

POLAND THE ADVANCE OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND OF SOCIALIST INFLUENCE IN THE WORLD

Vol. 1

J. POSADAS

A selection of texts, 1971 to 1981

Editorial's presentation:

We publish here thirteen texts by the revolutionary Trotskyist organiser and theoretician J Posadas on the process of the Political Revolution in Poland, ranging from 1971 to 1981.

In these texts, the author analyses the process of rectification of the Workers State of Poland, when the working class found the means to intervene politically directly and remove layers of bureaucratic communist leaders formed in Stalinism.

J Posadas calls this process of rectification 'The Partial Regeneration'. At the time, it was not happening just in Poland but in all the Workers States - and particularly in the USSR, as shown in the text by J Posadas on Suslov's visit to Poland.

Many of these articles were written in the last days of the comrade Posadas' life. He died only 21 days after his article on 'The First of May in Poland 1981'.

In spite of the implosion of the Soviet Union in the 1990's, the Workers States have not disappeared from the world. In itself, this represents a feat of resistance on the part of the international proletariat, and a sign of the continuing struggle of the Workers States towards Socialism.

Scientific, Cultural and Political Editions
November 2021

INDEX

<u>Short title:</u>	<u>Date</u>	page
The significance of the discussion in the Polish army	07.05.81	3
The revolutionary uprisings in Stettin and Gdansk	Feb 1971	11
The protest of the masses in Poland	27.06.76	25
The outcome of the strikes	31.08.80	34
The Workers State as step ... socialist society	26.02.81	55
The role of the communist vanguard	14.03.81	62
The process of the permanent revolution	05.04.81	68
The counter revolutionary ... of imperialism	07.04.81	86
The empiricism ... of KOR	16.04.81	91
The world process of social transformation	08.05.81	97
The right of recall in the Communist Party	02.05.81	114
On the visit of Suslov	24.04.81	117
On the First of May in Poland	03.05.81	121

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DISCUSSION IN THE POLISH ARMY

J POSADAS

7.5.1981

The Polish army is one of the closest to the Soviet Union. Its structure is one of an adhesion to the Soviet Union, hundred times greater than that of the Communist Party or the people generally. The Polish army was created by the Soviet Union and Poland lives thanks to the Soviet Union.

There is a discussion in the Polish army. In our view, it illustrates the depth of change taking place in Poland today, as much organisationally as on the plane of political preoccupation.

We have seen an article published in Poland, making general political points and referring to debates in the Polish army. The article offers some guidance to the soldiers. It welcomes the soldiers speaking out. It states that the soldiers are equal to the generals in the organisation of the army and its cells. It advises the soldiers to live more politically and to make political points instead of just criticisms.

The article refers to processes taking place in Poland and in the world. It says that the role of the Polish army is a socialist one, and that this socialist role must be further developed in the army.

In this, you see what the capitalists really mean when they scream: '*The Soviets interfere with Poland. Look out there in Poland, the Soviets are preparing to bite!*' In part this is true - just consider the case of this plane that crashed in the United States because it had been 'bitten' by the Soviets. Is it not so that they found one of Brezhnev's teeth among the wreckage? This is how things go regarding this: the Yankees kill, assassinate each other and bring down each other's plane. Meanwhile, Poland makes huge leaps forward.

We recall the criticism made by Brezhnev during the 26th Congress of the CPSU when he said: 'The trade unions must be more open to ideas. The trade union leaders must not be puppets. They must give ideas and allow people to intervene'. The bourgeois press has no scruples in saying that Brezhnev was manoeuvring, but it did not mention that it was Brezhnev who proposed the replacement of 5000 (corrupt) trade union leaders, and that this was actually done. It shows all the unwieldy nature of the trade union apparatus.

This discussion on the role of the Polish army is one of the most important events in the history of the construction of Socialism in Poland. This is the Political Revolution; it forms part of it! The original statutes of the Soviet Union used to prescribe cells in the Party and everywhere. They insisted on equal rights for all the members of the cell, and it was the cell who elected the leaders of the army! The cell - not and not some director or some general. This was adopted in the USSR, and it remained the norm for an entire period. Trotsky was a political commissar and cell member in the Soviet Army. If he did not attend the cell meetings, it was because of his activity during the civil war. It was because of this reason, in fact, that his cell granted him a special exemption.

The Polish army is the most Soviet of the Workers States' armies. This is still the case even if there are now opponents in that army who try to impede Soviet influence. These opponents are allowed to grow through to the continuing existence of the private ownership of the land. In Poland, the private ownership of the land has not resulted in a greater development of capitalist power because it has not been able to develop a fully-fledged capitalist function. The leaders and the whole military structure of the Polish army form a whole which is Soviet - and it is the Soviet leaders themselves who organised the Polish army. The Polish army took its share of the struggle against the Nazis, and against Stalin, side by side with the leaders of the Soviet army. Remember that the Soviet army entered Poland in spite of Stalin and his sabotage. The Soviet army entered Poland without waiting for Stalin's orders, with little regard for the orders Stalin gave and with no regard at all for what 'the allies' thought of it. 'The allies' did their best to prevent the Soviet Army entering Poland - and Stalin went along with them. Stalin had previously ordered the Soviet army not to enter

Poland, but the Soviet Chief of Staff told Stalin to go to hell and went in. In Poland, the army was – and is – more representative of the Party than any other organisation. The new Polish army was set up on this basis. A series of Generals from the previous regime were won to the Revolution in the same way as it happened before in the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. It is only afterwards and thanks to the power of command it had acquired that the bureaucracy managed to create sectors in the army that supported it.

This article on the army in Poland indicates that this process is going to go very far indeed. We are not just dealing with Poland but with other Workers States which are going to follow suite. The Hungarians have recently cast their eyes a little in the direction of Soviet democracy. It is a bureaucratic apparatus that thinks: ‘Let us take the antibiotic before the disease starts infecting us’.

This attitude of the Polish army will be a tremendous stimulus for the development of the Political Revolution and will have some considerable influence on the other Workers States. This applies to Yugoslavia, in particular, where the bureaucracy is so large that you can hardly avoid seeing it. Belgrade is a beautiful city, very dynamic and in full development. But there is an enormous hierarchical apparatus with roots in the various Federations and even in the Party. This is why the process in Poland has such an influence on all the Workers States and particularly on Hungary, where the bureaucratic apparatus is scared. It fears fear itself. Its roots go right back to the first stages of Stalin and although it has made many changes in order to keep up with the changes in the Soviet Union it nevertheless remained quite an apparatus. In Bulgaria, on the other hand, the influence of Poland is going to develop much more easily.

THE ROLE OF THE ARMY IS TO DEFEND THE WORKERS STATE

This article on the Polish army (about cells etc.) is Soviet in character. We shouldn't expect it to be applied immediately because it is going to meet resistance and sabotage. The path that leads to its application follows the same line as that of the world process. The Soviets denounced the war preparations of the Yanks specifically and they are quite clearly prepared to confront them. At the same time, Poland has the historic confidence to

say 'The life in the army has to be organised so that there are equal rights for both soldiers and generals. In the Party, they are all equal.' The only moment when this relationship can be changed is in relationship to technical aspects, military knowledge and during war. But even then, what must prevail are persuasion rather than arrogance and imposition on the part of the most technically capable. This is exactly what the Bolsheviks used to do.

This article on the army in Poland influences the Party, the people and the intellectuals politically even if it does not reach the other armies. It will possibly have an influence in the capitalist countries, but individually and not in the form of immediate actions or effects. It influences and prepares the capitalist countries but the most direct form of influence is political.

We must see that the Polish army is a Workers State army; it functions to defend, impel and support the Workers State. The fact that such a resolution could be taken, signifies that the army cannot remain separate from the life of the population in the Workers State. It depends on it. The capitalist armies on the other hand, are not prepared for this conclusion because for them, the maintenance of the regime means acknowledging the authority of those in command. In capitalism, the army is there to obey. In the Workers State, it is not a matter of obedience. Indeed, 90% of the activity of the army is social. It intervenes in the normal life of the Workers State. Here, the soldier is equal to the officer. In discussions and meetings of the Party, the general and the soldier are exactly equal.

This resolution is not the creation of the Polish people; it is a Soviet resolution which comes from the Bolshevik Party and from Trotsky who was the first to take this initiative. It was the Bolsheviks who adopted the resolution to form cells in the army where both soldiers and generals could take part on an equal footing. Mao Tse Tung did the same thing. He organised an infinity of activities through which the generals could say to the soldier 'What a good thing I am a member of the cell because this allows me to learn so much'. There is the story of the Chinese general who was a bricklayer. One day when he was carrying his bricks, someone asked 'Why are you a general carrying bricks?' He replied 'It is the only thing I know how to do. All the rest, I have to learn'.

The scum in the present Chinese leadership is sending all this experience to hell. This remains however a contribution of Mao-Tse-Tung to history, a contribution about which he learnt from the experience of the Soviets. Mao did not apply this principle as thoroughly as the Soviets did, but he gave it the same meaning. The Soviets would do everything to win people.

A number of Tsarist generals were won over by the Bolsheviks. Old generals used to walk around with mountains of medals would be invited by the Bolsheviks to participate in classes to be educated in social processes. No-one forced the generals to participate. They came because the Soviets could persuade them. The best generals of the Tzar went over to the Communist Party.

Trotsky referred a lot to the case of this general from an old aristocratic family who was so in love with his military function that he ended up being more of a military man than an aristocrat. He saw that it was possible to make a career with the Bolsheviks, and besides he was totally anti-German. The Bolsheviks turned this anti-German general into an anti-capitalist one.

It is in the military that a whole base of previous soldiers was won to the Bolsheviks. There was no time for these new recruits to be completely formed politically before Stalin came, and started to use them.

Trotsky explains how the Bolsheviks won two top leaders of the Motorcycle Brigade. He had started a speech to a large group of them who were listening with curiosity and reticence. At first, they were nearly ready to start their motorbikes and go. After Trotsky had spoken for 15 minutes, a good number of them had removed their hand from the throttle of their machines - two top leaders among them renowned for their military ability. Trotsky could impress with his own military ability. He spoke to them as soldiers. After a time, the group started to relax and light cigarettes. Trotsky recalls how the cigarette meant they were starting to think; he had been understood. Trotsky won them all, except one, and he won a few women who had been listening from a nearby balcony!

HOW POLITICAL REVOLUTION EXPRESSES ITSELF IN POLAND THROUGH THE POLISH ARMY

We must discuss the problem of democracy in the army in Poland and the solution to these problems. We are dealing with the process and a stage yet to be reached, in which political cadres with the objective maturity needed by the Workers State, are going to appear. In a historic sense, the Soviets are promoting this process in Poland and elsewhere, and it indicates that they are encouraging what is happening in Poland in order to develop themselves. This resolution of the Polish army is a very deep matter because it is part of the Soviets' preparation for the coming war, and besides, it tells the Yanks quite clearly what they can expect.

This resolution is intended to stimulate the political life in the army and signifies that it is going to be cleared of all the people who waver and doubt. Up until now, imperialism supported itself on these people! And now it screams: 'The army, the army!' Imperialism hoped that a reaction would raise its head in the army, and that this would find an echo in nationalist sectors outside the army to contain the Soviets or, even better, to oppose them. The Yanks were behind all this, as much in the army as in the Trade Unions.

