One of the more popular banners on climate change protests reads: “System Change, not Clima- Change”. There is no question that the present system is dragging humanity towards an environmental ca- tastrophe. The material evidence piles up every day: increasingly dangerous heatwaves, unprece- dented wildfires in the Amazon, melting gla- ciers, floods, extinction of whole species – with the extinction of the human species as the ultimate result. And even if global warming were not hap- pening, the soil, the air, the rivers and seas would continue to be poisoned and depleted of life.

No wonder that so many people, and, above all, so many young people who face a menacing fu- ture, are deeply concerned about this situation and want to do something about it.

The wave of protests organised by Youth for Climate, Extinction Rebellion, the Green parties and the parties of the left are presented as a way forward. But those who are currently following their lead should ask themselves: why are these protests being so widely supported by those who manage and defend the present system? Why is Greta invited to speak to parliaments, govern- ments, the United Nations?

Of course the likes of Trump, Bolsonaro or Farage constantly vilify Greta and the “eco-war- riors”. They claim that climate change is a hoax and that measures to curb pollution are a threat to economic growth, above all in sectors like au- tomobiles and fossil fuels. They are the unashamed defenders of capitalist profit. But what about Merkel, Macron, Corbyn, Alexandria Ocasio- Cortez and others who have heaped praise on the climate protests: are they any less part of the pres- ent system?

Many of those taking part in the present protests would agree that the roots of ecological destruc- tion lie in the system and that this is the capitalist system. But the organisations behind the protests, and the politicians who trumpet their hypocritical support for them, defend policies that hide the real nature of capitalism.

Consider one of the main programmes of the more radical among these politicians: put forward: the so-called “New Green Deal”. It offers us a pack- age of measures to be taken by the existing states, demanding massive capital investment to develop “non-polluting” industries that are supposed to be able to turn a decent profit. In other words: it’s framed entirely within the confines of the capital- ist system. Like the New Deal of the 1930s, its aim is to save capitalism in its hour of need, not replace it.

What is the capitalist system?

Capitalism doesn’t disappear if it’s managed by state bureaucrats instead of private bosses, or if it paints itself green.

Capital is a world-wide relation between classes, based on the exploitation of wage labour and pro- duction for sale in order to realise profit. The con- stant search for outlets for its commodities calls forth ruthless competition between nation states for domination of the world market. And this competition demands that every national capital must expand or die. A capitalism that no longer seeks to penetrate the last corner of the planet and grow without limit cannot exist. By the same to- ken, capitalism is utterly incapable of cooperating on a global scale to respond to the ecological cri- sis, as the abject failure of all the various climate summits and protocols has already proved.

The hunt for profit, which has nothing to do with human need, is at the root of the despoliation of nature and this has been true since capitalism be- gan. But capitalism has a history, and for the last hundred years it has ceased to be a factor for prog- ress and has been plunged into a profound historic crisis. It is a civilisation in decay, as its economic base, forced to grow without limit, generates cri- ses of overproduction that tend to become perma- nent. And in the world wars and “Cold War” of the 20th century have demonstrated, this process of decline can only accelerate capital’s drive to- wards destruction. Even before the global massa- cre of nature became obvious, capitalism was al- ready threatening to obliterate humanity through its incessant imperialist confrontations and wars, which are continuing today across a whole swath of the planet from North Africa and the Middle East to Pakistan and India. Such conflicts can only be sharpened by the ecological crisis as nation- states compete for dwindling resources, while the race to produce more and more murderous weap- ons – and above all, to use them - can only further pollute the planet. This unholy combination of capitalist devastation is already making parts of the planet uninhabitable and forcing millions to become refugees.

The necessity and possibility of communism

This system cannot overcome the economic crisis, the ecological crisis, or the drive towards war. It is therefore a deception to demand that the governments of the world “get their act together” and do something to save the planet - a demand put forward by all the groups organising the cur- rent marches and protests. The only hope for hu- manity lies in the destruction of the present system and the creation of a new form of society.

We call this communism - a world-wide human commu- nity without nation states, without the exploitation of labour, without markets and money, where all production is planned on a global scale and with the sole motive of satisfying human need. It goes without saying that this society has nothing in common with the state-run form of capitalism we see in countries like China, North Korea or Cuba, or previously the Soviet Union.

Authentic communism is the only basis for es- tablishing a new relationship between human- ity and the rest of nature. And it’s not a utopia. It’s possible because capitalism has laid down its material foundations: the development of science and technology, which can be freed from their dis- tortions under this system, and the global inter- dependence of all productive activity, which can be freed from capitalist competition and national antagonisms.

