

J.POSADAS

THE ROLE OF THE USSR

**In the Socialist
Transformation of Humanity
(Vol. 2)**

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION, THE DEGENERATION OF THE WORKERS STATE AND THE PROCESS OF PARTIAL REGENERATION (20.10.80)

The fact that the degeneration of the Workers state and its present partial regeneration both have their root causes in the world process of the class struggle, is completely decisive in understanding and dominating the present situation. The degeneration of the Workers State is not the result of particular failures, limitations or weakness inherent in the Workers State. It is not the result of the Russian Revolution, the Soviet Union, or the Bolshevik Party. It is not the result of what Lenin and Trotsky achieved. It is the class struggle that led to the degeneration. The class struggle determined both processes of degeneration and regeneration. In the last instance, over and above the fact that partial regeneration is the triumphant factor, the course of the process of history is inexorable. It is not possible to mock or belittle history. 'History' is an economic, scientific and technical process of advance which produces corresponding human relations to express that advance. History is the conscious rational form of all progress and advances through human relations. In the end, progress cannot be contained.

Humanity is far from being decadent. It is in a constant process of moving forward. The essential basis for this move forward is human relations, around which all progress concentrates and expresses itself. The many advances of the economy, of science and thought, are all expressions of progress, but it is in the field of human relations that this progress is materialised. In turn, human relations create an ambiance, a base and a relation, through which further advances can be made. There comes a point where the human relation eliminates disputes, creating a common identity between all people.

There is a process of partial regeneration because it is a necessity for the development of history. In this process, Marxist ideas are indispensable. Marxist ideas are necessary because without foresight, without the ability to unify the unconnected factors of the economy and nature, humanity would not triumph. Without seeing that the decisive factor unifying all independent processes – and giving them consciousness – is the class struggle, humanity would be in chaos.

Of course, it is capitalism that is in chaos. Equally, the absence of policy, of orientation in the political life in the revolutionary movement, leads to quite a degree of chaos when the revolutionaries are without clear knowledge of where they are

going. Marxism foresees and sows the unity between every aspect of life, whatever they may be. Marxism allows them to be seen as aspects of the class struggle. This is true even when they events as unpalatable as the degeneration of the workers state and the assassination of Trotsky. These are aspects of the class struggle. Marxism is the complete antithesis to the obstinacy of the stubborn who stick to the definitions of Marx, to the ideas and organisation, regardless of the changes in conditions. Far from this, Marxism means complete ability and confidence in analysing the course of history. Marxism means the understanding of how to make Socialism, what are the Workers States, how to construct the Party, how to elaborate programme and coordination, in harmony and conscious organisation. This is Marxism. This is why we see, and will continue to do so, with complete confidence, all the various aspects of history as part of the construction of Socialism. This includes future events. It includes the atomic war, as harmful as it may be. The atomic war will be nothing more than another war, with more capacity for devastation.

There were historic causes for the degeneration of the Soviet Workers State. These were both internal and world-wide. There was the weakness and reduction of its economic and social forces and there was also the poverty and backward nature of the world revolutionary movement compared with the peak the Russian Revolution signified. Nonetheless, the Russian Revolution and the constitution of the Soviet Workers State were the instruments for the progress of humanity. The soviet Workers state is the conscious instrument for the equally conscious progress of life in our stage.

Life developed in an empirical form under the regime of private property. Life was determined by priorities regulated by the usufruct of property and ownership. The organisation of thought and human relations were determined by interest. In turn, wars, revolutions and the class struggle were inevitable because of the existence of private property. The opposite of this is the conscious organisation of existence, and this is the construction of Socialism. It eliminates the consequences of private property because it ends private property itself, and that ends the struggle for existence.

LENIN AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION – INSTRUMENTS OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

The Soviet Union was the first example of its kind in history. It is necessary to take this fact into consideration all the time because it is going to be re-discussed very shortly. The Soviet Union was – and remains – the instrument for the progress of humanity. It demonstrated the way on which the human race has to proceed to make any sort of headway and progress. It was an instrument of organisation for all future advance and progress. It was necessary to extend the Soviet Union in the world as the instrument for the conscious organisation of life, to foresee, to organise the forces that transmit and generalise experience. The instrument created for the prolongation of the Workers State was the III International.

The Internationals that came before the III International had another historic function. The First International was the first instrument to organise the proletariat so that the latter passed from being a ‘class in itself’ to a ‘class for itself’ in the words of Marx. The proletariat could envisage intervening in the class struggle to take power and

build Socialism. However, it had to demonstrate that it was prepared and capable of doing so! The II International was the instrument that organised the proletariat politically for this aim, and played an important role in some aspect of the political organisation of the proletariat into a class party. This was important even if it became a reformist and parliamentary organisation. Nonetheless, the II International did this much. The III International was constructed to transmit to the world the fact that the historic experience (about the way forward) had already been made.

The intention of the III International was: to generalise this historic experience to the rest of the world, to coordinate the forces of the world proletariat and, through the class and revolutionary struggle, to bring down the capitalist system. To transmit the experiences of the Russian Revolution was a prime necessity. It was paramount to organise the most powerful university that ever existed in history, to generalise the experience of that revolution to the world. The capacity of the world proletariat for action had to be coordinated and centralised. It was also necessary to transmit the political/organisational experiences on how to do it: how capacity has to be harnessed in a monolithic concentration, and centralisation for revolutionary action. The III International was not just to defend the Russian Revolution – of course, it was for this also, but this was the least important of its roles. The most important was to generalise experiences and offer the world proletariat the vision of a world instrument with world objectives. This made it possible to discuss – in a coordinated and centralised way – all the world problems and concentrate them into a tactic, objectives, a ‘line’ and slogans on a world scale. Henceforth, every part of the world could be coordinated through the Communist International. This is the function of the Communist International, and this was the reason for its creation.

The organisation of the III International was the most important historic task. Setting up the III International was the most important principle and initiative. It was an instrument for the conscious organisation of the entire world. This is something that none of the regimes of private property could ever near to doing! At this point, the world needed to be constructed with ideas, experiences, scientific ability, more than with mortar and bricks. Society was no longer led by private interests, but by objective and collective interests. It was a crime that the Communist parties buried these fundamental principles. But these will soon re-surface in discussions, and you will see Marx walk about in the streets of the world.

Capitalism means imperialism and individual interest. What it achieves in history is a little like a house built near ravines and volcanoes, leading people to certain death. The construction of socialism, on the other hand, is conscious. It maps out what it is going to build beforehand. It is no longer motivated by the interest of property, exploitation or trade. It is solely motivated by the interest of human dignity and necessity for human organisation. It foresees. The fact that Socialism has human need as an objective gives it capacity. Moreover, it has Marxism as an instrument which allows it to carry out its programme. Capitalism has no instrument of any sort not even for what it seeks. Capitalism has had some very capable people, such as Descartes, the French encyclopaedists, and even Hegel. But we have had Karl Marx and we have the world proletariat. Capitalism has had some very intelligent people, but they could not go beyond the confines of private property. The frontiers of their capacity were determined by private property. Nonetheless, many of them could have been won to the revolution: Voltaire, Rousseau or Diderot, for example. They could

have been won. But they lived in a historic epoch in which the foundations for the advent of Karl Marx were being laid. These people could not advance any farther because the conditions weren't there. Private property still decided everything. Their thought could not make suppositions outside of the historic experiences already made at this stage. It was left to Marx to prove that – on the basis of these experiences – Socialism was indeed possible. He entered the scene of history and concentrated all previous knowledge. It is not that this couldn't have been done at the time of Descartes or Rousseau. Indeed, it could have been done. But the conditions to do it had not appeared, and Marx came quite soon after them.

Socialism is a conscious construction of humanity. It's not a system under which every one can do what they feel like doing. For example, 'this is my country', 'this is the frontier', prompts the question: 'who made the country, who put the frontier there?' Who decides frontiers? Why are there Russians here and Chinese there? In fact, it is all the product of the empirical organisation of private property, and it is not a question of 'life being like that'. This is not how life has to be. It is simply the organisation that comes from the past of private property. Socialism foresees the end of these things, and therefore is not a whim. It foresees that countries and languages will disappear. It sees that all people will be unified. For that unification, an instrument is necessary to realise this task in the future. We are talking about the conscious organisation of the economy and of human relations. The human being advances by overcoming the limitations produced by private property. In this way the world can be seen objectively and collectively. Human relations will become conscious. This is one of the aims the III International had.

It is a crime that the Communist parties have abandoned this, and that each of them speaks of its own domestic Socialism, local Socialism. If we had to wait another 30 years for a Workers state in Italy, there is no doubt that such a thing as the 'Pescara road to Socialism' (a place in Italy) and a 'Genoa road to Socialism' would appear. At that point the disputes that appear in the Communist parties are of decomposition. The various local interests that appear are ultimately the expression of the narrowing down of universal problems to the local plane and local interests. This is a logical conclusion. Marxism allows, and will allow, the understanding of the possibility, necessity and ability, to organise the struggle to the reverse of this, premeditatively. Marxism leads to the question: 'What is to be done?' and 'Why has it to be done?' Of course, there are events that can't be foreseen, and this means changes on the march. But Marxism foresees the main line of events, and tactic cannot be submitted to the changes that may have to be made. One cannot, therefore, let stages of history pass by. What will have to be learned will be learned within the process. This historic 'apprenticeship', so to say, is very simple – because the objectives and aims are simple. It is a matter of coordinating the human ability for collective life, gathering together all the forces that already have developed within capitalist society and nature. Among these forces there are the social and economic achievements already in existence. These need to serve collective life. That is all.

What has to be changed, therefore, is the leadership of society. Trotsky's conclusion of 1938 that 'the crisis of humanity is a crisis of leadership' continues to be valid. Humanity is ready to make that change. There is very little in the way. Countries like Thailand are fully ready. If humanity had the possibility of formulating its own opinion without fear, more than 80% would vote to throw out the capitalist system

and private property. As it is, humanity has no means through which to make this pronouncement. But in the places where it finds the means it pronounces for Socialism.

The III International played the role of unifying the Russian Revolution to the proletariat of the rest of the world. It played the role of extending and organising the experiences of the Russian Revolution in the rest of the world. It coordinated the world with the Russian Revolution. It organised action, and centralised it. It utilised all the world forces of the proletariat and the class struggle. It drew on all economic, political and scientific experiences. In this way it organised and impelled the struggle for power and socialism in the world. So it was able to reach layers of workers, of their leaderships and parties, through the concentrated and the universal experience of the Russian Revolution. This was the ultimate objective of the III International.

The fact that the Soviet leadership around Stalin eliminated this does not mean that it was an unnecessary task. It simply means that the task was abandoned. Historic factors caused degeneration in the Workers State, and this task was dropped. This is not because Stalin turned out to be a bad man, but because of historic causes – like the lack of coordination, lack of organisation, lack of time, lack of the proper coordination of the proletariat at the right time in the world. After the Russian Revolution there was a distinct lack of the conditions to coordinate that revolution with the rest of the world. There was a lack of revolutionary forces able to do this. There was the reaction of the capitalist system to the Russian Revolution, whereby the Russian Revolution was clearly perceived by them as a world-shattering event which threatened to spread. There was a Party in the USSR: the Bolshevik Party. However, such a Party did not exist in the rest of the world, and this was one of the missing conditions. The Bolshevik Party is one of the most fundamental instruments for the construction of history. It was superior to the Encyclopaedists, to those who laid down the laws governing thought, to those who produced inventions. The organisation of thought is not a small factor in the development of humanity. But, even then, the Bolshevik Party was superior to that endeavour. What the Bolshevik Party can do, and wasn't done before, is this: a conscious Party, conscious of its aims and objectives, i.e. the means by which to take power and construct Socialism. The Bolshevik Party is fully conscious of what it seeks. It moves and organises activity, develops revolutionary action, in accord with the foreseen objective. Its objective is no other than to take power, to transform society, to bring society to the level of the task of the construction of the Workers State and advance from the Workers State to Socialism. In this way the Party prepares for nothing else but this objective. This is why they took power in the USSR! They won – true enough – because the conditions existed. But one of these conditions, and the primary one, was the existence of the Bolshevik Party. The Bolshevik Party was there, headed by Lenin! It was this Party and no other that did it. It was a Party with a proposed objective; a party prepared and organised for its objective – to take power and build Socialism. This is why it was a Party based on – and fused to – the working class. It wasn't a Party that descended on the working class from on high, or somehow inserted itself into the working class, but a Party that arose from the working class. To say that it 'arose' from the working class does not mean that the workers built it. The majority of the Bolsheviks weren't workers. But it had the necessary thought for the organisation of society. It had proletarian thought, which is Marxism, and it organised the workers' movement on the basis of this. It also took this thought into the III International as a whole. The Bolshevik Party prolonged

itself and organised the III International on the basis of the experiences of the Russian Revolution, firmly based on the monolithic foundations of the Party.

Monolithism was – and will continue to be – necessary. It doesn't mean rigidity or an icon in front of which everyone has to swear allegiance! The monolithism of the Bolsheviks, in common with that of Socialism, lies in the fact that it has a proposed objective, and that all activity is determined by the objective and by nothing else. This is monolithism! This means the permanent discussion and interchange of experiences today, as in the time of the Bolsheviks. Never has there been a Party so full of tendencies and fractions as the Bolshevik Party. It was the norm to discuss fully. It did not mean to discuss any old thing, but what was discussed was the objective of Socialism, of taking power, and the violent form in which it has to be done. They discussed how to organise the Party and the struggle for power. Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn tell us that they want the right to discuss, but they want to discuss any old thing. The Bolsheviks were discussing most completely what was necessary for their objectives. Those who pose the right to discuss outside these objectives express dispersion and insecurity in the proceedings from the present to the future. Monolithism is the opposite. The Russian Revolution triumphed and the III International developed, proving its validity in history. The III International organised Communist parties all over the world.

We have to take into account the fact that the Bolshevik Party was the first experience of its kind. Previously there were only Socialist parties and they were all reformist. The Socialist parties had left wings but these were very weak. In the world, the process of the formation of Communist parties was very slow. There was a transitory disintegration of the proletarian forces because Communist parties had to be set up against the existence of Socialist parties. The intention to take power in various European countries – Poland, Germany and Hungary – failed through the absence of the Party and the lack of experience in the proletarian vanguard of these countries. There was not a ready made proletarian vanguard, acquainted with the experience of taking power, not even with the objective of taking power and leading the masses. The possibilities existed, but the essential factor – the Party formed in time – did not.

The essential thing is the (Bolshevik) Party. There are instances of the taking of power having taken place without the Party. But the Party is necessary to build socialism. The decisive proof of this is that in 1948 new Workers States were set up in Europe, and today they are all in some kind of a crisis. Hungary was set up in 1946, and in 1973 the Economic Minister has resigned, showing the lack of the Party. In the USSR, when it was newly constituted as such, there were no such crises. The USSR was the centre of all manner of discussion, because everything they were doing was new and for the construction of Socialism. They discussed everything. The USSR was the first experience. But 56 years after the Russian Revolution they now go back to re-discover in Hungary problems that have been solved in the Soviet Union. The reason for this is that there is no Party. If there were a Party it would transmit the experiences of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and afterwards. If there had been a revolutionary Party that had continued the experience of the Russian Revolution, it would be the most complete university, capable of organising thought and transmitting experiences. The absence of the Party impeded the experiences of the Russian Revolution being communicated to the world, and acting as an organiser. So the capacity of the masses for action could not be created, and the proletariat – the class which is numerically a

minority – could not attract the rest of society. This is so because it is precisely through the party that the proletariat attracts and organises the rest of society.

The proletariat demonstrates its ability to the rest of society that it is capable of leading society. In its actions it gives confidence that it is capable of doing so, as a class, through the trade unions. It is the most resolved, homogeneous, the most consistent leader of society, as a class. The working class gains these attributes via its function in the economy and history. What the working class can do cannot be done by another class. This is what the working class Party, the Bolshevik Party, comes to represent. If it is a Bolshevik Party, it is based on this conclusion. The scientific thought of Marx – i.e. the scientific ability of foresight – unifies the Party with the historic confidence of the proletariat. This is what constitutes the proletarian Party.

These conclusions could not be reached in time in Europe. The Russian Revolution did not find its continuation in time in the rest of Europe. If the Russian Revolution was isolated because of this, it is because it was a new historic event and there were not the proletarian parties prepared beforehand to take power at the time or after the Bolsheviks. The conditions existed to take power, but the leaderships to take power did not. So the Russian Revolution met fresh obstacles in the way of its historic objective. The other revolutions in the world failed and, in so doing, kept the Russian Revolution isolated, or very nearly so. If it had, in fact, been entirely isolated, then capitalism would have simply invaded and crushed it. This was not the case because the Revolution wasn't entirely isolated. But there was enough isolation to impede the development of the necessary forces to extend the Workers State.

The III International had been formed to extend the Workers State. It had been constituted on the basis of the propagation of experience, ability, monolithism, in the taking of power and the construction of Socialism. But still the Revolution did not spread to the rest of Europe. Thus, small nuclei, groups and parties arose, outside the Soviet Union, which could not be organs of mass organisation because the masses were not roused. Capitalism managed to isolate the Russian Revolution sufficiently in the political sense. It wanted to isolate the USSR, to crush it socially, and then obliterate it militarily, in the event it did invade, but it failed. Nevertheless sufficient isolation was imposed. There was an economic boycott that was an enormous blow to the Revolution, if only because it needed absolutely everything to make any start economically. At that time the USSR was recognised by practically not a single country in the world! This continued for some time, when the USSR needed everything. The Bolsheviks quite clearly saw the moment when the revolution might be destroyed or disintegrated. Their economic situation was blighted at the time when massive world support was more than essential. Besides, the Revolution was not spreading in the world, prompting capitalism to hope that the Russian Revolution would finally collapse into dust. Capitalism believed that the Soviet proletariat would be totally incapable of organising the economy. It believed that the Soviet proletariat would never manage to win the peasantry. Capitalism never thought the proletariat would manage to convince, persuade and integrate the peasantry into the Revolution. However, all this was done – against all odds.

