

THE ROLE OF THE U.S.S.R.

**In the socialist
Transformation of humanity**

J. POSADAS

Vol.1

The Progress of the Soviet Union And the Function of the Posadist IV International

1st March 1981

This text, written by J. Posadas two months before his death, shows the very high capacity of the comrade, which reached its peak in the last few years of his life.

The USSR dies if it does not support itself on the world revolutionary process. It decomposes if it tries, and with it also the bureaucrats, giving rapidly access to the intervention of the Trotskyist. The USSR, even with this (present) bureaucracy, cannot live without aiding the world revolutionary movement. In the past, Stalin could not live with the revolution, but today the USSR cannot live without stimulating the world revolutionary process. It may be that it does not support a revolution at the start, or that it later fails to support both necessary and best measures, but it has to support all anti-capitalist movements nonetheless. The USSR may still conciliate with capitalism in given places, but it cannot surrender either the least or the most important revolution. It may conciliate with capitalism to maintain a certain *status quo*, but the very condition of survival for it is to progress. And to progress, the USSR has to support all movements that tend to identify with the USSR. It has to support all movements tending towards the Workers State. The logic of history determines this condition, regardless of whether I drop dead now or continue to live. The USSR cannot live if it does not impel the world revolution, and this is the condition for its very existence.

Beginning from a given level – the historic situation that arose after the Second World War – the USSR felt the need to extend its world strength in relation to the capitalist system. It acquired this confidence the moment it got rid of Stalin. It matters little how Stalin came to be got rid of. He was liquidated, killed by history. Independently of who actually killed him, Stalin could no longer be supported because he represented a bloc and opposition to the very development of the Workers State. The

development of the Workers State needed to start acting in the direction of impelling the world revolution, and in stimulating revolution. This was not done with the aim of absorbing other revolutions, but in order to extend the world balance of forces against capitalism.

This is what underpins the thought of the present bureaucracy that leads the USSR presently. As to the other bureaucracies in the Communist parties or the other Workers States, they rather plod on with the same thought as before: how to continue to usufruct their positions. Undoubtedly, the bureaucracy of the USSR also usufructs (lives off the Workers State), but to a lesser degree because it has to stimulate the revolution. Capitalism has no idea of this process, and this is not because it chooses to ignore it but because it is incapable of grasping this much. This is why it still goes on hoping that it will find support in Poland! However, such hopes arise from desperation because capitalism has nothing else to turn to. The USSR has solutions to problems and, in front of this, capitalism must have belief in some way out because it does not have any historic perspective.

We must expect that, in the near future, the Soviets will start to advance in ability to analyse, to plan anti-capitalist struggles, and to influence the Communist parties. This is going to happen in the very near future. In reality, the Communist parties are the result of the Stalinist stage, from which the USSR has broken free. It has liquidated the thought of Stalin in work and in practice, in the same way as it removed his portraits. What has not yet been liquidated it's the remnants of what Stalin built, not in the USSR but in the Italian, French and other Communist parties. Inevitably this process of breaking free from the Stalinist mould passes through the channel which made it most easy, and that is the USSR. The USSR was the most open and ready channel for progress to pass. The USSR was the channel closest to this necessity, because it is a matter of life or death for it. This is why the USSR has had to change. There is no such compulsion, as yet, for the Italian Communist Party because it has been educated previously in the life and policy of manoeuvres, Parliamentary proceedings etc. On the other hand, the Soviets are forced to act in the concrete situation, faced with the capitalist system. This makes it progress, improve policies and liquidate the sectors inside the USSR which are a block to progress.

This process is slow because it develops in the USSR and less so in the rest of the Communist movement. We have had to understand this, and this reality has altered the previous concept of a gradual process of Permanent and Political Revolution. The Principles of the Permanent Revolution and of the Political Revolution are still valid but they don't develop the way they did before. As some Communist parties find it impossible to change, we are called upon to find the ways, the big events, and the crises, in order to weigh decisively inside them and to help the progressive wings of those parties to triumph and increase their links with the USSR. Despite all the threats of the Right wing and of the Centre of these Communist parties, the idea of not breaking from the USSR – indeed, increasing the ties rather than breaking from them – continues to prevail. Even Pajetta, the Italian Communist Party delegate who represented the PCI in the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in 1981, had to admit that Brezhnev's report had been very good.

With all patience and dedication, this is what we are doing. This is why, as a movement, we don't grow much numerically, but we grow in authority on a world

scale. We do not rush, and we are not impatient. Haste and impatience are the result of immaturity, and immaturity rests on a lack of understanding of the perspective of progress and how it develops. The development of the world process, in all its varied expressions, has to be understood in order to avoid the problems that arise out of haste and impatience. Above all, it is necessary to grasp the combination which there is between the advance of the Communist parties – determined fundamentally by the USSR and the world balance of forces it creates – and the process of the advance of the revolutionary movements in the world that influence the USSR and strengthen the necessity to confront capitalism. The revolutionary movements feed the USSR with their historic, political and practical confidence. A real level of theoretical confidence is necessary in order to understand this process. This is true also of the practice of intervening in a process such as the present one, when a small number of people have to defend the development of historic truth. We do not talk of ‘truth’ as an abstraction, a slogan, or a flag, but the development of the truth in the sense of the development of the revolutionary process. In other words, we are talking about the development of the historic conditions for truth itself, and all the other truths of history. The source of all historic truth lies in reasoning, in drawing conclusions, in making the necessary application for the harmonious progress of humanity, in suppressing all forms of oppression, violence and need.

This demands theoretical preparation and practice. Theoretical practice means the ability to measure a situation, to gauge the material and numerical factors, applying the force of our capacity of conviction, of reasoning, of theoretical preparation and political confidence. Theoretical preparation and political security are the keys to reasoning guided by Marxism. All this takes place in a situation that is very different from thirty or forty years ago, or when I joined the revolutionary movement. Now, one has to educate comrades in the most complicated ideas expressed in the most simple and yet profound and logical form. I have also learned, in doing this, because in teaching one learns. At times, I have made corrections in interpretations of a problem because a scientific thought occurred to me in the very process of thinking out another. My definition of principles – which is not the same as concepts – is never alien, extraneous or false. I always develop on the base of theoretical ideas, and these always go together with practical organisational conclusions. This is what we are really doing. Today, there is no one outside of ourselves who knows how to unite the revolutionary process with practical and organisational conclusions which have to be continually modified. These modifications do not change the original aims set out, or the nature of the problem we are faced with. But the conclusions keep changing, because this is needed in order to reach the objective. We have to know how to do this, and to know how to educate all the comrades in doing it also: how to live with others and with ourselves in order to fulfil this task. Whatever problem beset us now, the major one has already been superseded: the main problem was the sense of isolation. When we decided to build this Posadist IV International nineteen years ago we knew what we were going to have to go through. We were clear about what we were confronted with, and what sort of comrades we had inherited from the past. However, this was the material that we had and, even with it, we built all this. This is the force we have developed, the respect we have gained, and the authority we have in the world! We have dedicated our life to this role. We have created life in more ways than one. We have created life by having children, by educating all the children already there, and by educating their parents, mothers and fathers, in the conviction that comes from the practice of theory, policy and application.

We are developing the coordination without transition between theory and practice. The complexity of this process doesn't come from the fact that it is particularly difficult, but from a lack of force to set things in motion. The Soviets are unifying the force that we do not have, and we, for our part, are impelling this force. This is why you do not find currents in our movement that doubt, that are pessimistic, or that want to desert or escape. There is nothing of this in our movement! We have, in the most tricky problems, the confidence to call a spade a spade! We have educated the cadres of the International to do just this. We have acted in order to substitute for the lack of theoretical preparation in cadres who are animated by good will and militant decision. We have acted to give them theoretical understanding and the means to dominate all problems.

In the future, all humanity will live on the basis of the love for theory. Theory will reach new heights without losing any of its original historic significance. In the future, all concepts will be mathematical, arithmetical or algebraic, according to the development of humanity and its relationship with the cosmos. In this way, as humanity will develop this relationship, mathematics and arithmetic will change. It does not mean that these things as we know them will be no good, but that we will reach a higher level of knowledge. We are the level of acquired knowledge in as much as we have shown that a small number can play such a function. However, as great maturity is required for this task, there aren't very many comrades who can write articles to the level of this necessity. I understand this, and this is why I have taken the decision that I had to do it until the necessary level of maturity was reached in others. At the same time, all over the world and in all our Sections, comrades are writing very good articles on the local situation, which frees me to concentrate on the principle problems and to write on them. We already have a world team conscious of its historic responsibility, and that already unites its life with this responsibility.

Our preoccupation is to educate our cadres and to substitute for the lack of previous theoretical preparation. So we have to educate them theoretically and practically. In other words, we concentrate preoccupation at the highest level of interpretation. This is the source from which everything else flows. The knowledge of how to apply comes afterwards, at the point when analysis has been grasped. In 1962 we made the decision of organising this new International, and we have applied it. This new International now exists, and it is looking for the ways to increase its weight in history. Not to sell more publications but to increase its weight in history in order to telescope the historic stages. We seek to diminish the immense destruction which capitalism is going to cause before or at the moment of its own destruction. We are preparing to confront these atrocities. We have already characterised it as the 'atomic charco' in other words, the atomic war. We know that this is going to happen, but we also know that the atomic war will be a 'charco', and we will jump over it. A great many people will die in this process, but it will not be the end of humanity. A great many people will die, but confidence in life is going to grow in people – grow rather than be reborn – with the force of a tidal wave.

In the future, centuries as we know them will be concentrated into one year. My thought is very elevated precisely because I visualise this clearly and it is harmonious, full of rhythm. I find rhythm in everything. As there is harmony in a movement, my thought encounters the rhythm of its movement. We are organising the comrades for

this activity, longing for their improvement in order to compensate for their previous lack of dedication to these problems. We want them to progress as fast as possible.

We have, among other things, the joy of discussing the greatest events in history: one of these is the fact that world capitalism has to support itself on the Italian Communist Party in order to try and detain history. Capitalism is reduced to throwing stones at history, whose chariot is driven by the USSR with a remarkable and distinct confidence. When the Congress of the CPSU is attended by representatives of Nicaragua and the Polisario, it means that the USSR is the centre that leads the world. The best of humanity attends these Congresses. The world lives the existence and progress of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union has to advance precisely because it is a necessity of history.

J. POSADAS

1st March 1981

The defeat of capitalism in the Second World War, the development of revolutions and proletarian struggles in the world impelled the proletariat of the workers States to feel secure, weigh and intervene. The development of industry strengthened and broadened the proletarian base of the Workers states. At first, this generated a greater number of technocrats. But, in the world development of the revolution, what increased most was the revolutionary quality of the process, removing from the bureaucracy its world bases for conciliation with capitalism. This obliges it to have a [more] revolutionary policy. It cut the bases of support from under it.

Without changing its objectives, the soviet bureaucracy sees itself compelled to interpret history in a way that draws it back closer to Communism. In consequence, this facilitates the Political Revolution. Today, the bureaucracy has to help Peru, Bolivia, Chile and the Middle East.

J. POSADAS

1 March 1981

J. POSADAS

Partial Regeneration, Historic Re-encounter, The IV International and the Political Revolution in this stage.

27th August 1971

The historic re-encounter is a fundamental concept of understanding the course of the revolution. It is a consequence of the powerful objective development of the world Socialist revolution, of the disproportion and inequality between this powerful development and the absence of leaderships. But, of the two, the one which determines the course of history is the powerful development. Within the latter, the conscious, semi-conscious and empirical will of millions is participating; millions and millions of the exploited masses, of hundreds of thousands of millions of leaders and middle cadres, of Communist cadres, Socialists, Catholics and military - intervene, weigh and decide. All this emerges from a process where an economic, social and political structure tends to extend and elevate.

Between the Soviet Union of today and that of 1950 there is a fundamental difference. During the epoch of Stalin, industrial development was very limited and the world revolution in retreat. After the war the impulsion of the world revolution permitted the disappearance of Stalin. At the same time there was a very important development of industry, economic structures of the USSR, of agriculture, technique, science – above all, of atomic science – creating conditions for the greater security of the Soviet people. The development of the world revolution, the setting up of new Workers States, the development of the revolution in Latin America with Peronism, in Asia with Ceylon and India, in Africa, the breaking-out of the Chinese revolution impelled the world revolution, incorporating new layers to the process of transformations and introducing, in consequence, modifications to the interior of the communist parties. These modifications still remained within the limits of the apparatus, signifying that the bureaucracy was still able to dominate and determine.

The crisis of Malenkov, Molotov and Kaganovitch, was the expression of a reaction inside the apparatus. The same goes for the assassination and death or disappearance of Stalin. The succeeding new bureaucratic team immediately proclaimed the formation of a collective leadership. It was indeed clear that Stalin – his policy, and the structure of his team – no longer served to respond to the level that had been attained. The new team, which came to power in an unexpected manner from within the apparatus, did not emerge from a political struggle, from the conscious instigation of struggles, reflecting the need for the political revolution. They resolved in an internal manner to liquidate Stalin and to share power out. It was there that there was the first eloquent symptom that the world balance of forces weighed unfavourably on the bureaucracy.

This change from Stalin to a collective leadership obeyed the urgency of eliminating the Stalinist apparatus which was no longer needed. But these changes were not made by means of a revolutionary policy; the changes were made by means of an internal dissolution and a disintegration of the bureaucratic apparatus. However, the disintegration did not lead, could not lead to a political transformation. The old bureaucratic apparatus disintegrated, gave birth to, and led to the development of a new one. This new apparatus is the old one with only some changes. It emerged after 1953, not as a result of the political struggles, but from the world impulse of the revolution – expressed, first of all, by the eight new Workers states that were set up, and then afterwards by Cuba.

The dissolution of the Stalinist apparatus was produced by the impotence to lead the Workers States and the Communist parties, shown by the bureaucracy, and the impotence of Stalinism to face up to the new policy of coordinating with the new Workers States. Stalinism lasted until 1953 and expropriated all the other Workers States except Yugoslavia. They took away all the riches to the USSR. The later force of the USSR was, in part, based on these expropriations. But, while expropriating the Workers States, it also had to maintain the structure and development of these States. It was a complex process which determined the formation of a structure that later had to show itself politically.

The structure was such that, if the expropriations continued, the counter-revolution would come, and if they stopped the expropriations, they also had to impel the formation of a new leadership and dominate and control it in order to prevent it from competing with the Soviet bureaucracy. Stalin, with his policy, with the apparatus that he created, was no longer any use in these circumstances. This was because it combined certain norms of defence, nationalisations and collectivisation, with the inability to make itself adequate for the development of the economy which incorporated new layers of bureaucrats, technicians, planners; new layers of the population incorporated themselves into the State. The coordination of the Workers States, the bringing to a halt of the expropriations and exploitation of the other Workers States was compulsory. Stalinism was of no use for this. Its historic origin made it powerless to face this stage, and because of this, it disappeared as a political leadership but not as a political conception. The Stalinist leadership disappeared, but Stalinist policy continued, and still continues.

