

J. POSADAS

**NUCLEAR ENERGY,
WAR AND SOCIALISM**

A SELECTION OF ARTICLES

SCIENTIFIC CULTURAL
AND POLITICAL EDITIONS

The conception of the Communist parties on the Problem of Peace 17.02.1980

Certain Communist parties pose the problem of peace in a way that is not correct. One cannot simply say “peace, peace”. It is essential to proceed from the fact that imperialism cannot make peace because that is against its interests. One cannot then create the illusion of peace. We want peace, but to make peace social transformations are necessary. It is vital to unite the struggle for peace to that for social transformations so that from the beginning of the war, people will continue the struggle for social change. In posing on the contrary, the struggle for peace separated from the struggle for social transformations, people are given illusions and made to believe in the possibility that capitalism can be dissuaded and diverted from its main objectives. This allows the bourgeoisie to take the peace movement into their hands, so that they can do what they want with it.

The European bourgeoisie wants peace for Europe. A part of the Labourites and Liberals in Britain are in agreement to struggle for peace. They are against the Yanks who have not yet signed the SALT II agreements, but they create a series of illusions which mean that people are disarmed because, in this instance, peace means pushing the class struggle aside.

Instead of that, one should say that we want peace but to obtain it, it is indispensable to take power. That is the only way to obtain peace. It is important then to pose at the same time as the objective of peace, that of the taking of power – or of going to government to be able to determine the policy of the country.

One cannot exclude in the case of Italy that situations will occur as in the past. The Italian government which was allied to the Germans, in 1944 passed over to the other side when they saw that there was no other way out. And today, the Communists hope by their policy against the installation of atomic missiles, to win the support of the population on the basis of the rejection and the fear of atomic weapons – and not as a function of an analysis and political programme. They do not educate the militants in this. One can take the position of defending peace. We too are for peace: bread, peace and liberty. But for that, it is necessary to take power or enter government and guarantee peace from there.

But it is not only a question of the Communists entering the government. The question still remains of deciding in government. The communists

must make appeals, saying: “The bourgeoisie is not going to make peace”. Capitalism’s own fear can force them to make agreements and negotiations, but it is not the Italian bourgeoisie that decides upon such things. The Yanks are going to begin the war, and when it starts, the rest of the bourgeoisie cannot pull out of it. They will have to follow. It is also a disaster for the bourgeoisie because they are going to enter the war, in the worst possible conditions, in the middle of great divisions and divergences, and that is going to facilitate enormously the revolutionary movement.

What the Yanks fear is that the Soviets will occupy the whole of Europe in a month. This single fact alone is going to create a defeatist feeling in the United States, which will expand rapidly. That is why they are trying to speed up the war preparation. It is interesting to follow the polemic between Kennedy and Carter, in which Kennedy is the expression of a section of capitalism and of the well off petty bourgeoisie. The Kennedy sectors see that the war is the end of capitalism and that they cannot do as they like. They want to make pacts and agreements to continue to gain time but big business knows that this policy is worse, particularly because unemployment can only increase. One can see that in the closing of the big factories and of the consortiums in the United States and in Italy (Fiat), in Germany and Britain. If they do not launch the war, the situation is going to produce a collapse of major factories, a brutal crisis of capitalism and the Communists will go to the government. The capitalist are in the process of understanding how to confront this situation.

The Communists must see the whole picture. They have the objective of the transformation of the society, which is not incorrect but their political means are in the main incorrect. It is not wrong to say “Let us be against re-armament” but it is necessary to add at the same time “NATO out of Italy” otherwise confusion is created among the workers, the peasants and the intellectuals, who ask “but if we are against rearmament, we must also be against NATO. We want neither NATO nor the Soviets but it is NATO and not the Soviets who are in the country”. It is the Italian capitalism that provokes the crisis that the country experiences, and not the Soviet troops. NATO aggravates the crisis because it forces Italian capitalism to devote 20% of its budget to war whereas they could invest these in the economy. These military expenditures are made at the cost of the population and of the creation of means of production, life and creative opportunities for people. They also cause pollution – which is constantly denounced – such as the sites loaded with atomic missiles in Sardinia.

The Communist masses seek to intervene to weigh on the Communist Party, to push it forward and make it feel that we've agreed to go to government and take the country out of backwardness. The most important issue to be able to decide future policies is to oppose the war, go to government, in order to eliminate capitalism. In such a way, opposing the war also means opposing capitalism. This way one does not create the illusion that the bourgeoisie is interested in opposing the war.

The bourgeoisie is against the rearmament of France or Italy, in the same way as it does not follow Carter in all his policies such as the boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow. This is because it is a competitor of Yankee imperialism. But if there is war, they will go with Carter. This indicates the weakness of capitalism which will enter the war with only one leg and with neither capacity nor decision.

The decision of the Italian Communist Party to oppose Yankee missiles and be against the war, is very important because it is going to lead the Party to grasp the need to go to government, and to ensure that it decides in that government, and to dislodge from it the capitalist forces that are responsible for war. It is vital to show the link between NATO, rearmament, atomic weapons and war. It is not possible to be against war and allow at the same time that NATO stays in Italy. Moreover, the presence of NATO in Italy does not serve just for the war tomorrow, but for the present war today against the masses of Italy. It is a point of support of capitalism to intervene against any revolutionary movement. The Yankee ambassador in Italy recently said precisely this, and the delegate of the German Christian Democratic Party also intervened in the Congress of the Italian Christian Democracy to say that he was against the Communists of Italy going to government! This is interference in the internal affairs of the country! In spite of knowing that this will have unfavourable repercussions for them in the country, they nevertheless do this to stimulate the right wing so that the latter pushes back the Communists. If the Communists go to government, the Social Democrats will increase their votes in Germany. These are the consequences that they fear, and this is why they seek the unification of capitalism in Europe.

However, Strauss declares that he too is against rearmament because he wants a calculated one. His sector doesn't wish to break with the Soviet Union, nor above all with East Germany which is their main associate in an enormous amount of investments. One of the main engineering enterprises of capitalist Germany, called 'Krupps', declares that it is impossible to break relations with East Germany, the German Workers

State, because 30% of its business is done there. Furthermore, Krupps makes representation on an international scale on the behalf of the German Workers State. So, the German capitalist thinks: "Aren't we all anti-communist? But business is business; one doesn't have to alter that".