World capitalism kept the Russian Revolution under siege, and believed firmly that it was a matter of time. It combined military attacks with economic and political sabotage, just waiting for the collapse of the revolution. What else could capitalism

do? It thought that the ideas of Communism, the Bolshevik Party, Lenin and Marxism were rubbish and would not pass the first historic test. The first test was to organise the economy of the USSR. World capitalism visualises human motivation as it has developed within the system of private property. Capitalism relied on the egotism, individual interest, the ambition and appetite of people as they are in the system of private property. It relied on conservatism and avarice. Capitalism fully expected all these human endowments to re-surface in the USSR and bring the whole experience crashing down!

THE RED ARMY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF TROTSKY

At this stage capitalism was simply waiting for the end of the Russian Revolution. The Revolution stood firm and passed the historic test, chiefly because of the existence of the Bolshevik Party and the proletarian army, organised by Trotsky. It held firm, not just because the proletariat and the peasantry supported the revolution, but because there was a Proletarian Army fully prepared for Class War. There is no doubt that all this is going to be re-discussed. The Red Army was an army for class warfare. It was not for the defence of 'our country' against 'invaders', but to defend the central axis of world revolution. The very essence and heart of the Red Army in the first days of the Revolution was class warfare. Thus, it was equipped with more than guns! The 'Whites' had guns, but the Red Army had more than this. The Red Army was fully conscious that it defended the progress of humanity. It was an army built for the defence of the highest gains of humanity. It stood in defence of the gains of humanity which were the basis for the construction of Socialism. The High Command and the Red Army were for this purpose. The same experience was repeated later – but not in such a complete way. In Korea and China, they did this again. The Cuban army, that had not started as such, transformed itself into an army for class warfare later.

This is the full measure of the historic worthiness of Trotsky as War Commissar and organiser of the Red Army. He did not organise an army for pure military action against the capitalist invasion. He set up an army to combat invasion and build Socialism, all at once. The Red Army defeated world capitalism and laid the foundations for more Workers States. Had the Red Army been constructed just to defend the boundaries of the 'fatherland', the Soviet Union would have been engulfed. As it was, an army specifically organised to defend the historic objective of Socialism was able to defend those frontiers and be the fundamental block that resisted the process of degeneration in the Workers State, all at the same time. By this, one must understand that the Red Army could not be utilised for a 'coup d'état' to open the way for counter-revolution. It was not that type of army, and so it could not fulfil that role of counter-revolution. The army in any capitalist country would have done just this. But in the USSR it was an entirely new army, an army for revolution. The degeneration of the Soviet Workers State did not result in the Soviet army becoming the tool for state coup, to open the way back to capitalism, as it would be in capitalism itself. This is the nature of the Red Army. There were small groups and tendencies that survived after the Revolution that very much wanted capitalism back. None of these could organise the political and social force necessary for the restoration of capitalism. The III International, the Soviet Union, Trotsky and the Red Army must be seen in this light.

The USSR could not advance farther and began to degenerate. This is because of historic reason, outside the USSR and not inherent in the USSR at all. These historic reasons were not confined to Stalin in the last instance. They were historic causes in which Stalin found the conditions for degeneration. We must underline what an important factor the Red Army has been in all this; there is no doubt that the discussion of this will return, regarding the paramount importance of the function of the Red Army. At the same time, there is no doubt that the Chinese and the North Korean armies are also Revolutionary Armies. These armies have worked for the accomplishment of Revolution. But they did not decide the forms in which to do this by themselves: they based themselves on the experience of the USSR. There is no doubt also that all the works of Trotsky, which the Soviets have kept in archives, complete and unaltered, will be re-published. There is no doubt about this. They will be re-published because the works of Trotsky were for the progress of human thought and, in his time, corresponded to the role of the Encyclopaedists in their time.

Trotsky was the only one who gave the principles for the military function of the proletarian army in the struggle for Socialism. He incorporated into human knowledge the new experience and capacity of organisation freshly acquired, to operate for a foreseen objective, based on the teachings of Marxism. This knowledge was the capacity of foresight and the conscious organisation for the aim of Socialism. Trotsky proved that an army for the development of the revolution was entirely possible. We based ourselves on his experience for the present situation. It may be possible in some capitalist countries to win over the army. In this sense, we do not make a strict and mechanical continuation of Trotsky into the present. There will be some parts of the military in the capitalist armies that will join the Revolution. Indeed, there is not one revolution that does not win a sector of the army apparatus. Clearly, it is more difficult to win entire armies. But is it not the case that the Church used to be the most implacable instrument for capitalism and its armies, and now so much of the Church is won to the Revolution. The Church does not want to be left behind by history. So we can expect to win very large layers of the apparatus of the capitalist armies.

The III International analysed history and experiences, and proved itself to be an irreplaceable instrument. There is not a single university or institution capable of transmitting the cultural knowledge prevailing in the III International. The III International was a political instrument and not a place of academic, economic or scientific studies. It was an instrument to transform society, and this is the most complete science. It is here that all the qualities of confidence, coordination and centralisation between the aims, objectives and rhythms of human intelligence are needed. All these endowments – rhythm, to intervene in time, respect for the aims – were dealt with. Political activity is the field in which all these qualities are concentrated. The III International played this specific function.

THE ISOLATION OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

The degeneration that took place in the USSR was due to historic conditions. The Revolution did not develop fully because it did not find the necessary world support. It was all a new experience. However, the fact that it was a new experience did not produce disillusionment or disarray among the Bolsheviks. They were not broken by the non-advent of revolution elsewhere. They did not disband and disintegrate; they

saw the means by which to protect their revolution. They learnt how to wait for the next stages. The problem for them was that they had to cope with the situation in the meantime.

The historic conditions were quite unfavourable to them. There were unbelievable shortages. There was economic crisis, and utter devastation, in what had been up to then one of the most backward countries. There is a painting of H. Daumier (1818-1879 – French painter of social criticism) that depicts the Russian nobility before the Revolution. It shows them gambling to buy slaves and serfs. In their games of cards and dice, these aristocrats were playing for money to buy people. This was Russia. They collected 15 or 20 women and played for them, and slaves were changing hands. The serfs are shown chained to each other, waiting for the end of the game. This was the Russia where the Bolsheviks took power. There had been some progress before the revolution, like the abolition of slavery in the second half of the 19th century. This progress was extremely superficial. The Revolution triumphed in one of the most unlikely countries imaginable. The same goes for China, even though conditions there were slightly more favourable. But the reason why revolution triumphed in Russia and China is that there was a Party to organise the taking of power.

In 1945, after the war, the revolution triumphed in Europe and this was because the Soviet Workers State extended its own system, in the struggle against the Nazis, through the Red Army. In the process of bringing capitalism down in Eastern Europe the permanent revolution could be seen and foreseen. Everything had to be resolved at once. The Nazis had to be liquidated, and so had capitalism. The Workers State was the answer. It all had to be done at once, again in immensely backward countries – like Poland, Hungary or Rumania. In other words, it was possible to go from feudalism to the Workers State. Was it not? The Communist leaderships today remember, from time to time, what Lenin said in 1922. It was what the III International, no less, had explained, and it remains our view. It was enshrined in the programme of the III International and its first four Congresses.

Historic backwardness did impede the development of the Revolution quite a lot, but it did not stop the development of scientific thought. The III International dedicated itself to elaborating scientific thought in order to prepare the ability to think, analyse, and to remain integrated with the process of history. It worked to prevent any divorce from history and to integrate humanity with history whilst waiting for better times when revolution would spread. This required teaching people the political and theoretical ability to wait for better times. This meant not to give up, not to break down, and not to become paralysed. The task of the III International was of organising the parties of the world, capable of teaching people how to acquire experience and scientific ability, making them live the world experience of the revolution scientifically in all parts of the world with the single aim of being able to apply it when time would come. The retreat of the revolution in the USSR was the result of the absence of such parties in the world, the absence of mass experience and the absence of leaderships. The III International developed as much as it could, but mass experience and leaderships could not be created in Europe and the rest of the world in time. So the Russian Revolution became isolated. In turn, this led to the rise of sectors inside the USSR rendered insecure by the feeling of isolation. Elements of fear and timidity made their appearance, not because people were scared but because of a lack of Marxist preparation. The weakest and least consistent were the least prepared in

Marxist method. There had not been time to form them. However, a whole consistent team – among them the proletarian vanguard – was still there. It insisted on organising and concentrating around the objective of making the ‘USSR the world beacon in the construction of Socialism’. They were preparing to wait for new stages whilst developing and intervening, stimulating on a world scale, the development of the world revolution. They could do this because they were based on the Marxist conception and experience. In this way a team was formed by Lenin, and later by Trotsky in the same way.

There was, at the same time, another sector in the Party which had accompanied the revolution but whose insecurity was revived in the face of these new trials. Their insecurity expressed itself in a policy of national retreat. Everything became concentrated around the defence of the Soviet Union. For them, it was no longer a defence of the Soviet Union by extending the Revolution, but a defence to protect the Revolution. In turn, this brought out all sorts of national sentiments and interests. These national sentiments – as much as interests – had their own partisans and programme. This reanimated sectors that had never quite reached an understanding of what the Revolution had been all about. The possibility and necessity of the development of world Socialism was alien to them.

At this time the doubts - which had existed in the Party before the taking of power - about the possibility of the construction of Socialism, were also reanimated. This happened in the middle of most unfavourable conditions, produced by the isolation of the USSR. The Communist Party of the USSR found itself isolated too. It no longer had any historic point of support anywhere. All the militants and leaders – who had little Marxist preparation or none at all, without experience, uncertain people – felt even less organisational ability or strength. All this was the result of not having been able to prepare the Party in time, and this began to weigh on the Party. These uncertain sectors began to acquire a large weight in the Party, because the resolute and audacious Bolshevik team – the instrument of all the achievements under the leadership of Lenin – had been practically decimated. They had either been killed in the war against invasion or in the civil war, or had been nominated to key posts in the economy of the new Workers State. It all contributed to weaken the Party. Militants without tradition or experience, without revolutionary confidence, then gained access to the Party and its leadership. They soon dominated the Party. They were not alone, of course, because there were whole layers of the Party that had been Bolsheviks and had accompanied the taking of power. These old Bolsheviks were still there, but they too were demonstrating a lack of confidence, inconsistency, and a weakness in their Marxist preparation. They had accompanied the revolution, but had not had time to develop stability in Marxist interpretation. These were the individuals who now had to organise the new power in the USSR, in conditions where the Revolution had failed in the rest of Europe. We are talking about 1924 (year of the death of Lenin) onwards. These people took power and changed the programme of the Bolsheviks. Then, to protect their programme, they gave the justification that they had to ‘defend the Revolution’. In this way the conception of ‘Socialism in one country’ arose.

All the sectors that had been known for their lack of confidence, their weaknesses and vacillation, resurfaced. All those who had doubted the taking of power in the first place were now entering the very leadership of the Party. At the same time, a new kind of militant was being generated. They were most inconsistent and feeble people

in matters concerning the construction of Socialism. Their programme and policy were inconsistent and feeble in that sense and this shook the Party. They started to support themselves on a layer of careerists who were even more remote from the Socialist objective; for a time they showed inconsistency and insecurity to the highest degree. These people, above all, were conciliatory towards capitalism. This was quite a layer of people who, during the Revolution, had had no importance and were carried forward by events. A good many of them had indeed been won to the Revolution by the Bolsheviks and the Red Army. But, in the face of internal and world difficulties, they retreated. They saw danger in anything that meant a further advance, and danger in anything that called for audacity.

In the conditions of that moment, it was not a matter of procrastination but of the bold use of audacity. Audacity was then paramount, the most fundamental ingredient of politics. Unfortunately, audacity was not at all the characteristic of these people! They were the sort of people who had always needed someone more confident than themselves in anything they did. In the most risky situation they looked eagerly for anything that was 'secure' and involved no danger. The Revolution itself had been a tremendous risk. Any revolution demands immense audacity, a great ability of concentration, decision and judgement. Audacity does not mean vehemence, determination or rushing about arms-in-hand. This isn't it. Audacity means the ability to coordinate a small nucleus, such as the Bolsheviks were, and to know how to take advantage of circumstances as they arise. It is necessary to dominate Marxism completely and have complete confidence in the working class, to do this. The Bolsheviks had to be absolutely confident that the soldiers and the peasantry would join the Revolution. These new sectors freshly arrived in the Party no longer had this absolute confidence and ability. They were all 'new-comers'. The Revolution had triumphed, and they had to accept the fact. The siege against the Revolution was greatly diminishing the weight of the Bolshevik Party and of the revolutionary wing that survived. This created conditions in which these 'new' people could push their way in. They emerged, developed, and ultimately created what was to become a Stalinist current.

In order to give themselves some platform and programme, they invented 'Socialism in one country'. They were quite opposed to the previous policies of the Bolsheviks of spreading revolution in the world, and now they were equally opposed to 'waiting actively' for the time when revolution could spread again. The Bolsheviks' policy had always been that if one has to wait, one 'waits actively': meaning the capacity to wait for favourable conditions whilst influencing and developing Communist parties in the meantime. To 'wait actively' means to stimulate revolutionary wings which, in a later stage of flux, will organise the proletarian, petty bourgeois and peasant movement for the taking of power. This new team opposed this idea, and advocated 'Socialism in one country'.

THE ABSENCE OF THEORETICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE IDEA OF 'SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY'

The Bolshevik leaders were decimated by the Revolution and, with the death of Lenin, the remnants of cohesion and authority of the Bolshevik team were further diminished. This stimulated a whole gang of 'arrivistes' (self-seekers) who were chief conciliators with capitalism and supporters of the conciliatory tendency in the

Bolshevik Party. This conciliatory tendency was now led by Stalin. It became the fundamental reason for the subsequent historic changes. In all this process, the death of Lenin played no small part. It is not a matter of speculating just how Lenin died, or if he was got rid of; Lenin was very ill and he had predicted that he might not live long. But the absence of Lenin meant an enormous blow to the central authority of the Bolshevik Party. In the event, the death of Lenin was not absolutely decisive but it was a crucial factor that allowed a whole layer of careerists – now in the Party – to get to the top. Trotsky did not have an authority or tradition in the Party comparable to Lenin's. Trotsky was not the organiser of the Bolsheviks that Lenin had been. All these things combined to bring about the taking of power by a layer of truly revisionist people in relation to the aims of the Revolution. The objective of the Russian Revolution was to be the instrument to generalise the experience of how to make revolution in the world. It was a means of communicating and developing the revolution on a world scale, transmitting experiences, and organising cadres. All the time, it was waiting for the moment when conditions would be ripe for the taking of power somewhere outside Russia. This was the aim of the Russian Revolution. But the conciliatory tendency in the Bolshevik Party, led by Stalin, was 'revisionist' in relation to this.

Lenin, Trotsky, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Workers State fully accepted that a moment might come when it would be necessary for the USSR to pass new historic tests and to confront the capitalist system head-on, even at the risk of being crushed themselves. They tried to develop revolutions in Germany, Poland and Hungary. In other words, they saw the USSR as an instrument for the extension of the world revolution and not as an achievement for themselves.

The entry of this new team, which based itself on the historic retreat of the revolution, led to the adoption of the policies of 'Socialism in one country'. They then tried to justify this policy programmatically. They felt bound to pay lip service to some theoretical and programmatic justification, because this was the Party of Lenin and Trotsky. In the Party of Lenin, every activity had always had a justification in programme, policy and objectives. Therefore the necessity to clarify programme, policy and aims remained. In this new stage of the 'tranquilisers', 'Socialism in one country' was the justification. It did not mean that they were against revolution some time in the future, but they were leaving the universal aspects of revolution on one side, emphasising only the local one. In other words, they started hinting that a pause in the world revolution was necessary in order to build Socialism in one country.

These are the reasons for the appearance of 'Socialism in one country'. This being said, Socialism in one country had neither historic foundations, nor objective reason or analytical bases. The programme of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, is based on a wealth of experiences, comparisons, discussions and historic analyses. They never came to a theoretical conclusion that was not founded on historic experience. 'Socialism in one country', on the contrary, is just a formula. To make it work these 'revisionists' had to fight off the pressure of the revolution on the USSR. The least resolute elements in the Party – who were the most inclined to conciliate with capitalism – were the most sceptical about the world development of the revolution. They opened the Party to other elements who supported them in this. Naturally these elements were the least prepared in Marxism. The Party went from bad to worse because the Bolshevik cadres had been decimated. They had died or they had

disappeared in defence of the Revolution, or had been killed by the invaders. Others had been seen in various posts in the economy and in the social/political apparatus of the country. It naturally followed that, at the instigation of Stalin, people who supported and advocated 'Socialism in one country' rose in the leadership. At the same time, no instrument appeared to explain theoretically what that meant. No book worthy of the name was written to analyse how justified 'Socialism in one country' was. The question whether Socialism is the result of a particular national quality, or the result of a historic necessity for a world structure, was never clarified.

