

J. POSADAS

THE ROLE OF CINEMA IN HISTORY

THE CONTRIBUTION OF CHAPLIN TO THE CLASS STRUGGLE OF THE PROLETARIAT IN CINEMA

12.12.71 - J. POSADAS

The films of Charlie, as we've called him since we were little, convey strong feelings of sympathy and affection. They possess a meaning both cultural and revolutionary. Our aim is to analyse the way in which the evolution of society at this time is expressed by the cinema.

The cinema has been one of the most important means used by the capitalist system for diverting the revolutionary awareness of the masses. It has used the cinema as a means of imposing its authority, its domination and its empty concepts, as with theatre. But the cinema has an infinitely greater importance in the fact that it reaches illiterate people and the most deprived in the world. Literature is different: it only reaches those who can read, who are interested, who have an intellectual capacity. Cinema is one of the means that capitalism seeks to use to maintain the under-development of humanity which has cost so much already.

Capitalism has turned cinema into a vast enterprise where it can shape the thoughts and the feelings of people. Through cinema, the capitalist mentality has encouraged the attitude of greed, of personal gain, of usury and of exploitation. Cinema can be used to normalise the notions of exploitation and usury in the human relations. Such was the aim of capitalism in utilising the cinema. In spite of this, cinema became central to the organisation of culture. Now it has become a most important instrument that links all the social layers together. The Cinema binds people together, from the middle bourgeois and petit bourgeois people to the poorest and most marginalised where a great deal of 'backwardness' goes on. For the most marginalised, the cinema has been a means of gaining knowledge and of staying in contact with social life in spite of everything.

Invented by the Lumiere brothers, the cinema was developed for those who could use it and who could market it. Hence its use moved quickly from France where it was developed, over to the United States and the market. This did not happen all that quickly however, because when it was a new invention, the bourgeoisie showed no interest in it; it ignored it as long as there was no market and no public. It so happened that, just around that time, finance, market and enterprising ability happened to be developing in the United States. These elements were yet to reach the rest of the capitalist world. Only in the United States was there the accumulated capital to consider its investment in cinema.

We use all film, theatre and museum activity as a means of improving our culture and our knowledge of history. Such a revolutionary knowledge enables us to understand the development of history. This allows us to identify how particular human sentiments arose, and how they emanated from different ruling layers. It is through studies like this one, which we make of cinema, that we witnessed how, in spite of all the forces of backwardness, there have always been individuals, or groups of people capable of using the contradictions of backwardness to make advances. In the uneven process of capitalist development, there have always been those showing the way to fraternal human relations. By studying how it happened, we learn that culture is not the result of the unimpeded exercise of human ability, but from a very conflicted and restricted development. This way, we appreciate how humankind has always thirsted after progress, always! Its progress has been hampered because the class struggle did not allow it to use all its tools. Take the political Party, the Communist Party for instance. It had to be created. The same goes for the Trade Unions. The same goes for all the cultural means needed for the Party and the Unions to communicate with the population. The cinema is most apt in doing this. Theatre reaches restricted groups whilst cinema reaches the crowds immediately. It puts millions of people in touch with the rest of the world, and with the course of social progress. It can tell millions about the full extent of progress in a short time, particularly the progress that takes place in the human relations.

Capitalism articulates the human relations around greed, selfishness, corruption and sensuality in all its guises. Throughout time, it instilled these sentiments in all the art forms. The way it does it today through cinema, it did it through the theatre, literature and Art. Egoism is the foremost sentiment that capitalism seeks to instil in people. Egoism comes from the economic relation based on profit-making and personal gain. Egoism wells up from that relation, and from there, it organises the mind. In its beginnings, the cinema reflected this to perfection. Everything was

centred around the individual, the life of the individual, the life of groups of individuals, exclusive circles and that sort of thing.

CHARLIE MAKES CAPITALISM LOOK RIDICULOUS

We must wonder at the fact that Charlie's cinema developed when Yankee capitalism seemed at its most powerful. The Yankee cinema of when Charlie lived, reflects its omnipotence in the realm of films. In those days, films were used to pervert the notion of sex, the sexual relations and everything to do with love and the human relations. Chaplin's cinema broke with all that. None of his films praised capitalism, the wealthy, or the power of those in command. All Charlie's films – and this for the first time in the history of cinema – introduce the life of the poor. This was when capitalism seemed so much in the ascendancy.

In this, Charlie acts like Goya who painted kings with the face of idiots. When Goya was asked 'Why do you paint like that?' he replied: 'because this is the way things are.' Goya painted all the squalor of life in Spain, the poor people, the invalids. His art was an indictment of a regime wanting to be seen in splendour, treasures and wealth. And Goya, right in the middle of a scene depicting the king hunting, shows a drunk beggar seeking alms. To him, portraying a man drunk was not a condemnation of the poor man, but of the regime that had made him so. When Goya paints the king on his horse, and adds a beggar nearby, he is not painting to flatter, but to condemn. Faced with this regime wanting to lie, Goya says: 'look at yourself as you are'!

In his use of cinema, Chaplin does something equivalent in the middle of an apparently growing capitalism, in North America of all places. Those in power wanted Charlie to depict them as rich deciders able to impose their will on society. Instead of that, he portrays them as idiots and thieves who try to solve everything by the gangster-method - one of them falling in water without realising that there was water there. It may look like a joke, but it is not. It shows that such people *are* idiots. In 'The Bankers', a CEO hides away because he is afraid. He is a coward whose sole interest is money, nothing to do with love; Charlie plays the selfless employee who defends love, justice and truth. The banker feels fears because for him, only money counts.

The film ridicules capitalism as when it shows the safe in the brooms closet. This device shows that the whole system is shit. Even if it is not at conscious level, Chaplin's work expresses the class struggle. You see this

in the way he makes the safe a synonym of power - and this was the case in those days. Meanwhile he shows the bankers as imbeciles. Charlie's workmate is a good type, a bit stupid, but a good man without bad intentions. These are real life scenes, which incorporate a criticism of the capitalist system.

As a person, Charlie was not a leader or a revolutionary organiser. He was a simple intellectual from a poor background with artistic talents. He is the one that brought a critique of capitalism to the world of films. He created his cinema at the time when 'Son of the Sheik' was playing in the USA. Rudolph Valentino was used then for sexual exaltation and the myth of the hero.

The cinema was born at the end of the 19th century. It then developed around the years 1908-1910 with the first comedian Max Linder. The comedies made during this period became based on derision and a sarcastic view of humankind. Such was, in part, the work of Max Linder too, but Chaplin broke from it. Chaplin developed a way to show the silly side of a basically good person, as in his workmate in *The Bankers*. The workmate is shown as basically a good person, whilst the bankers are cowards and idiots only moved by the love of money.

Chaplin depicts the natural naivety of the basically good person. He shows this through his child-like gestures. In his roles, he displays a child-like simplicity to the pole opposite of those who are driven by money and sexual excitement. He can portray someone who find in music and dance inspirations that answer the call of the head and of sex, but where the head rules over sex. He shows this through the overwhelming importance he gives to the human relations. This is Chaplin.

In film-making, technical ability and material means are not the most important. This said, Chaplin was good in this line too, considering the strength of monopoly that big business already had over this art-form where nothing counted apart from 'love'. Of course, that kind of love had nothing to do with love. It focused narrowly on sexual attraction, the sexual attraction fit for heroes, as conveyed by the films featuring Rudolph Valentino. These films exalted sex to the point of provocation, a fit reminder of the human relations in the capitalist system. Valentino himself was a mediocre and low-grade person. In his treatment of women, there was an invitation to perversion, an attempt at preventing them from educating themselves, from having ideas, from being influenced by the Russian Revolution. They were films to stop the influence of the Russian Revolution. And it is right in the middle of this that Charlie Chaplin

appeared, with his love for people, his love for the poor and his attention to their problems.

In 'The Immigrant' there is a wonderful scene where the Statue of Liberty appears on the screen where immigrants are shown caged-in and behind ropes. This humour makes a parody of this so-called liberty. It shows it to be nothing but lies. This depiction is an act of protest, in a situation resulting directly from the class struggle. Chaplin never sides with the bosses. He is always with the oppressed. He never sides the gangster either. In the film 'The boxer', he is against those who want to buy him, and he does not sell himself. Against the bailiff turning up with a thug to evict a family with twelve children who cannot pay the rent, he makes a gesture meaning 'to hell with you'. He does not show the policeman as a copper but as a guy who has to do his job while thinking 'how unjust! What poor starving people!' and who feeds them. Chaplin never praises capitalist power. And he never praises the power of the church either.

CHARLIE SIDES WITH THE OPPRESSED

We must draw a revolutionary cultural experience from these films, not to be guided by them for they are already outdated, but we can obtain a revolutionary cultural experience at the same time. The comrades who have not drawn such a conclusion must use it as a means of learning. Some have said that Charlie was very individualistic and it is true. He appears as the hero, but he is not the only one. There is always a woman like him and others like him, good people. In the film 'The Policeman', for example, he seems capable of safeguarding everyone, but on what basis? He demonstrates that the baddies are the police and not the people. Let a good guy appear and he will feed all those who are hungry, so that when the fights are over it is not the police who have won but human relations. That is why too, at the end of his film the Church appears victorious and not the police, but a Church made to look ridiculous. Human relations are triumphant in the end.

In his work Charlie incorporates the problems of the poor, their naivety, siding with them and not with the wealthy. In 'The Immigrant' he presents the problem of immigration in all its brutality. Never before was that question raised in the United States. Never! Only from the years 1936-37 onwards, with 'The Grapes of Wrath' was it tackled. Chaplin made the first film in this direction twenty years beforehand. The film is a criticism of the system, of the relations created by the capitalist system.

It is certain that Charlie was not a trade union leader nor a revolutionary leader nor a political leader, but he knew how to demonstrate Communist sentiments, for without them it would have been impossible to make the films that he made. It is obvious that his work was not guided by the passion for making money but that its inspiration was his feelings. Charlie became rich enough to cover himself with gold – why then didn't he? He kept on making films in which he shows poor people and all the faults of capitalism, such as the big fellow who appears in 'Easy Street'. He depicts the faults of capitalism and not bad people. The proof is that at the end of this film the big fellow changes and becomes good. Certainly he idealised him but in what way? : By showing that people are good and that the police are not. There is a scene where the police force intervenes massively and when a neighbourhood boy appears with a menacing gesture, they disappear as fast as they can. Charlie shows people moved by human relations, human fraternity.

Chaplin is not a revolutionary but his work is a social criticism of the system. It is a condemnation of human relations established by the system. It's a searching criticism of the capitalist system. There isn't one scene in its favour. In the scene in the restaurant, in 'The Immigrant', the only person with pleasant manners is the painter. He's the one who gives away money: a good fellow. Capitalism is shown as a robber, and the painter as a good fellow who gives money to people.

He takes up the same theme in 'City Lights'. Charlie is in a café playing the violin when a rich man appears. It is a repetition of the scene from 'The Immigrant'. The rich man is eating with his wife and Charlie is playing the fiddle when the wife indicates that she likes the music. Charlie asks for money but the wealthy man refuses and scorns the little violinist, who then spits on him and goes to play besides a couple who have no money: a penniless couple who automatically give Charlie something. Thus, he compares the attitudes of the wealthy couple and the poor one.