Stalinist policy signifies bureaucratic conceptions, interests and rigidity in interpretation, planning and leadership. It means a policy of conciliation with the capitalist system, the elimination of revolutionary leaderships, the fear and rejection of revolutionary policy, and the opposition to such policy. This is Stalinism: the substitution of truth by the lie, the elimination of Marxism, the historic method of interpretation via comparison, analysis, investigation of history and objective discussion of problems. All this was replaced and the apparatus decides instead. It does not think – it decides. This is Stalinism. The apparatus decides, and consequently it decides in agreement with its thinking, and its thinking is in agreement with its interest, which is bureaucratic – fear of revolutionary ideas, comparison, scientific investigation, and scientific severity of truth. It is frightened of the truth. The Bolsheviks were never frightened of the truth, whatever it was. On the contrary, truth was for them indispensable for progress.

Stalinism emerged and developed in conditions of the world retreat of the revolution. With the progress of the revolution these conditions disappeared and Stalinism lost its historic bases. The masses did not have time to organise a revolutionary leadership, and the IV International did not have the historic means, the historic possibility, to be the leadership of the revolution. It could not be, because it could not substitute for mass movements simply with the truth, with purity of Marxist conceptions, with the continuity of Marxism. The historic organisational and organic conditions to be able to triumph were absent. Marx needed 70 years for the justice of his historic foresight to be verified. We do not need that long, because the stages of history respond to necessity rather than to the number of years.

The bureaucracy had had to consider the world development of the revolution, the setting up of new Workers States, the competition with their new bureaucracies. Stalin resolved these problems by means of arbitrary bureaucratic decisions, by imposing submission to the USSR, but the development of these Workers States and of the world revolution impelled, gave confidence and assurance to these States, raising the preoccupation of the proletarian vanguard in the Soviet Union, preventing the bureaucracy from continuing with Stalin, while still maintaining his policy. Nevertheless, it had to respect the new Workers States.

By its nature, by its need to confront the capitalist system, the USSR has had to organise its coordination with the new Workers States. It simply could not pillage them without provoking consequences. It had to respect their existence and to help their development, because it had to structure the social interest of the Workers State in common against the capitalist system, and Stalin was no use for this. Neither the Stalinist policy, nor its apparatus, nor its team, nor its political empiricism was any use for this. This is why Stalin disappeared. He was no longer of any use.

Those who succeeded him followed the same policy, for they had to defend the same bureaucratic interests, but in greater conditions for the development of the USSR. The origin and the reasons for the development of bureaucratic layers were ceasing; without yet disappearing, their historic bases were removed. At the same time as more bureaucratic cadres continued to be provided, revolutionary cadres, and objectivity, were gradually produced – more than the economic development could provide for the formation of new bureaucratic layers to enlarge the Soviet bureaucracy.

Socially, the historic and concrete conditions were gradually eliminating the rhythm, quantity and quality of the provision of bureaucrats and functionaries, and, on the other hand, the development of the revolution was increasing the number of militants, cadres, of conditions and structures favourable to the revolution. Even if Stalinism persisted, it had to confront conditions which opposed it. The ‘Moscow Trials’ of 1936 became impossible to repeat. All the new conditions were against it. This contained the bureaucracy without eliminating it, without excluding it, but forcing it – including in the period of Malenkov, and afterwards with Krutchev – to reason. But as they acted as perverted bureaucrats, they reasoned for a while and then disappeared. The disappearance of Malenkov, and afterwards Krutchev, was determined by the usefulness of their policy of maintaining themselves in power. They had to confront alliances, interpretations, confrontations, with new revolutionary movements. The bureaucracy was not prepared, did not understand, and felt bypassed by such a process. Its interior structure made it distant from this process.

The first experience of the bureaucracy to try to dominate the Workers States (which was over Yugoslavia) went against it. It showed that it did not have the power to make the world revolution submit to it. It had the power to control it, and direct it, but not to make it submit. It is this which explains the changes in relation to Tito and the adoption of a more flexible policy. After the war, the conditions changed. The relations between the bureaucracy and the proletariat, with the vanguard and the world course of the revolution changed.

Previously the bureaucracy had to confront a passive movement, a movement of small Communist parties. It did not have to confront the masses, and this allowed it to destroy all the leaderships which tried to carry forward a revolutionary policy. Twice it betrayed the leadership of the Polish Communist Party to the police. It did this also to the Czechoslovak Communist Party. All the way up to the end of the second World War, the bureaucracy dedicated itself to preventing the functioning of tendencies, groups, currents, or any political opposition which organised openly. It based itself on the fact that overall world revolution, while passing from a stage of retreat and entering into a stage of progress, could still be controlled and dominated. In the first moments of the rise of the revolution up until 1953 it had been able to maintain its control and domination inasmuch as the world process of the revolution had resulted in new Workers States which had emerged, not as a result of the revolutionary struggle of the masses independently of the Communist parties, but thanks to the intervention of the Soviet bureaucracy.

The conditions thus permitted the bureaucracy to extend its power by basing itself on the ascent to power of the masses of these countries, and maintaining them under its tutelage. Consequently, it was able to contain, dominate and control the mass upsurge by breaking up the revolutionary oppositions which emerged from these movements. It crushed them during and after the war. This was the case with the Warsaw Ghetto, the struggle of the Polish Jews, in which the bureaucracy should have intervened by supporting the Jews against the Nazis. Even at the time of the Warsaw uprising it did not intervene, because it knew that this was the revolution. It preferred not to intervene in an action favourable to the triumph of the war against the Nazis rather than see the revolution triumph.

By triumphing, the Soviet Union impelled the revolution independently of the bureaucracy, which found itself placed before a new situation. It did not expect the revolutionary events of the post war period. It was not prepared for them; it had not foreseen them. It had fought against them, on the other hand, first in Poland, then in Yugoslavia, then in China. Didn't it even say to Tito that he should give power to King Peter II? The revolution developed and triumphed despite the bureaucracy; this meant new conditions appeared which it had to take account of, as they developed. It had to yield, but it still controlled. It had to confront the resistance of Yugoslavia and China.

All this demonstrated that in the organisation of new Workers States the power of the bureaucracy found its limit. But the bureaucracy had nonetheless to count on these new Workers States in order to maintain itself. It tried to hand over Yugoslavia before discussing and arriving at an agreement with the Yugoslav Communist Party. At that moment the Yugoslav CP was truly Communist, and not bureaucratic. Later, it generated the bureaucratic interest much more. Its first reaction was to take the road

of revolutionary opposition. At that moment, the IV International took a position which was not incorrect but which remained general: simply not helping them. For it did not understand the process, and two years later it said that Yugoslavia had returned to capitalism!

This Yugoslav process indicated the resistance which the Stalinist apparatus was meeting, but at the same time, the historic conditions did not permit capitalism the force to confront the Soviet Union. Immediately after the war and the setting up of new Workers States, the Soviet Union and these Workers States had to confront Yankee imperialism, which took note of the danger that Europe was going to be entirely gained by the Workers States. This was the reason for the aid of the Marshall Plan that which gave 12,000 million dollars – dollars of that period, not of nowadays. It sought to prop-up the capitalist states to prevent the influence of the Workers States.

The revolution progressed in Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia, giving birth to new Workers States, new revolutionary processes in China, India, Ceylon, in Vietnam and Korea, stimulating a whole process of elevation. There were agrarian reforms in Japan, which, even though made to defend the internal market and give an agrarian social base and a solution to capitalism, nonetheless showed that capitalism could no longer maintain itself with the Samurai. It had to develop Japan socially, and it had to prepare to enter into competition with the USA as well.

The Soviet bureaucracy had to confront a process for which it was not prepared, which it did not understand. It had to face the development of powerful Workers States and new capitalist countries like Japan. Above all, it had to confront the industrial development of the Soviet Union and of Soviet society. It had to take account of the competition of Yugoslavia, the triumph and development of the Chinese revolution. It did not have any means to understand and confront all these new situations which demanded suppleness, coordination of interests, and conciliation with the interests of other bureaucracies in other countries. The new policy it had to carry on with the capitalist system could no longer be one of simple conciliation and concession; it had to take account of the development of big Communist parties which progressed not as satellites but as competitors.

All this created new conditions for the bureaucracy and it was for this reason that Stalin was suppressed. In fact he did not have any policy for this. Was not his policy to kill, assassinate and to put everyone in prison? He wanted to do it with Yugoslavia when he proclaimed, 'I lift my little finger and Tito comes tumbling down'. He moved his whole hand, and it was he who died.

All this indicated the end of Stalinism, determined by the development of the world revolution, of the struggles of the European proletariat, the development of new capitalist countries and of colonial and semi-colonial countries. Even though the bureaucracy faced new situations it did not organise new leaderships. Under the influence of the soviet bureaucracy and the Workers States, new revolutionary processes developed, like that of the Chinese revolution. This historic triumph immediately made the world balance of forces weigh in favour of the world revolution. Because it forced the capitalist system to seek ways of defence, feeling itself besieged in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe. Capitalism did not solely

have to confront one Workers State but all those of Europe and Asia, and the revolutionary process in Africa, and in Latin America with Peronism.

If Fidel Castro was able to triumph, it was thanks in great part to the Workers States, to the Chinese revolution, and to the Peronist masses. Guevara, an honest revolutionary but not honest politically, had combated the Peronist masses and the Peronist movement by treating it as if it were fascist. He showed all his theoretical and political weakness, the lack of theoretical and political preparation; otherwise he would have understood that the Peronist process opened a new course in the Latin American revolution. This process had been opened up with Mexico, and then it continued with Peronism. There were also revolutions in Chile in 1919 and 1933. Peronism was not a chance thing; it indicated that the world retreat of the revolution was not total and that some aspects of progress survived. In fact, from 1930 and 1936 the Chilean revolution emerged; there was Cardenas in Mexico and the revolutionary anti-imperialist movements of Cuba.

The understanding of these revolutionary movements, not identified with the Russian revolution, has a link with our subject. Because it gives a vision that in this revolutionary movement there were forces influencing the Soviet Union, and other forces which could have been profited from by the revolutionaries of that time. In every way it weighed within the Communist parties and showed the importance of the Communist parties, because, in all this process – be it of Chile, Mexico or Cuba – the Communists had very little strength. In Chile and Cuba, in the revolutionary movements, the strength of the Communist Party was divided between the Left Opposition, which was Trotskyist, and the Official Party. In Cuba we had two Trotskyist Deputies of the Left Opposition. In Chile we also had two Deputies and two Senators; this indicated that in spite of Stalinism, the general world retreat of the revolution was not absolute.

The unequal and combined process allowed the ascent of layers, sectors and revolutionary tendencies, which based themselves on local conditions but received the world influence. In this way it was a dual process: the existence of the Soviet Union impelled and gave birth to revolutionary influences, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the existence of a single Workers state encircled by capitalism that was preparing the war to overthrow it, and with the internal crisis in the USSR in which they murdered all the Bolshevik movements. When, in spite of these circumstances, revolutionary processes in Chile and Cuba developed, it indicated that the proletarian vanguard was not prostrate in front of the world difficulties but tried to draw advantage from the local conditions.

Guevara, who was in a very privileged situation to understand the revolutionary process, as in Argentina, was incapable of understanding it. He showed that he was beginning to act as a ‘protector’. He did not understand the Peronist process. He was against the Peronist movement and masses. He could have been against politically, but he should have considered it a revolutionary nationalist movement – combating it politically, impelling it, feeling and recognising that the Peronist masses supported Peronism because they sought to impel the revolution. If he had done it, the Cuban revolution would have been more complete from the start! There would have originated from the beginning more complete leaderships, leaderships that would have

been Marxist from the beginning. This would have influenced the Soviet bureaucracy directly, but the effect was only indirect and after a long delay.

The bureaucracy did not understand the movement of Asia, Africa and Latin America. It was a long way away from it, from the point of view of revolutionary interests. But it was interesting from the point of view of seeking associations, points of support, and relations to defend itself from the capitalist system. This also influenced in the Soviet Union, within the Party, in a limited way, but raising the confidence of leading layers and militants, cadres, and also in the Communist parties.

The common concentrated progress of the world revolutionary process allowed – within the Soviet Union and also outside in the Communist Parties – the new proletarian layers to influence sectors of the bureaucracy which were going to be, later, the support for the new bureaucratic leadership of Krutchev and Brezhnev. The process feeding the bureaucratic team of the stage of Stalin ceased. It continued to provide bureaucrats because, through their function in society, the bureaucracy had the need to create leaders and to make jobs, to compile statistics, to create military leaders, planners, all these people who are the bases of the bureaucracy. In the previous stage, without being fundamentally technocrats, they were bureaucrats who exerted the function of directors, bosses, administrators, people responsible for factories, leaders of the Party and the army. The workers' aristocracy was the base of the bureaucracy. In order to sustain its power and extend it on a world scale, the bureaucracy needed to grow continually and increase its power. This was never going to happen.

Far from it, as it had to spread Soviet power in the world, it was led to coordinate all the other new Workers States. But it did not increase the quality of bureaucratic layers of bureaucratic bases, because the bureaucratic layer, which was developing, was less than the revolutionary layer of the proletariat. While the same need still existed for bureaucratic function, it no longer had the ability to increase gradually the number of bureaucrats proportionally, nor could it exert the function of being pillagers of society as before. Yugoslavia gave the example of this and, after that, China.

REVOLUTION EXTENDED AFTER THE WAR IN SPITE OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE BUREAUCRACY

After the war, there was the world development of the struggle of the masses: the growth of the Italian and French proletariats, the struggle of the masses in France and Italy. In 1946, the Communist Party, in united front with the socialists and the independent masses, could have taken power in France. It was the same in Italy. They allowed the capitalist system to reanimate itself. This reinforced the existence of the bureaucracy. Without increasing its social power, its power of smashing, containing and rejecting the revolution, it reinforced its power, allowing it to use revolutions in order to compete with the capitalist system. And so, it made it appear before the masses as a justifiable instrument, not strictly necessary, but justifiable. Because the masses of the world did not see how to confront capitalism as a system, while there were the Workers States which the masses felt were the power, the force, and the

centre of the resistance to the capitalist system. And they saw that the Workers States were extending themselves.

In all this process the bureaucracy acquired customs, vices, forms of thinking and working, of seeing and judging, and of communicating as a bureaucracy. It thought as an apparatus. It saw the masses of the world as an accessory, judging always in agreement with what it could do. It did not take the world revolution into account. It did not take interest in it, on the contrary, it was concerned to contain it. As it could conciliate with the capitalist system and the capitalist system needed to conciliate, its origin coincided with this need: to develop a policy of conciliation with the capitalist system. The base of this conciliation was that the capitalist system, as much as the bureaucracy, felt harassed by a common enemy which did not have the same significance for bureaucracy as for the capitalist system, but which made both appear united.

