

# CAPITALIST CATASTROPHE AND PROLETARIAN REVOLTS EVERYWHERE

## THE ABC

The strength and importance of the current proletarian revolts cannot be understood in all their depth and historical significance, if we don't grasp them for what they are: i.e. the current answer of the humanity facing the bourgeois society and its more and more catastrophic development. We have to start from their real premise, the generalized catastrophe that the bourgeois society represents for the Earth, for Life generally speaking and in particular for the human race<sup>1</sup>.

In contradiction with all what is said, the world proletariat appears again on the world scene. It's not because and only against their direct "dictators" that proletarians in Tunisia, Algeria, Egypt, Yemen, Syria, Iraq, Libya, Bahrain, etc.<sup>2</sup> take to the streets, that they attack and set on fire bastions and symbols of the power. Once again the proletariat

---

<sup>1</sup> Read the text "*Capitalist catastrophe and proletarian struggles*" in "*Communism*" No.15 (July 2010) about the great wave of proletarian revolts in 2008 and the contradiction of Capital with Earth and life, as well as text "*Greece: it's going on... and on!*" in the same issue.

<sup>2</sup> As in 2008 any listing of the revolts of the proletariat by countries, just as the media are doing, is always a limitation (either unconsciously or deliberately) and systematically a reduction. Denominations like "Maghreb" or "Arab world", or what else we are forced to use here for lack of other better ones, are also meaningless and were outflanked by the social reality of the movement. As for the amount of regions where troubles broke out and the amount of proletarians involved in the struggles, the waves of previous revolts has already been overcome, and that's the reason why any simplistic denomination is ridiculous or simply out of tune. Moreover, when we write these lines, there are struggles in the streets in China, Burkina Faso, Bolivia, etc.

takes to the streets to struggle because its own means of existence are threatened by the raising in prices of all the vital commodities, because the current society starves the proletarians, because between the necessities of capitalist accumulation and human life the contradiction has already broken out.

The protest, which is more and more universal, is not against such or such tyrant or particular dictatorship, but globally against the general dictatorship of world capitalism. The struggles that spread everywhere are not against the political dictatorship of such or such oppressor, but against the social tyranny of a society that has become to be completely unbearable for us.

It's not only the revolutionary minorities that point out the increase in prices of absolutely essential food as being the first cause of the revolts in the "Arab world"<sup>3</sup>. But only a few expressions recognize the proletariat as a class in struggle (and not as simple sociological classification) and have stressed on the fact that what happens in all those countries is precisely the struggle of the international proletariat against world capitalism. This is the great truth hidden by all the bourgeois factions of the world, by all possible means of distortion of the public opinion, by all those who pretend to change

---

<sup>3</sup> We find fundamental to emphasize that already in the first week of January 2011 the situation was unbearable, that the catastrophe of capitalism already assumed openly that crisis which implies a new wave of hunger and misery for the world population and that from this point the international proletarian revolt began its Middle Eastern phase with the revolts in Tunisia, Egypt, Algeria, Morocco...

something while preserving the essentials of this catastrophic world, by all the forces that pretend to change the visible ugly face of such or such State ("the dictator") to leave everything (that is to say the basics of this society) as it is. All the dominant power of the world was focused on hiding the important things and distracting our attention while spreading democratic alternatives (political and/or religious ones) to the current form of the dictatorship, to preserve the essentials of the democratic and religious dictatorship of Capital.

Basically, what differentiates these revolts in the Middle East (fast-expanding as we write these lines) and those that already began to break out in the Far East (China, India...) with the previous revolts in Latin America, in Africa, or in Greece and in French suburbs? Which difference can there be between the struggles of proletarians in Tunisia, in Egypt, and in Syria, with those of the proletariat today in Bolivia? And in the United States, who can make us believe that the national wealth of the economy can impede the misery of the proletarians and that the revolt is not inevitable? We predict the contrary: proletarians in the United States or in the "rich" Germany will also be forced to join the revolt that has been already waged by their class brothers and sisters. They don't have any different reasons, they don't have any different methods, they don't have any different enemy, and they don't have any different perspectives. If the revolt doesn't break out yet at the same time, it's on the one hand because of the ability of world Capital to attack the proletariat little by

little, to space out austerity plans (ability which is decreasing because of the capitalist catastrophe itself)<sup>4</sup>, thanks to the instructions of counterinsurgency apparatuses, and on the other hand because of the organisational inability of the proletariat to centralise its own struggles, because of our own weaknesses to act in force as a class, that is to say because of the historical disorganisation of the proletariat as a revolutionary party.

Obviously in those valiant proletarian struggles in the Middle East a “dictator” always appears as the main enemy; but this “dictator” doesn’t only result from a national oppression and lesser from a particular killing frenzy. Indeed exploitation and oppression at a local level are nothing but representations of world Capital. At a more concrete level the political oppression of the dictatorships in question has been systematically imposed and reproduced by the big world imperialist powers (the USA, European States, Israel...). Everywhere French, English, North American, Israeli militaries have taught and applied this basic recipe of international democracy based upon torture and State terror. The weapons used for the repression in the whole Middle East are coming from France, the USA, and Spain... The whole democratic domination of world capitalism is based on that international State terror! They were those who formed and trained

---

<sup>4</sup> That is to say it is still possible for sectors of the bourgeoisie in some regions to not apply the austerity plans that are essential. While using carrots and tricks the bourgeoisie tries that some sectors of the proletariat don’t feel to be concerned by what happens to the rest of the world proletariat. Historically it’s on this principle that the countries working as repressive gendarmes in other parts of the world are managing and fuelling the complicity of “their” proletarians, which is essential for fulfilling that repugnant function. But this depends on that ability to grant certain benefits or union reforms to their proletarians; and even that, as it happens in countries like the United States and in Europe, it is difficult nowadays to maintain for the corresponding bourgeoisies.

death squads in Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Brazil, but also in Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen... The model is the same; the interests defended are the same: i.e. capitalism at any cost and whatever happens. Political murders, torture, disappearance of people as a method of domination and oppression are not an invention of Mubarak, Ben Ali, Gaddafi,... but the general method of domination, which is characteristic of the capitalist civilization imposed through violence and guaranteed on the five continents by the European powers, the USA, Russia, Israel...

They can always talk about dictatorship! Which dictatorship has never been supported by democrats all over the world? Indeed democracy, which is the Capital’s way of life and domination, is always dictatorial. State terror has always been the essence of the capitalist mode of production at the international scale.

They bombard us with disgusting pictures of such or such despot so that we forget the main universal despot they are going on to support: i.e. despotism of Capital’s profit, tyranny of capitalist market!

One of the best syntheses of this ABC of the struggle can be found in a leaflet in Spanish from “the friends of October” we largely reproduce in a box in the next page.

Against all the separations the revolutionaries claim that “it’s the humanity rising up against the tyranny of economy”; against all the geographical limitations the community of struggle yells that the struggle is everywhere the same; against all democratic takeover the proletarian militants claim that we struggle to destroy the system; against those who falsify the reality of our class brothers and sisters in struggle from Middle East to Asia the revolutionaries claim that the struggle is one and the same; against those who divide the proletariat into sociological strata

the protagonists all over the world claim that we are one and the same community of struggle rising up against the dictatorship of capitalism.

## **THE FORCE OF THE REVOLT**

The force of the revolt comes from this universal content, and that although the proletarians’ opinion wasn’t democratically canvassed (as it could suit their enemies), the proletarians from all those countries meet up in the struggle for their own interests. The force of the revolt is that none of the State powers in the world could stop it. And in the “Arab world” absolutely all these powers are present!

The force of the revolt leans on that organic nature of the proletariat’s action struggling everywhere for its interests and it started because of a generalized increase in the prices of an important part of vital commodities. The unified power of the bourgeoisie didn’t succeed at all in limiting the revolt neither to a national level, a regional one or in a religious way.

Everywhere they talk about the domino effect, about imitation, and infection. In fact it’s about one and the same interest, one movement and mutual stimulation, one organic nature based on the common interests and where each part feels to be a part of the whole.

