of debate with Leftcom, former IBRP, and had to conclude not even they understood that when the Bolshevik party established a party-dictatorship the party elite thereby changed its relationship to the working class population to be owners, i.e. state-capitalists. I guess by this that you disagree with <http://revsoc.org/english> and <http://www.internationalist-perspective.org>

Internationalist greetings,
Bjorn-Olav Kvidal

Our response

Paris, October 16th, 2011

The Fraction of the International Communist Left to comrade Bjorn,

Dear comrade,

We send you here – added file – the leaflet we are presently distributing. If you "feel" so, don't hesitate to send us your comments. We are sorry for the delay of our response – as you may suppose, our forces are very few.

We want to thank you for your frankness. Yes, as you supposed, we are in strong disagreement with you on the question of the Russian Revolution, the party and the State. For us, these questions, actually the one of the political attitude of the whole proletariat – not only its political minorities – in regards with the State is at the core of the revolutionary theory and practice. Thus it is the main and priority question to discuss and clarify, also the one where the class confrontations – at all levels – is the more acute and to be led.

We don't know if you want to discuss it with us and confront your point of view with ours. What ever is your purpose, we just want to underline a question of method : you seem to consider that that the bolshevik party had already the willingness to establish a Party dictatorship since the beginning : "*The October revolution is not the same as the Bolshevik party which had an aim of building a party state and subordinate the soviets to a state apparatus The October revolution is not the same as the Bolshevik party which had an aim of building a party state and subordinate the soviets to a state apparatus*". We don't know what is your position about the proletarian insurrection in the very October. What is a true proletarian insurrection or a bolshevik party "coup d'Etat" ?

What ever is your answer to this last question, to say that there was a plan already set up by the bolshevik is to build up an abstract history and not referring to the very concrete process which developed from February to October. And then it avoids you to defend with some credibility and efficiency your position. What has been the real historical process ? What have been the evolution of the attitude of the workers councils in regards with the State up to October ? What role have played the various parties in this process ? What role the Bolshevik one have been ? What has been the process and the evolution of the relationship of the workers councils and **the parties** towards the new State issued from October ? Actually, raising the question in this terms, it means in historical terms or concrete terms, makes everyone leave any pre-established and machiavelical plan and take into account the real and concrete difficulties, and even contradictions, the international 1917-1921 revolutionary process or wave have been confronted with.

We think that is the way, or method, you should follow... even for defending your present position on the State.

We have another question to ask you : why and on which basis do you consider the ICC to be sectarian ? What was the content of your discussion with it ? Is there still a real Swedish section of the ICC in the country ? We have heard that comrades have resigned and we see no publication for a long time now. Do you still have contact with them ? Do you have other comrades around you with whom you can discuss and confront your points of view.

We hope this short and very rapid letter is not too much confuse and that it can help you to understand what is the difference between an abstract vision of history and a concrete and historical one.

Communist Greetings.
The FICL.

STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

The Defence of the Proletarian Character of the October Revolution is still a class frontier !

The *Smolny* Publishing Firm has just published in a book a French translation of the review *Komunist* from the beginning 1918 by the "first Left Opposition" within the Bolshevik Party. The main act of this short-lived opposition called "Left Communist" and whose most famous leader was Bukharin, has been to oppose the signature of the Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk between the Soviet Russia and the German imperialism. The publication of these texts would have a secondary "historical" interest, a "curiosity" one, if its true aim was not, in its "presentation", a barely hidden attack against the Russian Revolution of October 1917 and against the Bolshevik Party.

Actually, the short introduction made by the publishers and above all the Preface written though by comrades with whom we have been members of the ICC during decades, take back to their account, 90 years later, the positions of *Komunist* and in particular its opposition to the Brest-Litovsk Peace. Still worse, they introduce the idea that there is a link, a continuity, between this opposition of the beginning of 1918 and the Left oppositions and fractions which fought in the afterwards against the counter-revolution and the stalinization of the Communist Parties !