The Bolsheviks based themselves absolutely on analyses that proved that Socialism is a necessity of the structure of history. There have been moments in history when even the economy has expressed the need to break out of the constrictions of the capitalist fetters, in order to progress. Other times, the economy was the main factor that determined the course of life. But then Marxism appeared, and showed that the development of humanity was determined not only by the economy but by the conscious action of human beings. The latter could consciously intervene to make a country as backward as old Russia go over to the Workers State. If it had been a matter of the economy only Russia would never have changed, and they would have had to wait for the more 'developed' countries – such as Britain, Germany, France and North America – to make changes first. However, the Bolsheviks based themselves on analyses and historic experiences that took account of all the factors. They made the instrument – the Party – that organised the working class and peasantry, and was able to solve all problems from the national to the historic ones, from the land questions to the economic and language problems. They did this through one centre, the Party, which coordinated and developed all the others. It was the most complete progress the world had ever seen. It is Marxism! In order to take power and extend that power everywhere they needed the Party.

Socialism cannot be constructed in one country because there is no one country that has the raw materials, the industry, the industrial bases, and the scientific and technical capacity to build by itself a Socialist economy. More than this, it has to live with the surrounding capitalist world. The structure which is called the 'world market' was built over previous centuries. In this period, economic inequalities between countries have been established as a norm; the resulting world division was that no one country could possibly have the necessary means to build Socialism. The world division of labour emphasised every word of this conclusion, and for the USSR it was a matter of building Socialism in the most adverse conditions of the world division of labour imposed over centuries by the system of private property. The construction of Socialism cannot ignore this basic historic reality. By the time of the Russian Revolution, the world division of labour was immutable. Today, of course, it tends to be less so because backward countries which used to depend on the capitalist system now associate themselves with the Workers States. They no longer strictly depend on capitalism. However, at the time of Lenin, the world division of labour held full sway. Even today this world division has not disappeared; it is immensely weakened by the conscious concentration of history in the hands of the Workers States. At the time of Lenin, there was only one Workers State in the world, and it was the USSR; people in the USSR had nothing at all. The USSR could not dispense itself from having to depend on the programme dictated by the world division previously established. This factor accounts for the rise of this idea of 'Socialism in one country' but it does not make it any more justified. It wasn't justified then, and it cannot ever be justified. The

proof of this is that the USSR, 56 years after the Revolution, is still a Workers State and not Socialism. Socialism does not mean that there is a boom in the economy, but that all forms of imposition, violence and inequality have been eliminated.

Socialism means the elimination of the idea of ‘to each according to their ability’, and its replacement by the idea of ‘to each according to their need’. The latter does not exist in the USSR, and it does not exist in any of the Workers States. The leaderships of these Workers States talk about ‘Socialism’ but it is an incorrect characterisation and a means of disguising the limitations of these leaderships. We have to see these countries as Workers States, not Socialism. Socialism means the elimination of all human dependency on the economy. Socialism is a rational relation determined by the mind, thought and human fraternity. It encompasses and resolves the problems of inequality naturally. A family of ten will receive in Socialism what is necessary for all of them. The planning of society will mean an end of individual production. There will no longer be a situation of individual car production when there aren’t enough houses. Of course, when the point is reached of enough houses for all the people, the level will have been reached for the elimination of individual cars – at that time people will wonder how anybody conceived the idea of an individual car.

Socialism in one country is not a necessity or a possibility. It is an invention. It was a programme invented with the idea of making it a centre of coordination for the timid and vacillating elements in what was left of the Bolshevik team and for the ‘arrivistes’ incorporated during the Revolution. These careerists joined the Party when they saw the Revolution was successful, and they entered the Party with the idea of deciding in it. They did have a certain intellectual ability and, as the majority of the most important cadres of the Revolution were now dead, these intellectuals found the field relatively free. Thus they began to weigh in, and for some time, they appeared as the representatives of reason, intelligence, and analytical ability. They seemed to fill the gap left by the decimation of the Bolshevik Party. It wasn’t a question of chance but one of concerted action, and Stalin – supporting himself on the traditions of the Bolshevik Party – allied to these new layers and gained the leadership. In this way a whole team based on ‘Socialism in one country’ was constituted.

This resulted in an opposition to the extension of the Revolution, its elimination where possible, or its development being checked. Moreover, this policy was intended to eliminate or combat any policy which tended to emphasise that the USSR was the spearhead of further revolutions. However, the historic task was for the USSR to continue to be such a spearhead, no matter what these people said. If this meant waiting for new stages, it also meant continuing to prepare the Bolshevik Party, as Lenin and Trotsky had done before the Revolution, by living the most elevated thoughts, actions and revolutionary experiences. The new team of Stalin threw all this overboard. It was true that it was necessary to wait for a later stage! But the task of developing in the Soviet people the ability to communicate to the whole world their experience was still necessary. The new leadership organised around the idea of ‘Socialism in one country’ did exactly the opposite. It put the emphasis on ‘defending the USSR’ and giving free rein to short-sighted nationalist sentiments.

The most prominent characteristic of the present-day Communist parties, whereby each one looks to its ‘own’ local Socialism, is the result of this. This idea does not come from Lenin, but is founded on the conception of ‘Socialism in one country’. In

effect the Bolshevik Party was eliminated and replaced by a Party based on Stalin's idea of 'Socialism in one country'. In consequence, narrow interests which could not see beyond their own locality were generated. All this was opposed to the historic internationalist interests of the revolution. The interest of the revolution is a historic-internationalist one, not because Marx formulated a precept but because it is the only way to build Socialism. Now, 56 years after the Revolution, where is 'Socialism in the USSR'? Where is the conscious leadership which acts only on the basis of political reasoning? Is it possible to call the crisis in the USSR, the changes in the leadership, the re-orientation of programme and policies and the obvious inequalities that there are – is it possible to call this Socialism? It is absolutely unnecessary to continue to produce private cars. Where is Socialism in this? There is great economic progress, but it can never amount to Socialism. If it is not Socialism, then, there are still unresolved problems that keep on being unresolved. We are not trying to criticise the Soviet Union for lack of development. But a simple comparison has to be made: in spite of the development that has been made, we make an assessment of the USSR which must include a criticism of the way in which the characterisation of 'Socialism' has been deformed. If there is no Socialism, there is no Socialism. The fact that the Soviet Union has progressed immensely does not change the other fact that it is not Socialism.

The historic process we have analysed gave rise to 'Socialism in one country' and Stalinism. At the time when it was urgent to create leading cadres with a sense of continuity of the experience of the Revolution and an idea of the past, Stalin was amongst those who seemed to respond to this necessity. Trotsky said: 'The bureaucratic, technocratic layers now in formation sought him out because he had links with the Bolshevik past'. However, Stalin reneged on his past and became, instead, a supporter of the worst limitations. This new team went on to ensure that no one could endanger their power by liquidating any opposition. They liquidated the whole remaining Bolshevik team.

'Socialism in one country' necessitated an authoritarian leadership and it was found in Stalin, the 'continuator'. Stalin had behind him the tradition of the old Bolsheviks, was he not an old revolutionary, an organiser of the Revolution, part of the Bolshevik leadership? Stalin centralised all the aspirations of the new layers of Bolshevik careerists who came into the Party and supported him, giving him his necessary base. As a character, Stalin was not formed at this point in time. Of course, he had developed the necessary 'ability' to play this role earlier; this ability was primarily based on his weaknesses. Weakness, lack of consciousness, lack of theoretical preoccupation: all came to his aid. Fear was the greatest of Stalin's motives. A vivid expression of this was his fear of anything that was not Russian, of anything that wasn't Georgian. He had an essentially provincial mentality which corresponds to today's regionalism. He had the parochial mentality of comrades we sometimes meet who cannot see beyond 'their' country or region. Stalin was a regionalist Bolshevik. He had been a Bolshevik, but he came from historic origins that gave him the endowments necessary to lead this new team in the USSR. We have to take account of the fact that Stalin's character wasn't what it became overnight. He had developed, in times previous to those we are dealing with, the 'qualities' that allowed him to become what he later became. It is fundamental to read the 'Stalin' of Trotsky. Trotsky wrote this book to demonstrate that the Russian Revolution wasn't undergoing degeneration because Marxism had faltered, but because historic

conditions – and Stalin himself – had roots which were allowed to grow at this time. Stalin would not have turned out to be the bureaucrat he became if the world revolution had continued to develop after the Russian Revolution, for example. Trotsky explains, in his ‘Stalin’, that ‘if Stalin could have foreseen where it was all going to end, he would have stopped in time because he was an old Bolshevik’. However, his personality weighed because of historic conditions. He tended towards intrigue, to a certain rancour which was in character with the old nationalist, localist that he was. Stalin lived a life of family, group and caste intrigues. He never reached beyond the level of cunning. He came to accept Bolshevism as an expression of the rejection of the Tzar, but never managed to organise thought scientifically and through Bolshevik discipline.

There is immense economic development in the Soviet Union today, and its policy is closer now to what is necessary. To say that it is ‘closer’ does not mean that it already has the necessary policy. The USSR has a leadership which is not quite sure what to do internally and, at the same time, it sends greetings to the historic enemy. It presents itself in front of the American masses as a leadership which connives with Nixon, whilst the North American masses are quite clear that Nixon is a murderer. Stalin was the product of certain historic conditions, and his rise could not be attributed to Bolshevism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the Russian Revolution. The proof is that whilst Stalin went – or was eliminated – the economic, social and political structure of the Workers State continued, and continues, to advance. It advanced all the more for being rid of Stalin, particularly after the war. Stalin was eliminated because he was not historically necessary.

Our confidence in Marxism and Socialism is based on the historic necessity there is for them. So, also, is our confidence in the function of the IV International, based on the historic necessity for a conscious instrument. Socialism cannot be constructed without consciousness because it is not the product of empirical and competitive development. The society of private property develops through competition. Indeed, it was the very embodiment of competition. Accumulation allowed investment and re-investment to enlarge and extend production. This was done through private interest and competition. Socialism is alien to all this; it is scientific capacity applied to raising the human being and human sentiments. No revolution can triumph without focusing on human sentiment, dignity and respect for humanity. What does not respond to historic necessity cannot triumph. The crises in Hungary and China are a proof of this fact. The bureaucracy could make there a certain progress – mainly through imposition – but it cannot build Socialism in this way. Sooner or later disquiet appears, and there is a new crisis in the Workers State. These crises progress continually and are necessary. This is the era of ‘intelligence and reason’, by virtue of the fact that Marxism is necessary in all the Workers States.

The rifts are very great in the Workers States. Crises in the Chinese Communist Party are an example. Lin Piao, the organiser of the Party, has been got rid of. Is this not a crisis? Lin Piao – who led the victory against Chiang Kai Check – was then accused of having sold the Party to the capitalists! On this excuse he was got rid of. One would have to be a simpleton to make such a pronouncement against him in the first place. This is Stalin’s level of depreciating intelligence and reason. The Chinese bureaucracy sinks as low as Stalin in this respect because they do not see the future. If they could visualise the future, then this defamation of Lin Piao would never have

been sought. The people who go on like this are prisoners of their national mentality, their national myopia, their bureaucratic intrigues and manoeuvres. In the USSR, their equivalent became a whole layer, and the isolation of the Russian Revolution allowed them to come to the top. The rise of the bureaucracy in the USSR was not inherent in the proletariat or in the Bolshevik Party. The historic cause for the rise of the bureaucracy was the disproportion between the possibilities arising in the USSR and the lack of objective conditions in the rest of the world.

THE LEFT OPPOSITION AND THE CREATION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL

However, instead of falling apart or disappearing, the Bolshevik Party concentrated itself within a small group of people who formed the Left Opposition. The Revolution had been, is, and will remain, the result of the accumulation of human experience. Humanity has all the experience offered by science. The purpose of studying the Russian Revolution is to show that it is perfectly possible to build a new society consciously, and not just a society that ambles along in the empiricism of private property and individual interest. To make such an experiment in life was the most important of all investigations made in the course of history. It had to be carried out with human brains that had been constructed within private interests, and nonetheless it was possible to make the experience, and that experience allowed the human mind to change for the first time. Comrades, mark this point! How significant it is to change the mind of humanity! What historic significance it is to have been able to organise and develop the human mind and to bring to it the consciousness that it is possible to build Socialism! The existence of the bureaucracy clouds this issue, creates difficulties, and accounts for delays, but not more than this. The bureaucracy unnecessarily prolongs historic stages, but it cannot negate them altogether. All the changes that have now taken place in the Workers States have proved this point.

Stalin in sole charge – without a Left Opposition – would have sounded the death-knell of the Revolution. The Revolution with Stalin at the helm would have left humanity in complete ignorance of this rich experience that has to be continued. There had to be someone to show the necessity of maintaining programme, leadership and revolutionary policies. Trotsky organised the Left Opposition to continue Marxism. This was the way in which Marxism was continued. Stalin hoped that Trotsky would die and, in common with the capitalist system, he did not believe that there was such a thing as objective historic necessity. He did not think the world proletarian vanguard could be the protagonist of this objective necessity. Stalin never thought this. His conclusions were simple: to get rid of Trotsky, deport him to Alma Ata, and hope that he would die. Trotsky himself reports how Stalin did not believe that he would survive. Stalin never knew the meaning of the ‘objective development’, of the necessity of the revolution. Stalin, in common with all mediocre people and bureaucrats, underestimated the tenacity of the objective force of reason. He exiled Trotsky and hoped that this would kill him or that he would become disheartened and would give up.

This is the bureaucratic concept of the problem. It hoped Trotsky would give up. However, if anything gives up easily, it is the bureaucracy – because it does not fight for historic necessity. Trotsky never gave up. He organised the Left Opposition, and tried to the last to remain with the masses through the Bolshevik Party. Trotsky explained: ‘I tried till the last moment to stay in the Bolshevik Party’. He tried to keep

organisational links with the world Communist movement, in the hope of remaining linked to the masses. He hoped that a new stage would soon induce a revival of Bolshevik principles in the Communist parties. However, he was not allowed to see this. He was thrown out of the USSR and his voice was drowned. So the Left Opposition became the instrument through which Trotsky hoped to re-animate the Bolshevik Party. When the Bolshevik Party and the III International (led by Stalin) adopted a political stance that allowed the triumph of Hitler in Germany, Trotsky saw that it was no longer possible to change this Party and that the Communist International had degenerated. At this point he formed the IV International.

Trotsky reached the point of deciding to form the IV International because he had drawn the historic conclusion that the Bolshevik Party and the Workers State had degenerated. This meant that the Workers state was not fulfilling its historic function. The basis for that historic function remained, but the Workers State had degenerated. The Workers State remained a Workers State, but a degenerated one. This demanded a new historic interpretation. An instrument that had been created on a sound historic basis had acquired a degenerated function. This is an essential method of interpretation of the process, and only Marxism could allow an understanding of it. Marxism means confidence in the historic process. It teaches how to utilise any and every instrument of historic progress. Marxism allows a rigorous analysis on how instruments for progress are formed, and how to base oneself on them in order to advance further. Thus, Trotsky never said: 'They threw me out', 'They want to kill me, so the Revolution is dead'. On the contrary, Trotsky said that the Workers state had degenerated but still existed. He showed how this was a contradictory situation. He analysed bureaucracy: The bureaucracy has a contradictory function. It supports itself on the Workers State because it has to retain state ownership – a thing completely revolutionary as far as capitalism is concerned – in order to survive. In consequence, the bureaucracy has to support itself on revolutionary elements in order to live. But, in order to live as a bureaucracy, it cannot allow the Workers State to exercise its revolutionary function either. If this were allowed, the Workers State would sweep away the bureaucracy. The result is, a contradictory situation: The Workers State continues to exist but with a reformist, conciliatory and conservative bureaucratic leadership. This is what is meant by a 'contradictory situation'. These contradictory factors produced degeneration when they first appeared; now there has to be regeneration because these contradictory factors are being removed...

...However, when the Workers state was degenerating, this degeneration extended itself. The culminating point of the process of degeneration can be placed at the time of the Spanish civil war, which was lost when all the conditions existed for victory. Stalinist policy is not governed by the desire to see that revolutions triumph because, if they did, they would send ripples back in the USSR against the Soviet bureaucracy. The slogan of 'Socialism in one country' meant this. This was designed to restrain, limit and eventually kill the revolution. In this, the bureaucracy found support in a policy of conciliation with the capitalist system. 'Popular Fronts' and agreements made with bourgeois and petty bourgeois sectors were to keep the capitalist system at arm's length and limit its antagonism against the USSR.

In spite of all this weakness in the USSR, capitalism was wholly in crisis and riddled with contradictions. Nazism and fascism were thrown up by it to seek a way out of its chaos by means of war, once again. At one moment, capitalism intended to hurl itself

at the USSR. But this policy deepened even more its internal contradictions. And then the policy of 'Socialism in one country' gave to capitalism a feeling that Stalin was not going to use its weakness to spread revolution. Stalin gave further guarantees through his policies in Spain and the Hitler/Stalin pact. This explains why a sector of capitalism was totally in favour of maximum use of these guarantees.

The communist International and the communist parties degenerated in this way. After its IV world Congress, the Communist International came under the hegemony of Stalinism. The International ceased to be an instrument for the measurement of problems, for comparison and analyses from experiences. It no longer lived the life of the revolution, and it stopped using objective analyses to reach conclusions. It was transformed into a cookery book which dispensed recipes to sustain 'Socialism in one country'. The principles of thinking, making judgements, and studying facts were thrown out. The Communist International became a means of simply defending the USSR. The Communist parties, waiting for better or worse, supported the International. However, they were no longer awaiting the taking of power either. In support of the Soviet bureaucracy they developed themselves into instruments of conciliation with the various national bourgeoisies. All the communist parties degenerated.