It is a criticism of the capitalist system and of the capitalist relations. Chaplin's actions aren't consciously revolutionary but he criticises capitalist relationships. All Charlie's films are not like that. He reached his peak with 'The Gold Rush' and 'Modern Times'. Afterwards he was to make some bad films, which meant he had slipped. But even today he remains sympathetic to the Communist Party, as do all his children. It is clear that only someone sympathetic to Communism could have created such films. This is why we are interested to see how these feelings are reflected in films, and in what the cinema should be. The cinema of great entertainment is made to exalt the capitalist system and to subject the

viewers to it. As for Charlie, he said: 'Look how life really is!' He introduced poor people and poor districts into his work, which at the time was a real crime in America.

A SOCIAL CRITICISM OF CAPITALIST SOCIETY

Capitalism was in an upward swing and Chaplin showed us poor districts and the brutality and stupidity of the police. To introduce such a criticism of capitalist relationships, of the capitalist way of life, of capitalist society, was to show the guiding force of Communist sentiments. Even if Charlie was unaware of it, had neither the programme nor the conception of this, his criticism of relationships arising from the capitalist system was fashioned by such sentiment. The only time when he attempts more or less to criticise the Workers state is in his film 'The Countess from Hong Kong'. And, even here, the criticism is indirect. There is no attack against the Workers States. On the other hand, every film of Chaplin criticises directly or indirectly the capitalist system.

We have to see these films of Chaplin as a means of incorporating in the cinema criticisms of relationships created by capitalist society. He does not raise the question of class relations, of the factory, the trade unions, the assembly or the Party, but he shows the poor people and the rich.

He presents the boss, the worker, the manager, the baker and the employee. It is a watered-down aspect of the class struggle but, nevertheless, an aspect of it, and he sides against the capitalist system. That is why he never shows the splendours of capitalist development, fine neighbourhoods, limousines, wealthy capitalists and bourgeoisie. What he shows are poor people with good intentions and good feelings. The policeman, however, is shown as an idiot and the rich man as a despicable guy. Even in scenes where he has to limit himself this is what Chaplin shows.

In his film 'The Immigrant' there is a moment when he is in a first-class compartment and some people make scornful gestures at the immigrants. Chaplin repeats such a scene in 'The Gold rush'. In both films he shows how poor people are treated like dirt and the rich like kings. There is also a scene in 'The Immigrant' where he shows how the wealthy can leave the ship immediately, whilst the poor are herded like cattle with tags around their necks.

It is true that in 'Easy Street' he depicts people of the neighbourhood as bellicose, but Charlie sees the father of twelve children and decorates him.

It's a little bit limited but he praises a man who does not run out on the problem of feeding his children, who tries to solve his problems and does not know how. This is the empiricism of society. So, he shows the wealthy man with his mistresses and wasting money, while the father of twelve shoulders his responsibilities.

He presents a couple with twelve children who don't abandon their responsibilities and who have to steal to feed them. He makes the capitalist system look responsible for that. The proletarian father has twelve children. He tries to feed them all, looking for the means to do this, and feeding everybody else's children as well. That is why we say that Charlie's films are the product of the class struggle even if they are not a direct expression of it. It is not direct because he only shows aspects. But he was the first to incorporate the class struggle in the cinema, sometimes obliquely, sometimes more directly. This is the case with 'Modern Times'. At the time, the Russian Revolution had already happened and war was approaching. It is a film with the maturity of showing that it is possible to go from criticising capitalist society to a more direct attack based on the class struggle.

With the art of miming, Charlie introduced to the cinema a very expressive technical method, taking into account that movies were still silent at that time. It is a very expressive way of miming that shows knowledge of human feelings. Chaplin inaugurated a way of miming infinitely superior to that of Max Linder and the others who pulled faces. Chaplin's miming is aimed at establishing relationships with the way of thinking of poor people. Goya expressed himself in exactly the same way in his time: by painting people from the lowest levels of society, poor people. Charlie shows poor people too, the dispossessed and, above all, the feelings of people without means.

It is for all these reasons that we recommend all our comrades to go and see Charlie's films with a view to improve their cultural ability – not their knowledge of the film world. Neither the cinema nor the theatre interests us as a form of entertainment. They only interest us when they express the class struggle and the progress of the revolution. They are the means by which humanity has always found a way of expressing itself, of representing its interest in the revolutionary progress of history. It is important to take into account the fact that Charlie's films were made at the time of the greatest boom of the capitalist system, when investments and the economy were in full development. The cinema was geared to the development and praise of capitalist relations. Charlie's films go against all that. He depicts aspects which are the result of the class struggle: poor

people, misery, hunger and the brutality of people caused by the brutality of the social contacts of those in command: scenes in 'The Policeman' show this well. He depicts a neighbourhood where everyone is in agreement. Charlie appears as a good fellow, fixing everything, but by that he shows that everything can be fixed by means of human relations. The capitalist system does not do that, nor does the capitalist cinema, nor the bourgeoisie.

That is why it is essential to consider this activity as a part of our cultural revolutionary improvement, with a view of understanding world history. We use all our means to try to educate our team in order to make it capable of acquiring a cultural revolutionary judgement. If not, the cinema and intellectual cultural and artistic preoccupations are linked with the capitalist system, which consequently influences our way of looking, judging and analysing. That is why some comrades were impressed by 'Little Big Man' and thought it was a good film, whereas it is not worth very much. These comrades go to the cinema with an impressionable way of thinking which reveals a limitation in their ability to organise, think and act in a revolutionary way.

That is why they are attracted by the cinema and see conclusions that don't exist. For them, it is still a means of replacing a sufficient form of development by impressionism, by making an adaptation which satisfies revolutionary feelings but which is not scientific. Thus, when they have to put it into action, the weakness of such an interpretation becomes apparent. That is why we stress emphatically the necessity to use all our activities, including visits to the museums, to the cinema, to the theatre or to sporting events, as a means of acquiring a revolutionary knowledge. It is evident that it is not the cinema that creates or can interpret the world, and neither can the museums, the art or literature. We go to the cinema with the design to improve our ability to see ourselves as a means of organising the ever-changing world. But this transformation has already taken place in us.

If Marx had not lived like a Communist and had not been convinced that Communism is possible, he would not have been able to write what he did. He wrote as he did because he lived Communism. His intellectual understanding was grounded in reality, which is why he was able to persuade and convince. He allowed intelligence and reason to guide his conduct and self-discipline, ready to take the steps necessary to the development of orderly revolutionary thinking.

The same goes for us. Our activities and experiences should not be wasted. One must try and get used to the world constantly changing. Some

comrades interpreted wrongly the film 'Little Big Man' in a way that showed a selfish point of view. This can happen without affecting one's political line for some time. Left uncorrected, however, this limitation will eventually affect the political reasoning. It will affect the relations between the comrades, and then it will affect all matters of revolutionary organisation, big and small.

To laugh is a good thing, a normal thing. But this amusement must not be an escape from reality. It must be a confirmation of reality. In the bourgeois class, mirth is too often an escape. For our part, we laugh to confirm our feelings and our tenderness. We laugh to express our joy on seeing people like Charlie do not lust after money but dedicate their lives to the creation of such cinema. They deserve the respect of humanity. Charlie is not a revolutionary and he is not a Lenin. There was a time when he did not understand, but he did later on. His art has been an impetus to revolution. His critique of capitalist society is an encouragement to revolution.

ALL CHARLIE'S FILMS ARE OPTIMISTIC

The last time that I saw some of these films, after a period of several years, I laughed as heartily as before, not in a condescending way, but good naturedly, the same as children do. By so doing we experience all the joy of seeing an act aimed at condemning backwardness, exploitation, human brutality and the lack of fraternity. And we laugh to see just how much human ability has the means of remaining optimistic in the face of such situations. All Charlie's films are optimistic. He tackles a thousand problems, but he is always able to come up with a solution, including for money problems as in 'The Policeman'. Money is only a technical means, and even when he doesn't find the means he does not let himself be beaten by it, he talks the matter over and looks for a way out. That is what emerges from Chaplin's films: that we should never let ourselves be beaten.

It is certain that the source of the confidence never to be beaten is Marxism. The cinema is rather remote from Marxism, but Charlie expresses this too in his work. He always finds ways of overcoming, always, and they work well! He doesn't make himself out to be the triumphant hero, but he finds a way of tackling all the circumstances he finds himself in. And then he appears as a good fellow, willing to listen to a good argument and be convinced by it, for example in the church scene in 'Easy Street'. He does not steal so that he can make a profit. That doesn't interest him. He steals out of necessity, but he let himself be persuaded, gives the money back and goes on his way singing. No capitalist cinema is able to show a thing like that.

Chaplin shows that people are good. That's his cinema: people are good, the regime is bad. That's the way it is in all his films: people are good. That is why he depicts a fat man in 'Easy Street' who is used to solving his problems by force and by coming to blows, but who lets himself to be persuaded to behave otherwise. Optimism is everywhere in Charlie's entire cinema, from the very first period to 'The Gold Rush'.

It is the influence of the development of the revolution which is expressed in the cinema. That is why he shows such completely different guys won over by persuasion because they were motivated by necessity, as in 'The Gold Rush'. In the latter, there are some fine scenes criticising the North American system, the brutality of the search for gold. It is not his best film. It is not totally consistent, but there are some severe criticisms of the search for gold. And who triumphs in the last instance? Truth, the good fellow. He's making fun when he shows the poor guy without gold whom capitalism sends to the devil but who is, on the contrary respected when he has some. He denounces capitalism which is based on gold.

We must take into account the fact that in 1925-26 Charlie was a contemporary of the period of capitalist splendour when it was developing. He never praises the capitalist system. He shows up all its faults instead. He shows that people are good and that capitalism is bad. People who have money are bad because of their greed for gold. But, put into other situations, these people can change. It is a condemnation of the relationships created by the capitalist regime, a condemnation of capitalist society.

Charlie's films must be seen in this light, with the aim of improving our cultural ability, our discipline, our role and ability as militants. Charlie's optimism is expressed by the fact that all his films end well. In 'The Immigrant' for example, he gets married at the end but doesn't make it out to be the case of a fellow who marries so he can go to bed with the woman as her lover. No, he marries because that is part of life. He shows that life is like that. The capitalist system does the opposite. Charlie is an optimist in harmony with the need for fraternal human relations, naively showing what people want.

REVOLUTIONARY HUMOUR

In the capitalist system humour is the product of capitalist relations. It is based on scorn, on mockery. Capitalist humour is made at the expense of

the human being, to bring him down, to despise him. It transfers its commercial relations into human relations.

Capitalist feelings are created by exploitation, material profit, as expressed by the economy. Capitalist humour is based on that, on jokes against the human being, on slander, misery and scorn. It is the humour of someone making fun of those who have nothing, and who can do nothing. The humour of the revolution, on the contrary, tends to explain the difficulties between the goal of human fraternity and the lack of means, the lack of ways to attain it.

The revolution creates optimism, creates a humour which explains all the contradictions and serves as an impetus, an example for humanity to overcome its difficulties, showing that every problem can be solved. Such must be the true sentiment of humour. In the capitalist system this sentiment is one of escape from reality, of paralysis, of conservatism.