The historical negation of the proletariat has been too strong so that this class calls itself by its name and proclaims the historical and unavoidable necessity of the communist revolution, but it cannot be hidden that in all the countries the stimulation of the proletarians in struggle has transcended national boundaries and that little by little the real protagonists assert themselves as a part of one and only one movement against the power. We cannot deny the real symbiosis of all

the “national factions”<sup>5</sup> of a class that has neither factional interests, nor national ones, and that struggles against the whole social system. The great majority of the protagonists didn’t yet proclaim that they want to abolish Capital and the State, but these proletarians in the practice don’t doubt to feel being a part of the same struggle against the dictatorial status quo that prevents to live. Moreover, for the first time since a long time, there is a feeling of social force overcoming boundaries and confronting the power.

This will remain a secret for the analysts and sociologists, experts in changes, but for social fighters who are confronting armed capitalism all over the world, it already ended to be a secret and the feeling to belong to one and the same community of struggle starts to assert itself.

This qualitative element that our enemies are still able to hide more or less, and whose foundation is the identity of interests and perspectives, was also developed by the quality and the type of the revolt. Indeed they couldn’t trap mottos like “*we are fed up!*” or “*get out, may all of them get out!*” within any confines or national flag.

In fact the movement showed not only it was tired of the ruling tyrants, but also of all those who asked our class fellows to be patient, resigned, submitted and therefore to behave like good citizens. And let’s remember that Islam is and precisely represents this conformism, that the word “Islam” is derived from an Arabic

---

<sup>5</sup> The classic denomination of “national factions” corresponds to a certain level of organisation of the bourgeoisie, in its struggle with other factions as well as to exploit and dominate the proletariat. When this denomination is used for the proletariat, that has neither factional interests, nor national ones, it’s in reality to deny the proletariat, or better said, it’s to imagine it subjected to the interests of the bourgeoisie. The constitution of the proletariat as a class and therefore as a party is in fact the negation of all those factionalisms.

### **Maghreb and Middle East: Re-emergence of the proletariat**

Since December 2010 the flame of the revolt is spreading across countries of the Maghreb like wildfire. Echoes of the revolt pass over all geographical limits, while reaching other neighbour countries where the voices of their inhabitants and the sound of the swords begin to be heard, making beat the hearts of their class brothers who accept the challenge of also confronting the capitalist tyranny to defend their living conditions.

The international bourgeoisie meets day after day to manage how confronting the revolt; at the same time the weapons of democracy have been displayed all over the territory: the militaries led the repression in the streets during weeks, the faces of the various governments change every hour, the bourgeois alternatives are lining up and try to seduce the rebels, the promises of reforms are piling up one after the other, the democratic fundamentalism is renewed, the transformation into an inter-bourgeois conflict tries to force its way through...

The international media of our enemies hasn’t stopped to manoeuvre and indoctrinate in order to hide the real cause of the revolt. Firstly it brought discredit on it while depicting it as a “typical expression of uncivilized population peculiar to underdeveloped countries”; then it had to qualify it as a Tunisian revolt “in favour of more freedom”; and later it said the same thing about Egypt. Today the struggle for democratic rights is the media resort. As the other tools of Capital, the media tries to wedge in the revolt, to impede that it continues spreading like the plague, to prevent that the proletarians of other countries could identify with the protests and that we could take to the streets to confront our oppressors. It’s one of the methods par excellence to face the proletarian struggles: to suppress them in the quarantine lines of a country.

And even so, the fire continues to spread. Tunisia, Algeria, Lebanon, Egypt, Jordan, Libya, Mauritania, Oman, Yemen, Syria, Morocco, Kuwait or Palestine, in a very intense struggle or a lesser one, showed that the proletariat is only waiting a little signal to do battle.

The great extension of the revolt is ruining the intoxication of the means of information, showing that the uprising corresponds to criteria quite different from those they want to sell us, criteria that affect all the proletarians in this world, and that because deep-rooted in this system are calling into question the foundations which this miserable world is built on: i.e. social classes.

The abolition of class society is the essence of the revolt. If the proletarians from all those countries take to the streets, it’s not for the simple rejection of the president or the government in power, it’s not because of some irregularities that occurred in the management, it’s not for the democratic freedoms, or any other local particularity. The essence of the revolt is the same than in Greece some years ago, the same than what happened in the recent protests in Europe, or those that are running through the countries of Latin America. It’s the rejection to accept the brutality of the economic crisis that crushes us everywhere, it’s the rejection to continue suffering the capitalist system of exploitation and domination, and it’s the rejection to continue living where it’s impossible to live. It’s the re-emergence of the proletariat that, after years of social peace, is coming back as a nightmare before the eyes of its masters who thought it has been dead and buried, to take up its historical role again: i.e. sending all class society back to the history museum. It’s finally the humanity rising up against the tyranny of economy.

**“Amigos de octubre”**

[amigosdeoctubre@gmail.com](mailto:amigosdeoctubre@gmail.com)

word which literally means “submission”, meaning “to God”. The proletariat totally ignored the Islamite militants and other democrats when, instead of “struggling” democratically and wishing “to change the world” with votes or with prayers to the gods, it took to the streets and fought openly. Against the State terror, the proletariat assumed the necessity of proletarian violence. Ignoring all kind of pacifist, Islamite and other democrat containment, our class got organized for an open struggle against the State, in which neither the armed groups nor the determined actions of proletarian minorities were lacking. While responding to the social necessities, these minorities planned and assumed decisive actions against the State. The struggle is each time more antagonistic towards the bourgeois democratic consultants; the proletariat everywhere got organized outside and against the parties, official unions and the democratic opposition<sup>6</sup>. Against the world of commodity, hunger and State terror, the proletariat opposed and continues to oppose the revolutionary violence.

The historical importance of this general antagonism between the proletariat generalizing its struggle and the dictatorship of world economy has been underlined by revolutionary and internationalist organizations in other parts of the world.

---

<sup>6</sup> In some cases, structures arise, assuming a decisive function for the radicalisation of the proletariat, expressing the necessity of the proletarians to join forces for the struggle, as well as the necessity of the bourgeoisie to respond to this radicalisation with more radical containments. It will be the development of this contradiction that will lead to the explosion. In some structures it will be possible that forms or expressions of the proletarian autonomy affirm themselves, although in certain circumstances. But most of them if they are not yet bourgeois will be taken over and will affirm themselves as new unions and parties that change some details so that the essential thing remains as it is.

Contrarily to those apologists of the “citizens’ peaceful revolution”, all the important things the proletariat did has been done outside and against the law. The key of the revolt has precisely been this collective and widespread disobedience of all the citizens’ democratic advices. The demonstrations were forbidden, the prisoners were not released by laws and amnesties but they were snatched from the jails by their comrades and relatives. Proletarians had no democratic right to take to the streets and get organized, and even less to attack and burn down palaces, police stations, jails, premises of special corps, law courts... The organization of the proletariat as a crushing force against oppression and State terror has never been authorized, nor allowed, nor legalized by anybody. It has been assumed and boosted by determined minorities!

Nobody can deny that this dispelling of fear, facing the unified State terror, spread like wildfire, and that when in one or another country the proletariat emerged in the streets and the repression began to be destabilized, it gave courage to proletarians of the other countries and at the same time it destabilized the other States in the region, as well as the international imperial policy that offered them some support. More than a contagion or a domino effect we should talk about organic nature, unity of interest and perspective. Each victory becomes a milestone and an example, each qualitative leap becomes a revolutionary boost. The destruction of each apparatus of terror<sup>7</sup> is a living illustration of what can be made everywhere and constitutes a powerful call

---

<sup>7</sup> In the most global sense it’s clear that the proletariat has not destroyed the general apparatus of the terrorist State. But we want to underline here the cases in which the action of the proletariat paralysed, disorganized and eliminated the “esprit de corps” (thanks to indiscipline and defeatism in the repressive ranks), destroying this way its prime and essential function: i.e. to repress.

for the real unification of the class. In some countries jails are becoming empty of prisoners; happiness is coming back in proletarian homes. Torturers all over the world, may you live in fear and tremble... Let’s burn down and blow up all the bastions of State terror!<sup>8</sup>

It’s also a part of the biggest secrets of an essential part of the world counterinsurgency policy. For that reason it’s necessary to yell this very clearly: insofar as the proletariat was decisive and gained in vigour (precisely because it didn’t behave in a democratic way, because it rejected this behaviour of civilized animal that is the citizen) and that this feeling of strength transcended national boundaries, the international counterrevolution began to understand that it was no longer enough with sacrificing such or such regional tyrant, that it was no longer enough to support such or such agent of local Capital, but rather that we can see the beginnings of a general threat against the bourgeois order and against the world democratic State terror. Local mottos like “get out”, “may him get out”, “may all of them get out” (as it was said some years ago in South America) have been felt by those who yelled them, as well as by those who were targeted by them, for what they really are: international mottos, expression of the necessity and international collective rage.