THE OBJECTIVE REASONS FOR THE DEGENERATION

The degeneration of the Workers States was the result of historic conditions, of retreat instead of extension of the world revolution. This led to further retreats in the USSR. This allowed the degeneration of the Communist parties and of the Soviet bureaucracy even more. This degeneration was not the result of having taken power, or of the Russian Revolution. It wasn't the fault of the Bolshevik Party. The degeneration was the result of what happened after the Revolution, in conditions when it would not spread to the rest of Europe. However, even then, the USSR was not negated. The processes of degeneration were not inherent in the Party or the taking of power. They remained circumstantial events, although they persisted for quite a number of years.

The Soviet bureaucracy arose in history when capitalism was preparing another war to solve its internal problems. The Nazis tried to attack the USSR but they did not receive the support needed from the other capitalist countries. If Britain, France or the United States had supported Hitler sufficiently he would have tried to destroy the USSR at any cost. As it was, Hitler was aware that the destruction of the USSR would mean, afterwards, his own destruction at the hand of his competitors. Such is the nature of capitalist competition that they would support him only as far as destroying the Soviet Union. After that, they would deal with him. When Hitler realised this, he back-tracked and tried an alliance with Stalin. This was an attempt to keep the rest of capitalism at arm's length. He hoped to be able to deal with the USSR by himself, without the help of his 'friends'. Such are the inane dreams of imperialism, whether 'Nazi' or 'democratic'. None of their plans ever acknowledged the existence of the masses. They were making only economic and military plans to secure victory. The masses did not count for anything in these plans. They never expected that the Czechoslovakian, or Polish or Hungarian masses would intervene. Imperialism, encouraged by the strength of its deadly weapons, thought victory was inevitable. A situation in which a Tito would arise never crossed their mind. Even less than Tito

would defeat the Nazis with four guns! The idiotic mentality of capitalism never allowed for this possibility. The bureaucracy of the Soviet Union did not show any better grasp of the situation. It, too, trusted exclusively to military instruments and discipline. In common with imperialism, the bureaucracy trusted in military rather than class laws. Consequently, none of the capitalist or bureaucratic plans ever worked. Nazi imperialism first moved against France, then against Britain, in the hope that it would soon be able to turn against the USSR. When the Nazis did indeed attack the USSR – aided in this by the criminal policy of Stalin – the masses of the world were fully alerted. The Soviet working class defended the USSR in a way in which no other class in history ever defended a country before. It did it practically without means. The Soviet working class did not make a centre of Stalin! Hitler hoped that the Soviet working class would bring Stalin down, or would let the Nazis enter passively in order to get rid of him. At the moment when the USSR was being attacked, Trotsky produced documents showing that the masses were going to defend the Soviet Union tooth and nail. He was right. In the period immediately before the war Trotsky had founded the IV International, and we will see more of this later. He foresaw that the war would mean the rout of both ‘Nazi’ and ‘democratic’ imperialism. In fact, immediately after the war, this was seen in the form of twelve more Working States.

STALINGRAD: CENTRE OF HISTORIC CHANGES

Stalingrad was the centre for historic change. The defence of Stalingrad by the Soviet masses inspired a sense of authority and a resolve to renew the fight against the capitalist system. Europe was soon to give birth to new Workers States and, even with Stalin, the Soviet masses continued to work according to the conclusion that Socialism was being constructed. The masses acted throughout on the basis that it was entirely on the agenda. The Soviet masses felt no sense of terror in front of the Nazi threat. During the war they were not cowed and the invasion did not make them panic. That resistance inspired the rest of the world masses, and showed what an immense capacity and resource existed in the world to defeat the capitalist system. By 1943 it was already obvious that Nazism was doomed. A sense of victorious confidence swept Europe and flourished amongst the partisans who were confronting the Nazis and their national capitalists. Thus, Stalingrad must be seen as the start of a new stage, not quite of ‘regeneration’ but a stage in which all the seeds were sown for ‘regeneration’. To put it in another way: the Hitler-Stalin Pact against the German revolution was counter-revolutionary, but the defence of the USSR and the confrontation with Hitler was not. This dual policy was not decided by Stalin but by the contradictory nature of the Workers State that had degenerated and whose leadership was reactionary. In the end, it was not reaction but revolution which decided the evolution of this contradiction. The historic legitimacy of the Workers State was confirmed, and we base our confidence in the knowledge that history has ratified the legitimacy of the Workers state.

However, the Communist International had now been disbanded. Stalin was not interested in it, and he destroyed this conscious instrument of revolutionary organisation. In 1938 Trotsky founded the IV International, precisely to maintain the continuity of the thought, organisation and links with the world masses. He founded the IV International whilst waiting for the time when there would be a new flux in the world revolutionary movement and in the USSR. At no time did Trotsky raise the concept of a ‘total regeneration’ or even ‘partial’. But he did talk of ‘currents’ in the

world Communist movement, without saying what names these would have when they would appear. This was at the time when he elaborated the programme of the IV International. Trotsky foresaw the war and provided us with the programme for the development of the revolution in the course of the war itself. This programme was aimed at gaining more than simple reforms. It was a guide on how not to be dominated by the bureaucracy of the USSR or of the various Communist parties. Stalin liquidated the Communist International, traded it with capitalism as a vulgar commodity. In other words, Stalin used it to pay capitalism with. He hoped that capitalism would give him support against the Nazis! This meant more than the liquidation of the name of the International. It destroyed it as the instrument that may have revived at any moment and become – as far as capitalism and bureaucracy were concerned – a fresh danger in the re-animation of a world leadership, but the International had been killed before it had been dissolved in name. There was no longer any force or tradition linked to it. Capitalism and bureaucracy were most mindful in not letting anything at all revive. Trotsky founded the IV International in immensely precarious and difficult conditions. He could only hope to keep alive the programme, policy and perspectives to perpetuate confidence in the development of the revolution. It was Trotsky's aim to keep this alive. He did not construct the IV International to compete with the Communist parties but to continue the programme and to show that there would be, some day, a process of reanimation. He believed this in spite of the chaotic conditions into which the world workers and revolutionary movements had been plunged.

Trotsky in his writings said that: 'Within ten years millions of revolutionaries will move Heaven and Earth'. He did not say that in ten years time it would all have to be started again from scratch. He saw the process ahead as one of continuation of what had already been started. He saw this as a reanimation or regeneration. Implicit in this was his confidence in the world working class and in the Workers State. It was not a belief but a conscious confidence built on knowing that the world masses had accepted the full historic validity of the Workers state. He knew that the world proletarian vanguard would not fail to appreciate such historic achievement. Trotsky was absolutely certain of this. And this is also the basis for our own confidence. Our confidence is based on this complete trust in the proletarian vanguard, inside and outside the USSR.

Indeed, the proletarian vanguard was not confused by Stalin's disasters. Stalin presided over the retreat of the USSR and such deeds as the Pact with Hitler. The proletarian vanguard remained confident and unshaken within its historic class sense of security.

Socialism cannot be constructed without Marxism. Power can be taken without Marxism, and the economy developed to some extent without it. But Marxism is necessary for the construction of Socialism! Socialism is not an 'improved' economy, but social and human relations entirely superior to those of the capitalist system, and the source of organisation to end all violence and injustice.

The degeneration of the communist parties and of the soviet Workers state went very far. The Hitler-Stalin pact bears witness to this. It was a demonstration of how the bureaucracy lost confidence in the future of the Workers state. People like Oto Sik developed in the bureaucracy and, having been appointed for their technical ability,

went over to the counter-revolution as soon as conditions permitted. If Hitler had found the Soviet population disheartened and passive when he invaded and if the USSR had been really weak, the Hitler would have triumphed through the use of stooges inside the USSR. In the event he lost because he was socially inept even though the Nazis had overwhelming military superiority and coordination. Hitler lost because he was socially incapable.

The soviet masses created Generals, they produced leaders, military coordination, and even weapons, in the midst of war. They did all this in the very course of the war. The Nazis were never capable of producing such a creative capacity because the vanguard of the proletariat would not have given them one iota of support. The Soviet Union had this support, and the Nazis could never have it. There was no doubt in the USSR on the question of whether to get rid of Stalin or of Hitler. The task was to destroy Hitler. The Soviet people did not give way to their social anger against Stalin, but dedicated themselves to bring down Hitler, the historic enemy. Stalin was seen as part of the Communist movement, part of what they had managed to construct and that they knew they would be able to correct later. The Soviet people were not confused at all about this: this experience is an example for everyone.

The historic behaviour of the world proletarian vanguard was fully in accord with this historic necessity. In common with the Bolshevik Party, its behaviour corresponds to the process of history. The parties of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and the Posadist IV International, are not parties for disputes or to show themselves more than everyone else. They are not parties for the fulfilment of ambition or careerism. They were, and are, a public historic benefit to develop thought, action, experience, confidence and organisms which are historically necessary. If we dispute, it is not to show that we are right or that we want to triumph to fulfil our own plans, but what we are saying is the necessary path to progress. The polemic of today is no longer as sharp as it was in Lenin's and Trotsky's time, although it is still very sharp. Now, humanity has complete confidence in the inevitability of Socialism. At the time of Lenin and Trotsky, this point still had to be proved. They had to tenaciously uphold the idea that Socialism was the only possible perspective. The only one to maintain this after Lenin's death was Trotsky.

The fact that the movement of Trotsky has continued – through ourselves – is not because we decided to venerate him. This is not so. We render homage to Trotsky and give recognition to what he was, that is to say: his confidence in Marxist thought. Trotsky represented Marxism as a method of thinking and an essential instrument of humanity. He maintained the continuity of Marxist thought, a disciplined life in the Party and in the movement, and as an individual, without which Marxism cannot be advanced. History has produced a good many revolutionaries. Those who are not revolutionary have little participation in the course of history. The conduct of humanity shows that either people are revolutionary and they participate in life, or they carry on a vague passage through existence. To be a revolutionary, one has to intervene in the process of historic change, to finish with the essential hindrance that impedes the progress of history and humanity – class society! This is quite logical. There are now fourteen Workers states and sixteen Revolutionary States. Humanity has shown the path it is taking for the future stages.

Trotsky dedicated himself to organising the IV International. He was aware that he would be killed for this. But it was the instrument that he felt he had to construct and leave after him. He could not leave us a programme valid for ever, but he did produce a complete programme in relation to the historic confidence of humanity: the Workers State is the legitimate result of the historic process, revolution is necessary, and the war will bring revolution in its wake. He foresaw that the war would mean the reanimation of the world revolution. How right he was! How was this going to happen? He could not say precisely, but he firmly planted the seeds of the confidence that war would mean revolutions. The seeds of the Communist parties sown at that time, instead of this, produced a vacuum. The Communist Party of the US went as far as to support the US against the USSR. Stalin dissolved many of the Communist parties that remained when they did not submit to him. In Argentina, Chiordi wrote a book that supported the Hitler-Stalin Pact. Then he wrote another book – when the agreement was broken – this time to support an alliance with the ‘democratic’ imperialists: just like that! This demonstrated the absence of confidence in programme or policy. These people saw the war as an absolute catastrophe in which the question was ‘to make the best out of the worst’. They had no personal interest, but had no Marxist method. They weren’t all careerists, either. Chiordi was imprisoned and tortured. These comrades simply expressed the absence of Marxist ideas or functioning.

Trotsky organised the IV International in order to await new phases in history. The degeneration of the Workers state resulted in the degeneration of the policies of the various Communist parties. The Communist parties, armed with a policy of conciliation with the capitalist system, applied their conciliatory conceptions in activity – thus becoming the channel through which the Soviet bureaucracy could have a voice and a say. They became a channel for the soviet bureaucracy, and a block to revolution. In turn, this produced a whole raft of opportunist policies, careerism and nationalism. This policy brought to the fore the worst features and aspects in the Communist militants. It supported their national sentiments and cut them off from an international perspective. As the international method of analysis had long disappeared from the Communist Party, these comrades focused exclusively on national interests, and thus reduced their political vision to strictly national dimensions. The idea of ‘socialism in one country’ was extended to each country, and each Communist Party sought its own ‘road’ to Socialism.

Togliatti is a product of this in Italy. Today, everything shows that there is no national or local road to Socialism. There are indeed peculiar conditions in each country which account for a greater or lesser speed in the process of revolution. But there are no national qualities as such. What there is is the class struggle on a world scale expressed locally. Clearly, specific local conditions lead to certain conclusions in terms of rhythms, stages and resources. For instance, local conditions decide at what level the proletariat establishes a relationship with the bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie, but the norm of socialism, the path to socialism are universal. The construction of Socialism is a universal process. While the construction of Socialism is still incomplete it is possible to advance more, or less, in one place or other but the construction of Socialism retains in any country its universal character. The fact that the revolution breaks out in one country, and not in another, does not negate the need for the revolution everywhere else. Marx, Engels and Lenin never meant anything else. They demonstrated that some countries can come under a revolutionary

leadership – without this signifying complete Socialism – but when this happens, it speeds up the process everywhere. This is because humanity sees what can be done, that killing and war are not necessary in order to live. A revolution in one country lays the base for the construction of Socialism in the world. This does not mean either that the rest of the world has just to wait for the influence that comes from the country in revolution. Revolution in one place does not render revolution unnecessary elsewhere! Far from it! When Trotsky said that ‘the developments and victory of the Russian revolution are going to gain more and more authority on a world scale’, he meant that the revolution in the rest of the world would be facilitated, not rendered unnecessary.

Stalin suppressed the communist International and buried revolutionary policies. ‘Socialism in one country’ was a policy designed to foster national interests in the USSR. This policy was incorrect, and the proof is that ‘Socialism’ was not constructed. There has been an immense economic progress in the USSR through the state-owned system of property and production, the monopoly of foreign trade and planning. This is an immeasurable progress over and above private property, but it is not the product of ‘Socialism in one country’. It is the product of historic conditions inherent in the qualities of state ownership, the planning of production, and state monopoly of foreign trade. It is essentially these three measures that account for the development of the USSR and not ‘Socialism in one country’. These measures are the three historic reasons that led to the development of the economy in a superior form to that of the capitalist system.

Socialism is altogether higher than this. It means not only the development of the economy but the development of consciousness and the intervention of the whole of society in the process of eliminating all forms of coercion. It means replacing the organs of repression with the logical behaviour of society. The bureaucracy cannot see this. It continues, for that matter, with a capitalist mentality – thinking that people want to dispute property, to acquire goods and to accumulate. The Workers State eliminates all this by generating a sense of confidence and security. It gives historic proof of its ability to create this confidence and ability. It constantly proves, by its very structure, that it is not necessary to argue over property and possessions. The Workers State produces in people a rational way of measuring human necessity without the individual motives and conservatism that the system of private property induces. This is Socialism. It requires undoubtedly a certain development of the economy, but not strictly abundance. Abundance is as much a matter of the mind as it is of the economy! Indeed, real abundance is what flows from the mind.

Stalin eliminated the communist International and made the Communist parties the instruments of the bureaucracy. In consequence, revolutionary thought was thrown out. The degeneration of the Workers State and of the Communist parties – this includes the Bolshevik Party – meant this. Stalin eliminated the revolutionary role of the Workers State, but not the historic foundations of the Workers State; state ownership is paramount amongst these foundations. The statified economy is a source of immense progress in the competition of the Workers States with the capitalist system. Moreover, as long as any Workers State survives, it cannot be anything but a ferment of external revolutionary developments. This is because the Workers State is a permanent proof that nationalised and planned property can create sentiments of confidence, consciousness, and social capacity. This is what sustained and defended

the USSR in the last instance, enabling it to defeat the Nazis and to move forward from that point. What did not pass the test of the Nazis is private property, not the Workers State. Is it not the case that half Europe became Workers States? Humanity gained from this its source of ideas and sense of historic confidence. Statification is the example of how to proceed.

Posadas is the only remaining representative of the IV International founded by Trotsky. All the others deserted in one way or another and capitulated. This is why we continue the IV International. It is the continuation of Marxism through this instrument. It operates by using all the bases, experiences and historic confidence of Marxism. It applies all these to now. This is the proof of the necessity of the continuation of Marxism, whilst waiting in the meantime, organising the ability of people to await the massive revolutionary groundswell that will not fail to come. The ability to wait means preparing cadres theoretically and politically. Waiting does not mean the vacuum of passivity or tranquillity. It means preparing oneself, intervening in all the problems of history, and developing the theoretical Marxist ability. This is till necessary. After Trotsky it was necessary to wait and perpetuate the certainty that the process of the revolution would be reanimated and, in turn, would revive the masses intervention. It is not a question of 'waiting', in the sense of being subjected to the process, but to educate oneself in historic confidence and to learn how to foresee. Historic confidence means the ability to understand the course of the historic process, and thus to put forward the correct policy.

THE TRIUMPH OF THE USSR WAS THE SIGNAL TO THE WORLD REVOLUTION

It is essential to understand, among other things, that the establishment of Workers States in Europe was the result of the victory of the masses at Stalingrad against the Nazis. There would have been a tremendous retreat in history if the USSR had been defeated, but the USSR won and prepared the ground for an immense leap. The Soviet masses, faced with the choice between avenging themselves on Stalin and smashing Hitler, chose to smash Hitler. It was a logical dedication stemming from a historic necessity perceived by the proletariat. How did the bourgeoisie deal with this problem in the meantime? Take Poland and the Polish bourgeoisie, for example. They were initially part of the allies against Hitler, but they soon allied themselves to Hitler against the Polish Revolution. This clarified for the masses the task in hand. It became a simple matter of crushing Hitler and the Polish bourgeoisie! In other words, it was a matter of taking power. The bourgeoisie could not solve its problems in any other way but in accordance with the interests of private property. The masses did not put up with this. They had nothing private to defend. They had no other interest but to construct and improve life.