Revolutionary humour states the existence of difficulties so that it can fight them, which makes progress advance so that it can envisage them without fear. It makes us see these difficulties as they are. These are the contradictions of humanity and even of revolutionaries, but it is possible to overcome them. Then humour serves as a stimulus for uniting human revolutionary feelings. It is a source of confidence that all problems can be resolved. That is why revolutionary humour has a constant centre, a reality which exists. Capitalist humour is determined by economic relations.

Chaplin's cinema, without reaching the level of revolutionary humour, has a humour which tends to show that people are good and that he who commands is bad. Such is the humour of Chaplin. Revolutionary humour is undoubtedly superior to that of Charlie. But he, like Beethoven, travelled along the way of the progress of humanity. At no point does his humour convey a sensation of catastrophe, brutality, of the destruction of human relations. He doesn't advocate selfishness, scorn, or individual accumulation. Instead he urges consideration of the human relations. To make people coexist with each other capitalism has had to invent a series of notions on tolerance. But, in actual fact, it scarcely tolerates the proletariat, which it kills and assassinates continuously.

The humour of the revolution is very tolerant, but within the margin of the problems upon which it needs to intervene. It is flexible, but it also needs to impose certain things. In this sense, Chaplin comes close to Lenin or us, but not entirely, however. Lenin was full of a kind of humour geared to resolving the pressing problems of the day. When Lenin could be seen

running in a funny way from room to room and the peasants asked: ‘Lenin, what do we do? Do we seize the land?’ he answered ‘No, not yet; we must take power first’. He perceived the fun, but as part of being within problems, not outside them. If humour is just a way of staying out of problems, one succumbs to difficulties. But Lenin dominated problems – included via humour – in order to be able to confront them.

Lenin created the will to progress and advance, and in all things applied a dialectical conception, not a theological one. His sense of fun was grounded on the knowledge that progress cannot be contained. He knew, therefore, how to organise even when he had to bide his time, but always organising in order to line up with the elements that determine the progress of history.

Chaplin’s humour approaches ours, particularly that of the first period. Later there were changes. But these had not yet taken place at the time of making ‘Modern Times’ where he directly presents the class struggle. Chaplin’s cinema was overtaken by the progress of society. Today, there is a whole system of Workers States. The Soviets have made no films which follow those of Chaplin. Why is it that the Workers States don’t further the humour put across by Chaplin in this era? Mostly because the bureaucracy is incapable of putting across humour and optimism. Among those who go to see Charlie’s films today there is, underneath the surface, a scorn for the capitalist system – even if this is not at a conscious level. It must be seen that we live at a time when all the Workers States advance, when the revolution advances in a thousand different ways, including that of Pakistan where a war between two capitalist countries was transformed into a revolutionary one. The principles of the Communist International are currently applied with the help of the Soviet Union.

Although it has at its disposal tremendous means for making the most costly films imaginable, capitalism has not been capable of presenting any film of value. It has nothing. That is why Charlie’s films are being put back into circulation. Capitalism thus reveals itself to be incapable of producing films that interest and attract the crowds. The Workers States don’t do that either. Charlie’s films are shown as a substitute for that, for it is obvious that they don’t belong to our times. We go to see them, guided by a cultural revolutionary feeling. The crowds flock to see them not merely to be entertained but out of scorn for the capitalist system. There is also a sector of the bourgeoisie which goes there seeking a refuge, to close their eyes to reality, by considering these films out of touch with reality, in order to justify themselves. But generally speaking his public is not bourgeois; it is

rather composed of petty bourgeois, both poor and well off, and particularly of young people.

We must consider the need to go and see such films because these are the best so far. If this were not so, we would be seeing and discussing the better films. There should be films today on the theme of how one makes a Workers State grow for instance. The bureaucracy of the Workers States doesn't make such films. It is not interested and not capable of it.

Soviet cinema tried to do this in the beginning, and it had an impact in history. However, although Lenin's works are read all over the world, the early Russian films are left in archives. The bureaucracy does not see the need of them.

Lenin advocated the use of Cinema in education. We must expect new periods to come, times when what Lenin advocated for the cinema will be put into practice. This is the sort of cinema that must be created. It is only that, for this to happen, the Party is required, and a revolutionary leadership is wanted that does not yet exist today.

J. POSADAS

12th December 1971

THE NEED FOR A REVOLUTIONARY ROLE OF THE CINEMA IN THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES, IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORKERS STATES AND SOCIALISM

21.12.71 - J. POSADAS

There is only one way to make films today because life is a complete unity, and whatever transformations take place life remains a complete unity. Why does the film have to be something apart? Life is regulated by the relations within society, society with economy, and the economy with nature. So all the subjects they use in films must be related to the central concerns of humanity. If previously there was no unity between the economy, society, the family, and all other aspects of life – including the cinema – it is because the bourgeoisie and class society have tried, and always try to separate each aspect and each activity, but we have to unite them. The cinema has to respond to necessity, to build the world. If the cinema does not serve to build the world, what use is it? It is an entertainment aimed at deceiving people. It gives neither culture nor knowledge, and it is of no use for anything. So the cinema that speaks directly of the working class has to show the capacity of the working class to act. There are 14 Working States and 16 Revolutionary States; half the world is outside the capitalist system and the other half is coming out. It is vital to show this.

The influence that dominates the world no longer comes from capitalist relations, science and technology or from private social relations. The influence comes from forces which anticipate the new world. If artists are not capable of seeing this, what are they? Half the world is already like this. It is no longer a question of the ancient society; we are talking about the new world. The new society is already in the minds of the people. Socialism has not been constructed, but there are the Workers States (Socialist countries) and already the possibility of Socialism can be seen. It is already in people's minds. Ordinary people who are not obsessed by economic interest – and even rich people – say: 'Things can't continue this way'. They feel that this is a relation remote from the feelings that have already created the possibility for the human being to feel the master of everything. 'There is the Soviet spacecraft on the moon, and down here we are still fighting. I am well fed, but he is dying of hunger.' All this wretched capitalism, making it feel weak and big capital, the bourgeoisie as a class, shuts its ears, and puts itself at a distance from every feeling of life. This is what is crucial to show on the screen.

It is essential to show to other people, to the proletariat, to the petty bourgeoisie, and to the peasantry, that sectors of the well-off petty bourgeoisie are won. Who wins them? The bourgeoisie does not win them, the proletariat wins them. To what? To culture? The proletariat has no culture. What it possesses is a superior social relation and a superior economic regime. It has social relations that are superior to culture and show the superiority of human fraternity. The cinema has to reflect all this; otherwise it is of no use. In this sense it must be a continuation of Chaplin because Chaplin's objective was to mock those who give orders, who were all idiots, while the poor remain the good people. They appear naïve and foolish but he shows they are good and the rich are unpleasant.

Today, theatre and cinema artists go to the factories. When these artists do this, it is to put themselves in contact with the world, not with social interests. They go to put themselves in contact with the world. They go to the factory because they see a more fraternal social and human relationship. They do not just see the interest of the working class; they do not make a cull of the working class. They go to associate themselves with a superior relationship which they do not find in the bourgeoisie. This is also a criticism of the Communist parties, because they do not find in the Communist parties the relations that they see in the factories. In the factory they see objectivity and collectivity. In the Communist party they see hierarchy. They see the rooms where the leaders meet, with somebody else serving cups of tea. All this has to be shown in the cinema.

Today, one has to make a cinema that relates to actuality. In general, artists and intellectuals make works – in cinema or in other art forms - about past events. They tend to be the interpreters of distant events that they echo. As these artists do not live a political life they do not feel the task is to transform society; they tend to be commentators of society. They put a certain contemporary flavour into old things. This is very much the case in films or theatre works like 'Salt of the Earth', 'Sacco and Venzetti', and 'Area without Sun'. And this means that the interpretation made by the artists is not an instrument to act here and now. It is different with the revolutionary intellectuals – the artists who are the bearers of Party interests. But for the majority of the others who aren't revolutionary leaders, who do not use Marxism – they do not feel capable of using history to transform what exists now. They are commentators of past events, which may have a certain importance. There is no doubt that this is useful in one way or another. In the unequal and combined process, the combined aspect advances as part of the revolutionary struggle. But many films have little value.

Some films even positively deceive with regard to the world situation, and give support to the trade unionists, to the people who do not want to use the trade union movement to take power. It is all on the plane of pity and human solidarity. They combine the two things: human solidarity with trade union solidarity, the trade union fight with trade union rights. But all this has already been conquered! Why don't they make a film where it is possible to see the forty million in America who went on strike for Vietnam on 'Moratorium Day'? Why don't they do this? The North American masses fight for Vietnam today. Why don't they show the massacre of the Negroes which is going on now? Luther King and all the others they have killed? Why don't they do this? They have not felt attracted to it because this already has a concrete political significance, it is specific, and so they must take a position on it. They are afraid to do this. Only a militant of the Party accepts this and does so as a function of being a militant.

The cinema must be an exposition of what is happening today and serve life usefully, immediately. It has to be a continuation of life. Literature, on the contrary, belongs to the past. Almost all works of literature are of the past. This is why literary works have not lasted very well. They comment on the past, and do not organise the present or the future. The cinema has to serve this. This is the beginning of a cinema able to have its own public and its own finance. It is important to form this. There is some difficulty with regard to its own financing, but it is a difficulty crucial to discuss with the Communist parties. It must have its own local cinemas to distribute the films, because the bourgeoisie is going to sabotage it. But, having the means, it is possible to secure local cinemas even though they may not be very good ones; any locality that can be rented or bought and used to make films will attract people. Propaganda should be part of the objective of the film. People go to make a political contribution through political interest.

Today the politicisation of the public makes it ready to accept, support and stimulate the production of films that have the aim of organisation, of political activity. Political activity does not mean saying 'Vote for the Communist Party' but presenting reality, showing the necessity to fight, struggle, and elevate Communist relations in the communist sense. Although there may not be the material conditions for communist distribution, there are the conditions for Communist relations. For example, to show solidarity, films expressing the problems of the community – not of the couple – of the family, of the worker or engineer. Individual problems can be touched on, but as part of the collective interest. Show how people unite, have the interest in centralising themselves to impel society – in the Workers states and in the capitalist countries. Show that everything that unifies the masses is significant and gives an impulse

to progress. These are the films that are necessary to make! With good propaganda to awaken interest so that people see that it is not a question of party political propaganda, or propaganda to attract the public commercially. Doing this will pay for the films ten times over and, moreover, it will have a great educational effect.

It is needed to define the function of the cinema today. The cinema has to express the will of the masses and the way they are building life. There is nothing about this in the world today. Even with the defeats the masses suffer no stabilisation or progress for the capitalist regime; they are merely partial victories in a chain of events which do not allow the capitalist regime to stabilise itself. By the side of the victory they had in Spain, the victory they have just had in Sudan and the other one in Bolivia, capitalism devalues the dollar. How are they to sustain their victories? How are they to finance them with nothing? On the other hand, they create conditions which immediately stimulate the development of the struggle.

The cinema that exists today is not cinema; it is the reproduction of false images. The cinema must acquire a centralisation. This is the reason for the cinema! The cinema must be the centralisation of facts by means of images and speech. Otherwise it is just a photograph. The cinema has to transcend the photograph. It has to achieve conviction, a reproduction of reality that allows the increase in the capacity to reason; otherwise it is of no use. How does it increase the capacity to reason when in Spain, in the film 'To die in Madrid', we see a worker who comes from work crushed, showing defeat? Was it like this in the rest of the world? Besides, this film was made in 1964. Perhaps it was so in 1939, but thirty years after the war when there are 14 Workers states in the world, this is absurd! Whoever made this film does not see reality; such cinema does not express what is happening but expresses a decadent and egoistic sentiment of the individual who sees the world through himself. On the contrary, it is vital to show Marxism to the world.

