

**INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST
BULLETIN**

Organ of the Fraction of the International Communist Left

n° 10

**02/ 02/ 2013
(English version February 15th, 2013).**

For contacting us :

E-mail : **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.

Presentation of the Bulletin.....	1
--	----------

Conference of the Fraction (October 2012)

Activities Report of the Fraction of the International Communist Left.....	2
Reply to the Activities Report of the Fraction (Internationalist Communist Tendency).....	14
Our Response to the ICT.....	16
Statement of the Internationalist Communists – Klasbatalo to the Report of the FICL.....	19

International Situation

War in Mali :

In Africa, France is the Gendarme of Europe against the USA and its Acolytes (January 20th, 2013)	23
---	-----------

Presentation of the bulletin

Our Fraction has held a « general meeting » which enabled it to globally draw a general balance-sheet of its activities and of its history – since the formation of the Internal Fraction of the ICC of which it is the direct continuity – and to also draw new perspectives in regards with its future and its intervention. Because the important development of world capitalism's situation since 2008 – marked by the economical crisis and the perspective of massive confrontations between the social classes –, the question of the revolutionaries' regroupment with the view of the future setting up of a true communist party becomes a priority ; and even a matter of « urgency » regarding the real state of the communist forces today. We all know that, historically, the formation of the party comes rarely too soon but often too late. This situation could not but having implications on our activities as « fraction of the ICC », at least from the point of view of our immediate and concrete policy of regroupment and intervention. Consequently, for now at least two years, we were feeling the need for drawing a balance-sheet of our activities in order to strengthen our ranks and draw new perspectives. Unfortunately we have got difficulties to mobilize for this task. And when it become possible, our comrade in Mexico suffering increasing militant disengagement, could not participate to this event.

Thus we held this meeting with two militants. But far from « turning in on ourselves », we thought indispensable to open our reflection to the Internationalist Communist Tendency and to the comrades of the Internationalist Communists – Klasbatalo with whom we have developed fraternal relationships and work in common. We want to salute here the political effort the comrades of the ICT have accomplished with their participation to our balance-sheet and to the definition of new perspectives for our fraction. Their statement is published just after of our report of activities. We make it followed by our response. Far from stopping at the acknowledgement of our present differences – they are clearly exposed and they don't enable our immediate adhesion to this organization –, the ICT and ourselves, every one at its place and in relation with its own responsibilities, we are engaged in a long term process of discussion and political clarification as well as in an immediate process of political bringing together and of practical collaboration. This response – the fraternal and **politically positive** reaction of the comrades – comes to confirm what we have defended these last ten years, that the ICT remains the only communist organisation capable to assume a role of reference and to be a pole of political regroupment at the international scale.

Far from being contradictory with this central axis of our intervention which has been reaffirmed in our report, this one ends also with the more immediate and concrete proposal of organisational regroupment with the comrades of the IC-K. Since, as the IC-K's response that we publish also in this issue underlines it, our perspective of regroupment, of setting up a new group, with the comrades, fully fits into the perspective of regroupment around the ICT ; clearly, it is not a matter of creating an « alternative » pole, even least an organization « in competition » with the ICT but a group around the ICT, supporting this one. We are convinced that the presence of our

historical current by the sides of the ICT is an asset to lead the fight for the future party.

Actually, and it is an essential point of the balance-sheet we present in our report of activities, the experience of our fraction – IFICC and FICL – shows clearly that the **two historical currents** – PCInt-ICT and GCF¹-ICC – are not inescapably opposed, nor in competition, but on the same side of the barricade in the battle for the formation of the Communist Party of tomorrow on condition of ending with sectarianism – which doesn't mean to silence the disagreements. In this sense, our fight as **fraction of the ICC** has not been in vain². We are convinced that we have saved the honor of the ICC, preserved its theoretical and political acquisitions, defended its organizational experience as well as the one of intervention within the workers struggles. Anyone who wants to refer to the true ICC – with its strengths and its weaknesses, its lessons and its mistakes – can do it thanks, for a great part, to our work of fraction. The fact the comrades of the IC-K, after almost 6 years of discussions and contradictory debates, stand today within this theoretical, political and even organizational framework, verifies this recording. And it means that « our » historical current lives on and will be present in the process of the party constitution.

We engage thus a process of regroupment with the comrades of the IC-K whose term we can't plan today – we have just received their text. Up to that moment, we remain organized as Fraction of the International Communist Left since we know that communist activity can't be conceived and realized but in a collective and organized framework.

So, it is as FICL that we have published – it is reproduced in this bulletin – and that we distribute our statement which denounces the French military intervention in Mali and the exacerbation of the imperialist rivalries it expresses. Even if we open up a process of organizational regroupment which will require the essential of our energies, our duty of communists is to carry on intervening as much as we can towards our class.

February 2nd, 2013

1 GCF : Gauche Communiste de France of the years 1945-1952.

2 It has now become obvious that this organization as such, caught in its sectarianism – towards the Communist Left – and, which is complementary, in its opportunist openness towards anarchism and some forms of leftism, blinded by its idealist and opportunist thesis on “decomposition”, and the revision of its basic positions and the ones of marxism, won't be able to correct its course. Carrying on addressing to its members of today as fraction of the same organization has no more possible positive effect. On the other hand, participating to the process of regroupment around the ICT and making this process a reference, can help the honest members of this organization and still driven by militant willingness, to break with their organization and join at their turn the dynamic which comes out around the ICT and which is an historical necessity.

Activities Report of the Fraction of the International Communist Left (October 2012)

1- A Report ?

Why an activities report ? What meaning, what sense can have such a report for a so small group as ours ? Why such an effort ?

The activities reports are a tradition for the organizations of the workers movement since they are a necessity in order these organizations can define their orientations and their perspectives of activities. For this definition be the most complete possible, it matters to draw a critical balance-sheet of the past activities. This means that the political organizations of the proletariat refer to and fit themselves within the historical organizational continuity, within a continuity of collective organization, which "obliges", which "compels", which imposes these political organizations, as political vanguard of the proletariat, to refer and to claim their own past. They can't, and their members must respect this obligation, "free" themselves of their history and of their class and political organizations' one. Any communist organization is responsible of its history and must take it in front of the proletariat. Nor their members, the communist militants - the communist commitment has no meaning but within a collective rejecting any individualism - are "free". Their only "individual freedom" lies in the fact they can dismiss militantism, they can quit the organization, the collective body, the very essence of the fight of their class.

Thus, for the proletariat and the communists, an activities report of organization is more than a simple mean to draw a balance-sheet and perspectives. Above all, it is the expression of a method that we qualify as "Party method" (and even as "Party discipline") which belongs to the proletariat's vanguard organizations. It imposes the critical verification of the past orientations on the basis and the claim of the historical continuity and the Communist Program.

« Nobody ignores that before the formation of the Russian Social-Democrat Party, the revolutionary movement existed in our country under various forms. The following question has been often raised in our press : "Do we reject the legacy of the first generations of the cultured revolutionary class which was not marxist, which, actually, was not even socialist ; but which, without question, has had great merits in the past ?" That is our legacy, have we responded, and we accept it. We are the only continuators of the best part of the movement initiated by the cultured revolutionary class of 1850 up to 1880, and even well before. » (Zinoviev, *The Origins of the Russian Communist Party*, 1918, translated by us from French).

Even for a small group as ours, the necessity for making balance-sheets and drawing orientations of activities from these balance-sheets is imperative ; as disproportionate this work and this effort can seem to be at first sight in regards with our forces. We must point out the fact that our Fraction of the International Communist Left, coming from the Internal Fraction of the ICC, has been unable to realize such a balance-sheet before – while we had expressed its urgent

need and while we had formally decided to do so more than a year ago –, manifested the growing difficulties and growing weaknesses we were confronted with. Some are peculiar to us. Others affects the whole proletarian camp and its main organizations – we'll try to come back on this in this report.

2- 2001-2008 : The Legacy of the Internal Fraction of the ICC and the defence of the "historical" ICC within the Communist Left

Though dissolved in 2008 – we come back on this after –, we carry on fully claiming the Internal Fraction of the ICC, its fight within the ICC against the opportunist drift which have openly and overwhelmingly overcome the latter since the 2001 organizational crisis and the expulsion of our fraction ; we carry on claiming its fight for the regroupment of the communist forces around the only organizational pole capable of being a genuine historical and political reference – we are talking of the ex-IBRP, today Internationalist Communist Tendency – and too claiming the validity of its intervention in the events of the classes struggle through its statements in the 49 issues of its bulletin as well as through its leaflets and communiques (the reader can refer to the web page http://fractioncommuniste.org/index_eng.php?SEC=b00 for the reduced English version of our bulletins³ to get the list of the summaries of the bulletin of the Internal Fraction).

At first, within the ICC and then outside since we were expelled in March 2002, the activity of our internal fraction has been marked and defined by the fierce and daily fight against the political drift imposed on our organization by the new "leadership" and against the ceaseless attacks of any kind – insults, false accusations, physical violence, censorship, expulsion of the "public" meetings – that the latter has only opposed to our political disagreements. Despite this daily battle and the nauseating ground on which the liquidationist faction which imposed itself fraudulently⁴, attempted to plunge us, we succeeded to determine our activities of fraction from the balance-sheet of the ICC drift. Our activity has been thus defined in various activities reports designed and intended to the members of the ICC as a whole which proposed a political alternative to the new opportunist orientation. One can still read them today and we proudly claim their political content⁵. More over, we have realized, from the minute of the weekly meetings of the International Secretariat and of the meetings of the International Bureau of the ICC of the years 1995-2001 an *History of the IS* (only in French : [Historique du SI, 1e partie](#) et [2e partie](#)) which

3 For the complete version, see the French pages : <http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/index.php?SEC=b00>.

4 It was through the elimination of the 2/3 of the members of the former central organs that this faction "took the power".

5 See the bulletins 1 and 6 in English and the bulletins 1 and 16 in the French version of the IFICC (<http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/index.php?SEC=b00> for the French and refer to the bulletin 16 for the Spanish version. For instance, the bulletin 16 published the Activities Report we presented for the 15th Congress of the ICC in 2003.

doesn't limit itself to refute the genuine falsification of the ICC history and the most extreme accusations against us (and other militants who could not then resist to the destruction work), nor even to highlight the dubious and indignant behaviour of a militant having things in common for the least with actions of a provocateur, if not worst ; this document goes further and, according to us, draws important concrete political and of principle lessons regarding the functioning of a communist organization ; in particular in a situation of internal crisis and with the presence of dubious individuals. These texts (the reports and the *History*) are constituent of the internal fraction, of its orientations and of its political development. They are and will remain, we are convinced, a reference not only for the "historians" who will want to establish the ICC history but above all for the militants and the political organizations of the proletariat of tomorrow.

We have carried on defending the political orientation, as weak and as questionable it could be, which have been adopted unanimously in the congresses of the ICC all along the 1990's and which still prevailed up to 2001. The defeat of this political orientation at the 14th congress of the ICC in 2001 opened a Pandora's box and enabled opportunism and political and theoretical revisionism to rush into our organization at a speed we were far to imagine. In the space of a few months, theoretical and principle revisions were adopted at the congresses – without real debate, nor reflection, not discussion or "orientation" texts were published on the subjects – such as the abandonment of the notion of historical alternative "Imperialist War or Proletarian Revolution" (2003), the cycles *crisis-war-reconstruction-new crisis* (one of the basis for our conception of Capitalism Decadence) in 2005 and the rejection of the threat of any new generalized imperialist war (2007)... All these innovations, turning their back to the marxist principles and to the ICC basic positions, are the result of the replacement of the theory of "Capitalist Decadence" by the one of "Decomposition". We have systematically criticized and denounced through texts, all were published in our bulletin, the principle drift which was taking place.

As well, and to "theoretically" support all these fantasies aiming at destroying the theoretical and political legacy of our organization, the liquidationist tendency had to set up woolly theories on *Confidence and Solidarity*, on *Morality and Ethics*, on the *Culture of Debate*, and including on *Revolutionary Indignation* ; the latter served as theoretical justification within the organization for the insults and the banning of speaking for the new minority that we were. Today the ICC is well discreet on all these fantasies. It is quite true that we have systematically denounced and ridiculed these great idealist and speculative theories which were marked by an a-classist, a-historical, approach up to pretend to the sanctification of a "Human Morality" above the social classes and history. All these bright ideas, terribly destructive for the consciences and the communist convictions of the ICC militants who remained faithful to the original positions of their organization and more largely to those of the workers movement, could not but lead to political and concrete betrayals of the class struggle : first in the denunciation of the strike as a proletariat weapon by the German section at the very moment the OPEL workers of

Bochum were on wildcat strike (2004) ; then in the public expression of solidarity of the ICC with the anti-riot policemen wounded during the repression of the students demonstrations in France (2006). But beyond these betrayals, it is all a councilist and petit-bourgeois approach which took hold of the ICC all along the years 2000, from the "fetishisation" of the General Assemblies – preferably the students' ones – up to the support to the ideology of the "Indignados" [the "Indignous" whose movement started in Spain up to the "Occupy Wall Street" in the United-States] and even the support to ideological themes put forwards by the bourgeoisie in order to counteract the workers struggle revival. The finale of this drift openly expressed itself in the opportunist opening and concessions towards anarchism that the Current has made the last years and which manifest a step in its drift up to the point this organization appears today, for the ones who are able to observe and read, in full deliquescence. Its apparent "good health" which is artificially maintained, won't resist to the first serious gust of wind of history and the *Permanent Commission of Investigation* – they call it *Special Commission* as the Stalinists called it *Commission of Control* – which is in charge of watching the loyalty and the ideological purity of the militants, and which was set up since 2001 and which has even justified a change of the Statutes in 2009, won't change nothing ; all the contrary.