It should be understood that the Communist Party has accepted NATO for a long time, and that it has taken within its ranks a great number of intellectuals who have no ideas for this stage of history, no analyses and no policy, and who adopt capitalism. The Communist Party seeks to get over that, by declaring to be against rearmament and war. But to be a part of NATO means surely to support NATO in war. However now, the Communists are against war. Which one of the two is going to decide? To be with NATO? To be against war? What is decisive is to be against war. Then, one has to intervene to help the understanding of these problems, and realising that there is already a process of elevation.

J.POSADAS

17.02.1980

THE WAR AND THE ELIMINATION OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM ON A WORLD SCALE

J POSADAS - 06.12.1979

The present process is one of inevitable preparation for war by imperialism. This is going to require time but war could break out any moment because it does not depend on the military preparedness of imperialism but on the development of the world anti-capitalist social crisis. And this crisis will crush capitalism from every point of view. Capitalism is going to enter the war as it prepares it, in full revolution.

The Communist parties of the capitalist countries do not discuss this. The Workers States have in part a notion of these problems – not all but in part. The war is going to be very short and the revolution very fast. The world revolutionary upheaval will be very fast. All Europe, Asia, Latin America and a part of Africa are going to emerge as Workers States from this. This is going to be a whole world process of development – even if not immediately.

Imperialism sees this. It prepares the war, not only because of the economic crisis but because it sees this process. Even without the economic crisis, imperialism would still prepare the war. A process is coming that will overthrow the whole social fabric of capitalism. The Communist parties are not used to think in this way. They are used to an idyllic way of thinking, hoping to persuade the capitalists, displace them, and make them change or just annul them. This is how they think. They have developed a whole spectrum of compromises. History, however, will not put up with this because it cannot go forward on that basis. The Workers States do not yet have a genuine leadership. Their leadership is bureaucratic but it comes closer to what is necessary, even if it doesn't express fully this necessity. More and more, the leadership of the Workers States tends to approximate to necessity, eliminating those who are a block in their way or a disturbance to a better integration of people in the Workers States. The depth of the criticism by Brezhnev of various Soviet ministers lies in the fact that these elements, which he criticised, separate the population of the Workers States from the overall plan and conclusions stemming from the Workers States (and it is not just because they are thieves).

The Workers States have to prepare for the historic antagonism with capitalism. This arises naturally and people in the Workers States are

educated in the way of antagonism with the capitalist system. They do not feel antagonistic to the people of the capitalist countries, but towards the capitalist system. At the time of Stalin, it was already like that in spite of all the limitations of Stalin himself, and in spite of the fact that he tried to crush Marxist thought, any thought at all even if it was only empirically dialectical. But the element that ended up being crushed was the Soviet bureaucracy and Stalinism which is the killer aspect of bureaucracy. But today, the present bureaucracy of the Workers State has to impel the revolution. Today, the Soviet Union is the natural ally of progress and not is circumstantial ally. It is the historic objective roots of the Workers State that makes the Soviet Union the ally of progress. The bureaucracy does not have either the understanding of this or the necessary social interests as yet but it is not opposed to it either. This can be seen in the new Soviet Constitution.

None of this is discussed in the Communist parties when it should be a fundamental preoccupation for them. While the Communist parties don't engage in discussions, the mother of Carter wastes no time saying publically that someone should kill Khomeini! In the face of all this Brezhnev is telling his ministers that they are self-interested, that they work for themselves, whilst the people of the country need to have basic services at their disposal.

In this process, the evaluation of the significance of the working class, as a class, in the capitalist countries and expressed under the shape of Workers States – which are superior forms in which the working class is expressed – has great importance. The Workers State represents the historic interests of the future and this cannot be done by the proletariat of the capitalist countries however important it may be. The proletariat of the Workers State represents its historic interests for it has already built the Workers State. The proletariat of the Workers State impels the world revolution. There are no discussions about this in the Workers States or in the Communist parties.

But in any case, the proletariat of the capitalist countries is important because it is the centre that impels the social struggles in these countries, and for the preparation to bring down capitalism when it launches the war.

We have confidence not in the strength of one or other Communist Party in the capitalist countries, even though we are sure that they are going to elevate themselves – and this has already started in the Italian Communist Party for instance – but in the proletariat of the Workers States. It is the

latter which has authority in the world and not the German, the Italian or the French proletariat by themselves. These have an important function to play but it is the proletariat of the Workers States that influences the world. Humanity sees in them a leadership, and it sees the Workers States as the proletariat as the world leadership.

Neither capitalism nor the bureaucracy has the possibility to make history retreat because the necessary intelligence, the world structure of knowledge, the necessary human relations and the grasp of scientific and technical ideas already exist for progress. All these can be destroyed but will be rebuilt and better. All that which is material may be destroyed but the knowledge and confidence already acquired by humanity, its organisation, homogeneity and cohesion, all that cannot be destroyed.

May 1968 was the expression at a given moment of a stage without leadership, but a stage that meant a resistance to the Communist and socialist parties, and a rejection of these parties by a great number of people who became revolutionaries outside the Communist and Socialist parties. But because they had not received a programmatic response, and because they had not received any leadership or policy to guide them, they dissolved later. These sectors of 1968 were neither crushed nor smashed nor made to retreat, neither were they dissuaded or disbanded by capitalist repression. They were simply limited by the lack of political leadership, programme and objectives.

It is not true that May 1968 is long in the past. The present process is a new May and this means that many sectors that are not organised by the Workers parties, or by the trade unions, come out to struggle alone. A part of these are the Ecologists. Society is ready for changes, hence the urgency of capitalism to prepare the war. Society is about to change dramatically.

Imperialism prepares the war albeit the resistance of some capitalist countries. Those countries are resistant not because they object to atomic weapons being used against the Workers States and the proletariat, but because they feel weak as capitalist countries and in their ability to compete with the Yanks who weaken their ability to compete. Such are the contradictions of the capitalist system. The Workers States do not have such problems.