Continued on page 3
Brexit: a quagmire for all factions of the ruling class

The following article was written before many of the most recent twists in the continuing Brexit drama, such as the confirmation of the prorogation of parliament, the bill designed to prevent a No Deal Brexit, Boris Johnson's attempt to have a general election and the resignation of 21 moderate Tory MPs from the party. As of today, the situation is patchily covered among its representatives. So today, the momentum is heading towards a no-deal Brexit, although the 'meaningful vote' in the European Parliament elections, there is a polarization between no-deal and Brexit. Theresa May spent most of her premiership trying to persuade Europe that her deal with the EU should be accepted as the lesser evil. Without success. From the point of view of the ruling class, May's deal is certainly the lesser evil because it would offer more or less the status quo that the EU had been. The lesser evil. For many of the country's 'policy makers' and 'opinion makers' at least, the option of a clean break, although amounting to the UK still by and large having to follow EU policy on many issues, but no longer having a say in formulating them. This dilemma has caused a growing disorientation within sizeable parts of the state apparatus. One of the products of this mess has been the development of a whole swathe of what we might call wavers. Their state of mind is brought to bear by the complex and volatile factors of Brexit, and the number of member of number of member of number of member of number of member of number of members of parliament: MPs who either advocate one thing today and the opposite tomorrow, or who have no idea how to position themselves, and who apparently would prefer not to do so for as long as possible. Impossible to predict the advance which side they might take in the end.

Another result has been the crystallisation, with in the Conservative Party, of a growing axis of real Hardline Brexiteers. 'Real' in the sense that they advocate a no-deal Brexit, not out of career opportunism, but out of ideological conviction. These are the people who have long been pushing very much onto the defensive, their radius of influence steadily shrinking. This group undoubtedly made for such an influx of hundreds of thousands of new inhabitants. The already acute situation at the social level, best described under the term: capitalist paralysis. Almost no protracted capitalism had made for such an influx of hundreds of thousands of new inhabitants. The already acute situation at the social level, best described under the term: capitalist paralysis. Almost no protracted capitalism had

The formation of a new government in London under Boris Johnson, the new British Prime Minister, was an exercise in political and economic crisis and the power struggle within the British ruling class which became a dominant factor in the determination of the outcome of the Brexit Referendum of June 2016. On the contrary: with the appointment of the Conservatives of Johnson and the Liberal Democrats, the government, on the one hand, the government would be the principal beneficiary in the case of a ‘Remain’ vote. At the other hand, the government would be the principal beneficiary of the government, instead of being a step towards a Salvinian takeover, it led to a coalition between the Five Star Movement and the Democratic Party. This might only be a short-lived interlude, but it does show that the battle between the factions of the ruling class is not a one-way street towards a re-establishment of the power of the ruling class. However, the underlying problem is still there for the bourgeoisie. The loss of control of the political apparatus, the escalation of the conflicts between different factions means the deepening of the political crisis, which will be further worsened by the development of the economic crisis.

The new phase of this power struggle is not in the first instance one between Johnson himself and the party opponents, or between Johnson and the Labour opposition, or between the PM and the staunchly Remainer and the (now deposed) Home Secretary Sajid Javid. The immediate threat facing the government, instead of being a step towards a Salvinian takeover, it led to a coalition between the Five Star Movement and the Democratic Party. This might only be a short-lived interlude, but it shows that the battle between the factions of the ruling class is not a one-way street towards a re-establishment of the power of the ruling class. However, the underlying problem is still there for the bourgeoisie. The loss of control of the political apparatus, the escalation of the conflicts between different factions means the deepening of the political crisis, which will be further worsened by the development of the economic crisis.

The new phase of this power struggle is not in the first instance one between Johnson himself and the party opponents, or between Johnson and the Labour opposition, or between the PM and the staunchly Remainer and the (now deposed) Home Secretary Sajid Javid. The immediate threat facing the government, instead of being a step towards a Salvinian takeover, it led to a coalition between the Five Star Movement and the Democratic Party. This might only be a short-lived interlude, but it shows that the battle between the factions of the ruling class is not a one-way street towards a re-establishment of the power of the ruling class. However, the underlying problem is still there for the bourgeoisie. The loss of control of the political apparatus, the escalation of the conflicts between different factions means the deepening of the political crisis, which will be further worsened by the development of the economic crisis.

The new phase of this power struggle is not in the first instance one between Johnson himself and the party opponents, or between Johnson and the Labour opposition, or between the PM and the staunchly Remainer and the (now deposed) Home Secretary Sajid Javid. The immediate threat facing the government, instead of being a step towards a Salvinian takeover, it led to a coalition between the Five Star Movement and the Democratic Party. This might only be a short-lived interlude, but it shows that the battle between the factions of the ruling class is not a one-way street towards a re-establishment of the power of the ruling class. However, the underlying problem is still there for the bourgeoisie. The loss of control of the political apparatus, the escalation of the conflicts between different factions means the deepening of the political crisis, which will be further worsened by the development of the economic crisis.

The new phase of this power struggle is not in the first instance one between Johnson himself and the party opponents, or between Johnson and the Labour opposition, or between the PM and the staunchly Remainer and the (now deposed) Home Secretary Sajid Javid. The immediate threat facing the government, instead of being a step towards a Salvinian takeover, it led to a coalition between the Five Star Movement and the Democratic Party. This might only be a short-lived interlude, but it shows that the battle between the factions of the ruling class is not a one-way street towards a re-establishment of the power of the ruling class. However, the underlying problem is still there for the bourgeoisie. The loss of control of the political apparatus, the escalation of the conflicts between different factions means the deepening of the political crisis, which will be further worsened by the development of the economic crisis.
Homelessness: product of the capitalist crisis

Today, if you walk the streets of the towns and cities, you may well perceive a kind of urban plague. The underlying cause of the situation is the economic and political system itself, especially the capitalist order. The response of the European Union (EU) to this problem has been to impose economic austerity, with all its consequences. The EU has imposed strict economic policies on member states, effectively freezing wages, eliminating welfare benefits, and privatizing public services. This has resulted in a surge in homelessness, as people are pushed out of the housing market by rising rents and real estate speculation. Additionally, the policies have led to cuts in social services, leaving many with no support. This has resulted in a dramatic increase in homelessness in Europe, with millions of people living on the streets.