For us, it is clear that it is essentially the permanent and determined affirmation of our theoretical, political and organizational continuity with our ICC and our fight against its opportunist drift that made fail the destruction and disparition enterprise directed against our fraction and its members. This political fight and the maintaining of our organized activity had quickly got a very significant echo and, actually, reduced to nothing and made still more ridiculous the accusations, the slanders, the insults and the public sentences – the worst and more serious being that we were cops. It too matter to underline the **political and fraternal** role of the IBRP – to a lesser extent the one of the International Communist Party-Proletarian [*Le prolétaire*] notably by its militants in France – in the ICC liquidationists' failure to isolate us and make us condemned by all, so hoping to muzzle us.

3- The Struggle for the Regroupment of the Communist Forces around the IBRP (today the ICT)

One year after our expulsion, we drew a balance-sheet which has been published – in English too - in our bulletin 13 - [Presentation/balance-sheet](#) [actually the original text title was *Work Perspective for our Fraction and Balance-sheet of the ICC Crisis*] - in which we put forward another aspect of our fight, a second axis of our activities orientations : to open up to and to intervene towards the proletariat camp ; uppermost to the main historical groups of the Communist Left :

“Since we've decided to open our internal bulletins to the whole proletarian political milieu, organisations and their contacts and sympathizers, we consider that our area of internal discussion is not any more limited to the single ICC but to the whole political milieu which will have to become the active and determining factor for the building-up of the future world communist party. We think that the questions

which are raised by the ICC crisis, its opportunist drift, concern and "belong" to the whole components of this milieu. Moreover, if we think we are still in the phase of "internal fraction", of "redressment", of the ICC with its method and its very precise political requirements, we have also to make up for the responsibilities that the ICC is giving up, such as the struggle for the unity and the defence of the Left Communist. Or too, if it's the case, in front of a crucial event (such as September 11th, the war against Irak, or significant workers struggles) which would need the widest and the most united intervention of the revolutionaries."

In the course of time, this aspect of our activity has become more central. We have tried to give priority as much as we could to our relationship with the IBRP which we considered as the only pole of regroupment remaining after the political and organizational failure of the ICC. This resulted in meetings, political debates and clarifications (in particular on the question of class consciousness, the Party, and the formation of the *Partito Comunista Internazionale* in 1943⁶), a political collaboration which resulted in common meetings of our two organizations, public meetings of the IBRP in Paris supported by us and through translations of articles of this organization in French and Spanish. At the same time and in addition to this central orientation, we have systematically sought to respond to the various contacts, individuals and groups or circles, emerging throughout the world – it can be referred to several correspondences we have published in our bulletin. In particular, we have begun to develop a political work of clarification with the Internationalist Communists of Montreal (today the IC-Klasbatalo) on the basis of the IBRP and ICC political platforms. After a period of belonging – or at least of close collaboration – with the Canadian group, the Internationalist Workers Group, member of the IBRP and after their split with the IWG, the comrades were able to open up to the whole Communist Left – the ICC, the "bordiguist" ICP, ourselves. Our first task was to avoid that these comrades adopted an "against" positioning towards the IBRP after an experience they valued as unfortunate.

According to us, one gain of this orientation has been the debates we had with the IBRP even though we can regret that they couldn't be continued and developed up to today as they should have been. The official ICC has quickly given up at the same time some of its principle positions and the ground of the political and fraternal confrontation within the Communist Left. It has preferred to turn towards leftist, unionist and anarchist groups so breaking with its original policy and, at the same time, it has adopted a Resolution aiming at discrediting and destroying the IBRP⁷ – "what matters is to **discredit** the IBRP (...) **that it disappears** at the political level. If this policy ends up with its physical disappearance, **it is all the better**". Our fraction found itself

to be the only organized form to defend the political legacy of the ICC and of the one of the 1940 and 1950 group of the Communist Left of France (*Gauche Communiste de France*) ; specially on the question of the class consciousness, the Party, and of the formation of the ICP in 1943 in Italy. In great part, the merit of this political confrontation with the comrades of the IBRP has been to clear up several misunderstandings and above all, even more important, to clear up the obstacle between the two historical currents regarding the formation of the ICP in 1943-1945. We refer to the bulletins of the internal fraction of the ICC for this debate (bulletins #33 and #37 mentioned in footnote #4). These discussions have clearly specified that our two historical currents shared the same position about the fact that the class consciousness was not the mechanical and immediate product of the economical struggles of the proletariat and moreover that it didn't come from "outside the working class". It is in that sense that our two currents claim Lenin's fundamental vision in *What is to be done ?* (Lenin's book) and that they reject at the same time the "Economism" – its modern version being the "Councilism" that we can define as "Anti-partidism" – and the "Substitutionism" of which the "bordiguist" current is, in our opinion, the more obvious expression within the Communist Left. We can't develop here and we refer to the articles (we fully claim) of the *International Review*⁸ of the CCI to grasp what is the position of the genuine ICC. A point on this : for long the ICC has been marked by Councilism and the May 1968 "student" spirit. It is only through political debates and fights, all along the years 1970 and 1980, that it had succeeded, at least in its public and official statements, to free itself from its anti-partidism and anti-Lenin prejudices. With great difficulty, it has to be admitted, up to the point that, very quickly, during and above all in the following of the 2001 organizational crisis, it has rapidly fell in its "youthful mistakes". The main consequence of the ICC crisis of 2001 is that the defence of the political lessons of this organization, in particular on these "Party" questions but not only, has fallen on our single fraction.

Another consequence of the ICC past, of our past, appeared clearly during the debates with the IBRP. Though still carrying on claiming in particular the GCF (The Communist Left of France), we had to acknowledge that a great part of the criticisms that "we" had raised against the formation of the ICP in 1943-1945 shouldn't have been fundamentally so all the more since the members of the GCF which the ICC comes from, agreed with the need and the formation of the Party in Italy at that time⁹.

6 See the IFICC Bulletins #33 in English, http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/index_eng.php?SEC=b33, and the #37 only in French, <http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/index.php?SEC=b37>.

7 See our *International Communist Bulletin* # 6 : [Shameful Resolution of the ICC against the Communist Left : In secret, the Present ICC Betrays itself and the Working Class](#)

8 In particular, the *Review* #96 et #97 : [Have we become "Leninists"? - part 1](#) and [Have we become "Leninists"? - part 2](#)

9 In the ICC of the 1970's, because the origin and reticences of Anarchist and Councilist nature of most of its young members of that time, it is above all an other version which has remained in the imaginary world of its militant and which has been favoured, we have to acknowledge it, by the crass ignorance of the Left in Italy and of its history in which they basked ; in which we basked. On the basis of *Internationalisme* articles (the publication of the GCF) subsequent to the formation of the Party in Italy, this version defends that the setting up of this latter had been an error because it was against the current of the historical course.

Finally, it is following these discussions and these political clarifications that we realized that our ICC had never pronounced itself on the fundamental texts of the fraction of the “Italian Left”. Its claim has always limited itself to the review of the Fraction of the Left of the Communist Party of Italy, *Bilan* (1933-1938), and had never ventured further. And yet, in keeping with its political battles of the years 1970-1980 against Councilism and Anarchism, **our ICC should have followed through the logical conclusion and re-appropriated and clearly claimed, even if in a critical manner, the Thesis of Roma of the CP of Italy (1922) and the Thesis of Lyon presented by the Left at the 3rd Congress of the CP of Italy (Lyon, 1926).**

The political implications of the political platform of the ICC, its principles and positions, as well as its political legacy, liberated from its “Councilist” and “Anarchist” infantile mistakes of its beginnings, lead to the special claim of the history, and the political legacy of the Italian Left¹⁰. Most of the positions of the ICC and the main ones, at the theoretical, political and organizational levels, come more from the experience of the Italian Left than of the Dutch and German ones.

After these discussions with the IBRP which had underlined our political closeness and the deep agreements on central and historical questions, a misunderstanding arose between the IBRP and ourselves. Actually, one of the disagreements we keep on having with this organization – and which no discussion has come to raise – is about the conception of the organization **today**. For our part, we remain convinced that any communist organization, as small it can be, must consider itself and act as a **centralized** international group, with the same political platform in particular, what ever is its shape and its geographical presence. The IBRP, the ICT today, considers that the regroupment of the communist forces must be realized on the basis of the emergence of internationalist groups at the local and national levels and then, then only, it is possible to form a genuine international and centralized organization. Moreover the misunderstanding has increased by the fact the IBRP seemed to consider the final purpose of our discussions as a simple adhesion from our part to the political positions of the IBRP and the abandonment of the ICC positions. Except being finally convinced after a political confrontation of the positions – which we don't formally rule out in absolute terms –, we don't consider that the debates and the struggle for the communists' regroupment has the immediate and first aim to formally regroup in the same organization through the renunciation of political positions on which there is conviction. All the contrary, one of the first

10 *“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 ”* (Basic Positions of the ICC in the last page of all its publication).

objectives of the struggle for regroupment is the exposition and the confrontation of the political positions in order they be clarified at the best – we refer to the results of our discussions with the IBRP on the question of consciousness and of the Party as an illustration of the validity of this method for political clarification and the rapprochement between different political currents.

4 – The End of the Internal Fraction of the ICC

This misunderstanding have had two important consequences for our internal fraction. First, it put a brake to the development of our rapprochement with the IBRP even though this one carries on developing. Second, it provoked a confusion amongst the members of our fraction which had not been discussed at the time – the comrades didn't raise it as a debate and preferred to silence their doubts and questionings – and which ended up becoming a disagreement, amongst others, in our ranks in 2009.

We can't come back here on our past Conference in 2008. We refer to the [*Resolution of Activities of the Internal Fraction of the ICC \(January 2008\)*](#). On this occasion, we reaffirmed unanimously the general orientations of the fraction. If we read again this Resolution, we can note that it particularly puts the emphasis on two points that our fraction has not ceased to repeat since its constitution :

- the struggle for the regroupment around the IBRP as the only pole of regroupment ;
- the struggle against opportunism, particularly the one of the ICC still considered as a group of the Communist Left – it means a group to “defend” and to “redress” since it had not crossed the class frontier.

Unfortunately, and the experience of the years 1990 in the ICC had warned us up to the point we had strongly stressed that all the questions which had raised troubles within our ranks be discussed, the whole comrades of the fraction have adopted without real discussion the report of that time as well as the Resolution of Activities. One year later, the crisis of our fraction broke out. As usual, if so we can say, it appeared on organizational questions. We saw then reappearing a vision of the organization and of practices of functioning that the former majority of the ICC before 2001, of whom we are the continuity, had wanted to fight against and on which, despite the unanimous votes of the 1990's, it had been defeated. We had called this vision of the organization and of its practice in the ICC at that time, the “policy of injunction” [or the “policy of ordering”] by the Central Organs. We can sum up in broad outline the alternative as this : “whether the respect of the political orientations put forwards by the Central Organs by discipline what ever is the understanding and the conviction of the militants or whether winning the militant conviction over these orientations in order to gain the genuine communist conviction”.

But very quickly, other disagreements – sometimes contradictory – appeared which were questioning the whole orientation of the fraction. For some comrades :

- we had made a mistake when we refused to accept

the conditions that the IBRP proposed us in order to join it, it means we should have accepted to give up our conviction on the political platform of the ICC ;

- we had made a mistake when we granted in a footnote the ICC statement which denounced an anti-terrorist campaign after the workers struggle in France against the attack on the pensions system in the fall 2008 (see only in French [*Le terrorisme n'est pas l'arme du prolétariat*](#) [*Terrorism is not a proletariat's weapon*]) ;
- the comrades also opposed to our first attitude of “openness” towards the comrades who had just quit the ICC and who were to set up the review *Controverses*. They considered that we had first and foremost to demand that they presented their excuses and formally retract on their active participation to the slanders, the insults, the violences exerted against us, on the public denunciations we suffered and on our expulsion during the 2001-2002 crisis of the ICC ;
- afterwards, it has been published in the bulletin 48 of the Internal Fraction [not in English], they opposed the proposal of web site made by the Internationalist Communists – Klasbatalo.

On each one of these questions, the comrades were challenging the orientations which had though been adopted at the 2008 Conference. Even worst, they were challenging questions of principle. Very quickly, our fraction found itself paralysed. And the last two bulletins were realized by the only comrades called “minority” who were to form our present Fraction of the International Communist Left. Useless to come back here on the concrete conditions of this paralysis and the inevitable personal tensions such a situation provokes. We ended up agreeing on the conditions of separation. The comrades of the “majority” kept the name and the web site... they actually left to abandon since then. This end of the fraction and the desertion of its fight by the comrades is unfortunately not, we must acknowledge it, but a new manifestation of the bourgeoisie's pressure through its campaigns against communism which do attack directly, amongst other things, the militant conviction of the vanguard individuals.