Except rare expressions, it has been a long time that the peace signed at Brest-Litovsk was not questioned by people who claim communism. How can one affirm today that *"to be defeated as the Paris Commune was better (in January-February 1918 while the international revolutionary wave was not but at its very beginnings and that the World War carried on !)* than participating in a corruption of the power distorting socialism and the revolution" (Preface⁵) ? The only credit of the book is that it reproduces Lenin's article about the [*The Revolutionary Phrase*](#) which criticizes the booming declamation, and empty of any practical meaning, about the revolutionary war advocated by the "Left Communists" while there were no more army for the massive desertions it was suffering.

Unfortunately, the writers of the Preface does not contend themselves with adopting the Bukharin's "leftist and infantile" position about Brest-Litovsk. Characterizing since January 1918, barely two months after the October insurrection, the Revolution as *"a confiscated socialist revolution"*, they pretend that *"since the insurrection [the Bolshevik Party] has progressively substituted the Soviets by assuming the power in their place"*. Even worse, they affirm that *"the Bolshevik Party progressively abandons the development of the international revolution for the benefit of the defence of the Russian bastion and ends up adopting the theory of socialism in one country"*. This is a political outrage ! The thesis according to which Stalin is Lenin's continuity, is one of the greatest lies utilized by the bourgeoisie to attack the very idea of communism and to distort the Russian Revolution of October 1918. How the authors could so much slide from the ground of the *revolutionary phrase* up to, it seems, abandon the fundamental position of the Left Communist about the proletarian character of the October Revolution and bring their support and their participation to the bourgeois campaigns of today against communism ?

Will they have the political strength and courage to acknowledge their major fault and to dissociate themselves from this Preface or will they end up joining in the classes fights which are coming, the crowd of "thinkers" who are in bourgeoisie's pay ?

The FICL, December 24th, 2011

"By revolutionary phrase making we mean the repetition of revolutionary slogans irrespective of objective circumstances at a given turn invents, in the given state of affairs obtaining at the time. The slogans are superb, alluring, intoxicating, but there are no grounds for them; such is the nature of the revolutionary phrase. (...) Anyone who does not want to comfort himself with mo rewords, bombastic declarations and exclamations must see that the "slogan" of revolutionary war in February 1918 is the emptiest of phrases, that it has nothing real, nothing objective behind it. This slogan today contains nothing but sentiment, wishes, indignation and resentment. Ada slogan with such a content is called a revolutionary phrase. (...) It is clear to everyone (except those intoxicated with empty phrases) that to undertake a serious insurrectionary or military clash knowing that we have no forces, knowing that we have no army, is a gamble that will not help the German workers but will make their struggle more difficult and make matters easier for their enemy and for our enemy."

Lenin, *The Revolutionary Phrase*, February 1918.

5 All the quotations of the book are translated by us

The 19th ICC Congress or the Bankruptcy Declaration of the Policy led since 2001

The ICC held its 19th international Congress in Spring 2011. As we try to do it for every congress of this organisation which also remains ours, we want to take position on the balance-sheet it has published.

The balance-sheet article ⁶ which presents this congress comes to confirm the continuation of the opportunist drift of the ICC and to point out the precise step where this process is now. About the congress, we can take back word by word the judgement we made a year ago for the 19th Congress of its territorial section in France :

"No innovation. No particular liquidation. No so-called theoretical deepening. Nor political. No real debate. No perspective put forwards. Nor for the working class – in particular in front of the question of imperialist war. Nor for the revolutionary minorities. Nothing. The ICC opportunist of the Liquidation has nothing else to say to the proletariat" we said at the time (*Bulletin communiste international* 3, this article is not translated in English).

Thus has the 19th ICC congress been a congress for nothing ? Not exactly. First because it officially ratified the policy of classes collaboration with anarchism which breaks with the ICC platform. Then because, as acknowledges the article, *"the Congress, on the basis of different report, noted the biggest weaknesses of the organisation"*.