There are millions of people ready to see revolutionary films. At the very least, there are 500 million people ready to see revolutionary films, beginning with the United States where they have boycotted all revolutionary films, excluding them from the main cinemas – so they use rooms only holding three to five hundred people. And they have an immense success there.

It is not a problem of the cost of production and of takings. These films will pay for themselves because there is a public and there is a need for it. The cinema must impel human relations. The cinema has the advantage,

compared to painting for example, of being able to explain while the painting cannot. In part, music can explain and also reason by means of sound. Music can reason, the painting cannot. The cinema can reason too because it binds the reasoning of the world with image, impression and example. Such a lot can be done on the themes of culture, science, physics and the revolutionary struggle! Not emphasising revolutionary heroism but showing that the world already lives the necessity of Communism, of relations that are determined by the logical judgement, the dialectical judgement of the people. The cinema can make infinity of things like this.

There is a world process of reasoning. It is the mind and reason which dominate history. This has always existed, but then there was the petty bourgeois reaction, transmitting its own lack of trust and rejection of the proletariat. The feeling of solitude, sadness, anguish and distance – all of which is because they do not have human communication – because they see from the point of view of individual relations, they feel themselves isolated by problems of their mothers, sons, money. Humanity still lives the stupidity of having to depend on money as a human relationship! In the future, it is not going to be like this.

It is essential to discuss 1905, the Russian Revolution, and the other revolutions, to show the life of the masses which leads to the revolutions; not seeing them in the restricted forms of ‘leaders’ and teams without showing the Party. No! It is crucial to show the Party in contact with the masses. A film on the Bolshevik Party would be great. This would be a film! Or to show the genius of Lenin who knew how to unite the Party, to organise the Party, who placed himself in contact, identified himself with the masses, and felt the masses – and they transmitted into the Party their state of spirit, and their feelings, and the Party transferred to the masses their capacity, orientation and worth.

It is important to criticise the Workers States. The Soviet Union does not have one objective film. The majority of the films they make in the Soviet Union are all still about individual problems, of the couple, the home, and of people’s difficulties. There is nothing on the construction of socialism, or on superior social relations. They do not show what is happening in the world, or the need for opinions. The Soviet masses want to give opinions on what is happening in the Soviet Union. They are not concerned with themselves but with advancing Soviet life.

There is not one film on this; they are all far from this. All! Including the one of the three men in a dinghy, where they criticise bureaucracy. They

criticise a bureaucratic action but not the bureaucracy as a regime, and even so it is in the middle of a river.

Life in the Soviet Union is the concern of the Soviet masses who are thinking how to help the North American masses, the masses of the Middle East, and they ask why capitalism still exists, why there is still injustice. Why are there still massacres in Pakistan and Indonesia? Why? How can capitalism still exist in the world when we have 14 Workers States and 16 Revolutionary States? Why? The Soviet masses reason in this way. Why doesn't the cinema take account of this reasoning? The cinema still exists in the petty bourgeois ambience, explaining the problems of the individual, of love, the city, of the trouble between them. These are the films of the Soviet Union. There is not a single scientific film which serves the development of the revolution. For example, why don't they make a film on the Soviet cosmonauts, of the socialist sentiment which impelled them to show such heroism in their attitude when they said: 'If we die for the well being of humanity, we are happy'. There is a film. Why don't they make this? If they made a film in this way, they would stimulate criticism, objective Socialist reasoning, and then the bureaucracy is shown to be neither socialist nor objective. So, they hide and don't make films in this way.

In the cinema it is important to show the life of the people, life as it is, to show how people live and elaborate the capacity, the reaction, the thought, the will, the support and stimulus to progress. Instead, the cinema concerns itself with seeing life in the unimportant aspects of personalities, because it is directed at a public that pays for it. And they think that all the people judge things like the one that pays for them. It is not so. People do not have money but they understand. What they do not understand, what they do not dominate, what they do not know, they are going to know tomorrow. People are guided now by the decision and the capacity to intervene. And scientific discovery draws closer to Communism because it draws closer to the capacity of avoiding dependence on the forces of nature and the economy, and to depend instead on the capacity to take hold of 'intelligence and reason' and to see that, with this, they can achieve anything. This impels and increases the capacity for Communist concentration, for persuasion to build Communism, to convince the people and to disintegrate the forces of capitalism. The scenarios of cinema directors are still guided by public opinion. Then the reasoning and objectives are a function of this opinion, and they do not see the force of the revolution. For example, in Israel, in a full campaign of chauvinism and assassinations, there are constant increases in the number of strikes. And there is a whole reactionary response to the strikes from the government.

When, in Israel, with the chauvinism of the Israeli fatherland (Public Opinion!), with such a great military pressure and, above all, with the apparatus led by those so-called Socialists who try to oppress and terrorise to prevent strikes; nevertheless, the strikes spread everywhere, in all forms and in all spheres of production. This shows how the world pressure of the revolutionary struggle reaches the Israeli masses. It is important to show this, or to show how Korea came out of the Second World War as the most backward country in the world. They took power – there was a Communist Party of sufficient tradition of struggle under the influence of China and the Soviet Union, but above all, China. And the Koreans have developed one of the most capable industries of the world. In some aspects it is comparable to the best and most elevated industries. In agrarian production they make tractors that perform all the combined operations at the same time. They call them ‘combined’, as they carry out eight or ten operations very quickly. And they came out of nothing! Nothing! Because they were Communists!

It is indispensable to speak of all this, and the cinema too. And to show that the writers of the cinema, have to see humanity through these experiences. The cinema writers are accustomed to seeing life through the ruling layers of society, the layers which have power or which are decisive intellectually. Their propaganda is based on all this and is directed at the small circle that ‘creates taste’, as they say. These people need to convince, so they use the cinema to create a current. On the other hand, the immense majority of the people are not interested in this.

There is a public that wants to know, which is hungry for culture. What capitalism gives it is not culture. What characterises the life of humanity now is: human solidarity, concern for everything that makes humanity progress, its objectivity, the necessary support to the people, the struggle for progressive ideas, for human welfare, for brotherhood and truth. Well, the cinema must show this. But, instead, they continue to show the problem of the couple or the ‘misunderstood’ director! Why don’t they show a meeting in the Soviet Union where there is a discussion of the problems of the economy and where they show the director is of no use? And why don’t they show discussions about the Middle East, China, and all the problems in the world which are being discussed? Does the worker talk about all this or not? These are all living concerns. Workers observe and they discuss. This is normal, real life. Films do not portray this life. They invent another one. They still deal with the petty bourgeoisie which lives for themselves. They pose the problems of one person and they load the films with these problems. It is false! The same is true of the soviet cinema.

These are not the problems with which the Soviet Union lives. They are the problems of small circles. This is how capitalism makes culture and science in agreement with what it wants. It is a circle. If the circle is bypassed, it is because science has a strength which stands above capitalism's attempts to contain it. And it is the human being that feels attracted by the truth and sees the limits of all this.

There are millions and millions who push forward for progress. It was not like this before. Before, they felt that it was capitalism, the apparatus, which was commanding. Now, they see that capitalism cannot even order the shit around, and men who have nothing determine life. They see the truth before their eyes. They had it in front of them before, but they did not see it because the strength of humanity that allows them to see did not exist.

These are the themes of the cinema. In so far as the proletarian vanguard, the intellectual petty bourgeoisie, feels this, it is going to become the most important propaganda. Why do people despise the films that were made before of hotels, eating places, luxury houses, full of ostentatiously well-dressed people? 50% of old films were showing luxury. It disappeared because people have already sent all this to hell. Half the people who go to see films are penniless. Humanity seeks an explanation for life. The cinema must have the motive of cultural education – not of entertainment, deceit, perversion and sensuality. It is important to open a discussion and to show what the essential problems of the cinema are, what the problems of life are.

Any intelligent person can see that Communism is necessary, and any intelligent person looks at the discoveries the Soviets have made in science and says: 'It is stupid that people die of hunger'. This is logical. It is the logic of the head, and now the head is controlled by logic because nature no longer dominates or oppresses us. We dominate nature. The mystery of life is over! People discuss this way, they reject what is absurd, and reason.

It is important to feel that this stage of 'intelligence and reason' comes about because humanity feels secure to deal with all problems – not as the human species but via layers that represent it and transmit confidence to the rest. The proof of this lies in the Church; the greater part of the devout is using the church as an anti-capitalist tool. They are using it so. They do not feel they are denying their religion, but they feel that what they wanted can be obtained in another way. And to those who are looking for tranquillity, peace and peaceful loving human relations, the priest now says: 'I am going to the factory because we are on strike today. We will have mass at six, because at seven there will be the strike'. So, they mix

the mass with the strike without heresy. Now it is not heresy, it is not against God; on the contrary, it is helping God to see straight. It is crucial to show all this in films. It is important to deal with themes of today in the cinemas. Why doesn't the cinema take the themes of today? Because it has a fear of the authority, of the dominant public. We have our own public! We do not have established authority but we are establishing it. When they do not make the films of today, it is because they are afraid of established opinion. But what establishes it? It's the daily press, the bourgeois critics, those who have the theatres and media. All these people who previously dominated the public, today no longer dominate anything.

'The Comrades' is a film which has been discussed throughout the world; capitalism sabotaged it quite a lot. I read the commentary of the bourgeois critics who said it was crap and I said to the comrades: 'Go and see it; this film can't be bad'. In reality, it is a very good film. The one who made it is someone who loves the working class; he has a great affection for the masses of the world but he does not succeed in choosing contemporary themes. But the film was a great success throughout the world. They showed it in Brazil where they applauded madly with enthusiasm. It was completely sold out for months and months. They tried to sabotage it but were not able to. They did the same with this film as they did in the United States with the film in defence of the Black people 'Black Blood'. They sabotaged that too. It was a team of cinema people who the complete film, very limitedly but very good and very well made. It was a brutal blow against Yankee imperialism, and they were denied the use of rooms or cinemas. The same happened in Brazil with 'The comrades'. They used to project it, and for months they showed it in the little coffee houses in the workers' areas. Afterwards they began to find rooms, and finally it was shown in the biggest cinemas, because capitalism saw it was a market success: the cinemas were full. This was ten years ago. Today is infinitely more favourable for us. The public are avid for culture, they are avid to see revolutionary cinema.

INTELLIGENCE MUST MEAN THE USE OF KNOWLEDGE FOR THE CONTINUATION OF EXISTENCE

If there is a determined and audacious team, they can find the current among the intellectual vanguard which sees that it is possible to lean on the proletariat to make decisions or to go further. This is the problem. Let's take the example of painting, literature and the masses. In the past, in literature and painting, they wrote and painted through commission; they all believed that intelligence was constituted from above. The one that gave the orders was the one with intelligence. They did not see that intelligence

was established, not born or determined or bought by the one giving the orders. It is established and develops with human relations. They wrote and painted in accordance with those giving the orders. When the masses began to intervene, all these people felt attracted by them, and the masses influence, attract and win them to our side. So capitalism today does not have one writer or painter, not a single one of any value. Any honest intellectual who does anything of value is immediately won and passes to the workers' camp, the camp of the revolution, immediately! He is won to this because here lay the truth, justice and reason. And this wins him over. These are the favourable, unequalled conditions in which to make these films today.