Then we set up the Fraction of the International Communist Left and created another web site. Actually, we decided to carry on the work of the Internal Fraction and we completely claim its history. It is thus in the framework of this continuity we can now tackle the balance-sheet of our activities since 2008.

5- Balance-sheet of the Fraction (FICL)

The period since 2008 and our last Conference is marked, by the violent explosion of the economical crisis of capitalism, crisis which can't be hidden any more, crisis that the bourgeoisie is compelled to acknowledge openly and in front of which it has passed through various moments of panic. From the American estate crisis – the “subprimes” – to the European countries sovereign debt crisis, the capitalist world

reveals openly to every one its impasse and plunges the world into a generalized recession, misery, wars and the preparation for the generalized imperialist war. We can't come back in this report on the analysis of this situation. It just matters to underline its implications for the historical relation of forces between the two antagonistic classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat, on which depends the humanity's fate.

The first consequence of the open crisis is the world generalization of the attacks against the working class in all countries ; these attacks are frontal and simultaneous and they force the international proletariat, despite its weaknesses, to resist.

The second consequence is the intensification of the imperialist rivalries, increased economical and “geo-strategical” competition, which drives the main imperialist poles to define themselves, to precise themselves, and whose one manifestation is the persistence and the multiplication of local wars ; another one is the more and more direct tensions between great powers as we can see at the very moment between Japan and China ; and finally, other particularly important manifestation, the strengthening of the military expenses which obliges all national capitalisms and above all the main ones to redouble their efforts to follow the rhythm of militarization imposed by the crisis and the very dynamic of imperialist rivalries. This last manifestation of the imperialist logic imposes at its turn a doubling of the attacks against the proletariat who have not only to pay for the capitalist crisis but also have to pay for war. We don't develop any more here.

Consequently, our fraction carries on claiming the fundamental analysis of the ICC and of marxism in regards with the alternative “imperialist war or proletarian revolution” as the only possible – it was precisely one of the first fundamental points that the ICC of today had liquidated at its 15th Congress in 2005. In particular, we carry on claiming the notion of “historical course” as our organization had defined it and specified it in the years 1970-1980.

So it is by the yardstick of our understanding of the situation and more widely of the historical course that we have to evaluate the validity of our activities. What is the situation of the historical course according to us ?

The bourgeoisie's offensive against the perspective of Communism

The anti-communist campaigns have provoked a withdrawal of the extending of class consciousness within the workers ranks. In particular, the “idea” that another society in stead of capitalism is possible, has been largely moved aside of the workers consciousnesses. Besides the withdrawal of the struggles of the years 1990, the success of the capitalist ideological offensive still determines today the content and the dynamic of the workers struggles which break out and generalize in all countries – and all particularly in Europe. But for all that, have we come back to the situation which prevailed in the years 1930 when the international proletariat tended everyday to let itself dragged in warlike ideologies – in particular nationalism and the opposition (through anti-fascism) between “democracy” and fascism ? Have we come back to the situation when the working class of various

countries, in particular the ones of capitalism's central countries, adhered to great parties and unions as the Stalinists and Social-Democrats ones? That is not the case. Nevertheless suffering, as never, the ceaseless offensive of bourgeois ideology, the great masses of the proletariat are far from submitting to it. Even though it is not yet capable to put forwards, not even the slightest bit, its own perspective, it is far from surrender hands and feet tied to its exploiters. Currently, above all since 2008, the objective reality of capitalism, it means its open crisis and the violent and massive attacks against the international proletariat, imposes to the latter to resist and to struggle more and more massively. If the proletarians may individually forget the reality of classes struggle, the bourgeoisie – since it knows where is the genuine danger for itself and for its system and while it doesn't stop declaring the inanity of such a concept – leads a class struggle, a true class war, in order to carry on defending its exploiting class interests. The crisis doesn't but accentuate its determination and the setting up of teams and men within its State apparatus corresponding to this war. In brief, since the international proletariat “is not defeated”, in particular it is not ready to accept the sacrifices the bourgeoisie wants to impose upon it because the crisis and the needs for imperialist war, and since the bourgeoisie has no other choice now but to attack violently, massively, frontally, simultaneously, the whole international proletariat, we consider that **the “historical course” is towards massive confrontations between the classes**. Obviously, this doesn't mean the path to revolution is great open – the proletariat can be well defeated in these historical confrontations.

There is in particular one factor which can not prevent the development of this dynamic to massive confrontations but which can limit its potentialities, and still worse becoming a cruel lack for the success of the “course towards revolution” : the situation of the communist forces.

These ones have also suffered the negative effects of the anti-communist campaigns even though with some interval in relation to the great majority of the working class. But before tackling this central and determining factor for the resolution of the historical problem we are facing, this activities report have to first evaluate the balance-sheet of our modest intervention in the situation.

Why an intervention ?

For any communist organization, the intervention towards the class – publications, leaflets, communiques, etc... – in the historical situation, in the workers struggles indeed but not only, is a central dimension of its activity what ever is its size and its immediate influence. It must be a permanent concern that only the concrete conditions of its realization – real state of the militant forces, relation of forces between the classes, degree of the repression of the enemy class and its State apparatus which is precisely determined by that relation of forces – can limit the extend and the intensity.

Linked and in coherence with our vision of the construction of the party, in particular in accordance with the understanding that any communist group must set up itself as an **international and centralized** organization, as an embryo

of communist party, the intervention has to be international and historical which doesn't exclude, and even all the contrary do favour, its indispensable “declension” at the immediate and local levels according to the circumstances. Believing that resolute intervention, and thus the effort and even the political fight for its realization, is not but for the party of tomorrow because the weakness of both the workers struggles and the militant forces, their influence in the class – what is the point of mobilizing and contributing so much efforts to distribute a few thousands leaflets which won't change nothing to the situation since “nobody reads us” ? – turns the back to the responsibilities of the political vanguard of the proletariat. At their turn, these reluctances, hesitations, doubts – as expressions of the wrong understanding of the role of class consciousness in the classes struggle, in particular expressions of political concessions to anti-party and a-political visions which belong to the opportunist political current Lenin defined as “economism”, we today qualify as “councilism” – come to reinforce and to worsen the initial lack of militant conviction and to weaken it even more. It is also at that level that the “danger of councilism” manifests itself as the ICC had defined it in the years 1980 (see *International Review* 40 : [*The function of revolutionary organizations: The danger of councilism*](#)) and as such it is exerted within the very proletarian camp and its political organizations. In that sense, at the level of the “external” intervention as well as at the level of the “internal” functioning – see the first part about *why a report ?* – we claim a party method, included for a small group as our.

Let's carry on our remarks a little further. It would be erroneous to see in that method a kind of “training” for tomorrow, a kind of “formal” intervention and to “remain trained”. Not only the today intervention of the communist groups is necessary and – relatively – effective for the communist propaganda point of view but it can also be **decisive** for the communist agitation in some particular moments, all specially in some workers struggles and at crucial episodes of these ones. An example amongst others : the “Black March” of the Asturian miners to Madrid July 11th 2012. The demonstration has been organized and controlled by the unions and the Left political forces and these ones aimed at wiping out any concrete willingness for the extension and the generalization of the struggle to all sectors of the class. Nevertheless the “marchers” have been receiving the active sympathy and welcomes of the whole Spanish working class all along the road and in Madrid. Thus the march has been a particular moment which was containing a political stake for the two antagonistic classes : the transformation of this specific Union Day of Action into a moment of generalization of the fight to all the sectors of the class. As slim could we estimate this possibility, it was nevertheless real and the communists had to intervene with resolution putting forwards the alternative of the spreading and the generalization through concrete slogans for that day and even within the demonstration itself. What ever could be then the immediate effect of this intervention, the ability to present an immediate and concrete alternative would have inevitably crystallized the oppositions by highlighting them to the eyes of everybody and as so the communist intervention would have been **decisive** ; or if we prefer, it is so that the

intervention would have been a concrete, material, factor in this instant of political confrontation between the classes. And the communists would have played the role of political vanguard assuming their role of political leadership by putting forwards concrete and clear-cut orientations of fight¹¹.

Our intervention since 2008

We have published 9 issues of our *International Communist Bulletin* since the end of the Internal Fraction of the ICC at the end of 2009. We have to add to these issues the last two of the bulletin of the Internal fraction, the #48 and #49, we have entirely taken on and while the internal fraction was finding itself paralysed. With the exception of the *Bulletin #2*, we have always taken position on the global situation and in particular on the evolution of the classes struggle in front of the deepening and the spreading of the capitalist economical crisis. We have mostly defended the perspective of massive classes confrontations to come and whose process was starting with the massive struggles in Western Europe – fall 2010, Spain, France, Great-Britain, Germany... –, followed by the workers struggles and the revolts in the Arabic countries – North-Africa mostly, Tunisia and Egypt – while the workers mobilization in Greece kept on and even deepened, at the same time this renewal of the struggles found its expressions on the American continent up to China. This situation of struggles “responding” the ones to the others, spreading from Western Europe up to the Mediterranean Sea, going around it, even making a quick stop in Israel, before coming back to Europe via the Greek fire, starting with economical demands, then raising political questions up to directly confront the States – some governments had to be overthrown – to come back later at the economical level, in brief “mixing” struggle against economical misery and against the dictatorship of the States, whether they be democratic or not, is a situation, a process, that Rosa Luxemburg in particular had studied and revealed defining it as the process of the “Mass Strike”¹². It is what we have attempted to highlight in various articles. Then in the followings, we have intervened more precisely on mobilizations and on more immediate stakes of the massive struggles in Greece and Spain both for supporting them and for calling to follow the Greek example – mobilization, refusal of austerity and of the attacks, politicization of the movement through the different attempts to paralyse the State, in particular the attempts of blockage of the Parliament against which the Greek bourgeoisie had no other resort but to utilize the Stalinist militia for preventing its realization ; and we criticized and denounced the ideological counter-offensive of the bourgeoisie through the use of the democratic mystification and its declension to the specific situations of each country, Tunisia, Egypt, etc. up to the more sophisticated with the movement of the “indignados” [indignous] in Spain we have first criticized, then denounced afterwards because it

11 The only intervention of an organization claiming the Communist Left has been the ICC one and it has been pathetic from the communist point of view. See in our bulletin 9 : *The Working Class doesn't need any more "This" ICC*

12 It is not useless to recall here that Lenin, amongst others, has clearly sided with Rosa Luxemburg in the struggle which opposed this one to the Right wing of the Social-Democracy and to the German Union bureaucracy of that time.

direct use by the bourgeois ideology. In this phase, we have reproduced several articles of the ICT whose statement was similar to ours ; at least it sets the one and the others on the same side of the class barricade while the whole councilist milieu, and in first place, the “official” ICC of today, took back into its own account the democratic fetishisation around the “indignados” – the “example” to be followed according to the ICC.

During this period, we have published and distributed two “international” leaflets” on the mobilization in Greece (March 2010 and October 2011). The first has been realized and distributed with the Internationalist Communists of Montreal (ICM), today IC-Klasbatalo. We have also published an additional communiqué on the struggle in Greece because its sharpening and the increasing political stakes that the situation raised in Greece itself as well as for the international proletariat. As well, with some lateness, at least two weeks, we have published a communiqué on the miners' struggle in the Spanish Asturias.

Our intervention didn't limit itself only to the workers struggles even though these ones have been at its core. If we intervened on several occasions in the bulletin of the Internal Fraction of the ICC about the bursting of the economical crisis since 2007 – [*Crisis of the real estate, financial crisis? Or more simply a capitalist crisis of overproduction?*](#), bulletin 41, October 2007 or even in the issue 42 [*Financial Crisis: A new manifestation of capitalism's bankruptcy*](#) –, we did not come back a lot on the subject since it has become obvious for everybody that the open crisis is not but at its very beginnings. Even the bourgeois class, economists and media, even politicians, acknowledge it. There is no more immediate and decisive political stake between the classes on the reality of the capitalist economical dead-end. On the other hand, the question of imperialist war and of the historical alternative “war or revolution” remain a fundamental stake that the communists must denounce relentlessly. For our part, we have intervened on the conflict between Russia and Georgia, on the war in Libya, and on the increasing definition of the great imperialist poles, polarization yet accelerated by the generalized fall in the economical crisis which worsens even more the economical and imperialist competition.

Globally, we think that in regards with our militant reality, our forces, above all since the split of the other comrades of the Internal Fraction of the ICC, we have succeeded to face our task of political intervention and we have made the good choices in terms of political priority. Nevertheless, we have suffered increasing organisational and militant difficulties for taking on this work.

6 – Internal Difficulties and Limits of the Fraction

Today, at the very moment of this balance-sheet, our fraction has formally no more than two comrades of which one is particularly and badly affected at the physical level. The concrete work, material work if so we can say, of our group doesn't rely but on one comrade.