The response of the European Union

The response of the European Union to the problem of homelessness has been largely inadequate. The EU has imposed economic austerity measures, including strict fiscal policies and cuts to social services, in an attempt to reduce public spending. This has led to an increase in homelessness, as people are unable to afford housing and are forced to rely on charity and social services. The EU has also imposed strict regulations on housing and homelessness, including restrictions on housing benefits and social housing. These policies have contributed to the increase in homelessness, as people are forced to rely on charity and social services.

Continued from page 1

Capitalist democracy is a fraud

Democracy and the nation have become today what religion was in the days when Karl Marx first coined the term “opium of the masses.”

The interaction of these different tendencies and countermovements is complicated and always goes on the basis of contradiction, as the various economic and political changes in the member states have surprised themselves by how well they have succeeded so far in closing ranks in the face of the EU’s economic austerity measures. In the longer term, all the attempts of London to divide them against each other. Indeed, the very global turbulences of the present time, the surge in nationalism and the explosion of trade wars centred around, but not restricted to, the big two USA and China, have reminded the Remainers of the benefits of being part of a commercial bloc which is a real heavy weight on their economies and also a bulwark against challenges. Furthermore, with the conscious effort to misrepresent the people in Parliament as being unable to get things done. But this is yet another false choice for the working class.

The proletarian alternative

The historical movement of the working class has shown another way. The Paris Commune of 1871 already went beyond the limits of parliamen
tarianism, so that “instead of deciding once in three years which member of the ruling class is to misrepresent the people in Parliament,” the working population began to organise itself in neighbourhood assemblies whose delegates were not only elected and mandated but could be recalled at any moment. The soviets or workers’ councils that arose in Russia in 1905 and 1917 took these principles a step further, since they were based on assemblies of workers in the facto
dries and other workplaces, making the contours of proletarian power even clearer than in 1871.

During the worldwide wave of revolutionary movements in 1917-21, the workers’ councils arose in direct opposition to parliamentary (and imperial) structures, and the soviets under
tested this very well, because - above all in Germany, where the fate of the world revolution was to be decided. it did everything it could to buttress the soviets, to turn them into a powerless appendage of parliament and the local state, and then to kick them away, it is a condition of a rotten system. Javid’s latest measures are an integral part of the preparation for a possible election. There will be no alleviation from the attacks that cause social deprivation. It is the crisis of capitalism that lies behind the root popu
sanity, of squabble, of despair, and the loss of hope. In Engels’ The Housing Question from 1872 he goes to the root of the question “As long as the capitalist mode of production continues to exist, it is folly to hope for an isolated solution of the housing question, and only in this way in order to affect the fate of the workers. The solution lies in the abolition of the capitalist mode of produc
tion and the appropriate measures that will make the conditions of work and labour by the working class itself.”

Melmoth 7/8/19

1. Marx, Introduction to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, 1843

2. Marx, The Civil War in France, 1871
Eighty years ago, one of the most important events in history - the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War - came to an end. This major conflict was at the heart of the world situation in the 1930s. It had been the subject of great attention for several years. It would provide a decisive test for all political tendencies claiming to be proletarian and revolutionary. Like previous events, the Spanish question that a decadence would take place within the currents that had fought against the degeneration and betrayal of the communist parties of the 1920s, and that would divide them into two those who would maintain an internationalist position during the Second World War and those who ended up participating in it, such as the Trotskyist movement. Even today, positions on the events of 1936-1939 in Spain are central in the propaganda of the currents that claim to support proletarian revolution. This is especially the case for the different tendencies of anarchism and Trotskyism which, despite their differences, both agree that there was a “revolution” in Spain in 1936. A revolution that, according to the anarchists, went much further than in Russia and that overturned in all of the constitution of the “collectives” promoted by the CNT, the anarcho-syndicalist trade union, an analysis rejected at the time by various currents of the Communist Left, by the Italian Left and also by the German-Dutch Left. The first question for us to answer therefore is: was there a revolution in Spain in 1936? What is a revolution? Before answering, we need to agree on what exactly is meant by “revolution”. It is a particularly overused term since it is claimed in France for example by both the extreme left (Melenchon with his “Citizen Revolution”) and by the extreme right (the “National Revolution” of the Front National). President from 1981 onwards, Le Pen entitled the book setting down his political programme, “Revolution”. In fact, beyond all the fanciful interpretations, the term “Revolution” has historically expressed and entailed a violent change of political regime where the balance of power between social classes is overturned in favour of those representing progressive change in society. This was the case with the English Revolution of the 1640s and the French Revolution of 1789, both of which marked the political power of the aristocracy in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Throughout the 19th century, the political advances of the bourgeoisie at the expense of the nobility represented progress for society. And this is because at that time the capitalist system was experiencing growing prosperity and settling out to conquer the world. However, this situation would change radically in the 20th century. The bourgeois powers had finished sharing out the world between them. Any new conquests, whether colonial or commercial, would involve challenging the claims of a rival power. This gave rise to the increase in militarism and the outbreak of imperial tensions that led to the First World War. This was a sign that capitalism had become a decadent and obsolete system. The bourgeois revolutions were no longer relevant. The only revolution on the horizon was the one to overthrow the capitalist system and establish a new society free of exploitation and war, i.e. communism. The only subject of this revolution is the class of wage earners that produces most of the world’s social wealth, the proletariat. There are three fundamental differences between bourgeois revolutions and the proletarian revolution. A bourgeois revolution, i.e. the seizure of power by a particular group of the bourgeoisie, is the outcome to a whole historical period during which the bourgeoisie has acquired power over major spheres of society through the development of trade and techniques of production. The political revolution, the abolition of the privileges of the aristocracy, is an important (although not indispensable) step in the growing control by the bourgeoisie over society, which enables it to achieve and accelerate this pro-