---

<sup>8</sup> This feeling of power against the oppression continues being deepened while becoming more explicit all over the world when we write these lines (April 2011). The rage against repression cannot be stopped with boundaries. We feel once again the fraternity (even in an incipient way) facing the tyranny of the whole social system. The jubilation when a tyrant is ousted or a jail is emptied or a bastion of the tyranny is burned down, this jubilation spreads and is waved like a flag in other parts of world. In China proletarians take to the streets with banners referring to those who struggle in the “Arab world”. And in this “Arab world” they are going on struggling fiercely. If a centre of revolt is cooling down, another is breaking out again, where the pseudo-changes are denounced.

Of course each of those sentences or mottos can be interpreted in its most restricted, pacifist and limited shape as it's done by all the forces of the counterrevolution (the media translates: "the demonstrators asked for So-and-so's renouncement" and "free elections"). They can also be interpreted in a more or less centrist way ("against such a party", "against corruption"). Or they can be grasped for what they really contain: calling into question the whole power, the whole oppression, and the whole society. Those "readings" or interpretations of course correspond to the class interests of those who make them: it's normal that those who have the power in the world distort these mottos as if "they ask for such a dictator's renouncement", as it's normal from our class point of view that we appreciate and live them as a qualitative leap in the struggle against Capital and the world State.

In some cases, so that the enemy couldn't swindle and distort the mottos, the protagonists on each barricade (as we do where we

can!) try to be more explicit and clearly express that they won't be satisfied with half-measures, that they don't accept a simple change of the ruler or dictator. The motto "*Que se vayan todos*" ("*May all of them get out*") yelled in Argentina in 2001/2002 explicitly means that the struggle is against the whole political system. In previous revolts in Algeria the proletarians clearly said "**Power murderer**", and now they express openly that the whole social system must disappear. "*Get out*" is now combined with the system: "**Get out the system!**"

### **The counterinsurgency**

*From falsification to change so that everything remains the same, from change to imperialist war.*

**F**irst they deny the movement or the reasons of this one, then they falsify it and boost some change so that everything remains as it is, and finally in a third phase when the alleged change is called into question and the movement continues to

assert itself, it's always the same strategy that is imposed: i.e. turning the social protest into inter-bourgeois contradiction, going to the superior phase, the imperialist open military action whose objective is the transformation of the revolution into imperialist war, the elimination of the proletarian force and its repolarization in two opposing imperialist camps.

Everything done by the bourgeoisie in the world is against the proletarian movement. All repression, falsification of the information, call for elections and political changes, all war actions... are actions that belong to a general strategy of response to the movement: i.e. they are counterinsurgency strategies. At the centre of this strategy there is the disinformation, the production of alternative ideologies, the necessity to deny the proletariat as a class. Everything is made to deprive the historical enemy of its general perspective, to try to impede the radicalisation and extension.

These are the guiding lines for the intense international mobilization which is fundamentally orchestrated by the Gendarme-States in an hidden way (secret diplomacy, intelligence service, operations of specialized military corps, politico-military experts in counterinsurgency) as well as in an open way (both inside and outside the country in question), trying to impose a "political realism" that invariably consist in resorting to the classic old trick: i.e. changing a little something so that everything remains the same. All the means of information are well-oiled for reciting the same speech and getting in tune with a new official speech. In fact, it's already more than one decade that the ruling class has started again to talk about a change in the pipeline, an alternative option that counterinsurgency services knew to be unavoidable. It's not by chance if "the change" has been the dominant speech of Lula, Obama and ruling factions all over the world.

### **Another example of the role played by the bourgeois media in the reproduction of this society**

In Algeria, since decades, the proletariat hasn't stopped defining itself as a class, it always affirmed its autonomy facing its oppressors and exploiters, and it has never stopped opposing its own class interests to the interests of capitalism.

That's how emerged the motto "POWER MURDERER" which didn't only centralize the struggles in Algeria, but also pointed out the State and its terror as being the enemy to confront, to destroy. The murderer is clearly the POWER and not only one or another government.

Up to France, in various demonstrations in solidarity with the proletarian struggle in Algeria, the proletariat chants this motto. And the yelling are not only targeting the government faction but also the alternative ones, including Trotskyites and other Social Democrats. How clearly our class fellows point out their enemies... This motto has also been used again by proletarians in Egypt and in other countries of the region.

A team of French journalists covered demonstrations in Algeria. And whereas the proletarians yelled, in French, "POWER MURDERER", the journalists didn't do anything else than "translating" this motto, also in French, in "GOVERNMENT MURDERER" and commenting they were "struggling to change Buteflika, for more democracy..."

Merchants at the service of Capital, as agents of this power, they try as always and unscrupulously to transform our struggles, and our class mottos, into inter-bourgeois struggles.

In this way, Social Democracy undoubtedly has not lost its historical role of the party for containing and eliminating the proletariat. On the contrary, with the unification of the program of the

whole bourgeoisie, its function is assumed much more generally by all those factions of Capital which talk about reforms, changes, anti-imperialism. The matter is not that Social Democ-

racy would adopt a middle-class outlook (as it is supposed by those who say that it has become more neoliberal, whereas it has always been bourgeois), but rather that the situation has become so critical for the political domination that an always growing number of factions of the party of the classic order have introduced "the change" in their speeches, assuming and occupying thus the classic functions of Social Democracy.

This speech for "the change" is completely logical in face of the explosion in the "Arab world". When the calling into question of the proletariat in the streets proved to be unstoppable and widespread, we "began to realize", through the media they control, that the regimes they have always supported now were "corrupt", that there was "excessive personal enrichment", that there was a "disregard for the people", that there was a "genuine nepotism", that it was about a genuine "autocracy", that there was a genuine "kleptocracy" (a government of kleptomaniac). When they arrive to an extreme degree, those same and cynic media confessed what they always hid: "in fact, it was about genuine dictatorships". Obviously the problem for capitalism is not sacrificing a government faction that is now unable to continue ensuring social peace after decades' loyal service, but rather constituting an alternative and controlling the process.

They can talk of nothing else than "international community", "democratic States", "entente between nations", as if there is really another capitalist community than that against us. With this empty and cynic verbiage, they look for hiding the war of vultures on the watch, which are coveting the place left vacant in order to profit from raw material and the exploitation of human beings. The disgusting world stemming from the new sharing out of the booty, with its mercantile agreements, its commercial and military agreements, its col-

### **THE TIME-LAGS BETWEEN DIFFERENT MEASURES OF AUSTERITY**

Before the bourgeoisie could really show different faces, there were relatively different economical policies. Although the right and the left always represented the same thing about the basic points, they could be distinguished by different social economical plans: some were more liberal, others were more Keynesian, that is to say that some directly followed the diktats of the profit rate, others had understood that in the medium term it was better to create a purchase capacity to improve this profit rate. This is the reason why some were in favour of tightening one's belt and others praised a certain general well-being as better way of improving the capitalist profit. On the other hand, faced with the widespread catastrophe of the world capitalist system, the politics of the bourgeoisie is one and the same. Even in the short term and although the long-winded speeches are made to sound like being different (and even being an opposition), the politics of the bourgeoisie is now of total austerity for the proletariat (what the bourgeois call "liberalism" or "neo-liberalism", as if there is something new...), because ultimately the policy of the International Monetary Fund is nowadays adopted everywhere. Which always implies a bigger deterioration of all the means of existence and forms of life, contamination of the whole existence (what we eat, what we breathe, what we drink...), more people "living on the margins of society" and sleeping in the street, more control, more repression, more refugees and undocumented, more democratic speeches, more jails and psychiatric hospitals, and more State terror. Find a single country where it doesn't happen this way...