This situation is not simply due to personal “objective” realities. Of course, the dispersal of the three comrades of the fraction, one in Mexico, the others geographically separated

in France, of course too the respective personal difficulties of which some are real and important – the living conditions of the comrade in Mexico, the health of one of the two comrades in France –, are material elements which made more and more difficult the political commitment of the whole. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the events, pressure of the anti-communist campaigns, lack of immediate results – the contacts in general, the process with the IC-K, the slowness of the evolution of our relationships with the ICT, the relative isolation too – have contributed to shake our understanding of our orientations and to weaken **above all our political and militant convictions**. It is particularly clear as regards with our comrade in Mexico. The last two years, the comrade's commitment has reduced up to the point the rest of the fraction could not any more count on him for its regular activities which thus begun to be strongly reduced : the realization of the bulletin, the internal discussions, the intervention in particular towards the contacts relatively numerous in Mexico... Caught in personal and daily difficulties, our comrade has progressively disengaged himself and did not participate but formally and intermittently to the activities of the fraction. This disease, the weakness of comprehension and conviction, is for the essential as we recall it, the result of the ideological offensive of the bourgeoisie.

7 – The Proletarian Camp, the ICT, the Regroupment and the Struggle against Opportunism

One of the key factors of the outcome of the massive confrontations between the classes whose process already engaged is speeding up, is the ability of the proletariat's political vanguard to fulfill its role of political leadership. And so to take on the political battles of any order which impose to it : the fight for the regroupment of the communist forces and for the Party, the struggle against opportunism in its own ranks, the fight for the intervention in the workers struggles, the fight against apolitism, the fight against the forces of the bourgeoisie in the workers' ranks (unions and Left parties), the defence of marxism and of the principles of the workers movement, in particular and above all the one of the revolutionary and communist perspective, etc...

Since the bursting of the present open crisis which marks for good the capitalism's bankruptcy, and in order to look for reducing heavily the only fatal danger that the struggling proletariat do represent for it, the world bourgeoisie has above all doubled up its ideological anti-communist campaigns. Especially it is the automatic and constant offensive the international bourgeoisie leads against the working class since the end of the USSR and the fall of Stalinism (which it expands great effort to present as communism). This offensive presents itself at different levels : denigrating and disguising marxism (the theory of Communist Revolution), the historical experience of the working class (the Russian Revolution of 1917 above all), its political and organisational lessons (all specially the Bolshevik Party and Lenin).

These ceaseless campaigns led since 1989 carry on still today having a negative impact on the development of the workers struggles and on the proletariat's ability to defend itself as a class with a minimum of efficacy at the economical level as

well as political (see [*The Historical Perspective of "Communism" is the Key of the Proletariat's Present Struggles*](#) in our *International Communist Bulletin* n°9, August 2012). But they also have a negative impact as well strong on the communist groups and their members. All the history of the workers movement, at first its political organizations, is marked by the theoretical and political fights between the revolutionary Left and political opportunism which expresses the pressure and the introduction of bourgeois ideology within its own ranks. It is a permanent feature. Nevertheless, it is not an abstract fight on general principles but it always passes through particular battles, through immediate and concrete political stakes.

We could have thought that the opportunist drift of the ICC during the years 2000 was not but a specific phenomenon whose cause and dynamic were only due to its own weaknesses and that they did not express nothing else. Today, it appears increasingly clear that the drift of this organization which used to be the main and the most important one of the Communist Left – at least in strength and international influence – in the years 1980-1990, was only the most striking result of the enormous pressure that the anti-communist campaigns has **also** provoked on the communist forces. The attacks against marxism, against the historical lessons of the workers movement, all specially against the inestimable experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia in 1917, and against Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, but also against the rest of the Communist Left of that time and in particular against Rosa Luxemburg, have received some echo in the proletarian camp up to the point that today a number of individuals or circles – often stemming from the ICC even though not only – and this very organization itself do relay the ideological and political themes directed against marxism and the perspective of communism. With regards to the ICC of the years 2000, the introduction of idealist and a-classist concepts – we don't come back here on what we have briefly recalled previously – has opened the “theoretical” door to the adoption of openly opportunist and revisionist positions up to the opening and the practical and active collaboration of this organization with anarchism and up to its will to make the latter a full component of the... Communist Left ! And this to the detriment of the intervention towards the other real components of this Left. But the opportunist drift of the Current has largely favoured also the renewal of the milieu of councilist kind around a group as *Internationalist Perspectives*, the circle *Controverses*, indeed the publisher *Smolny*, around whom various “ex” and “disappointed of the ICC” have crowded and are living a “new youth” up to firing on all cylinders against marxism, the experience of the workers movement and all particularly against the Russian Revolution and Lenin's Bolshevik Party¹³ ; but also against the present Communist Left that, in the following of the present ICC calling for the IBRP destruction, they have declared it was bankrupted.

13 See [*About a publication of the Smolny Publishers : the Defence of the Proletarian Character of the October Revolution is still a class frontier !*](#) (Bulletin 7) and only in French [*Encore une fois : "Bas les pattes..." sur la Révolution russe et sur le parti bolchévique de Lénine !*](#) (“One more time, hands off the Russian Revolution and Lenin's Bolshevik Party”, bulletin 9)

In this way, the ICC has become incapable of playing a true role of pole of international regroupment because its opportunist drift, its opening to anarchism and leftism, and because the assertion of the sectarian tendency – it could be already affected by it while we were still in its ranks but it had not become then dominant and permanent – which asserts itself against the rest of the Communist Left and particularly against the Internationalist Communist Tendency (ICT, ex-IBRP).

Of course, we consider that the question of the revolutionaries' regroupment cannot be posed but in the theoretical and political framework of the Communist Left and the supporters of the fundamental, indispensable, essential, crucial role of the Communist Party as political vanguard and leadership of the proletariat. From this, all the "councilist" milieu can't but oppose to the process towards the formation of the Party and becoming objectively the relay for the ideological and political themes of the bourgeoisie. For instance, it has been the case of the ["Appel au milieu pro-révolutionnaire"](#) (Appeal to Pro-Revolutionaries)¹⁴ realized by *Internationalist Perspective*, supported with enthusiasm by several circles and groups, in particular French, Belgium and Italian. We rejected it at the time and we can't come back on it here.

The Internationalist Communist Tendency

*"Because of its direct organic continuity with the Italian Left, because its program, because its political analysis and because its international organisational existence, the IBRP remains so the only organisation which has today the means to assume a real policy of international regrouping. And, actually, it constitutes the only true pole around which the elements and groups which tend to come close to the positions of the Communist Left can refer to and around which they can really "regroup" (Resolution of Activities of the Internal Fraction of the ICC - January 2008 - Bulletin #43, IFICC). Today we have not changed our mind. The ex-IBRP, the ICT, is the only organization which, for its history, for its programmatical positions, its statement on the question of the Party and for its ability to set itself at the political vanguard of every ideological and political battle imposed by the bourgeoisie, is actually the pole of reference and regroupment for the communist forces and individuals who want to work for the setting up of international Communist Party of tomorrow. Two concrete facts have come to confirm our assessment: the publication in English of an article [Marxism or Idealism – Our Differences with the ICC](#) written by the ICT comrades in Germany and the editorial article of *Revolutionary Perspectives* #59 – [The Difficult Path to the Revival of Working Class Struggle](#). This two material facts are the expression that the ICT can, and must, be at the core of the theoretical and political confrontations within the communist camp – until today we have been the only ones to respond to this texts: [Agreement with the ICT: the time of gathering around the "Communist Programme" comes and](#)*

14 [Appeal to Pro-Revolutionaries](#) - this link refers to the IP site and their Appeal while our first link in French in the text refers to our statement on this Appeal in the bulletin #47 of the IFICC. There is no English version of this bulletin and thus no English version of our statement.

[prepares itself](#) (Communist Bulletin #7, FICL) – even though we could not do it as deeply as the comrades' texts required.

However, we have to acknowledge that, from our point of view and as far as we can judge it from "outside", it means without knowing the all internal reality and all the tasks of this organization, the ICT doesn't take on with the necessary resolution and conviction this role of pole or axis of reference and regroupment. It is true, it seems to us, from the international regroupment point of view which is often seen and understood as a simple "adhesion to the ICT" and not as a confrontation and clarification of the political positions and as common work, collaboration, intervention as united as possible, which can lead to – it is the aim at full term – the formal regroupment in a single and same organization. It is also true, it seems to us, in regards to the hesitation that the ICT can show for criticizing and even denouncing the opportunist erring ways of the other components of the Communist Left and the attacks against marxism led by the councilist milieu.

For all that, the forces do exist within the ICT for engaging resolutely in the work of regroupment at the international level as well as the will to fight against the opportunist attacks coming from the proletarian camp itself. We have welcomed the articles of the CWO which denounced the political drift of the ICC; we have supported the ICT statement about the setting up of the *Istituto Damen*; at its time, we had also underlined the importance of the IBRP Conference of May 2008¹⁵, in particular for having decided to engage into the path of a greater international centralization with the setting up of the genuine International Bureau¹⁶.

15 "The ability the IBRP shows for regrouping around itself on clear basis new forces as the comrades of the GIS in Germany, is a manifestation of this dynamic. It comes to express the will of this organization to clear perspectives of openness and regroupment and to realize the orientations it gave itself at its last May 2008 Conference. Here is a feature, a political approach we want to support and to which we want to participate as much as we can" (Presentation of the French version of the bulletin 46 of IFICC).

16 "We expect the crisis not only to continue but to deepen (in one way or another). We expect that the world working class will be made to pay for any policy of so-called recovery. We also expect that the current acceptance of austerity etc. by the working class to give way to increasing resistance and anger. We also expect inter-imperialist rivalries to become more acute and for many to become the innocent victims of intensified war. In this circumstance revolutionaries need to be as prepared and organised as possible and this is why the Bureau decided to build on the steps taken after the Parma meeting in May 2008 (see "A New Development for the International Bureau" in *Revolutionary Perspectives* 47 or at [leftcom.org](#)). In the Parma meeting we decided to take one step in the centralisation of our activity (...). In view of this we decided that the Bureau should become the centralised coordinating body of our international organisation. It will be the link not only with the affiliated organisations in each country but with individuals in different countries. It will conduct all affairs relating to the functioning of the organisation as a whole (such as relations with other groups, correspondence, international statements and policies etc). In order to give clearer expression to our existence as a united international organisation we decided to change the name of the organisation to *The Internationalist Communist Tendency (ICT)* (and we will attach the subtitle "for the

But above all, we carry on thinking that the ICT should engage more resolutely than it seems to do in the political orientation put forwards by the editorial of *Revolutionary Perspectives* #59 :

“In short, 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”* (we underline).

We fully fit into this orientation - [Agreement with the ICT: the time of gathering around the “Communist Programme” comes and prepares itself](#) (Communist Bulletin #7, FICL) – and we regret that this one seems not to be really taken on, or understood, up to our knowledge by the whole ICT as a central and international orientation for this organization. On the contrary, we think this orientation should be one of the axis of the ICT international intervention and of any consequent communist group **above all in the historical period of massive classes confrontations which begins.**

8 – Relationship with the IC-Klasabatalo

Guided by this political orientation since the formation of the Internal Fraction of the ICC, we have systematically attempted to respond to the contacts and groups who wrote us, indeed to take contact by ourselves.

Since 2006, we have developed particularly close relationships with the *Internationalists Communists of*

revolutionary party” on the website). ([The International Bureau for the Revolutionary Party becomes the Internationalist Communist Tendency](#), IBRP Meeting, September 26th and 27th, 2009).

Montréal (ICM), today the *Internationalist Communists-Klasbalo* (ICK) – <http://klasbatalo.blogspot.fr/>. In a first time, our intervention – correspondences and trips – towards the comrades aimed at avoiding them to fall into an “anti-IBRP” attitude and statement after their unfortunate and painful experience with its Canadian group the *Internationalist Workers Group* (IWG). We refused to “take sides” and struggled for convincing the comrades that the IBRP remained the only pole of international regroupment and that their future as militants and as a group newly constituted could not be but in the framework of this understanding. We then tried to develop discussions and a process of political clarification with the comrades in particular around the political platform of the IBRP and the ICC. Even though this process remained largely incomplete, according to us, it has developed positively for the essential : despite the discredit they received from the ICT, the comrades carried on – as our fraction – to fit clearly their positions and their activities in the perspective of the regroupment of the Communist Left considering that the ICT was at its core ; they ended up adopting basic positions which, even though close to the ICC ones, are not far from those of the ICT (see [Basic positions of the ICK](#)). It meant that, at the programmatic point of view, we found ourselves on the same positions of principles. Thereafter, the ICK intervened with us through leaflets in various occasions and our two groups have published on their respective web site statements of both groups. In short, a process of collaboration and common intervention begun to develop. Finally, the comrades, convinced – at least apparently – by our vision of the proletarian camp and of the process of regroupment, had begun to be involved in the same orientations as ours ; it has been very clear when they presented their [Proposal for an online discussion forum within the Communist Left](#)¹⁷.