cess of control. The proletarian revolution does not in any sense emerge at the end of a process of economic transformation of society, but on the contrary is active from the very start. The bourgeoisie had been able to establish its own economic “islands” within feudal society, with trade in the towns and other commercial networks, “islands” that gradually would grow and be consolidated. It’s nothing like this for the proletariat. There can be no islands of communism in a global economy dominated by capitalism and market forces. This was the dream of the utopian socialists such as Fourier, Saint-Simon and Owen. But, despite all their goodwill and their often profound analyses of the contradictions of capitalism, their dreams clashed with and were shattered by the reality of capitalist society. The fact is that the first stage of the communist revolution consists in the seizure of political power by the proletariat worldwide. It is only through its political power that the revolutionary class will be able to gradually transform the global economy by socialising it, by abolishing private ownership of the means of production along with market relations. There are two other basic differences between bourgeois revolutions and the proletarian revolution. Firstly, while bourgeois revolutions have taken place at different times depending on the economic development of each particular country (there is more than a century between the English and French revolutions), the proletarian revolution must be concluded within the confines of the same historical period. Should it remain isolated within a single country or within a few countries, it would be of no use to anyone. This is what happened to the Russian revolution of 1917. Secondly, bourgeois revolutions, even extremely violent ones, occur within the framework of the apparatus of feudal society (the army, police, legal system and bureaucracy). In fact, the bourgeois revolutions took charge of modernising and per-
fecing the existing state apparatus. This was pos-
sible and necessary since this type of revolution provided for a process of succession between the two exploiting classes, the nobility and the bour-
geoisie, to the helm of society. The proletarian revolution is completely different. In no way can the proletariat, the exploited class at the heart of capitalist society, use the state apparatus designed and organised to guarantee this exploitation, and to suppress the struggles against this exploitation, for its own benefit. The first of the tasks of the proletariat in the course of the revolution will be to arm itself in order to destroy the state apparatus from top to bottom and to set up its own organs of power based on its mass unitary organisations with elected delegates revocable by general assemblies: the workers’ councils. 1936: a revolution in Spain? On July 18, 1936, following a military coup against the Popular Front government, the prole-
tariat took up arms. It was successful in defeating the criminal enterprise led by Franco and his as-
sociates inside most major cities. But did they then take advantage of this situation, of its position of strength, to attack the bourgeois state? A bourgeois state which, since the establishment of the Repub-
lic in 1931, had already distinguished itself in the bloody repression of the working class, particular-
lly in the Asturias in 1934 where 5,000 were killed. The answer is “absolutely not!” For sure the workers’ response was initially a class action, preventing the coup from succeed-
ing. But, unfortunately, the workers’ energy was quickly channeled and ideologically recuperated behind the state banner by the mystifying force of the Popular Front’s “anti-fascism”. Far from attack-
ing and destroying the bourgeois state, as was the case in October 1917 in Russia, the workers were called upon to defend the bourgeois state, as the state no longer acts as an organism that takes advantage of this situation, of its position of strength, to attack the bourgeois state? A bourgeois state which, since the establishment of the Repub-
lic in 1931, had already distinguished itself in the bloody repression of the working class, particular-
lly in the Asturias in 1934 where 5,000 were killed. The answer is “absolutely not!” For sure the workers’ response was initially a class action, preventing the coup from succeed-
ing. But, unfortunately, the workers’ energy was...
The proletariat must learn
the lessons of the Spanish War:

- Unlike those who want to bury the proletariat and seek to discredit its struggle, those who think that the Spanish Civil War was an “attempt at proletarian revolution” or “old-fashioned”, that we should free ourselves from the revolutionary past of the proletariat, that of “superior” revolutions, is to be shown.