The biggest weaknesses ? At the organizational level ? It is not possible. Any regular reader of the ICC press can't believe it. At first sight, we could not believe it. Had not the organisation overcome its organizational difficulties of the past ? Did not it fly from progress to progress in its general activities, particularly at the level of its organizational functioning ? Was not it more united than ever before ? And we begun to worry. To question : of what kind were these difficulties ? *"The Congress examined these difficulties at some length, in particular the often degraded state of the organisational tissue and of collective work, which can weigh heavily on some sections"*.

So, let's acknowledge we are being taken aback !

What did happen ? The "organizational tissue" is again degraded ? One more time ? But how such a situation of **big weaknesses of the organisational tissue** could happen while all the congresses since the 2001 crisis praised the state of mind which prevailed within the organization, the recovered confidence and the "human solidarity" developed between the militants, while they brandished well high the banner of *Ethics and Morale* and displayed the *Culture of debate*, in short while they vaunted the quality of the recovered "organizational tissue"... after the struggle against the so-called clan with nazi and stalinist methods, infiltrated by police, that we were and that they had to expel⁷. Certainly,

⁶ .<http://en.internationalism.org/ir/146/icc-19th-congress-report>

⁷ . A quotation amongst others : *"This was a difficult test and a certain number of its "old" militants did not pass it (in particular those who formed the IFICC and those who gave up the struggle during the crises we have been through during this period). Today, while the perspective is becoming brighter, we can say that the ICC, as a whole, has overcome this ordeal. And it has come out of it stronger. It has strengthened itself politically"* (The ICC's 16th International Congress, *International Review* 122, 2005). Two years later [we are obliged to translate from the French version since the works about the 17th congress

there is not – yet ? - *"phenomena of a loss of conviction or disloyalty"*, are we reassured. But the worry comes back quickly because we are told that *"the causes of the present difficulties are partly of the same order"* as the crisis and the clans of the past ! The same order ?

But how ? How did it happen that had finally reappeared the same diseases against which the ICC had armed itself, had protected itself thanks to theoretical contributions of "first order" such as the texts about *Confidence and Solidarity in the Proletarian Struggle* (*International Review* 111-112) and *Marxism and Ethics* (*Review* 127-128) and had acquired its precious *Culture of debate* ? How could not these diseases be eradicated, at least contained, by the Permanent Inquiry Commission - they call it *Special Commission* - in charge of keeping "watching" the loyalty and the ideological purity of the militants and which had been set up since 2001 and had even justified a change of statutes in 2009⁸ ? Then, all these texts – "genuine theoretical innovations" whose invaluable "marxist" quality has been appreciated by everybody and that we have at their time "estimated" at their right value⁹ -, all these "new" organisational measures which had introduced new organizational rules would have been useless ? All these political sacrifices for so many militants have not succeeded to eliminate the disease ? So much personal humiliations and political capitulations for being back to the point of departure ? Would the balance-sheet of ten years of so-called fight for cleaning up the organizational tissue, for confidence and solidarity amongst militants, against the clanish spirit and the personal hatred be negative ? Even maybe a complete failure ?

Fortunately thanks to its theoretical vision of the Decomposition and of clanism (the roots of the organizational crisis within the workers movement according to this theory), the Liquidationist faction which rules the ICC gives us a political analysis, oh so much "consistent", of its recurrent

are not available on the English pages of their web site, nor on the *Review's*, nor on the *WR* and *Internationalism* pages) : *"As this congress has noticed and as the 16th Congress had confirmed it, the ICC has largely overcome the organisational weaknesses which were at the origin of that crisis. One of the elements of first order for the capacity of the ICC to overcome its organisational difficulties, consists in a close and profound examination of these difficulties. To do so, the ICC has set up since 2001 a Special Commission, distinct from the Central Organ and nominated by the Congress, which is in charge of doing this work in a more specific manner"* (*International Review* 130).