There is no antagonism or contradiction between the Soviet Union and China. The problem is elsewhere. It is a problem of political leadership. On the other hand, in the capitalist system, it is not the case. The latter

has the problem posed by the structure of each separate capitalist country, with each bourgeoisie, each one confronting and clashing with the other. In the Workers States, the problem is one of leadership and not one of the structures of the country.

On the other hand, when it starts changing, the Chinese leadership is going to change very fast. In China, there have been continual changes in the leadership – from the time of the ‘Hundred Flowers’ up to that of the enormous exaggerations about wheat production: the production figures were made up by the leadership. They made complete reshuffles of leadership in China because of the lack of functioning and lack of structure of the Communist Party. All this resulted from the Soviet bureaucracy itself and not from the Chinese. This isn’t a Chinese weakness but the result of the Soviet bureaucracy which strangled the Chinese leadership in its formation, pressurised it and imposed its line on it in order to keep the Chinese leadership dependent on the Soviet for arms, military leadership and for all kind of necessities.

The war will be a desperate act on the part of imperialism, which still has the means to launch it because of the limitations of the Workers States and the bureaucratic interests of their leaderships who did not create the necessary Communist currents. The Communist parties of the capitalist countries, with all their limitations, are the result of the Soviet policy of Stalinism. But the war is the end of capitalism, and this has to be posed to educate and win over the petty bourgeoisie. It must be posed to prepare the working class, the communist Parties, the scientists and technicians, for this period before the war. And also to make the war as short as possible and arrange for the quickest revival after the war.

This war will not be like the others. In previous wars, revolution ensued only in the final stages of the war. This time, revolution will break out immediately, because the Soviets are going to promote and support it. The conditions aren’t going to be as imperialism would like it to be. This is why imperialism seeks to make a ‘blitzkrieg’ (lightening war). They realise they cannot survive any other way. The war isn’t going to be the disaster that the Communist leaders imagine but will bring a rapid revolution. The revolution isn’t going to await four years as in the last wars but will be very quick. Moreover, the Soviet army and the Workers States have the support of the masses included in their strategy. In the same way as the Russian proletariat which appeared helpless but took power, in the same way the North American proletariat reads and learns in spite of not having political or trade union life.

Capitalism is preparing the war but the capitalist world cannot determine the consequences of the war. On the other hand, the Workers States can decide and are already prepared. The war is going to be very short and it will mean the destruction of the main centres of the capitalist system, because capitalism will not have the strength to recover, whilst the Workers States naturally will recover. If in the previous war and under Soviet influence, half of Europe became Communist, now the process will be all the more profound, and the leadership in China is going to be liquidated.

The war of 1870 brought the Paris Commune in its wake. The war of 1914 brought the Soviet Union. The one of 1939 brought 20 Workers States and the war in Vietnam three more Workers States. The war that imperialism is preparing will bring the end of the capitalist system and of the bureaucracy.

This will not be an automatic process but this is the programme of history. This is why imperialism would like to do something tremendous and involve everyone in it. They realise that they cannot just launch the war – a war in which their rivals come out on top. Besides, imperialism doesn't just have to deal with the Soviet Union but with its own competitors too: the Germans, Japan, and the other capitalist countries too. It is true that it is its class interests that will prevail in case of a confrontation with the Soviet Union, but capitalism has also to deal with inter-capitalist competition which is a historic competition.

The missiles that the Yankees want to install in Europe do not alter this situation very much. The European countries that already have such weapons want to install others to reach the USSR. This will force the USSR to liquidate all those European countries, which is a very easy matter because the USSR has all the necessary missiles. The interest of imperialism is to ensure that the European countries pay for the missiles. This is why capitalist countries such as Germany resist the Yankees and feel that they could do without all this. But they can achieve little against the Yanks because as capitalists, they have to confront the Workers States in any case.

This is going to stimulate a tendency in European capitalism to become harder against the trade union struggles, against the Communist parties, in order to prepare the war apparatus. But capitalism in its foolishness, doesn't see the difference between an inter-capitalist war and the war against the Workers States, in which - although they have the necessary repressive means – they will have no support and there will be a very swift uprising because invaders and invaded will unite with each other.

As part of its strategy, the Soviet Union will need to unite with the countries which it enters in the war. It did this in Germany, and this time, it will do so in a very superior fashion.

The European bourgeoisies want Yankee missiles to defend their own German or Italian or other interest as capitalists, and not because they want to defend or do a favour to the Yanks... But the Yankee bases aren't there only for the interests of the capitalist system in the European countries, but for the Yanks' interests. The missiles sited in Europe will be controlled by the Yanks.

However, to control this entire network, from Naples to Belgium, they need a means of coordination which can only be established when there is historic confidence in the regime. This level of coordination cannot be achieved by military command only. It can only be achieved when people are confident that what is being done is a good thing. But there is no such confidence in Yankee imperialism. Half of those who compose the apparatus are going to run away. They don't feel safe and they don't have the required confidence. They are there because they are paid or interested in some way, but moved by the fear that interest induces and have developed the consciousness which is the product of fear. Such a situation doesn't occur in the Workers States. In spite of all the limitations of such people, Ceausescu from Rumania has had to declare in the Congress of the Rumanian Communist Party that if the Warsaw Pact was in danger, Rumania would be by its side. And Tito is not far off from saying the same thing.

Many European Communist leaders feel satisfied: "We have not had any war for 30 years". They think that it is the result of their own abilities but they do not speak of the wars which have occurred in the world where millions have died. They don't speak of all those who have died as a consequence of the capitalist system. They say this because there has not been a war in Europe and because as far as they are concerned, they didn't suffer from the consequences of the wars which took place elsewhere. These leaders believe that people are frightened by war but it is imperialism that is frightened by war.

These comrades believe that *they* have avoided the war! But it is the Workers States – and not them – that avoided it. Capitalism has managed so far without war but now it cannot put it off any longer, because the crisis is deepening. Now together with the war preparations capitalism is preparing to defend itself from unemployment and also lowering unemployment pay as it does in Italy. It feels as if big struggles are on the

way and so capitalism prepares the war. This is the combined plan of capitalism: install missiles and no unemployment pay. If the workers don't have work it isn't because they don't want to work but it is because there isn't any work. This is being generalised; it is starting also in France where they have started to send back the immigrant workers. When the bourgeoisie takes such measures that are going to mean also losses in vote, it is because they prepare for something else: the war. They have all this in mind. As they cannot launch it when they want, or as they want, and above all as they feel that this will mean their own liquidations, they have fears, hesitations, doubts and they go slower in doing this. If it wasn't like this, they would have already made this armament plan (with the missiles) a long time ago.