All those who are against the revolution are not intelligent. They may be scientific technicians, like the Yankees, but they are not intelligent. Intelligence can be measured by the use of reason, how it is applied and with what perspective it has in relation to the human being. This is the measure of intelligence. The rest is not intelligence. The rest is the use of knowledge. Intelligence is a centralisation of knowledge objectively used for the continuation of existence. This is how intelligence is measured. There is a quantity of people who love and are won to Marxism. This is the basis for the cinema which is indispensable to make.

Communism triumphs because it arises from the objective necessity of the process of history; it arises from the economy and the structure this has reached. It is the rebellion of the economic forces, of technique, science, against capitalism and also against the bureaucracy. But, at the same time, it arises because there is the working class. And this is capable of persuading and winning sectors that are not from the working class – the poor, middle and even top layers of the petty bourgeoisie. It is capable of winning intellectuals and a layer of the bourgeoisie, although it does not win them socially as active militants. It wins them intellectually and annuls and deprives the enemy of their support. It deprives them of teachers, intellectuals, writers, scientists who come from the bourgeois camp, soldiers, part of the Church, and also bourgeois who have factories and live in an antagonistic contradiction between the factory for profit and the development of Communism. It is a personal antagonistic contradiction, not objective. Objectively there is no contradiction. The bourgeois class is bourgeois, but individuals of the bourgeoisie can be won over.

Humanity led by Communism – although still not by the communist idea based on Marxism – goes toward a synthesis. The basis of the synthesis is to obtain from nature and society – for now it is society, afterwards nature – all the concentration of forces to release the highest power with the

minimum effort, the most extensive utilisation with the least mobilisation. For this it is crucial to organise life. And real life is between human beings. Humanity goes to this. There is already a discovery of increasingly concentrated energy that allows much greater impulsion with less force of nature. Society goes toward this. It is not an imitation of nature. It is a coincidence with nature. From there arises the dialectic, the proof of the functioning of nature. The cinema must also be a synthesis transmitting all this. If we want to transform the world it is essential to have ideas to transform the understanding of life to be able to do it. The more solid the theoretical and militant preparation of the poet, the intellectual, the art professional, and the film producer is, the more extensive the capacity to imagine life. Because then they live it, they see it. They see inside the existence, and this is very simple. They see the human behaviour and the human relations of this current epoch, they see the need for Communism and the force that goes to Communism, and they see that it is vital to overthrow the capitalist power. It is on this basis that it is necessary to make cinema productions.

Although the work and elaboration of the director are important, the essential ingredient is the theme that reaches a collective conclusion. What does it fear to do? What does the film propose? There is a level of revolutionary cultural understanding already reached by humanity. The Party has the cultural level which can raise directly all the people and unite them. The cinema can do wonderful things with this, showing the heroism of simple people. Simplicity is what has built the world and what has, in the final instance, stimulated and animated the scientists to keep on studying science, investigating endlessly the unknown on the basis of what is already known.

Among the themes it is important to bring in the children and the old people, to involve the people that capitalism never involves. It is important to make films in which one can see the intervention of children, of women over sixty and of human beings of sixty or eighty who intervene in the struggles. All the commercial propaganda that capitalism makes concerns a man and a woman. It is basically all sensuality, the sexual act, the private interest of the family or of the husband and wife. Why not use children as a theme of propaganda? Why not human solidarity? Is it because the public won't accept it? But the 'public' we are aiming at must be the workers. Films must be made for the workers first and foremost and not just for the petty bourgeoisie.

The proletariat lives differently, it lives in solidarity with the children, with the masses in Vietnam, Pakistan, the Middle East, Ireland. This is what is

important to highlight! To explain the present! And to have the scientific and technical capacity to take the past to explain the present: the two things at once. It is an effort for the cinema because it does not have revolutionary imagination. There are still actors with period costumes to give a sense of a previous epoch. This is already very backward. It isn't bad but it is no longer much use. People already have a conception of life in which they can see the past with the clothes of today. On the other hand, they make films or plays with guerrillas wearing impeccable suits, straight from the cleaners. The Chinese do this a great deal. The Chinese make a ballet where the guerrilla leaps in from the jungle and his clothes are spotless! All this is no longer of any use! It is essential to change the entire conception from top to bottom and make a new cinema, a revolutionary cinema!

THE REVOLUTIONARY FUNCTION OF CINEMA IN THE WORKERS STATES AND IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM

It is very important to make films that deal with the history of the struggle of the proletariat, whether it is the trade union struggles, the great strikes or the revolutionary movements. And to present them as they have been – if they were mistaken or defeated or if they are lost, then to show this. But this must be accompanied by the scenes of today, where one can show that there are errors, limitations still from a lack of organisation, experience, capacity, organisational capacity of the proletariat and lack of means. It is not through lack of decision. The proletariat is very heterogeneous, but is united through its intervention, action, analysis experience. 'The Strike' was a failure because the working class did not have the organic strength; it was weak and lacked experience. But the Russian Revolution triumphed and showed that the proletariat triumphs. This is part of its experience. This is part of culture, and so in showing this film, it was compulsory to continue it with another one.

It was essential to show that Marxism triumphed there through its historic tradition, although the proletariat did not have the means. It was not through the power of the capitalist system but the organisational weakness of the proletariat. It is important to show the other aspects. This has to be the cinema of the Workers States and when historic films are made retrospectively, it is necessary to include the facts of today. Why show the defeats of the proletariat? Why? It is not necessary in order to win the petty bourgeoisie, because it is already won to the revolution. It is essential to educate them and to show the conquests of the proletariat. If it is convenient for cultural objectives to show such historic facts like 'The strike', then it should be immediately accompanied with a better film that

shows the superiority of the proletariat, its brotherly character and nature, which have no feelings of revenge. It is not despotic. It seeks to eliminate every oppression and poverty. It is vital to use this in the cinema. The bureaucracy cannot make this type of cinema because it does not behave in this way. Hence there are no such films to indicate such a superior form, conduct and behaviour of the proletariat.

Capitalism's historic objective is private property. The interest of property and the development of exploitation, expressed and materialised in trade and, through trade, the hiring of the proletariat, hiring and buying labour power, develops a whole sentiment of property, egoism and conservatism. Within the regime of private property, one cannot have feelings of affection. Those feelings are foreign to people living under private property. The capitalists say 'business is business', which is to say, profit at the expense of the others. Then one cannot create sentiments of human affection, love and human fraternity. In the contrary, it creates bellicose, aggressive, antagonistic and competitive feelings. On the other hand, the proletariat creates a feeling of fraternity, it seeks to win and elevate socially, to increase consciousness and human affection and to demonstrate that, even in the worst circumstances in which there is not enough to eat and live, its behaviour continues to be the same. The behaviour of the children of Dacca, of Korea and the Middle East, is not determined by a regime of better food but by a regime of superior human understanding, which is given to them now by the organisation of the workers States. It is vital to make the Workers States weigh in the education of humanity to develop the superior capacity of the proletariat.

The bureaucracy cannot make films of this nature because there is neither trade union democracy nor Socialist democracy. In a few more years, if the atomic war has not broken out, it will be able to do it because there will have been changes. Already, with the progress there is in Poland and Czechoslovakia, soon in Bulgaria and Rumania and even in the Soviet Union, there are going to be films of this nature. They have not made films against the bureaucracy in Cuba but against a bureaucrat like 'The Death of a Bureaucrat'. It is against a bureaucratic functionary, but not against the bureaucracy as a political power, which is what must be combated. The bureaucratic functionary exists in the capitalist system. What one has to combat is the bureaucracy as a political power, as the sector that is determinant politically. It is essential to eliminate this. They do not eliminate it because then the power of the bureaucracy is finished.

The cinema in the Workers States has to create social consciousness in the most elevated way, in the use of the scientific capacity of the instruments

of society, it must generate revolutionary organisation, it must show how to transmit revolutionary ideas and show the example of superior organisation. There is no dispute for food, for wages, for human well-being; but now in the Workers State there has to be the resolution, solidarity, to achieve the best for all. This has to express itself in consistent social conduct. Conduct is determined by the social consciousness; this is what regulates conduct. In capitalism it is 'every man for himself'. This is capitalism. But everyone must help each other and together struggle to eliminate every system of oppression. Why does this not exist in the Workers States? It is vital not only to educate people but to show it in action. For example, why not make films showing the masses of the Middle East, of Pakistan and Vietnam? Why not make films in which the masses of the Workers States demonstrate their solidarity and fraternity? Why not make a film, for example, which shows the life of the workers in Soviet factories, what they discuss and live through and what they concern themselves with, and so communicate their cultural concern to the rest of the world! From the masses of Pakistan to the planet Mars! Why not unite all aspects of scientific knowledge to the practical utility of revolutionary action?

These are the problems which are being lived today, and they put it in perspective problems of the couple, of marriage and the family. Certainly all these problems exist but they do not determine life. What determines life is the collective thought impelling humanity's progress. This has to be present in any film, because it is the guide, sentiment of the population of the Workers States. Within the Workers States the class struggle has diminished because the essential aspect of the class struggle has disappeared: power has been taken. It is not like the Chinese idiotically say, 'when power has been taken, the class struggle intensifies'. What imbecility! What is the most elevated, the most acute form of the class struggle? The struggle for power. Power having been taken, the class struggle diminishes. It is no longer a problem of taking power but of developing power. Methods change, forms change, the cost changes and the social consequences change. How can one say that the struggle becomes more acute? The bureaucracy says so because it feels in danger, so it says that the struggle is intensifying.

In the cinema in the Workers State, apart from 'The Strike', one must pose other themes of much greater importance: how to take power and how Socialism is constructed. There is no longer any reason to make Eisenstein's 'The Strike'. Why? What does it want to teach? Culturally, the proletariat knows how to strike, how to triumph, how to win. In what time are we living? Why do they show this film now? If one shows this film one

must add to it films of the Russian Revolution. In the Workers States today the cinema is not an instrument of Marxist culture. It is an instrument to entertain. The principle effect of the cinema in the Workers States should be to teach, dominate, develop the social struggles, to understand the world process of the revolution, the importance of Socialist democracy, the importance of demonstrations and meetings, of discussions, and the importance of the masses' involvement in the problems of the economy. Humanity is still going through the problems of the economy, and the problems of the class struggle against the world capitalist system. Certainly, in the workers states the intensity of the class struggle has diminished because the capitalist system has been eliminated, but the struggle is not eliminated, it does not disappear. For instance, in Yugoslavia, it is very acute. But, even so, it is less than before because, in the immense majority of cases, power is in the hands of nationalised property. But there is not only Yugoslavia, there is also Poland, Czechoslovakia and the USSR where private property is limited or exists only on a scale which does not affect the monolithic structure of the Workers State. There also the struggle has diminished but not disappeared.