⁸ . After the quotations of the previous note about the *Special Commission*, here is the other element which might have enabled the ICC to overcome its organisational difficulties [still translated from French by us] : *"This being said, one of the major elements having allowed this capacity of our organization to overcome its crisis, and even to reinforce itself, had been its ability to have a profound reflection with an historical and theoretical dimension about the origins and the manifestations of its organisational weaknesses, reflection which developed in particular around the various texts of Orientation that our Review has published important extracts"* (*International Review* 130). The texts to which they refer to, are precisely the ones we have just mentioned previously...

⁹ . See the bulletins of the Internal Fraction of the ICC on our web site.

organisational difficulties. This analysis leads to an orientation as well "coherent" towards the militants and the organization : *"All the militants of the sections where these problems have arise (...) have known each other and militated together for more than 30 years. There are thus many solid links of friendship and confidence between them. But the minor faults, the small weaknesses, the character differences which everyone has to accept in others have often led to the development of tensions or a growing difficulty to work together over a period of many years in small sections which have not been refreshed by the "new blood" of new militants, precisely because of the retreat experienced by the working class. Today this "new blood" is beginning to arrive in certain sections of the ICC, but it is clear that the new members can only be properly integrated if the organisational tissue of the ICC improves"* (19th ICC Congress : Preparing for class confrontations, *International Review* 146, we underline).

We invite our readers to pay attention to the "profundity" and the "coherence" of this kind of reflection that the Liquidators of our organization have become the specialists and that we have so often pointed out. Let's sum up : the organisational tissue is deteriorated because militants are "old" and that it has *"not been refreshed by the new blood of new militants"*. But, in order to be able to properly integrate young militants and their new blood, beforehand you need to... improve the organisational tissue ! Any reader and serious sympathizer of the ICC will be astounded. Here is the kind of stupidity that the distinguished thinkers and theoreticians – was not one of them presented by his close friends of the Liquidationist faction as the greatest marxist of the 20th Century¹⁰ ? - has become the specialists. A real trademark.

What concrete meaning has this brilliant thought ? Because, actually what can be – from the Liquidators' point of view - reproached to the old militants who are presented as responsible for the deteriorated organisational tissue ? Their supposed inability to accept the *" the minor faults, the small weaknesses, the character differences"* between them – only explanation given for the **greatest difficulties** - while they *" know each other and have militated together for more than 30 years"* ? Who can accept such a psychological inanity ? But it is true that the family nucleus of the Liquidators have succeeded to make swallow by the great majority of the ICC members that the organisational crisis of 2001 was due to the fact that, amongst 6 members of the former International Secretariat – the Central Organ -, 5 of them – a so-called clan, one more - were jealous of the particular affection Marc Chirik (dead ten years before) had towards the one who was going to be ordained as the "greatest marxist of the 20th Century". Then, why the present nonsense about the character of the ones and the others would not be accepted ? Bigger it is, more it is accepted as says the proverb.

No actually, for the Liquidationist faction, the genuine defect of the old militants would not be the fact they have been formed and integrated in the ICC on the basis of its original positions in the years 1970 and 1980 ? That they are still

carrying these positions, at least partly and despite the political capitulations they had to accept these last years ? The political and organisational reflexes of these militants, or what remains of them, impede and limit on a daily basis, it seems, the destructive action of the ICC and of the Communist Left undertaken by the Liquidationist faction. Moreover, this latter has always provoked and fuelled the suspicion upon categories of militants¹¹ in order to develop the internal paranoia – the ICC seen as a besieged fortress - for justifying the existence of the *Special Commission "of investigation"* and to establish its power by throwing anathemas against categories of militants : today it is the turn of the "old" members.