This is why the masses resolved all the problems at once and instantly. They made the permanent revolution, and how delightfully permanent it was in this case! The starting point of a chain of events stretching through Europe and going as far as China was Stalingrad! Rest assured that, without Stalingrad, there would have been no guerrilla struggle in France, Italy, parts of Belgium and Holland. Equally, the 'Four Days of Naples' started in Stalingrad.

The IV International was constructed to await the advance of the world revolution. It demonstrated Trotsky's confidence in the objective necessity for revolution. He knew that the necessary material, social, economic and political conditions would arise with the fresh advance of the revolution. He was sure that capitalism would have little possibility or historic strength to contain the advance to Socialism. We have to remember that Trotsky was murdered before the USSR had demonstrated its ability to overcome Nazism. He was assassinated before the USSR had passed the historic test that the Nazi invasion represented. Trotsky, who didn't see this before he died, had an absolute confidence in the triumph of Socialism, left in all his writings. All his conclusions were based on the certainty that the USSR would pass all the historic tests. He had no doubt on this score. He said that 'within ten years millions of revolutionaries will know how to move Heaven and Earth'. He could not give a blueprint for the future, but he was fully confident that the world masses would defend the USSR. With this foresight, he produced the texts necessary to organise this in the understanding of the necessity to maintain the continuity of the International. The International means – essentially – programme, policy, tactic, and a world instrument to organise the objective progress of the class struggle.

The programme of Trotsky was not simply a programme for the defence of the USSR but for the defence of the USSR by means of the revolution. The revolution was – and is – the best means of defending the USSR. We have to take account of the fact that Trotsky, in the founding documents of the IV International, made absolutely clear that the war would lead to the mobilisation of the world women and youth: these people would become incorporated into the process of the Revolution. Already in 1938 Trotsky saw the importance of the incorporation of women and youth. (See the Transitional Programme: 'The Mortal Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the IV International' – edit). Following this, Trotsky underlined an important characteristic of the process already in train in 1938: he saw that women and youth were going to come on the scene even in 1938, because changes were on the order of the day. He gave the necessary elements for an understanding of that stage of history, and for the acquisition of the confidence that this was really so. However, he could not foresee precisely how that stage would unfold. It fell to use to live it, understand it, and intervene in it.

Trotsky left not just one or another clarification, but the very foundation from which to understand. The rest was up to us. It was up to us to interpret the events resulting from the fact that the Workers State fought, defeated the Nazis, and continued to exist. This fact was not just a victory of the USSR but the greatest influence in reanimating the world revolutionary process. It was our role to measure the stages in which this was going to happen and the rhythms. It had to be lived to be understood. The conditions that allowed victory for USSR meant the defeat of Stalin. It remained to be seen how the process of the reanimation of the revolutionary advance was going to unfold. How it was going to happen, and what combination of factors would enter into it. Trotsky could not foresee it all, and therefore it was up to those who followed him.

The Communist movement did not foresee any of it. Not one Communist Party was able to foretell what would happen after the War. They had been both allies and opponents of Hitler. The Communist Party of the United States preferred 'its' imperialism rather than the Soviet Union. It allied with Yankee imperialism against

the Soviet Union and, unable to foresee the course of history, meandered on without policy or programme. Above all, it had no confidence in the masses. Driven by bureaucratic interests, the Communist parties repeatedly clashed with the process of history.

It was the USSR and the Soviet masses that organised the resistance to Hitler. It was they who defended the USSR and ensured the continuity and extension of the USSR in the rest of the world. The Soviet masses fought and contained the onslaught of Stalin at the same time. This reanimated some sort of Bolshevik team to begin extending the revolutionary struggle again. It shows the immense force of the Workers State, and certainly no capitalist regime would have survived a similar test. In the meantime, the European bourgeoisies had broken up into a hundred pieces.

The French bourgeoisie was split in three parts: with one tendency being that of de Gaulle. It was the same in Britain. In the USSR, of course, there was no capitalism for anyone to grab hold of and sustain. The homogeneity of the Workers State was remarkable, and determined by the superiority of statified property. The other important factor was the utter determination of the Soviet masses. If the Soviet masses had not moved so unconditionally in support of the Workers State, they would have perished. Currents would have appeared internally in alliance with the Nazis, just as a tiny sector of the bureaucracy did, in fact. However, it was so tiny that it had no effect. In the most extraordinarily difficult circumstances, the Soviet masses demonstrated how confident they felt. They were historically secure. When the Nazis laid siege to them they were unshaken, and it was the Nazis troops that began to decompose. The Italian battalions which were present at the siege of Stalingrad dissolved completely. The Italian army was utterly routed. The Soviet people gave the Italian soldiers food and the Italian Generals reported afterwards that they could not convince their soldiers to fight the Soviets. The Italian soldiers just would not open fire on the Soviets, and they did anything but fight. There are dozens of stories recounting this event. The German army was more difficult to disintegrate, but the same process was at work there. Hitler had to make continuous changes in the German army and move battalions around, not letting any one regiment remain in one place for more than a few months. They dreaded the influence of the Soviet masses on the German troops. The longer the siege lasted the more this influence increased. The German soldiers were themselves peasants, and had to be moved from Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia every three months!

The triumph of the USSR meant the renewal of the revolutionary struggle on a world scale, but it did not reanimate the Communist International. The Communist International was, by then, dead and buried. Equally, some Communist parties had been entirely dissolved, rebuilt and reorganised on the basis of conciliation. After the war, the Communist parties no longer had the habit of supporting themselves on revolutionary experience. They had all developed on the basis of 'Socialism in one country'. The various Communist parties were no more than an extension of that policy. Each CP developed its 'own' national road to Socialism. It is not that the Communist parties invented a new policy, but they drifted back into nationalism, for historic reasons. If they had continued to live the world experience through the Communist International, they would have maintained an internal life of investigation into the world process of the war. It would have given them the necessary bases and confidence to lead new victories.

The idea that 'democratic' capitalism defeated 'Nazi' imperialism is totally unacceptable. The masses of the Soviet Union – animated by historic confidence – influenced the German and Italian masses, who, in turn, felt they could bring down the capitalist regime. The conditions to have brought down capitalism existed in Italy, but the communists did not do it. The bourgeoisie was utterly divided and the King was locked in deadly struggles with the Republicans; the Communists and Socialists were strong. The bourgeoisie did not hold power at that time in Italy, for it was effectively in the hands of the guerrillas. This is why Yankee imperialism intervened in the War! It was to impede the guerrillas, the 'Partisans', from taking power. As it was, the Partisans were the effective power in the country and had created a series of separate 'Socialist Republics'. There were up to twenty such 'Republics'. The same was done in France. However, the Communist parties failed to unite the 'Republics', through their lack of policy. They did not unite this struggle with that to bring down the capitalist system.

THE NATIONAL INTERESTS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Communists had no tradition, antecedents or historical bases to enable them to act. They had no confidence in the masses, and no confidence in themselves. So power slipped out of their hands. If they had developed on the basis of trust in the masses, they would have led the struggle for power. The reason for them not taking power was neither cowardice nor negligence. The Communist and Socialist masses showed an immense courage, but they were not led by policy, programme or objectives. The Communist parties did not believe that the socialist Republic could be on the order of the day, and they did not trust the masses. Under the pressure of Stalin and the leadership of the USSR, such as it was, they handed power back to capitalism! The Communist parties had become Stalinist in that sense. Therefore, when confronted with the question of power, they hesitated, vacillated, and... surrendered. The conditions for power were there! We know that they are now discussing, once again, why they did not take power in 1943-45. This is not a superficial discussion in the Communist Parties, and, in a short time, they will be discussing this extensively. The Communist parties did not prepare themselves with the Marxist method. This is why none of the Communist parties – either in Europe or the rest of the world, and not even the CPSU – made any analysis of the process of the war in that light. Before the war, they had not bargained with the taking of power. In their conception there was no idea of taking power. It was unthinkable, and the immediate danger was 'Nazism'. And then they hoped to advance towards 'democracy', as they called it. In their perspective, the question of power was for the very distant future. There was no longer any scientific preparation in the Party. They should have decided to defeat the Nazis by means of taking power, as it turned out to be, anyway, in several countries of Western Europe. The masses of each country united the defeat of the Nazis with the rout of the local capitalists, by taking power; the masses did it! This could have been done in France and also in Italy. However, it was not done, because of the lack of political Marxist preparation in the Communist parties. This was the reason, and not because the conditions did not exist for taking power. The communists lived amid opportunist, conciliatory and nationalist conceptions which prevented them from seeing the possibilities for taking power. The conditions were there, but they were not prepared for them. Even when the War was started, the Communist leadership had little idea of where it was all going. All they saw was a struggle between the 'democrats' and the 'Nazis'. They saw no more than this.

As it was, the advent of the War created the possibility for further revolutions. The Communist masses took the helm in this process and became the essential factor for the various revolutions, even where some of the Communist parties were opposed. Opposed! Then, in each (newly formed) Workers State, tendencies developed in the Communist parties that became antagonistic to the (leadership of the) USSR. At this time the soviet bureaucracy entered these countries and robbed machines, raw materials and essential products. It was a real robbery at the expense of the new Workers States. However, it was not a measure from which capitalism could take advantage. The bureaucratic leadership of the USSR, once having robbed the new Workers States had to start to support their development as Workers States. The Workers States developed, and capitalism could never have achieved this in those countries. Capitalism had been there, as it had been in places like India, Africa or Latin America, for plunder. The Soviet bureaucracy, on the other hand, even though it expropriated had to return soon afterwards to a policy of aid for the development of these countries. This conduct was determined by the superior structure of the Workers State. The initial expropriations were for the benefit of the bureaucracy, but the structure of the Workers State finally obliged the bureaucracy to look to the development of these countries. In this, we have one of the bases of 'partial regeneration'. It was the structure of the Workers State, rather than the bureaucracy, that forced this change of conduct on the part of the USSR. It was not because of the political consciousness or capacity of the bureaucracy; it was not that a new capacity for leadership had arisen: the very structure of the Workers state forced the bureaucracy to support the development of other Workers States. It is the structure of the Workers State that eventually determined the global conduct of the bureaucracy. As we are dealing with a bureaucracy, its conduct is not consistent and different policies are often contradictory. The elevation of the conduct of the Soviet Union is not so much determined by a rise in political consciousness (study of experiences, or the utilisation of the Marxist method) in the leadership. If that consciousness could arise in the bureaucracy it would lead to the ability to foresee clearly the process of history. This, the bureaucracy cannot do.

The USSR really devastated some of the new European Workers States, but, after that, it had to support their development and transformation. We have to measure in this the different conduct of the different regimes in history. Imperialism devastated Asia, Africa, and Latin America etc. Amongst other motives, the idea was to crush them. But the social regime of the Workers State has a different effect: the social regime of the Workers State is different: the social regime of the Workers State is superior because its regime of property is superior. In consequence, superior conditions for consciousness are created. In turn, this produces a situation in which the bureaucracy cannot dismiss people who think, nor the necessity for the development of other countries. The bureaucracy still acts in a competitive manner but it cannot dismiss this necessity because it is based on a Workers State.

Today, when we observe the competition and dispute between Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and the USSR, it is essential to think how this developed. These disputes stem from the fact that a bureaucracy developed in Hungary and Bulgaria, motivated by national interests and national aims. The tragedy for these tendencies is that they cannot live without protection against capitalism. So they have to draw together and coordinate against it. They need to defend themselves against the capitalist system, all being bureaucracies. But they do not want to become a single instrument, because this

would render them subordinate to the Soviet Union. At the same time, they are moved by rancour against the Soviet Union – in part because of what the Soviet bureaucracy did to them in the past. In the end, these bureaucracies have very little consciousness and simply follow their local interests.

The limited discussion in the Workers State comes less from disputes or different economic interests than a lack of scientific preparation. This, in turn, makes bureaucratic sectors come to the fore, and these impose their regional, local and narrow way of thinking. The national bureaucracies are undoubtedly animated by a feeling of competition with the USSR and fear of confronting capitalism. But the prime factor that makes them what they are is their lack of preparation, of consciousness, of how to construct Socialism. In Hungary, for instance, Harasti has made criticisms which are quite important. His book 'Piece Work Wages' is a criticism of the way in which bureaucracy increases productivity. He criticised the trade union leaders and the factory managers by showing how the workers are exploited. He says: that 'piece work' is totally inhuman. He also draws the conclusion that if the trade unions and the Communist Party really functioned, such a situation would not exist in Hungary. Harasti and others like him do not question the superiority of the Workers state and do not deny that there has been great progress since power was taken in Hungary. They protest against the injustice and inequality that still exist, because they see that there is no reason for them. As Hungary is no longer under a capitalist regime of exploitation, there is no reason for this. These militants are the expression of the resistance against the organisation, the rise and extension of layers which profit from the state.

The organisation of this activity is one of the essential functions of the IV International. The Workers States were constructed without programme and without even a revolutionary policy. They never accepted the idea of the permanent process of the Socialist and world revolution. However, the proof that it is a process of permanent revolution today is given by the continued existence of china, Korea, Vietnam, Guinea and Algeria.

The revolution develops in every continent, not as a result of the War but as a historic necessity. There are Workers states – or countries very close to being Workers states – on every continent. This is surely a proof that it is a necessity determined by the very structure of history. At the same time, there is no Communist International and no coordination or unity between the Workers States. There is, however, great economic progress in the Workers States, as well as partial social progress. There is also a fair degree of coordination between the Workers States in their conduct against the capitalist system. This coordination remains uneven, and this explains the dissimilarity in the behaviour of the Workers States. At times a tendency appears in one Workers State that tends to link up with capitalism. We saw it in the case of Yugoslavia or Czechoslovakia, or in Rumania. (This refers to the regionalist or federal tendencies in Yugoslavia, or the 'Prague spring' people in Czechoslovakia and sectors in Rumania that resist centralisation with the USSR). There are tendencies like this in the USSR also, and Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn are examples.

It is important to understand that these people do not arise from the vital economic or military sectors of the Workers State, but from more peripheral areas. They are the residue of a process that generated tendencies opposed to the centralisation of the

Workers States. These people are now fought off and pushed aside, not because the bureaucracy has understood but because the consolidation of the Workers State – upon which bureaucracy rests – demands the expulsion of these marginal tendencies.

The advance of the Workers States makes them more capable in their competition with the capitalist system. Capitalism feels that it must make some sort of front in the face of the Workers States which are now historically and economically superior. World capitalism used Hitler and other means to try to smash the Workers State militarily. Capitalism also saw that the masses defeated Hitler. The masses of each country participated in this defeat and acted, in this sense, as an extension of the Workers States in each country! In their sentiments, consciousness, aspirations and will, the masses are an extension – even if it is not yet organisational – of the Workers States. Capitalism has to admit that it is a fact, and therefore it fears not only the weapons of the Workers State but the effect the Workers States are having on the masses in each country. The masses have shown themselves capable – and available – to do the same with the capitalist system as they did with Hitler. Capitalism now has to try to survive by playing for time. Capitalism feels that it has already been militarily defeated in the sense that it is faced with problems it cannot resolve by means of war, and the question of ‘what comes after’ remains. The First World War resulted in the Soviet Workers State, the Second World War in fourteen Workers States, and the Third World War?

The Soviet bureaucracy senses that it is not historically necessary, that it cannot quite justify its existence. It perceives that it is also going to disappear. The base of the economy and social structure already demands conscious coordination and planning, as well as the intervention of the whole of the population. The development of the economy in the Workers State is not achieved in the same way as under capitalism. Under capitalism the reproduction of capital is the basis for everything. Accumulation of capital still takes place in the Workers State but there is also, in the Workers state, a gigantic accumulation of the capacity of the masses to intervene. In capitalism it is only a matter of investment and capital, recruitment of technicians, scientists and experts. But statified property, as opposed to this, demands as a condition for its existence a leadership that responds to the necessity of the masses. The Workers State develops every possible form of reproduction through its own structure.

The crisis in Yugoslavia comes from the fact that it is necessary to eliminate all this bureaucratic apparatus in order to develop the country economically and, if it is not done, to give up. To give up in Yugoslavia, would mean letting all the various local interests – from the Federations – take over, and they would strangle the economy. The economy of the Workers State cannot move forward under the leadership of caste, groups, sectors or federation interests. The federations may invest in their locality, but if their investments develop federal interests the overall economy cannot expand. When a particular federation invests, it goes to enrich some investor or some people in one federation. But when the proletariat of the Workers State leads and decides, it does so with a collective interest and not with a federal or sectional interest. In other words, the proletariat is the only force capable of developing fully the Workers State. The nature of the proletariat makes it the only force for full reproduction in the economy.

This is a common development in all the Workers States. The present course of the historic process, determined by the economy of the Workers States and the social crisis of capitalism, leads to the wholesale confrontation between capitalism and Socialism. The bureaucracy tries to continue a policy of conciliation with capitalism. It would not mind surrendering, as it did in Yalta, or bargaining over revolutions with capitalism. But, as the world revolution extends, the struggle of the masses narrows down the zones where capitalism can have any influence and where bureaucracy can make deals. The development of the revolution increases the opportunity of the proletariat to intervene, and generates a staunch confidence in the possibility of Socialist development. This reaches constantly newer sectors and continents. The world develops in a way that allows the progress of the Workers States to a point where they are entirely capable of competing even economically with capitalism. In turn, this creates new social and political bases upon which another, and greater, development of the revolution can take place.