And however they don't confess it. The fact that everywhere it's the same economic policy, and that the whole bourgeois factions end up doing the same thing, this is the genuine secret of domination. Why?

Because if they would confess that Capital attacks everywhere the living conditions of humanity, Capital would lose its legitimacy, because to reproduce domination and exploitation in the current situation of extreme disaster, it is indispensable to maintain the appearance of an opposition in the power. And to this end, although the measures to be imposed to the humanity are exactly the same ones, the international services of counterinsurgency (included and very especially the world means of disinformation) advise that these measures not to be imposed everywhere at the same time. Otherwise, it would be too easy for the proletariat to identify itself as a class, to get organized as such, to recognize its historical enemy.

It's indispensable to confuse everything, to create other faces, other oppositions, other channelling. Although nowadays there is only one economic policy (always against the proletariat!), although the real unification of the world State is more completed than ever, although international organisms of economic policy rule over each small State (International Monetary Fund, World Bank, international banks like ECB or the IBD, international Unions...), although the counterinsurgency services are also exactly the same everywhere (centralized for example by the Pentagon acting and leading the repressive services of more than 100 countries), the most open antihuman measures appear with different faces and everything is done for these measures not being enforced at the same time. Although the general militarization of life is a general plan and the political plans obey to this all over the planet (what is currently done in this way in Brazilian shanty towns is monstrous!), they attack us in a separate way, while repressing sector after sector, country after country, region after region.

laborations between torturers and death squads, all that is covered by this very “community of nations” denouncing such or such dictator.

At the same time bourgeois factions are reorganizing things between each other and building a political alternative, they are “politicizing” the proletarian movement in the sense to confine it to the bourgeois policy. It’s about considering the material reasons of the struggle and therefore its revolutionary perspective of secondary importance. Instead of that, Kautsky- or Lenin-style politicians, intellectuals, media introduce ideology in proletarians’ awareness. They explain that the important thing is not their immediate or economic interests but the political interests, the “democratic changes”.

Ideologically, to take away from the movement its radical nature, it is reduced to a struggle against such or such individual and simultaneously it is purged of all its class components, especially proletariat’s radical violence. They deny the obvious, they lament about “excesses”, they misrepresent the minority action, and they condemn the “uncontrolled” and generally speaking all actions of class outflanking. They come to systematically lump the most radical sectors of the proletariat (which in fact were the most determined ones to arrive to this situation) and such or such a repressive action.

Terror actions of the State repressive apparatus against such or such smallholder or against entire neighbourhoods are presented as being similar and identified with actions of the most determined insurgent groups. Targets of the proletariat’s rage, either “economical” or “political” ones, are systematically falsified or hidden because its genuine knowledge could be used as an example and contribute to the extension of the movement.

The best way of weakening a movement always consist in

praising its weaknesses. Our movement is dissected, what’s inseparable for us is separated (like the immediate interests of our class from historical ones), our subversion is devitalized and dismembered so that the lifeless pieces can after be sewed up again together with reformist bastards. In this way, they are building, under the means of disinformation spotlight, a creature worthy of Frankenstein they will shamelessly baptize after the name “revolution”, to which they add comforting, colourful and florid terms like “jasmine”, “democratic”, “Arabic”.

This Frankenstein’s work becomes a spectacle and a universal star by all the media, thanks to the whole power to bring discredit on all practice that doesn’t correspond to that of good citizens. It also translates in its own dominant language all demand expressed by the movement into a good citizens’ reform<sup>9</sup>. This way the struggle “against the power” is translated into “a request that such or such a dictator gives up”. The confrontation with the State is translated into “demonstrators claiming democratic elections”, the protests against the increases in prices into “necessity of changes in the economic policy”...

The success in the counterinsurgent strategy is not to be considered in the ability of the State and the ruling class to make the disinformation channels working as one, because indeed that’s routine, but in imposing this fully ideological representation (a “Frankenstein’s one”) of the movement as a material force acting in and against the very movement. The representation the movement makes about itself, about its force and its potential but also its contradictions is indeed a substantial part of the balance of forces between the classes.

Therefore the revolutionary fervour that arises in such region will in some places boost the movement whilst in other places the State succeeds to distort this fervour... The key of the success for this manoeuvre is obviously the renouncement of the struggle, the reproduction of the ideas of the ruling class and mainly the idea that the movement can be fully carried out only as a political opposition movement within capitalism.

With a same fervour moving back, while giving up its struggle and the class interests at stake when confronting violently the State despotism, the proletariat is “invited” to grasp the reforms as an application (of course insufficient but at least “realistic”) of its desires. And it is commanded to go back home, to go back to work and to trust parliamentarianism and this providential “opposition”, promoted by all the means of production of information.

This is in fact what the bourgeoisie demands from us: letting our heart beating of rage against this world be broken and accepting that instead they transplant a pacemaker beating to the pace of capitalist valorisation and following the schedules of political reforms.

Simultaneously a “political opposition” is (re)formed and financed, as credible as possible (while honouring it with the presence of victims –Social Democrats and pacifists- of the repression of the fallen regime) whose weighty task will be to swallow up the proletarian desires and demands, and to vomit a spectacle of reforms with national liberation undertones against the imperialist yoke, with national economy undertones looking anew towards the domestic needs, etc., with the eternal promise that a prosperous future will follow the days of sacrifice.

Among this package of reforms, the worn-out card of the “Constituent Assembly”, Social Democratic old song (taken up with

<sup>9</sup> Read the text “Demand and reform”, available on our web site.

conviction at the time by Lenin until he had to give up under the revolutionary pressure of the proletariat), seems to still have good times ahead at the funeral of the struggles.

Considering that the manoeuvre is accomplished enough (while pulling out all the stops about the means available in the media, military, diplomatic and political forms, which are not separated in the practice) and with the purpose to consolidate it, the world political leaders develop then remarkable ends, praising the so-called “democratic revolution” in progress, greeting the courage and self-abnegation of the people to oust the tyrants, condemning the violence (of course “disproportionate” or “indiscriminate”) of the “regimes” with which those same leaders signed economic and military treaties only yesterday whose ink of blood is still fresh.

Confronting alarming circumstances, the bourgeoisie adapts its mechanisms to isolate the struggles and to separate those “here” from those “there”. It tries to hide the real process behind a double curtain of smoke: the usual speech on the otherness of the “Arab world”, the “Arab regimes”, the “Arab revolts” is substituted by a repugnant apology of a democratic and progressive community of destiny and desire, praising an identity with the “Arab people”, which should follow the same historical steps than us, illuminated by our famous Eurocentric “Enlightenment”.

### **Democracy**

Let us therefore synthesize the important role played by the international democracy as a counterinsurgency method. This can be described at many levels:<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> As for any enumeration of this kind the points cannot be separated. It's about facets of one and the same reality; it's about successive and complementary

★ Before anything, they shoot at the protest when it becomes really strong. The unanimous reaction of the States and the universal mercantile democracy (all of them and everywhere!) is always to send their shock troops, to heavily shoot at the social movement, to torture, to eliminate people, etc. In this first phase (that sometimes lasts for decades!) there is not any demarcation with the tyrant, but he is rather recognized for what he has always been: a part of the totality. Democracy arms the tyrants, it forms and trains death squads, it heavily murders, it shoot at demonstrations...<sup>11</sup>

★ When the movement cannot be controlled anymore, they distinguish themselves from the most hated dignitaries as the best way of containing the movement and imposing the democratic horizon: i.e. overthrowing “the tyrant” to conquer the “democratic revolution” (the one about which the current colonizers say: “we, the civilized countries, achieved it 100, 200 or 300 years ago!”).

★ Democracy freshens up and takes a new face, as supposed to be an alternative one to the State terror, as being the alleged purpose of all the revolts. With this new face, democracy is in fact a genuine rampart (defended by well-armed guards!) that seeks to be insurmountable.

★ Democracy acts then as a counterinsurgency power at another level: inasmuch as it is applied as a method of dilution of the class into atomized individuals, the class is condemned. Paramilitary troops, special units of the international security forces

---

expressions of what is essential in the mercantile bourgeois domination, in the capitalist social and political oppression.