These "old" comrades have to watch their back ! They are under surveillance. Either they shut up, they accept the new opportunist positions without balking ; or they still let themselves express on occasions, by reflex, the genuine positions of the ICC on such or such question and then they'll be charged guilty for the "personal" tensions linked to any important political disagreement as a mark of "their character" and their "inability to work collectively". The discussion about the political difference will be then obscured and denied by the discussion about their psychological traits, their friendships and their hostilities. Their interest is – they already know it in their deepest beings - to be careful and to avoid any confidences, gossips, or other reports which the *Permanent Special Commission of Surveillance* could be submitted.

In regards to the young and new militants, integrated on the basis of the new positions and orientations, political as well as organisational, few remain in the organisation on the very admission of the Liquidators according to whom the new members are hardly integrated in a tissue deteriorated... by the "old" members.

So, given the circumstances, it does not matter to speak about the banalities and the contradictions that this congress has issued by way of analysis about the international situation when it dared to express a rather clear-cut opinion. It does not matter to come back on the extracts published in this balance-sheet of the Resolution on the International Situation about the crisis which underlines *"an infernal spiral"* of *"the crisis of sovereign debts"* ; an assessment of a pathetic banality that even the bourgeois press launches joyfully. Should we laugh or rather sadden for the self-satisfaction declaring that *"the period that followed the Congress has confirmed this analysis"* and that it *"doesn't derive from any particular merit of our organisation"* since this one would be, they claim, *"faithful to the classic analyses of the workers' movement"*... except that since its 16th Congress, the ICC has amongst other things rejected the theoretical basis for the understanding of capitalism' Decadence : the cycle crisis-war-reconstruction ; that, since it 17th Congress, it has worsened this betrayal of *"the classic analysis of the workers' movement"* by declaring the definitive disappearance of the perspective of the generalized imperialist war and, at the level of the historical alternative, the appearance of a "third way" (the destruction of

10 . It is true that himself, in an internal text which all the ICC members of that time remember with a lot of emotion – we have no doubt -, presented himself as the "red thread" between revolutionaries of the past and those of tomorrow.

11 . We refer to our History of the International Secretariat of the ICC (only in French) : *Historique du Secrétariat international du CCI (1996-2001) (1e partie) (2e partie)* about the use of the suspicion through gossips and ceaseless slanders from the "militant Louise".

Humanity by the Decomposition).

What can be said too of this last Congress according to which *"the very brutality of the attacks provoke a feeling of powerlessness in the workers' ranks"* while massive struggles have not cease to develop for more than a year, particularly all around the Mediterranean ? The only kind of struggle which find favour to their eyes is in Spain *"where the movement of the "indignant" has for several months acted a sort of beacon for other countries in Europe and other continents"* ; this analysis confirms that the present ICC is not only influenced by the councilist vision of the classes struggle but, above all, that it has particularly become permeable to the bourgeoisie's ideological and political campaigns, in particular the Democratic one, up to take them over ¹² !

The ICC of today tends increasingly to replace the clarity of the marxist conceptions by a poor thought borrowed from the bourgeoisie and the class positions of the genuine ICC (inherited from the Communist Left) by the "fashioned" ideology, the one that the ruling class is presently hurling against the working class.

Despite the theory of the "culture of debate" which the Liquidators went on and on about during all these years, we'll know nothing about the *"different points of view [that] were put forward"* about the evolution of the economical crisis ; nothing too about the lack of *"total homogeneity in the discussions"* about the development of the classes struggle and thus about the contradictory arguments and reflections which, it seems, have been put forwards at that congress.

As well we'll know nothing, no exposition or sum-up, even concise, of the numerous and *"rich discussions"* that has raised the new "collaboration" with the anarchist groups (and even trotskist as the article tells us). We won't know no more about the arguments of the new members of the ICC, in Turkey in particular, who reject the analysis of parasitism - one of the political weapon of Liquidationism against the ICC and against the Communist Left. Finally, the balance-sheet informs us that the congress has come back about the Resolution of the 16th Congress (which we had denounced at its time) which had proclaimed that *"the ICC is already the skeleton of the future party"*. But why, how, such a position which was fully breaking with all the the policy of the ICC since its origin could have been adopted ? And why is it abandoned today ? Nobody will know and the Liquidators are very careful not to "open the debate".