The formulation of such a resolution goes against these sectors and it elevates the whole country. We must not consider it as a limited or casual event. This resolution aims at breaking the bureaucratic apparatus up, and the roots of this are very deep. Who can this resolution be directed against? Does it not say 'rights for everyone'? Then it must be that someone is not in agreement with it and does not let it be applied. The progress of the soldiers has become necessary in order to make the next step. But against whom? It isn't against Brezhnev since the resolution speaks of 'socialist-development'. Therefore, it is against a bureaucratic clique that has formed inside the army, and who shot a large number of workers in 1970. The present Polish government, on the other hand, has paid tribute to the dead workers: this is the best proof that it is not them who killed the workers.

This discussion in the Polish army is going to have an importance and effect on the life in Poland and particularly on the Polish Communist Party,

PUWP. In a very profound if general way, it indicates the manner in which Socialist democracy unfolds. This is really the political revolution and, at the same time, it is also the permanent revolution developing through the form of the political revolution. When such a process has reached this level, it is because both Poland and the other Workers States are ripe for progress 'a la polonaise' and it is not just something happening in Poland. This is so because the force that allowed this to develop in Poland is the Soviet Union. It is the Soviet Union that has to oppose the pro-capitalist sectors inside Poland, and the pro-Polish sectors looking for changes in Poland in order to prevent even greater ones! All these people eventually cling to capitalism. In all this, the Workers State is undergoing the actual process of the Political Revolution.

This process of Political Revolution unfolds in a partial and fragmented way. All the aspects have to be united with each other, but already the process has reached the army. Why is this? It is because there was a clique in the army that prevented progress. What does it mean when they resort to such a discussion in the army? It means that there was up to now, a gang and a clique that oppressed the country and the army, and which had its agents in the police and the whole administration. It all announces further clearances. This process in the army announces clearances in the Party itself. It is not peculiar to Poland. It is the form that clearances will take or are taking in the Workers States. It affects the Party, the Trade Unions, the army, and soon it will reach the judiciary apparatus.

This is the way the Political Revolution advances without civil war, which means without people dying. In the mobilisations of 1970 and 1971, there were some deaths. There was an uprising and it did not succeed in clearing the bureaucratic apparatus. This uprising however, prepared the ground for the present process. Today, the workers are attaining the wishes – to change the Party apparatus – they proclaimed but could not attain in 1970 and for which they died. Now, it is being done without people dying, without the help of the Pope or the Church...It is the Party that leads the movement. The meeting and demonstration on the First of May in Poland has given us an immense joy. It was a historic event that marked a stage of a very great progress in Poland.

This resolution of the army is a proof that the new functioning will be beneficial to the Political revolution. It will ease our intervention and it also means an impulse to all the Communist parties of the Workers States even when they have a limited leadership. They will see that Poland means a process of progress and culture, of learning and teaching how to oppose the immediate social interests of some layers in the Workers State and how to triumph over these interests. These bureaucratic cliques could be formed in the army because the historic conditions the Workers States found itself and not because of the nature of the Communist process. Bureaucratisation comes from the fact that the Party, the leadership and programme, were not formed in time. All this process also demonstrates that the Party, the leadership and the programme, are elements that have to be constructed even though Communism is not a construction, but a necessity of history. Capitalism cannot draw the least profit from this process. And the masses of the world, particularly those of Poland, see that the development of Socialist democracy now reaches the sectors most remote from the life of the Party. The army which – by its very nature and the conditions of this stage in history – has to be busy all the time with military preparations, constantly on watch against Yankee intervention, is a prime example of this.

J.POSADAS

7th May 1981

THE REVOLUTIONARY UPRISINGS IN STETTIN AND GDANSK AND THE NEED OF SOVIET ORGANISATION

J POSADAS

(Extracts, Feb 71)

The events in Poland are a process only in its opening stages. It is not the same as in 1956; it is beginning and not retreating anymore. In 1956, it was another historic and world situation. One must see Poland through the world process. This is not easy for the leaderships of the Workers States and the Communist Parties, because of the bureaucratic life and enclosed atmosphere in which they live. They live an enclosed life but the reaction of Stettin shows that the workers as far as they are concerned don't like that. The workers have their feet in Poland but their mind in the world.

The Polish proletarian vanguard took the proletariat with it and it succeeded so easily because already the vanguard is not only in the Communist Party PUWP, but also outside the Party. There is an important sector of the vanguard outside the Communist Party. The deciding force, naturally, is in the Party, which has the required understanding, ideas and a sense of what is happening. There is another sector, which incorporates itself into the Party as integral members who act as Communists and consciously so. Why aren't these people in the Party therefore? If they work as conscious Communists, why are they not in the Party? The fact that they are outside the Party is a form of protest which in Poland, is expressed differently from such countries as France or Italy. It is a source of negation and rejection of the bureaucracy and an opposition to it.

However, the fact that the movement has broken out in three different areas of the country simultaneously, indicates that the vanguard has an immense authority and that it was accompanied by sectors – by the population – which, even without being in the Party, worked as a vanguard, defending the Workers State. From the reports that the bourgeois newspapers give on Poland, one can gather that it is quite a progress in the programmatic objectives of the revolution. The bourgeois journalists give information but no analyses, no conclusions. Their interest is not to further the Political

Revolution but to use a movement which they cannot conceal, in order to show the chaos, the upheavals and clashes in the Workers State, to show that there are no organisms of decision, that the force to decide has gone. They want to show Communism beset with as many or even more problems and difficulties as the capitalist system. When capitalism shows the workers making demands, requests, and obtaining them, it is to show the bureaucratic leaders the same as the capitalists. In the bourgeois way of seeing, there is no identity between the leaders of the Party, the trade union leaders and the workers.

In reality however, they all have a common point of identification, in their defence of the Workers State. They are based on this level of identity among themselves. The journalists give the impression of a 'normal' conflict between exploiters and exploited, when this is far from the case. The Polish workers are seeking to impel organs where they can discuss problems and resolve them. When they make the point that the 'police attacked and not the army' it is because they want to present the army as 'neutral'. The bourgeois journalists have no interest in showing that the army is seeking support in the Communist Party. They merely say that it is a question of the 'neutrality' of the army. But why neutrality? They do not show the identity of the workers with the regime of the Workers State.

In the entire attitude of the workers, there is nothing that damages or harms the programme, the objectives or the operation of the Workers State. What the workers want is the right to intervene to improve the conditions of life and existence and to expand the development of the Workers State for the benefit of the entire population.

The journalists have narrowed down everything. The workers sing the 'International' to demonstrate 'We are workers, not hooligans'. They should also have made references and declarations on the Soviet Union and the Workers States which have continuously said that they are no problems between the enemies of Socialism. The bourgeois journalists have no interest in showing the structure of the feelings and the consciousness of the masses that adhere to the Workers State.

All the reports indicate that the programmatic character of the resistance in Poland is advancing. The workers propose not only an increase in wages, but a series of norms, rights to intervene and to discuss, which as a whole, is a quest for proletarian democracy. It is one of the bases for an intervention to further the political revolution. The journalists have no interest in the progress of the Political Revolution; all they want is to use the Political Revolution in order to show the Workers State in chaos, bedevilled by differences, antagonisms and struggles. They want to present it as the same as capitalism.

In capitalism, the workers call strikes and try to overthrow the system without bothering with the consequences for the system. For example: the strikes of the North American workers in General Motors damage the whole military apparatus of capitalism because they force a greater expenditure on the capitalists. Increase in wages, improvements in working conditions, impede the ability of the Yanks to intervene in Vietnam as they would like. The workers do not submit their class demands to the interests of Yankee imperialism and at the same time, they told them to 'leave Vietnam'.

In Poland, on the contrary, the workers call strikes, protests, mobilise and sing the 'International' declaring 'we will do nothing that damages the Socialist State'. The workers do not prepare to destroy the structure of the Workers State, the economy or the regime of state-owned property. Indeed, they have an interest in making strikes so that planning is not damaged. After all, who is the planner and how is the process of planning organised? They are not saying that they want to destroy the regime of state property, the structure of the Workers State or that they are against Socialism. They are against bad planning and bad political leadership. They want to change the political leadership and they are engaged in doing precisely this.

We must insist on this: at the same time, showing the level of consciousness the Polish masses have reached, showing that this is a very great step forward in the Political Revolution, because they are proposing programmatic demands. They are demanding the right to intervention, control, and decision and planning. Who plans? What is the basis of planning at the moment? These are fundamental of the Political

Revolution. It is a question of a series of programmatic demands for proletarian democracy, independent trade unions, and representative of the interest of the workers in the struggle over the distribution of remuneration. What to produce? How to produce? Who controls production? Now it is not just a question of wages but of production for the benefit of the whole population, and besides, this is the rational form of planning. But the bureaucrat is afraid and opposed. 'A great deal of time is necessary. Not even your children will be able to improve the situation'. The workers reply 'Yes, we can and immediately'. The workers are committed to arguing with the bureaucrats over the leadership of the economy.

The bureaucrat is incapable of genuine planning. He plans for self, for the layer he belongs to, and within the constrictions of bureaucratic interest and incapacity. Bureaucratic impotence stems from incapacity, from not being based on social forces capable of producing and of advancing the Workers State. It isn't only a question of increasing production, but also improving the organisation and the planning. The workers strive to lead the trade unions, they have thrown out a good many bureaucrats; the problem is they don't have organs. Thus, they look for the best way to be influential. This shows their historic and concrete confidence. Without this, the lack of specific organisms in which to express themselves would have led them to desist. They are trying to influence the leaders in order to make them useful. As they feel that the leaders are indirect instruments and implicated in the apparatus, they say 'We are going to see how they behave'... Meanwhile, they prepare their own organs and aren't determined by the actual situation only.

The first stage of this process – in the USSR or in the other Workers States – has to take place in the apparatuses, where the base is going to be faced with all these bureaucratic people. This will continue until such time as, in a later stage, the workers and Communist militants find their own team and structure, capable of advancing on their behalf. Gierek is not the same as earlier bureaucrats. He signifies a step forward in the Partial Regeneration of the Workers State. He represents an effort to negotiate with the workers instead of repressing them, conceding to them rather repressing. It is going to mean that the bureaucracy will have to make programmatic concessions

as well, that is, concessions on the plane of democratic rights for the masses. This is inevitable.

ECONOMIC PLANS MUST BE UNITED TO THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORKERS STATE

The discussion of these events in Poland is needed and has to be based on the understanding that they are partially the reanimation of 1956. It is based on this. Therefore, it is very important to give a didactic explanation on the structure of the economy and the function of the Soviets and Workers Councils. It is important to always show this didactic revolutionary and cultural aspect which builds life. Control, yes! But why? What is the function of control? Conflict with others? No, it is for coming together and unification!

In capitalism, the function of the organisms of the masses is one of conflict (with the State for example – Editorial), but in the Workers State, it is not the case. We have written on this, on the function of the Trade Unions in the Workers States, and that of the Trade Unions in capitalism. They exercise similar functions in the defence of wages and in the realm of conflict with the bureaucrats, the leaders, over the distribution of national income. But the conflict in the Workers State has a different quality from that it has under capitalism. Under capitalism, the objective is to organise the forces to overthrow capitalism, whilst in the Workers State, the Trade Unions work to make the State firmer. This means a level of consciousness, culture and relations opposed to those in the capitalist system. If there is not a Soviet functioning in the Workers State, the consciousness of all this tends to be diminished and at times, destroyed.