So, based on this, one must show how the proletariat will act to educate the rest of humanity, since its concern is to eliminate the capitalist system and to use the superiority of the proletariat directly against the capitalist system. What do the soviet masses discuss? How is the new society built? Everyone should pose, discuss and analyse problems. It is crucial to make the entire population lead, to show the flexibility of knowledge, and to make a more elevated Socialist life. There is no lack of buildings to teach in, in the Soviet Union, but the teaching building is not as indispensable as the teacher. In the workers States it is still rather like elsewhere: there is a whole hierarchy of power, from classrooms to teachers. The Workers State must eliminate all this.

If there aren't any such films in the Workers States it is because there isn't yet that sort of proletarian power. The proletariat hasn't got really the reigns of power yet. It has not been able to impose such things. The cinema of the Workers State has to be an instrument for Revolutionary Culture, and it is going towards this. Such cinema must serve for broadcasting knowledge, from the simplest things – like how to eat and sleep – to such topics as fraternal behaviour, ability to solve problems collectively, and how to replace the organisms of power by collective life. This can already be done. This can't go as far as the elimination of the army or of atomic weapons in the Workers States because defence is still necessary against imperialism. People are not obsessed by war in the Workers States, but they are quite aware that war will have to be fought. They see that there is

no remedy to this because capitalism is still in existence and is going to launch the war. But, meanwhile, collective life in the Workers States generates a sort of human joy which has to be portrayed in Cinema.

There is no reason to dwell solely on tragedies in the Cinema. In the face of events such as the murder of three million people by Mujibur Rahman in Pakistan, what is the importance of one couple, the wife who deserts, or the shopkeeper who becomes bankrupt? When the capitalist is told 'But haven't you seen what happens in Pakistan?' he can only reply 'Ah, what will come of me? My business...' But his life is not the only life; it has to be considered as part of so many millions of lives. Then the collective ability of humanity teaches how to reason. This must be what the cinema shows in the Workers States. Cinema in the Workers States must highlight the Socialist mode of reasoning, the elevation of sentiments, the capacity for observation, for analyses, and the ability to resolve, in a collective manner, all the problems. The Workers States do not do this yet, because there isn't yet the objectivity required for this in the Communist leadership. It is not wrong to talk about the problems that they do raise, but they must place the emphasis on what expresses the superiority of social organisation, of the organisms of the masses, and the social relation with the masses. Cinema must be at the service of the masses, and this means to incorporate the petty bourgeoisie and educate it. This is what the Workers State must respond to.

In the capitalist cinema life is private, scenes of life are private, and the motives of the scenes are also private. But why? Because life in private property is like that. But it isn't so in the Workers States where everything is collective, and collective life is paramount. Children and old people are no longer the residue of society or burdens. They form part of an existence in which they are incorporated. But in its turn, this demands a political regime superior to bureaucracy. Cinema must refer to this also; it can be done.

Theatre – to speak of theatre for a moment – is in the process of advancing regarding the themes it tackles. The class struggle is increasingly shown in the theatre. It was very apt to bring out the works of Ibsen, for example. But one must make a theatre for today, a theatre which poses the questions of how to govern society, how to lead, how to suppress the organisms of repression, how to involve all the people so that they can lead collectively and learn to elevate the collective sentiment. The cinema is the means which capitalism has used to exalt the sentiment of private property, to fortify the individual nucleus of the couple, and the individual resolution of problems. But there are no individual problems; there are individual

necessities where one has more and another has less. The problem is how to construct the world. Individual necessities are then submitted to this central problem of how to build Soviet society. Then the cinema is an instrument of culture of a very great importance.

It is essential to show the function of the Communist Party and the trade unions in the Workers States and in the capitalist countries and, also, that they are elements of revolutionary organisation and culture. Organisation means to organise the masses, and culture means to increase the concern, to develop the trade unions and the Party, to prepare to take power, and in the Workers States to be an essential element of organisation of meetings, demonstrations and assemblies, to organise constant meetings, to elevate the sentiment of coordination, affection and fraternity expressed, for instance, in football. To play two teams and not stimulate one against the other, to eliminate competition, to play for the beauty of the sport, to stimulate people to play well and score goals. To play in a beautiful way because otherwise sport is a dispute that continues the dispute of the capitalist system in sport. It is crucial to eliminate dispute, to play for health, for the desire and joy of beautiful combination of movement, and for the development of exercise combined with movement and thought. At the same time, the social concentration of desiring that the others play well because it is good that way using the forces that are the best. In sport, using effort to the best advantage. Why not do this in the Workers State? This requires a revolutionary leadership and the revolutionary function of the Communist parties. For this one has to return to Marxism, and elsewhere to use Marxism for the first time. It is essential to organise all the knowledge of the history of the Revolution with Marxism. Let the workers States take, as an essential motive, the history of the Russian Revolution, the history of Marxism and the history of the Internationals. This is fundamental. To have a comprehension of how the struggle of the masses develops to reach the Workers States. Why don't they do this? All this has to be done. There isn't a decent film on the Russian Revolution. It is important to make films on Vietnam, the Middle East and the Workers States. There are films on the war, but with war themes. They are all made with the criteria of the petty bourgeoisie – to win and satisfy the petty bourgeois public.

In this stage, the petty bourgeoisie is the essential clientele of culture, and are won by the Revolution. There is not a single Christian Democratic Party that remains immune to the progress of the revolution. All are overwhelmed and broken. The petty bourgeoisie are won to the revolution. The bourgeois parties disintegrate; they are destroyed, which is to say that there is a public ready for these films. And if this public is not ready, the

proletariat is. If the proletariat no longer goes to the cinema, it is not because it is too expensive. This is only one factor. They do not go because they do not see there what they need. If they could see cinema as contributing to existence and revolutionary culture, they would go every day. If the film contributes to thinking and revolutionary action, it serves to educate and impart understanding. One has to change the way the human beings are made to think.

This is the objective of Socialism. It is not a question of banging people on the head and putting Marxism in there but, through experience and life to make it absolutely obvious that collective life is superior to the selfish life of private property. There is no doubt that the progress of automation and cybernetics means that the problem of the economy is resolved. This has to be the object of the cinema – educating people in this. Instead, the cinema in the Workers States still continues to think in terms of the petty bourgeois public and is afraid of clashing with capitalism.

All this is a product of the fact that the leadership is not revolutionary. If it were revolutionary, it would not be afraid, it would act. Hence the Communist parties and the trade unions in the Workers States play such a small role. They have to have the main role, which is the organisation of the activity of the masses. The triumph of the Revolution does not eliminate the function of the Communist Party and the trade unions. On the opposite, it elevates their function. It does not intensify the class struggle, but it reinforces the role of the communist Party and the trade unions. It strengthens them in the role of promoting the class as a leadership, as organiser of society and the economy, of distribution, of world and national policy – linked with the economy and the necessity for the development of the revolution. This has to be the function of the Communist Party and the trade unions. For this, there has to be Marxism, the Marxist life, the socialist democratic life, the most complete freedom, and the most complete expression of ideas, all submitted to the unconditional defence of the Workers State and the development of the Socialist revolution. This is the cinema which is needed and which the masses are pressing to go to see. If there is no mass public for the cinema, it is because the cinema is of no use to the masses. When it is, the masses go to it.

Lenin, Trotsky and the Communist International had the conception of making the revolutionary cinema, but it was the first experience. They had to base themselves on the means that they had, and they had to construct the Communist parties. It was crucial to move on from the social democracy, the Socialist parties, onto the Communist parties. It was essential to establish a new condition in history. Their means, their

possibilities, were infinitely less than what there now is in the Workers States. They had to build the Communist parties and the Communist International to defend themselves from the world isolation in which they found themselves. But not now. Now there is a constant and uninterrupted offensive. Now the Communist parties exist throughout the world and there are Workers States. It is a different situation. Now they could make revolutionary films daily.

A cinema that does not show the victory of humanity is not worthy of its name. Cinema must show victories and highlight how humanity triumphs because it works collectively. The films the Chinese have brought out are absurd. They show war Generals in elegant costumes; this is grotesque. Cinema must always serve revolutionary education. This is why victory – the victories of humanity – has to be prevalent in Cinema. It is not ‘stretching the imagination’; it is entirely like this in life. In any case, and quite apart from this, we have Right – historic Right – on our side. Marxism fully foresaw that we are right and foresaw the triumph of humanity. Are we now having to ask the capitalists for the right to say that we will triumph? The capitalists want everything to be proved to them, and then they ignore the proofs that are given them. Marx wrote the communist Manifesto in 1848, and if they want to know, it is all laid out down in there.

A marvellous film could be made on the communist Manifesto, on the First International, on the Paris Commune, and on the Congresses of the International in 1905 and 1917. It is vital to make the communist Manifesto of today – not the Communist Manifesto back then. To serve the Revolution, it is compulsory to make the Communist Manifesto of today. This is the Communist Manifesto! I would begin with the origin of Socialist ideas. Then going on swiftly until Marx and coming on to today. It is not possible to overlook the three essential phases in Marx’s life: when he formed himself and was won to the Socialist idea. To show the life of Marx, how his life was ordered. It is not simply a question of intellect. No, he was never gained by this. If the conduct of life did not prepare the intellectual conduct and discipline he would never have succeeded in being Karl Marx. It is not simply a problem of intellectual understanding but of will and discipline. At the same time as a great – the most complete – intellectual capacity, the greatest most objective intellectual capacity in history, most beneficial for humanity, Marx also had organisation of will. A man who was able to incorporate the three crucial stages of human reasoning – in the philosophical sphere – without rejecting any and making the most elevated criticisms of every one of them. Capitalism treated him as if he was a turncoat of some kind. But he was confident: ‘A turncoat – me? Just you wait and see’.

When a film, a work of art or poetry is made, it may be based on elements and events of history. This is good. It is right to do it when the past is united to today. It is important to have the capacity of synthesis. The poet has it. But there are few poets, they hardly exist. Poetry is not much use now. There are very few poets capable of making a powerful synthesis – to unite the past and the present. Without this synthesis of the past into the present, one plunges into the past and...becomes blind.

The Communist Manifesto has already been verified. The Workers States already exist. Any revolution, with any motive – even a bourgeois one – if it begins with a social pressure and content, ends up being Communist. What other programmatic, theoretical, and political conception is there? There is no other. For this reason, they end up being Communist. This is why we speak of Communist movements of non-Communist origin. It is not like 1917 at the time of Lenin, when it was compulsory to pass through a whole stage. Today, it is not necessary for every country to repeat all the experiences of the process of the bourgeois revolution to the Communist. This is so because there are already fourteen Workers States which make up in part for the lack of the Communist International. What a subject this is for a film! But, to make such a film, one must be deeply in love with the life of the masses and trust fully in their ability to build the society.

Now there is Dhofar and Kuwait. It is essential to show that the masses – which have nothing – put on a hat against the sun, work on their tiny strip of grassland, and discuss how to take power. They have nothing and they are constructing power. This is the confidence that the Workers States have given them. This has to be highlighted, more than a couple's problems of love. All these problems have to be posed in the cinema. The French May, the trial of the comrades of Burgos, are the problems of education today, in which the function of the child, the woman and the old people are shown. Capitalism despises them, but the revolution edifies and wins them; it gives them the opportunity to participate in life and they feel they live in a dignified way. The cinema has to pose all this.