The bureaucracy usurped the power and, to sustain itself, it had to prevent the revolution from triumphing. On this the bureaucracy and the capitalist system coincided. But on the development of the relation of the masses, they did not coincide. It is on this that they had to put themselves in agreement. The conciliation with the capitalist system was made on the basis of a regulating of the world revolutionary process. While there was only the bureaucracy, it could dominate. Starting from 1931 the bureaucracy tried to go towards power and made the third period line. When it failed, after making adventures, it changed this policy for the Popular Front. It inaugurated a stage of open conciliation with the capitalist system, as a system and a policy.

In 1926, in Britain in the general strike, it was already possible to have taken power. The bureaucracy associated itself with the leading bureaucracy of the Trade Unions and prevented the triumph of the general strike. Starting from then, a retreat began in the bureaucracy. It took such a defeat as a justification for its empirical policy. Later, in Germany, the policy of the bureaucracy showed that it feared the advance of the revolution more than the threats of capitalism, and its policy led to the betrayal of the German revolution. It was not only its fault, but that of the Socialists as well. But the policy of the Soviet bureaucracy gave to the social Democracy the possibility to betray the revolution. Starting from then came the process of retreat of the bureaucracy. And thus, starting from 1932, it passed from one policy – called the ‘Third Period Line’, the line of the revolution at all costs – to the policy of conciliation with the capitalist system.

After the ‘Third Period’, the policy of conciliation of the bureaucracy with the capitalist system took a further step back. Conciliation and the murder of revolutions were no longer effected just to combat revolutions, but to try to preserve bureaucratic power as such. The world proletarian vanguard was told that, as the USSR was the only Workers State it was necessary to conduct this policy. The reason why that was necessary is never discussed in the Communist parties.

The Communists hide all this. This is not in the history of the Communist parties; they don’t discuss it and there is no literature about it. They have hidden, or they don’t know, the Congresses of the Communist International. They have hidden the struggle at the time of Lenin and Trotsky to associate the world revolution with the objectives

and the destiny of the Soviet Union. The Communists hide all this; they don't discuss it. They present the Communist International as a circumstantial instrument which was useful for a few years, but no more. It served to construct the Soviet Union, to construct the Communist parties. This is the most it did, but no more. They don't discuss anymore. Why was it useful for a period and not now? What function did it play? What result or what inheritance does this function leave now? They don't discuss anything of that.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, AND THE SCIENTIFIC CONCEPTION OF MARXISM.

The Communist International left humanity the irreplaceable value of the organising instrument of the world revolution. It is expressed in the programme, the policy, in the tactic and in the functioning. The Communist parties deny all this, hide it, and take it as an occasional fact which was useful while Lenin was there and for a period after, but nothing more. Later on, 'it did not serve'. 'Later on, there were historic conditions created', say the Communists, 'in which the Communist International was no longer necessary, but instead the independence of each country and university in diversity'. All these are inventions of the Communist parties to defend bureaucratic interests in every one of them in their own country.

During the first years of the Communist International there were no local interests or local leaderships. There were local leaderships which applied the general policy of the world revolution. By not developing the Communist International the Soviet bureaucracy solidified and affirmed the rise and development of local interests in each Communist Party. Because they did not have confidence in Communist policy, in Communist objectives, and because they have not learnt, these have not been educated. It is not at the beginning a problem of understanding, but of education leading to an understanding. No Communist Party has developed in the understanding of the experience of the Communist International.

The leaderships of every Communist Party consider their country cut-off from the rest of the world, thus demonstrating all their naivety, their ignorance. In relation to the economy, science, technology, they do, on the other hand, start from a world and unified conception which permits them to transmit their influence. Why don't they start from the world in politics?

The thread of history passes through inventions and development of general and particular qualities in each country. All this gives, as a result, the progress of science, technology and culture. It is necessary to act in the same way in politics.

The communists who discuss with our comrades ignore the role of the Communist International, some of them do not even know it, and have not read about it. Many of them despise the importance of a Marxist culture and believe that such a culture consists simply of reading 'Capital' of Marx, or his biography. Marxist culture is, above all, the study, the knowledge and the deepening of the understanding of the Communist International. Without it there is no Marxism. There is a desire, a wish

that wants to lead to a Marxist understanding, but nothing else. Marxism is an explanation and the living materialisation of the conception of Marx, of his analysis of history. How would this be expressed if it were not through the Communist International? The Communists have left all this on one side, but very soon they are going to have to go back to it.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL: A NECESSITY OF HISTORY

The first four Congresses of the Communist International constructed this stage of history. Without the Communist International the USSR would not have existed. Stalin, Malenkov, Molotov, Khrushchev and partly Brezhnev, buried the first four Congresses. Today Brezhnev must begin to reopen the doors so that the air penetrates once more and the dampness disappears. They are still not widely open because of the fear that the dampness will envelop him. But where the others closed the doors, he must open them.

The first four Congresses of the Communist International determined the revolutionary orientation, analysis, policy, tactics and objectives. Today, it is quite certain that conditions are different. In that period there was only one Workers State. Today there are fourteen! The process was then very limited: the proletarian masses intervened very little, quite the opposite of today. But, between these periods, the analysis is the same: the need for the Communist International is the same. Today, conditions are much better. The fourteen Workers States give a formidable basis to such a Communist International. In 1917, it was necessary to create Communist parties to unify the world policy. Today, on the contrary, it is necessary to plan the Workers States on the base and on the objective of the communist International. The planning of the economy and of the policy must be determined by this need for unification, by the Communist International.

The bureaucracy of the Workers states, while being heterogeneous, must coordinate its action to confront the capitalist system. It must act as a single political leadership. Today, while continuing a policy of conciliation and of 'compenetration' with the capitalist system, it is more and more urgent for the whole of the bureaucratic leaderships to plan their general policy, and this goes hand in hand with the internal struggles. Even being heterogeneous, they must contract alliances and coordinate their interests.

But the centre that decides this stage of history is not the manoeuvres of the bureaucracy but the fact that capitalism can no longer support it, and consequently the capitalist system is preparing, and is going to try to survive with the atomic war, against the Workers States. In spite of the divergent interests of the bourgeoisies amongst themselves, capitalism cannot suffer a single Workers State and has to prepare itself as a system to smash it – against one or another bourgeoisie, but unified as a system. This takes away from the bureaucracy the possibility of manoeuvres of great historic scope of the sort made by Stalin. It does not annul the possibility of agreements, of the utilisation of the inter-capitalist disputes, of the inter-capitalist contradictions and competition. But it takes away the base of historic procrastination, exemplified by all manner of actions of coexistence with the capitalist system.

In all this process the bureaucracy has not increased its level, its number, its bureaucratic capacity, but, on the contrary, they have reduced. Compared with the progress of the world revolution, the bureaucracy is inferior to what it was before. The Workers States increased in number. In each country the number of bureaucrats increased, but proportionally less than the advance and progress of the revolution, and numerically, socially and politically less. The bureaucracy does not reproduce itself according to industrial, social and revolutionary development. It reproduced itself, but in a numerically very small way and qualitatively too. The commanding positions are not entirely in their hands. They still have them from the previous stage, but now they have to dispute them with the world revolution. The influence of the world revolution within the Workers States obliges them to discuss, appreciate, and see reality and to have to respond to the revolutionary reality that demands changes.

The numerical and social development of the bureaucracy was made in a stage of world retreat of the revolution. This is where it strengthened itself. It acquired the habit and custom of thinking as a bureaucracy, and the pleasures of the rich capitalists. Trotsky laughed at the women of the bureaucrats who went to Paris to buy hats, and at the bureaucrats who planned sweet factories. Trotsky analyses it in 'Revolution Betrayed'. The bureaucrats thought to live at the cost of the Workers State. It did not enter their heads that they had to respond to the necessity of constructing Communism. On the other hand, this was the preoccupation of the Bolshevik layer that was eliminated by Stalin. He began the policy of world development, of full alliance with the capitalist system.

The defeat of capitalism in the Second World War, the ascent of the revolution, the development of the colonial and semi-colonial revolution in Africa and Asia, the development of the proletarian struggles in Italy, France and England, impelled, sustained and encouraged the proletariat of the Workers States to feel secure to weigh and intervene. The development of industry strengthened and broadened the proletarian base. In the first stage, this encouraged a proportionately greater number of technocrats. But, in the world development of the revolution, the nationalist revolution, the decomposition of the Church, of part of the capitalist armies, the numerical development of the proletariat in the Workers States, industrial concentration in the Workers States, the coordination of the necessary struggles of the Workers States against the capitalist system: all this increased much more than the numerical increase in the reproduction of the bureaucracy. More important than its numerical increase was the increase in the revolutionary demands of the world revolutionary process which removed from the bureaucracy its world bases of conciliation with capitalism and with the backward countries. This, on the contrary, impelled the necessity of the revolutionary policy. This cut the bureaucracy off from the bases of its proliferation, of the extension of its domination. This is why, after the death of Stalin – or the assassination of Stalin – the bureaucracy defends itself; it did not widen itself, it defends itself.

The old (prior to the reorganisation of 1961) International's judgement of the 'birth, development and death of Stalinism' was not incorrect. But it was incorrect not to see the consequences. The consequences of the 'origin, development and death of the bureaucracy' were not the consequences of an inanimate process of nature. They were the consequences of a process in contact with the world revolution. So the process of disappearance, of numerical containment of the bureaucracy – the increase of

Workers States and the development of the Workers States – where was it leading to? What was the conclusion? The old International took up ‘The policy of entrism’. They took up entrism and they dissolved, disintegrated, and perverted themselves. It was a lack of appreciation of the process. They gave the liquidation of the bureaucracy as a numerical, global result of the forces of the proletariat, of the concentration of the proletariat, of the greater development of the Workers States. They hoped that automatically or simultaneously in the Communist parties there were going to be struggles that would correspond to the greater weight of the proletariat. This is why their policy of entrism failed. The policy of Pierre Frank Pablo and Mandel was to wait for the development of the proletariat and of the revolutionary struggles, which would lead to the organisation of revolutionary tendencies that would gain a majority.

The International of the time judged mechanically, not dialectically, the process of liquidation of the bureaucracy. It took it as a stage previous to the taking of power, when one could see that the liquidation of the bureaucracy formed part of the process of the world revolution, of organisation of tendencies and changes in the historic function of the bureaucracy. Without changing its historic nature, this modifies its conduct; the revolution was going to produce qualitative changes. Not in sufficient quantity to lead to transformations, but qualitative changes that were going to make possible bases of interior struggle in the bureaucracy. This was going to permit the ascent of forces for the development of revolutionary struggles that facilitate the political revolution.

The International of the time hoped that bureaucracy was going to expire because the development of the revolution and the Workers States was going to suppress it – as a mechanical and messianic conclusion. They hoped that the numeric increase of the proletariat and of the struggles of the masses of the world would facilitate the organisation of the revolutionary leaderships, independent of the objective process and of the influence on the bureaucracy itself. This is why they did not expect any change in the conduct of the bureaucracy. And, when the change came, they passed from antagonistic opposition to the bureaucracy, to adaptation to the bureaucracy. And, when Khrushchev made the criticism and condemnation of Stalin, Pablo declared, ‘The light of Socialism is already in view’. Pablo said this! As if our objective had already been accomplished! Pablo said this at the time of ‘de-Stalinisation’. This was the term they invented when it was only an aspect of world revolutionary influence on the Soviet Union. The world process of revolution was tending to impel the USSR forward through an increasingly favourable world balance of forces against the capitalist system. All these influences made themselves felt, provoking ruptures in the structure of the apparatus, changing its conduct.

These changes were eased by the comparative lack of reproduction of bureaucratic power, numerically speaking – compared with the world spread of revolution. This lack of reproduction, however, is not due to changes in the nature of the bureaucracy. These are due, rather, to the entry of more objectively Communist tendencies. An alteration started to take place in the lower rungs of the apparatus, and fresh influences made themselves felt there. People no longer joined the Party for the sole purpose of making a career, but to help improve the USSR in line with the world process. A pressure started to be applied on the Communist party (particularly the CPSU), propelling it towards Communism. There was a reanimation of Communist concepts. This process remained limited, but it was one of reanimation, nevertheless,

of Communist concepts. This is logical, because the historic base that had protected hard-line Stalinist conceptions was being extinguished. This process was – and is – far from being complete. As it started to appear, it was not set to give way directly to revolutionary and conscious leaders. Stalinism had done too much previously to ensure that these could not be born, and so would not arise. He had killed them ‘in the bud’. Capitalism – at the time of Stalinism and in complicity with it – had murdered and routed the elements in the world proletarian vanguard that could have become these leaders. So there was no fresh revolutionary leadership that could take over from the old style Stalinism. An intermediate sort of layer appeared, and an intermediate stage arose, through which bureaucratic power was to live some time longer. The difference today between this new layer and the old Stalinist one is that it can no longer reproduce itself as a layer, and it cannot extend as a power anywhere.

As a conscious leadership was not allowed to be formed to take over from Stalinism, various layers of bureaucracy arose, representing currents in distinct cleavages of bureaucratic power. These can be seen in China, Cuba, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and, of course, in the USSR. They each have differing tactics, varying levels of acceptance of the necessary objectives, each one distinct from the other, in the face of the world flux of the Socialist revolution.

The course of history changed, but not the objectives. The course and the forms changed. The growth of the bureaucratic social power was contained. Its political power was strengthened, but not its social power. The world point of support of the bureaucracy was diminishing. The bureaucracy, without being suppressed, lost part of its forces. It still exists as the social leadership, it has a powerful apparatus in the Soviet Union and in the Workers States, but it no longer supports itself on the justification that ‘it is necessary to defend the Workers State, whatever the cost’. Now it must support itself on the justification that ‘it is necessary to construct Communism’. The unequal and combined development allowed it to sustain itself but no longer to justify its historical conduct. It is not merely and simply a question of political and military power. It has to justify historically why it exists. While every layer of the bureaucracy in the previous stage justified its power with isolation, in this epoch it has to show that they genuinely represent the world ascent of the revolution, the empirical coordination between the struggles of the French, Italian and English proletariat with the Workers States, and that it coincides or agrees with this activity.

THE COMPENETRATIVE POLICY OF THE USSR

The Soviet bureaucracy discusses with European capitalism, but the European proletariat shakes the bourgeoisie and it obliges it to yield. The struggles of the English proletariat and of the masses of Ireland are favouring the Soviet bureaucracy which profits from these struggles because it obliges capitalism to have to seek conciliation with the Workers States. There are the conditions to take power but it cannot deny that such situations exist. It cannot ignore them, because, if it ignores them, it is replaced. So it has to seek how to impel a policy which responds to this necessity. It does it on the basis of bureaucratic interests, to unify Europe, to compete

with the Yankees. To profit from the inter-capitalist dissidence, to impel the disintegration of the homogeneity of the political structure of the common interests of the capitalist system. To disintegrate this policy is the least ill for the bureaucracy. But, at the same time, it's a blow to the capitalist system. It does not favour the existence of the capitalist system. It weakens it. Before, the policy of the bureaucracy favoured the existence of the capitalist system. Not now. Even the policy of agreement with Berlin, being an important concession of the bureaucracy, does not favour the existence of the capitalist system but weakens the unity of its structure and in every way permits an influence on the German capitalist state, which is a fundamental cornerstone of the capitalist system.