Capitalism seeks a balance in the economy to prepare the war. Its crisis grows constantly. The depth of the revolutionary process increases. Imperialism enters the war in the worst possible conditions for itself. It doesn't have any real allies in the world; in every country which is capitalist, people are against it.

J. POSADAS

06.12.1979

THE NEUTRON BOMB: A SOCIAL COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY WEAPON

J POSADAS - 28.08.1977

The mortal agony of the capitalist system takes shape very clearly. 15h40 It demonstrates this through the neutron bomb. It is to be seen quite categorically that this weapon has been specifically created for local, counter revolutionary use, against demonstrations, meetings of the masses or assemblies. It is for use against the revolutionary movements. It is a weapon invented precisely for this purpose. It is essentially a social counter-revolutionary weapon to confront the revolutionary movement.

In front of this – and as in front of any other weapon of mass destruction – an equally effective weapon will be found. We propose that the Soviet comrades study the means by which to reply to this militarily, and we propose that they make preparations and mobilisations against such a bomb. No one can prevent it from being manufactured and this is taking place now. Then instead of letting ourselves be attacked as a single target, it is crucial to disperse ourselves in one thousand targets which will force the aggressors to disperse their forces. After the Paris Commune, capitalism built wide avenues to confront the proletariat which learnt the art of unifying itself in the back streets. These wide avenues have not stopped the current twenty Workers States from being built. We are going to counter this death dealing weapon therefore with a weapon just as deadly: organisation!

The neutron bomb expresses the fact that capitalism prepares itself because it is conscious of the progress of the revolution. It is a counter-revolutionary bomb. The war of imperialism will be a counter-revolutionary war by nature, and this weapon is directly aimed at the revolutionary masses. In the war itself, it is not a very useful weapon for capitalism. This war will not be waged with large armies confronting each other. It will be waged by the movement of weapons controlled remotely. Therefore, the use of the neutron bomb is not for war, but aimed at the revolutionary movement of the masses, in the United States and Britain, and all other places. It is particularly aimed at the North American, British, French and German masses.

Imperialism is not preparing this just for military ends, since this bomb will have little military effect. What they expect from it are social results. The aim is to kill people. The imperialist war as a whole has a counter-

revolutionary character. The neutron bomb is a weapon directly aimed at the revolutionary movements of the masses in each country and against the soldiers of the capitalist countries who are going to rebel.

Such are the contradictions of the capitalist system. It kills all the people that it can, and then, it seeks to rebuild the economy thus destroyed and creates consumers. Ten years later when the cycle is complete they start once again to kill people or try to prevent them from being born. These are the contradictions of the system of private property.

The following conclusion has to be restated. The neutron bomb is aimed against the revolutionary mobilisations of the masses; this is the essential aim of it. There is not going to be a war of positions. The ships on the sea will, themselves, have little importance. It will be an atomic war, on land and on sea.

Imperialism is trying to find the invincible weapon! However the latter does not exist because there is no weapon which can substitute for people. People are more decisive than any weapons whatever. Also, consider that the war is going to throw into revolution, half the people who aren't already involved in it. Capitalism foresees this. This is going to be the case in the United States in particular. Before the Second World War, it would have occurred to no one to say that the revolution was going to reach Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria etc... Now capitalism sees that the war is going to reach the United States and give a vigorous impulse to anti-capitalist currents there. This is why they need the neutron bomb. Capitalism sees the behaviour of the masses of the United States. It cried for the defence of 'democracy' and there was no answer. Instead the people said: "Get out of Vietnam and leave it alone!" People did not have an attitude of indifference regarding Vietnam. They showed that they cared and that they wanted it to live and in peace.

There is no doubt that the neutron bomb is also for use against the Soviet army. It is not just aimed at the masses. They are going to use it against the Soviet army. They will also use it against the Workers States and try to kill as many people as possible.

But one has to count on the rising against capitalism of half the forces now at its service as soon as the war starts. Soldiers will forget their guns and bullets will not be found. In one way or another, these forces will turn against capitalism. So, capitalism which feels this, is working away, studying the means of intimidating and threatening. This is due to the fact that they see the political behaviour of the masses and also the one of the

army officers and this is not the time when they can start making new layers of officers. There is no doubt at all that the present officers (in the various capitalist armies) feel influenced by the social disintegration of capitalism and they also feel the influence of the elevation of the Workers States. If it was only the influence of the disintegration of the capitalist system, the bourgeoisie would still have some sort of hope. But they are faced with the progress of the Workers States which is a decisive factor in this capitalist disintegration. The officers of various armies feel the impact of this disintegration. It is not simply that they feel that they are soon going to be defeated and may be killed, but it is rather that they are attracted to a socially superior regime. On at least three occasions, high ranking officers in capitalist countries have declared: "We are going to loose the war because the USSR is a superior social regime."

We propose that the workers States right now, think about how to organise in order to confront this bomb. An essential element that must be taken into account is the need to appeal to the soldiers of the world, to influence them and call on them to turn their weapons against their own commanders. More than this still, an anti-neutron bomb will soon be produced. If a bomb has been made that can burn oxygen and murder, there must be another which will do the reverse. There is no force that can impede the progress of the revolution because the revolution is a fundamental necessity of history.

J.POSADAS

28.08.1977

THE INSTALLATION OF THE YANKEE MISSILES IN EUROPE AND THE POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

J POSADAS - 27.10.1979

The world process is taking various aspects, like Nicaragua, El Salvador, Vietnam, or the declarations of Mugabe who poses that there is only one way: the adoption of the socialist road. All this shows that there is great maturity in the world.

The decision of Vietnam to confront the Chinese also indicates the confidence of the Vietnamese Workers State which based itself on the grasp that further interventions inside Vietnam would mean unfavourable repercussions inside China.