In this dynamic and after another direct meeting, our present fraction, the FICL thought it was time to propose to the comrades to engage more concretely in a process of organizational rapprochement. Far from being in contradiction with our aim of regrouping around the ICT, this organizational perspective fitted into the framework of the communists' reinforcement and unity around the ICT. It is true that the difficult and contentious state of relations between the ICT Canadian group and the ICK did not enable and still does not enable these comrades to consider in the short term any collaboration. Determined to set up this orientation of rapprochement, we proposed to the comrades the realization of an internal bulletin of the two groups which would be the tool of the confrontation and the clarification of the positions. Two issues of this bulletin have been realized. It has been materially taken on by our fraction at the expense of important efforts that the enthusiastic perspective towards a larger international regroupment greatly justified.

Unfortunately, at that very moment the relatively homogeneous dynamic of the ICK on the political orientations we had in common reversed itself. Besides the demobilizing effect that could have provoked the split within the Internal Fraction of the ICC amongst the comrades, the

17 See also our statement in the IFICC bulletins 48 in French and the responses the comrades received from our groups at that time : <http://www.fractioncommuniste.org/index.php?SEC=b48>.

political offensive of the councilist milieu, in particular the new seemingly “brilliant” circle around the publication *Controverses* and its web site declaring “the historical bankruptcy of the Communist Left” and calling for the destruction of its organizations – logical continuation for “former ICC members of the years 2000” of the policy of this organization aiming at destroying the IBRP –, has provoked a real trouble amongst the comrades of the ICK and the calling into question of the political orientations we shared – up to their adoption of a point of view largely influenced by *Controverses* on the reality of the Communist Left. It is important to note that this offensive against the Communist Left is not only developed by the only franco-belgium councilist milieu – to which we see today adding an Italian group *Connessioni* – but also that it has its Italian variant and anti-ICT with the creation of the *Istituto Damen* which takes back the thesis about the Communist Left bankruptcy. This direct attack against the very existence of the main organizations of the Communist Left which defend and fight for the vital necessity of the Party – since they call implicitly or explicitly for their dissolution – by groups or political circles which claim communism, relays a particular component of the ideological offensive of the bourgeoisie against communism.

We have published the ICK text which expressed this “change” (only in French : [Contribution à un état des lieux de la Gauche communiste internationale \(les Communistes internationalistes-Klasbatalo\)](#)) and our critical response (only in French and Spanish) in our *Bulletin communiste international* n°4. As a result, the essential content of the internal bulletin focused on this question until the discussion begun to block itself. Our fraction decided then, advising the ICK, to take note of the break, at least of the suspension, of the process of organizational rapprochement with the stoppage of the publication of the bulletin.

We can't come back here in detail on the ICK's path since then and up to a few months back. The comrades begun then quite quickly to realize the dead-end the *Controverses* and councilists' orientation was driving them to. Afterwards they launched into risky initiatives towards the IWG-ICT in Canada without principles and without any clear orientation which damaged even more their relation with the ICT. Then we had to send them several critical letters which have certainly helped to provoke amongst them contradictory debates (see on their blog : [Vues et positions politiques divergentes dans les CIK](#)).

For our part, we can assess that we had also our part in this momentary failure. We have lacked of determination in our initial approach whose expression has been some lateness in our intervention towards the ICK. The result has been that our more resolute intervention towards a rapprochement overlapped with an ICK's important political withdrawal. The other lesson it matters to draw¹⁸ is our incapability to lead a

serious and sufficiently thorough debate on the positions of principles, on the political platform, on the positions of the Communist Left (and thus on the uncompromising criticism of councilism), and **above all on the indispensable political break the individuals coming to the communist positions must fulfil with the leftist positions.**

Despite our reorientation towards them, we have carried on remaining open to the debate and to the fraternal confrontation with the ICK. These ones – it is their strength and the expression of their vitality – realized quite rapidly that their erratic political “orientations” of the last two years could not but drive them to the dead-end and at last to their disappearance. After their internal discussions, they ended up coming back on their previous statement on the state of the Communist Left – [Retour sur une "contribution à un état des lieux de la Gauche communiste" \(Bulletin communiste #9\)](#). The text is from May 2012. The fundamental obstacle which had stopped the process of organizational rapprochement so seems to be removed.

Perspectives for our fraction

Today more than ever, the proletariat requires its political vanguard and the revolutionaries' responsibility is multiplied. Capital's crisis is unsolvable and it reveals this system's bankruptcy ; the bourgeoisie's attacks against the working class can't but intensify until demanding the final sacrifice in the generalized imperialist war ; the proletariat has no choice but to resist and the historical course leads to massive confrontations between the classes. In these massive fights, the international proletariat can't do without its more resolute fraction, it means its political vanguard. The bourgeoisie's attacks don't limit to the only economical level but also to the political and ideological levels. It is in particular at the level of the class consciousness, and notably the one which corresponds to the proletarian perspective of Communism, that the revolutionaries work in the direction of their regroupment in order to form the leading political Party of the class without which, we can be sure, the proletariat will fail and humanity will be destroyed.

The fundamental orientations of our fraction are confirmed and even reinforces for it as well as for the whole communist vanguard. In this sense, we fully agree with and we fully support the “appeal” put forwards by the ICT in the editorial of *Revolutionary Perspectives* #59 (and which confirms what we have always said : this organization is at the core of the communists' regroupment) : “*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*”. In front of these elements, dramatical speeding up of the situation, communists' lateness, orientation of regroupment of the ICT as unique existing pole of regroupment, we are led to raise the following question : is our fraction still the best tool for taking on this reconfirmed and strengthened orientations ?

a “region”, Quebec, which is particularly marked by Maoism and secessionist nationalism.

18 This lesson recalls us our intervention as ICC towards the comrades who were to finally set up... the Canadian group of the IBRP and the lessons we draw at that time. Perhaps it is not by chance if we found ourselves twice, once in the ICC, then in the present fraction, and in different circumstances, grappling with the same difficulty in so an acute manner in a country and

The question of the “recovery” [“redressement”] of the opportunist ICC has now become, according to us, of secondary order which doesn't mean ruling out the necessary struggle against opportunism. And the communists' regroupment is the central question for the situation especially as they have seriously fallen behind on that level. Facing these requirements, it seems to us that our fraction as it presently exists is no more the best tool. In this sense, we propose to those who are politically the closest to us, notably the ICK, to engage a process of setting up a new organization after, of course, thorough discussions and an agreement of a platform of positions and common political orientations.

For us, it is obvious that the ICT, as unique and genuine pole of reference today, must be an active factor in this process and help in order it starts positively. For us, we will carry on placing the whole of our activities, in particular the fundamental ones aiming at the regroupment of the communist forces, around the ICT and what it does represent from the historical point of view. For we are more than ever convinced of the imperious necessity of the Party, organ of the proletariat's political leadership, as expression of the higher class consciousness, for the success of the massive confrontations between the classes which are brewing. Without a communist vanguard's minority, it means regrouped in an international and centralized Party, the proletariat runs to historical defeat.

More than ever, and despite the anti-communist campaigns at all levels which provoke doubts, abandons, despair, fatalism, resignation, scepticism, even cynicism, we are convinced that the communists' duty

“ ... is, at any moment, without fear and without reproach, to « tell the truth », it means to make the masses see, clearly and avoiding any subterfuge, what are their duties in a given situation, to proclaim the program of action and to put forward the slogans the situation requires. The concern of knowing if and when the revolutionary masses will rise up is not a socialism's matter [today the communist groups]. This concern, socialism can put it to history. If it has complied with its duty in the sense we have just indicated, it will strongly contribute to unleash the revolutionary elements that the situation entails and it will have made the necessary for speeding up the movement of the masses. But, even if assuming the worst, even if socialism first seems to talk to a brick wall, if the masses don't follow it, in the end it will always and inescapably present a morale and political situation of which it will harvest the fruits a hundredfold when the historical hour will come” (Rosa Luxemburg, *The Alternative*, 1917, www.marxism.org, translated by us from the French version).

October 2012

Reply to the Activities Report of the Fraction of the Internationalist Communist Left (Internationalist Communist Tendency)

Comrades

Thank you for sharing this report with us. It reads as we suppose it was intended to read as a balance sheet of an experience which you are trying to draw certain strengths before taking a new direction in your particular attempt to contribute to the struggle for the emancipation of the working class.

We have now been in discussions on and off for a decade both with the FICL and before that the IFICC, and we can see some considerable points of rapprochement on some issues in this latest document. We would particularly like to underline your more decisive views on the party and how it will not simply emerge from the economic struggle spontaneously. To quote your document

“During these discussions it became clear that our two historical currents shared the same position that class consciousness was not the mechanical and immediate product of the economic struggles of the proletariat and that in addition it did not come from “outside the working class”.”

We are also happy to read that:

Another consequence of the past of the ICC, of our past, became clearly apparent in the debates with the IBRP. In continuing to refer to the GCF in particular we can state that the major part of the criticisms that “we” have issued on the formation of the PCInt in 1943-5 haven’t a real basis in fact as the members of the Communist Left of France from which the ICC came were largely in favour of the need for the formation of the party in Italy at that time.

We have appreciated all that you have done both in the IFICC and the FICL to support our tendency as a point of reference for potential communists. We have to acknowledge the truth of what you write here:

“Overtime, this aspect of our work has become more central. We tried to make the best possible relationship with the IBRP which we considered the only pole of regroupment remaining after the political and organizational collapse of the ICC. This has resulted in meetings, debates, political clarification (especially on the question of class consciousness, the party and the constitution of PCInt 1943), a collaboration policy that has resulted in the joint meetings with both organisations, public meetings of the IBRP supported by us in Paris and translations of articles from the same organization in French and Spanish. At the same time, and in addition to this central focus, we have systematically sought to respond to various contacts, individuals and groups or circles emerging in the world - you can see more matches that we published in our newsletter. In particular, we began to develop a work of discussion and political clarification with the Internationalist Communists of Montreal (now CIK) on the basis of the political platforms IBRP and ICT. After a period of membership – or at least close collaboration – with the Canadian group GIO adhering to the IBRP and following their separation from the GIO, the comrades were open to all

of the Communist Left - ICC, the so-called “Bordiguist” PCI and ourselves. Our first task was to ensure that these comrades did not position themselves against the IBRP after what they felt was an unhappy experience.”

Your political consistency in this respect has been unwavering and matched by many acts of personal and political kindness. No one can doubt the integrity and honesty with which you have tried to carry out what you believe in. Indeed we have often felt guilty that we have not been able to reciprocate more and in a better way. In some ways our relationship has been a model for how communists with differences should relate to one another. We may disagree but we have mutual respect enough to recognise that our goal is the same even if our strategies and perspectives are different.

Thus we can agree with your conclusion that

“... we are more than ever convinced of the imperative need for a party, an organ to politically guide the proletariat, the highest expression of its class consciousness for its success in the massive class confrontations to come. Without a vanguard minority i.e. regrouped in an international and centralised party the working class will face a historic defeat.”

But this is also precisely what takes us back to the beginning of our discussions. Despite all our mutual attempts to understand one another we have entirely different world views. We don’t wish to engage in a discussion or a critique of a third party but your emergence from the ICC and your insistence that you are the “real” essence of the ICC has been the single greatest barrier to reaching a resolution of our differences.

This is even apparent in the areas where you have done us the honour to call us the “pole of regroupment” for the communist left forces today. We can agree that we have raised a banner, a point of reference for communists but our perspective of how, and when, this will come about is entirely different. In the first place you see the “pole of regroupment” concept as an absolute. Once it was the ICC, now it is the ICT (since all the Bordigists in their separate “parties” think they are already the finished article they have no concept of anything beyond the rest of the world joining them). But we have always insisted that we are not only **not** the future international party of the proletariat but we are not even its only nucleus.

This is something we don’t think you have taken on board because you are still precisely in the old framework of the ICC. We don’t wish to rake over old coals or do a deep analysis of what has gone wrong with “Project ICC” but we need to say something in order to make one further effort to demonstrate how different we are from the idea which you repeat yet again in your report that we are the only future nucleus of a world proletarian party. To make this clear perhaps we need to say in what way we have been different from the ICC from the beginning. The ICC was formed from

primarily young highly-educated people in the perspective that the end of the post-war boom would quickly lead to a serious crisis for capitalism. To put it in ICC terms the counter-revolution was now over and the working class was in a position to re-assert itself historically. The historic course was towards revolution (or, failing that, war, but that was unthinkable since it meant the end of humanity in their chiliastic vision). The link between crisis and class struggle and between class struggle and class political consciousness was not as spontaneous as the ICC thought. And you now seem to agree if we may repeat the earlier quote:

"During these discussions was clear that our two historical currents shared the same position that class consciousness was not the mechanical product of the immediate economic struggles of the proletariat and that in addition it did not come from "outside the working class."