The bureaucracy is a layer guided by the capitalist conception of the law of value. This law still applies in the Workers state but it is dominated, controlled. Trotsky proposed in ‘The Revolution Betrayed’ that it should be so, 50 years ago, and now these problems are understood and mastered. In the Workers State, prices aren’t determined by blind market forces, themselves the product of the law of value. The market is determined and dominated by State planning and the control and intervention of the masses. The bureaucrats are not interested in planning

this way and they have no idea of it. They have on this aspect, a capitalist conception of determining prices rather than a socialist conception. What they are saying now in Poland against arbitrary prices is important. This system is distorted and far from reality, partly because they fear to go to the depth of the problem and partly because they don't know how to. They cannot use the Marxist definition because they don't know how to. This results in them saying 'the plan does not work', and all this conceals bureaucratic interests because their conception of planning and financing is for the bureaucracy and the plan is blind.

The plan has to be verified every day. It has to be controlled daily in the factories, the workers areas and amongst the people. This is where it can be checked. It is really quite simple. The Bolsheviks counted on 160 million people for the plan. The Party decided but the 160 million people discussed it, from the adults to the children. This did not annoy the Bolsheviks but it did annoy the bureaucracy. The Trade Unions must intervene in all these problems.

The most important problem that must be discussed in this stage is that of the construction of the Workers State, the relation between the Soviets, proletarian democracy in the economy and the functioning of the economy in the Workers State. The capitalist regime favours, concentrates and centralises the personal power of the capitalist class so that, within this, the economically powerful sector dominates. Through this mechanism, which impedes the use of intelligence and reason, it also impedes the economic might of science and technology. In the Workers State, it is the reverse.

In the Workers State, there can only be economic progress if there is progress in society and in the social relations. There must exist social organs that guarantee that what is being produced, and how it is being produced, continues to be in the workers' interests. In essence, the Workers State creates the collective consciousness of the communist sentiment - and this is the historic difference with capitalism. Capitalism generates the disposition to private property. It induces the sentiment of antagonism with the proletariat, antagonism with the need for revolution. Far from this, the Workers State needs the unification of society. It needs the unity of the

collective social sentiment through fraternity, solidarity and mutual understanding.

Events like these in Stettin and Gdansk can only occur when conditions have developed which approximate to the capitalist relations. This could not have happened otherwise. Stettin and Gdansk can only originate from an antagonism between programme, economy and necessity – something that the Workers State normally resolves without antagonism through organs, human relations and planning.

Whether there is really an ‘economic disaster’ in Poland remains to be discussed. If there is such a disaster, it is because the plan is dominated by bureaucratic conceptions and interests. There is a great source of economic backwardness in the private ownership of the land, the lack of coordination in the forming of cooperatives and Sovkhoz. This maintains a constant source of backwardness in agriculture.

Planners talk of their intention to produce more freezers, TV sets and cars. They speak of repairing the grand old houses, palaces and castles. Goods are being produced for a rich layer of the population, top functionaries, technocrats, leaders, soldiers, police chiefs and others. A market has been created for these people which wants for a substantial amount of production, raw materials, effort, time, machinery and administration. All this for luxury goods. A TV should not be a luxury good, certainly, but it is so at the present time.

Why private cars when the population has not enough transport? Why radios, sewing machines, desks and TVs for a privileged layer of the population when there is an urgent need for houses? Why repair old palaces when the masses have to be housed, and for whom thousands of homes could be made with the money invested in restoration? Why return properties to the Church? For whose benefit? Is this an impulse to Socialist planning and programming? Is it an increase in productivity and production? Clearly not. This only satisfies a layer with bourgeois notions and mentality. When the bureaucracy devolves properties to the Church, it is to strengthen its alliance with private property. The elimination of private property has to be proposed instead. If this were done, there would be a

20% increase in production immediately and a much better quality of products. The elimination of private property and a plan to produce what people actually need would be enough, in themselves, to increase the productive capacity of the country by 20%.

Investments must be directed towards this. An upper limit must be put on large incomes. This was done in Peru by the Velasquez Alvarado government, and it was done in Bolivia by the Torres government. They combined this measure with wages increases aimed at doing away with the wage differences. In Bolivia, the maximum salary for a technician became fixed at one thousand dollars a month, instead of five or six times this amount previously. Under Alvarado in Peru, the top salaries were similarly reduced in the foreign firms earmarked for nationalisation. These are important anti-capitalist measures.

This should apply to Poland. Top salaries are part of the reason for lack of production, bad priorities in production, lack of elementary goods for the use and consumption of the population. Planning in Poland was made for bureaucrats' interests, layers of the Communist Party and the State. There is no consultation with the workers and the factories to see what to produce and how to produce. The same applies to wage distribution and the prices.

One must consult the workers in the factories and the trade unions! This will not work against the economy, how could it? So why not consult them? How can the bureaucrats know what is necessary for consumption? With what criteria do the bureaucrats measure the required labour and capacity to invest in production? On the basis of profit? If so, whose profit? Profit is not the objective of the Workers State. Its objective is the satisfaction of the needs of the population. In comparison with the capitalist countries, production in the Workers State could double simply through such measures. You get this result with the simple suppression of profit, and you increase the well-being of the population as well.

If there is not a high level of production in Poland, it is because 80% of the land is still in private hands. There is a considerable amount of property in the hands of the Church and this is a measure intended to sustain the Church in spite of its lack of value or importance. The catholic masses can

all be won to Socialism and the collective form of life when Socialist democracy advances. The Catholic masses can remain Catholic for a time but within the system. They are no obstacle to a Socialist form of planning, but the bureaucracy makes concessions and keeps the catholic masses apparently satisfied. But it is the reverse that must be done: the bureaucracy foments bourgeois sentiments, interests and accumulation.

All these problems have to be discussed and can be resolved immediately. The uprisings of Gdansk and Stettin are a result of all this. The workers rose against unjust planning, bureaucracy, and the arrogance of the planning to satisfy people at the top. They repudiated the market that only serves those who have purchasing capacity. This is not an example of Socialism for them. Far from it, it is a social differentiation which cannot influence the catholic masses, because all they see is inequality and they hold on to their beliefs. But if equality and justice developed in Socialist democracy, the Catholics would be won to sentiments through which they would see their previous limitation in knowledge and they would feel the need to progress. At the same time, they would leave aside their hope that Heaven will help them because planning for the population and the elimination of all superfluous expenditure would bring them down to Earth.

It is crucial to eliminate all the unnecessarily high salaries for the bureaucrats. Party members in whatever position should receive the average workers' wages. Expenditure on high salaries is unnecessary. Why high salaries? For what purpose? This has to be discussed. Better Communist relations are needed. One must not make any plans out of the Workers' wages, and income can be found on the basis of lowering the top salaries. There is a tendency towards equality in the workers of Stettin and other places that resolved to give the wage increases to those who needed them most. The attitude of the workers was 'we have enough; let us give the increases to the lower paid'. This discussion is very urgent.

It is not a matter of changing and transforming everything, but it is urgent to have discussions leading towards the conclusion that it is logical to have a plan of production for the interests of the population with an upper limit on wages, a general increase in the minimum wage, and control by the

population over production and needs. Private cars are not necessary but collective transport, radio and TV for all the people are. These should be produced for mass consumption. At the moment, TV sets and sewing machines are for those who can afford it, and the same goes for electronic household goods. Eliminate this! There has to be popular consumption in the way the Chinese developed it. There is no economic disaster in Poland and one has to measure the Poland of before against what it is now, and to see therefore, that there is no such 'economic disaster' at all. On the other hand, only ten per cent of the economic power of Poland is developing compared with what it could do.

There has to be a discussion throughout the country on the programme of planning. This is going to encounter resistance from the bureaucracy of Poland, the USSR and the other Workers States, because all the bureaucracy is going to realise that an attack is being made against it. It is going to react against this. All this is foreseeable but history and the current process go against these people. Today, they cannot contain the process as they did before. The events in Poland are an index of the depth of the process. It is vital to prepare, to foresee the favourable conditions that will come later and not to expect that it will show itself right away. The Polish events are a phase, a stage of this process which is going to go forward. Inevitably in all of this, the world development of the revolution and what happens in Cuba, Italy and France will have a weight. The weakness of capitalism also plays a part.

Cooperation and discussions are required to intervene in the Trade Unions of Poland, in the Communist Party, in the Conferences and in the public debates which are going to become more frequent. All this will develop and it is necessary to prepare to intervene in the life of the PUWP. Inevitably, in a short time, all these problems will be discussed in the Party. They will have to discuss it as one of the essential things to be resolved. One shouldn't be fixated in the contemplation of the present phase. This is transitory. Proof of this is in the speed of events. In only one month and a half, there has been a whole series of events, and the resolution of the Central Committee of the PUWP, which is an important resolution but does not go as far as the actual process allows. However, it expresses the will of many layers of the Party and of the workers to make progress.

BACKWARDNESS IN THE PEASANTRY AND THE RELIGIOUS PROBLEM

The process in Poland expresses the will and capacity of the masses which want to advance social relations in the Workers State. The central axis has not been the partial demands for limited reform on the part of the proletariat. The centre was the improvement of social relations and the intervention of the masses. This is a conscious, socialist aspiration and it has to be given a voice in the Central Committee. Indeed, it has been given a tumultuous reception. In 1970, for this reason, in the Resolution of the International Secretariat of the Posadist IV International (of the 22 January 1970) we had analysed that the settlement reached in 1970 was transitory, in view of the impulse that had come and the lack of its complete reflection in the leadership. The impulse we said was contained and later, the leadership would have to concede further. The bureaucracy tried to evade the pressure, waiting for it to evaporate or be negated. However, they also had to respond, and the agreement reached at the end of 1970 was transitory. Nothing programmatic had been resolved.

This meeting of the Central Committee today has attempted to give a programmatic response. But it is also transitory. There is no definitive resolution and newspapers only publish fragments. The Central Committee tries to answer the demand for greater democracy, rights for workers, workers councils but they lose sight of the depth of the problem. They have improved the industrial part of the problem but they have still left the agricultural one as it was. The foundation of the support for the bureaucracy still exists and is confirmed. This is totally in contradiction with the movements of Stettin and Gdansk. Brezhnev himself has proposed the liquidation of this (private) form of agrarian property which represents a tremendous hindrance to the progress of the Workers State. There is no economic reason for this immense backwardness, and it is a little like fetching water with buckets when there are highly developed pumps.

The newspapers report that there has been a meeting of a Catholic Party (peasants) and that there is a crisis. They have removed 6 members of the leadership. It gives the impression that they are liquidating the right wing.

In Poland, of course, there is a very concentrated and political proletariat, and a petty bourgeois sector of more weight than any other Workers State, of peasant and catholic origin. They are not reactionary Catholics but Catholics who accept and defend the Workers State. But they still maintain a life which is separate to a certain extent, so they go on feeling Catholics.

This weighs on the Workers State; and the problem is that this sector has no reason to exist. They are owners of 80% of the land and although they are small and medium owners who cannot become millionaires, they have production in their own hands, and make a partial accumulation of capital. At the same time, they also make an accumulation of anti-Soviet and anti-Socialist aspirations because they have individual interests, tendencies and conceptions.