The bureaucracy no longer finds the means of reproduction in number, in force, and in weight, to face the development of the revolution. Ultimately, history is decided by centres. Globally considered, the bureaucracy in the epoch of Stalin and after Stalin was measured with the world revolution, comparing the forces in the dialectical relationship between it and the world revolution. It profited from the circumstances in which there was no leadership; there were no great Communist parties, great mobilisations of the masses and great proletarian weight. There were mobilisations of the masses, but no great proletarian weight. There were the conditions for the revolution in France in 1934, 1936 and 1938, and conditions for the revolution in Spain and Austria, but there was not the coordination, the demand of the Revolutionary Party and of great Workers Centres, and the global weight of the proletariat to impel such activity. On the other hand, today there are the sixteen Workers States.

In a certain moment the bureaucracy can prevent the proletariat from taking power in France, in Italy, and in England, but it cannot prevent the objective influence of sixteen Workers states which prevent the re-establishment of the structure of capitalist power. This creates new conditions and influences in the Workers States, greater weight of the revolution, of the communist thought and of Communist perspective. And it alters the omnipotent, unquestionable power of the bureaucracy. It alters it: it no longer feels secure. It feels shaken. It has to respond to the problems of Communist policy, thought, sentiment and perspectives. Humanity no longer discusses just the struggle against capitalism, but how to construct Communism! It no longer discusses whether or not the Soviet Union intervenes, nor does it wait for it to intervene. It uses the existence of the Soviet Union, of China, of Cuba, of Czechoslovakia, to take power. This already has a direct effect, independently of whether or not the bureaucracy of the Workers States intervenes.

This creates a condition which did not exist before, a certain condition favourable to the revolution, to the pressure within the bureaucracy. Since it is favourable to the revolution, consequently it stimulates and impels discussions, comparisons, proof, and analysis in the Communist parties in such a way as has never been before. It obliges them to think, to orientate themselves in confidence in Communism. The capitalist system is disintegrating; the struggles of the masses of the world – of Europe, Africa and Asia, and of Latin America – empirically coordinate against the capitalist system. This increases the confidence of the proletarian vanguard of the Workers States, of the intellectuals, of Communist layers, that feel the possibility of eliminating capitalism and constructing Communism. It helps, stimulates and impels groups, sectors and tendencies, to discuss objectively as Communists. The bureaucratic apparatus

impedes it, it goes on being as powerful as before. But it no longer has the capacity of reproduction, nor the perspective before it of developing. It no longer has any perspective before it. So it is an inverse process.

The bureaucracy keeps the apparatus, but it can no longer exercise the power as it did before, because it no longer finds the process in retreat, in stagnation, but in continuous advance. The continuous progress weakens the bureaucratic layers, the bureaucratic conception, the relationship with the capitalist system of alliance against the revolution, and aids and stimulates revolutionary tendencies. As the bureaucracy has the apparatus, it is expressed in a very limited form. It is not expressed directly. It advances successively, according to the forces that impel it, that are from the world revolution. But the revolution is contained. That is why it is not expressed in an uninterrupted progress, but is interrupted and unequal – in which it approximates more to the necessity of Communism in aspects of the analysis, but not in the policy. In others the policy approximates more, and not the analysis and conclusions – because it is a bureaucratic leadership that, to conserve its interests and power has to make these concessions. It does not raise the policy which is necessary for the development of the revolution. It no longer supports itself on the fear or preoccupation of the Soviet masses, feeling themselves isolated. It no longer supports itself on a single Workers State, on the justification and lie of appealing to the rest of the world ‘to defend the only Workers State’. It supports itself on the world expansion of the Socialist revolution. So it no longer has political or social justification with which to maintain power. It has the same bureaucratic power, but changing the relationships of forces, not increasing the power of the bureaucracy but increasing the power of the progress of the revolution. Moving forward the revolutionary struggles of the masses of the world which press on the on the bureaucracy and oblige it to respond to this necessity. But, at the same time, it no longer has the chance of coordinating and conciliating with the capitalist system. It has to prepare a global confrontation with the capitalist system.

The bureaucracy finds itself before an historic situation which it did not foresee, did not prepare for, which it could not have thought of. It has to respond at the same time to the capitalist system that prepares to attack the Workers States and tries to survive by means of the atomic war, and defend itself from the world revolution that progresses, advances, and tends to influence, and at the same time it does not increase numerically, it does not increase its weight in society and the economy, it diminishes. Taken in this process, it must respond. It can no longer conciliate with capitalism as before, selling out revolutions. It tries to conciliate, but it can no longer sell out revolutions. Now the central objective is not to sell out revolutions because it cannot.

The absence of the mass Communist International, of the centralisation of the world Communist movement, dispersed the objective capacity to analyse the world. The bureaucratic apparatus dispersed it. In the masses of the world the conception is maintained intact. It is not conscious, programmatic and political, because there are not the instruments. The conception exists in their sentiment, and they show it and express it through solidarity, through the repercussions that the revolution has between one country and another, amongst them, the United States. A world climate, a world situation, exists which means that the bureaucracy cannot dispose of these movements by confronting and containing them. It sees the capitalist system, which seeks to sustain itself, survive through the atomic war – and so it's less disposed to

defend itself from revolution. Technology and science advance, scientific capacity advances, knowledge advances; the struggle of the masses of the world, of the most backward countries, impels the communist sentiment.

Taken in this process, the bureaucracy receives constant pressures in its interior and is obliged to have to respond to this process. It has no interests in the revolution, but neither can it reproduce its power to be able to face the relationship of forces favourable to the revolution, so it responds bureaucratically, partially yielding to this necessity. It yields partially, trying to elevate its relationship with the world working class, with the world revolution, because it can no longer conciliate with the capitalist system. The capitalist system is reaching the end of its existence. It survives because the bureaucracy was incapable of overthrowing it. But, in surviving, it has armed itself with atomic arms and it threatens the power of the bureaucracy, and the latter feels that this can dislocate and smash it. And it takes as its enemy, as the essential fear, the capitalist system. It does not express it, it does not materialise it in literature because it does not have revolutionary literature, but it approximates to this necessity. So its internal structure weakens, permitting the progress of the revolution to exert a growing influence within it.

But the bureaucracy, for all that, doesn't cease to be a bureaucracy – that is to say, it puts a brake on this influence and defends the aspects which are less favourable to the restoration of the forces of the revolution. It defends itself from any Soviet functioning, from the objective revolutionary functioning of the communist parties. It seeks to yield as little as possible. At the same time, it must maintain and develop its alliance with the world proletariat. To defend the bureaucratic power, it must confront the capitalist system. Before, it used to ally itself with the capitalist system, now it must defend itself from this. It is incapable of reproducing itself quantitatively and qualitatively so as to maintain its relation of forces with society unchanged. Therefore, it has to yield. It must also confront the technocrats who are a threat to its power.

The development of the technocracy, in the absence of a development of the world revolution, has allowed the creation of group and caste interests. The bureaucracy must confront them today so as to avoid seeing its power endangered. What is lacking is a world centre of the Communist revolution, a centre which emits ideas and Communist objectives. What lacks are the Soviets, the development in each country of proletarian democracy. Because of this, local bureaucratic interests develop and clash together. It is such interests which provoke the dispersion of the forces of Communism. This favours the capitalist system, but does not diminish – on a historic scale – the force of the Workers States. This dispersion of the forces of the Workers States is compensated by the struggle of the masses in the capitalist countries, which weakens the capitalist system and prevents it from concentrating on confronting in a united form the world revolution. This is what allows the impulsion of the Communist parties to play the role which is objectively theirs.

Capitalism is preparing for the war in a short time, for a war it can launch at any moment. The masses of the world feel and live this situation every day. They are conscious of the weakness of the capitalist system. The process is a global one, empirically structured – including, in one whole, the bureaucracy, the Communist

parties, the revolutionary masses, all united by the need to confront the capitalist system which is preparing for the atomic war.

The influence of the revolution weighs on the masses of the most backward countries; it permits to gain sectors which, until then, had been servants of capitalism; it disintegrates the organisms of defence, of functioning, of the capitalist system such as the Church, the army, the intellectuals, all the vital centres. The masses of the world feel that this force acts against the capitalist countries. This is why they feel full of confidence in their alliance with the Workers States. They see the final settlement of accounts approaching, and they seek to centralise and maintain this centralisation through the organisms which already exist: the trade unions led by the Communists and Socialists, or by the Left wing Catholics and the Communist parties. The latter are drawing profit from this situation, just as the Social bureaucracy does; previously they used it to conciliate with the capitalist system, now they can no longer do this. Now they must inevitably confront the capitalist system, thus creating conditions which the Soviet bureaucracy can no longer control. It still maintains the interests of impeding the struggles to smash the capitalist system. It is, however, conscious of the fact that the capitalist system seeks to solve the antagonistic and historic contradiction between the Workers States and itself through the atomic war. This leads the bureaucracy to see that their world ally in this confrontation is the proletariat.

This situation exerts an influence on the whole world. The policy of the Soviet bureaucracy, of the Communist parties – whilst remaining conciliatory and opportunist – has become, for this reason, Left wing opportunism. It is still the same opportunism as before, but now it is directed to weaken and liquidate the capitalist system.

THE BUREAUCRACY NO LONGER HAS THE POSSIBILITY TO CONCILIATE

Formerly this opportunism consisted in conciliating with the capitalist system. Today, the latter can yield nothing either to the Workers States or to the bureaucracy. All the discussions they are having express this. For years they discussed on Berlin. The importance of Berlin is social and not geographic. It is a means of relation – a centre of influences and of communication. Economically and geographically it has no importance. If the discussion on Berlin lasted years, it is because the balance between capitalism and the Workers States was unsteady and constantly on the verge of provoking struggles, breaking and bursting. Capitalism is constantly in a deadlock because of the struggles of the masses in the capitalist countries which tend to suppress it. It is in a deadlock because of the influence of the revolution. Its relationships with the bureaucracy in the Workers States can give it no steady basis for conciliation and opportunism. Both of them are deadlocked by the revolution and no longer have the possibility to conciliate. The agreements they make together are temporary and cannot last many years. The Sino-Soviet conflict is an expression of this situation. In the absence of a Communist International, of a revolutionary policy by the Soviet bureaucracy, local interests are created and develop, mainly the case of the Chinese. The Chinese are now trying to imitate the Soviet bureaucracy in the

exploitation of an alliance and an agreement with the Yankees who were thus assisted in their counter-revolutionary military and atomic preparations.

The Soviet bureaucracy carried out the same policy in the past, and did so for about ten years. The difference with today is that then, they could lean on a passive situation, on a retreat of the revolution, and not on the progress of the struggle of the masses. Now there is the world process of advance of the revolution; there are sixteen Workers States, which means that the Chinese cannot exploit the same situation. This has an influence on the Soviet bureaucracy which sees the danger that the competition of the Chinese represents for it. It must therefore respond, seeking a social support which compensates for the competition of the Chinese. It can no longer, as previously, ally itself with the capitalist system, but must instead ally itself to the world proletariat.

To maintain itself it is inevitably compelled to seek part of the truth, to criticise the Chinese for their alliance with the capitalist system, when it did the same thing for so many years. It still does it with the agreement on Berlin. This conciliation on Berlin is, true enough, of a limited range, but it is nevertheless an alliance with the capitalist system. The capitalist system will not be able to draw any profit from it, just as it won't get anything out of the alliance with the Chinese through the 'ping-pong' policy. This, however, has an influence on the bureaucratic apparatus, destroying some of its stability.

The result of this unequal and combined process of progress of the revolution is that the bureaucracy must discuss at the same time as the process continues to advance. The revolution develops in new countries. The Workers States progress economically and scientifically in a constant way. They are also reinforcing their military and atomic power. All this gives the basis for an unlimited confidence in the future of Soviet society, independently of the bureaucracy which cannot assimilate the struggle to bring the capitalist system down. This gives the necessary confidence to certain layers but, above all, to the base, to the proletariat of these countries, to exert a favourable influence on the Communist parties.

BUREAUCRACY IS FACED WITH UNFORSEEN HISTORIC CONDITIONS OPPOSED TO THOSE THAT GIVE IT BIRTH

There is no conscious programmatic power to lead the situation. This power remains in the hands of opportunist and conciliatory Communists. There is no centralised leadership, whereas the process seeks to centralise itself. In these conditions, it is possible for the capitalist system to conciliate with the Workers States, China included. Capitalism does not succeed in steadying its power and simply act with a desperate policy which in no case suppresses the development of the revolution.

The interest of the bureaucracy is in not yielding. It tries to maintain in its hands the control of the situation. But the fact is, it no longer has the necessary points of support to maintain such a rigidity of control. The proof of this is Khrushchev. Did he not conciliate all he could with capitalism? Did he not promise Communism for 1980? A

‘goulash’ Communism! Now, what is Brezhnev saying today? ‘Communism is human fraternity’. Apparently this looks like literary declarations. No! No! And No! It is a question of conceptions. From Khrushchev to Brezhnev there is no change from the point of view of their historical function, but there is a change in the weight they can have. The bureaucracies, of the one as of the other, attempt to maintain their power. But, whereas Khrushchev promised better food in twenty years time, Brezhnev promised human fraternity. This is not a mere literary conclusion. It is a social conclusion which the bureaucracy sees itself compelled to put forward. Already it is no longer possible for it to maintain itself at the level of mere promises of a better economical being. It must respond to a social necessity, to the revolutionary intellectual preoccupation of Communist layers which realise that it is possible to suppress capitalism and wars. It is in this direction that it must find its way.

The bureaucracy has the power in its hands but, to retain it, it sees itself compelled to say in the letter Brezhnev sent to Gierak: ‘The objective of Communism is human fraternity’. Eight years ago Khrushchev said, ‘The objective of Communism is to give more goulash’. This difference in the prognosis and in the analysis indicates what is weighing inside the Workers States: the Communist preoccupation of the vanguard. This is why we talk of ‘Partial Regeneration’. Without changing its aims, the Soviet bureaucracy sees itself obliged to interpret history in a way which is nearer to Communism. It does this without changing its objectives. And, in consequence, this facilitates the tasks of the political revolution. One thing is Khrushchev speaking of ‘goulash’ and an altogether different thing is Brezhnev speaking of human fraternity. One thing is Khrushchev seeking an agreement with Yankee imperialism on the back of the Workers States, another thing is today’s bureaucracy which has to support Peru, Bolivia, Chile and the Middle East at the price of the alliance and the agreements with the capitalist regime. Without giving up its interests, the bureaucracy – to defend itself – must yield in part to the requirements of the revolutionary policy. To prevent itself from being knocked down it must yield. We support ourselves on this process with the perspective of deepening it systematically, to build the new leadership inside and outside the Communist parties. This is the way; one must know how to take advantage of the stages of history, and particularly of the Sino-Soviet conflict. One must intervene so as to incorporate, influence and compel them to an objective discussion. Our material force is that we incorporate ourselves in this discussion.