<sup>11</sup> We should not have to forget that the democratic and populist Obama ratified all that the USA did before him in Africa, in the Near East and the Arabian Peninsula, including the unconditional support to the massacres made by each of those States, by each of those dictators and very particularly those carried out by Israel.

(from England, United States, Israel...) and national ones (Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iran...) execute actions against people and infrastructures that affect the population, trying to create a general confusion and to lump those actions and the determined actions of the proletarian minorities together.

★ Democracy, presented as a method of decision, acts while seeking to paralyze and turn the vanguard away from the rest of the proletariat while accusing it for not respecting “the majority opinion”. In this sense, democracy is a power disorganizing militarily and politically the opponent.

★ At the same time democracy works for encouraging the whole social spectrum that is opposed to the revolutionary action; it brings discredit on and isolate (while presenting it as an “excess”) any classist expression that organically assumes the subversive interests of the movement under way. Democracy is opposed by all possible means to the needs of negation, destruction contained in any healthy movement!

★ Democracy promotes the lowest common denominator of the struggles, as a result of which the qualitative rupture is liquidates in the individual addition, indispensable basis for the reproduction of bourgeois domination. It's the very expression of evolution and progress being opposed to the revolutionary negation.

★ Finally democracy prepares the political change to impose anew the terrifying world of resignation, submission, exploitation, that of the citizen.

All of those plans have been used since the beginning to calm down and contain the revolts of the proletariat in the Middle East, including the superior level of the counterinsurgency strategy which consists in transforming social war into imperialist war. That is the supreme objective of



Capital, because it's that liquidating totally the proletariat as a class opposed to the whole bourgeoisies and all the States, while imposing anew an inter-bourgeois, and ultimately an inter-imperialist, polarization.

In the current international situation, alone the opposition of the proletariat to that transformation can stop the war, and reciprocally the whole current struggle of the proletariat contains the tendency to liquidate those wars and to impose the social revolution.

### **IMPERIALIST INTERESTS AND GENERAL INTERESTS OF CAPITAL**

As we have already developed in other occasions, total Capital is nothing else than capitals in competition and opposition, each atom of Capital contains the imperialist war. Although each faction of Capital goes to war for what each faction wants to impose, the general interest of Capital is achieved in war. Imperialist war is always a war against the proletariat. In the heat of the generalization of the international proletariat's movement, the imperialist war is objectively the ultimate weapon to destroy the social revolution, while channelling the proletarians and alienating them into the imperialist forces, while leading the alienated masses under national and imperial flags to the generalized slaughter. The transformation of the international revolt of the proletariat into an inter-bourgeois war is for that reason the real objective of the whole inter-imperialist polarization.

Beyond the struggle for raw materials and the conquest of markets, beyond the rupture of alliances and the re-forming of new and various imperial constellations, the whole propaganda tries to impose those inter-capitalist contradictions in order to deny the general objectives of the pro-

### **The historical creation of the polarisation fascism vs. antifascism was going the same way**

The democratic State (there's only one State), e.g. the Spanish Republic, assumes the open repression of the proletarian struggles, and during which particularly bloodthirsty sectors and forces are standing out. However all of them are involved in this repression and it's the most famous republicans who give orders to shoot, orders that the generals execute (like in Casa Viejas in 1933 and in Asturias in 1934).

The repression is questioned, denounced and confronted, prompting consequently a radicalization of the social movement. It's at that point that a faction of that State tries to accuse another one of having carried out this repression, of being tyrannical, dictatorial, fascist... Using the best defensive strategy, the State splits up, divides into two and presents the other part as an alien and different body and which doesn't issue from it. "Antifascism" can thus wash its face and hands after the bloodshed it caused and create a spectre with something worse than it, i.e. "fascism". "It's not us who committed these atrocities; it's the Fascist generals who did." Yesterday they were all of them hand in glove, Alcala Zamora with Franco, Stalin with Hitler, Allende with Pinochet, Obama with Ben Ali, Sarkozy with Mubarak, Berlusconi with Gaddafi... and together they feasted the same banquets while proletarians were slaughtered.

In the third act clothes and costumes have already been changed to remove from them the dry blood. They have been washed with all kind of bleaches like the denunciation against "the dictators", "the fascists", "the corrupted"... Quite clean thanks to the denunciations and speeches, they get ready to "help the people in its struggle for democracy"... With the same weapons they used yesterday against us, they pretend now to defend us and want to "abolish the tyranny". They are looking for the complicity of proletarians all over the world so that they contribute to that new war, either actively or simply while being good workers, citizens, taxpayers and TV viewers.

In fact, they are imposing the fourth act, the grimmest one: the transformation of the struggle between antagonistic social classes into a struggle between bourgeois factions, they are recruiting for the war between bourgeois factions, they recruit for the war between bourgeois factions, between opposed imperialist forces. The elimination of the proletariat that they didn't achieve with direct repression is now within their reach with the "anti-dictatorship" crusade, through the breakdown of the class into an anti-dictator front, through the recruitment in the antifascist one-front. The purpose is the elimination of the proletariat as a class, in a bloodbath between partisans and opponents of such or such dictator. The final purpose of Capital is the disappearance of the proletariat as an antagonistic class against the established order, in an imperialist war between fascism and anti-fascism. The war against Franco, Hitler or Mussolini... cost not only 60 millions of deaths, but also the disappearance of the proletariat of the historical scene for decades. Stalin, Truman and Wilson left that gigantic slaughter as winners, i.e. with concentration camps, atomic bombs, new wars and tortures as the usual system against the oppressed. There's nothing to choose between antifascism and fascism.

letarian revolt, those concerning the whole human race.

The action of the various bourgeois factions for the defence of their specific interests coincides with the interest of the bourgeoisie in containing the proletariat while dissolving it in different alliances or fronts (until transforming it into a single addition

of citizens), and at the same time it's the very expression of the deep nature of Capital that contains the war and the necessity of destroying the proletariat as a force in formation.

Against all the current proletarian struggles, this ineluctable tendency of Capital acts to encourage the imperialist war and

destroy the proletariat as an autonomous class. In that way and as an ineluctable tendency of Capital against the proletariat, the case of Libya is symbolic. Indeed it's in this country that the qualitative leap in the application of the counterrevolutionary violence of the international imperialist powers takes an open form. Indeed it's where the civil population is bombed with long-range weapons, leaving no other option than to struggle against those who drop the bombs; it's where imperialist gangs confronting each other appear the most clearly.

However we should not forget that the imperialist war is only a generalization of the war among bourgeois factions with which the bourgeoisie always responds to the uprisings everywhere. We should not forget that since the beginning the bourgeois answer to the proletarian uprising in the "Arab world" tries by all possible means to contain them into inter-

bourgeois contradictions. The general way for eliminating a bourgeois faction considered as being too much "dictatorial" is nothing else than to wash the face of the old faction. This whole process always contains the capitalist interest to channel the proletariat into inter-bourgeois gangs confronting each other. And ultimately in each of those countries all the imperialist powers and interests confronting each other are acting and seeking a fair share of the cake after some changes in the situation.

The imperialist armed actions didn't begin when they told us that the UN, the NATO, the USA, England, France, etc. began to drop bombs against the territory and people in Libya. There were military actions, especially made by special forces and counterinsurgency units from those powers in the very Libyan territory much before and their actions against the population were denounced everywhere in many

media (not in mainstream ones). In other countries the direct military presence of the international gendarmes is permanent and of course they are part of the counterinsurgency forces, while defending the particular interests of these respective powers, and sometimes of such or such Yankee, English or French oil or arms company. Nobody doubts about the importance of this presence and military action in Egypt or Saudi Arabia and their permanent action in those countries as well as in punctual operations of "preventive military invasion", as for instance the State of Saudi Arabia did against the movement of the proletariat in Bahrain. But once we clarified this, there cannot be any doubt that the qualitative leap in that militarist effort to destroy the autonomy of the proletariat is the very military action: the bombing and militarization of the whole political contradiction. When we write these lines we are in the

#### **About the National Transitional Council (NTC) in Libya**

It's obvious for us that the National Transitional Council is not an emanation of the struggle but a fully bourgeois, imperialist initiative, whose finality is to break the very real dynamics of centralization and coordination of the struggle. This Council is only one of the tips of the iceberg of counterinsurgency, in the sense that the Special Forces and English, French, American secret services also intervened early in the field. At the same time there was an international campaign of disinformation pushing everywhere the contradictions in the sense of a bourgeois takeover, of a new inter-imperialist polarization of the struggle (notably while trying to dissolve the proletariat in arms, its militias, into a regular army opposed to that of Gaddafi), to break the development of our class autonomy (notably in the various organizing initiatives of territorial struggle committees: cities, regions...).