- A proletarian revolution is not at all the same as the “antifascist” struggle or the events in Spain in the 1930s. Quite the contrary, it has to situate itself on the political terrain of the conscious workers’ struggle, based on the political force of the workers’ councils. The proletariat must maintain its self-organisation and its political independence from all factions of the bourgeoisie and from all ideologies that alienate it. This is what the proletariat in Spain was unable to do since, quite the contrary, it found itself, and therefore surrendered, to the left-wing forces of capital!

- A proletarian revolution is not at all the same as the Spanish Civil War also shows that it is not possible to “build a new society” through local initiatives at the economic level, as anarchists believed. Revolutionary struggle can only be the first and foremost an international political movement and not limited to preliminary economic reforms or measures (even those that seem radical “experiments”). The first task of the proletarian revolution, as the Russian Revolution has shown us, must be a political one: the destruction of the bourgeoisie state and the seizure of power by the working class on an international scale. Without this, it is inevitably doomed to isolation and defeat.

- Finally, democratic ideology is the most dangerous of all those promoted by the class enemy. It is the most pernicious, as the Bolshevik party was the first to proclaim: “The working class itself - fascist wolf look like a protective and “sympathetic” to the workers. Antifascism was therefore doomed from its birth in Spain and South America; as the Popular Fronts to send workers to be massacred in the imperialist war. The State and its democratic myth is not only a mask of the state and the bourgeoisie to hide its dictatorship, its social opposition, and exploitation, but also and above all, the most powerful and difficult obstacle for the proletariat to overcome. The events of 1936/37 in Spain, as the workers’ councils. The proletariat must maintain its autonomy in fighting uncompromisingly for its own interests, on its own class terrain, with its own methods of struggle and its own principles.

The communist revolution can only be victorious if the proletariat arm itself with a political party of the working class that can take up its responsibilities, as the Bolsheviks were able to do in the first revolutionary attempt in 1917. History has shown how difficult it is to construct such a party. It is a task which demands numerous and diverse efforts. It can only be done, or can take shape around programmatic questions and the principles of organisational functioning, a clarity which is necessarily based on the entirety of the experience of the workers’ movement, and its political traditions.

Read ICC online article
Nuevo Curso and the “Spanish Communist Left”:
What are the origins of the Communist Left?

The communist revolution can only be victorious if the proletariat arm itself with a political party of the working class that can take up its responsibilities, as the Bolsheviks were able to do in the first revolutionary attempt in 1917. History has shown how difficult it is to construct such a party. It is a task which demands numerous and diverse efforts. It can only be done, or can take shape around programmatic questions and the principles of organisational functioning, a clarity which is necessarily based on the entirety of the experience of the workers’ movement, and its political traditions.

Only the international class struggle can end capitalism’s drive towards destruction

But above all it’s possible because capitalism is based on the formation of a class with nothing to lose but its chains, a class which has an interest both in resisting exploitation and overthrowing it: the international working class, the proletariat of all countries. This is a class which includes not only those who are exploited at work but also those studying to find a place in the labour market and those whom capital throws out of work and on to the scrap heap.

Citizens’ protests or workers’ struggle?
And it is here in particular that the ideology behind the climate marches serves to prevent us from grasping the means to fight against this system. It tells us that local action is enough because the “older generations” got used to consuming too much. But talking about generations is misleading. The fact that, yesterday and today, the problem lies with the division of society into two main classes, the capitalist or the working one, which has all the power, and one far larger class which is exploited and deprived of all power of decision, even in the most “democratic” of countries. It’s the impersonal mechanisms of capital that have got us into the current mess, not the personal behaviour of individuals or the greed of a previous generation.

The same goes for all the talk about the “people” or the “citizens” as the force that can save the world. These are meaningless categories which cover up antagonistic class interests. The way out of a system which cannot exist without the exploitation of one class by another can only take place through the struggle of the working class, which starts with workers defusing their most basic interests against the attacks on living and working conditions inflicted by all governments and all bosses in response to the economic crisis – attacks which are also more and more being justified in the name of green policies. The environment is the only basis for the working class developing a sense of its own existence against all the lies which tell us that it’s already an extinct species. And it’s only the class struggle that can overturn the economic and political dimensions - drawing the link between economic crisis, war, and ecological disaster, and recognizing that only a world-wide revolution can overcome them.

In the lead-up to the First World War, hundreds of thousands marched in pacifist demonstrations. They were encouraged by the “democratic” ruling classes because they spread the illusion that you could have a peaceful capitalism. Today the illusion is being spread far and wide that you can have a green capitalism. And again, pacifism, with its appeal to all good men and true, hid the fact that only the class struggle can really oppose war – as it proved in 1917-18, when the outbreak of the French Revolution forced the rulers of the world to bring the war to a rapid close. Pacifism has never stopped wars, and the current ecological campaigns, by peddling false solutions to the climate disaster, must be understood as an obstacle to its real solution.