The progress of the Workers States – and the inauguration of new Workers States – alerts and organises the masses of the large capitalist countries. The advance of the economy, science and technology establishes bases to show that the economy can be developed to respond to necessity, and not to capitalism or bureaucracy. This fact is becoming increasingly obvious in the mind of humanity. When we say ‘humanity’ we mean the proletariat and intellectual vanguard and the petty bourgeoisie. The struggle of the European, Japanese, American, Vietnamese and the Middle East masses all confirm this conclusion. It is all summed up by the resolute fight of the Vietnamese masses and the Communist Party that resisted tooth and nail the Yankee massacre. Vietnam neither weakened nor capitulated, and their struggle influenced the whole world. This resulted in a greater progress of the revolution outside and inside the Workers States.

THE ECONOMIC, SCIENTIFIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS OF THE USSR

The Workers States have reached a very high level of social, economic and scientific development, which demands conscious leadership and the end of group and sectional interests in planning and orientation. This accomplished progress in the Workers States will be limitless. The development of the Workers State stimulates all kinds of scientific, economic and technological progress. Nothing short of complete objectivity in planning will do in the Workers State. If planning is subjective – for some only – it reduces the scientific ability of the Workers State and limits its progress. It is obvious to everybody that the possibilities of the Workers States are immensely superior to their achievements. It is plain that the possibility to produce plenty and allow the full participation of the people in the leadership of the economy exists in the Workers States. People also see that the bureaucracy usurps the Workers States. It makes cars instead of houses and, on top of that, state and party leaders have secondary houses when there is the need to install running water and electricity in places like Siberia. However, alongside this bureaucracy, there are the young people, technicians and engineers prepared to work for next to nothing in order to develop Siberia and build entirely new cities there. It is this – and not the bureaucrat – that shows the immense confidence of the Soviet masses in the future.

The Workers States have developed highly the economy and science; they have the support of the world revolutions; now they need a revolutionary leadership able to

deal with this progress. Conditions have arisen in the Workers States that inspire confidence in the world. So it is now a matter of developing a revolutionary leadership to stimulate the Communist Parties, the Catholics, the intellectuals and the armies of the capitalist system. The conditions to allow this are already present. It is not a matter of spreading a sense of tragedy or heroic duty. The struggle for Socialism is a simple matter of ordering life. It means to develop the ability to face the atomic 'Charco' and put order into life. The immense majority of the population are preparing to do this, with no sense of sacrifice at all. The whole world is convinced that Socialism is the way to human progress. The 'Charco' of the atomic war still has to be jumped because imperialism controls the atomic weapons. This is just about all that it does control.

There are new conditions in the Workers States – that did not exist before – in which everyone is perfectly confident in the existence of the Socialist future of humanity. This creates new bases upon which it is possible to improve the economy and generate the leadership capable of the following double task: the final elimination of the capitalist system, and the full development of the Workers State. This necessity and possibility create the conditions for 'partial regeneration'.

Conditions of disintegration prevailed before 1940 in the USSR, but once the USSR triumphed, the Workers State wholly demonstrated its historic validity; it did not disintegrate. This happening, it could not produce anything else but the conditions for its regeneration. The leadership of Stalin sailed along the process of degeneration, which was not inevitability. For example, the Workers State could have undergone the whole historic period of retreat of the revolution whilst waiting for later and new stages – in particular, the war. However, the leadership of Stalin went in the other direction – and thus has been history.

Today we are talking about new conditions. Partial regeneration is taking place, and this raises new issues. The lack of leadership that corresponds to regeneration means that the latter is not consistent and does not unfold as rapidly as prevailing conditions allow. There are already fourteen Workers States and sixteen Revolutionary States, and many of the Revolutionary States – like Algeria – are close to being Workers States. Algeria is closer to the Workers State than it is to capitalism. These are the necessary conditions, but there is no leadership to take them forward correspondingly. There are the conditions to coordinate all the Workers States and, in part, they do. But there is no conscious leadership to lead this. Despite this lack of leadership, there is a process of advance because the conditions in the world are sufficiently mature to sustain, protect and stimulate the Workers States, even then. In these circumstances, capitalism is unable to use the lack of coordination between the Workers States for its own benefit. On the contrary the Soviet Union and the other Workers States have been forced to give support to the revolution. The structure of the Workers state and the world revolution have combined with each other so that the Soviet leadership has no choice but to support. This is the fundamental base on which partial regeneration rests.

Partial regeneration does not obey absolute rules. It has, at times, very partial aspects, and at other times, it has very complete ones, like Vietnam. It is absolutely certain that the stage of retreat and disintegration of the revolution is over. We are in the stage of the full advance, progress and consolidation of the revolution. This does not mean an

automatic progress in partial regeneration, or towards the return to the Communist International, or a revolutionary leadership in the Workers States. There is the dead weight of probably as many as fifty millions bureaucrats in the USSR – not counting all the other Workers States! This apparatus was formed and solidified during a whole previous stage of history and they hold the reins at present. Nevertheless, even these people have to change their policies – confronting capitalism more than before – and correct their objectives, planning increasingly for the state and not for themselves. At the same time as they have to carry out this policy they go on being involved in a thousand actions of conciliation with, and adaptation to, bureaucratic interests. This is why it is not a systematic process of partial regeneration.

The process prevents the bureaucracy from reproducing itself. Of course, it can still reproduce itself numerically but not in the same bureaucratic functions. At the point when bureaucratic usufruct started affecting the development of the economy noticeably, this was stopped and reversed. As it is still a bureaucracy, it goes on impeding the development of the economy, but what the bureaucracy can no longer do is to be a total block to the development of the Workers State or brake on the world revolution. This is now excluded, and it is a reason why bureaucracy has stopped reproducing itself. No doubt when it supports the world revolution the bureaucracy does it very superficially, but it can no longer complicate the objective course of the development of the system against system struggle.

For its part, capitalism already understands that it cannot compete with such a foe. The Workers States are such a challenge to it, socially as well as economically, that capitalism sees no other way to deal with it but militarily. This is precisely why imperialism prepares the war. Obviously, capitalism sharpens the internal contradictions in the bureaucracy by these war preparations. It becomes utterly imperative and urgent that the Workers State is organised to pre-empt the capitalist system and its preparations. Capitalism, through imperialism, is getting ready to assail the Workers States, and seeks the pretext – any pretext – to do it now.

This obliges the leaderships of the Communist parties of the Workers States to adopt policies that respond more directly to Communist interests. They have to enlarge their field of action by having more strength and influence in the whole world. They have to work – once again – as the USSR did in 1939 in Poland and Finland, by intervening in other countries. What is more, they have to assist the creation of new Workers States precisely with this objective: a thing which they were opposed to previously. In Poland and Finland in 1939 the soviet leadership did not work as it should have done: power was taken in Poland, but it was not taken away from the workers and peasants. Finland was a different problem, in part due to the weakness of the Soviet bureaucracy and its incapacity to impress the Finish masses; the Soviets were forced to leave Finland and power was surrendered to capitalism. The Soviet Union cannot act in this way anymore. Now it has to go, take power, and build Workers states.

For example, the Soviet bureaucracy could very well have come to an agreement with the Yankees over Vietnam. But it didn't. If the Soviets had decided not to arm Vietnam it would have fallen prey to the Yanks. The resolute conduct of the masses of Vietnam forms an enormous part of this process because, without it, Vietnam would also have failed. But Vietnam had both the support of the USSR and the determination to triumph.

In the case of Vietnam, the iron will of the masses to end capitalism is fully demonstrated. It shows that there is a universal consciousness of the need for the Workers State, that the Workers State is superior to the capitalist system, and the means through which to resolve all the yet unresolved problems of humanity. Moreover, the Workers State is the way to develop the economy without limit. The masses understand that, if there are difficulties in the Workers States, it is only a transitory circumstance due to the lack of policy and programme, and the lack of the complete intervention of the masses. The masses understand this, and know they can deal with this.

All this weighs on the Workers States, and they eventually have to respond. The change from Stalin to now is that the bureaucracy has been forced to yield. This is one of the reasons for partial regeneration. The leaderships of the Workers states have no other choice but to look for the more authentic functioning of the Workers State; this is the exact opposite to what Stalin did. In 1930, to ensure some economic development and resist the danger of capitalist restoration, Stalin launched an attack on the large peasants the Kulaks, and murdered a great number of them. Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes were arbitrarily set up. The peasants opposed this; they burned their farms down before surrendering their land to the state. Stalin imposed this collectivisation of the land by bureaucratic and repressive means. The idea was to prevent capitalist restoration, but the objective was incorrect. The same goes for the invasion of Poland and Finland. The invasion was, rightly, to stop Hitler – but the political objective was incorrect. In both instances, power should have been handed over to the workers and the call made for a Workers' and Peasants' government. If this had been done then, it would have solved problems without the need for imposition, and would have tremendously influenced the masses of Germany and Europe.

The stage of history from Stalin to today has changed very much. We are no longer in a stage when the necessity to impose anything on the peasants by force arises. It has arisen nowhere else since Stalin. It happened nowhere else! There are still backward countries in which the peasant mentality is a backward weight: like Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos, countries in Africa and Latin America, but even in those countries, the peasants accept measures of collectivisation. There are no longer any countries where the peasants come to this sort of confrontation with the state. This is another factor in the process of revolution and partial regeneration.

The conditions of today continue to allow a certain extension of bureaucratic power and usurpation, but it is increasingly forced to agree with the population. It has to conciliate the population and thrash out plans that take the population into account. It is no longer the same as in Stalin's time, when collectivisation was brutally imposed. Bureaucracy continues to try and conciliate with the capitalist system. But the capitalist system has reached saturation point and cannot take anymore. Its essential preoccupation now is the atomic war. You can see it every day, in smaller as well as in more important events like those in the Middle East. If the objective of capitalism wasn't war, it would not do what it does in the Middle East – going to the very front door of the atomic war.

J. POSADAS

20.10.1973

THE WORLD PROCESS AND THE ACTUAL STAGE OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION IN THE WORKERS STATES (25.10.80)

All the positions that gave birth to the IV International, the Political Revolution, the Permanent Revolution, and the anti-bureaucratic struggle, are being brought together – and we participate in this process. Our influence is not immense, but it is not negligible. The readiness of the world for Communism pushes the process forward; it has to advance. The fact that the world is ready for Communism means changes in the communist parties and in the Workers States. Poland was not the beginning of this process, and is not the end of it. Poland is part of a process in full flood, taking constantly new resolutions of progress and helping to push aside all the bureaucratic garbage. It is a process of change rather than correction, which corrects, through changes, the function of the bureaucratic apparatus.

The Soviet intervention in Cuba or in Nicaragua is the Political Revolution. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is the Political Revolution. It does not appear to be a Political Revolution inside the Workers State, but how could it be so outside the USSR and not inside? It is indeed the Political Revolution inside the USSR. It is neither violent nor bloody, because it takes the form of the USSR extending the revolution on a world scale. This is the form the Political Revolution now takes. The extension of the world revolution is only one aspect of the Political revolution. Trotsky could not have foreseen this precisely, and the ‘old Trotskyists’ never understood this at all.

The Political Revolution no longer needs to take the form of armed movement, not even in China. Even without a conscious political leadership the maturing world revolution makes the necessary advances, which should have been made through the Political Revolution. The exit of Kosygin from the Soviet leadership is significant. Kosygin was not a counter-revolutionary, but an old Bolshevik coming from the Russian Revolution, and part of the bureaucratic apparatus. As such he was a bridge of conciliation with the capitalist system. When the Soviet leadership gets rid of him and replaces him with someone who is the ‘left hand’ of Brezhnev, it means that the USSR and the Workers States are deepening their discussions and programmatic conceptions. It means that they are correcting their objectives towards an anti-capitalist orientation and better planning. This is all the more significant since capitalism sees people like Kosygin as an embodiment of the disposition of the Workers State to conciliate.

The changes made in the Workers States are not yet completely radical but they tend towards some pretty fundamental changes. We cannot expect ‘to each according to necessity’ yet in the Workers States, because the bureaucratic leadership is not interested. But we can expect already a redoubling of the sharpness of the confrontation between the capitalist system and the Workers States. The latter are now throwing out leaders who were, up to now, a point of support for the capitalist system. Kosygin was admittedly an old Bolshevik – by no means a capitalist agent – but he was the embodiment of the policy of conciliation with capitalism.

Kosygin wasn’t removed for being a ‘conciliator’ and a ‘weakling’ but for his disagreement with policies and because he did not centralise himself with the war preparations generally. The war preparation by the USSR (against the war capitalism

is preparing) is a deep expression of the staunch resolve with which the Workers States are preparing to defend the Socialist regime. The Workers State creates the bases for its own defence. In sending a Cuban, a Vietnamese and a Bulgarian into space, the Soviets display a great determination. This cannot be separated from the ability from the USSR to organise its own defence. By sending these various people into space, as representatives of the unification of the most historically advanced and backward, the USSR addresses the world masses. It was a direct act of propaganda aimed at the consciousness of humanity as such, and is head and shoulders above all the radio propaganda possible.

There is unification in the revolutionary progress. Permanent Revolution, Political Revolution and the Revolutionary anti-capitalist process were three distinct aspects of the struggle, and they are now being unified. These aspects can be seen, at times, separately – when one of the three grows faster than the others. But, even then, they are never distant from each other and they are not drifting apart. Whatever the unevenness of process locally or on a world scales, the Political, Permanent and Social Revolution are unified. The progress of life can only come through the anti-capitalist struggle, and this means the elevation of the Workers States.

Afghanistan is an example of the Political Revolution. It is being carried out with the Soviets – but it is also a case of Permanent Revolution, and it incorporates the Social Revolution. It is the Political Revolution, in the sense that the Soviets have corrected their previous policy of conciliating with bourgeois leaderships. They have cast conciliation aside and are developing the Revolution. It is a dynamic process which obliges the revolution to move onto a higher level. It does not realise its full potential because the leadership isn't prepared for it, but the revolution manages to produce the most advanced measures, anyway. There is no longer any revolution that maintains and respects bourgeois norms. They proceed directly to the elimination of capitalism, and go on to produce the type of organisation necessary for the continuation of the revolution. Afghanistan is a case in point.

Partial Regeneration is the most eloquent form of the Political Revolution in the Workers States. It develops and tends to unify the Workers States between them. Poland is an example of this process, even though it is not at the highest level and certainly not the highest point which the Political Revolution will reach. Political Revolution is an unavoidable necessity. It leads to the preparation of the Workers State against the war of the capitalist system. This is why you find the phrase 'inevitable war' more and more in the speeches of the Communist leaders of the Workers State. They will say that war should be avoided, but they also say that it may be 'inevitable'. They are not playing about with probabilities, but even as a bureaucratic layer they realise the need to be prepared. It will not be possible to confront or sustain this war, with the present bureaucratic apparatus. The coming war will demand nothing short of a leadership that grasps the significance of the war entirely, and prepares itself.

The process of Partial Regeneration advances as much on the political as on the social level. It is happening in Yugoslavia, where they are throwing out a large number of bureaucrats. The Soviet bureaucracy may feel good when it castigates the Yugoslav 'small fry', but the USSR has the biggest bureaucracy of all. Yugoslavia is a Workers State and, as such, it has resolved problems in the field of housing, health, and other

things, which no one had ever solved before in that country. In spite of all its problems, Yugoslavia has achieved this and, although there may be some disagreements between the Federations, there are none between the people of the Federations. The masses of Yugoslavia built Socialist Yugoslavia, and they feel that Yugoslavia has progressed. Thousands upon thousands visit Tito's Mausoleum every year because they feel this way.

Regeneration is not a question for one or other Workers State but an inexorable necessity for the whole system of Workers States. Bureaucracy perverted Socialism, but it failed because Socialism is life. On the other hand, bureaucracy is death. The bureaucracy uses all kinds of vehicles to move about, but these vehicles refuse to take the path to the cemetery. Any bureaucratic strata that feel the need to live have to adopt policies for the development of the Workers State. They do not do this because of the economic necessity there is, but because of the Socialist level of culture of the masses which imposes it. Bulgaria was nothing but a granary thirty years ago, for the benefit of the capitalists of Europe. Today, it is a modern developed and industrialised country with culture. It is a country where people who, in the main, were from peasant origins have stopped talking, thinking or operating as a peasantry.

THE POLISH GOVERNEMENT MUST PUT ITSELF IN AGREEMENT WITH THE POPULATION, IF ONLY TO CONFRONT CAPITALISM.

The world process has to be participated in, and lived without interruption. Poland does not signify just an occasional strike. A strike is the form that expresses – at the bureaucracy's weakest point – the fact that the bureaucracy has to ally more with the workers in order to prepare the final settlement of accounts with the capitalist system. The concessions the bureaucrats make are not purely cynical, because they are an absolute necessity for the Workers State. The leadership of the Workers State has no choice but to seek a unity with the population, and prepare for the war the capitalism is organising. Although no one talked of the war during the 1980 Polish events, in reality all these events and the changes in the leadership form part of the preparation of the Workers State for the war. The changes that occurred have served to unify the Workers State for the coming confrontation with capitalism.