The reason for the relation of conciliation by the leadership of the Polish Workers State with the Church is because it seeks allies against the masses. It is an alliance that the bureaucracy seeks to create and use for a larger and more powerful apparatus. Also, it is to defend itself against the masses. These are sectors which, without being from the right, are conservative. The Catholic Party is not reactionary; it supports the revolution and the Workers State. It exists because it represents a sector of middle peasants without great economic power who cannot accumulate capital in any significant way; it exists for this reason and not because it is strong. It is not a Catholic layer capable to reproduce and accumulate capital or extend power because it cannot buy land. They aren't peasants who compete in property with the Workers State. Hence, the Church makes an activity of support for the Workers State among the peasants, and makes an alliance with it. The statification (State ownership/control) of the purchasing activity of agricultural products is a blow at the private owners because it prevents the supply and demand of the free market. This was done by the Chinese when all purchasing was put in the Workers State's hands and the peasants were free to produce as before. As the state had done this, it decided the price. There is always a margin of manoeuvre, the black market and besides it, a market of political pressure from these people who cannot produce, sell, and plan solely for the black market. It is more difficult for them to do this because production is controlled. The Chinese do this, and the role of the Trade Unions in this is very important because they work as

controllers of the owners. The owners themselves acknowledge this. The state is the only purchaser and it fixes the price in such a way that there is no competition or free market. The only market activity is that of selling to the state.

Although these Polish Catholics are not reactionaries or counter-revolutionaries, the existence of their private plots, the intention to reproduce and extend the property, always make them seek forms and measures to elude state control. They resort to manoeuvres and subterfuges in this, to escape the state and the state-controlled market. It produces in them the drive for property, because the simple fact of having private property in the Workers state, leads to this. This does not apply to the small artisan sectors which have no such problems. But this form of ownership in the land stimulates individualist, egotistical and competitive feelings against the Workers State, feelings of tranquillity, passivity, conservative attitudes and this is a stimulus to the sectors of the right.

It is a repetition of the Soviet Union. Even though economically its weight may not be decisive it is partially decisive. It is a factor of conservatism because it is a social stratum working in its own interests, for the interest that arises from private property and this leads it to conservative and placid sentiments which are against any policy that brings some danger to the small holdings. For example, they are against the war, the revolution, the support for the revolution, and they have no sense of the collective structure. They are opposed to all what happens. These are tendencies and factors always inclined to ally with conservative sectors, which may not be important or decisive economically, but which have a great social weight.

Hence, the Church has a harmful effect. It is not because the peasantry is counter-revolutionary, but because the interest of private property pushes them towards counter-revolutionary positions. The form it takes now is through the pressure they exert on the population against a revolutionary policy. Thus, they support the centre and the right in Poland. They also seek the way – in any situation – to associate in order to give themselves a social base against the possible advance of measures towards Socialism. Their relation with society is conservative, passive and competitive. They cannot create culturally, socially or scientifically, in any way favourable to

the Workers State, because the ideas that arise from these sectors are those that arise from private property, and therefore, in competition with the collective organisation. This is a hindrance and a delay. The manner in which the land is divided in small parcels means a very low level of productivity. They get together as owners in order to derive strength in front of the Workers State which they regard as a rival. Indeed, the state is their competitor. When they seek to make collective forms, it is also against the State, and in order to barter for more against the State. It is not to make Poland go towards the Soviet State.

It is possible to make cooperatives as in a previous stage as a transition towards collectivisation and to prepare, with a campaign of agitation for 4 or 5 months, the step from individual agriculture to a collective form or socialist cooperatives. This is one of the bases for the increase in productivity that is needed. It will allow a superior planning of the Workers State, for what must be produced and sold. The State as the sole purchaser is a step forward, but the State must also be the planner and must decide on production and control. The Unions are to be allowed to control. As we are dealing with small plots of land, the agricultural workers are small in numbers and it is the peasants' families themselves who do the work. Workers' control there will be minimal, and as Catholics, they seek to incorporate Catholic workers with whom they make a partnership based on mystical sentiments and collaboration. It is now essential to raise a cultural and revolutionary struggle against the Church and religious ideas.

J. POSADAS

February 1971

THE PROTEST OF THE MASSES AND THE INTERVENTION OF THE WORKERS STATES IN THE OBJECTIVE COURSE OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

J POSADAS

27.06.76

This is a report given by J. Posadas at a meeting of the International Secretariat of the Posadist IV International on 27th June 1976.

The problem of war is latent. Imperialism tends inexorably towards war threats. But as it cannot control the historic process and has lost any possibility of maintaining the system, it throws desperate and random blows (1h) in all directions.

Take Lebanon, which is geographically small and with little social or economic importance. Both the Soviets and the world capitalist fleets confront each other in the Mediterranean, just off the Lebanese coast. It is not Lebanon that produces this, but it is possible that the world conflict could flare up here. Lebanon is not the motive but Lebanon is an extension of the world. In the current world balance of forces, the Soviets have to unite with the ascending course of the world Socialist Revolution. The USSR is drawn into this surging tide of world revolution, and this finds its expression in the Polish events.

The Polish process has its roots in such thing as the events in Lebanon and the Italian elections. The Palestinians in Lebanon, even though they have nothing, are already progressing away from the idea of a Palestinian State towards the idea of a Federation. It is a dialectical social progress and the Palestinians are heroes of history. It is not because the Soviets defend Lebanon that such a small country becomes the focus of confrontation between imperialism and the Workers States, but because the world balance of forces has reached such an acute stage that any part of the world can become a flash point for war. This is by no means a superficial judgement.

The Soviet fleets in the Mediterranean and the Baltic have not mobilised. They have not sent any troops anywhere, because what might appear to be small steps, acquire in this stage, a permanent significance that can lead to world war at any moment at all. The Communist parties are not prepared to look at this fact in the face, but the South African incursions into Angola and Mozambique prove the point.

Meanwhile there is the most furious inter-capitalist competition which is well demonstrated by the enormous quantity of 'hot' capital, which capitalist Germany possesses but never invests. Even if it were to invest this 'hot' capital, it would solve nothing. These funds are not the result of production but of accumulation, and for this money not to produce inflation it would have to go through a whole cycle of accumulation and consumption. They would need this whole cycle in order to avoid an even greater unbalance in the capitalist system than exists already.

In reality, there is the greatest possible unbalance in capitalism that it does not and cannot control. The capitalists constantly repeat that 'the crisis has ended, a new boom is coming, it will be alright... just wait for next month'. They invent deadlines. They cling to appearances, to an apparent boom, an increase in sales. This is not a normal crisis of the capitalist system. This is its death-agony. This is why we characterised the elections in Italy as 'agonized elections'. Of course, the agony may last for some time. Franco lasted for quite some time, for instance. But for the system, this drawn-out agony did not bring more vitality, strength or capacity. Quite the reverse.

Inter-capitalist competition has to be considered in its totality. It is not just a question of France, Britain or Italy, but a global process. Mexico, Peru and Colombia, each have to be considered as part of the capitalist whole. Even the countries that strive for development and are on the road to development, like Venezuela, Colombia or Mexico, clash amongst themselves and they discover that they cannot keep on the capitalist road. These countries do their utmost to get capitalist investments in order to develop their economy, but the world structure of the capitalist economy, is already unified. It is true that it is divided into social and economic bases which are opposed and antagonistic, but it is all part of world relations.

In all this there is the added factor of the limited policies of the Soviets. This makes these countries depend more than necessary on the world economy. Even a revolutionary policy would leave scope for relations with capitalism, but they would be infinitely less because there would be the possibility of planning between the Workers States and with them. In these circumstances, the degree of dependency of these countries on capitalism would be far less than it is now, without actually breaking relations with capitalism. However, the bureaucratic policy of separating the Workers States allows quite a degree of dependency of these countries on capitalism. It is much greater than is either necessary or possible. Poland is a case in point. The basis for this situation in Poland is that 80% of the land is in the hands of private property, and – even though they cannot use this for the reproduction of large quantities of capital – it does allow the continuation of private interests, which impede planning and the lowering of production costs.

The private sector in Poland is small in one way, but large in effects. The private bakeries and Housing Building enterprises have interests in private property and even though the State has resolved to make cooperatives in the field of Bakeries and Construction, these private enterprises continue to sustain interests in private property. Of course, at the same time, the intervention of the State impedes a return to capitalism. It is true that cooperative and group interests are superior to private ones. But there is still the main obstacle to planning. It is an absurd situation, and it is a deficiency in political leadership, not a deficiency of the Workers States. The same applies to the lack of planning between Workers States. If Poland and the other Workers States including China, planned among themselves, the level of production in the Workers States would – without any increase in effort – increase by 50 % in five years, 50% without increasing anything, with the same technical means as they have at present.

It is beyond question that we are not dealing just with the problem of planning but with the social resistance of the property owners and it isn't a small thing. The resistance of the Polish peasants is not proportional to the 80% of the land which is privately owned because this land is in the hand of people whose children no longer believe in private ownership. We are

not dealing therefore, with the old type of peasant resistance. It's much easier to win them now. The uprisings of the Polish workers are of enormous importance, and it is going to have a great impact on the peasants and their children. This will raise the consciousness of the peasant masses and of all the Polish masses. It will allow them to see that Poland isn't backward, and that prices do not have to be increased. It will allow them to see that it all stems from insufficient planning in production. This is the factor that makes prices rise, because it makes the country depend on foreign trade and in consequences, forces it to pay increases in oil costs, and it forces it also to contribute to the war expenditures of imperialism the cost of which is expressed in commercial relations. This would be finished with if the workers States planned among themselves. This is one of the most and fundamental conclusions which will be heard in the workers State in due course. The need for planning amongst the Workers States is bound to become more compelling each day.

The backwardness of Poland will be resolved by planning the Workers States and this is one of the first and foremost conclusions. We are not dealing with the problem of Poland in isolation, but with the fundamental problem of the planning between the Workers States. There has to be collectivisation. All the difficulties and social clashes will be resolved with much less risk to both the economy and the progress of the revolution in Poland, when the question of private property of the land is faced.

When that question is raised, the problem will be resolved with far less risk or cost, even to the social layer that the peasants represent, and it is the workers who have real social influence rather than the peasants.

If the workers represented the defence of narrow sectional interests, then the Polish political leadership would have opposed them to the population, showing that they were out for themselves. However, the leadership did not base itself on them; it did not go to the population at the time of the workers' uprisings, precisely because everyone felt that what the workers were expressing was everyone's opinion. In other words, the workers voiced the unanimous protest of the population, and at the same time, the will of the population not to damage the Workers State. The immediate resolution of the workers to stop prices increases was to communicate to

the population their perception of its sentiment of protest. The people wanted to lower – and not to increase – the cost of living. By opposing prices increases, the workers demonstrated that they were not out for a sectional and trade union interest only. In this way, the trade union and the workers' mobilisations represented the population. This is going to have an enormous influence clearly on the population and the children of the peasantry.

The Polish Workers State has made an enormous progress and covered a great deal of ground since 1956. The Polish process will be repeated in Hungary in not a long time to come. It is no accident that the Hungarian writer Harazsti who went to work in a factory to see the conditions there (in Hungary) and to write how to improve the Workers State appeared at that time. It shows that there are enormous forces in Hungary which are interested in the progress of the Workers State.

The Polish events exist, in one form or another in all the workers States, and it is no catastrophe. The standard of living in Poland has increased in a ratio of 10 to 1, compared with any capitalist country of Asia, Africa or Latin America. There is an enormous difference between what the Workers States were in their origins and what capitalism was in its early days. The Workers State, as opposed to the nascent capitalist system, is forced to spend additional money in support of the world revolution. But what capitalism now spends on the counter-revolution in the whole world, it recovers through its own mechanism and productive apparatus. In spite of all this, the USSR, in only 65 years, and the other Workers States in only 35 years, has eradicated unemployment, hunger, misery and much of the unbalance between town and country. The remnant of this unbalance is now being eliminated.