Brezhnev must discuss on the basis of human fraternity. The Chinese are going back on the achievements of the ‘cultural revolution’. The Chinese leadership must retreat, but the Chinese revolution is more powerful than any apparatus. Stalin assassinated the whole Bolshevik leadership; Brezhnev must speak of human fraternity. The Chinese leadership made the ‘cultural revolution’ to contain the urgency of the objective process and the necessity to discuss as Communists.

The agreement with Yankee imperialism seeks to avoid a new cultural revolution, to contain this process, but will not succeed in annulling it. The Yankees cannot give what the Chinese need, i.e. the coordination with the world Communist movement. The agreement with the Yankees corresponds to a local bureaucratic interest, when the world tends to unify and when Brezhnev speaks of human fraternity, ‘The objective of Communism is human fraternity’, this is not a sentence, a mere statement. No! They are compelled to speak in this way so as to contain, to respond to

the requirements of the development of a series of layers inside the Communist parties. One must not be deceived by an apparent immobility.

The French Communist Party has condemned the masses for their struggle in May 1968, including the Communist masses. 80% of the masses that mobilized in May and June 1968 were Communist and Socialist. They had to sustain the attacks of the Communist Party and repelled them. In Renault, for instance, they rejected these attacks unanimously, yet they did not abandon the CP. This signifies that they are conscious of the fact that their leadership did not want power, but that the Party remains a centre of class concentration. This is also an aspect of the 'Partial Regeneration'. Later on, the leadership of the Communist Party had to admit the mistake it made in May 1968. It did not say that it was possible to take power, but it did admit that the movement had not only been composed of 'hooligans'. The leadership of the Communist Party sought, in this way, to justify itself in front of the Communist vanguard. But the latter had already drawn its own conclusions. It saw that it had been right against its leadership. This leadership has survived at this stage, but has gained no authority. On the contrary, the Communist vanguard was reinforced in its conviction of being right. And in the May to come, it will attempt to triumph again, as much in France as in Italy and in the rest of the world.

If a Communist International existed, the activity for the new leadership would be carried out in an organised and organic way, with Congresses and discussions. Insofar as such an honest and conscious leadership responding to the revolutionary process does not exist, the construction of the new leadership develops itself in this way, in an empirical way, by leaps, in phases, which are constantly interrupted by the aggressions of a leadership which imposes retreats, but which leads neither to a dissolution nor to a decomposition, as in 'May 1968'. These events in France are part of the process of Partial Regeneration expressed in the USSR through the policy of the bureaucracy seeking an alliance with the colonial and semi-colonial revolutions, or with the revolution in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America, with the struggles of the proletariat in France, which it feels is going in the right direction. In the next stage, it is going to find the means to advance in this right way.

The Chinese are going back on their previous policy, but the conquests of the Chinese revolution are never going to be gone back on. Already, there has been a pact signed with the Yankees. Even if the Chinese leadership does not go any further, one cannot deny such a pact has been signed. It is impossible to walk back on the conquests, and particularly on the functioning of the Communist Communes. A conspicuous fact which points out the weakness of the leadership of the Chinese revolution is that, in the whole process, the proletariat did not intervene. Does this signify that it had no interest in intervening? Not at all! No appeals were made for it to intervene. When, in 1967/1968, in the heart of the 'cultural revolution' the Trade Unions were called to mobilise, it was by hundreds of thousands that the proletariat came out, waving the Red Flags from the trucks to accelerate the Cultural Revolution. When they were not summoned, they did not come out because they had no independent means of acting. As soon as they saw the possibility to do it, the proletariat came out. They came out singing the 'International', and not the 'Red heart of Mao Tse Tung'. There were many examples which constantly show that in the Chinese Communes, there is a deep progress of Communist sentiments and relationships.

The policy of the Chinese leadership is a bureaucratic attempt to carry out the Stalinist policy of conciliation with the capitalist system in objective conditions of history which no longer allow such a policy. Stalin used specific historic circumstances which were favourable to such a policy. He started off by suppressing all revolutionary leaderships, and then drew profit from the inter-imperialist conflict while the Germans were preparing for the war – as were the Italians – against the French and the English and the Yankees. Today, the situation is different; it is a situation in which the Workers States are against capitalism. The conditions of Stalin's epoch, no longer exist neither for the economic policy nor for the preparations for war. The policy of the Chinese has no perspective, neither in the long nor in the short run. It is going to fail and therefore the future revolutionary tendencies inside China which want a policy of coordination with all the Workers States. The behaviour of the Soviet bureaucracy, which appeals for the united front with the Chinese, is more logical, for it responds to the needs of the Workers States. It is also part of the 'Historic Re-encounter'.

PARTIAL REGENERATION AND HISTORIC RE-ENCOUNTER – TWO FORMS OF THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION

The Soviet bureaucracy defends itself from making such a policy, but the difference with the past is that it no longer does it by signing pacts with the capitalist system. Today, it seeks an agreement with the Chinese against the capitalist system. Why does the Soviet bureaucracy no longer repeat Stalin's policy? If the Chinese have the ping pong policy, why don't the Soviets have a tennis or football policy? No, on the contrary, they make appeals for a united front with the Chinese against the Yankees! All this is the product of the structure that the Workers States have already reached, of the progress of the world revolution. This is what obliges them not to enter in competition with the Chinese on the basis of conciliation with imperialism. But the main difference from before is that, today, they have to impel the struggle against imperialism. And all this is going to have important consequences in France, in Italy and in England, as much as in the whole world. This is inevitably going to lead the bureaucracy to impel the struggle of the proletarian vanguard, which feels sure of itself and decided to confront the capitalist system. All this is part of the Partial Regeneration.

This regeneration has limits. The bureaucracy cannot assassinate itself. It is going to seek to conciliate with the revolution, with the Communist parties, with the masses, as long as it is at a level which does not compromise its authority and its power. This is obvious. The proof of this is given by its constant retreats, retreats which are different in the Workers States and in the Communist parties. It is in the latter that the retreats are the greatest. The bureaucracy has to defend itself from the capitalist system, and to prepare itself for the final settlement of accounts. It must count with the interior processes which directly endanger its power: in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, and in the Soviet Union.

What was the behaviour of the Soviet bureaucracy in Poland, Stettin and Gdansk? During twenty days it did not intervene, thinking that the proletariat was going to be dissuaded, and was going to abandon its opposition to the leadership of the Communist Party. But, when the bureaucracy saw that the proletariat was likely to maintain its intervention, giving proof of its spirit of decision, it intervened with the

letter of Brezhnev. Whereas, in the past, Stalin gave the order to the bureaucracy to kill, to assassinate, so as to prevent any questioning of the bureaucracy's power, today Brezhnev writes a letter, saying: 'We must yield and come to an agreement'. Not only yield, but also come to an agreement! The object is without doubt still the same one: maintain the power of the bureaucracy – but to yield will always weaken this power and enable the advance of democratic and soviet functioning. This is not going to re-establish the Soviets and democracy, but the process moves towards them. All this is the Partial Regeneration.

We call this 'regeneration' because the bureaucracy must abandon its policy of repression for a policy of concessions. It must shift from a policy of alliance with capitalism to that of seeking alliances with the world proletariat, from a policy of selling out revolutions to that of selling arms to support revolutions in the Middle East, Asia, Latin America and Africa. We call it a 'partial regeneration' insofar as the intentions of the bureaucracy in this policy are quite obviously to maintain its power. As it can no longer do it, as in the past through repressions, through the sell out of revolutions, and through the alliance with the capitalist system, it must make concessions. For this reason the regeneration is only a partial one.

PARTIAL REGENERATION AND HISTORIC RE-ENCOUNTER

But, on the other hand, these concessions, this regeneration, facilitate the development of the discussions, the policy, the movements and orientations, which are weakening the system of domination of the bureaucracy. It is for this reason that we see in the Partial Regeneration a means to develop the political revolution, not a substitute but a means to make it less cruel. It is not a question of eliminating it, but of trying to prevent some of the damage it will cause in the uninterrupted course of the revolution.

For this reason, such a Partial Regeneration takes place and also the development of influences and processes for the formation of the revolutionary leadership. For this reason, the Historic re-encounter originates from the Partial Regeneration. The impulse, the movement, the appearance, and the development of Communist layers seeking a communist revolutionary policy are made easier. These layers are seeking Marxism and, for the first time, they are interested in it.

The Partial regeneration and the Historic Re-encounter do not supplant the political revolution; they mean conditions which facilitate the revolutionary policy of the IV International. Our role is not annulled by this process. It is facilitated for the very reason that the objective of our revolutionary policy is to develop and generalise the world course of the revolution, to give consciousness of the need to return to Marxism, or to see it applied if it is for the first time. Therefore, our task is facilitated. If there were another way, we would use it. The Partial Regeneration facilitates our activity and enables us to introduce ourselves in the vital centres where the proletarian vanguard is concentrated, and where the world revolution is concentrated. In consequence, this enables us to exercise and develop our influence.

In Trotsky's epoch there was only one Workers State. Today there are sixteen. The atomic war then was not the problem which it is today. There were no Revolutionary States. Today they exist. It is on the basis of these conditions that we must see the

centres which decide the possibilities of development, the bases of the new revolutionary leadership in the Workers States and in the world Communist movement.

Throughout the world today the process of revolution can start, and does start, from heterogeneous, nationalist, non-Communist, Catholic movements. But, insofar as they advance, they become Communists. Why? Because the Workers States already have their authority asserted and history has shown they are the right way for the new society, which does not mean that the leadership and the policy were correct. No! This is what we are discussing.

We take support in the Partial Regeneration of the Communist parties, their role and the Workers States' role, as much as in the new movements, in order to influence them. This is the case of Torres for instance, the case of the Left Christian Democracy, or of those who present certain Socialist or Communist aspects. All these movements converge towards the communist movement. There is no revolution in the world which, to maintain or develop itself, does not become Communist.

This does not depend on the Soviet bureaucracy, but on the Communist objectives and programme. The policy is not a Communist one, but the objectives and the intentions are – showing that it is the way of history. This is the reason why we do not seek an independent way to develop ourselves as a big mass movement. But we do maintain our movement as an independent one, so that we can develop the theoretical, political and organisational capacity to influence these movements. The more we develop ourselves, the better it is.

To understand the overall course of this Partial Regeneration, its differentiations and its unequal development, it is compulsory to experience the objective movements of activity in each country which determine the policy and the perspective of the country in question. We must also rest on the world course of the revolution and take account of the Chinese-Soviet conflicts, of the inter-bureaucratic conflicts in the Workers States, of the necessity to smash capitalism and to construct Communism and the new society. The Soviet bureaucracy does not know what to do. It is faced with historic needs that it doesn't understand. In consequence, it must prepare itself differently and, for this, has to resort to Marxism. We base ourselves on this perspective.

It is impossible to reinvent or to supersede Marxism. To build the new society – which the Soviet bureaucracy and some of the Workers States see themselves obliged to envisage – Marxism is necessary. None of the bureaucracies, none of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries, are preoccupied with Marxism. Be it in Great Britain, Italy or France, the leadership of the Communist parties has not foreseen this need. It is urgent to build a new society: The Communist society. It is urgent to develop the Workers States towards Socialism. How are we going to do this? All the Communist parties are in crisis. It is urgent to act everywhere to organise the struggle for power in the capitalist countries, in alliance with the struggle in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, with the revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America. We must prepare ourselves for the atomic war. For none of these tasks do they have a policy, a response. The Partial Regeneration and the Historic Re-encounter go together with this process.

The aim of maintaining our independent activity as the IV International is, among other things, to respond to the need for the Communist parties to return to Marxism. They have to return to Marxism. The more we are prepared for this task, the more we are going to exercise an influence.

The bureaucracy in the Workers States, starting with the Soviet Union, sees itself constantly obliged to reformulate the Marxist conception – true enough in a limited and partial way but nevertheless in a real way. The letter in which Brezhnev talks of human fraternity, as the objective of Communism, clearly indicates how they are obliged to discuss.

They can no longer pose that the objective of Communism is ‘to secure life, a job and work’. Now they have to talk of human fraternity – thus reflecting the preoccupation of the Communist vanguard. We are advancing towards this preoccupation. This is why the more we develop our movement, our texts, our capacity to write, to organise ourselves, the more we are going to show ourselves capable of objectively influencing the process.

The Partial Regeneration is not going to lead to a total regeneration. ‘Partial’ means that the bureaucracy is obliged to take an interest, to preoccupy itself, and to favour the revolutionary policy in a limited way. The bureaucracy does not only consist of Brezhnev but of a whole series of layers. There is the apparatus of the Party, of the economy, of the army, of the police. These are all different categories. The most remote from the Communist interest is the one which does not exercise the role of the leadership of the Party. But it is also the strongest category, the one with the closest links with the economic apparatus, with usufruct. Even the military apparatus is closer to the Party, because it depends on it. The layers of the economic apparatus are remote from the Communist interest in the Workers State: be it in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania or Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, it is the Party which determines the most.

The limits of the concessions that the bureaucracy can make are determined by the danger of its being dislodged by the proletariat. It is not going to yield or abandon its power. It must make these concessions, but it does so in order to maintain itself in power. But, in their turn, these concessions stimulate the intervention of the proletariat. Faced with the uprising of Stettin and Gdansk, Brezhnev had to say that the responsibility fell on the Polish Communist leaders and on the Party’s bureaucracy. He did not use the word ‘bureaucracy’ but said ‘lack of democracy’, which is the same thing! The proletarian vanguard is well aware of this and elevates its struggle to suppress the bureaucracy. This policy of concessions is limited by the dangers that the bureaucracy runs of being eliminated. However, its existence is insecure, insofar as the constantly ascending course of the revolution weakens its interior structure. Before it abandons its power, the bureaucracy is going to deal with many blows, but each time with less success. The case of Yugoslavia is clear and relevant.

To maintain itself, the soviet bureaucracy abandoned Marxism and suppressed all those who still retained Marxism. It eliminated the leadership which arose from the revolution, the continuators of the Russian Revolution, and all those who represented the continuation of the Party, of the revolutionary policy and of Marxism. It attempted

to survive by suppressing the revolutionary policy and Marxism. It made a caricature of the Party by suppressing all the revolutionary leaders. Today, it must come back on all this. It must return to a Party functioning.

To confront Ota Sik, Brezhnev had to reorganise the Party in Czechoslovakia. To contain the strikes in Stettin and Gdansk, Gierek had to liquidate a fair part of the bureaucratic apparatus. He had to yield under the pressure and liquidate Ministers he had himself nominated three days before. All this indicates the behaviour the bureaucracy is obliged to adopt. To discuss with the Chinese, the Soviet bureaucracy has to call for an anti-imperialist united front, whereas a little time ago it had to make appeals in the name of bureaucratic interests.