Let us consider a Communist documentary film which appeared recently on Vietnam; a part of it was very good. It shows meetings with Ho Chi Minh and Giap, the children speaking with Ho Chi Minh, people building roads and bridges, and the downing of Yankee planes. But the film shows also quite secondary aspects in the activity of the rearguard of the revolution, and quite a lot is made of one meeting or another or one interview or another. What is to be shown about Vietnam is the capacity of the population in building and living human relations all at once. One

should dwell on the aspects that show how human relations are – like everything else – constructed fully, starting from nothing at all. One should show how they discuss in Vietnam! One must show how the leadership of the Party could not have generated such behaviour in the people just by itself. There is no Party on Earth that could achieve this if the people did not want it. With the living conditions in Vietnam, there were billions of pretexts for rebellions against the Communist leadership, and both the Yankees and South Vietnam tried to use these to the utmost. Result? No rebellion at all; nothing happened. The Vietnamese put up with it all. Why? Because their life was determined by reasoning, in the same way as everything was calculated: how much rice per person, and how to go about everything collectively. One should have shown this joy in the Vietnamese people.

The power of Vietnam is not to be measured in how many planes were brought down; this is a secondary issue. It has to be measured through the way in which the population behaved. The film shows very well the hospitals underground etc. This is very good. But how was this possible? Because the people generated the will to do it. So, one must give paramount importance to the life of the people in their houses, in the markets, at work, in all the places where revolutionary public opinion is created and passed on to the children. In Vietnam, the family as a cell of society is still essential. So, it must be that the family is one of the mediums through which this is done. Then this must be shown, together with how else the capacity of creation of the Vietnamese people is generated. But, in the film, one sees only apparatuses: Giap, the Army, the Military, the people who lead, Ho Chi Minh – but the population is not there at all!

That documentary shows a scene in the underground system. It is very well done from the point of view of the military of the military organisation, and it shows the very great capacity of forecast that prevails. But the people aren't there! When the people are shown it is in a very sketchy and secondary way! A little old lady is shown passing stones to others involved in setting up a wall. It is very good to show her doing this, but more important is to show how her sentiments have been generated. How is it in her home? What does she say? What do the little children get involved in at school? How are opinions elaborated and developed in the children? How could it have been that a little old lady of eighty feels like being part of the chain to pass the stones? Nothing of this is explained in the documentary film.

To do this a revolutionary political life and leadership is needed. The cinema is part of the development of the revolutionary struggle. It is not a

special sphere of activity. The cinema is part of the revolutionary struggle, of the organisation of revolutionary activity. So it is important to translate the problems of revolutionary culture to the cinema. Otherwise the cinema is established as superior artistic activity, quite remote from society. But the cinema is a continuation of revolutionary culture. This expresses itself in the cinema; it is expressed in the trade union, in the political party, in demonstrations – it has the same objective. It is another sphere of action but it has the same objective.

Life is a complete unity. This is established in an increasingly evident way. There is unity between birth, the development in life, the economy, social relations and objectives. It is the continuity of human existence. Through what? Through human fraternity. Human fraternity means the elimination of conflict between human beings. Can it be achieved or not? Yes, it can! Marxism shows that it can. The cinema must reflect this, and that it can be reached. This is the conclusion of the human being: human fraternity, eliminating every dispute. All the preoccupation and the organisation of feelings, consciousness and even the reflexes, must be used to eliminate dispute. This must reach the three zones of the brain, that is to say, the conscious, the sub-conscious and the unconscious.

The cinema must be used to laud knowledge, human capacity, human relations and the relations of humanity. It must serve the development of brotherly feelings. It must display the human capacity which exists, sufficient already to create a superior regime in the economy and property, like the Workers States do, or something even superior. The cinema has to pursue this end. Socialism is going to succeed in ending the conditions that have led the humans to conflict, class struggle, war, and the ambition to possess. Socialism is going to replace all this; it is going to overcome all this, in the knowledge that human fraternity is the way. It is only that a superior regime is required to get this. But even before we get to this superior regime, consciousness and understanding demonstrate that these simple things can already exist. Before the Workers State ('socialism') even existed, there was Marx with the Communist Manifesto and the First International, followed by the Paris Commune. In other words, before reaching the economic structures of abundance, there was already a grasp in the consciousness and in the mind of people. People visualised what was going to be possible. Any project appears in the head before becoming a reality. It cannot happen otherwise.

The cinema has to reflect this. Elements of culture continue, including the problem of war, and the problem of trade unions. The cinema reflects capitalism and capitalist production as being endowed with mysterious

ability and means. They idealise this. As if it was the product of individuals who were born with the ability and ideas to make the economy, to sell, to make war and to kill. One must show that this is the simplest thing in the world, and that all the capitalists are donkeys. There is not one intelligent person among them. Their intelligence is all for war and for trade. It is not intelligence. It is important to show that the mystery of the capitalist system is not such a mystery. It is simply a mode of production. One has to show how the Workers State surpasses all this by putting the masses into production and so eliminating the mystery of production which is one of the fundamental mysteries that has maintained the cohesion of the human being. It must serve for this.

Instead, the cinema dedicates itself now to the problem of the couple and individual problems, as if they were synonymous with the problems of the whole of humanity. No. This is not so. Humanity today wants to eliminate every system of oppression and repression. The cinema must serve this. Already there is a public and the human desire to do it. Capitalism cannot make these films because they are against it. On the other hand, there is a public avid to find a means of collective education in the cinema. Not just to spend time in distraction or passivity with no collective education. The cinema today is produced by means of heroes and individuals; it is taken as an example or highlight on thousands of cases. It is crucial to suppress this. It is essential to make a mass movement which goes through the problems that all the population experiences today. The Revolutionary Party is needed for this, and so are the revolutionary trade union, the functioning of the trade unions with proletarian democracy, political life, full trade union life, a constant permanent life of exchange of ideas, a permanent discussion of ideas, positions, verification and analysis, and comparison in which all the population can intervene. The more the population intervenes, the better - from the five-year-old child to the hundred-year-old child.

Society centralises the individual capacity, centralises it in social functioning which is then expressed in a centralised way in better ideas and better capacity. It is the way in which social capacity is centralised, through the life of the Party and trade unions, through the life of organisms which allow a complete discussion to develop. This requires a revolutionary leadership which is not afraid of the masses, which has confidence in the masses, and which does not regard leadership as a privilege or special function but simply as an elected leadership. For it to function well there has to be proletarian democracy and a full discussion of all ideas and all problems without fear. The contrary leads to dispersion, but this leads to centralisation – because the masses immediately centralise themselves and

do not discuss just anything, but what has to be discussed when it is necessary, and in within the time frame. As they do in production.

Until now humanity has been educated within the system of production, its form of thinking submitted to production. Now the Workers States and the existence of the great Communist parties, the existence of the Workers States as Marxism materialised, as Marxism in a material form, shows that this condition can already be overcome. The cinema must reflect this necessity in order to be an instrument of revolutionary culture.

THE FUNCTION OF HUMOUR

In the comic cinema of the Workers States now, neither the mime nor comedy are the result of the forms of relations of the masses of today. Comedy in the capitalist system is based on the joke, irony and sarcasm. In the cinema of the Workers States comedy must be based on the power to overcome all difficulties, not on impotence but on the power to conquer all difficulties. Comedy must express this.

All comedy has a depth of ingenuousness, but pure ingenuousness, which does not have a bad intention, the ingenuousness of someone who finds himself before new facts but feels he is capable. Then there is a certain amount, a great percentage of ingenuousness, a mature ingenuousness which does not let itself to be battered or smashed but which draws upon the forces to conquer. Humour has to be like in the Workers States. Humour based on the joke, irony, or sarcasm is no longer of any use, it does not construct or communicate with life.

Comedy, like art, like painting, literature or culture, has to contribute to progress. The world is a unity. The harmony of the world establishes the human relation. The world in itself is not united - we are the ones who make the unity of it: the unity between nature, the economy, society, human relations – with the human relation in the centre. The capitalist regime, private property, production for the market, the class struggle: they all create inclinations, tendencies, habits and necessities which prevent attention from focusing. Add to this the need to be constantly dedicated to the struggle to contain capitalism - which is part of the struggle for progress anyway. This causes a large amount of human forces to escape. In the Workers State, these forces will be used to defeat and conquer capitalism. Be optimistic, for capitalism no longer holds the reins of power. Although the proletariat has still to take power in the capitalist countries, those with the power are the Workers States. This is why they need to incorporate proletarian power in their comic films.

THE ROLE OF HUMOUR AND OF COMIC CINEMA IN THE WORKERS STATES

At the same time, it is necessary to gradually eliminate the comic cinema, going from comedy to optimism in the construction of the Workers State. It is going to be a superior stage. Comedy in the Workers state means the optimism to conquer all that is needed in order to go forward. There is nothing that cannot be done. Not showing the incapacity of the human being, the deficiencies and insufficiencies of the Workers State, but rather showing all is joy, all is satisfaction, because everything means the capacity of the human being to build, communicate human fraternity, to think how to create a mutual elevation for the benefit of humanity not for one's own benefit. From there, the type of cinema has to arise in which comedy stops being the type of comedy of the capitalist regime and show joy, pure optimism, pure relations which impel the constructive sentiment, the creation of human affinity and fraternity and the search for all the means needed to advance. This is what the cinema in the Workers states has to be: to abandon the comedy developed by the capitalist cinema, including the French cinema and its mime artists. This is already surpassed. It is only entertainment. On the contrary, every cinema, theatre or television action must be a point of communication and impulsion to creation. The cinema is the continuation of life. The thing that the cinema sees continues life and draws from it the elements to create and continue moving forward – not to entertain, not to surprise, not for mere gestures. What does the gesture communicate? It must communicate action, thought and human relations. This is what the cinema must be!

Hence comedy must be surpassed by forms of complete optimism, above all taking account of the fact that now the proletariat shows that it is the master of history and that it is building the next society. In the cinema, in the theatre, and in literature, the social relations that impel this have to express the fact that the proletariat is building a society which is not narrowly for itself, but for all humanity. It builds a society which is not to affirm its power but to make its power disappear. As opposed to all the other classes in history which had to affirm their power to be accepted, for the proletariat to build the new society its advance has to make its power disappear, that is to say, it has to advance by making the state disappear. But, until then, it has to affirm the character of the Workers State to build Socialism. All the different forms of the cinema and comedy have to arise from there.

It is not yet possible to abandon humour, but it is essential to unite it to the optimistic sense of the constructor who feels he is able and who attracts humanity to make it feel it can do everything, starting with including the children in comedy. It is essential to include the children in humour; this will have an immense effect, and how beautiful!

The humour of the cinema, the theatre and capitalist literature, and still of the petty bourgeois servants of capitalism, is based on contempt for the human being in the market economy and in human relations through the market. Just as they sell shoes and manufacture to sell shoes, so they maintain the same sort of relations. Capitalism categorises and analyses according to value and to the capacity or position each one has. This is the literature of the capitalist system, its theatre, cinema and also its humour. It is the contempt, the scorn for those who lack capacity, those who have nothing – or taking individuals who are inadequate as a result of the capitalist system – and making jokes at their expense. Goya had already painted them, but to condemn the regime. When Goya painted the beggars he condemned the regime, saying ‘Look at all this splendour, so much luxury, such a fine palace – and look what there is in this regime’. This is a condemnation. He did not only paint the King or his knights. When he had to paint the King and the Princes he painted them with the faces of idiots. He would paint a fine hat with the idiot prince under the hat. And the first impression of the honest and objective person is to say ‘What a fine hat!’