The level of child mortality in Czechoslovakia has decreased to an amazing degree and is now the second lowest in the world. There is one doctor per 390 inhabitants compared with one to 560 in capitalist Germany. It is an immense progress of the Workers State, whose failures in the economy are the result of the political leadership, and the initial backwardness of the country, rather than incapacity, backwardness or some erroneous, incorrect, historic course. At the same time, whatever plan they adopt has

to cater for war: half the income of the Workers State has to be dedicated to war purposes. In its early days, the capitalist system did not have this type of problems. The conditions for the birth of capitalism were established thousands of years before, and by a solid 500 years of world production, stabilisation and relations. This cannot be said for the Workers State.

We insist that the unification of the Workers States is a necessity. The system of the Workers States has to be unified and planned! The planning of the Workers States is one of the essential bases for the progress of all countries, in production and living conditions. COMECON is simply not enough for this. There is a need for a public debate on planning, the common planning of the Workers States together with the improvement and political life within them. We don't base this demand on some kind of impatient urge, just to recriminate, but on conditions that the ascending process of the Workers States provides, and to which we adhere. In other words, the criticisms we presently make of the Workers States' leaderships do not prevent us from supporting them.

All the slogans and characterisations we make are formulated in the way which is called for by the consciousness that we are in the final stages of a historic era. This is not any more the stage of Lenin, when there was still time for a historic process in which new movements could be constructed. In the last few years, the guidelines for an entirely new stage in humanity have been laid. We have to recognise that we have to deal with the present leaderships in the Workers States such as they are, in this new stage, and also with the leaderships of the Communist parties. Therefore, we have to operate within these movements and weigh inside them. We have to know how to avoid swamping them with hosts of criticisms. We have to avoid treating them as opponents or traitors, or as people out of touch with reality. On the contrary, we have to know how to impel tendencies which are advancing within, for example, the Workers States. It is up to us to give them ideas, support and examples about how to progress. We have to show them what is to be done in a global form, without missing opportunities to stress certain points that they can grasp. Of course, this does not mean hiding criticisms but acting as we have done towards the Italian Communist Party. For example, 'critical support to the Italian communist

Party in the elections' or 'critical support to the French Communist Party in the French Popular Union' was our positions.

This is not a process which is going to start changing radically now. It is a process well on the way. We are no longer at the epoch of Trotsky's 'Left Opposition'. Our criticisms towards the leaderships of the Workers States are a sort that tends towards identification with their aims, rather than identification with their point of view, policies or ways of doing things. We share the objectives of these of these leaderships, in Poland, the USSR and any other Workers States, because they have the aim of ending the capitalist system. They all want to finish with the capitalist system; it is their aim, even if they still hope to do it with certain reforms. Even Pajetta who used to assure us he wouldn't take any big steps, now talks of being against 'all blocs', which means in any case being against the NATO bloc as well...

The Communist movement can no longer accept the idea of progress through pure reform, so it makes reforms without being submitted to reformism. Meanwhile, a left which has a scope for development in spite of its lack of coherent political form or programme advances inside the World Communist Movement. The time has long past when left oppositions or movements that competed with the Communist movement served any usefulness.

When such a tiny place in the world like Lebanon becomes a point of confrontation between the Soviet and capitalist fleets, it is because the world is no longer in retreat. Lebanon is a flash point for an extended world process, and why do the Soviets bother about Lebanon? It is because the progress of the Workers States, that of the anti-capitalist struggle and of the Revolution have become more clearly and decisively identified with the interests of the Workers States themselves. This is the objective path that the Workers States have to take, and the leaderships of the Workers States have little choice but respond to this overwhelming fact.

There is an increased process of identification between the Workers States and the advance of human progress. It is not a question of the Workers

States wanting it this way or wishing it, it is a question of an objective necessity.

For the Soviet Union, or China for that matter, to perpetuate themselves, to continue to exist and to develop, they need to intervene in the world revolutionary process. The world class struggle is increasingly identified with the Workers States, and this means that the debate within the Workers States cannot fail to develop along these lines. However, there are also commercial relations between Workers States like Poland and the capitalist system, relations of a considerable importance. Indeed, capitalist Germany has recently been called upon to invest in Poland. The Soviets do the same with the Yanks, the Japanese, the Italians, etc. Therefore, what we see in Poland is not a 'Polish sickness' but the bureaucratic concept of making relations with the capitalist system.

The leadership of the Workers States have resorted to economic expediencies in order to develop their economies, but these are incorrect because it has made them dependent on the capitalist system. These economic measures, done in this way, tie them down to, and link them with, the capitalist system. This diminishes the effect of the world revolution, delaying the moment when the necessary support has to be given to Lebanon, the Middle East altogether, Angola and Mozambique. It is a delay because the ties with capitalism forbid supporting them.

The USSR in particular and the Workers States in general try to use the forces of capitalism, to beat the capitalist system itself. This is not completely incorrect, but it leads to incorrect conclusions. Lenin too, used the capitalist system, certainly. But today, it is nowhere near as important to act in this way. What is more essential than technology and capitalist investments is the planning of the Workers States among themselves. This would result in an infinitely greater economic, scientific and socio-revolutionary progress than this present policy. This is what we have discussed with the Workers States without ever making this an accusation or a condemnation.

Comrades tell us that Lenin initiated the ‘NEP’ (New Economic Policy), but in Lenin times, the Soviet Workers State was alone, it was the only Workers State and it had just started off from nothing at all.

Today, the point of departure of the Workers States is the support they give to countries like Angola. It is not the same situation as under Lenin. One cannot compare the epoch of Lenin, when the USSR was alone, with the epoch of Angola, as if they were in the same conditions. This would be absurd, but it must be discussed.

The appearance of someone like Haraszti¹ in Hungary is part of the discussion to be had. He is an intellectual with many good and clear ideas. He cannot be dismissed just as a leftist or a counter-revolutionary. He is a revolutionary who wants to intervene. He criticises the use of ‘piece-work’ as a means to protest against the working conditions. He wants to make a contribution but he has no global view or programme. He does not say what to put instead of 'piece-work' because he lacks ideas and is not clear about what to do. So, he protests. This is not being ultra-left, even though it can look like it when he has no alternatives. Someone like him comes from the absence of a (communist) leadership capable of motivating the thousands of others who think like him. Now that this matter has come to light, the State prosecutes him - only to set him free afterwards. He was released because he had a lot of support, but he would have been punished in a previous stage. This is not happening just to him. There are many others like him.

The necessity of Cuba’s intervention in Angola and Mozambique has repercussions inside the USSR. This doesn’t come from the wishes of a bureaucratic wing but from the objective necessity of the Workers State. What is going to decide: capitalist investments in Siberia, or Soviet support to Angola, Mozambique or Cuba? What will decide the course of the USSR – Siberia or Angola? Rest assured that it will be Angola!

¹ Miklos Haraszti, originally a young worker in a Tractor factory in Hungary. In 1976, he co-founded the *Hungarian democratic Opposition*. In 1977, he published the book "*A Worker in a Workers State*" where he protested the bureaucratic management of production in Hungary. He was tried for it, and then freed.

The position to have towards the Soviet Union cannot be determined by one or the other aspect of Soviet policy, one or the other aspect of the USSR. Judgement cannot depend just on this. The Soviet Union has to be seen in its totality, and this totality shows that the Workers States as a whole need to plan between themselves. That need is one of the essential factors in the advance of the economy, policy, society and technology; it is vital to the progress of the Workers States and their world authority. The discussion about the common planning between the Workers States - within which the unification of the USSR and China is crucial - is an inevitable one.

J. POSADAS

27.06.1976

THE OUTCOME OF THE STRIKES: A HISTORIC EXPERIENCE AND ADVANCE IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM

J POSADAS

31.08.1980

This text deals with the wage rises and improvements won by the Polish workers by August 1980. Solidarnosc was founded on same date as this document. It had not had time, yet, to fall in the hands of the Catholic church and the dissidents of Communism. Editorial note.

What has been conceded by the Polish Government has an importance which transcends the preoccupation of the workers themselves. These events cannot be considered as trade union struggles, in which the workers – like in capitalism – have gained more democracy and freedom. It would be a mistake or a lie to say this. For the Communist movement, it is a mistake to interpret events in this way, and as far as capitalism is concerned, it is a self-interested lie.

The mobilisations and successes of the workers are not just a question of Soviet democratic advances. What progresses is the historic function of the Polish Workers State. The idea that the movements of the workers are a defeat for the Workers State, or even a defeat for a bureaucratic leadership, has to be rejected outright. What happened is less a matter of workers versus a bureaucratic leadership than the matter of a bureaucratic leadership having become influenced. We are no longer in the epoch of Stalin. If a weak leadership has yielded here, under pressure, it is because it feels the influence of history.

These events in Poland are not isolated or particular to one Workers State. They are the context in which all the Workers states are intervening. The Chinese leadership (opposed to the Soviet Union) has not had the historic

strength to weigh in these matters. And apart from it, all the other Workers States have intervened through the Soviet Union.

The successes gained by the strike movement have advanced the life and historic function of the Polish Workers State.

The Polish Workers State has seen its influence grow in the system of the Workers States. The successes of the strike do not represent a victory of the Polish workers against the leadership of the Polish Workers State. What they represent is more in the way of a triumph for the Workers State through to its workers' movement. In this way, the Workers State influences the world. This is the conclusion that flows from the Polish events. This is why we saluted the forward steps taken by the Polish Workers State in all our previous texts. We demonstrated all along that the Polish masses do not move against the Workers State, but that they want to participate and continue to improve the Workers State.

The Polish masses have not only intervened for wage increases and improvements in work conditions, but also sought a better system of distribution, to ensure that articles of common use are not just available to the bureaucrats or people in the apparatus but available to the whole population, and for a greater sensibility and humanisation of working conditions. This is a gain for the Workers State. Why is it not the same in the capitalist countries and why don't they do this in the United States? In reality, in the United States the opposite is happening: they constantly kill people, replace them with machines that asphyxiate and poison the workers and the population. In Italy for example, there are 5000 children exploited at work and under school age, and a sizeable proportion of these die every year because of the conditions they are in.

In Italy, where one is dealing with a capitalist state opposed to the workers movement, any victory of the workers is necessarily against the Italian State. In Poland, however, any victory of the workers advances the historic function of the state, allows the masses to participate, leads to a more equitable distribution and to a more objective and humane discussion. In these circumstances, the masses of the world reason; they reason that this is what the Workers State is capable of, whereas the same thing is

impossible in Italy, Germany (capitalist), France or any other capitalist country.

The Polish events represent a triumph for the Workers State, decided by the masses themselves as part of the Workers State. It is not a case of the masses against the state, but of the masses with an attitude of criticism towards their leaderships. It is not something that could be avoided because it is a logical process of the masses learning how to build Socialism. There has been no finer experience since the first seven years of the Soviet Union. Stalin ensured that all the experiences of the masses were hidden. He disrupted the transmission of all this experience, and annulled, destroyed any form of Soviet democratic development. In fact, he instigated the development of a bureaucracy that crushed any attempt at Soviet democracy.