In each Workers State there is a similar process taking place which has neither the same the same depth nor the same level, but a similar one. It will lead inexorably to the same conclusion. To intervene in this process, it is compulsory to return to Marxism, to its utilisation, and to the Marxist knowledge of the history of the Workers States and of the Communist International. It is necessary to deepen the understanding of the history of world Communist movement, of the Communist International and the Workers States, and their construction. All this is going to be discussed in a very short time from now. The 'Partial Regeneration' and the 'Historic Re-encounter' do not mean a policy to be carried out, but the consequence of an irreversible process. It is a means to prepare oneself to discuss with the Communist vanguard, with the Communist leaderships in the world, to restructure and apply Marxism before, during and after the atomic war. This demands from us that we deepen Marxism, our knowledge of the history of the world Communist revolution, of the Communist International, of what the Workers State represents, and how to move from there to Socialism. We must be able to discuss with the Communist vanguard and with the Workers States on all these problems. Brezhnev's letter, talking of human fraternity as the objective of Communism, shows us what we must discuss, linking it up with the atomic war, its preparation, with the organisation of big strikes, with the anti-imperialist struggle, with the construction of Communism.

The 'Partial Regeneration' and the 'Historic Re-encounter' also signify that it is necessary for the Communist parties to return to Marxism. In doing this they are going to have to coordinate and to seek new support. It is in this way that we prepare the Historic Re-encounter. It is not determined by the fact that the Communist parties let us discuss with them or not, but by the fact that they are obliged to return to Marxism. Such is the basis of such a Re-encounter. The deeper our preparation is the quicker and the deeper we will impel the Communist vanguard and stimulate it to confront its leadership.

It is necessary to consider the fact that we have in front of us a powerful apparatus, with a solid structure to dominate, an apparatus in the hands of a bureaucratic team, which has the power. It remains nevertheless indispensable to form new leaderships to carry forward the revolutionary policy which, in turn, cannot develop without Marxism. Hence our conscious and absolute confidence that Partial Regeneration leads to the Historic Re-encounter which, in its turn, signifies the unification, the centralisation, the coordination of all the conscious forces which seek to apply Marxism in order to develop the revolution and to build the Workers States.

It is in this way that we understand the Historic Re-encounter, and not as a re-encounter between them and us. It is a necessity of history in the process of development. Brezhnev denounces the Chinese because of their policy of encounter with the Yankees, instead of having 'a policy which favours the front against them'. This also leads to the Historic Re-encounter and not to some assertion of the bureaucracy. This favours the Partial Regeneration.

THE ROLE OF POSADISM

We must go forward and meet this necessity. We have to stimulate this Communist vanguard, make it feel that it can carry out a policy that links up with Marxism again, a policy of struggle for power, for the revolutionary leadership, without the fear and the dread of remaining isolated from the whole of the masses. It is for this reason that we must publish and publish. It is for the same reason that Trotsky is published today in all languages. Trotsky responds only partially to the needs of the stage, insofar as the relation of forces, the structure and the forms of the process, have changed from the stage in which Trotsky lived. Today, it is our texts that serve and must be applied. Also, the more we develop independently the more our forces increase and the more our capacity of action and our weight is great to weigh on the process and orientate it.

We must not guide ourselves on the communist parties' reaction, containing actions of repressions. These reactions are everywhere the same. Only, the biggest Communist parties of Europe are less sensitive, because their bureaucratic leaderships are more solid, with closer links to the economic apparatus and to the state.

Therefore, these apparatuses feel themselves compromised. They have acquired the habit of judging in a bureaucratic way. Their very conception of the world is bureaucratic. In other countries it is different because the bureaucracy is not as strong, is less dependent on the commands of the state apparatus, is less linked to the exercise of the bureaucratic power. This is why we can have a great influence on them.

The bureaucracy of the Workers State has acquired a conception of the world in harmony with its own function of apparatus, leading it to see everything in an individual, selfish way, with the sentiment of being the boss, the chief. The tendencies, the tastes and the way of thinking of these bureaucracies is based on private property; they extol the bourgeois habits, be it in the way they dress, the way they eat, or in family relations. They use Communism for their own individual interests.

But with the progress of the revolution and of Partial Regeneration, new layers are going to start thinking as Communists and no longer in an individual and selfish way. They are going to learn how to see the interests of the revolution in a more objective way. It is obvious that the bureaucracy as such is not going to change. Its historic nature remains the same but its behaviour and its conduct are going to have to change. Through the internal struggles a whole series of new layers will be able to elevate themselves, thus making the Partial Regeneration easier. The latter is going to be expressed in the changing of conceptions and of the norms of observations of the bureaucracy. Although as a caste it cannot change, a part of its composition is going to be modified.

In any case, the guarantee of the Partial Regeneration does not lie in such changes, but much more in the fact that the world proletarian vanguard and the process of advance of the world revolution is going to impose it. It is under such a pressure that apparatuses of today are going to explode and the new leadership is going to appear. The bureaucracy is not going to give up any of its interests or the exercise of power. It is not going to change. But it is going to have to give up its place to new layers of the bureaucracy which have not yet been compromised in the exercise of power and receive more directly the influence of the revolution.

The policy based on Partial Regeneration and on Historic Re-encounter presents some very high risks. The greatest is the danger of adjusting to the policy of the communist parties. The risk is of seeing the Partial Regeneration as something which is going to deepen progressively to the point where the bureaucracy will be won to the revolution. No never! Never is the bureaucracy going to be won to the revolution! It is going to resist and oppose it. But its weakening favours the development of new layers, and enables our influence to be exercised in order to organise the new leadership. If we do not understand the process in this way, if we do not have an intense political life and preparation, we might expect the Soviet bureaucracy itself to change and to become revolutionary. Never! Never is the bureaucracy going to change in this way!

The place it occupies in society obliges the bureaucracy to usurp the power of society. However, and as we have already analysed, it needs to make concessions and this facilitates the ascent of new layers, internal discussions, and the return to Marxism. In this way the proletarian vanguard can weigh more to impose Marxism. We must therefore consider that the bureaucracy as such cannot change but sees itself obliged to yield to favour certain changes. We know it is incapable of changing, but we use the changes it is obliged to make to progress in the revolutionary policy and to organise the new leadership so as to support the objective struggle of the masses in each country against capitalism.

It is to ensure its own survival that the bureaucracy must favour certain measures, take a series of positions favourable to the revolution, under the impulse of forces which oblige it to modify its conduct. It is for this reason that it has no consistent policy programme to build socialism consciously, hence, the incoherence of its positions. The Soviet bureaucracy politicises with the Chinese and correctly criticises certain points. If it were the result of a programme or of revolutionary objectives of a Marxist conduct, of a Marxist programmatic decision, this criticism would be continuous, in the form of analysis, of political positions, and of tactical measures against the capitalist system. It should orientate itself to enable the restoration and the installing of Soviet democracy. The bureaucracy cannot act in this way, insofar as it has to defend itself. The way to measure the impact of the political revolution and the degree it has reached is by the level of Soviet democracy in the USSR.

The Soviet Union' foreign policy in this period is an important aspect of the conduct it has to follow in order to confront the capitalist system. Without using revolutionary methods, it has to confront capitalism. However, as long as it does not return to Trade Union democracy, as long as it does not permit to restore and install Soviet democracy, all its activities and all its attitudes towards imperialism will lack strength and will not enable the world revolutionary movement to be coherent at the necessary

level. The correct positions that it can take remain isolated and suffer from a lack of logical and consistent support. This is the product of an absence of interests, of capacity, of programme, in the bureaucracy. Therefore, it is necessary to measure the bureaucracy not only in function of its foreign policy but also of its internal policy. Its foreign policy cannot go very far because of the fear of being suppressed at the same time as the capitalist system. For the same reason, the bureaucracy refuses to permit any democracy in its internal policy. It is incoherent to refuse the application of democracy inside if it makes appeals to smash capitalism outside. Besides, the bureaucracy has to face also the need of building Communism. It has to confront the need to build a new society. It does not know how to do it. It has no imagination and no revolutionary culture to do it. And it is impossible to build Socialism without such culture.

A revolutionary culture signifies Marxism and a world Marxist team. To be constructed, Socialism requires a conscious culture and this much more than in the capitalist system, because the masses must all intervene. Culture is not knowledge. It is not the scientific or technical capacity of part of the population. It is this capacity of the whole population. Only in this way is it possible to construct Socialism.

It is compulsory to make a distinction between the internal and the foreign policies of the Soviet bureaucracy so as to measure better the degree of evolution it reaches and, in consequence, the way in which we can use it to intervene. We expect nothing from the bureaucracy. Events like the bureaucracy's criticisms of the dissidents and of the market economy indicate how the Soviet bureaucracy must seek coherence between its internal and foreign policy. But it cannot achieve this because it has no revolutionary interests.

However, in spite of the unequal character of progress from one country to another, it comes out as evident that the bureaucracy needs logic to build the Socialist society, to pursue the construction of the Workers State, and for its own survival in the Workers State. It feels that it can no longer vegetate in the Workers State. It must respond to the necessity of constructing the Workers State. It lacks policy, a previous experience and a team to do this. However, it must do it because independently of the pressure and intervention of the masses to impel revolution, new Workers states are in construction. There are some countries that are constructing themselves on the way to the Workers State. They are developing and putting pressure on the bureaucracies and on the Workers States by impelling the masses.

The various sectors of the bureaucracy are obliged to think logically. They try to solve the inter-bureaucratic problems through agreements or through reciprocal exclusions: this is the case of Ota Sik and of Liu Chao Chi. The two bureaucracies try to eliminate their opponents, but this does not solve the problems.

The structure reached by the revolution and by the economy in the Workers States, by the Socialist revolution, by the revolutionary struggle of the masses, by the struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist countries, impels the elevation of the structure of the Workers States. The Soviet bureaucracy must respond to this necessity – because the masses of the Workers States participate, have acquired conviction and security, they weigh and receive the influence of the proletariats of France, Italy, Great Britain, Latin America, and of the world revolution. The bureaucracy feels it is no longer

alone in the leadership. It must take account of this revolutionary world pressure and it is incapable of responding to it with a coherent programme.

Although the French, English, Italian and Latin American proletariat and the North American masses have no direct communication with the Workers States, their influence is exercised by the sole fact of their anti-capitalist mobilisation. They remove from capitalism all its capacity to manoeuvre, to conciliate with the bureaucracy, and oblige the latter to adopt an intransigent class attitude. They suppress any possibility of making concessions, obliging it to prepare the confrontation of the atomic war. The intervention of the proletariat in capitalist countries takes away from the bureaucracy its field of manoeuvre to conciliate with imperialism. This weighs on the state of mind, on the capacity, on the decision of the proletariat vanguard in the Workers States, but also on the bureaucracy. The proletarian vanguard feels impelled to try and re-establish Soviet democracy. As for the bureaucracy, it must make concessions in order to defend itself.

One of the aspects of these concessions is the participation, limited but still participation, of the Soviet Trade Unions in the struggle of the world proletariat. The soviet proletariat has not intervened like this for many years. Although it does it through its leaderships, it still participates. It has made collections, sent resolutions, particularly about Sudan. For the first time in Sudan, after decades, the Soviet bureaucracy has to take an attitude like a Communist International – which means the defence of the world Communist movement and the preparation of the war. Since it does not have a leadership which genuinely and directly represents the interests of world Communism, it is through these aspects that we have to gauge the possibilities which exist to impel the political revolution.

They are not measures that are continued either politically or economically. They are aspects that show the half of the retreat towards the destruction of the essential bases of the Workers State. Whilst the bureaucracy could lead and impose without having to take account of others it did not need discussion, programme, policy, meetings and Marxism. Now, it has to discuss. It has to direct itself towards the Sudanese masses. It has to explain before the Communist parties of the world why they massacred the Sudanese Communist Party. It has to discuss. It has to explain why there are differences with the Chinese. And it has to explain that it is aspiring to the Anti-imperialist United Front. In Hungary, it has to show why there is disharmony. How to discuss? It can no longer lie. Its lies are not accepted. It goes on lying, but its lies are no longer accepted. Because the proletariat of Hungary and the Soviet Union listens to, feels and enters into, the struggles of the proletariat of the rest of the world, of the programme of the revolutionary struggles, it stimulates them to participate.

It is necessary to take account of the fact that it is not a led and programmed process; it is empirical. So its features are shown empirically. But the line of history is like this. It is necessary to lean on it, to intervene and favour the changes, until the opportunity and possibility occur to constitute organisms. Inevitably they have to be constituted whether for the discussion with the Chinese, for the internal discussions, for the preparation for the war, or for the war itself. They have to be constituted and have to take Marxism as the conscious beginning, the working class and the proletarian vanguard of the Workers State, to be able to weigh – if not directly, then through layers of the Party in the first stage, and then directly. Us, too. Since they

have to discuss coherently they will not be able to avoid it; they will have to discuss everything they want to discuss on the basis of Marxism.

The bureaucracy conducted all the previous stage in their own sectarian and corporate interests. It was to defend themselves. Now, to defend themselves they have to widen the discussion. Tomorrow, to face and to prepare for the war, to elevate the construction of the Workers State towards Socialism, they will have to open the doors to a discussion with all revolutionary currents. And there are few revolutionary currents. We have the legitimate right, the legitimate aspiration, and we prepare ourselves to intervene in this discussion. We are already doing it. It will be impossible for them to deny us or prevent us from participating in the discussion and the leadership. It is urgent to seek a greater authority, a greater weight, a greater internal coherence, in our own International and to be able to weigh in this process. We need greater theoretical and political capacity and preparation, greater capacity to discuss the construction of the Workers States, and lead the Workers States to Socialism. We need greater capacity to discuss the problems of the economy, of the construction of the organs of soviet society. This requires greater preparation on our part, greater capacity and greater dedication.

The crisis of the Communist parties is determined by the fact that they must face a stage of history for which they are not prepared. They have to take power, and they are not prepared for power. Fundamentally, the French and Italian Communist parties, the Chilean and Uruguayan Communist parties are not prepared for this task, while the bases of these parties receive the influence of the revolution and demand from the leaderships the discussion of coherent positions, and the utilisation of Marxism. This is why they pay attention to and seek our texts. They need coherent explanations based on Marxism. What does that mean? It means to take the analysis from a previous period, to dominate what is developing and to prepare the later developments. To foresee the legitimate interests of humanity and the objective interests of Socialism. They do not have this method, their leaders and cadres are not accustomed to discussing the truth. They are not accustomed to discussing with the truth, with Marxism. To face the atomic war and to pass from the atomic war to the continuation of the construction of the Workers States and Socialism, Marxism is necessary. This is why the intervention of all the currents that struggle for Communism is necessary. Those that genuinely represent Marxism, those that have teams prepared for this task, will have prevalence, priority and greater capacity. In Lenin's epoch the Russian Revolution was made. In this stage there is the existence of sixteen Workers States, without leadership, but which need to unify themselves to face the final settlement of accounts. The bureaucracy tries to unify itself solely for the war, but objective necessity impels them to prepare themselves for the war and the revolution. Revolution – war – revolution. Marxism is irreplaceable. And we are prepared for this activity. To do it we have to improve quality and quantity. Quality means greater theoretical and political preparation, greater political life. And quantity means a greater number of militants, cadres, greater influence and links with the Communist parties, and greater capacity and dynamism to intervene in the process.