When the wave of strikes that greeted the end of the post-war boom (1968-76) did not produce a rise in political consciousness the ICC's conclusion was that this was due to bourgeois mystifications and all their analyses were devoted to the machinations (or Machiavellianism) of the bourgeoisie. And the ICC soldiered on with the idea that it was **the** pole of regroupment (the CWO was told that the PCInt was Bordigist and anyway was "sclerotic" so we should not even discuss with them). This quasi-religious attitude and the assumption that everyone would just recognise the new virtue of the ICC helped to destroy the International Conferences although the ICC will never admit it. We won't go into all the splits of the ICC that followed but the first (around the Chenier affair) was really about the ICC's lack of orientation towards the real class struggle and not the one they imagined. The notion of the "years of truth" was then dreamed up to maintain the fiction that "the historic course" was towards great class conflicts. Instead we were in an entirely new situation where the state capitalist managed crisis, which has sustained and is still sustaining the capitalist system despite the obvious horrendous manifestations of all its contradictions, gave way to the dismantling of the post-war settlement, globalisation and the supposed "free" market beloved of the neo-liberals. What you call the ICC's opportunism derives from the same need to deal with the collapse of its perspectives. What does an organisation which claimed to be the pole of regroupment do in the face of such a challenge? Well it could have revised its perspectives and said the "course of history" was going to take a longer time to work out or it could dream up another ideological fix (and it did this in "decomposition"). This was for you a sign of opportunism but in fact was in direct continuity with what had been said before about "the course of history". What we are trying to explain is that the roots of the crisis which led to your expulsion from the ICC were present from the beginning.

This is why we have insisted that our two approaches to the question of how the working class' international political organisation will emerge are different. For the old ICC, the question was to establish a centralised self-proclaimed pole of regroupment to which everyone should subscribe **today** as the nucleus of a future centralised international party. The ICC now considers it was a mistake to refer to itself as "the pole of regroupment" but you still cling to the notion (except now

it is the ICT which fulfils this role) or as you put it

*"... we remain convinced that any communist organisation, however small it may be, must consider itself and act as an international **centralised** group, with the same political platform in particular, regardless of its configuration and its geographical presence."*

As you are well aware have never shared this way of looking at the problem, despite agreeing on the ultimate outcome. From the first we have always assumed that the class struggle would take longer to arrive at a level of consciousness on a global scale adequate for the formation of a future international. Along the way the world working class would add yet more experiences to its already rich history, experiences which we might guess at but could not predict with any certainty. This is why we have always said we are not the only nucleus of a future revolutionary international although we hope to play a significant role in its establishment. Similarly it is better for real organisations to emerge within the working class in each territory where it is present than for us to establish warehouses of three or four comrades who just happen to agree with our platform. In fact we would say that premature centralisation can be a **barrier** to the emergence of new forces within the working class in any single area. What holds the ICT together is not an artificial system of discipline but a recognition that the working class of every territorial grouping is faced with slightly different problems (mainly for historical reasons) and that each local affiliate has to work this out on its own. We don't need to decree a "culture of debate" because that is what has held us together for 20 years or more. It doesn't make for very clean or neat solutions to the problems of political work but that is probably because it is closer to the real situation of dispersal and confusion within the working class. In fact it is possible that when we talk of a centralised proletarian international of the future we mean something which is centralised only around a common political programme but which leaves to the local activists how that programme should be carried out on the ground (a scenario not too distant from the reality of Bolshevism when it was a real revolutionary tendency inside the working class).

We are not entirely clear what you mean when you say you aim "to engage in a process of formation of a new organisation with those nearest" to you (most notably the CIK) but we hope this step will improve the dialogue between us all. In this respect we would not be too dismissive either of the groupings that you label as councilist (some, yes, are such but not all). Most of these comrades have come out of the ICC and from the documentation which you yourselves have amply provided on your website it is quite clear why anyone so burned by that experience [like the comrades from *Controverses*] would wish to renounce what they believe to be the "normal" trajectory of already over-centralised organisations. They now have an entirely different project but they are open and honest (like yourselves) and we can thus have a real dialogue even if all we end up doing is recognising our differences and our different aims but we are ultimately on the same side and struggling for the same goal. Such debate is not a waste of time but, as you already well know, is a part of the inevitable process of clarification of the

international proletarian minorities faced with the unpredictable onward march of history.

In the meantime it would be a great step forward if you could participate in the formation of an internationalist organisation based amongst French communists which could act as a real nucleus oriented, not only to debate amongst the

internationalists around the world, but also to the working class you are directly in contact with.

Internationalist greetings

J. On behalf of the International Bureau of the ICT

Our Response to the ICT

The FICL to the ICT,

Dear comrades,

At first, we want to thank you for your statement on our Activities Report. We know the effort this political act has required in the midst of the different tasks that you have to deal with. The political meaning of your fraternal and militant behavior towards us goes over the simple relationship between the ICT and our fraction ; it even goes over the « historical » relationship that should have developed between our two currents – the PCInt-IBRP and the GCF-ICC – since the years 1970 up to our days. As you write, « *in some ways our relationship has been a model for how communists with differences should relate to one another* ».

A « Model of Relationship » between Communists

This « model of relationship » does not represent an abstract or moral principle. It has a political and concrete meaning from the communist and proletarian point of view. Far from remaining in the « polite » respect of our relations and our differences, this « model » has no meaning but in the concrete expressions of solidarity and communist fraternity in front of the class enemy and its attacks of any kind **linked with**, in « inter-action » with, the discussions and the confrontation of our political differences in order to clarify them as much as possible, indeed to overcome them when it is possible.

In this sense, we note and we particularly appreciate the reassertion of your confidence in « *the integrity and honesty with which [we] have tried to carry out what [we] believe in* ». Since our disgraceful expulsion from the ICC and the ignominious condemnations that this organization had made against us, you have always assumed with responsibility and seriousness a fraternal **political**, and at the same time **critical**, attitude which had encouraged and supported us in those extremely difficult moments at the political point of view as well as personal. Nevertheless, this communist confidence that you have verified, would have got a small and limited interest for our class if it had not been accompanied, if it had not enabled, if it had not been an active factor of the discussions and the clarification of different political positions and principles ; at first the one of class consciousness and of the party. Useless to come back here on the passages of our report and of your document on these questions which, according to us, do mark the line of division within the proletarian camp of today and of tomorrow

between those – the currents – which will be led to be the active, decisive, factors of the setting up of the Party and those who will turn away this fundamental task, indeed will oppose it openly or in a « diverted » manner, it means in a « centrist » one as teaches us the history of our class and of the communist movement.

On this point, and by the way, we would have a difference of evaluation of secondary order about the political approach towards comrades who **tend** more or less openly to place themselves in the rejection or the under-estimation not only of the historical role of the Party, but also and above all of the present organizations of the Communist Left up to declare their bankruptcy. Actually it is the case of the review *Controverses*. Our attitude and our intervention towards the comrades of this milieu are only political and the fact they have participated – the members of *Controverses* – to the most ignominious accusations and condemnations against us when they still were in the ICC, doesn't intervene in our political evaluation, we would like it be clear. The very fact that they have fraternally saluted us after their dismissal of the ICC when we met, is enough for us¹⁹. On the other hand, we estimate that their present political statement based on the declaration of bankruptcy of the groups of the Communist Left do represent a true danger that we intend to particularly fight back since we think this class fight is at the core of the historical front line between the classes.

But let's go back to our main subject. We are convinced that the « model of relationship » we were able to establish between us – model which is still suffering weaknesses according to us and whose responsibility we certainly share – is the path for establishing the most healthy and the most solid basis for the regroupment of the communists and the setting up of the world Party of the proletariat.

Two Differences Which are not Such

Here, we get to a point of misunderstanding between us : the

19 Their fraternal behavior reveals the reality and the deepness of their conviction during the crisis of the ICC in 2001-2002 in regards with the condemnations brought against us and whose worst one was that we were supposed to be cops. And it does say a lot about the conditions in which the members of the ICC were feeling themselves constrained to vote the worst resolutions and motions against us in the crazy atmosphere of panic created on purpose by the Liquidationist Faction of that time in the name of the « defense of the organization and of its unity ».

question of the pole, or the poles, of regroupment. We have never said that it could only exist one single pole of regroupment, nor that « *once it was the ICC, now it is the ICT* ». Nor the Fraction, nor « our » ICC : « *However, if the ICC had become the main pole of regroupment, that doesn't mean it was alone in the world. Despite the confusions built into its origins, the IBRP, in comparison to the political delinquency of the other groups who formed the proletarian milieu, formed the other pole of reference and of relative political clarity within the communist movement and its debates* » (*International Review* #54, The Evolution of the Proletarian Political Milieu since 1968, 1988, underlined by us²⁰).

And today, 20 years after this assertion of the « old » ICC, 12 years after its organizational crisis and the beginning of a ruling opportunist course in this organization, what does remain of the poles of that time ? Here is what our Fraction, whether as Internal Fraction of the ICC or FICL, has never ceased to defend :

« *Actually, since its setting up, and even before the exclusion of our Fraction from the ICC in March 2002, we addressed to the IBRP because, from that moment on, we considered it as the unique pole remaining within the proletarian camp, around which a regrouping of communist forces can organize itself. The political consequences to come of our exclusion upon the ICC itself couldn't but lead, amongst other things, to the rejection of its policy of regrouping - led, more or less correctly, until then - as well as to the quick triumph of sectarianism. Since then, the sectarian drift - which has been reinforced by political statements of this organization that were every time more opportunist - has not denied our "prediction" - and our warnings - of that time. Furthermore, the situation of extreme dispersion of the so-called "bordiguist" current since the break-up of the ICP in 1982 doesn't enable it to assume this role that it succeeded to play beforehand.*

Because of its direct organic continuity with the Italian Left,

20 Or still : « *We have already seen that this pessimistic vision does not take into account the fact that the majority of the revolutionary milieu in the years 68-75 stayed rigorously outside any dynamic towards contact and discussion, whereas today, the two main poles of regroupment which exist at an international level - the ICC and the IBRP - both defend, even though in different terms, the necessity for a debate. It's no accident that the new groups that are now appearing, in particular on the peripheries of capitalism, tend immediately to refer themselves to the debates between these two poles. Today, however displeasing it may be to those who believe that debate between revolutionaries is a type of supermarket which, in order to be rich and satisfying, has to offer a choice between thousands of diverse products, this selection process is not an 'impoverishment' but a step forward. This polarisation allows the new elements to situate themselves clearly with regard to the FUNDAMENTAL political divergences that exist between the main currents of the revolutionary movement, instead of getting lost in the thousand secondary refinements of this or that sect* ». (*International Review* #55, Decantation of the PPM..., 1988). Today still, we remain convinced of the validity of this assertion and « method ».

because its program, because its political analysis and because its international organizational existence, the IBRP remains so the only organization which has today the means to assume a real policy of international regrouping. And, actually, it constitutes the only true pole around which the elements and groups which tend to come close to the positions of the Communist Left can refer to and around which they can really "regroup". » ([Resolution of Activities of the Internal Fraction of the ICC](#), Bulletin #43 of the IFICC, January 2008).

Up to today, we maintain our analysis on this point. Nothing, not any material element, indicates that this situation has changed – even though we don't rule out in the absolute that this one can change, or be disrupted in a possible future. Not any « *honor* » we did you while considering that the ICT is the only pole of regroupment which remains today, but just a material record, an objective one, and an enormous responsibility to your organization.

On the same question, or almost the same, we have never defended that being a pole of regroupment means automatically and in any situation, in particular the one which prevails now since 1968 – to limit ourselves to this period – to be « *the future international party of the proletariat* », nor « *its only nucleus* ». Historically, it can happen – or can't happen. But it is not the situation of today for the ICT, nor was it the situation for the ICC when we considered it as one of the poles. It is precisely the present ICC, become openly opportunist, which revised in 2005 its positions of 1988 and its vision of the process of regroupment driving to the formation of the Party when it declared « *that the ICC already constitutes the skeleton of the future party* » ([Resolution on the international situation](#) of the 16th Congress of the ICC, *International Review* #122).

We have re-read our report and we have not noticed any part which « *repeat yet again (...)* that [the ICT is] *the only future nucleus of a world proletarian party* ». Thus, there is not any real political difference on these two points between us but a problem of comprehension.

A True Difference

However, and the last two questions drive us to it, there is well and truly a real disagreement on « *how the working class' international political organization will emerge* ». For the ICT, « *it is better for real organizations to emerge within the working class in each territory where it is present than to establish warehouses of three or four comrades who just happen to agree with our platform* ». For us, « *any communist organization, as small it can be, must consider itself and act as a centralized international group, with the same political platform in particular, what ever is its shape and its geographical presence* ». We don't think our conception corresponds systematically to the setting up of a « *centralized self-proclaimed pole* » – ourselves, we are not and can't be an international pole of regroupment in the present circumstances – formed with « *warehouses of three or four comrades* ». But here is not the question we must debate and clarify.

It is true that the national limits the bourgeoisie is unable to

overcome, determine also the proletariat's struggle and that this one confronts a national State with its historical particularities. In this sense, each proletariat is facing particular conditions and circumstances. But, its weapons and its methods of struggle are, and today more than ever, the same in all countries. Only the « moments » – in the extensive meaning of this term –, the circumstances if one prefers, can be, and are, distinct. It goes the same for its political vanguard which is also obliged to organize itself in territorial « section », groups or parties... but always, and today more than ever, on an international programmatic and political basis. According to us, and it seems to us that the experience of the workers movement and of its communist vanguards comes largely to confirm it, it is only armed with an international vision and practice in all the proletariat's struggles that the communists can intervene and assume **in the most efficient way** their task of political leadership in all the struggles of the proletariat, immediate and local struggles of today and tomorrow, as limited they can be, massive and generalized struggles of tomorrow, revolutionary and insurrectionary struggles of the day after tomorrow, exercise of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country or a group of countries, etc...