International Communist Current
27 August 2019
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cupyi the Barcelona telephone exchange that was in the hands of the CNT. The most combative part of the proletariat responded to this provocation by taking control of the streets, erecting barricades and going on strike. The proletariat was fully mobilized and certainly had weapons, but it didn’t have a clear perspective. The democratic state had retained intact. It was still on the offensive, contrary to what the anarchists had said, and had no in way given up plans to suppress attempts at resistance by the proletariat. While Franco’s troops voluntarily brought an end to the offensive at the Front, the Stalinists and the republican government attacked the very workers who, in July 1936, had defeated the fascist coup d’état. It was at this moment that Federica Montseny, the most prominent anarchist minister, called on the workers to stop fighting and to lay down their arms! So it was a real stab in the back for the working class, a real betrayal and a crushing defeat. This is what the magazine Bilan, publication of the Italian Communist Left, wrote on this occasion: “On July 19, 1936, the proletarians of Barcelona overpowered the attack of Franco’s battalions THAT WERE ARMED TO THE TEETH USING THEIR BARE HANDS. On May 4, 1937, these same proletarians, NOW DISARMED, left behind them many fallen victims on the streets than in July when they had had to repel Franco; and now it was the antifascist government (only including the anarchists, to which the POUM indi-}


Economic crisis

A new recession

Capital demands more sacrifices from the proletariat

In India an industry source told Reuters that car panel makers, who supply auto parts to assemblers, have announced job losses. Producers of auto parts, including manufacturers, parts and dealers, have laid off about 150,000 workers since April. As Indian banks are now facing more pressure to write off bad loans, unemployment figures remain strangely stable across the board. The explanation is simple: the number of layoffs is based on sophisticated statistics and new evaluation methods. In addition to the growing number of unemployed who are no longer counted in the official figures, those formally deemed in search of work are totally disregarded in recent years by an explosion in precariousness and the deterioration in the quality of jobs. In all countries unemployment benefits are being significantly cut and situations are deteriorating sharply: many jobs have increased the amount of casual work. It is these “active policies” that artificially “increase employment rate” at the expense of the proletariat and their families.

In the United Kingdom the flexibility of the labour market and “ubiquisation” have boosted “zero-hours” contracts, which offer no guarantee of working hours. Employers are free to fire employees at any time for no reason other than the sharp jobs needs of their deteriorating business and declining order books. In Germany the Hartz reforms of 2005-2006 allowed the development of casual work at 450 euros per month, and these jobs are now increasing. In many other countries, such as the United States, it is now the case that non-regular jobs have grown strongly. In the Netherlands, “zero-hours” contracts and German-style “casual work” are also on the rise. In Portugal, the “recursos de quebra” (the jobs that can be terminated on an employer’s head of the economy) fell by 22% per annum between April and June 2021. But job losses are already spreading from the service sector (for example, the merger of Karstadt and Kaufhof will lead to the loss of 2,600 full time equivalent jobs) to the manufacturing sector: 4,000 (3,000 in Germany and 5,000 people because workers are part-time), 5,600 at T-Systems, Deutsche Telekom’s IT subsidiary, insurance (700 fewer jobs at Allianz), in industrial conglomerates: Thyssenkrupp (6,000 worldwide including 4,000 in Germany), Siemens (2,700 worldwide including 900 in Germany), Bayer (12,000 by 2121), etc.

Short-term work which had disappeared from the automobile sector five years ago is now returning in force: affecting 150,000 people. In the United Kingdom, in the chaotic context of Brexit, the situation is also worsening. For example, the British car industry is in a difficult situation as Ford, Honda, Nissan and Jaguar Land Rover have all made major cuts in their global workforce. In the United States the trades and the rise in customs duties are already having an impact on manufacturing companies: “What interests us today are the reasons given by employers to justify job losses. In the last report in July, tariffs were one of two main reasons. Indeed, 1,053 reductions due to tariffs were announced in one week, from a total of 1,430 this year and against 798 in 2019.”

1. Those who read French can see our article on the attacks in France on our French language website. See “Massive street protests in France: Yellow Vests move against unemployment and precariousness profiteers/fabulistes du proletariat-labourers"
3. The Argentine peso was at parity with the dollar at the beginning of the century; it is now worth only about 0.20 pesos per dollar. For example, the IMF’s loosened its controls on the peso in 2020. In 2019 the peso had been under austerity and severe budget cuts that have already caused 5 general strikes since the beginning of the year. Argentina is now not rated among the countries that already live below the poverty line (Web source: BFM Business, 13 November 2019: “Argentina has become the 3rd in the longest group of Latin America”).
4. See https://lepresseleanup.com/article/economie/alternatiba/
5. Austerity measures have been implemented in this period.
6. Not to mention Volkswagen’s new plan to cut 30,000 jobs in Europe by 2023 (more than 30,000 since 2017) or Ford-Germany’s plan to cut 5,000. In addition to 370 redundancies, Mercedes-Benz is eliminating temporary and fixed-term contracts.
7. See https://www.capital.fr/entreprises-marches/states-
8. It is becoming more and more difficult to make ends meet despite sophisticated means to hide the truth. This is whyilly estimates suggest that the car industry, including Ford, General Motors, and Volkswagen, is expected to lose 18,000 jobs in the US and Canada by the end of 2021. In the United States, the car industry, including Ford, General Motors, and Volkswagen, is expected to lose 18,000 jobs in the US and Canada by the end of 2021.
9. See ‘The “Yellow Vest” movement: the proletariat must respond to the attacks on capitalism’.
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... I agree with Jaycee about the positive nature of the recent ICC contact meeting ... The ICC itself – as well as Jaycee’s thoughts - led me to reflect about time-spans, about evolution and degeneration, about continuity and rupture, immediate and perspectives ... On the one hand, it is difficult to explain why the class struggle doesn’t obey the rhythm of the human life-span but has its own dynamic, though it is not totally dictated by the evolution of capitalism’s objective economic and social crises. Associated with this is the crucial importance of continuity within the proletarian movement – the handing on of ‘lessons’, of political coherences which can become material weapons at certain moments. These thoughts prompted the following critical observations of what Jaycee’s written ...