With the effect of clearly establishing historic principles, it is necessary to consider the fact that the nature of the bureaucracy through its function in history prevents it from changing. It can acquire many means, but not revolutionary culture, because it does not feel attracted to this. Revolutionary culture is opposed to their interest and

function. It is not that they cannot educate themselves or do not want to educate themselves, but that historically they do not feel the necessity; it is against them. But, since history does not permit them to strengthen their power on a world scale, it is constituted on a national scale, the process surpasses their capacity to foresee and understand. The revolution shows itself to be superior to them. Since it could not triumph, because the leadership was not constituted in time, a symbiosis is produced in which the bureaucracy is obliged to partially modify itself. This permits forces to gather and develop, and we still do not know how they are going to appear. Forces that will have to play a role of leadership of the political revolution and which will be a combination of the interior struggle in the Workers states and the struggle of the proletariat of the capitalist countries and the revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The function of the small Communist parties in countries like Belgium, Holland and Great Britain, has to be made precise. What is their function in countries where they are not the leadership? Through their vegetative and competitive interests, they tend to present themselves as the leaders of the revolution, and they dispute the leadership of the proletariat. An impossible thing, completely impossible! The role of these parties is to help the proletariat to take power and so to exercise the function which we exercise with regard to them. This is the polemic that these Communist parties have to open. They do not have the possibility of leading the struggle for power; they must serve as a bridge, as a base that helps the proletariat to take power. Not as Trade Union leaders, no! No! But as political programmatic organisers. To help the masses in their internal struggles to acquire the notion, the consciousness and the capacity to struggle for the programme, and to foresee, with documents, orientations, material, analysis, policy and tactic. They must do this otherwise they have no sense. The English masses, for example, like the Irish masses, are not Communist. But it is a permanent process of the revolution with certain characteristics that are determined by the place. And the Permanent Revolution – in England at this stage – passes through the Labour Party. Before the masses reach the Communist organisation of the revolutionary policy, they still have to make policy in the Labour Party.

Meanwhile, what does the Communist Party do? Does it wait for a majority? This does not make sense! The English masses will take power before the Communist Party can become the Party of the masses – and it is never going to be the Party of the masses as a Communist Party. So what is its historic function? To vegetate? It is urgent that we intervene, advising and impelling the communist Party to exercise this function. The same in Belgium. It is the way for the Communist Party to develop itself, ‘that the masses take power’. This is our function in history. It is necessary to explain it to them! It is not that they feel ashamed or belittled but they do not understand. They believe that, since the USSR is powerful and china is powerful, they too are going to be powerful. But they do not see the stages, tempos, and necessities of history.

It is necessary to establish clearly that the bureaucracy cannot change. It cannot transform its historic function, because its historic function in the economy is not necessary. If it is not necessary, it cannot have ideas for the future. When it does, then it is dying. It cannot execute itself but neither can it transform itself. On the other hand, since it remains in power and needs to maintain and widen that power, it must develop its capacity to understand, but not to transform, itself. This produces internal

crisis and internal revolution. We profit from these circumstances to develop to the maximum this internal revolutionary development. There are layers that are becoming incorporated into the bureaucracy, that try to assume a new function, supporting themselves on the function and the action of the world proletariat. This will permit the ascent of new layers to build the conscious leadership during or after the political revolution.

THE SOCIALIST PROGRESS OF THE WORKERS STATES AND THE ROLE OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL IN THIS STAGE

To understand how the progressive development of human civilisation takes place, how the history of humanity unfolds, is one of the most difficult tasks. However, it is also a key to aid its progress. We are – on a historic scale – at an intermediate point, already emerging from the previous cycle of humanity (of private property). To understand the process of transformations, and hence to intervene in it, one has to take account of the stages which the political revolution undergoes. Partial Regeneration is only a part of the Political Revolution. It is one of its phases.

This present stage of human development we live in is one of the most important in all the history of humanity. This conclusion includes confidence in the future of humanity, the security to intervene and to lead the process so as not to allow oneself to be carried away, to be shaken or to underestimate this process. We intervene with few material forces, but with the most complete theoretical and organisational capacity since Trotsky. Apart from us, there is no other force with this capacity. There are enormous material forces like China. But it is not China that is going to resolve this problem. It has the material means which is one of the bases for the solution of the problem, but what definitively resolves this problem is not material means. Imperialism has more material means than China. It has atomic arms and it has people who go to the moon, but it is not going to resolve the problem. The Soviet bureaucracy has more material means than China, and it also has a structure as a Workers State which permits a superior organisation of forces than China, which is the base of the political revolution.

We have the enthusiasm, the complete affection, the communist fraternity, to intervene in this process, not as the IV International, with a selfish and sectarian aim as a Party, but, as a Party, to intervene in a process which requires the concentration and centralisation of the best of humanity. It is not a problem of the Party, but it is a problem in which it is compulsory to intervene as a Party. Science in its most developed aspect is Marxism. It demands the greatest human capacity. The best weapon that humanity has is Marxism, to progress and utilise the best instruments within reach. The USSR is the most complete of these instruments, and also it is the basis of the revolution. The stimulus can be given by any revolution, but the central decisions are made in Moscow.

THE NATURE OF THE BUREAUCRACY WILL NEVER CHANGE

The most difficult aspect to understand is the behaviour of the bureaucracy and the evolution of this behaviour in relation to the world revolutionary vanguard and to ourselves. One cannot place oneself in this process with attitudes of ignorance or

uncertainty. How is it going to go? It is true that there are certain aspects which we cannot foresee, but we must know the fundamental laws which, of necessity, are going to determine the process and its principal phases. In order to know it we must start from the vital centres which are determinant: the historical and social nature of the bureaucracy.

The analysis of the bureaucracy must start from the fact that it is a historic leadership which, while acting as a class in defence of interests which make it similar to a class, has neither the structure nor the social relations nor the situation nor the category of a class. The role of the bureaucracy in history is determined by its role in the economy. As it is a question of a Workers State it has to extend its power on the political plane. One has to start from there in making an analysis. Why cannot it transform itself? Because of its function in history and not because of theoretical or political incapacity. It has neither a legitimate past nor present, and it cannot have a future because its role in history is completely unnecessary. It has nothing to justify its existence, either in the past or in the present. Without a doubt it exists and has power at its disposal. Nevertheless, it does not have a present because it cannot structure any revolutionary theory, any culture, any programme or any policy. This is where it is necessary to start, and the text of Trotsky on the subject 'The Revolution Betrayed' is one of the most beautiful texts of the history of humanity after 'Capital'.

The bureaucracy must justify its existence. As it cannot do it by arguing about the historic necessity of its role, it seeks to do it by the power of its apparatus. It searches as hard as it can but it cannot find either programme or theory or policy. It is conservative, passive, stupid, imbecile: these are inherent qualities. But it is the bureaucracy of the Soviet Workers State! And the social, scientific and economic level attained by the USSR, its development and that of the world revolution, provokes the incorporation of new layers who no longer come from the all-embracing passive, conservative interests of the old bureaucracy. They feel more secure, they feel that they have a certain function in society, and they feel that they are participating in the construction of society. But they do not have their own ideas.

The future is not of the bureaucracy, it is of the Workers States and of Socialism. The bureaucracy has no future. Even the new layers have no future. If they had a future they would build the programme, theoretically and politically. Since they don't have it, it is necessary to await internal struggles. But they cannot make internal struggles in a revolutionary way, or they would hang themselves. They have to make the internal struggle because a new factor is added which, later and already now, is a fundamental aspect of the progress of history – which is the revolution. But then they no longer work as a bureaucracy. They already have one foot in the revolution. But not even these sectors are going to decide. What is going to decide is the combination of these new sectors of the bureaucracy, part of the bureaucracy elevated through contact with the world revolution, with us and with other tendencies that are inevitably going to arise. They will arise in China, in Cuba, and will be a concentration of revolutionary tendencies. We are an inseparable part of this.

But it is not necessary to wait for the bureaucracy so that it can formulate programme and policy that imply the conscious development of the revolution. This is going to happen, but together with the internal struggle of the bureaucracy. This is why we pose as the fundamental example to measure the progress of the political revolution,

the internal relations of the Soviet Union. Above all in the Soviet Union. We do not make a separation between the internal and external policy of the soviet bureaucracy. We measure the behaviour of the bureaucracy, in part, by its external policy. But we say, and we repeat, the bureaucracy can be more audacious in its external policy than in its internal policy. Because in its external policy it faces capitalism which it is preparing to overthrow, and there is no other way except to be more audacious. It finds obstacles that previously were not there.

Previously it was capitalism itself that prepared to overthrow it, but it coincided with it against the revolution. Not today. Today capitalism has no chance of coinciding with the Workers states. The cycle of agreements is closing. The bureaucracy decides to confront it, but to better preserve its internal interests. This is why we say that the external policy is a reflection of the internal policy, but not always an immediate or successive continuation. At times there are contradictions. These contradictions exist, and will always exist, in the bureaucracy. Even under Stalin. How are they resolved? Either the external policy determines the internal policy or the internal policy determines the external policy. The duality cannot persist in a pronounced or prolonged form.

The bureaucracy can make concessions externally, appealing for the taking of power in Italy. It does not prejudice it a great deal. On the contrary, it is in its interests because it increases its forces in relation to the capitalist system. But not internally. So we measure it through the internal concessions that reflect Soviet democracy, the independence of the Trade Unions, the functioning of organs of Soviet power. This is where it is necessary to put the stress. This is where it has to be measured to judge the progress of the political revolution in the Workers States. Otherwise it is a mistake, an error, a delusion, to hope that the bureaucracy can manage to understand by means of intelligence and reason. These are not the qualities of any bureaucracy – because intelligence and reason are instruments for progress. When they are not used for progress, they are not intelligence and reason. It is not reason because it is not for progress, it is for bureaucratic interests. And it is not intelligence because it doesn't use the best that the human being has.

These are the fundamental problems which have to be considered and are going to be discussed in the coming stages; the bureaucracy cannot formulate a revolutionary programme because its function in history is unnecessary. The programme formulated by Brezhnev, although very advanced in relation to the past, is made because he has capitalism before him – which sends people to the moon to liquidate it. It stimulates interior forces that make him see the danger and advance and surpass the state of mere defence. But, not to pass on to providing the proletariat with the means, the organisms, the positions, the programme that would allow the proletariat its revolutionary function. The bureaucracy is not going to do it. It is never going to do it.

The historic nature of the bureaucracy cannot be transformed, its conduct can. But its conduct does not reach the degree of transformation of its historic nature. Its conduct changes and it shows it in the confrontation it makes with capitalism, in the provision of arms to Egypt, in the support to Peru; it stimulates forces that are opposed to the capitalist system. Internally, it liquidated Solzhenitsin but it does not give independence to the workers' movement. It does not permit the functioning of the Soviets. And, when it speaks of the 'regeneration of the Soviets' it does not refer to

Soviet functioning but to the functioning of the central Soviet organ, so that they can decide new elections – a new selection of candidates which approximate more to these layers of the bureaucracy that are closer to the revolution.

There is no doubt that in all this process, sectors of the middle bureaucracy, some higher but above all from the middle downwards, are stimulated and gained by the revolution. In capitalism, too, the Church is disintegrated by the revolution. The bourgeois officers of the army are gained by the revolution. Layers and sectors are gained, it is certain, and in the high layers of the bureaucracy, too. We take account of this to be able to place a series of influences within the bureaucratic functioning that permit the elevation of the internal struggle – very sharp internal struggles - to reach more elevated levels. To measure this sharp struggle, it is enough to see the Sino-Soviet struggle. It is a tarnished mirror, not a clear mirror, but it is a mirror, and if you clean it a bit you can see.

We take account - we must take account - of the fact that in the bureaucracy and in the intermediate layers united to the lower layers and the class, the revolution has an influence. It modifies the conduct of sectors. Without losing their bureaucratic functioning, their political comprehension is elevated and they are gained. There is no doubt. The highest layers too. For example, Brezhnev has been moved by the revolution. He cannot be gained consciously to lead the political revolution because he represents a bureaucratic layer of millions, and they are looking to see where he wants to go. But the proletariat is looking too, and it is pushing; it obliges him to go further than he originally wanted.

The struggle within the bureaucracy is an unequal struggle. The bureaucracy enters this stage of history in internal conflict: the inter-bureaucratic struggle, the Sino-Soviet Yugoslav-Soviet, Rumanian-Soviet, and Czechoslovak-Soviet. Together with the preparation for the war! One of the reasons for the reaction of the Soviet bureaucracy in Czechoslovakia and Poland was the atomic war. It wants to enter the atomic war with a certain security for tomorrow. This preoccupation is motivated by its interest in the domination of society. But it is closer to the necessity of the Workers State. Stalin did not do this. Stalin was preoccupied to survive by containing the revolution.

The bureaucracy now feels that it can no longer hope for a new agreement with capitalism. But it is conscious of the fact that the final settlement of accounts is approaching – not because it wants it, but because capitalism is preparing for it. There is no chance for conciliation with capitalism, so it tries to get ready for tomorrow. It is an historic calculation through bureaucratic – not revolutionary – interests. But, since it can no longer sustain itself in the camp of conciliation with the capitalist system, it has to do it in the Socialist camp. If it does it with the programme of the revolution, it must share the power with the proletariat. This is why it is going to respond with the atomic war, with which it hopes to smash capitalism and prevent the revolution. These are the bureaucracy's calculations.

But, at the same time, the world process of the revolution escapes the control of the bureaucracy. It cannot dominate it. The process in Italy, France and England, in all Latin America, part of Africa and the Middle East, escapes the control of the bureaucracy. It is a revolutionary process which it can no longer control or dominate.

In a certain way, not completely but in a certain way, it sees itself obliged to follow it so as to be in alliance with it to awaken the forces which it feels are going to be necessary to face the capitalist system. In this calculation the bureaucracy includes a very high percentage of fear, of impotence and of incapacity. It does not have confidence in the future. It does not know what is going to happen during and after the atomic war. This is why it looks for a certain security by extending its alliance with the world proletariat. It has no notion of the future of society. If it had, it would already have a programme. The bureaucracy enters the atomic war without programme. Trotsky entered the inter-imperialist war saying 'within ten years we will be millions', which means to say that he had the logical perspective of what was to follow. In conditions where the precise course could not be determined, Trotsky foresaw it.

On this eve of the atomic war the Sino-Soviet conflict arises. They spent three years in Czechoslovakia and the bureaucracy still could not dominate the crisis of the Czechoslovakian Workers State. They could not dominate it. In Poland they had to yield in 1956, and install Gomulka. And now they throw out Gomulka after having supported him. The bureaucracy cannot foresee. If it cannot foresee now from one month to the next, it can foresee the course of the war much less. Hence its fear and the extension of its links, seeking support in the world proletariat. It has to do it because the roots from which this search for agreement arises are in the Workers State. Previously too they came from the Workers State, but previously they sought alliance with capitalism. Now they cannot because capitalism gives nothing to ally with. The world revolution, outside and within the Workers States, progresses in spite of the containment of the Soviet bureaucracy and the Communist parties. In spite of the containment of the Communist parties in the rest of the world – outside the Workers States – the revolution develops in movements not led by the Communists. This influences the Communist parties, the Communist masses, and the Workers States. It gives a catastrophic image of the future to the bureaucracy of a process which it cannot dominate. It is enough to see the literature of the Soviet bureaucracy, the timidity and vacillation with which they face this process. Even the appeals that they make are not fundamentally theoretical and programmatic. The appeals which it makes to the French and Italian Communist parties to go to power are not made fundamental. They are not animated to fight programmatically; they are afraid to do it because they are not a class; they are not a necessary leadership. Consequently, they do not have the programme or policy necessary for the conscious progress of the revolution.