In spite of all this, the Workers State won in the end. This proves that Soviet democratic forms and the Workers State itself are superior to all bureaucratic apparatuses. Stalin has been excluded from history, so much so that there is not one single statue of Stalin left in the Soviet Union. Anyone can see this and they can also see that all the experiences of Lenin – and very soon those of Trotsky – are alive today.

These events have to be seen as part of the process of the organisation of the Workers State in its advance towards Socialism. The leadership of Poland has intervened as much as the masses. If the leadership of the Workers State was murderous, criminal or exploitive, it would not have yielded in front of the masses. In the event, this leadership has felt a common sentiment of concern with the working class for the existence of the Workers State. At the same time, the collective influence of the Workers State – the USSR and the other Workers states – has made itself felt within Poland itself. All the Workers states have had their own influence except China; China is opposed and has tried to support the Polish strikers in order to deliver a blow at the Polish leadership. However, the Chinese (leadership) did this very quietly and without any real public campaign. It acted in this way because it feared the effect that any support for strikers in Poland would have...on the Chinese workers! It was frightened of the impact it might have on the Shanghai workers for

example, who could not fail to tell their leaders that it was all very well and good to let the workers intervene in Poland, but what about the conditions of the workers in China? This is why the Chinese leadership made no real public outcry over Poland.

The Polish events have to be considered as a superior stage in the life of the Workers State, in which the masses have now been able to make such a strike movement. It is a superior stage because the masses were listened to, they were able to discuss matters, all this without repression. It all indicates a new advance, a superior stage in the Workers State. It is not the stage of 1956, 1970 or even 1973-76, but a stage when the Workers State is functioning in the proximity of the final settlement of accounts with the capitalist system. This means that the Workers States have been taken onto a path where they have to be more sensitive to the masses and much less determined by bureaucratic interests. All this is still limited, but it is what the Workers State can do, and there is no capitalist country which will be able to ever come anywhere near doing this.

There are no previous experiences or traditions of Soviet forms of functioning. It is a process at its very beginning. It means that such movements will occur, develop and generalise in all the Workers States. However, it cannot be expected that all the Workers States are going to undergo the same process immediately. But the course of history is going against bureaucracy and bureaucratic interests. At the same time, there is a process of change and advance in the historic necessity for the presence of the masses in the leadership of the Workers States; this is an immense progress for the struggle for Socialism.

At the same time, it cannot be said that the workers have now won and they would be able to speak. On the contrary, what they have done has been to widen and extend the functioning of the Workers State. It is the functioning of the Workers State which has been extended, and even if bureaucratic sectors seek to limit the scope of all this, the workers have learnt that it is perfectly possible. These events have been and will continue to be an increasing stimulus of layers of the leadership of the Workers States and the Communist parties. This is the way to look at this!

The bureaucracy comes from the stage of Stalin and the war and is still very powerful. The leadership of today has its roots there. It means that it has defended bureaucratic interests, impeded the appearance of revolutionary sectors, and prevented the development of the struggle for soviet functioning. In the time of Stalin for instance, it worked to impede Soviet functioning, which includes fair wages for the workers. Soviet functioning concerns - inasmuch as the Workers State allows - a fair distribution of goods and commodities, trading and exports in meat, milk, eggs, etc., and housing.

All this has to be in the interests of the population and not just in agreement with bureaucratic convenience that can never fulfil collective and objective need because the bureaucracy thinks of itself, its family and its mistresses, first of all. The workers always come last.

This movement in Poland is demanding improvements in the organisation of planning. This is to say that the workers are intervening in the construction of the Workers state in a different form. They can see that this can be achieved without damaging the Workers State in any way at all.

The masses of the world also see that there are places in the world where this can be achieved, that there is no need for war or armed uprisings in Poland. They see that the leadership of the Workers States could not do anything else but yield to a movement that had the support of the masses and of the population. It is clear that the population gave its support. Only a minority of workers – hardly 20% - actually took part in the strikes.

Neither the vanguard nor the bulk of the proletariat intervened in the strikes, but they did not support the Government either. Their attitude signified that they were in agreement with the concessions given by the Government, that they supported the measure of a wage rise, and agreed with the re-organisation of trade in such products as milk, meat and butter.

The world masses are learning from what Poland is demonstrating: The Workers States resolve their problems when they allow a greater intervention of the masses in the building of Socialism. The masses are not born 'socialist' - they learn to become so. Up to our present stage in history,

the masses have experienced political and trade union struggles, but they never experienced the task of building a State! They have never been allowed to do this! Now they have the possibility of building a State, and the masses of the capitalist world see that they, in their turn, can also do it.

The masses of the capitalist world are going to learn how to intervene for the same demands as those that arose in Poland. However, in the capitalist world such demands will have to be imposed, because, unlike for the masses in Poland, the capitalist state will not yield! In the capitalist world, conditions are entirely different from those in the Workers State, where agreements can be made between the masses and the leadership of the State without any problem or damage for the State.

The Polish workers have agreed to recompense the Polish State for the losses incurred by the State through strike pay and work undone over the period of turmoil. This shows the high level of consciousness in the Polish masses and the influence which they have over the leadership of society. In so doing, they have admitted that the losses incurred have been losses for everyone. This agreement is not a deal with a boss, it is a historic event. The workers have admitted that the struggles have meant a loss for the entire State, and that it has to be made up for. It is clear that they are going to make up for it. This event shows how much the workers feel themselves to be participating in the Workers State. They are going to increase their participation. None of this is lost on the masses of the world. This is why the capitalist world hides these events. It only highlights the activities of Kuron and the likes of him, to make it appear as if the Polish masses were following these people against their Party leaders!

At the same time, these events show the process of Partial Regeneration in the Workers States. They form part of the Partial Regeneration. An important aspect of the Partial Regeneration is expressed when Poland supports the revolution in Angola, Mozambique or Vietnam; but the most fundamental aspect of Partial Regeneration lies in events such as those we have analysed in Poland. For these events are as important as having intervened in support of Vietnam. They stimulate the workers of all countries, of the Soviet Union and of China included. All this is going to have profound repercussions in China very soon. Have no doubt about it.

THE POLISH MASSES HAVE IMPOSED THEIR WILL WITH THE AIM OF MAKING THE WORKERS STATE ADVANCE

There is a very great maturing of the workers' vanguard in the Workers States. This is why we have stressed that the strikers won because the rest of the workers' vanguard supported them. The vanguard is learning to intervene politically in the process of the construction of the Workers State. This is going to stimulate a sector of the bureaucracy and give it confidence in understanding that it can make progress without peril. It is clear that the leadership of the Workers State and the bureaucratic sectors with bureaucratic interests fear what is to come. This is an experience however in which they learn how to abandon their fear!

Audacity is one of the fundamental elements in the construction of the Workers State and Socialism. All what is happening in Poland is going to have an enormous effect in the Soviet Union, not because there are going to be strikes in the USSR, but because they are going to be moved to make greater changes in Socialist democratic life.

This is the stage of the final crisis of the capitalist system. Capitalism tries to use the criticisms which the masses of the Workers States have of their leaderships, as a means to attack the Workers States, to damage them and disorganise them if they could. The masses on the other hand, show that they do not want to damage the Workers State. They show that they raise their expectations of the Workers State and their desire for a more direct intervention in it, without damaging the Workers State. This is going to influence the masses – particularly those of the United States – of the capitalist countries. However, it is in France, Italy, Britain, Germany, Japan and Latin America, that they will have the most immediate impact. They are going to make an impact there because the superiority of the Workers State over the capitalist system is being fully demonstrated, a superiority from every point of view. The criticism levelled by the capitalist countries against the Workers States, suggesting that the bureaucracy is simply a new capitalist boss, now finds the ground cut beneath its feet.

The masses are learning how to gain more influence within the Workers State, rationally and without violence. At the same time, the extent of the bureaucratic apparatus is revealed; even in the leading ranks of the Party

and the State, there was a whole bureaucratic apparatus which has been made to yield. The important thing is that it is the Workers States and the Soviet Union fundamentally, which forced that apparatus to yield. They did this because the major Workers States, the USSR in the main, demanded that the Polish leadership made concessions. In addition, the masses that did not intervene in the strikes had made it clear to the Party that it had to give in. But in spite of all this, it is obvious that the previous bureaucratic apparatus in the Trade Unions and the Party is still here, it hasn't gone away. This is the reason why one of the agreements that came out recently said that those who want to remain in the old Trade Union can do so. There is no objective reason for this. If the Party yields to the strikers, then it has to agree to the New Union as well, and with all the new forms of organisation. However, when the Party and the Polish state decide that the old Unions can continue to function, and that those who want to continue to belong to them can do so, it is because the apparatus is organised in these old Unions and has not disappeared. Those who want the continuation of this old Union are those who want to maintain their privileges.

The struggle against bureaucracy advances. It is constantly unfavourable to the bureaucracy which finds itself exposed. This struggle forms part of the Political Revolution. The workers succeed in imposing trade union democracy as a phase towards a superior level of Soviet democracy. This is going to influence the rest of the world. The bureaucratic weakness of the Workers State is neither inherent to the Workers State nor part of the structure of the Workers State. It is the result of the weak way in which the Workers States had to be formed in the first place.

One conclusion is obvious and beyond doubt. The Polish Workers State is not determined by its limitations of leadership or by its peasant sector. It is being swayed by its workers, its petit bourgeoisie and intellectuals of the left. This situation imposes itself over and above all the bureaucratic policies, the high percentage of private land ownership, the important social weight of the small peasants and the weight of private property in agriculture. Had the Workers State been in the hands of those private sectors, the latter would have never given an inch to the strikers.

These are days of phenomenal importance for the masses of the Workers States. They are learning how to make the Workers State go forward.

The conclusion to draw is not just that the workers have received increases and improvements, but that they have given a crucial impulsion to the functioning of the Workers State, which naturally includes what the workers and masses need. What is wanted from the Polish Workers State is logical planning, the fair distribution of 'to each according to their needs' and a better unity between the leadership and social base. The Workers State cries out for the improved intervention of its masses and the workers in the leadership of the State. In this experience in Poland, the masses show how they learn to lead.

THE NEW UNION SOLIDARNOSC

There are those in Poland who wish to see the old Trade Unions continue to operate alongside the new Trade Union just set up. They represent backward bureaucratic union layers with allies in the Party and the State. These people want to continue being represented alongside the new Union. They feel that the new Union leaves them behind; and that they will soon be liquidated as a social sector. The same old Trade Union apparatuses exist in Yugoslavia and Rumania. They try to maintain themselves through the limited support they give to the State, and the State tolerates them because of their allies in the Party. In the new situation in Poland, the logical thing to propose is that only one Trade Union should function: the new Trade Union.

The new and autonomous Solidarnosc is an advance and the result of the struggle. Since it is a Trade Union, it has to respond to the interests of the workers specifically. The old Trade Unions were made of old bureaucrats and conservative sectors of the PUWP (the Polish United Workers Party). The new Union is going to be a blow to Kuron and company (dissidents of Communism). The latter have always wanted 'free' Trade Unions, 'autonomous' and 'independent'. But independent from what? The resolute struggle that the Polish workers have waged stayed within an autonomy that sustains the State. The functioning of the old unions is not going to last very long. Those who continue to favour the old unions are

the apparatus and the old bureaucrats looking for supports against the new Union.