This link between international and national dimensions of the fight for revolution and Communism is a dynamic link – dialectical – in which the first one is the determining element. In particular, it determines the activity of the communists and of their organization. It is not by chance if one of the essential contributions of the « Italian Left » has precisely been its fight for precisising, « hardening » and imposing the 21 conditions of admission to the Communist International against the national exceptions and particularisms that all the centrists and opportunists who were running after the prestige of the Red October - « Gods » knows they were numerous ! –, were attempting to invoke and introduce in order to keep their « autonomy » within the International and to refuse the programmatic, political and organizational centralization – or if one prefers to reject the communist discipline. As well, it is the Left which fought in order that the national question in general, and above all the ones which directly touched the Bolshevik party, the « Russian » party, be posed and discussed by all the International – they were the only ones who had this audacity of « internationalist intrusion ».

Of course, nor the ICT, nor any group today, is the party, nor even its nucleus. Nevertheless, and as the formation of the **internationally centralized** Party of tomorrow will **inescapably** be subjected to a fight, in particular against all the tendencies towards national and local autonomy, it means against all those who will struggle and will oppose, often under a diverted manner and in the name of particularism and other « exceptions »²¹, the communists must already consider themselves as militant with « international dimension » what ever is their geographical origin or their present passport and

21 Is not it already the case of the « councilist » milieu we have mentioned and whose a great part is formed by « disillusioned » comrades coming from the ICC, but not only – the Istituto Damen for instance – and whose one motivation to leave the communist organizations they were member of, is rightly the demand for their « autonomy » and their « freedom of thought » whether they are individual or circle ?

they must organize consequently in order to prepare and to arm themselves for this fight. As we must aim at the constitution of the Party well before the revolutionary process – with the danger of an historical defeat in the contrary situation –, as well we must already prepare to the theoretical, political and organizational battle which is beyond us in order to participate to the success of its later setting up.

By the way, a small comment : we think that the ICT argument according to which a « *premature centralisation can be a barrier to the emergence of new forces within the working class in any single area* », can engage the necessary process of regroupment of the communist forces in some confusion. Nevertheless, we also think it is necessary to reflect on this remark. At least since the experiences of the PCint-Communist Program and the ICC, 2 experiences of internationally centralized organization, two experiences in great difficulties today, can appear to prove this vision right.

Thus, and even if we agree with the purpose of the invitation you address to us as a conclusion and according to which « *it would be a great step forward if you could participate in the formation of an internationalist organisation based amongst French communists which could act as a real nucleus oriented, not only to debate amongst the internationalists around the world, but also to the working class [we] are directly in contact with* », we know that, at the present stage of our respective understandings and visions, we don't exactly understand the same thing.

We don't develop anymore here, these few lines – already too long – only aiming at posing the terms of a confrontation of the positions on this question and their clarification, even at overcoming the disagreement. The international centralization of the Communist Party is a question of principle. Nevertheless, we don't think the difference, as such it is expressed today – the ICT comrades also struggle for a centralized party –, are up to prevent a common work, even a rapprochement – included organizational – stronger and closer.

About the Roots of Opportunism

We won't respond here on the critical evaluation, criticism you have already brought against the vision and the analysis of the ICC, but on the link which is made between the analysis of the development of the workers struggles in the years 1970 and 1980, and behind this the idealist approach you have always seen, and the bankruptcy of the present ICC. Just a word on the method.

First, if the analysis of the « years of thrust » – the years 1980 – of the ICC can be criticized, it is difficult to present it as a particular moment of the final opportunist drift. For is not it also on the basis of this analysis that the ICC has freed itself – in its official statements, in congresses, resolutions, articles, and militant practice too – of its councilist and anarchist origins ? That it has regained – of course with much difficulties – all Lenin's struggle against Economism and for the Party, as organ of political leadership ? Our Fraction didn't cease to defend these theoretical, political, organizational and militant gains of that time against their open liquidation since 2001.

Then, it seems to us that defining the reason for an opportunist degeneration of an organization or a political current through its incorrect analysis of the course of the classes struggle is a mistake, or at least an insufficient explanation. Is not this the criticism the ICC – we took our part in this and made that criticism – has made **wrongly** against the formation of the PCInt in 1943 ? Formation which would have been, according to the ICC, in a counter-revolutionary course, so « against the current ». But the PCInt has not fallen into an opportunist degeneration and have lived on, so well, until today up to be the main organization of vanguard of the world proletariat of our days. The ICC argument against the setting up of the PCInt so falls. And we don't think the same « argumentation » towards its own drift is anymore sufficient. Certainly, a mistaken analysis weakens an organization and can favor weaknesses already existing leading to an opportunist drift. But it is above all the programmatic and theoretical armament which is determining for the resistance of a communist organization in front of the weight and the attacks of bourgeois ideology and no its analysis on the situation. Thanks to the faithfulness to the

principles and to the programme, it is possible to resist to the mistakes and the weaknesses which are the daily fate of the communist organizations. On the other hand, the accuracy of the analysis of one situation, even an historical course, doesn't guarantee the ability to resist to the sirens of opportunism and renouncement.

Here, dear comrades, the few reflections and precisions we wanted to make regarding your statement on our Report of Activities. As we have already said, we are ready to debate all this, but above all we remain disposed and determined to participate to the ICT work and to struggle siding with this one – at the place that you and we will define – in the difficult path to the revival of the workers struggles and above all in the one even more difficult and actually fundamental, primary, towards the regroupment of the communist forces and the formation of the world Party.

Fraternally,

January 10th 2013,

The FICL

Statement of the Internationalist Communists – Klasbatalo on the Report of the FICL

Dear comrades,

First, we apologize for the delay in response to your report. Indeed, as we had already told you in recent weeks, as a result we've had a lot of difficulties holding meetings with all of us present, I (Alex) personally was delayed in responding to you. Don't see this as a lack of enthusiasm on our part. On the contrary, we were aware, with great interest, of your document of October 2012, your balance sheet of the IFFIC and the IFCL over the last ten years. For our part this response, will often see us returning to some points: some observations and statements. It is that, like you, we see the urgency of the global political situation, both in relation to the attacks of the bourgeoisie and the response of the proletariat to them, and the opportunity we face in organizing ourselves differently.

Now, let's begin by saying that we fully agree with the preamble on the nature and the need for organizational activities report. As with you, we say that an organization of Marxist allegiance has a programmatic history to as appoint of reference if it's to maintain a dialectical approach. Indeed, this means a review and a critical return on the political activities of the Organization in order to clear its proletarian programmatic positions from elements that are alien to it; because, of course, no revolutionary organization is immune from any penetration of bourgeois ideology into its core. As well in 2011, to a greater or lesser degree, experienced, having produced the document 'Contribution à un état des lieux de la GCI', experienced a fight that was, in many points, beneficial!

Actually, at one point, we even entertained the idea of split. In

fact, we have avoided a worse situation because a faction would have probably resulted in the breakup of our group given our lack of political experience on this issue. However, we can say with pride that we have been able to avert this by remaining united despite somewhat-bitter differences that arose, keeping the focus firmly on the debate, criticism...In the end undertaking an internal repositioning of the IC-K. It's an experience that is important to us and that we fully accept despite this detour to the "into the swamp" of the Communist left (Controversies, IPPI, IOD). Our 'critical return', although with relatively less discussion, allowed us to set the record straight at the time grasping more clearly what presently represents the real proletarian camp as well as our role in it.

We therefore made your formulation ours:

« Any communist organization is responsible of its history and must take it in front of the proletariat ».

And now :

« Even for a small group as ours, the necessity for making balance-sheets and drawing orientations of activities from these balance-sheets is imperative ; as disproportionate this work and this effort can seem to be at first sight in regards with our forces. »

This is what we have worked on hard in the year 2011, while managing to maintain an activity of intervention within some struggles, and this despite the divergences and contradictions of political order within the group caused by the document 'Contribution '. We will come back quite often on this but we believe, to some extent, that the work may be an example for other groups that comprise both the swamp of the Communist left, and the historical Communist left; in this sense where, currently, among the groups of the GC, disagreements seem more to point in direction of ruptures and divisions rather

than the emergence of internal discussions and attempts at clarification for the proletariat as a whole. It is in this serious light that we consider, , the future of the IC-K and that we continue to respond diligently to the struggles and movements that appear here and there. For example, last Sunday, Comrade RJ gave a lecture on the current economic crisis before twenty-or-so people and received a good welcome, despite the recent (in the same week) death of his mother. In short, we firmly deal with our meagre forces.

On the inheritance of IFFIC, of the IFCL, and the defence of the ICC.

We continue to consider the ICC programmatic contribution as possibly the most important work ever produced by an organization from the Communist Left, as well as the one from the Italian fraction around *Bilan*. We note despite this contribution (which should be a real tank against the opportunistic derivative) growing confusion about the interventions of the ICC within the proletariat. That is how an organization regardless of its strengths is never immune against an opportunistic direction, treason and counter-revolution. For we, who feel closer to the platform of the ICC, we note with regret the various injuries that has experimented the organization over the past years starting with the departure of the EFICC, subsequently the JJ's case, and then by the ICC's activities against the IFFIC.

In this regard, we believe that the political work conducted by the IFICC has born fruit historically, without unfortunately preventing the ICC from continuing its path towards resonant opportunism that overwhelms the organizations belonging to the Communist Left²². For the history of the revolutionary movement, for the rehabilitation of the ICC also, it would have been legitimate for IFICCs activities to continue unabated in order to maintain the real parallel continuity of the ICC. Unfortunately, the break up of the fraction in 2010 significantly weakened its political action. Despite the analysis that you have produced and that we share on the drift of the ICC of the past ten years, nothing is yet lost. The work of the fraction was conducted as far it could taken under the circumstances, with hard work and conviction.

The constitution of the IFCL – with its mandate to pursue both the work of the IFICC opening up again to the benefit of the other groups of the Proletarian Political Milieu – is a huge task for forces at its disposal, especially with the absence of Ldo.

You mention in the Bulletin no. 13 and in your report:
“Since we've decided to open our internal bulletins to the whole proletarian political milieu, organisations and their contacts and sympathizers, we consider that our area of

internal discussion is not any more limited to the single ICC but to the whole political milieu which will have to become the active and determining factor for the building-up of the future world communist party. We think that the questions which are raised by the ICC crisis, its opportunist drift, concern and "belong" to the whole components of this milieu. Moreover, if we think we are still in the phase of "internal fraction", of "redressment", of the ICC with its method and its very precise political requirements, we have also to make up for the responsibilities that the ICC is giving up, such as the struggle for the unity and the defence of the Left Communist.”

As we have pointed out in the footnotes, we share the same understanding of the proletarian political environment and we see the Communist Left as a whole belonging to this historical critique, even before it is a current divided in this or that organization. On the other hand, in the current context (exacerbation of the crisis, rise of the proletarian struggles, threat of a polarization of the enemy forces lading to war, weakness of a genuine revolutionary intervention within our class to deal with all of this), we believe that it is time for you to close the chapter on the fraction and undertake new activity to strengthen our ranks; to concentrate the activities of the IFCL to the regrouping of revolutionary militants around an organization capable of leading the fight. We agree with you that:

“Today, at the very moment of this balance-sheet, our fraction has formally no more than two comrades of which one is particularly and badly affected at the physical level. The concrete work, material work if so we can say, of our group doesn't rely but on one comrade.

*This situation is not simply due to personal “objective” realities. Of course, the dispersal of the three comrades of the fraction, one in Mexico, the others geographically separated in France, of course too the respective personal difficulties of which some are real and important – the living conditions of the comrade in Mexico, the health of one of the two comrades in France –, are material elements which made more and more difficult the political commitment of the whole. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the events, pressure of the anti-communist campaigns, lack of immediate results – the contacts in general, the process with the IC-K, the slowness of the evolution of our relationships with the ICT, the relative isolation too – have contributed to shake our understanding of our orientations and to weaken **above all our political and militant convictions**. It is particularly clear as regards with our comrade in Mexico. The last two years, the comrade's commitment has reduced up to the point the rest of the fraction could not any more count on him for its regular activities which thus begun to be strongly reduced : the realization of the bulletin, the internal discussions, the intervention in particular towards the contacts relatively numerous in Mexico... Caught in personal and daily difficulties, our comrade has progressively disengaged himself and did not participate but formally and intermittently to the activities of the fraction. This disease, the weakness of comprehension and conviction, is for the essential as we recall it, the result of the ideological offensive of the bourgeoisie.”*

22 One parenthesis however, we consider that there is always a real revolutionary movement known as the Communist Left, which claims programmatic contributions from successive fractions of the Third International Left and offshoots with roots in both the Italian Left and the Germano-Dutch left, unlike the Internationalist Communist Tendency which currently seems to use the name "communist internationalist."