At the same time as this world process develops, the crisis of Yankee imperialism continues its course. The French, German, Belgium or Dutch capitalists, and the Italian capitalist in part, question the decisions of Yankee imperialism. They are not against it but they feel weak. This is the reason why they do not want to confront the Soviet Union. The Germans, as much as the French (imperialists) show all their weakness in what they do in relation to the Soviet Union. Equally, there is the weakness of Yankee imperialism revealed in the fact that it cannot impose its will over the other capitalists and must restrict itself to pressurise them so as to install missiles directly poised against the Workers States in Europe. The siting of nuclear missiles in Germany is a very clear sign of war preparation. It may not be for immediate war but it is aimed at stimulating German, French and European capitalism in confronting the Communists and the workers movement; all this with the objective of an even greater war preparation. This is what Yankee imperialism is up to.

North-American imperialism also hopes to draw greater advantage in the inter-capitalist competition with European and Japanese capitalisms. The siting of missiles is a way of forcing the European bourgeoisies to make a greater contribution to the cost of war preparation which will hinder their ability to compete because they will have to increase prices to make up for it.

All this affects the capitalist system and sharpens the class struggle. It accentuates the development of the workers struggles and those of the

peasants and of the petty bourgeoisie. It stimulates them to seek support in the Communist and Socialist movement, and in the other movements of the left. Capitalism acts in this way because it cannot do otherwise. This measure to expand arms expenditure affects capitalism adversely on the economic plane. But it has to do this because of the danger coming from the Workers States.

It is not true that the Workers States have increased their armaments so much. The superiority of the Workers States resides – and will reside – in their world wide relations with the masses. In the arsenal of the Soviet Union, this is the most important weapon. Any military means is important and essential but the necessary basis for it to be decisive is the world support of the masses. There already exists coordination between the masses of the world, the development of the struggle of countries which emerge from backwardness, and the development of the Soviet Union. It is the case even if it is unplanned. All this is part of the same process even if there is not yet a unified political leadership for it. There is coordination between the interests of the exploited masses of the world and the backward countries on one hand, and the interests of the Workers States on the other, the Soviet Union in particular.

Imperialism sees all this and it is why it screams. This debate on armaments comes after the ‘SALT 2’ agreement with Carter and Brezhnev. It is the right wing that imposed this on Carter. He wasn’t completely opposed to it either but imperialism sees that its own existence is at risk. So, it resorts to means that clearly show its war preparations against the Workers States. In turn, the Workers States are going to react quite justly to the conclusion that imperialism is preparing for war.

The installation of the missiles is also an attempt to intimidate the mass movements and the Socialists. It is intended to contain them and to make them clash with the Communist Parties. A sharpening of inter-capitalist competition expresses itself in the attitude of the Social Democratic government of Germany. It has rejected the plans of Yankee imperialism and made a call for conciliation over armaments with the Soviet Union. And it does this to gain a certain respite.

Imperialism prepares for war. The Workers States are fully justified in seeking to profit from it all. The Workers States may continue with declarations for ‘peaceful coexistence’, arms reductions etc... but they cannot go on believing it and this is what matters. The Workers States must prepare militarily and above all socially. The campaign for the

reduction of armaments must be accompanied by the greater development of anti-capitalist struggle and the revolutionary struggle.

One must continue in the direction that Brezhnev indicated on the occasion of his meeting with leaders of South Yemen where he confirmed Soviet support for any movement that struggles against imperialism and capitalism. In this statement Brezhnev made a correct appeal for an alliance with the masses of the world. All this indicates the process of crisis of the capitalist system and the nature of the relationship between the capitalist countries and the Workers States.

This crisis is going to increase even more over this question of the siting of missiles. Imperialism could not intervene to liquidate Nicaragua or El Salvador. No doubt, it is looking for compensation by attempting to make all the capitalist countries centralise around its own power, around the increase in armaments, and around the military structure and command which they have.

The European bourgeoisie feels that it is not just a matter of missiles or installing nuclear weapons – and naturally paying for them...- but that in doing so they come to clash with the workers movement. They have to try to contain the influence that the Workers States are having on the world masses but they feel that the increases in war expenditures limit their capacity for negotiation with the workers movement. But Yankee imperialism keeps increasing its own war expenditure and it has forced the European bourgeoisies to cover an important part costs.

In general, the European bourgeoisie agrees with all this because it is the capitalist system, as a system, that decides. One or another capitalist government may take decisions but they are temporary. What decides is the system as a whole. However, this does not mean that the system will succeed because struggles may develop and increase the weight of social democracy against U.S. imperialism and these struggles may develop in the whole of Europe, France, Britain, etc...

The Communists, Socialists and Social Democrats, the petty bourgeois movements, see quite clearly that imperialism is preparing for war; the present measures are not seen just as means of intimidations, but of war. Yankee imperialism prepares it with a certain caution, and with a good deal of indecision and uncertainty, so it is not quite an open process of war preparation. They camouflage it and hide it from the North American people who are against. Also, the Yankees cannot really say that they prepare for war against “Communist barbarism” because the North

American people would ask: “Communist barbarism? Have you seen what is going on over there? The ‘barbarians’ are here!” There isn’t yet the means of contact between all the component parts of the American masses but those who have organised movements such as the anti-nuclear ones, or those against the intervention in Vietnam or against the construction of atomic weapons have been hundreds of thousands. In spite of the trade union democrats in the US at the service of capitalism, capitalism has not been able to organise a single movement in support of atomic weapons or for the siting of nuclear missiles in Europe. Neither have they been able to make one movement in the US against ‘communist barbarism’ as they call it.

The world process shows the weakness of the capitalist system, the very elevated conditions for the progress of the anti-capitalist struggle and a very firm intervention of the Soviet Union that confronts imperialism. The Soviet Union today is not the same as the one under Stalin who yielded to imperialism and allied himself to Hitler in the hope that he could defend the USSR against the ‘democratic’ imperialists of France, Britain, or the US in that way. Today, the Soviet Union seeks conscious allies; it does not make alliances just with one to fight the other, but alliance to impel the revolution. This has to be taken into consideration. The Soviet Union must not be measured according to an agreement which it makes now with Germany, but in the light of the support it gives to Ethiopia. The Soviet Union impels the revolution in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Ecuador, etc... If it still takes limited steps, it is because it does not have direct access to revolutions. It does not have the necessary communist parties through which to intervene.