The strength of the Workers State, however, does not just lie in the above events. Its strength lies in the existence of 20 Workers States. This is where it lies. It forms part of the world balance of forces in which the Soviet Union, the G.D.R. and Czechoslovakia exerted pressure on the Polish leadership for it to concede. They did this to diminish the influence of Poland on their own proletariat, but the outcome is still a blow to the bureaucratic apparatuses. The bureaucracy did not manoeuvre, it retreated. And the workers did not back down. The concessions they won constitute democratic and Soviet rights. Workers States with a similar bureaucracy pressed Poland to yield, for fear of the phenomenon spreading. This was all resolved, however, inside the camp of the Workers States. No one turned to capitalism for support. The concessions made to the workers were encouraged by other Workers States' bureaucracies anxious to avoid strikes in their own countries.

At the same time, it is not just a question of the bureaucracy yielding. It is also that sectors inside the Party and the Trade Unions forced the leadership to retreat, and not as the least evil for them, but as a necessity. It is a necessity in the sense that they cannot continue to prepare against the war of imperialism in conditions of a deep rift with the masses. The fact is that the contradictions can no longer be borne. The leadership of the Workers State had to retreat, but in a manner more convenient to the progress of history than to the bureaucracy.

In the Workers States, the experience of the strikes in Poland points to a very profound and favourable process in the development of Soviet democracy. The formation of the new Union represents a defeat for the likes of Kuron. The latter tried, but they failed, to use the Trade Union movement for the introduction of a new and sectional concept in society – their own concept. They failed when they tried to inject the notion that the Trade Unions in Poland must be independent from the Polish Workers State. They wanted to have it accepted that the interests of the workers are independent from those of the Workers State! But far from agreeing, the workers kept to their view that their interests are not independent from

those of the State; and that they have, quite naturally, the same interest as the Socialist State. Let it be said here that there is no such thing as a 'Socialist state'. Such was the phrase used at the time.

The workers in Poland said many times that they were not intending to attack Socialism. It is Kuron and the dissidents like him who muddied the waters. Their idea was to lead the movement outside the Workers State, turn it into an independent movement dedicated to a social democratic conception outside the Workers State, a conception linked to capitalist democracy. In this attempt however, they failed. This is a great reverse for all the dissident movements in the other Workers States. All in all, these dissidents have little strength or importance.

The balance of world forces which is favourable to the revolution in every part of the world is also favourable to it in the Workers States. It is favourable to a process of democratic Soviet development which is – to one degree or another – already unfolding in all the Workers States. This is also true of the Soviet Union. The Soviet bureaucratic apparatus, even if it has been very cautious, did intervene in pressing the Polish (leadership) to yield. It looked for the least dangerous solution for itself, certainly, but it realises also that its preparation for the final settlements of accounts with the capitalist system is incompatible with the pursuit of internal repression; incompatible with Trade Union organisations deprived of Soviet democratic rights; incompatible with Trade Unions weighed down by bureaucratic apparatuses hostile to the masses inside the Workers State.

In the confrontation with the capitalist system, the uprising of the Polish masses gives a measure of the Workers States' preparedness. It measures the extent to which the Workers States have matured in their resolve to confront capitalism, to defeat it. The high level of consciousness displayed by the Polish masses indicates the high level of consciousness reached by the masses in all the Workers States.

The influence of all this movement is going to be felt in China; and this very shortly. The Chinese (leaders) kept their mouth shut over Poland for fear of making the wind of Soviet democracy veer towards China.

THE PROGRESS OF THE WORKERS STATES IS A NECESSITY IN HISTORY

It is not really correct to refer to 'Socialist Democracy'. Democracy is no longer necessary in socialist society because the highest form of democracy is Socialism itself. In all the above analyses, we have referred to the need for more democracy in the structures of the present Workers States. After a certain level in their advance towards Soviet structures, the USSR will stop being Soviet because it will have become Socialist. There is also the other characterisation to be made regarding 'the Soviet structure'. Note that any country that starts becoming a Workers State becomes 'Soviet' in its structure. It acquires a Soviet structure. It leaves behind the capitalist forms and adopts Soviet form. What Soviet forms? The Party and the Party relations; the new institutions, State planning and the new human relations. They are 'Soviet' more than they are socialist because we are only dealing here with a Workers State. This is why democracy in the Workers State should be called 'Soviet Democracy'. In a country that has not yet reached Socialism but is advancing towards it, there is need for democracy to keep advancing. If democracy is no longer a concern in Socialism, it is because it is already there. Socialism is the highest form of democracy.

All the problems of humanity find their solution in Socialism because it is the stage when all the antagonisms and all the social divisions have been overcome, eliminated. This does not mean the end of debate! Every form of discussion and debate is going to continue. What will have ended is the social divisions. These are the reasons why we demand 'Soviet Democracy' in the Workers States, and do not call it 'Socialist Democracy'. We go along with the term 'Socialist Democracy' because it is in common usage. It is an incorrect qualification however, because there is no Socialism in any of the Workers States. Socialism means 'to each according to their needs', but the division of production and distribution in the Workers States is still on the basis of the wage - 'to each according to their capacity'.

'To each according to their capacity' means that distribution is unequal. This generates inequality in the social relations, bureaucracies and apparatuses dedicated to leading production for their own interests. This

happens in the Workers States, but the Workers State induces socialist consciousness as well. The improved social relations of the Workers State strain towards a better and more Soviet sort of economy, paving the way for further advances. We believe that distribution 'to each according to their needs' is already possible in several Workers States, the Soviet Union in particular. This only wants for some reorganising like planning in agriculture for instance, and a better intervention of the masses where the goods are being produced. With just these measures, you could increase production by 20% in any Workers State, definitely so in the Soviet Union. A 20% increase in production with the simple elimination of bureaucratic apparatuses!

This is what we think is already possible today. It is important however to consider that we live in the period of the final world confrontation of the Workers States with capitalism. We have called this 'the final settlement of accounts' between Socialism and capitalism. The matter of democracy in the Workers States must be seen in the context of all the preparations that capitalism is now making for war. It must be seen against the fact that every plan, discussion, reform, change and advance in the Workers States is bound up with the war preparations of imperialism, and the preparations of the Workers States to defend themselves accordingly.

All this in Poland about Soviet democracy - all this elevation in the intervention of the masses of Poland - means that the Workers State is improving its capacity to confront the war that capitalism prepares. This is not without influencing the masses of the capitalist countries. The advance of Soviet democracy in Poland lends to the Workers States an immense authority over the masses in the capitalist countries. It communicates to the masses of the capitalist countries the determination to rise immediately against the capitalist system as soon as the war starts.

TRADE UNIONS AUTONOMOUS FROM BUREAUCRACY, YES, BUT NOT FROM THE WORKERS STATE

The strikes in Poland are a victory of the Polish Workers State against the capitalist system and against Workers State bureaucracy. This is not finished yet, and there is more than one struggle to come. The way the

bureaucracy has yielded shows that the Workers State has to look for peace with the masses. It has to partner with the masses to confront the capitalist war together.

This victory of the Polish masses is a tremendous blow at the Chinese bureaucracy. The Chinese masses see that the problems they face in China can be resolved quite simply, the way it was done in Poland. Soviet democracy is going to be stimulated in China, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary. This, in Poland, is going to have an immense influence in all the Workers States.

This experience demonstrates that the Workers State resolves its problems in line with what human progress requires. It does not resolve them to continue serving local interests or the interests of cliques. The local and clique interests have not been eliminated, but the process of history causes even these to eventually align with the interests of the progress of humanity – through the masses of Poland, through the Workers State.

The behaviour of the bureaucracy of the various Workers States has not been uniform, but it has been generally favourable to the concessions made in Poland. This casts some light on how the Workers States may turn out to be influenced in the future. Same for what to expect in the capitalist world. The masses of the capitalist countries are going to be moved by the actions of the Polish masses, the behaviour of the Polish leadership and government, the Communist Party. They are going to want more from the Communist and Socialist parties in the capitalist world.

We can expect further political changes in the Party and in the Trade Unions of Poland. Count also on strong reactions in the bureaucracy. It is going to defend itself. The conduct of the strikers however, and their leaderships, shows that they are not looking for solutions harmful to the Workers State. The masses of the world have understood this. The masses of the world are going to see that the ‘autonomous’ function of the Trade Unions is both autonomous and united with the Workers State. They are going to see that the Trade Unions in Poland may be ‘autonomous’ regarding the decisions of the Party - ‘autonomous’ as organisms - but that they have the same interests and aims as the Workers state.

The masses of the capitalist countries are going to learn a great deal from this experience. In their countries, they are going to want changes in the Communist and Socialist parties. They are going to move so that their leaders stop defending the capitalist state, prepare to confront it instead. The class struggle is going to be stimulated all over the world. Poland is not a defeat for Soviet democracy! It is a defeat for the capitalist system and world imperialism. This process measures also the level of Workers State influence in the world at large, in this stage of the 'final act' of the existence of the capitalist system. These are conclusions from events in Poland full of lessons for China, Africa, Asia and Latin America. The whole world will be influenced.

In Poland, the State accepted and welcomed the intervention of the workers movement at country's leadership level. The Polish working class showed its maturity by announcing, at the same time, that it did not want to damage Socialism. When they learnt that their strike had won, the first action of the Polish workers was to sing the 'International' and get rid of all the Kurons. Contrast this with El Salvador where more than 300 people were murdered in the last general strike. In Bolivia more than 1,500 Trade Union leaders were thrown in jail for crime of wanting democracy. They hadn't even asked for Socialism, just democratic rights, respect for the elections. Still in Bolivia, a handful of soldiers representing less than 5% of the population imposed their military response to the remaining 95%, with measures to serve their interests and those of big capital. The masses of the world see much-vaunted capitalist 'democracy' dropping its fig-leaf in Bolivia, while proper democracy goes forward in Poland. They make the comparison.

The events in Poland are going to impact strongly all the Communist parties. These events are going to educate the Communist parties in what they lack at the moment. They lack in grasp and confidence in the communist method. They do not cultivate the political life that draws from the communist theoretical principles in order to apply these subsequently in practice.

Through these events in Poland, we are also seeing how the question of 'pluralism' poses itself in the Workers States. The only possible form of

‘pluralism’ in the Workers State is the one that combines the Trade Unions, the political leadership (Communist Party) and the State. It is in this combination that you have ‘pluralism’ in the real sense. It is not the pluralism of varying currents and conceptions. The aim of Socialism is a unity and the conception of Socialism is indivisible. The masses of the capitalist world, those who support the Communist and the Socialist parties, will say about the rights won by the workers in Poland: ‘So, this is what pluralism is! It is not a diverging, antagonistic or contradictory interests thrown together. Pluralism comes with the growth of currents and tendencies in the very process of the construction of Socialism. You get pluralism only when the capitalists have been expropriated, production is planned and the mass of the population intervenes in the leadership of the country. The masses are learning this. In Poland, they learn how to intervene in the leadership of production.

We salute with immense joy the victory of the Polish workers. Undoubtedly this struggle is not finished. The bureaucratic leadership has not yielded to the workers from a position of understanding, but because it had to. It is going to continue defending itself, as it does when it talks of wanting two sorts of Trade Unions now, alongside each other. The need for Soviet democracy will eventually trump all this. Soviet democracy will win because only it, can answer the problems.