The advances in the Workers States are uninterrupted, or if they do pause at times, they quickly break out again in a straight line of progress. In other words, the uninterrupted progress of the Workers State only suffers small interruptions. Even when there are interruptions, progress is never made to retreat. The course of progress can be checked at one point or another, but it soon advances again. This is not just a generalisation but a specific analysis. It is enough to see the difference between the strikes of a previous stage in Poland and those of today. Today, the government has had to accept the representation of the trade unions and their right to discuss and decide in conjunction with the government. It is obvious, although the government of Poland seeks to hide how much it has conceded. The Workers states have an irrevocable need to free themselves from the bureaucratic form of planning. We have entered the stage of the Workers States freeing themselves from the bureaucratic apparatus and superseding it – the only way in which the state could do it. These Polish events are an indication that this is happening. The events in Poland highlight the weakness of an apparatus that had to yield and yield again. There is no doubt that the bureaucratic apparatus in Poland would have acted much more harshly against the

Polish workers if Poland had not been confronted with the capitalist system and the war preparations. If circumstances had been less acute, the bureaucracy would have given nothing. As it happened, the bureaucracy had to give a little, even though it gives with one hand and takes with the other. It only acts in this way because it is confronted by the war. It has no choice but to look for a unity with the masses. It is an avoidable necessity, not just for the bureaucracy but for the very future of the Workers States. It would be silly to think that bureaucracy makes concessions to the workers because it has changed heart. In reality, it makes concessions because it has no choice. The Polish government has to unify with the population against the capitalist system.

The process in the Workers States is the manner in which the Political Revolution unfolds. Poland is a very profound expression of this process, with immensely important consequences for the Political Revolution. We are not talking about 'conquests' of the workers in Poland, which the bourgeoisie keeps on talking about. These are not 'conquests' of the workers, but the rise of an order which corresponds more to the real function of the Workers State. When the intervention of the workers to advance the state has to be accepted by such leaderships, it is because it is the norm for the future progress of the state. There may be momentary or transitory breaks in this progress, but the principle remains the same. This is what decides the course of history. This interpretation in no way depreciates or minimises the importance of the strikes and the political struggles in Italy, France, Britain or Belgium. It is only that what happens in the Workers States is the fundamental aspect that decides the course of the process today. The Communist parties have no idea of this, and we must intervene – understand it ourselves – and show this to the Communists. We have to make the Communists understand this.

The true workers leaders in Poland recognise that the Communist Party (POUP) is the leadership of society. This is the lesson of the latest events. Moreover, the workers see the need to resolve problems on the basis of strikes. The workers have intervened to stop those who try to use the strikes as a weapon against the Workers State. There are groups and privileged sectors that try to take advantage of the strikes in this way. There are people who, in the Workers States, have no love for it; there is a bureaucracy in the Communist Party, with different levels of interest and control. There are, in a similar way, sectors of the workers' aristocracy who think in terms of gaining advantages for themselves, and want a trade union with no allegiance to the Communist Party. They want a union independent from the Party. This cannot be, because if this existed it would be against the masses and would not have their support. The masses reason and act in exactly the opposite way.

The workers' aristocracy is made up of people who have economic privileges. We analysed this in previous texts. Official trade unions are not unions of the workers but of sectors of the oligarchy of Labour, so to speak. It is a previously formed layer which acts like an oligarchy, and now wants to use its strength to acquire more privileges or keep those it has. They support the strikes, and then cream off the benefits. This has all been stopped now. Even Walesa was against it and had to put a stop to it. This is a new and very rich experience which has to be discussed, analysed and developed.

The most recent strikes in Poland are of an immense significance. The world relation of forces favours the occurrence of such risings. The gulf between the Workers States and the capitalist system widens every day, and this makes it impossible for the workers to be repressed successfully. The leadership of the Workers State needs support in these circumstances. In this sense, it is neither Brezhnev nor Kania who made concessions. It was the bureaucracy, in fact, as a whole that had to give in. This is because the final encounter with capitalism is drawing near. The strikes mean that the workers feel strong and resolute. They feel capable of striking and fully defending the Workers State, at the same time.

We take full account of the strikes – such as those in Poland – but they do not characterise the form of the activity of the workers. When such strikes are very big they are simply to make further gain in trade union and democratic rights. But we never lose sight of the fact that the workers are completely animated by the feeling of defending the Workers State. It is a situation in which we see the need to pose a plan of production in Poland, the need for more Soviet democracy, and all this whilst defending staunchly the Workers State. The trade union movement must be able to intervene in the Workers state and in Poland, with Soviet democracy, in the overall development of the country. This does not quite mean that the unions lead the country, but the trade unions must intervene to discuss the plan, to make proposals regarding what has to be produced, and become involved with everything in the country. If applied, this would mean a return to the original conditions of the Soviet Union. Then, under Lenin, the trade unions formed an integral part of the Soviet state. All this has to be discussed, and it does not depend on whether important measures are immediately implemented or not. All this cannot be solved immediately. It cannot be done just in one sweep, and one must proceed step by step, because this is the way progress has turned out to be. Better conditions are going to arise, but it is step by step.

J. POSADAS

26.10.80

Miscellaneous:

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 revolution, what increased most was the revolutionary quality of the process, removing from the bureaucracy its world bases for conciliation with capitalism. This produced the necessity for revolutionary policy. It cut the bases of support from under the bureaucracy. In consequence, this facilitates the Political Revolution. Today, the Soviet Union has to help Peru, Bolivia, Chile and the Middle East.

J. POSADAS

THE NATURE OF THE PROCESS IN THE WORKERS STATES (13.04.80)

J. POSADAS

When in a Workers State of the importance of East Germany – second to the Soviet Union – they have reached the stage of discussing at a congress of sociologists a criticism of social functioning and the structure in order to make society progress, it is because all the Workers States are maturing. In Poland the texts of Posadas are to be found in the libraries. The maturing is especially so because in Poland there is a much closed bureaucracy, but also a very active proletariat.

The critical proposals of the Polish sociologists arise through the class struggle on a world scale and also in Poland. In Poland there were the outbreaks of Stettin Danzig, and afterwards two more strikes. In 1956 there had been a movement to overthrow the bureaucracy. In Poland – as in Hungary and Germany – reactions against bureaucratic power have occurred.

The development of the Workers States and the world development of the class struggle favourable to Socialism – with limitations in one or another country, but favourable to Socialism – finds various expressions in the Workers States. It is expressed in the form of sociologists and philosophers because, underneath, the process is infinitely deeper than their formulas or evaluations. Thus neither the sociologists nor the philosophers speak about the reasons for Stettin or Danzig, and when they refer to them it is as an episodic fact about which they protest and react.

When the process is expressed in philosophy, it is because the pressure and the movement to rectify and make the Workers State advance is very great. This does not come from their initiative, nor is it part of culture or reasoning. These academicians are a valve (not an escape valve) but they express a very great pressure and a need for change.

We take this as an indication of a process, not the representation of the process. Even if the philosophers or the sociologists express it, either to defend themselves or in order to contain the process, they must interpret a process which until now they had denied. It is not any philosopher who must interpret the living forms of Stettin and Danzig (movements of February 1971 for the programme and Socialist organisation of the Polish Workers State) but the party must interpret them. This is not a question of philosophic or sociological consideration, but of political consideration and conclusion. It is imperative to elevate Socialist democracy, to develop the right of the masses to speak, communicate and intervene.

The deficiencies of the Workers States have no rational basis, even the economic difficulties. It is not true that in Poland there is a shortage of food because there is not enough. It's not because the means don't exist to do better, but there is a bureaucratic interest to organise things like this, defending sectors of society only. Thus it is essential to consider the unequal and combined development of the world relation of forces. The Unified Workers Party has to discuss all these problems. If the sociologist and the philosopher want to discuss it, it is better. If they want to make a congress of sociology on Poland, let them discuss. But the POUP fundamentally has to discuss,

and the conclusions have to be drawn by the Party. The masses have to intervene. The worker has an objective preoccupation which the apparatuses do not have, and even the sociologists and the philosophers are an apparatus.

It is vital to intervene towards the Party, the cells, the trade unions, and in the factories, towards the factory committees. The latter must intervene and, if they do not exist, then it is imperative to organise them democratically – bearing in mind that for a period they are going to be bureaucratically based. However, this process is going to lead to understanding the need for elected organs in the factories, so that people decide. It is required to form factory committees so that all the factory workers participate to intervene on the problems of the factory and politics.

The Soviets are the most advanced in all this because they have a meeting every three months with their base in which they discuss problems. This is a process in the Workers States that now shows a solid structure based on its original formation and cannot be substituted with another movement. It is needed to make this movement change itself and, at the same time, the process of history requires a change of functioning, of policy and of the objectives of this movement.

We propose to take part in a necessary process of changes and transformations that are going to come. It is not possible to make a new movement rejecting what exists, but to participate to help the understanding of this movement which must change, go forward and grow because the process compels it to do so. The most direct confrontation with capitalism now compels it to advance. The political growth and maturation of the working class impels the Communist movement to upraise. Thus, it is not a problem of changing some people for others. It is obligatory to measure the epoch of Stalin with now. All conditions for Stalin have gone. There is a bureaucracy, but the functioning of the bureaucracy is more linked to the objective need of the Workers State. Therefore, it is creating and feeding essential bodies and organs for the Workers State, not the bureaucratic functioning which defends the Workers State only to defend the bureaucracy.

CHANGES IN THE WORKERS STATES SHOW CONSTANT PROGRESS

The old Trotskyism was shattered against this conclusion of history. Stalinism was shattered and the old Trotskyists were not called upon as they believed they would. It is a process in which the intellectual maturing is slower than the development of the economy, of the military forces, the will of the working class to change the world, and the world crisis of the capitalist system, and therefore it is vital to intervene in this process.

Analysing the process of Brezhnev from when he came in until now, it is clear that there have been changes. It is not a transformation, but there are favourable changes. We have defended Brezhnev, not supporting him in all he was doing, but saying that the situation was better since it was a bureaucracy which could not live as did Kruschev, and that it was necessary to wait. That was in 1964 and in sixteen years one sees the progress of the Soviet Union – the Soviet Constitution and the Soviet intervention in the world which gives confidence to humanity. For example, it gives confidence to countries like Liberia, difficult to find on the map as they are small.

Thus it is important to develop the understanding of this process. The Soviet bureaucracy and that of the other Workers States differ among themselves because local interests exist and, as the Soviet Union has to progress, these local Polish, Hungarian and Rumanian interests are furious – they perceive that the Soviet Union needs new states, needs real Workers States with leaderships that defend the Workers State and struggle against capitalism. These people with local interests do not want to intervene with anti-capitalist objectives and policy. They want to accommodate not in the form of life of the car or the house, which are forms in which this is revealed, but in the thought that it is not required to confront antagonistically capitalism, that it is necessary to leave it alone. The Soviets are confronting it.

This process pushes along a part of the leaderships of the Workers States to a different life. It is the process of the unequal and combined development and of the world relation of forces which is expressed in all aspects, i.e. the economy, politics etc. Our preoccupation is to accentuate our understanding on the present condition of the Workers States, the type of struggle which is going on there and its causes. A fundamental fact is that there is no place for the formation of new movements. One cannot expect another process than that occurring in Poland. This is because the Workers States prepare for the war that imperialism is preparing. Although recent events may not lead to war, they are part of the preparation of war by imperialism.

Imperialism is preparing the war, trying to dominate the capitalist world to impose on the other capitalist countries the line of the United States which is a fight to the very last Frenchman with the Soviet Union. Now, all this reveals a series of the most important experiences, one of the most important one being that imperialism no longer dominates history. The progress in the extension of the economy, of technology and science, comes from the Workers States. The capitalist system goes on, but that is all. It has the means to sustain itself, but only by arms – otherwise its economy, science, art, culture, even its technology, count for nothing. The capitalists have great productive technology, but the Soviets advance in arms technology, and now they have space vehicles with atomic weapons.

Our concern to understand Poland and the other Workers States expresses our concern for the function we perform in the development of the Workers States towards Socialism. The more we deepen and develop the concern to deepen the understanding, so we feel more passion, more love and attraction for this work. There is no place to form new parties: even if there is division in the Communist parties, there is no room for new movements. They have to occur within the Communist parties or in the wing which makes a break. The conditions are favourable and the masses of the world have seen and learnt that the world relation of forces determines that it's the Workers States that win and take the lead.

In the study of this process, we do not simply make an analysis but come to organisational conclusions. The movement of the cosmos and the earth, moves, acts and organises. The natural forces need to continue living and they have to organise themselves in a relatively unconscious form. They lack the predisposition, the knowledge to foresee a course of action, but they must have a certain consciousness of what they are doing – not as ourselves, but a certain level of memory and knowledge in order to proceed. Thus we intervene with the concern to raise our scientific capacity and affirm the need for changes in the Soviet Union towards

Socialism – the necessity of Socialism which is a necessity of life – and the forms that this process acquires in this stage.

The leaders of the Workers States have no other solution than to go forward. This is not the epoch of Stalin. Human history has now passed through the stage of Stalin and buried Stalin and Stalinism: In this stage of history, it's the Workers States that decide, not the capitalist countries. It is imperative to deepen the knowledge of the character of the Workers States and how the Workers State differs from Socialism, to explain that the problems of the Workers States are not the mistakes of Socialism. When Berlinguer says 'We want a Socialism that is still not clear to us', it is vital to explain that Socialism still does not exist anywhere. Berlinguer takes Socialism to be the Workers State. They all take Socialism for the Workers State, and he makes criticisms which are the ones we make – that there is not enough democracy, that there is not enough activity of the trade unions. But they say less of this. They say much more: 'They do not let the dissidents speak, they intervene in Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan', and they take this as an invasion considering that this is Socialism, and as a result they say that Socialism works in an imperialist fashion.

In all these problems we intervene to understand the present stage and what is developing in the Workers States and in capitalism, and the preparations of the military confrontation with imperialism. It does not mean that the war is going to occur shortly, but imperialism is preparing the war, and the preparation of the Soviets is for war. The dread of German capitalism when it says that there is a feeling of war – before they said sabre-rattling – is not because they are afraid but because they see that the Yanks are preparing to sacrifice them.

Imperialism prepares for war and is trying to unify and coordinate capitalist countries in a fever that is going to benefit the Workers States, and the Workers States have to advance in their internal functioning. The next discussion is going to generalise about this. Hence our activity is fundamental to prepare the understanding of what and why a Workers State is. This has been written about in many texts, not of Trotsky but ourselves, because those of Trotsky refer only to the USSR. We refer to all the Workers States, and also because we wrote when the Chinese invaded Vietnam – which is not a problem of Socialism but a question of the Workers States still having forms of capitalist functioning. And, if the Chinese say the class struggle continues, they base themselves on one correct conclusion from which they draw the other, false, conclusions. The correct conclusion is that it is true that there is a class struggle in the Workers States, but in a diminished form, and the class struggle is determined by unequal distribution which creates camarillas and bureaucracy confronting the Workers States.

Thus it does not require the struggle to overthrow the system but the revolutionary struggle to make the Workers State advance – which means revolutionary democratic interests.

Another important aspect of this stage is on the way of thinking. The thought and structure that create thinking, which was created in a previous stage, today is developing in a world half consisting of Workers States. There is an influence and force of history which show that it is essential to think on this basis, and that already within the capitalist system the development of the Workers State and superior forms

of thought are arising superior to that in the capitalist system. Although this is still not Socialism it is superior to capitalism, because thought proceeds with the confidence that the problems of knowledge, of earth and cosmos, are going to be resolved.

Although the Soviet Union has not succeeded in eliminating backward forms of social relations – for example, the bureaucracy – it carries out nevertheless policies that determine great progress in the human decision, in the confidence in Socialism: the man in space, the birth under water, and the support to the world revolution. They are combinations and contradictory processes, but the essential line in the contradiction is the progress in anti-capitalist struggle. Thus it is important to think and to see that there is no time or possibility of constructing another movement. It is on the basis of the present movement that it is vital to build.

The trade unions in the German Workers State intervene little but they welcomed the wounded Nicaraguans, cured them and send them back. A month's wage of the workers of East Germany is dedicated to financing the revolutionary struggle in various parts of the world. Therefore, this is a bureaucracy but it carries out these functions. Thus there is still a bureaucratic apparatus, but the Workers State as an organism has to do something else – that is, the element that decides is not the bureaucratic apparatus. The Workers State continues at the level and interest of the bureaucratic apparatus but the bureaucracy has to impel the revolution, and the more it impels the revolution the fewer points of support, consistency and development the bureaucracy has.

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE SOVIET UNION HAS NO OTHER OPTION THAN TO ADVANCE

It is essential to dominate this process because it gives bases and forms of thought which determine the unity of the world, and it exists now in our confidence in what is going to be achieved. The forms of thinking are now superior to the past, although we are not living under Socialism. We ourselves express this. Our forms of thinking are infinitely superior to the past. Already we think as a Socialist society. At the same time, we have to act and work in capitalist society and in the Workers State. There are complicated conditions, because we do not have material means and because these are various forms in which it is required to intervene rendering it essential to select and determine what is the fundamental form and that is the Workers State.

At the same time, capitalism is preparing the war against the Workers States and the Workers States have the right – and are right – to impel the revolution in any part of the world. Thus it is not possible to make a policy within Germany or Czechoslovakia, a policy that tends to impede this conclusion. Thus the philosophers discuss abstract problems! Like the sociologists they are judges, but democracy and the development of the Workers State do not develop in this way, but with the intervention of the masses and of the trade unions. The philosophers and the sociologists reason for themselves, separated from the life of people, and express sentiments and positions of people – even with good intention – reflecting bureaucratic functioning.

It is important to learn the meticulousness, the exactitude, the concentration on what has to be done. It is necessary to give an order to function and think, to act and study,

to give order to the preoccupation. It is vital to learn the love and passion for science which demonstrates that it is possible to do more than is being done now, to understand more than what is being understood without any hurry over time, maturing and thinking. For example, capitalist Germany appears to be stagnant but, at some moment, it is going to make a sudden leap – and one does not wait for this leap, to understand that it will require intervention. To leap does not mean that all Germany is going to make a leap, but first the most needed elements are going to bring along the rest.