The European media carefully avoided giving too much publicity about the service record of the members of this Council, and for a very good reason, because in addition of some human rights opponents playing their usual role, this Council is the pure product of a recruiting effort of first-rate Libyan leaders, politically and militarily supported by France, England and the United States, and among whom some already worked for the secret services of these countries. Here is a brief but eloquent presentation:

Since February 27<sup>th</sup>, *"the committee is set up and appoints Mustafa Abdeljalil to its head. He's the former Libyan Minister of Justice, i.e. a key man of Gaddafi's system. He's assisted by Abdelhafed Ghoga, a lawyer and human rights militant, who according to 'Le Monde' [French newspaper] is overtly hostile to him. On April 2<sup>nd</sup>, considering the internal tensions that destabilize the committee, the spokesman Mustafa Al-Gueriani announces the creation of a crisis staff of ten specialists, all Libyans who comes back from abroad with 'their know-how'. The council becomes henceforth the 'legislative organ' according to 'Le Monde' on April 5<sup>th</sup>, which presents also the 'Minister of Finance' of this new council, Ali Tarhuni, professor of economy in the USA, where he lived since thirty-five years until the last month. He's a partisan of ultra-liberalism, and the fact he's in charge with this ministry is a clear sign of the economic and social orientation of the group of Benghazi. At the head of the new committee there is henceforth Mahmud Jibril. He's a businessman already present in the old committee. Still according to 'Le Monde', "It's him who, with Ali Al-Essawi, former ambassador and henceforth Minister of Foreign Affairs, met the president Sarkozy on March 11<sup>th</sup> in Paris". In charge with the military affairs there is the general Abdul Fatah Younis, former Minister of Interior, present to the sides of Gaddafi since 1969 and the putsch that overthrew the monarchy. He has soldiers at his disposal, especially trained by the British SAS and French commandos, probably the 13<sup>th</sup> RDP, what compared with the military incompetence of the 'chebbabs' gives him in fact an advantage in the field, and therefore an advantage on a politic point of view."* (\*)

heat of the generalized imperialist aggression with the gross pretext of defending humans, although they don't hesitate in saying that if they won't invade other countries where nobody can hide the massacres like in Yemen, Syria... it's because there's no oil over there. The cynicism is such that even those who encourage to bomb openly admit that Libya is important *"for the good and light oil and not for the quantity or quality of the deaths killed by Mr. Gaddafi"*.

A systematic bombing of the cities as the gendarme powers are doing in Libya obviously makes the survival very difficult. And, although the struggle of the proletariat is an example to develop, if the proletarians from other countries don't impede this imperialist war against the proletariat in Libya, it's very difficult, if not impossible to maintain the class autonomy. Bombs, dead comrades and relatives, countless difficulties to be able to stay alive make the daily life a hellish one. Although it's known that both camps of the imperialist war are murderers, it's impossible to live and affirm the autonomy of the proletariat without impeding through force these international bombings.

In Libya the struggle of the proletariat had an exceptional development, going so far as to attack all-time repressive centres (e.g. Security headquarter), to surround and burn down barracks, to eliminate key persons of the repression and well-known torturers, to set on fire banks, courts, jails, police stations and centres of military police. During this development the proletariat got armed in an embryonic way and affirmed itself with a relative autonomy against the State action groups and other special forces of the Western powers that manoeuvred in the region. However, confronted with the systematic bombing of the imperialist powers, without the logistics of the imperialist forces in both camps, it's impossible for the proletariat to appear as an autonomous force and to acquire a power representing a credible opposition against the imperialist camps. The most elementary subsistence is completely disorganized in Libya by the imperialist force of international Capital and reorganized from abroad in the profit of capitalism. This (dis)organization by Capital (like in other wars against the revolution, e.g. Iraq in 1991) aims to objectively reduce the proletariat to people receiving aid. The pur-

pose of the State is always: *"May they give back their guns and we will give them food and we will nurse the wounded."* Bombs and organized charity, once again the carrot and stick approach tries to liquidate the class autonomy that has been developed against the regime.

Only the generalized collapse and revolutionary defeatism everywhere led by the proletariat in arms can reverse this process. Nevertheless, we find indispensable that a consequent struggle has to be developed by the proletariats whose States are intervening, which is regrettably not the situation. And it's precisely against this risk that those powers drop bombs from far because they fear a war of attrition for their militaries. If they are bombing Libya and not other countries, it's obviously not to defend people but, in addition to oil, in addition to the contradictions they can have with Gaddafi, in addition to the needs to polarize the society into inter-imperialist terms, it's because it's much easier to intervene only from a distance, in a country which is a desert and whose cities are located only the coast and are completely exposed to the bombings. The bourgeois militarist and gendarme option is much easier

Moreover, early April, the USA affirms that the CIA "coordinates" the movements of "rebels" in the field. The CIA really brought back to Benghazi a certain Khalifa Hifter, former leader of the Salvation National Front of Libya in the eighties, which was at the time the main anti-Gaddafi group financed by the United States, and who lived a quiet exile in Langley, Virginia since more than 20 years, in a genuine stronghold of the CIA. *"Al-Jazeera channel is the first to relay the information about his arrival in Benghazi on March 14<sup>th</sup>. Without referring to his adherence to the CIA, the 'Daily Mail' sings his praises on March 19<sup>th</sup>. Finally the warlord is interviewed by 'ABC News' the following Sunday night. (...) None of the media that published articles about him thought it was worth mentioning this information available on internet, nor to wonder how a Libyan soldier could go to live in the USA, whereas Libya was under military embargo and retaliatory measures after the bombing of Lockerbie. Nobody either was wondering how he arrived in Benghazi."* (\*)

All the rest is pure spectacle: since March 5<sup>th</sup>, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs follows the Franco-British and American score while greeting the setting up of the NTC. On his side, the staggering French philosopher, bootlicker and warmonger Bernard Henri-Levy ("BHL") fled to Benghazi and from there he called president Sarkozy *"as a citizen"*, adding his voice to the call to war in order to *"to avoid a horrible massacre"* (sic).

On March 10<sup>th</sup>, three eminent members of the NTC are welcomed in Paris by Sarkozy (with some ministers... and BHL) and declare when they left that *"France recognized the National transitional council as being the legitimate representative of the Libyan people"*. Great visionary as regards democratic benefits, BHL for his part already announces *"targeted airstrikes"* whereas there is not yet any agreement, neither at the European level nor at the NATO and the UN level, what will be done one week later, on March 18<sup>th</sup>.

(\*) Moulay Siba, *"Libya, the hidden side of a revolution"*, Indymedia, April 2011.

### **Libya: Inter-bourgeois competition and counterinsurgency**

History is fundamentally the history of class struggle, there is obviously no doubt about for us. It's precisely to hide this fact that the whole international means of disinformation are always mobilized (including "in the name of revolution") to present and stage or to "reveal" inter-bourgeois contradictions (between countries, coalitions, sectors, government and "opposition", etc.), which are real or merely spectacular, superficial or serious... behind which we are (exclusively) supposed to mobilize. To take a stand in this world can only be to take a stand for one or another of these bourgeois factions, for one or another egoistic interest within this society. For us on the contrary, to take a stand means to stand as a party... But our party, the one that subvert the social order, must stay officially non-existent. However for us the inter-bourgeois contradictions will never determine the content of the struggle of our class, nor the bourgeois necessity to crush it, but they only show which bourgeois factions or coalitions will come into play to recruit and repress the proletariat. Against those who, especially about Libya, deny the struggle of our class in the name of inter-bourgeois contradictions at work, as if both these aspects of the reality don't always co-exist in this society, we can on the contrary get the measure of these contradictions compared with the present wave of revolt.