"The point I’m making boils down to this: the weakness of the working class since WW2 (including the resurgence which was quickly co-opted and controlled in 68) should not be underestimated.

One of the (to me) intriguing aspects of the ICC meeting was the juxtaposition of the recollections of the ‘older’ ICC militants and sympathisers - some of whom were openly apologetic about their memories of intervening in the struggle of different sectors of the class, urging the extension and self-organisation of the manifold struggles of the 60s, 70s and 80s going on under their eyes – and the questions raised by young militants about the situation today: ‘how do we convince people of Marxism? How do we convey the potential power of the revolutionary working class?’

This striking difference of the tasks facing revolutionaries yesterday and today – and the conditions under which they were and are working – can only be appreciated if one recognises the immense social change brought about by the re-emergence of a new generation of workers from the counter-revolution at the end of the 1960s and its impact on all areas of social life. This stark contrast should in itself alert people to how powerful this upsurge was and its lasting legacy.

‘The apparent ‘bolt from the blue’ that was May ‘68; the subsequent years of inspired struggles from one sphere of the globe to another; the reawakening of the international proletariat in three successive waves of struggle spanning over 20 years; the question of how the proletarian effervescence placed in the machinery of the war economy – cannot and should not be reduced to ‘a resurgence which was quickly co-opted’... Just as the idea of a post WW2 working class pacified by the welfare state and consumerism is a distortion of the time-space continuum, so too was the idea that the ‘resurgence was quickly controlled in May ’68..."

This meeting will take place in London in October.

See the ICC website for details:
http://www.internationalism.org

From the ICC online forum ‘Recent discussion at contact meeting organised by the ICC’ thread

Continued from page 8

Kashmir: crisis, communal conflict and imperialist tensions

In fact the conflict in Kashmir cannot be divorced from the overall shifting imperialist situation in Asia, with the growth of China as a rising power aiming to challenge the USA for control of the region. The Chinese expansion in the Indian Ocean compels all bordering states to position themselves. On the one hand China must push its Maritime Silk Road along the coasts of the Indian Ocean up to the Iranian coast. This creates additional tensions between Pakistan and India. In Pakistan, the port of Gwadar, not far from the Iranian border, will be connected to the extreme west of China after the construction of a 500 km road connection. The port should give Chinese trade easier access to the Middle East than by sea through the Strait of Malacca (between Malaysia and Indonesia). India is protesting against this road project that crosses part of Kashmir claimed by New Delhi. A new international airport is to be built in Gwadar.

And the Maritime Silk Project also pushes India to take counter-measures. On the one hand India does not want to be too dependent on China: this is why it seeks to strengthen its ties with India. India contributed to the construction of the new Iranian port of Chabahar, allowing India to avoid passing through Pakistan to reach Afghanistan. At the same time, India itself, which has had special links with Russia for decades, has intensified these, despite the fact that on a military level India has also tried to diversify its arms purchases at the expense of Russia, and that India is seen by the US as an important counter-weight against Chinese expansion. It has received American backing for its stronger militarisation, in particular increasing its nuclear capabilities. And together with Russia, Iran and Azerbaijan, India has been attempting for some time to establish an International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC) which is to connect Mumbai to St Petersburg via Tbilisi and Baku/Azerbaijan.

In any conflict or tensions over Kashmir, India has to take account of Pakistan’s ‘all weather’ alliance with China. In a past war, though it was not a military alliance, the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation, which India had signed with the communist Soviet Union before the 1971 war, ensured that China refrained from aiding Pakistan militarily during the war. The Indo-US strategic partnership has been described as India’s ‘principal’ strategic partnership. Its defence cooperation element does not offer such protection as its previous alliance with Russia in 1971.

The situation in India, Pakistan and Kashmir today show us what capitalism has to offer humanity: unstable imperialist tensions, communal conflicts, in a word a growing barbarism. Alex
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Communist organisations and class consciousness

Donations

Unlike the bourgeois press, revolutionary publications such as World Revolution have no advertising revenue, no chains of news agents and no millionaire backers. We rely on the support of our sympathisers, and those who, while they might not agree with all aspects of our politics, see the importance of the intervention of a communist press.
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Housmans 5 Caledonian Rd, Kings Cross, N1.
Freedom Bookshop Angel Alley, 84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX
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Contact the ICC

Write to the following addresses without mentioning the name:
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL PO Box 28, NIT, Fardsabad, 121003 Haryana, INDIA.
WORLD REVOLUTION BM Box 869, London WC1N 3XX, GREAT BRITAIN