The bureaucracy has neither programme nor policy. Nevertheless, it needs programme and policy to face this stage. What are its allies? Previously it sought them in capitalism; it can no longer find them. It previously maintained the alliance between distinct sectors of the bureaucracy; now they are in a permanent fight. Why? Because a sector of the bureaucracy, through its position in society, has developed interests that are distant from the Workers State; it strengthened in the economy. This internal conflict is what motivated the inter-bureaucratic conflict in the USSR, in Czechoslovakia, and in the rest of the Workers States.

Another fundamental aspect in our relationship with the bureaucracy of the Workers States is our activity with regard to the political revolution. The changes in the bureaucracy, the Partial Regeneration, cut the links of economic and social influence

with imperialism. It is compulsory to intervene in this process with the effect of supporting the revolutionary wing in the Workers States which want to go on progressing in the revolution.

The bureaucracy is slow and stupid. Not through personal limitations, but through its position in history. It is determined by an intellectual and political weakness acquired through its position in history. And whilst the essential problem of the economy is not resolved, this is what determines the function of classes in history. But, since the Workers State is no longer a state of exploitation, because it combines bourgeois distribution with Socialist structure and objectives, it is no longer strictly determined by the economic function – but by the social and political function.

The bureaucracy shows all its stupidity; it cannot have logical, coherent and consistent thought. Its lack of quality is inherent in the lack of its necessity, its lack of necessity in history. But it is compelled to live; its links of permanent alliance with the capitalist system – permanent but not complete – are broken and it has to seek new alliances and new supports. The bureaucracy is seeking this, it is preparing itself for the atomic war, and it is seeking the support of the proletariat. While it makes the atomic war, it does not make the revolutionary war.

And the bureaucracy says, ‘If the atomic war comes, capitalism will lose and Socialism will triumph’. But it refers to its own ‘Socialism’. It does not speak of the independence of the Trade Unions, of the Soviets, of Soviet democracy. No! It speaks of the ‘Socialism’ of the bureaucracy. It means by ‘Socialism’ the elimination of private property, but to replace capitalism. It is not disposed to hand over power to the Soviets. It must approximate itself more to the Soviet form; it is obliged to because it can no longer make links with capitalism. It needs alliances with the proletariat; it needs to fight the pro-market economy bureaucrats.

THE CHANGES IN THE LEADERSHIPS OF THE WORKERS STATES AND OUR ROLE

Our preoccupation for this progress of the Partial Regeneration and the Historic Re-encounter is based, and must be based, on the strictest, most profound, the clearest and precise knowledge of the function of the bureaucracy and of its function, origin and development. Trotsky could not leave more important antecedents to understand it. When Trotsky wrote his last texts, conscious of the fact that they were going to kill him, he did not add many more profound considerations than those he left in ‘Revolution Betrayed’. When he left the conclusion that ‘within ten years, millions will follow the IV International’, he did not pose the future of the USSR and the bureaucracy, not because he was imprecise in perspective but because he did not know in what form it was going to develop. He could not foresee in what form it was going to occur. What he saw was that the revolution was going to be uncontrollable, and all problems were going to be resolved through this – as he himself said, ‘And this will resolve or will be the basis to resolve all the problems of history’. It fell upon us to interpret this.

From the epoch of Trotsky until now there have been no changes in the structure of the bureaucracy. But there have been changes. Amongst the fundamental changes that there have been is the appearance of new sectors of the bureaucracy, the inter-

bureaucratic dispute, and the development of tendencies that, from the beginning, intended to exercise the function of impelling the Workers State to Socialism, as there were in Yugoslavia in the first stage. Yugoslavia intended to do this. It failed. In fear of being attacked, it took the way of alliance with the capitalist system – which showed the weakness of the Communist parties.

Trotsky could not foresee the form of this process because there were not the theoretical means nor the form of organisation at that moment which could have given the vision of what was to happen tomorrow. Instead, he gave the general notion of the course of history: ‘Within ten years, millions of revolutionaries will follow the programme and objectives of the IV International and will know how to move heaven and earth to attain these objectives, and this will be the base for the resolution of all the problems of history’. And this is so. How? This is something else. We are the ones who must intervene in this. That is why it is necessary to see the changes and modifications in the bureaucracy but, at the same time, the continuity of its historic nature. It is necessary to see that it does not transform its nature, but changes its conduct, and to see that it is possible to influence even the instruments of the capitalist system – like the Church and the army. That is to say, it is possible to win a part of them, not the institution, but a part of its composition. This weakens its historic function! It weakens it! And under the influence of the revolution these sectors are won.

It is not a transformation but a utilisation of bureaucratic layers. These are not going to decide history. Without the struggle of the English, French and Italian proletariat and of the Latin American masses in Chile, Bolivia and Peru, the Kosygin wing would be stronger than it is now, and the actual conciliatory policy of the Chinese could have been made for years. But the world process of the revolution influences within the Workers States, and is one of the essential bases for the deterioration of the bureaucratic apparatus. Ota Sik was thrown out by the world revolution. The Soviet bureaucracy executed this, but he was thrown out by the world revolution which encouraged sectors of the bureaucracy to intervene in defence of their own interests. Before, they sold out Spain; now they protect Czechoslovakia. Before, and now, it is their own interest which decides. The contradictory character of the bureaucracy which supports itself on the Workers State needs to promote it, develop it, because it is its life. But, in turn, it needs to protect it so that it, itself, is not destroyed and it germinates interests against the development of the Workers State.

The bureaucratic process germinated tendencies and interests that affect the Workers State. Dubcek and Ota Sik are expressions of the internal bureaucratic struggle. They are not the result of small cliques but they are the consequence of the bureaucratic functioning of a whole stage of history where the market economy, made by them, created, originated and developed this wing. As this wing threatened the structure of the Workers State, the bureaucracy liquidated it. This shows how far the dispute in the bureaucracy has gone.

But, at the same time as they liquidated Ota Sik, they gave arms to the Middle East. Two distinct forms of behaviour with the same aim! In Czechoslovakia they used the troops; In the Middle East they used arms to impel the revolution against imperialism. This shows the difference and the divergence in the criteria and intervention of the bureaucracy. The attack on the market economy, the attack on Lieberman, shows how

far the bureaucracy can go: pretty far! But there is not a single case in which the bureaucracy has organised, programmed, and led the struggle to fight the capitalist system. It appeals 'to take power', but it does not organise it or give programme. There is not a single example of this! Nevertheless, it could do it. It could! In certain conditions it could do it. It has already done it in a limited way in Poland and Finland. It did give power to the masses. On the other hand, now, it is going to have to give power to the masses, trying to organise the bureaucratic apparatus; it can go as far as this not because it has changed its nature but because the internal relations are no longer of alliance with the capitalist system, they are within the camp of the revolution.

We are irreplaceable for this period of history. Ideas, programme, the verification of ideas and programme, are necessary. We are the only ones who have this. The bureaucracy has no notion of this process. It is seeking to understand; it needs to understand. But, at the same time as it needs to understand, to see how to solve the problems of the existence of the Workers State, it has to pass on to build the new society. It finds itself facing determined necessities of history and it does not know how to respond. They hesitate and vacillate and doubt, but there are tendencies which show that the structure of the Workers State already imposes a conduct on the bureaucracy which is globally determined. It does not let it retreat, in Rumania, Yugoslavia or in China. In China, they have made one Cultural Revolution after another, and each went against the one before. Now they have just revealed the last to justify the policy they are making. They want to make the policy of Stalin without the conditions of Stalin. There cannot be a retreat in the USSR and it is the USSR which is decisive and not a country like China for instance. This does not come from the fact that the USSR is more powerful – even though this is important – but because the USSR (and not China) has known the first Seven Years of the most complete revolution, the most complete Soviet functioning. It has generated a state most concentrated, most logical and powerful in the economy. It has the most equally powerful, concentrated and politicised proletariat. The Soviet proletariat has the most complete revolutionary traditions, the most solid internal structure and coherence. This is why the USSR decides the whole world process. These problems are going to resurface and will be decisive in the next stages of the history of humanity.

J. POSADAS

27.08.71

THE SCIENCE OF TACTICS

(Extracts)

20 January 1980

The problems the USSR faces are those of the construction of Socialism in this stage of the Workers State. The Workers State is not Socialism. It differs from Socialism in this aspect: it is based on the premise of 'to each one according to ability'. This premise comes from the capitalist system, is the source and origin of continued inequality in distribution, and determines the selection of leadership to maintain this distribution. What shows in terms of inequality is also expressed politically. Currents and tendencies that seek to affirm the principle of 'to each one according to ability'

are constantly being formed; the latter thus create social relations, distribution of posts, and orientation of studies, for the satisfaction of the bureaucratic layers. These, in the name of 'to each according to ability' allocate the best to themselves. This explains the present leading apparatus in the Soviet Union.

It is not the Soviet Union that needs to be corrected. To change the Soviet Union is not the task today, whilst in the epoch of Trotsky it had to be substantially changed. Today, it is a problem that has become fused with the Soviet Union's antagonistic and final confrontation with capitalism. It is a matter now of Workers States – progressing towards Socialism – versus the capitalist system. Now, any pronouncement that is made about the Workers State has to be combined with analyses in relation to the forthcoming final confrontation between the Workers States and the capitalist system. It is not possible to make judgements of the Workers States separated from this process of confrontation. It has to be a unity, the two factors together. There will be no moment in history that will allow the separation of these two factors or their separate resolution.

Capitalism prepares the coup (the war) and the Workers States have to prepare for this coup by being equally prepared. The Workers States prepare for this. For our part, whilst we seek to elevate all the conditions and better development of the Workers State internally, whilst we propose to intervene to contain the bureaucracy and to improve the status of the political and social life of the Workers State, we also pose that these measures must rather be postponed in the sense of being made secondary to the confrontation between the Workers States and the capitalist system. This is 'the science of tactic'. If this method is not used, there is a tendency to see one or another problem – sometimes important problems – as a thing in itself and not as a part of a whole process. It has to be understood that the entire world revolution walks on the feet of the Workers States. Capitalism wants to cut these feet off in order to bring down the world revolution. This is what it is trying to do in Afghanistan.

There is still a Soviet bureaucracy and it is an apparatus, but it is no longer the same bureaucratic apparatus it was at the time of Stalin. It is no longer the unconditional advocate of its own privileges or interests. Now, this bureaucracy puts these privileges or interests at risk by confronting the war with imperialism. In extending themselves to the world, the Workers States increase their social base with all manner of links and associations determined by Socialism. This saps the bureaucratic apparatus. The apparatus is not suddenly negated, but it is weakened. Its function is made more difficult and intelligence develops in the Workers State.

Humanity, in its immense majority, supports the Workers states even when some aspects are still unclear and bureaucracy still lingers. When we say 'humanity' we mean the majority of the people. It is clear that the majority of humanity sees that the German Workers State has rightly thrown out this Bahro and this Bierman (the singer). These people have only one complaint: 'They don't let me speak, I can't do what I like, this is injustice!' People see clearly that these disgruntled people – who are never more than a handful – never had a single proposal to make for the development of the economy of the Workers State, or for the development of workers' cadres. They have no preoccupation with these problems and only think of themselves. None of them has ever spoken in the name of humanity or for the development of the struggle for Socialism. On the other hand, Brezhnev, who comes

from bureaucratic origins, confronts the Yankees in the name of the Afghan revolution and in the name of the development of world revolution. He does not do it as a representative of the programme of revolution, but as a consequence of the USSR having to spread revolution on a world scale. This is the conclusion from which all considerations regarding improvements in the Workers States must flow. Anyone who makes an analysis on how to improve the Workers States must understand how to intervene in support of the Workers states as part of the final settlement of accounts with the capitalist system.

Of course, this does not mean that one casts aside the need for the fullest Socialist democratic functioning. However, Socialist democratic functioning is bound up with the anti-capitalist struggle. These two things are now united. In this stage we live in, the struggle for democratic and Socialist rights in the Workers States rests fundamentally on the imperious duty of finishing with the capitalist system. It is this process that will throw up the democratic rights we have talked about. There is no possibility of these rights flourishing in the Workers States without the struggle against the capitalist system. This is what we mean by 'tactic'. This is the dialectical conception it is necessary to have of the struggle in the Workers States.

Bahro and Bierman speak only for themselves. 'They don't let me speak, they don't let me sing'. Once they were in the capitalist system, they were given all the microphones they wanted. And what did they have to say? They did not make a single attack on the capitalist system. They made no criticism of capitalism, not a word against capitalist barbarism. The masses of the German Workers State GDR had the audacity to send film-makers to Chile to denounce Pinochet. The film they made is called 'One Minute of Darkness is not Blindness', and was made in Pinochet's Chile under the constant threat of the film-makers being caught and shot. This action by the GDR is worth more than a thousand Bierman's songs. Who to support? Bierman or the GDR? Who is protecting, developing and organising the struggle for the progress of humanity? Bierman who speaks of himself or the GDR masses who produce film-makers who work at the risk of their lives against capitalism? This is the way to reason.

Democracy and individual rights cannot be posed in the abstract. They have to be posed as part of the present task of history. Democracy has to serve the anti-capitalist struggle. The most advanced anti-capitalist struggle is taking place via the Workers States, although this is not so true with the Communist parties. The actions of any Workers state have more effect against the capitalist system than any other action. And regarding the actions of the Communist parties, even when they are correct in some place or other they also have less effect than those of the Workers States. The Italian masses are Communist because the Soviet Union exists and in spite of the fact that there has been a Stalin. The Soviet Union has fully proved that the programme and the necessity for Socialism were more powerful than all the bureaucrats and dictators like Stalin. The masses are capable of understanding this, and they prove their great intelligence.

We have to continue intervening to move forward and develop the process of gaining Soviet democratic rights in the Workers States, but only as part of these considerations. In this way, the masses learn to operate with the ability of the tactical method. They learn how to take advantage of the forces that move in society, and

harness them for the advance of the struggle against capitalism. They learn how to recognise and support all that means progress in the anti-capitalist struggle. Nicaragua did not even have Trade Unions before the revolution, but it brought down Somoza. How could this happen? The masses of Nicaragua are to be given – without doubt – the credit for having delivered the blows to bring down Somoza, but the organisation of these blows came from the Soviet Union. This is the way the world is united. The world is not united through the prevailing world of economy, power or distribution. Far from it! The world is united through the struggle for social progress, essentially through the Workers States.

J. POSADAS

20th January 1980