In a case like that of Libya, which arouses strong international economical appetites, an opposition exists between the countries already in a good position for granting market shares as well as commercial and strategic agreements, and the other countries that try to take their place. This hierarchy obviously determines the political position of each partner, with all the flexibility that determines the life of States: for the sake of appearances, nothing else than principles, behind the scenes, nothing else than interests. Thus, the political status quo in Libya would rather have been in the interest of Italy, Russia and China and they chose to bet on Gaddafi's regime to stay in power. A new political order was rather in the interest of the United States, England and France (except of course at the cost of a revolutionary destabilization of the State), and they bet on the overthrow of Gaddafi in favour of a regime more favourable to their merchant ambitions (oil, armament, wheat...), as France did in Ivory Coast at the same time. Nobody has to wonder that the same Sarkozy hardly elected as French president in 2007 played first the card of reconciliation (at economic, military and police levels) with Libya of Gaddafi... That's fair enough... Anyway this option lied within the scope of the continuity of Franco-Libyan agreements since about forty years.

in Libya than elsewhere, for those who are in the war as well as for the proletarians who constitute the rearguard of the war, because this option can be lived from a distance, while pressing buttons, without living the horrors of war. Another thing would be for the imperialist powers and their rearguards would be to go helping militarily (in favour or against the government, never mind) the power in Egypt, Syria, Iran... where the armies would have to deeply advance in the country, and where (like it happens in Iraq and Afghanistan) the militaries would get bogged down in an endless intervention and where revolutionary defeatism could get generalized; all the more so in a wave of struggles as the current one where the international gendarme is confronted with massive social movements. This is the reason why it's necessary to say clearly the things: it's the international proletariat who can impede this imperialist action against the social movement and mainly the proletariat of the countries that act as gendarme powers; it's the struggle against

"its own" bourgeois, against "its own" States.

As we already said, in addition to the bombing in Libya the tendency to impose the imperialist war is everywhere. Although it was much less mediated than the "Libyan issue" the genuine military invasion of Bahrain by the State of Saudi Arabia has a huge strategic importance for containing the movement as well as generally speaking as a dress rehearsal for a large-scale imperialist repolarisation. This invasion represents without any doubt a decisive quality leap in the intrigues of capitalism against the proletariat because of the quantity and quality of the military presence of Saudi Arabia in Bahrain (while protecting at the same time the powerful US military base in Juffair which is a strategic centre of repression) against the proletarian demonstrations (in this very little country 1,000<sup>12</sup> strong militaries who are equipped with modern arms

<sup>12</sup> Some accusations uphold that in fact there are two or three times more of repressors sent to this country.

by the Western imperialist powers, it weighs a lot). It's also a qualitative leap because this invasion destabilizes and reconfigures the whole region at an inter-imperialist level, while affirming the pro-American and pro-European presence against the State of Iran, which from the outset reacted with accusations, declarations and thinly disguised threats to intervene in Saudi Arabia<sup>13</sup>.

It's in the same sense we have to grasp other military actions of the States of the region and the Western powers. At the same time, in defiance of all the criteria they pretend to defend, the hated French militaries didn't hesitate to shoot at people in Africa like for example in Ivory Coast. The change of a president for another didn't happen without arming one faction against another,

<sup>13</sup> We have to point out that the Iranian State is one of the few ones pretending to support the whole social movement in the "Arab and Muslim world" since it considers it as a "wave of Islamic resurgence", as a product of the "fall of influence of the United States and Europe in the region".

Facing the insurrectionary movement in Libya, France and England took the initiative, on the political, military and counterinsurgency levels, while being moreover supported by the UN and NATO (under American command).

The Russian, Italian or Chinese scenario was thus demolished: with or without taking into account the possibility of a wave of struggle as the nowadays one, this scenario betted whatever may happen with the capacity of Gaddafi's regime to remain in power, what constituted an uncertain bet to say the least.

In order to not be thrown on the scrap heap of war dividends, Italy has finally been forced to join the coalition and on February 28<sup>th</sup> to abandon its friendship treaty with Libya, which included many and lucrative economic cooperation agreements as well as the control of immigration, an euphemism for a particularly brutal, cynical and murderous policy of eviction towards Libya of the refugees who cross the Mediterranean Sea, policy that will surely be restored as soon as possible with the European support.

As for Russia and China, very involved in Libya (China had to evacuate from there no less than 36,000 nationals working in various companies), they first gave up vetoing the resolution 1973 of the UN in favour of the military intervention before criticizing its (very predictable) broadened interpretation made by the hegemonic NATO on the field. A similar moderate changeability has been observed on the side of Arabian States, as Saudi Arabia that supported the resolution of the UN while keeping militarily out of things as far as the enforcement of this resolution is concerned. It's necessary to say that these allies of the UN-NATO great humanitarian cause have a hard job in Bahrain they militarily occupy to suppress the uprising. In the big murderous cacophony of the market, there is indeed a crucial point on which States' violins are invariably in accordance: the superior imperative of the counterinsurgency.

without shooting at the population, without imposing the candidate and agent of the International Monetary Fund, and without putting the country to fire and sword. Although it was hidden beyond the forces of this president or dressed with the uniform of the United Nations, the age-old terrorism in Africa executed by the French State was predominant to preserve private property and is still and always the main guardian of bourgeois order.

### **PROLETARIAT: FORCES, WEAKNESSES AND PERSPECTIVES**

The proletariat can be defined as a class defending its vital interests against Capital. But obviously, it's not enough to impose its interests against capitalism and even less to destroy it. The historical power of the bourgeoisie did nothing but improve, developing its forces, ideologies, and specialized structures against all movement that seeks to subvert law and order.

So that the proletariat can triumph, it requires to be a more powerful force than its historical enemy, and although it has the strategic advantage of being the class that creates all the wealth

of this world, it's a fact that without the organization, the structuring, the directions, the awareness... which correspond to its interests and its revolutionary perspective, it cannot get rid of the bourgeois society. It's what the revolutionaries call the constitution of the proletariat as a class and therefore as a party opposed to the whole capitalist system social.

The current revolts of the international proletariat (mainly centred in the Maghreb and Middle-East but with a tendency to the generalization all over the world) possess the characteristics that we put forward since decades<sup>14</sup>. In this text we have spoken about the elements of force and underlined that the movement was stronger in terms of generalization, organic nature in the action, mutual stimulation...

Now we would like to speak a little bit about the weaknesses, while beginning to make clear that we cannot always do it, because it would bring us to repeat indefinitely on the same issue, without being able to give elements qualitatively different. Al-

though the forces can be very different in each movement, in each generalization or as now when the movement overcomes the national boundaries, the weaknesses are systematically the same ones. Indeed, when the movement starts, it can do it for local causes or for local realization of general causes, as it is with the widespread increases in prices of foodstuffs. But in both cases, there are always, when speaking about the forces, some characteristics which are different as for all resurgence, as if each rising of a movement would bring something relatively "new", "original".

The weaknesses, on the contrary, are globally the same ones, because it's as a world class that the proletariat has historically been defeated by the counter-revolution, because since around 90 years it has not been able to impose itself as a world force, because the organization and international conscience of the proletariat as a class is a genuine calamity. At the world level there is less proletarian centralization than in the whole history of capitalism, there is less class organizations and publications than in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, and even in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Each time we intervene in the

<sup>14</sup> See in this respect the text "General characteristics of the struggles of the present time" in "Communism" No.9 (August 1995).

proletarian struggles or that we write about them, we cannot repeat that there is a “lack of consciousness”, a “lack of organization”, a “lack of class autonomy”, a “lack of internationalism”, a “lack of going to the root of the critic of Capital”, a “lack of international centralization”, that there are “too many national flags”... because, although indeed all that is true and it’s never useless to underline it at least succinctly, we prefer to concentrate on more qualitative contributions that are different according to the cases.