The world relation of forces is expressed in the form of the unequal and combined development in capitalist Germany, and the world relation of forces means that it is the Workers State that determine the course of history. It is capitalism that is on the defensive, in retreat and disintegrating. In the Workers States and in the Communist parties there is a crisis of growth. The cause and the base of this crisis is that the Communist parties do not know how to act in front of this process. This crisis first occurred in the French Communist Party, but now part of the base of this crisis is corrected. Now it is the Italian Communist Party and the Spanish Communist Party that have the biggest crises.

THE CHARACTER OF THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION HAS CHANGED

The people of Germany have been divided in various stages, but a sector seeks contact with the world. It is not Schmidt who represents Germany but he represents the organised form of the German people. The mistake is not that of the German proletariat but of the Communist parties, as we said before, and now. Immediately after the war the German proletariat saw Stalin and put up with him until 1953. This was quite a few years, and Stalin based himself on this to organise the Social democracy. The proletariat saw what Stalin did, including the plunder of the German Workers State, to develop the Soviet Union, and, besides plundering, he eliminated revolutionary Communists and produced a frightful bureaucratic apparatus with Ulbricht at its head. All this gave the basis for the Social Democracy to develop – otherwise it would not have done so.

There was the same process in Czechoslovakia. In 1968 the USSR had to do the same as they did with Ulbricht when they chucked him out. Similarly in Poland and Hungary, they had to throw out all this apparatus formed by Stalin that was no use to the development of the Workers State. Today the changes are better in the Workers States because there is a more profound development of Communist consciousness. Our attitude and activity in capitalist Germany is going to influence people and currents, and the unequal and combined movement acts so that the combined element influences Germany, although not the Communist and Socialist movement directly. But the combined process influences, demonstrating that it is capitalism which is preparing war to try to contain the process of advance, and not the Workers States who want war. People see that imperialism is preparing war.

We are at the end of a cycle of the history of humanity which is the end of the capitalist system. Thus all the problems that are posed in relation to the bureaucracy of the Workers States have to be unified and submitted to this. Capitalism prepares war to try to contain the development of the Communist growth. In this struggle, then, our centre is not the struggle against the bureaucracy, but against capitalism – with the

support of the Workers States – at the same time as the struggle against the bureaucracy. But the struggle against the bureaucracy is not the struggle as before: of making a campaign, of criticism, of accusations. No. It is essential to accompany the Workers States even with the bureaucratic leaderships in this process, while we seek to give ideas so that the new cadres who come can proceed to develop.

Today is not the epoch of Trotsky, and hence the political revolution changes form, not in necessity but in forms and changing forms it means that the necessity diminishes – because the form is rising up and the leaderships of the Workers States have to confront capitalism, and, in this process, the political revolution is made.

J. POSADAS

13.04.80

THIS IS THE STAGE OF INTELLIGENCE AND REASON

J.POSADAS

21.07.80

In this epoch the most important progress of humanity is the development of a process of intelligence and reason. It is intelligence and reason which has progressed most of all in this stage of history after the Russian Revolution. The world relation of forces is expressed in the form of intelligence and reason in the political, military, economic, and, above all, social form.

Among the most important sector of scientists in the world, a whole layer is Communist, although they vote for other parties. They are Communists! All the development of science gives them the conviction of the need for the Communist life, not the life of private property. This is so, in the first place, through the existence of the USSR and, afterwards, the other twenty Workers States.

The development of the process of history expressed in a social form develops intelligence and reason, because experience ranges from the Soviet Union to Nicaragua, Bolivia and El Salvador. The Yanks kill, but they do not conquer. The Salvadorians die, but they win. Former arithmetical judgement is converted into a conclusion, which is a social, dialectical conclusion in that the sum is not determined by adding one thing to another or more, but through the effects produced in life which is one of the forms of the sum. The conception of capitalism is so much here, so much there, and that's the total. El Salvador had nothing – no food. Result: submission. But the result is that one of the computer knobs gives the capitalist the boot and raises the red flag!

But there is a process of intelligence and reason which is not determined because people study and know, but through a social process. It is needed to change and improve the mathematics. The principle of mathematics must be that the coordination, the conception, and the conclusion of mathematical calculation is social, due to the world relation of forces. The centre, the force, and the power lie in the objective necessity of changes in history. This is the force: change. The base of this necessity lies in the fact that the Soviet Union endured Stalin and Hitler, liquidated capitalism, and extended itself.

The singers of Nicaragua speak of the 'Sons of the mountain' – referring to the song of the guerrillas – which is very well said. In relation to history, it is important to say 'the sons of the Soviet Union' and, in a more distant way, 'the sons of Lenin' and 'the sons of Marx' and, in the name of Marx, the 'sons of humanity'.

There is a process of intelligence in which people see that it is not possible to be scientific, to study a science, and accept the form of life that exists under capitalism. This goes against the conception of life which arises from scientific analysis. The doctors, technicians and scientists who just serve the capitalist enterprises are a minimal part; there is a proportion of infinitely better scientists who are not attracted by capitalism.

It is the objective conclusion of life which leads to Communism, because now there is the base, the proof, the testimony of humanity which develops a natural inclination of people towards the conception of the unitary life of human beings. To the extent that knowledge advances, the necessity of a unitary life advances. Although the family still exists, and will exist for a long time, it's no longer exclusive family but the family as link, centre and nucleus of humanity for a superior task. This is now being achieved by the Workers States.

All the scientists see and feel it. Any mathematical or scientific calculation they make drives them to the conclusion of the immense power to advance in the knowledge of intelligence which clashes with the barrier of capitalism. They see the war, the massacres, the pollution, and they see how capitalism kills. But, above all, they see how it impedes and inhibits the scientific study of art and culture, which is the base of the progress of history. Hence this is the epoch of intelligence and reason. Hence so many people from the enemy camp are won.

How is it possible to believe that the scientists plan projects of the multinationals to poison people? Those who do are not scientists but a small circle of degenerate people, and now they are not scientists. Hence more and more scientists, soldiers, generals and sons of the big bourgeoisie are won over to progress, as in Germany where almost all the youth whom capitalism accuses of being terrorists, are from the top bourgeoisie.

WORKERS STATES DETERMINE HISTORY

In this stage, in certain aspects and certain very important sectors, it is consciousness that determines existence. This is expressed in the attitude of the Catholic leaders. When this level is reached it is because society is mature everywhere for change. The problem is that there is no leadership.

After the Russian Revolution the Catholic movement began to break up. The proof is that it has retreated. No intellectual figure emerged because it could not do so. The Catholic who is scientific has to be Communist. He cannot simply ignore Communism. The thread follows the needle and not the needle the thread. The only way to make history advance is the Communist way. All those who develop find the Communist logic of history, of life. Communism is a necessity of life, not a necessity for the working class. The working class is no longer the centre which leads the

struggle against the capitalist system. The Workers States do that. Now the working class is no longer the most representative of the historic force of humanity, but the Workers States are the superior forms of the proletariat. The Workers State is a more advanced level of the proletariat. The proletariat is still the class subject to the contingencies of class limitations and power but the Workers State is the concentrated force which moves history and gives the world the example of how to construct.

In order for the vanguard to function in Italy and exercise the influence that corresponds to it, it has to be linked to the Soviet Union which is the real vanguard of humanity. This is the vanguard, and not the Italian proletariat. The Italian proletariat is the vanguard through the Communist Party. But, as the Communist Party is weak, and with anti-Marxist positions and tendencies, or tendencies outside Marxism without being actually anti-Marxist, the Soviet proletariat has no means of influencing Italy or influences it only to a lesser degree.

The Soviet proletariat does not influence by its trade union function or by its function in work, by its weight in society or by its social function, but by being a Workers State which is the superior form of the proletariat. Thus it is vital to establish the link between the Italian proletariat and the USSR – this is advancing not so much because in the USSR there is a greater understanding, but because there is a need to understand. It is not the stage of empiricism which says: ‘Good, tomorrow we see’. If the right course is not taken then, it is a catastrophe. Thus it is essential to advance, advance and advance. We intervene in this process and for this, when we write, we take into account the effect of this stage of history. Otherwise our conduct would be different.

This is the epoch of intelligence and reason, which is an objective necessity of history. A short time ago we wrote: ‘There is no historic reason for the Italian Communist Party to transform itself into a social democratic party.’ We did not say: ‘It is not going to be social democratic’. We did not show confidence in the Party in itself, but we said: ‘There is no historic reason for such an instrument created for the objective of the struggle for Communism being transformed into the opposite’.

However in history, such cases have occurred and there has been degeneration of Communist parties like the North American. It degenerated to such a degree that, in the previous war when Stalin allied with Hitler, the North American Party declared its ‘defence of the fatherland in any attack, including by the Soviet Union.’

Our confidence in the Communist Party – not in the Communist leaders, but in the Communist Party – is because it is an instrument of history. The experience and the will of the masses play a fundamental role in the construction of Socialism, above all, the will of the masses. The will is united always to experience, to acquired consciousness, to the intelligence developed by consciousness – of which the fundamental basis is the previous experience – that Communism is possible, necessary, and verifiable. The working class of the world has already seen it like this. The base is the USSR – it had Lenin and it had Stalin. Stalin assassinated and made the USSR retreat. Although the working class of the world did not understand completely, it saw there was a retreat. But, after this, the USSR defeated Nazism, capitalism, and all the tendencies that wanted to oppose the development of Socialism, and extended itself through the world with the new Workers States.

INTELLIGENCE IS SOCIAL

This is the basis of the intelligence of this stage of history, which is more important than all science joined together, even space science, because it is the basis that gives historic security that the human being can acquire all the rest. Without this, there is a void: the social void. ‘Where are we going?’

Human intelligence can learn chemistry, biochemistry, any part or aspect of science, but it acquires it limitedly and without social security. But humanity has already the historic confidence that it can act, construct, reconstruct and develop in accordance with objective necessity, not just as it wants, but the objective necessity which is what it wants. Between what it wants, what it needs, and objective necessity, there is unity. Unity arises from the historic experience of the construction of Communism. It is not studied but is learned from life. The poorest worker who has nothing to eat learns it and votes for the Communist Party. He criticises the leaders, but votes for the Communist Party.

This is the stage of intelligence and reason, and the world is moved by reason. The human being seeks to be consistent with intelligence by applying reason. Already reason has the experience, capacity and life in order to see. This develops the capacity to reason. Humanity is developing an incredible capacity. Countries like Nicaragua have nothing, but the best of its songs are dedicated to the children, the women and old people – not to the leaders, to Sandino, but to the children and the old people. This is the progress of humanity.

These are the conditions to transform society, but the leadership to do this is absent. The conditions mean the crisis of capitalism and the economic, social and cultural disintegration of capitalism, the lack of being able to solve by war when they want – when they go to resolve it, it’s going to be late – but there is no leadership. The Soviets are the natural leadership of the progress of history, but only moderately. These are the natural instruments of history. In order to live the USSR has to advance, to progress and to make the others progress: otherwise it does not live. There is no other example in previous history of this situation. Neither Marx nor Engels, or Lenin or Trotsky could foresee this. Hence the old Trotskyists disintegrated, because they had to confront a process that did not fit into their scheme. Their scheme was ‘everything fails – the bureaucracy failed, and they will call on us to lead’. Pablo finished by criticising the Soviet Union and defending capitalism. Without saying openly that he was defending capitalism – in attacking ignobly and maliciously the Soviet Union – he favoured capitalism. Their position was ‘neither one thing nor the other – neither Moscow nor Washington’. The process of history is not a plant which has a good aroma and a bad fruit. No. There is the process of history, and it is essential to understand and prepare for it in order to intervene.

Our conviction that the Italian Communist Party cannot be social democratic is determined by the same reason: it is the epoch of intelligence and reason – not because people today are more intelligent nor have more reason than before. Intelligence is a result of the social process, not of individual capacity. Those who claim to make a ‘super genius’, ‘a superman’, are stupid. Intelligence is social, and socially the world is intelligent. Any peasant today – is not now as before, because he has the experience of the world – learns in a year what before took him forty years:

because culture is 'in the air' as the poet says. It is in the air, it is true, and the birds carry it. This is the social basis of intelligence. Social development develops intelligence. The essential basis is to understand the security that we can resolve everything. This is the highest basis of intelligence. 'We will resolve everything! We will do everything! We will settle everything! We will destroy and remake everything!' But now it is less a question of destroying and more of making everything, although capitalism is a centre which has power and is going to make a massacre. This is history.

Capitalism tries to make it believed that destructions are a necessary part of the cycles of the universe and the earth. It is a lie. They are the ones who kill. But people are not intimidated when capitalism refers to the cycles in the universe as catastrophic. They are not catastrophes but logical and vital movements of the atomic composition and atomic relation. On the earth it is the same, but the composition is different. Between the earth and the cosmos there is a difference of trillions of years, but nothing more. It is the distance of time, not the time that makes a distance, which is different. It is the distance of time which has constructed and developed the cosmos. In that, intelligence developed, and social intelligence determines all the rest. Human intelligence is social. The human being learns to solve all the problems and is not intimidated by the difficulties. One of the factors that have delayed the development of the human being is capitalist crisis and unemployment. All this gives the human being the sense of impotence.

The scientist does not wait for things to be given to him: he seeks to obtain and secure what is compulsory for the history which is coming. We have an unlimited, absolute and complete confidence in this process. I use 'unlimited', 'absolute' and 'complete' because they are definitions which arise from the level of relations that exist, in order to give an idea of this. But what has to be given is not only the measure but a conclusion that 'this is so'. Humanity is now learning, and sees that from the most backward areas in history comes the greatest progress of history. Now humanity sees this and works, feeling it is not a question of material means but of social capacity to achieve.

In Italy it is the same process. What is happening in the Communist Party is a result of the world, of the world relation of forces, and of the direct weight of the Soviet Union. The USSR has a direct influence on the Italian Communist Party. One of the changes required in the two parties (in the CPSU and the ICP), is for the Italian Communist Party to adapt itself to that of the USSR; it seeks the Party of the USSR because that is the Party which is right.

In the world the necessity for a policy of a united front between the Soviet Union, the Workers States and the Communist parties is elevating. It is an objective necessity of history. The process is determined by the USSR, and this is going to determine events in Italy more than it has done until now. The element that has changed is the Italian Communist Party and not the Soviet Union. The one that is rectifying programme, policy and line is the ICP and not the USSR. The Soviet bureaucracy has a lot to change, but historically little. The element that has to change is one of immediate policy – but historically, no. In general it confronts capitalism well. It is not a question of making an up-to-date policy with capitalism, but seeing that the historic sense of confrontation and the atomic missiles are fundamental. It is erroneous to believe that

it is necessary to leave out the missiles; the issue is resolved by missiles. The missiles are not the construction of history, but they are the means that determine the course of the progress of history. This is a fundamental part of our understanding.

The force that retreats in this problem is not the USSR but the Italian, Spanish and French Communist parties. The French Communist Party, after having posed a thousand objections to the USSR, having opposed whatever intervention the USSR made, now supports Afghanistan. The logic of the process has to lead the Communist leaders to understand that it is not a pressure of the Soviets but the objective pressure of the world that makes them change.

The epoch of intelligence and reason means that already humanity sees that the social problems can be resolved, and resolving the social problems resolves all the other problems. The basis of the existence of conflicts, including conflicts with the cosmos, is that the social problems are not resolved. Before, it was all a mystery, but now the mystery is finished.

It is consciousness that now determines existence. In the future it is going to be like this: consciousness is going to determine existence, because there will not be any social problems. When we say that today consciousness determines existence, it is a conclusion that is applied to the whole of society, because capitalism as a social system continues working and determining its function according to 'existence determines consciousness'. But, as for the servants of capitalism on which the capitalist system bases itself, their structure weakens and disintegrates. In an important sector of these people 'consciousness determines existence' – for example, among the priests, the Church, the police, the top functionaries, the technicians and within the army. Among all of them, the process of society exerts an influence. But the class as class continues determining its consciousness in accordance with its existence.

The bourgeoisie is a small minority of society which supports itself on branches that arise from capitalist production and creates determined social categories in which existence as a group depends on the existence of capitalism as a system. This creates their level of consciousness, and also through their structure of being submitted to the functioning of capitalism. But, among sectors of the Church, the army, of the police and the judges, their consciousness is no longer determined by the existence of capitalism but by the consciousness which they have now secured.

To the extent that the world process develops, the authority of Communism is acquired and extended. But it is not possible to make the boss change. The function of the boss is antagonistic with Communism. The function of the bourgeois class is antagonistic with Communism. The other sectors that serve the ruling class and which cannot exist without that class have no force of support and are destroyed, disorganised, and disintegrated through the progress of Communism.

It is not only the class struggle – as struggle between the worker and the boss – which is the simple class struggle, but the antagonistic struggle: Communism or capitalism. The Workers States now perform this function.

This is not the epoch to discuss the so-called problems of tactics or of small issues, as do the left groups, but the fundamental problems of history which are not decided in Italy but in the relations with the USSR. There is no way of measuring history if there is no understanding of the USSR, of the behaviour of the USSR and the historic sense of this behaviour which can never be contrary to the interests of the progress of humanity. It can be opposed to the immediate tactic, in the partial interest – but historically it cannot now be contrary. The Soviet Union lives in history because its roots are governed by the necessity of history.

Ideas and principles are essential and people are concerned with ideas and principles. There is no more concern with the life of the 'groups' (left movements). Hence all the groups that arose in 1968 were extinguished. For two years the 'groups' have been in the final stretch, not because now they have fulfilled their function but because they have no reason to exist. They have the virulence of empirical and inorganic protest, and now there is an organic movement in the Communist movement in which we are intervening.

J. POSADAS

21.07.1980