But the Soviet Union today supports the revolutionary movements whilst Stalin made a pact with Hitler. With that pact he prevented the Soviet army from weighing in the decision to confront the Nazis. Stalin believed that the Nazis would not attack... Today the Soviet Union is getting prepared and it won’t be taken by surprise. It is also impelling at the same time the revolutionary movements which it supports. This activity of the Soviets is limited and is not accompanied with a global anti-capitalist policy, but it does not abandon the revolutionary movements.

J.POSADAS

27.10.1979

ON THE FALSE ALERT FOR A SOVIET NUCLEAR ATTACK AGAINST THE YANKEES

J POSADAS - 09.06.1980

The Yankees are making war rehearsals such as in the instance of the black-outs*. They are preparing people for war and trying to catch the Soviets by surprise. It is folly however. The simple fact of conceiving such things appears quite impossible, but it's part of the 'last act' for the capitalist system. There are not going to be other wars after this one. It is the end of a system. And as far as the capitalists are concerned, it is the end of life, the end of everything. It is the reason why these guys who imagine such rehearsals today, would never conceive such things in normal times. It is neither Carter nor the big capitalists who decide and already there is a team outside Carter and the big capitalists, which makes the decisions. Those who do this are a gang and not the whole of capitalism. It is a group that reflects and expresses the madness of the capitalist system. It is not that capitalism has reached a state of insanity but it is rather the actual state of the capitalist system all the time. If all the capitalists were summoned together, what you would see is a mad house: Carter, Giscard, Kennedy, Thatcher, and such types as the one who tried to murder the former president of Bolivia.

This false alert in the same way as the black-outs and the mass murder in Guyana are rehearsals. All these actions are part of the strategy of imperialism, which tries out tests and investigates processes that they don't yet master, to see how to use them. They also want to make their own people and the population accustomed and see how they react and behave. Moreover, imperialism makes rehearsals after rehearsals, right up to the day when it will be for real.

Take into account that this will not be any old war. First it is a war with atomic weapons and right from the beginning. Secondly, it is the final class war: it is the end of the existence of a system. This is what creates malevolent, diabolical feelings in the thought of capitalism, not because they are diabolical but because they do not take into account any of the reasoning of the people. So they think as a caste, as a class that realises that it is going to be wiped out, and the only thing they can bother about is how to save themselves at whatever cost. This is devoid of any reasoning, devoid of intelligence and even of the small grains of logic that capitalism had to use in order to develop. Normal logic means suicide for capitalism. But capitalism's logic confines itself to this "I am in charge, I am the one with the money, I have the weapons". It does not

see further than the fact that the world escapes from its oppression, and a full bloodied realisation of this fact itself would lead capitalism to dissolution. It is the layers inside capitalism that realise this and are influenced by this. Such layers are military people, politicians and quite a few bourgeois starting from their families.

Among those who receive an influence from all this, are the North American military people. The press reports, once again, and about the 15th time in a few weeks, that a large numbers of officers have deserted the US army, they have lost heart and they do not want to know anymore. This is quite a commentary on the fact that they do not see the coming war... as the path to glory! This shows the effect of the conduct of Yankee imperialism on its own military who don't think that the war will mean victory, medals and individual advancement. They have already made the experience of Korea, Vietnam, and in Europe they see that it all goes out of hand. Whatever they do, it goes wrong. The Soviets have sufficient weapons to defeat them, and not essentially nuclear ones... It is the people of Europe who have importance and the Yankees know this. This is why the French capitalists are preparing the neutron bomb now, which is not against the Soviets but against the French masses. However, and as

It happened with all the previous wars, it is the masses that are going to turn the weapons against them. Half of the high ranking officers are going to turn their coats.

There isn't normally such a level of desertions in time of war as there is going to be now. All those people who prepare the war act from interest. But today, war is not a problem of conscience but of political consciousness. A very highly placed military of capitalism already sees that the war is senseless. This shows in the fact that leaders of capitalist armies have already made public what they think of the war. "The war is crazy", they said. One of them was at the top of the Belgian army in NATO and he said "War is a stupidity. I will have to wage it because I have to, but that doesn't change the fact that it is a stupidity." When they have to resort to the only means they have to survive, it is because despair creeps over them all.

** Black-outs refer to when New York in particular was plunged into darkness (Editorial).*

J.POSADAS

09.06.1980

NUCLEAR ENERGY MUST BE PLACED AT THE SERVICE OF THE POPULATION

J POSADAS - 30.09.1977

We aren't against nuclear energy. We are against the form in which it is produced and used, because it kills people. We are in favour of nuclear energy, but in what context? What they are doing with regards to nuclear energy is like Seveso, and it means Seveso for all Italy, France, Germany, etc...(*)

Nuclear energy is a progress of science, but in the hands of capitalism it means no progress at all. It diminishes the cost of production and allows a greater use of light and energy, but it kills and poisons many people at the same time. Moreover, extended areas are polluted. Then what has to be proposed is nuclear energy at the service of the population, and this means control by the population over nuclear energy, control by the trade unions, the workers areas, the organs of the parties, and by the workers. Let them control it, and not parliament, which has shown that it cannot do it.

Nuclear energy has to be for the population and not at the cost of the population, at the cost of a polluted environment. Capitalism cannot do this; only a workers' government can do it, whose interest lies in the health of the population and not in the lowering of the cost of energy at the price of poisoning the population. Moreover, every factory which is not controlled in the way we have described is a potential factory of atomic weapons. It is essential to pose this because it is the reason for the distrust of the population in Germany for instance. People say they are not against nuclear energy, but they see that atomic weapons are in preparation. In Germany, under the pretext that they are producing nuclear energy, they are making atomic weapons. The German scientists themselves denounce this. They are going to try to do the same in Italy as well.

People are concerned with this problem, and it is vital to show that this is not against progress. But this situation is not a progress for people but a utilisation of science and technology for the capitalist system at the cost of the population. This is what they did in Seveso, and we do not want new Sevesos. It is not capitalism that can use nuclear energy for social benefit.