Write by e-mail to the following addresses:
From Great Britain use uk@internationalism.org
From India use India@internationalism.org
From the rest of the world use international@internationalism.org

http://www.internationalism.org

ICC public forum

Only the international class struggle can end capitalism’s drive towards destruction

Rather than a fatalist acceptance along the lines of panic and the idea that “we are all doomed”, the present resurgence of capitalism into the abyss can be a spur, an element in the development of class conscious- ness in the sense that it is becoming apparent that, as Marx and Engels indicated in The Communist Manifesto, the present state of things has renounced the present society and its perspectives untenable. Thus the only possible result that can avoid the future destruction that capitalism harbours for us, the only possible result for the defence of the whole of humanity, is the active emergence of the proletariat: a class with a future.

International2016

International Communist Current - Life of the ICC

International Communist Current - Manifesto on the October revolution, Russia 1917
Situated and divided between India, Pakistan and Kashmir, the region has been a battlefield for many years, and claimed by both India and Pakistan, Kashmir has been a region of instability since the British left in 1947. It has been a war between the states of the Subcontinent, and a war between India and China, which have cost an estimated 45,000 lives. The conflict has been continued with the Pakistan-backed Muslim separatists, costing tens of thousands more lives since 1989. The working class can expect nothing from these conflicts, except to see more civil wars or civil war, or in uniform, being used as hostages and cannon fodder. Whether Kashmir is ruled by India or Pak, the rule of the bourgeoisie on both outsiders buying land, which has been relied on by Kashmiri nationalists (and Pakistan) to prevent its Muslim majority population from being diluted by an influx from the rest of the India. The BJP in fact propagates and benefits from a very divisive Hindu nationalism that has gained great popularity in India and even among the minority high caste Hindu population in Kashmir. A similarly divisive policy has been carried out in Assam, where over 1.9 million residents have been robbed of citizenship because they were unable to prove they had not been born in Assam since 1971. Unlike the nationalism of the 19th Century, which saw the unification of Germany and Italy, today’s nationalism tends to feed centrifugal tendencies. The Hindu nationalism of the BJP underlines the secular nationalism that has been necessary to the unity of India as a country with numerous religious and ethnic divisions. The BJP is not a national, Indian problem: we see parallels across the world. If Modi’s Kashmir policy has increased divisions in the India state, in the UK Brexit is fueling Scottish nationalism and putting in question the conditions of the Good Friday Agreement that brought about an end to the sectarian ‘troubles’ in Northern Ireland.

Feeding communal conflicts

* The statified regimes which arose in the USSR, China, and India are not specific to one country, but an aspect of the degenerating Third International in the years 1920-30, the three Internationals (the Communist International of Marx and Engels (1847-56), the Communist League of Trotskyists, Maoists and ex-Maoists, ‘Communist’ parties (now ex-‘Communists’), the leftist organisation, whether ‘official’ or ‘rank and file’, serve their own interest and their own purposes, always in contradiction to the interests and purposes of the working class. The working class has a clear interest in opposing these organisations and in demanding that they cooperate with the working class in the common struggle.

* In order to advance its combat, the working class has to unify its struggles, taking charge of their extension and organisation through subordinated alliances and committees of elected delegates and revocable at any time by these alliances. The working class is 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 the larger struggle, which derives from conscious and organised mass action by the proletariat.

* The working class is the only class which can carry out the revolutionary combat. 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 in a world-scale form. The creation of the power of the workers’ councils, regrouping the entire proletariat.

* The decomposition of capitalist social relations: wage labour, commodity production, national frontiers. It means the creation of a commonality in which all the peoples of the world 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 not ‘to organise the working class’ not to ‘take power’ in its name, but to participate actively in the movement towards the unification of strangles, towards working 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.

Our origins

The positions and activity of revolutionary organisations are the product of the past experiences of the working class and of the lessons of the political organisations that 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) of the three Internationals (the International Working-

Continued on page 7

Indian soldiers enforce curfew in Kashmir

These are all examples of the rotting of a society that can give no perspective to humanity, not even the completely insane perspective of mutually assured destruction in war, while at the same time the working class is not able to show society its own revolutionary perspective.

Shifting alliances exacerbate instability in Kashmir

Despite Indian government protests, its action in Kashmir is anything but an internal matter, with repercussions felt far away. Pakistan’s PM, Imran Khan, has protested loudly, calling for it to be discussed in the UN Security Council, (a call supported by China), and threatening to take it to the International Court of Justice, as well as accusing India of acting like Nazis. Pakistan, with its powerful Afghan border and tacit support for the Taliban, has threatened to move troops from the Afghan border to Kashmir, just when the US wants it to control that border because it is in talks with the Taliban with a view to withdrawing its troops. ‘Pakistan’s ambassador, Asad Majid Khokhar, em- phasised ... that the Kashmir and Afghanistan issues were separate and that he was not attempting to link them. On the contrary, he said, Pakistan

2. The book Malevolent Republic by Kapil Komoreddy, recently claimed that the current state of Kashmir was unprecedented in 70 years of independent India”.

4 South Asia