The policy of liquidation of the political lessons and positions thus carries on and this congress is its last conclusive manifestation. For us, what is essentially striking, is that the Liquidators keep their control on the organisation and they obviously have the intention of completing successfully their enterprise up to its destruction, indeed up to the Communist Left one as a whole - particularly aiming at the destruction of the other organisations of this Left and, firstly, its main one :

12 . We refer our readers to our various statements on the "Indignous" and also to the ones of the Internationalist Communist Tendency for a clear understanding of their reality, of their weaknesses and increasing limits as well as for the utilization that the bourgeoisie makes against the working class's consciousness.

the Internationalist Communist Tendency ¹³.

For the honest militants of the ICC, faithful to its principles and its political positions, it is time to draw a balance-sheet of the last ten years. This one is dramatical at all levels and this 19th Congress confirms it. The result is a demoralisation and an increasing lack of conviction which express through dismissals and withdrawals more or less important of members. Lie ? Interpretation ? Exaggeration ? It is enough to read the last sentence of the article about the congress to get an idea of the "militant and committed" state of mind which rules today in the ICC amongst the militants [this sentence in French has been rephrased by the English translator, the term "after all" being moved in the previous sentence which fully changes the political meaning - an old militant ? Thus we translate ourselves from French the conclusion of the article]¹⁴ : *"After all, a fundamental characteristic of every communist militant is to be a fighter"*. Should we recall you, comrades of the ICC, that a communist militant is **above all** a fighter ?

November 2011.

13 . See [Shameful Resolution of the ICC against the Communist Left in secret, the Present ICC Betrays itself and the Working Class, International Communist Bulletin n°6](http://fr.internationalism.org/forum/312/askinan/4807/resolution-secrete-du-16eme-congres) and the "response" of the present ICC (only in French) made on their internet forum after the publication in our bulletin of extracts of the Secrete Resolution of the 16th Congress calling for throwing discredit on the IBRP (today the ICT) and even to its destruction : <http://fr.internationalism.org/forum/312/askinan/4807/resolution-secrete-du-16eme-congres>).

14 Here is the English version : *"But this perspective should not discourage us. After all, the struggle of the working class as a whole is also long and difficult, full of pitfalls and defeats. This is a perspective that should inspire militants to carry on the struggle; a fundamental characteristic of every communist militant is to be a fighter."* We underline. Every one can notice the political change the translator has made...

**New Statement about the Hidden Resolution of the ICC 16th Congress (2005)
The Liquidators of the ICC and their Shameful and Destructive Practices : They do Persist !**

After the publication in our bulletin 6 of extracts of the 2005 ICC Resolution which called for the destruction of the IBRP, the ICC has been compelled to respond publicly on its internet forum [only the French pages].

This "Statement"¹⁵ of those who liquidates the ICC and wants to do the same with the Communist Left - they don't even hide it anymore - is worthy of political wheeler-dealer, of maneuvers and a spirit belonging to the grossest leftism. And it moves away increasingly from proletarian spirit and the "culture of debate" between communists in front of their class ! It does its utmost to fudge the issue - the attacks and the destruction of the IBRP - into a so-called argument about the fact the Resolution was not secret since it was enough to remember they have written to the IBRP in 2004 "ordering" it to break any relationship with... the Internal Fraction of the ICC ; and about the fact it is enough to read the Resolution on the international situation of this 16th Congress in which they claim that the ICC has become "*the skeleton of the future Party*"¹⁶, to deduce that the disappearance and the destruction of the IBRP had become a goal to wish for and to achieve...