Now, today, there are superior forms of energy among them, solar energy, which do not cause damage and don't need as much investment as atomic energy. But the capitalist regime cannot develop them because it is not within the context of profit and accumulation. The guide has to be 'the benefit of the population'. The capitalist regime cannot do this, nor can any programmatic agreement with the Christian Democracy do it, because those who control the C.D.U (Christian Democracy of Germany), are the capitalists. They make programmatic administrative agreements which do not damage the functioning of capitalism. It is necessary to discuss this.

(This refers to the mass poisoning of the Seveso population in Italy, which led to a vast number of deaths and continuous suffering through malformations and other harm to the people. (Editorial)*

J.POSADAS

30.09.1977

ON THE ECOLOGIST MOVEMENT

J POSADAS

08.03.1979

These mobilisations against nuclear power stations in Germany which started with 50 people and reached the 50.000 mark in three years, exist because the Socialist and Communist parties did not fulfil this role. This movement forms part of the knowledge of people who defend themselves against the existence of capitalism. It is not an isolated problem but that of the existence of capitalism. Besides the people reason: they say that they aren't opposed to progress but they don't want nuclear power stations because they are a menace. The people say this for they have seen how the chemical industry functions under capitalism. The technicians in particular have seen what capitalism does normally and they are opposed to nuclear power stations. Better power stations are possible but the technicians don't say this because they do not have the Party through which to develop their thought and express themselves.

Olaf Palme, prime minister of Sweden has admitted that their power stations were built in a hurry, and that there was no doubt that they had to be examined. He went on to say that nuclear power stations had to be built to be economical but that it was also necessary to ensure the safety of the people.

The Ecological movements are 'politico-ecological' movements because they need to come onto the political plane for them to defend the environment. It isn't just a problem to be dealt with reason and arguments; it is not just a problem of environment and of work but a problem that has to be dealt with politically with the Party. Ecology is a problem that has very profound consequences.

The Socialist/Communist victory in Spain and the victory of Mitterand in the Congress of the French Socialist Party are signs that there aren't favourable conditions for the right to go forward. The Communist Party of Spain has pushed Lenin onto one side but Lenin continues. They have left Lenin but Lenin has not left them.

When there is such progress in the Ecologists movement, it is not because currents and tendencies have just started to form themselves out of thin air but because the conditions for change already exist. It is a movement that seeks to develop and is already expressing a state of animation,

capacity for thought, experience and resolution in the people. It is expressed in a very indirect manner but has great scope. It is a very limited movement still, but the fact that it starts to move people like Olaf Palme shows just how important it is.

J POSADAS 08.03.1979

ON THE ECOLOGISTS

J POSADAS

06.06.1979

When we consider that ‘the world is ready for Communism’ we consider the Ecologist movement as well. The Ecologists express the reaction there is against the means of production and the relations within the capitalist system. The Ecologists do not have a theoretical, political or programmatic preparation, but they are attracted to the movement. They started from a position remote from political life. They come from outside political life but not against it. This means that they cannot be seen as originating from a political life or development in previous years. But they have to be included in the left because the Ecologist movements represent forms of anti-capitalist protest. They do not have the same conclusions as the left about how to work, but generally they all start from a position of condemning the capitalist system. This means that the conditions exist for them to be influenced in every way. Even ‘Le Monde’ was forced to say that many scientists and technicians are against the capitalist system in France.

The task of the Communist Party is to direct itself towards this large layer of the population in order to attract it. However, it cannot be attracted just by appeals from the Communist Party. The Party has to be seen with its conduct and that of its militants, cadres and leaders, in the trade union and political fields. Instead of this Marchais (Secretary of the French Communist Party) who recently accused the Ecologists to have been sent by d’Estaing. But the Ecologists answered however: “Not true, Giscard doesn’t dream like that anymore”. Besides, it is not at all as Marchais said. In reality, these movements are still contradictory forms of progress because they have no political formulation and the workers parties don’t help them. In this respect, the Socialists have also to make progress, but when considering the French Socialist Party, it is necessary not to see it purely through Mitterrand but through its Socialist base. The Communists stop at Mitterrand in recognition of him as the boss who speaks for the masses!

Humanity is ready for Communism and the masses of South Africa who are opposed to nuclear energy are the same as those in France, Belgium or Italy. All of them are against nuclear energy in the hands of capitalism. They are still not clear about this, so they say that they are against atomic energy, because they see the way in which it is used. They also see that

the Workers States participate in this discussion very little and give no ideas. The Workers States take political advantage but little more and very distantly. They do not provide either theoretical or programmatic explanations or guidance. It is for this reason that the Ecologist sectors do not know how to orientate themselves. However, they have a brotherly feeling in the sense that they are concerned about the harm being done to mankind. This feeling has to be made use of to show that instead of being an injury to humanity, energy can be seen as an opportunity to learn from the Workers States, even when they do not intervene.

What the Ecologists express in a limited form is the necessity for the transformation of society in order for humanity to be able to live. The Ecological movement expresses this and it includes people from the working class and peasantry to the intellectuals and upper layers of the bourgeoisie. In Belgium a member of the upper strata of the bourgeoisie has said that the present trend would be the destruction of everything. And beyond the question of physical death inflicted by pollution, there is the question of a living death which means that the system diminishes and cancels the functioning of human thoughts and feelings. It strangles them and impedes them from functioning. This is what concerns the children of the bourgeoisie. This is quite clear in Italy: three Marshalls have admitted that their sons are 'leftists' and that they are entitled to be so. What they said was: "If they are young, how is it possible not to be leftist?"

J POSADAS

08.03.1979

ON THE DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST NUCLEAR WASTE IN CAPITALIST GERMANY

J POSADAS

17.3.1979

This is about the demonstrations against the installation of a nuclear waste processing plant at Gorleben. Title by the Editorial Board.

We should intervene in the struggle against pollution, poisoning and chemical contamination. We must oppose the manufacture of adulterated foodstuff and the chemical products which harm people. It is also necessary to oppose the atomic installations and factories that harm the population. At the same time, we have to be in favour of the development of atomic energy for the benefit of the people, in a way that does not harm anyone. However, to reach this goal, it is necessary to bring the capitalist system down. So, the problem has to be posed in this way – capitalism can do nothing else but what it does now, because it uses the energy it produces for competition and the manufacture of atomic weapons. All this must be explained.

