

Postures and Impostures

The way the so-called “Far left” has forgotten the most basic intellectual heritage of the labor movement is increasingly astonishing...

Around the 1900s, anarchists practiced "individual recovery". The underlying idea was that what is produced by the workers – that is to say Everything – rightfully belongs to them and hence may be taken back. The revolutionary interest of such practices is doubtless debatable, but their theoretical justification cannot be, unless we recognize that we are now acting and thinking outside the framework of the Labor movement. After all, a communist revolution ¹ is nothing but the collective recovery of the products of the producers' labor.

*Hideous in their apotheosis,
The kings of mining and rail
Have they ever done anything else
Than to rob Labor?
In bank vaults
What Labor has created is melted away,
By decreeing that it be returned to the People,
The People only want their due..*

1 I am getting rude !

Oh! Yes, it's true. This is not the first verse of L'Internationale... By dint of not singing it anymore, we inevitably forget it... Probably the reason why it is now necessary to recall that *the money of the capitalists is Ours!* And even, that all the money that has ever existed since the origin of class societies *is ours* and has always been ours.

The capitalists have no money. *They are just using our power and our money against ourselves.* But beyond the words of L'Internationale, which some now pretend not to understand, in every big or small demonstration in France, people always sing loud and clear: "*Everything is ours, nothing is theirs*". Does the "far left" posture hear? Does "far left" posture still understand these songs?

Apparently not. For many people who live from the vantage posture of working for the establishment of a classless society have now come to believe in capitalist private property itself and to accept the framework of thought that it implies. We celebrate the Commune de Paris, but we forget "by a system carelessness" (Charles Fourier), that the Commune de Paris, was reduced to famine and capitulation, for lack of daring to seize the enormous gold stock of the Bank of France.

Tens of thousands of revolutionaries died because they did not dare to use *for their own needs*, the private property... of their enemies! Despite this fairly well-known fact, it seems that this obvious fact must now be recalled, that the money of bankers and merchants is *ours*, the money of businesses and companies is ours, and the money of the State and sponsors is also *ours*.

Therefore, one can wonder about the origin of these surprising fables according to which the revolutionaries must refuse the money of the sponsors or the State for *ethical reasons*... Ethical? Come on... *Whose* ethics? The ethics of a "far left" posture that now admits that capitalists' money belongs to capitalists? Who comes to the point of thinking that producers may get their hands dirty by seizing the fruits of their own labor – that is to say everything – in order to put it to communist ² use? Hasn't such a "far left" posture lost all common sense? More than 170 years after the Communist Manifesto, would this "far left" posture have become foreign enough to itself to accept the idea that capitalists could rightfully own anything? In any case, such a "far left" posture, obviously no longer co-signs The Internationale. To live happily, let's kneel and lie down !

2 I am getting even ruder

There is no other ethics, there has never been any other ethics than the ethics of the collective. The collective is, and always has been, the only source of all ethics. And what counts, what really counts, is the use that is made of our work, it is what is made of our own living activity, and money is always well spent if it is used communist way and for communist purposes ³. It doesn't matter where the money falls from, whether it falls from Heaven or Hell or from anywhere else, because it only ever trickles from us and our work.

Should we now accept the term "social security load" that French capitalists use about "their" part of the social security system, and stop considering that this way, we are just fairly recovering at least part of the value we have created and that they stole from us? Should I refuse health insurance reimbursements and my pension money on the pretext that they would be partly paid with capitalists' money? Is there any source of funding other than our labor that fuels the French social system – originally created by the working class itself and stolen from it? Should those of us who work for the State now refuse their wages?

Again, the capitalists have no money, and whatever they pay is always with ours. So whether we "steal" it from them in

3 My rudeness is reaching new heights

the romantic Robin Hood fashion or Jules Bonnot's way, or whether capitalists "give it" to us in the form of sponsorship or state subsidy, it's our money and we we have to take it back and use it in a communist ⁴ way . And the only real question, the only important one, is precisely how to use it in a communist way. A point on which the "far left" posture has remained silent for quite a long time in word and deed. The thinker's posture does not make the thought...

How do we build a classless society? Here's what the "far left" posture consistently fails to consider. What interests them is where the money comes from. Has the "far left" posture now got financial?

One night, Spartacus manages to enter the Master's workshop. There he finds an anvil, a chisel and a hammer. Something to break his chains... He reaches for the hammer, and then changes his mind. "Ah! No, he said, that's out of the question! My ethics forbid me to break my chains with the Master's tools ! "..

We have reached this point of stupidity...

Note : The French version of this text was first published in *Revue de la Poésie in toto*

4 How may anyone be rude to such a degree?

Afterword

Let's be serious... The bourgeoisie needed 4 centuries to take over the world. Bourgeois revolutions never did anything else but legalize things. In this, it was only a question of *re-interpreting the world*, and not of transforming it, since this transformation had already been underway for several centuries. It was in fact only *a change in the imaginary*.

Making a communist use of the world is not about killing people for just changing the owners' names. We have seen this movie before. The Soviet Union had nothing to do with communist at all, it was only Russia. And as anyone can see it is still nothing else than Russia. Russia was a shame and is now an even deeper shame. As Russia also shows, when a world collapses, the mafias and gangsters seize the power and rule.

Making a communist use of the world means using what is there in a collective way, for our own needs, for our own projects, for our own pleasures, *here and now*. For the time being we are not deprived of technical means, we are not starving as our ancestors were. We were sold lots of things among which lots of tools, some even more or less usable. We

can start pooling our resources immediately without worrying about who owns what ownership. Creating a cooperative is more efficient than attending a demonstration.

*The emancipation of workers means **work***, and can only be achieved by working together. It is the way Mankind has survived for 300,000 years, the egalitarian way of life of hunter-gatherer peoples, without which we would not exist. In an autarkic way of life where everyone is armed and where gestures are precise and swift, domination can only be acquired slowly and by trickery and certainly not by force. Establishing inequality took thousands of years, and as we now know it started even before the Neolithic. The human species could never have survived without this permanent mutual insurance of the hunter-gatherers way of life.

We are literally and even genetically *made of* these 300,000 of freedom, equality and collective life.