What an hypocrisy¹⁷ ! What disgrace too ! We challenge the liquidator's faction of the ICC to publish the whole Resolution - won't it be the best of the answers ? But above all, what betrayal of all the communist principles ! Since it is not - the destruction of proletariat's political organization ! - a question of secondary order. Such an orientation which is a 100% break with the orientation adopted by the ICC since its origin - towards the IBRP as well as the whole proletarian camp - is a fundamental orientation which determines all the activity of the organization towards the "Proletarian Political Milieu". How can one adopt a Resolution of such importance and never mention it ? Doing as it does not exist ? Isn't it a particularly hypocritical practice worthy of leftist ?

Because, if suddenly, one of the rare organizations of the Communist Left, fruits of decades of struggle and sacrifices by **our class**, has become an obstacle to the historical struggle of the proletariat, how is it possible not to raise publicly the problem ? How is it possible not to alert the whole proletariat ? How is it possible not to call its members to react and to quit it if they want to remain proletariat's fighters ? The first responsibility for communists when they advance an orientation and a reflection on a political question of such importance is to make it public, to present it to the whole proletariat. Here is the attitude that the communist movement has always put forwards and into practice. Here is the attitude and the practice that our ICC has always defended before it be taken hostage and driven into an harmful opportunist drift by the "liquidationist faction".

It is in this sense we'll fight against opportunism up to the end. It is in this sense that we'll highlight up to the end and we'll denounce its methods, its lies and its hypocrisy. And we call all the communists - organizations and militants of the Communist Left, without forgetting the members of the ICC - to join us in this struggle.

The FICL, October 24th, 2011.

15 . <http://fr.internationalism.org/forum/312/askinan/4807/resolution-secrete-du-16eme-congres>

16 . The last congress of the ICC has criticized and rejected this formula even though it was adopted at the 2005 Congress. Why ? How ? After what debate ? We'll know nothing about it. Here is practice, breaking with all the ICC experience, introduced by the liquidators during the organizational crisis of 2001, which enables the sudden changes of positions as well as their betrayal without giving any account to anybody and above all to the proletariat.

17 . Any reader will be able to judge it by noting the use of "conditional and future tenses" for the verbs and of the "if" in the quotation of the 2004 letter to the IBRP mentioned by the ICC answer : "*if the IBRP carries on with its policy of lie, slander and, still worst, of "letting say" and of complicity silence in front the acts of small groups which are dedicated to these acts such as the «Círculo» and the Internal Fraction of the ICC (...) then it **will make** the proof that it also **has become** an obstacle to the development of the proletariat's consciousness (...) it **will be** better that the IBRP disappears and our goal **will be** all we can to favor its disappearance*" (translated by us). From a public letter using the "conditional and the future" tenses to an hidden Resolution using the "present" - "*Besides the IBRP, the other groups of the proletarian milieu are not anymore able to positively contribute to the future class party, the priority of our intervention is not anymore to help them to do so (...). We must be consequent : if we say that the groups of the proletarian political milieu have a destructive attitude, we must discredited them politically...*" -, arises clearly the "two-faced" dimension of the liquidators of the present ICC.