In contrast, in the Workers States there are factory committees which intervene and discuss the problems of pollution on a permanent basis. These committees exert control over conditions of work in the factories and this is an aspect of the planning that characterises them. This is a norm that is completely respected in the Workers States. As soon as a factory is set up, a committee of control over the conditions of work and the purity of the air is established. This is why there are so few accidents in the Workers States. There, the accident rate is 0, and 001% of that in the capitalist states.

All the movements that struggle against the installation of nuclear power stations must be given a lot of importance. These protestors are from intellectual sectors, they often are well-off people and sometimes landowners. This movement expresses in depth a reaction against the capitalist system. When these people protest against such installations, it is because they are opposed to the way energy is going to be produced under the leadership of the capitalist system, and they know full well that their opposition goes against capitalism. The result is that they come closer to the struggle for social transformations and in very important aspects. The motive for these present mobilisations is not in defence of individual interests, but an intelligent cultural and scientific understanding. In fact, they oppose a system that leads to consequences

which are counter to this understanding. Moreover, many of these people come from bourgeois sectors or sectors close to the bourgeoisie. This reaction against the system brings sectors originating in the bourgeoisie, into conflict with the capitalist system. These people aspire to the development of life and they see that the capitalist system means the grave.

The trade unions and workers parties must put forward a policy aimed at winning these people over. There can be no question of ridiculing or despising or ignoring the people of the anti-nuclear movement. Far from it, they have to be given a great deal of importance. The objectives they have must be defended and at the same time, attempts must be made to elevate the character of their struggle. This has to be done without waiting for them to come and join the trade unions, the socialist or communist parties, etc. It has to be understood that they can progress. A whole cultural policy has to be launched aimed towards them with explanations to help them realise that there is one thing needed for them to get what they aspire to. In the immediate sense, their opposition to nuclear power stations or in the case of a factory for reprocessing nuclear waste has to be supported.

It would be wrong to believe that these people are the result of inter-capitalist competition, or that they come from capitalist sectors opposing nuclear energy because they have interests or investments in coal or hydro-electric power. No! These movements are opposed to nuclear waste! There may be within them some capitalist sectors with their own interests but it is not them that are decisive. These may try to use the anti-nuclear movement for their own interest, as they have tried before, but these movements are already acquiring an important social character.

One has to consider that the ecologist movements in capitalist Germany are part of the process of the country. If these mobilisations do not take on a much more important form it is because the leadership of the workers parties and of the trade unions do not intervene. What has to be done is to unite these movements to the actions of the working class – such as the recent engineering strike that took place in Germany – and which was very impactful even if its scope was limited. The strength of the steel workers did not come from the number of strikers but from their weight in the economy. This strike shook the whole world and had repercussions far beyond Germany.

The Ecologist movements are symbolic of the fact that capitalist Germany is in movement, and that it moves very quickly. Moreover,

these movements in Germany are planned. They are not sporadic events, but well planned movements prepared to confront the capitalist system. This tends to have a disintegrating effect even on the police. In the strike half the policemen said that the strikers were right and that if it all goes on as now, we will all end up poisoned. There is something that unites all these movements against the capitalist system.

We support the Ecologist movements and we appeal to the trade unions, the workers parties, to also support them. The social democrats have been against these mobilisations because they have agreements with capitalist enterprises and do business with nuclear energy, in industry and with those who produce this dangerous radioactive waste in Germany. Now they are digging huge wells where to bury waste right along the boundary with the German Workers State. And this is only what we know. Capitalist enterprises are free to install a system of drains through which they get rid of radioactive waste as close as a hundred kilometres from the East German border. Such is their present industrial capacity that one cannot know all the things they are up to. They tell us for instance, that all these things are to do with military secrets and that no-one can know about them. But they are digging underground waste-disposal systems right up to the frontier of the USSR.

All this poisoning is completely unnecessary. If atomic energy is going to be used, if it is a good thing then it must be produced without waste that contaminates people. Capitalism has no other alternative but to act in this way, because if it took measures for safety, it would raise the price of electricity and this would signify a loss of profits for capitalism. It is only a socialist society that can really deal with all this.

Socialist society however, will use water power, wind power, solar energy, etc. It will eliminate the existence of atomic waste. It will use atomic energy but without creating waste. People are poisoned by radioactive waste because in capitalism, capitalist society is not concerned with humanity but with inter-capitalist competition and its antagonistic struggle against the Workers States. This is why it produces poisons and radioactive waste. It is no longer just a matter of the inter-capitalist competition, but also a matter of their antagonism with the Workers States. This is why capitalism must reduce the socially necessary time in order to produce what determines the price on the market to produce in the cheapest way possible for them. This is why they use nuclear energy.

In the atom there are elements a million times smaller than the seed and which contain a million times more energy than what is used at the present moment. This is to say that there is enough energy available! All the energy of the sun is concentrated in these small particles. Everything can be a source of energy. The air, which the Greeks of Ancient Greece studied, and water are sources of energy. Everything at all can be used. Capitalism does not develop any of this because profits, competition or capital accumulation determines everything that it does. Capitalism decides to use or not to use something on the basis of whether it suits capital. It decides nothing on the basis of human necessity. Objectively there could be atomic power stations everywhere in the world without any danger to humanity. And this could be now. This would diminish a million times the effort now spent in getting energy from coal or oil. In this case, the inhuman activity of coal extraction could be ended. In fact coal could be left where it is at present and then we could see what it turned into in 500 thousand years time...

The advance in science has already produced the knowledge of these particles which constitute the atom. These are so small that they cannot be seen under a microscope. The knowledge of their existence comes from the study of their behaviour. These particles contain such energy that they are what set everything else in motion. This shows what could be done today. The more this scientific capacity is developed the more the human brain acquires great speed in the realm of calculation, decision making, and above all understanding. One of the reasons that delay the development of understanding today is the limited means of establishing human relations. All this is not expressed by the Ecologist movements. These mobilisations are not directly aimed against the government or the capitalist system. However, all the demands that these movements make for the right to live, the right to have a dignified life, to end pollution, all these go against capitalism. They do not propose to confront the capitalist system or the government directly, but neither the present capitalist government nor any other capitalist government or the capitalist system itself, can answer their problems. This means that they are movements which call the capitalist system into question.

J POSADAS

17.3.1979