The ICM and the IC-K have experienced their moment of discouragement, we are well placed to understand the situation of Comrade Ldo. Alex nearly resigned in the spring of 2010 faced with feelings of political isolation. Luie himself also had to take a short break in the summer 2011, and Réal has also offered his resignation during our discussions around the Contribution. It goes without saying all the pressure on organizations of the proletariat since the beginning of the 1990s has Indeed shown, that isolation does not help us at all. Now, if we return to our question, the abandonment of the IFCL's fraction work does not mean the abandonment of possible interventions - addressing - of the possible direction of ICC's militants. Indeed, for the IC-K, since our critical return on the Contribution, the Communist Left tendency (the partyist one), even before a conglomerate of organizations with more or less pronounced differences is first and above all a programmatic body to defend against all detours, attacks, and foreign intervention, that we need to defend the ICC or the ICP! Because the Communist Left was not bankrupt and is sharper than those who believe they can pronounce its end. Take the ICC as an example, threatening at any moment to abandon its class ground: nothing prevents a proletariat to resume the positions of the organization...And to extract its proletarian positions from its opportunist trajectory, just as organizations that once formed the left fractions were able to reconstitute their approach from the first Congress of the third international.

In this regard, let's us recall that the IC-K has had to make a long journey for more than a year to understand the limitations of the proletarian camp, to see more clearly the issues that arose out of a conciliatory position towards a group like Controversies. As well it's thanks to you that we can now say that we've escaped from the organizational swamp within the Communist Left.

Towards a first grouping

Comrades, you offered a close connection, and we offer you a grouping together. In fact, from one part and to an other (IFCL and the IC-K), the need to come together in as a single organization seems to us both a historical duty as well as a chance to appeal to the proletarian camp. Moreover, we are already politically "close", let's gear up, without hiding possible differences. The work of political clarification between us has been going on informally since 2006. Because of your political responsibilities elsewhere (fraction work), it was not relevant for you to open your ranks to other militants, we have never really talked about regrouping, sporadically, but with no real action. If you agree, we believe that it is time to formalize this group's relation into something else a tighter relationship, on top of joint propaganda signatures, and the mutual opening up of our publications.

Recent years have plunged the historic organizations of the Communist Left through several crises: dismemberment of the ICP; major crises (with an "s") of the ICC; the crisis of IBRP/ICT to organise themselves effectively with the appearance of precarious groups and their disappearance of without much comment, with no interventions or poor ones (B & P, IWG), the split of the IOD. In short, the proletarian

camp suffered more attacks it gives. Not to mention the appearance of groups claiming to be members of the CL making an appeal, then quickly being reduced to silence (the Australians, for example). Of course, these were not only deceptions. The ICT and the ICC arrived to integrate new cells; but it does not appear that the call has truly paid off. The ICC continues on its downward slope while the ICT seems to lack the capacity for true international intervention. So, it seems to us that addressing the direction of the proletarian camp is our responsibility. If the ICC is slowly moving towards the enemy camp confusing in its various interventions; and if the ICT is unable to find the drive to become a pole of regroupment although occasionally it seems so (ex: RP no.59), sometimes not (ex: its policy towards us) - then why don't we start to organize ourselves together to work towards this grouping?

In regards to our two groups, we are already in agreement on several points even so we have to significantly deepen these. You come back, in fact, in your activity report, to discussions between the IBRP and IFICC, discussions on consciousness that we ourselves planned to begin with inside the IC-K. Unfortunately, we only discussed it in surface. This is a discussion that we could also conduct with you, although we can glimpse an agreement in advance, due to the fact that: neither of us are councilist or bordiguist. However, this has never been stated and furthermore is necessary to debate. On the other hand, concerning the legacy of the partyist Italian left, we can say with more confidence that it acts as the main reference for the IC-K with respect to its programmatic positions, though we consider the council communist tendency, which evolved into councilism, as belonging to the history of the Communist Left as well despite his abandonment of the Marxists principle of the organization of the international working class avant-garde into a class party.

With regard to the organizational conception of federalist type of the ICT, we fully share the criticism because we ourselves suffer its' backwash with the IWG. We consider the centralization of the ICC as being more effective, less problematic, even if there is always danger of an executive manoeuvre seizing the reins of the organization as is the case currently in the ICC. Therefore, if some militants were able to take on a direction of this sort, it means at some point that the self-study of organisational frameworks has work failed to meet the operational needs of the organization. In effect, provided that it is possible to do so, executives of a Marxist organization must develop fairly evenly to both taking turn at tasks; staying vigilant, reporting on our interventions (so that positions remain firmly on class terrain); and keeping an eye on the operations of the Executive Committees. The recent programmatic mistakes of the ICC can suggest that a takeover just seasoned the original positions of the organization is currently in work and little framed by militants with more experience. However, we miss the operation of internal self-study of the ICC and cannot say more on this. Let's continue :

Like you, we claim fundamental analyses of the ICC - prior to its liquidation - and Marxism as the alternative "imperialist

war or proletarian revolution" and we defend the notion of historic course as the ICC has defined and refined in the years 1970-1980. Thus, we share with you this observation that the historic course is towards class confrontation, understanding the shortfall in the organisation of the proletariat running against the time in ongoing class struggle and especially the in terms of the upcoming confrontation (threat of global war).

Also, it seems more relevant to take into account this statement of yours and take the opportunity to point out the merits of a merger between our two groups:

"For any communist organization, the intervention towards the class – publications, leaflets, communiques, etc... – in the historical situation, in the workers struggles indeed but not only, is a central dimension of its activity what ever is its size and its immediate influence. It must be a permanent concern that only the concrete conditions of its realization – real state of the militant forces, relation of forces between the classes, degree of the repression of the enemy class and its State apparatus which is precisely determined by that relation of forces – can limit the extend and the intensity.

*Linked and in coherence with our vision of the construction of the party, in particular in accordance with the understanding that any communist group must set up itself as an **international and centralized** organization, as an embryo of communist party, the intervention has to be international and historical which doesn't exclude, and even all the contrary do favour, its indispensable "declension" at the immediate and local levels according to the circumstances. Believing that resolute intervention, and thus the effort and even the political fight for its realization, is not but for the party of tomorrow because the weakness of both the workers struggles and the militant forces, their influence in the class – what is the point of mobilizing and contributing so much efforts to distribute a few thousands leaflets which won't change nothing to the situation since "nobody reads us" ? – turns the back to the responsibilities of the political vanguard of the proletariat. At their turn, these reluctances, hesitations, doubts – as expressions of the wrong understanding of the role of class consciousness in the classes struggle, in particular expressions of political concessions to anti-party and a-political visions which belong to the opportunist political current Lenin defined as "economism", we today qualify as "councilism" – come to reinforce and to worsen the initial lack of militant conviction and to weaken it even more. It is also at that level that the "danger of councilism"*

manifests itself as the ICC had defined it in the years 1980 (see International Review 40 : [The function of revolutionary organizations: The danger of councilism](#)) and as such it is exerted within the very proletarian camp and its political organizations. In that sense, at the level of the "external" intervention as well as at the level of the "internal" functioning – see the first part about why a report ? – we claim a party method, included for a small group as our."

The IC-K also considers:

"that the question of the revolutionaries' regroupment cannot be posed but in the theoretical and political framework of the Communist Left and the supporters of the fundamental, indispensable, essential, crucial role of the Communist Party as political vanguard and leadership of the proletariat. From this, all the "councilist" milieu can't but oppose to the process towards the formation of the Party and becoming objectively the relay for the ideological and political themes of the bourgeoisie."

It is also said that the prospect of a grouping for the IC-K, despite the present difficulties of conflict, is currently with the Internationalist Communist Tendency.

As well it's important for us to note that in this regard, this regroupment is not opportunistic because, if make a balance sheet of the relationship between our two groups, we can say that we have been corresponding for almost 6 years – through agreements (joint interventions) and critiques (Contribution); We share essentially the same programmatic positions (Italian heritage, the original ICC platform) and that we were already able to speak with a single voice in the past. Similarly, despite the differences that we have with you (some critiques of our leaflets, brochures, or most important political mistakes as with the 'Contribution'), we are still remained connected, as we continued to defend the spirit of the IFCL (especially in facing Internationalist Voice). It seems so logical and even essential to start a process of discussion leading our own groups ability, to intervene more effectively both within the proletarian struggles and within the proletarian camp (ITC, TCI) along with you!

If you agree, we could implement an initial plan and timetable in this respect, as well as the terms and conditions under which to operate.

Fraternally,

The IC-K

International Situation

War in Mali

In Africa, France is the Gendarme of Europe against the USA and its acolytes

France's military intervention in Mali marks an important stage in the evolution of the relations between the main great imperialist powers of the world. This war expresses the brutal worsening of the imperialist rivalries that the economical capitalist crisis imposes upon all national bourgeoisies. Unable to resolve the economic contradictions of their system, each national capital, each State, each ruling class, is inescapably thrown against all the others in a frantic and barbarous race for its own survival on the world arena. The only and unique "response" to the crisis that capitalism can bring is the perspective of generalized imperialist war.

Workers, proletarians, and other exploited, of France, Europe and elsewhere would be wrong to let themselves be convinced, and above all to let themselves be carried along, by the « humanistarian » and « democratic » arguments for a « war against terrorism ». The terrorists they talk about, the Islamic groups, have been created and maintained above all by the great powers for several decades now via the finance and other supports from countries like Saudi Arabia (which, we can be sure, works for Washington), Algeria, Qatar and others. They are « terrorists » and the barbarians as much as the others ! Regarding terrorism, the great imperialist powers are like the pyromaniac firemen who shout « fire ! » after having started it !

Through taking the initiative of a military intervention in Mali in the name of « war against terrorism », French imperialism takes back to its own account, and in another situation, the American policy of Bush, father and son, in Iraq – initiative of a « moral » war for defending their sordid imperialist interests in order to oblige their main rivals to side with them and to support them. Fundamentally, France aims at taking advantage of the present weakening of the American bourgeoisie – at the imperialist and economic levels – to regain the positions it was losing in Africa to the benefit precisely of the US and others powers like China – the latter being incapable of intervening militarily in this region. Besides the direct economic interests – control of the resources and wealth of this area –, the French bourgeoisie aims also at carrying on its counter-offensive which started with the war in Libya and to thus ensure a generalized lining up of the African countries of the Mediterranean surrounds to its imperialist policy. Already, it seems it has achieved some of its goals.

The intervention in Mali is compelling Algeria to give up its autonomous imperialist policy in the region – up to now, it « allowed », not to say that it utilized for its own account, some Islamic groups – and to go along with the French intervention. The authorization of flying over its territory for the French air force has marked its desertion of the Islamic groups. The reaction of these latter has been brutal and bloody – taking hostages in In Amenas – and have sped up even more the lining up of the Algerian bourgeoisie to French policy.

The American, English and Japanese bourgeoisies were not mistaken and the bloody counter-attack of the Algerian army

to the gas site gave them the chance – a small one – to show their opposition to the French intervention.

But the French bourgeoisie doesn't only aim at regaining the lost influence in sub-Saharan and at consolidating the lining up of the Mediterranean countries from North Africa behind its imperialist policy. By defending its interests, it also defends the interests of the bourgeoisies of "continental" Europe whose central axis is Germany. This latter, with Italy, Spain, Belgium – just to mention the main countries – support the French military intervention politically and militarily. Certainly, it is true that the French bourgeoisie attempts also to strengthen its political weight within the European Union. It is also true that it attempts to re-balance a little in its favor the German-French relationship through the use of its military card, unique in Europe, and by pushing to a "European defence" in which it could not but have a primordial role. Nevertheless it remains that the major political fact is that the other European bourgeoisies fully join the French bourgeoisie in its imperialist assertion of a continental Europe against its rivals – the first one being the USA.

As the refusal of these countries to participate to the 2nd American war in Iraq in 2003, the assertion of the European imperialist interests brought by France on the African continent and on the Mediterranean surrounds, as well as the discussion for a European defense, do mark an additional moment of the dynamic of imperialist polarization around two axis : an American one, the other German-European.

For the proletarians, for the workers, there is nothing good in this dynamic of growing imperialist confrontations : besides the wars and massacres, besides the use of terror and terrorism – the medias and the bourgeois specialists have never ceased to proclaiming that there are going to be still more bombings and taking of hostages, included in the very heart of the main capitalist countries –, the increasing militarization and the development of the armament production – the setting up of a "European defense force" for instance – will add yet more to the burden of the capitalist crisis the working class must pay for at the cost of an increased and exhausting exploitation, of unemployment and misery, of repression and State terror. For proletarians, nothing good but the perspective of generalized war, of barbarism everywhere and sacrifices of all kinds up to the final one, the one of their life.

Who is barbarous and who is terrorist ? Capitalism ! It is up to the proletarians to oppose it by refusing the sacrifices of all kind in order to end up with it and to set up their own power. Only the proletarian revolution, the destruction of the capitalist State and the exertion of working class' political power, in brief the class war against the terrorist and barbaric bourgeoisie, will open the path to an other society without misery and without war : Communism !

January 20th, 2013

The Fraction of the International Communist Left.

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 statified 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.