OUR POSITIONS

- Since the First World War, capitalism has been a decadent social system. It has twice plunged humanity into a barbaric cycle of crisis, world war, reconstruction and new crisis. There is only one alternative offered by this irreversible historical decline : **socialism or barbarism**.
- The Paris Commune of 1871 was the first attempt by the proletariat to carry out this revolution, in a period when the conditions for it were not yet ripe. Once these conditions had been provided by the onset of capitalist decadence, the October revolution of 1917 in Russia was the first step toward of 1917 in Russia was the first step towards an authentic world communist revolution in an international revolutionary wave which put an end to the imperialist war and went on for several years after that. The failure of this revolutionary wave, particularly in Germany in 1919-23, condemned the revolution in Russia to isolation and to a rapid degeneration. Stalinism was not the product of the Russian revolution, but its gravedigger.
- The stratified regimes which arose in the USSR, eastern Europe, China, Cuba, etc. and were called 'socialist' or 'communist' were just a particularly brutal form of the universal tendency towards state capitalism, itself a major characteristic of the period of decadence.
- Since the beginning of the 20th century, all wars are imperialist wars, part of the deadly struggle between states large and small to conquer or retain a place in the international arena. These wars bring nothing to humanity but death and destruction on an ever-increasing scale. The working class can only respond to them through its international solidarity and by struggling against the bourgeoisie in all countries.
- All the nationalist ideologies - 'national independence', 'the right of nations to self-determination' etc - whatever their pretext, ethnic, historical or religious, are a real poison for the workers. By calling on them to take the side of one or another faction of the bourgeoisie, they divide workers and lead them to massacre each other in the interests and wars of their exploiters.
- In decadent capitalism, parliament and elections are nothing but a masquerade. Any call to participate in the parliamentary circus can only reinforce the lie that presents these elections as a real choice for the exploited. 'Democracy', a particularly hypocritical form of the domination of the bourgeoisie, does not differ at root from other forms of capitalist dictatorship, such as Stalinism and fascism.
- All factions of the bourgeoisie are equally reactionary. All the so-called 'workers', 'Socialist' and 'Communist' parties (now ex-'Communists'), the leftist organisations (Trotskyists, Maoists and ex-Maoists, official anarchists) constitute the left of capitalism's political apparatus. All the tactics of 'popular fronts', 'anti-fascist fronts' and 'united fronts', which mix up the interests of the proletariat with those of a faction of the bourgeoisie, serve only to smother and derail the struggle of the proletariat.
- With the decadence of capitalism, the unions everywhere have been transformed into organs of capitalist order within the proletariat. The various forms of union organisation, whether 'official' or 'rank and file', serve only to discipline the working class and sabotage its struggles.
- In order to advance its combat, the working class has to unify its struggles, taking charge of their extension and organisation through sovereign general assemblies and committees of delegates elected and revocable at any time by these assemblies.
- Terrorism is in no way a method of struggle for the

working class. The expression of social strata with no historic future and of the decomposition of the petty bourgeoisie, when it's not the direct expression of the permanent war between capitalist states, terrorism has always been a fertile soil for manipulation by the bourgeoisie. Advocating secret action by small minorities, it is in complete opposition to class violence, which derives from conscious and organised mass action by the proletariat.

- The working class is the only class which can carry out the communist revolution. Its revolutionary struggle will inevitably lead the working class towards a confrontation with the capitalist state. In order to destroy capitalism, the working class will have to overthrow all existing states and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat on a world scale: the international power of the workers' councils, regrouping the entire proletariat.
- The communist transformation of society by the workers' councils does not mean 'self-management' or the nationalisation of the economy. Communism requires the conscious abolition by the working class of capitalist social relations: wage labour, commodity production, national frontiers. It means the creation of a world community in which all activity is oriented towards the full satisfaction of human needs.
- The revolutionary political organisation constitutes the vanguard of the working class and is an active factor in the generalisation of class consciousness within the proletariat. Its role is neither to 'organise the working class' nor to 'take power' in its name, but to participate actively in the movement towards the unification of struggles, towards workers taking control of them for themselves, and at the same time to draw out the revolutionary political goals of the proletariat's combat.

OUR ACTIVITY

- Political and theoretical clarification of the goals and methods of the proletarian struggle, of its historic and its immediate conditions.
- Organised intervention, united and centralised on an international scale, in order to contribute to the process which leads to the revolutionary action of the proletariat.
- The regroupment of revolutionaries with the aim of constituting a real world communist party, which is indispensable to the working class for the overthrow of capitalism and the creation of a communist society.

OUR ORIGINS

- The positions and activity of revolutionary organisations are the product of the past experiences of the working class and of the lessons that its political organisations have drawn throughout its history. The ICC thus traces its origins to the successive contributions of the Communist League of Marx and Engels (1847-52), the three Internationals (the International Workingmen's Association, 1864-72, the Socialist International, 1889-1914, the Communist International, 1919-28), the left fractions which detached themselves from the degenerating Third International in the years 1920-30, in particular the German, Dutch and Italian Lefts.