Their cinema, the comic cinema capitalism makes, is based on the joke, on inadequacy, on the inequality which the capitalist system produces, on the joke about individuals who are injured, inadequate or sick as a result of the capitalist system. They take these as a joke in order to show their own superiority. This is how they have made cinema, culture, science and everything else.

The duty of the revolutionary cinema, on the other hand, is to demonstrate that this is a consequence of their regime, but one doesn't have to be occupied with these problems as a fundamental concern now. But one has to be concerned with how to release the creative capacity of the human being. Comedy must be in the service of this.

The bureaucracy has no optimism because it has no past, no present and no future. It cannot say ‘Where have we come from? Where are we going? And what are we doing?’ It only says ‘There's so much to be done – what can I do?’ The bureaucracy has no past, no present and nor does it have any future, because it does not come from a legitimate, logical and

necessary past; it has represented no economic necessity. It has a certain force and a certain capacity because it depends on the Workers State. But as much as it depends on the Workers States it is obliged to think, partially, in terms of Marxism. And within the bureaucracy which is very heterogeneous – more heterogeneous even than the proletariat – there are layers that try to serve, developing links with sectors of the proletariat. They try to be closer to the truth and the needs of the Workers State. But not the rest of the bureaucracy. It lives thinking only of the apparatus, and it thinks as an apparatus. The present struggle in the bureaucracy shows that it is a struggle of the apparatus, a struggle for the liquidation of the apparatus: Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, and the liquidation of the ‘Solzhenitsins’ (who are parasites of the Workers States) form part of this.

These parasites are concerned with ‘democracy’, but just for them, not democracy for Vietnam or for the soviet masses, but just for them. They are elites that have arisen from bureaucratic functioning and which the bureaucracy previously used: just as the Church in the past used culture and science to show that it was the advocate of it all, and that without it nothing could exist. It accumulated, centralised and plundered. The bureaucracy also had all these servants to pretend that it was cultivated, capable, and had a creative capacity for culture, science and for ideas. And it had nothing! The crisis of the bureaucracy shows it. Every few years one apparatus is liquidated and another one comes, and then another and another.

The bureaucracy has no faith in the future because it does not feel represented in the masses and because, above all, it feels that to maintain itself in power it cannot give Soviet democracy because the masses would rise up as in Poland. It is afraid; it holds on to power and tries to keep it. But, since it depends on the Workers State – which is nationalised and centralised property, and the planning of the economy – it has to defend it. But, between nationalised property, planning of the economy and the bureaucracy, there exist a contradiction and antagonism. It is not a complete contradiction. It is a contradiction that reaches antagonisms but it has to defend part of the Workers State. And in some Workers States like the Soviet Union, it has to defend the functioning of the Workers State. The process of the world revolution produces internal struggles in the bureaucracy, allows the ascent and advance of the masses and a certain confidence in sectors of the bureaucracy that try to advance, supporting themselves more on the masses but also because they have no other way of defending themselves. Already the structure reached by the Workers State rejects the bureaucracy and overthrows it. It gets rid of it like the infection

that suppurates, and the source of the infection has to come out. It is the same.

All these conditions prevent the bureaucracy from having any humour. Its humour is the humour copied from capitalism, based on accidents and actions of people or groups and their inadequacy, errors, naivety and misunderstandings, on stupid attitudes and a whole series of complications, on actions that generate humour but without the building the capacity to progress. For example, the things or objects that collapse, mistakes in dialogues, in indirect terms those are conflicts that do not lead to anything. This is a passive relationship of thinking and feeling. Instead, humour must impel progress, overcome difficulties and organise life scientifically. So, the bureaucracy cannot have humour. The humour it has is the humour copied from capitalism but it does not build anything, it does not organise, and it does not plan the capacity to progress.

All these characters, Solzhenitsin, Nekrassov, Bukovsky, all this team of writers in the Soviet Union are a result of the life of the bureaucracy which allows them to make it appear powerful for its own benefit, to appear as a cultured regime which was necessary to retain. These writers arise from a society, developed above it, because they do not arise from proletarian democracy, from the struggles of the masses. They are sustained by the bureaucracy and stimulated by it. They segregate themselves and live their separate lives. Now they find themselves in difficulties, find they are drowning, and demand democracy for themselves – and not democracy for the rest. Democracy so that they can say what they want, when they have not written a single book on the world development of the revolution, on Vietnam, China, Pakistan, the Middle East, or on the struggles of the masses in Jordan. Nothing of this, nothing on the general strikes that have developed throughout Europe and which have moved the world, on the immense progress of the struggles of the masses that are smashing capitalism. There is nothing of this. They make commentaries on their own private lives, individual life, their problems and the aesthetic sense of art. But aesthetic in what way? They live a life for themselves and art for themselves. They do not see art, culture and science for the progress of humanity. And humanity means that all intervene. Why don't they concern themselves with this? They protest because now the bureaucracy feels obliged to depend on the masses and has no time for them anymore. So, the bureaucracy throws them out or sweeps them under the carpet. Now it has no need for them and, moreover, a layer of the bureaucracy is developing which needs to link itself to the world revolution and which sees the idiotic role of these guys. All idiots, all of them! None of them deserve our recognition, in spite of the fact that some of them have written

some lines of momentary importance, nothing more. Based on this, it is ten thousand times more important that Bangladesh comes from nothing and obliges Mujibur Rahman to say 'There is no solution here without socialism'. This is the basis for optimism.

The proletariat does not need comedy in order to be optimistic. It is confident and feels it has the power to build everything. So, it has no need for humour. Humour is a very secondary aspect. Superior forms already exist. I do not know what it will be called, or how it will be defined, but it already exists and is superior to comedy. It will be a superior form of seeing, of ascertaining and confronting the difficulties in construction. The Workers State itself already overcomes the forms of humour of the capitalist state.

In the capitalist regime, humour appears through the difficulties that there are. Different people do different things; they come out badly and they discuss among themselves. Not in the Workers States. In the Workers State they discuss 'This is the situation and these are the means we have'. They base themselves on this and ideas emerge to get organised. And they order things. They act when ready after discussion. Then there is no lack of humour. The creative capacity surpasses humour because it is constructive. Humour tends to do this, to give confidence to construct and to overcome difficulties. But it is possible to build without the need to pass through the stage of humour. This is the general conception which is not expressed because there is still no revolutionary leadership. There are approximations to this but very distant. And about all this there is a retreat in China, while in the rest of the world there is progress.

We do not need humour or comedy in the Workers States because fraternity includes humour. It is a superior sentiment that is felt because through the collective unity to confront anything, fraternity includes humour. Humour is born from this, from difficulty. In our humour, the conclusion is not to diminish but to impel, but even so, it is a factor that annuls or prevents a sufficient progress of the consciousness. On the other hand, being conscious, humour has less need to exist, because in the conscious relation there is joy and optimism in a superior form without being humour. In the future, the forms of expression which are given today through art will be made in a superior way.

In the Workers State, there is no reason for humour to be based on the difficulties of people, their forgetfulness, their mix-ups or confusions. Comedy in the Workers State must rest on the fraternal sentiment. Comedy will then become transcended by consciousness. Where there is more

consciousness, comedy continues to exist but humour takes superior forms. The collective sentiment grows inside the optimism of seeing that together, we can resolve everything.

The bureaucracy cannot do any of this. When it makes a humorous film, it is an individualist and stupid comedy based on the unforeseen, the improvised, the contradictory, the misunderstood.

The bureaucracy usurped power but it has no past. It maintained itself in history on the basis of usurpation. This is why it has no present and no future. It has no perspective, because it is unnecessary in history. This is also the reason why it cannot develop rational thought. When in the midst of difficulties, it cannot feel the joy of living. This renders it incapable of optimism. The Workers State, Lenin and Trotsky, have left behind them the highest expression of optimism and the joy of living. On one occasion Lenin said to Trotsky 'They will probably kill us'. 'Who knows?' said Trotsky, 'and who do we put in our place if they kill us?' 'Bukharin is the most capable,' said Lenin, 'the problem is we won't be able to control him'. Lenin and Trotsky were concerned about being killed. They saw that the most capable was Bukharin, but he was a Communist of the right. They saw that he was not going to take the required measures. He was not an energetic and determined type of person. See how Lenin and Trotsky talked about him with optimism and mirth. The bureaucracy is incapable of any of this. Bureaucracy is always anxious, and for good reason, since all it does is usurp the power. Where there is humour or comedy in the realm of the bureaucrats, it always expresses the anguish of having to live this life, their lives, under the constant threat of working class uprising, and no friends around. When the workers demand democracy, in whose name does bureaucracy refuse to grant it? The bureaucracy refused democracy to the workers of Poland, and now the workers won a strike. In the Hungary of 1956, the bureaucracy not only refused democracy to the workers, but had some workers murdered. Bureaucracy can no longer murder like this anymore. See that there have been changes! Now the bureaucrats must support Bangladesh. About these changes, it is essential to show them to the world.

Establishing comedy must elevate humour. Humour means to see everything well, with capacity but at the same time with the scientific sense. Not just comedy by the side of life but inserted, internalised, placed in life, and forming part of life.

The cinema is a result of life. The person who goes to see it has to continue it, elevating the creative capacity, and, above all, elevating the sentiments

of human fraternity, which provide the condition to be able to take all the initiatives, all the creative capacity needed to resolve all the problems of humanity. The struggle of one against the other, with another and another, is going to disappear and everyone is going to be united! And it is important to show how the will is centralised and the capacity, the feelings, the passion, the emotions and the intelligence are all for a common end. This has to be the cinema's humour.

This is what the cinema in the workers state is going to be in a short time, and it will gradually lose comedy because we have no further use for it now. Comedy arises from the relations of the system of private property; the joking of people can be seen as a measure of combat against the system of private property, against capitalism and the possessing classes.

In Socialism, comedy as a means of communication is not going to be compulsory; there are going to be completely superior forms of relations. There is not going to be the necessity of passing through a stage of comedy to demonstrate optimism. It is going to function directly. Then, when difficulties appear, there is not going to be a humorous attitude to resolve them but there will be instead a very profound and scientific way. And optimism will be very superior to the humorous form in which it is expressed today. Comedy is an invention of the relations of private property, a necessity of humanity which, to advance and progress, had to establish relations of superior objectivity in the face of life's difficulties. In the Workers State, as opposed to the capitalist state, there is always the optimism to progress.

Capitalism uses humour to censure, limit, intimidate and smash. It uses it as a tool to show superiority. What superiority? Capitalism is in no way superior! Its humour is the result of the relations of private property.

Humour as developed by humanity serves it as a means to keep going in the face of difficulties. One has to be optimistic because the basis of optimism is the necessity to live. All this needs to be expressed in the cinema.

Cinema must express the brotherly feeling and the consciousness of Marxism. With Marxism, consciousness no longer depends on the necessity to live; the necessity to live goes on, but already its basis is the idea.

The idea has the power to sum up and centralise. It works on that basis. I say that I am not just optimistic, I am conscious. I have an instrument which is Marxism.

This is the optimism of Trotsky when he was dying: Marxism. He believed in the power of Marxism. Trotsky represents the greatest expression of optimism ever, because it is based on Marxism, based on the greatest confidence in humanity. When he died, he said 'I believe in the triumph of the IV International. Forward!'

J. POSADAS

21st December 1971