Does it mean that the revolution is even farther than two centuries ago? NOT AT ALL! But it’s not thanks to the organization, centralization and class consciousness of the world proletariat, because admittedly from that point of view, it’s worse<sup>15</sup>. It’s rather because capitalism doesn’t have any future and its situation is and will be each time more catastrophic. More clearly: for sure capitalism will continue driving the deprived masses to the struggle all over the world because it doesn’t have anything to offer to them, because the future of capitalism is a permanent and always worse catastrophe for the world proletariat. That is to say that if before the revolts were sporadic or broke out in one or another “isolated” region, now it’s normal that there are hundreds of thousands of proletarians fighting and struggling nearly continuously and when it seems that somewhere the revolt comes to an end, it starts more strongly somewhere else. The same phenome-

---

<sup>15</sup> This assertion is valid at a global level but not at a particular level. We think that there are proletarian minorities almost everywhere that act in an organized way and they are very clear in the struggle against all those who take over our movement. These minorities organize determined actions against the oppressors and they also reaffirm the revolutionary classism. In this sense, from rupture to rupture, there are qualitative leaps, but which are not yet assumed neither organizationally nor programmatically at the level of an international centralization.

non appears with the divisions within the proletariat: before the revolts were those of the “excluded”, the “immigrants”, the “unemployed”, the “agricultural workers”... now the generalization at the level of the territory and the fact of embracing more general problems which are recognized as social ones, is almost becoming usual. In fact the employed or unemployed proletarians, agricultural or urban proletarians, women and men, the elderly and the children, coloured or not, are driven always more to the open struggle against the State.

It’s fundamental to underline that moreover the proletariat is pushed to also struggle against its moral or political beliefs. May the proletariat believe in god or not, may it believe that the left will be less bad than the right or may it know that it’s the same thing, may it delude itself about Gaddafi’s anti-imperialism or may it know that the latter is the other face of imperialism... its social survival will be threatened by the catastrophe of the world of Capital and it will be each time more forced to struggle for its life.

That is to say that beyond any belief or ideology, the “normality” of capitalism as a permanent catastrophe makes that it gets deepened in many regions and countries at the same time. It makes that no category of the proletariat stays cut off from the catastrophe and the struggle, it makes that the struggle for the survival implies each time more an international general social war. It’s very difficult to predict the cycles of this international class war, but it can be affirmed that in this decade we are entering into a permanency and escalation phase which was unknown until now.

It’s precisely what is confirmed in the current revolt, it would seem that it’s more general much more than in 2008, more regions and more countries are touched, there is more mutual emulation and also more consciousness

that it’s the same thing than everywhere else and that it’s somehow for the same reasons.

However it’s obvious that the real organic nature showed by the proletariat in the current international revolt, in the simultaneity of the struggle against capitalism everywhere, is not yet enough translated into organization, consciousness, direction... Although we are sure that all the trickeries and pseudo-changes within the political power don’t change anything, although we know that all the facelifts of each one of those small States don’t change anything essential (the world State is still as ever!), although we know that all the democratic mottos (may them be religious or “Marxist Leninist” ones) won’t be able to solve anything, we cannot assure that the movement will continue growing and developing as it would be logical. The past experience indicates that a part of the movement believes in those changes of face of the dictatorship as being a step towards freedom. We are afraid that those “changes” dislocate the force in the heat of the process of constitution, we are afraid that the proletariat splits up as a force of the movement and that it disappears for a more or less long time from the political scene. For example when we write these lines and the struggle is going on radicalizing in new countries and regions, in some among the first ones that entered into revolt, the bourgeois alternatives succeeded in imposing a certain order based upon the “successful” change of the defenestrated dictator... which is obviously an obstacle to the process of constitution of the proletariat as a world class.

According to all what said before, it seems for us nevertheless that this disappearance can last, neither in time nor in space. It’s impossible that capitalism, in the current situation, could restrain its antagonism with the humanity’s interests; the possibilities of imposing social peace with stability like in the past seem to be unthinkable.

## **PROLETARIAT AND BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY**

If the proletariat as a class would be aware of the international power it has in its hands, it would be too easy to make the revolution. The first secret of the negation of the revolution and of the practical counterinsurgency policy is to deny this power, this practice, and this force. It's maybe not too much to point out here the counterrevolutionary role always played by workerist and Eurocentric Social Democrat ideologies, which reduce the concept of proletariat from a quantitative and qualitative point of view, restricting it sociologically and geographically to a category of producers or a geographical area. We refer to all those who nowadays practically denies the proletariat while supporting "the Arab masses", among which the most brazen bourgeois agents add "in their struggle for the democratic revolution".

The counterrevolution doesn't have any interest in that the proletariat recognizes itself through its life, its practice, its general antagonism to the world of private property, so that it to take to the streets yelling "enough is enough" against this whole system of oppression. Against this and for centuries, specialists in social sciences (which express the ideological basis of the whole Social Democracy) have created the sociological categories based upon the division of social strata according to different criteria that the bourgeois socialism has codified on the basis of work and production. Instead of the proletariat as a dynamic force in constitution against private property and confronting the State, the Social Democracy defines the proletariat as a synonym of an industrial worker and generally speaking as a worker of big industry (\*). In the utmost situations, this elitist conception of the proletariat (conception that is implicitly apologetic of the industrial work) restricts the proletariat to the urban worker and also to the workers of the "industrialized countries". Facing the struggle of the proletarians in the Maghreb and the Middle East... these ideologies and forces unite to "support" the revolts of the "Arab masses". This is fundamentally against the movement... This ideology, which coincides with all the counterinsurgency alternatives the bourgeoisie tries to opt for, is useful only for hindering the necessary unification of the international proletariat in struggle:

- This contributes towards the division of the proletariat on a geographical basis as well as on a sectional one;
- This contributes towards the propaganda so that those proletarians in Europe, in the USA, in Latin America... feel less concerned by the struggle of their class fellows;
- This tries to introduce the old workerist ideology that considers the industrial workers as superior (closer to the struggle for socialism) than unemployed, agricultural proletarians, store and office employees, teachers, transport workers...

This conception is inextricably linked to the fact to ascribe other purposes (bourgeois democratic ones, what a "coincidence") to the struggle of the "Arab people", within which the variants in favour of "Constituent Assembly", "real democratic governments" or praising the necessity of the "democratic bourgeois tasks" are nothing but secondary variants. This progressive Marxist-Leninist ideology, which is not only a workerist one as we already denounced it, also contains the essence of Eurocentrism, the historical racism (the chosen people!) typical of Judeo Christianity: "all the people are backward in comparison of mine", "the genuine proletariat is that of my country", "the Arab people should go through the stages through which the European people went since a long time", "they have to make their democratic revolution". Its leftist expression which is not less cynical (as the ICC e.g.) considers that the Arab masses have too many democratic illusions (\*\*). As if in Europe or in the USA they would have fewer illusions! As if the industrial workers would be less manipulated! If it would be like this, they would take to the streets to prevent that their States go on intervening militarily and supporting massively the sanguinary dictatorships of all these countries! Once again it is forgotten that the greatest insurrectional movements of the proletariat against the State in the 20<sup>th</sup> century didn't develop in "more democratic" countries as it is pretended by this ideology, but in Mexico, Russia, Germany, China, Spain, Iran, Iraq...

(\*) The falsification consists in fragmenting and freezing what is in motion, in mistaking the picture for the reality, its (class) perspective for the life and analyzing social life according to those pictures.

(\*\*) *"The class nature of these movements is not uniform and varies from country to country and according to different phases. On the whole, however, we can characterise them as movements of the non-exploiting classes... The working class has, in general, not been in the leadership of these rebellions... [but rather] the peasantry, and other strata deriving from even older modes of production..."* For the ICC obviously, it's about backward countries which have modes of production prior to capitalism. Implicitly, this means that only when these countries will become capitalist ones there will be genuine proletarians who will be able to struggle for socialism. And they add: *"Illusions, above all, in democracy, which are extremely strong in countries which have been governed by a combination of military tyrants and corrupt monarchies..."* These expressions, taken from the text "[What is happening in the Middle East?](#)" published by "International Review" on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011, perfectly summarize the core of the prevailing ideology.

On the other hand we believe that the movement has advanced in the sense of having conquered not any reform or the ousting of a tyrant, but rather this feeling that you can be strong while taking to the streets and standing out. We think, although there is no guarantee, that this feeling

will be the most difficult thing to erase for all the rulers and oppressors. On this basis, we think that although the proletariat disappears once again from the streets here and there, it will keep its experience and will emerge again soon stronger and more powerful. We also think

that it depends a lot on the ability of the most consistent classist minorities.

**TRANSLATION  
TO BE CONTINUED**