The bureaucracy can still deliver kicks in self-defence, but its ability to succeed can only diminish. At every turn, the bureaucracy is going to clash with the need for progress, which is the progress of history. The progress of history demands the expansion of the democratic Soviet rights of the masses, for them to intervene in the construction of the Workers State. Not just for better wages, but to build the State, the Workers State. This is why the Polish masses kept repeating – throughout the duration of the strikes – that they were not attacking Socialism. They agreed with Socialism and they wanted to see more of it. For the masses, more Soviet forms means more of their involvement and greater intervention, leading them having more say in the Trade Unions and the State, and then still more democratic rights. This is where the process in Poland is heading to, even if the present democratic rights of the Polish workers remain quite limited.

None of the above is enough however for there to be Soviet democracy and democratic Soviet rights for all. The latter require the life of the Party, of the Party's cells, the Party's organisms in the regions, etc. The same goes for culture and science. These need the Party to preside over their growth in the Trade Unions and throughout the country, with a stress on the countryside. Education must be of the kind that allows the masses to intervene in the leadership of society.

This is what the masses want. It is what they are learning to do when they insist on having their views taken account of. The leaderships of the Workers States are learning how to let people do this, that is to say, how to lead. When they do this, the leaders replace bureaucratic ambition with the objective role they need to play for the sake of Socialism. This amounts to them responding to the objective necessity of Socialism.

This is bound to greatly stimulate the masses of the other Workers States. In their turn, these will demand more democratic Soviet rights, more Socialism in their Workers States. The masses are learning how to progress Socialism, how to eliminate bureaucracy, and how to do all these things without damaging the Workers State. This is how they get ready for the war capitalism that capitalism prepares. They do all this, they preserve the Workers State, they put the Workers State in a better position for the confrontation with the capitalist system.

All this process in Poland is going to have an impact in the capitalist countries too. In the capitalist countries, it is going to have a strong influence in the Trade Union struggles. On the subject of Soviet democracy, it is going to be a great source of education for the Communist parties.

The world Communist parties and Trade Union movements have to discuss these conclusions. They need to study the experiences that the masses are making in building Socialism. Capitalism had hundreds of years to build itself. It had hundreds of years of participation in the economy before taking political power. There is no such background to shore up the masses of today. Although they never had any previous involvement in the leadership of the economy, they must learn how to build Workers States

and Socialism! It is only now, and only through the Workers State, that the opportunity has arisen for them to do this. Contrast this with the way capitalism could acquire, centralise and enlarge the wealth it collected in the process of robbing the entire world. None of this applies to the Workers States, some of which even give a large part of their incomes to the revolutionary movements.

The problems that confront the Workers States do not all come from the bureaucrats and their misdeeds. They are problems with roots in having to learn everything about making a Workers State. The experience of Stalin showed how damaging the bureaucracy can be, and how it maintained itself long enough to spread corruption on a world scale. This corruption expressed itself, for instance, in the differences which broke out between Stalin on the one hand, and the Yugoslav and the Chinese Workers States on the other. Throughout his tenure, Stalin worked to stop the revolution and prevent its extension. He kept pressing Yugoslavia and China into alliances with capitalism - but in the end, it was not Stalin who prevailed, but the revolution.

We live in a new stage with new historic conditions. These demand an awareness that one's intervention now takes place in this stage of the final settlements of accounts. The struggle for Soviet democracy in the Workers States cannot overlook the need to defend the Workers State against the capitalist system. That is to say, Soviet democracy is no longer just about gaining more democratic Soviet rights, but about the final war that capitalism prepares.

The Polish masses have displayed this high level of historic consciousness. They showed this by the way they defended the Workers State unconditionally.

This is the essential conclusion to draw from the strike movement in Poland.

The masses in the other Workers States understand this too. They are bound to be showing it soon.

THE WORKERS STATE OF POLAND HAS NOT BEEN DEFEATED - IT HAS BEEN STRENGTHENED

There have been neither victors nor vanquished in this strike in Poland. Because although with many contradictions, the Polish Workers State made a huge leap forward. This is going to show in all the Trade Union movements, in all the Communist parties of the world.

About the strikes in Poland, the leaderships of several Trade Union Centres in Italy declared that 'one should go to Poland and see for oneself'. There is no doubt that the Polish workers will say to that: 'Welcome to our socialist country'. They will then ask why the Trade Union leaders of Italy are not making more of what happens to the workers in Italy. In Italy, the capitalist State has just decided to rob the workers with a 5% cut in their wages. The Polish workers will want to know why this amount was not removed from the capitalists instead. They will want to know why the capitalists of Italy admit to inability to produce. Why not propose for Italy the remedies that worked in Poland - expropriations and State ownership? The Polish workers will say that the Trade Union leaders are elected in Poland. In Poland, the workers choose and elect their own leaders. Isn't it so, they will ask, that in Italy half the shop-stewards are chosen by the boss? Is that democratic? The Polish workers will say that this is pure mockery. It is a denial of the workers' democratic rights in Italy.

The experience that the Polish workers have just made is going to stimulate the workers and the Trade Union centres in Italy and in the world. There may not be effects to be seen immediately. This is due to the weight of bureaucratic apparatus in the various working-class movements of the world - but you will see effects in a later stage.

Meanwhile, the Communist parties of the world make the experience that Poland shows the way. The way to build Socialism. Poland demonstrates that it is perfectly possible to make criticisms of the Workers State whilst remaining loyal and united to its Workers State structure, and against the capitalist system, at the same time.

From the experience of Poland, the Communist parties are going to learn how the struggle for democratic Soviet rights is bound up and combined with taking the necessary measures to counter the war that capitalism is preparing.

The Polish masses do not take advantage of the difficulties of the Workers State. In this way, they display a very elevated socialist consciousness and capacity. They do not demand for themselves, far from it! In fact, they have made a movement based on the unconditional defence of the Workers State. This does not negate the struggle against bureaucracy in any way. It is only that this struggle takes the form of an increase in the rights and participation of the masses whilst maintaining the unity of the Workers State against capitalism.

J.POSADAS

31.8.1980

THE WORKERS STATE: A STEP IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SOCIALIST SOCIETY

J POSADAS

26.02.81

Poland represents a stage in human history, in which the world sees how the masses themselves, construct society. The changes in Poland do not represent the concessions of a government or of a Party under the pressure of the workers. They represent a necessity. They are the necessary changes for the historic progress of the country at this time. Like the NEP in Lenin's time, they are a necessity which had to be expressed in this way. The situation today is the exact opposite to what it was in 1921, but just like the NEP did, these changes fulfil a measure of progress. The Trade Union leadership developing today in the Workers States is learning how to give ideas. It does not have clear ideas yet, but this is due to the fact that it is the first time that the workers are allowed to intervene and speak. They also have a problem of a lack of cadres precisely because of this. They tried to speak in 1956² but they were brutally repressed.

To understand Poland today, one must remember that the Revolution rose there, originally, practically without a Party. A Party of sorts was set up after the war, but all sorts of people entered it. Stalin took advantage of this to inject into it all the bureaucrats he could. He built an iron apparatus, but today, its 'iron silence'³ "can no longer be tolerated". The masses of the world have seen the effect of the changes in Poland and they have learned from it. The children of Nicaragua, and of El Salvador, also learn from Poland. They develop themselves as a constructive factor in the History of Life, from birth. The children learn to think that if not all things can be done immediately, the important thing is to participate so that they will be done later. The children of Nicaragua or of El Salvador don't get all the

² June 1956, the Poznan protests in Poland. Massive workers' protest and strikes brought Gomulka to power.

³ Reference to the song by Jose Antonio Labordeta '*Canta Companero Canta*'. (Hay mucho que hay que cantar, Este silencio de hierro, Ya no se puede aguantar). See in Posadas' books, on Music and Songs.

food they need, but they feed on the confidence and culture of the world which is part of nourishment. Poland is the teacher.

The Communist leaderships that have campaigned against ‘the threat of a Soviet intervention in Poland’ have no idea of the character or nature of the Workers State. They followed Stalin when he was around, and now they endorse the criticisms of Poland coming from imperialism. It is imperialism that feeds them with arguments on this issue, as when they (imperialists) say: ‘*See? The USSR is about to invade*’ or ‘*Reliable sources tell us that the Russians are about to invade*’. The Communist leaders simply trail along behind the arguments of imperialism. Not one of them has drawn conclusions from the admission by the AFL-CIO (the North American TUC) that it sent 200 thousand dollars to dissident trade union and groups in Poland.

These Communist parties have a concept of pluralistic Socialism, and pluralism in this case means 200 thousand dollars from the AFL-CIO to Poland. But the real support that the Polish workers received came from the Soviet Union which gave one million two hundred thousand dollars, cancelled previous debts and sent a great deal of wheat at low prices.

The Polish workers are eating twice more meat, rice and wheat than the Italian workers. This is what food rationing in Poland actually means. The children can eat 100 grams of meat a day in Poland, and the adults 150 grams, which is more than the organic necessity of around 100 grams.

All these changes in Poland have been made without brutal collisions and show-downs. They have been made within a process of concrete discussions. At the same time as the Polish workers have managed to gain improvements, what they have done most importantly, is thrown out 26 top Party leaders and state functionaries for being bureaucrats. In other words, it is not a dispute over wages or improvements in working conditions, but a reorganisation of the Party leadership. It is not brought about by the pressure of strikes only, but by the fact that this was already a necessity in the Party and its leadership. This is why sectors in the Party and the leadership supported themselves on the pressure of the Communists in the Trade Union, to make changes in the Party. This is a process of internal

organisation of the workers' intelligence. They weren't trying to damage the State leadership, but simply to cleanse the leadership of the state and of the Party of all the bandits who were there. At the same time, they were never trying to demonstrate that they had won a victory.

It is the Communist Party militants rather than the common workers, who have pushed for these changes and convinced even Walesa that this activity was necessary. The Communist Party has higher preoccupations and aims than the workers, because it is not simply moved by the impulse to resolve the problems of wage increases, or whether to work or not on Saturdays, but on top of this, it is moved to understand how to improve the function of leadership. This is the way the working class learns to lead.

The process in the Workers States, in Poland in particular, is very elevated. It is the advance of the Socialist democratic process. The demands which were put forwards and obtained do not represent a strengthening of the working class against the government, but the elevation of social relations within the Workers State. This is an immense blow at the capitalist system because problems as serious as those which are being dealt with are being resolved within the framework of the Workers States.

One of the crucial demands of the strikers was to cleanse the state and Party apparatus, and this expresses the form in which the problems of the Workers States have to be resolved in this stage. Moreover, the Party agreed. Other problems such as the re-distribution of food and meat were also resolved, and this is immeasurably superior to what is happening in capitalist Italy!

The world's workers have seen the way in which the Workers State develops and progresses. The essential foundation of this process is the nexus of relations between the Party, the Government, the Trade Union and the workers. The Yankees say they have sent 200 thousand dollars to Poland, but this means that they actually gave a great deal more, probably around one million dollars. What have they got out of it? They have paid a lot of people who were given this money and are involved in movements and activities against the Workers State. In other words, the money is not dedicated to obtain democratic demands, but actions directed against the

Workers State. The intention was to show that the Workers State is no good, and they wanted to stimulate dissent in order to disrupt the functioning of the Workers State. This was the intention of the AFL-CIO which sent this money in the name of Yankee imperialism and world capitalism. This money wasn't sent in the interests of the Trade Unions of any country, but in the interests of capitalism which is also the interests of the North American Trade Union leadership...

The Workers States are a step towards the construction of a new society, socialism, and socialism is in the process of construction now. A fair number of leaders in the world workers' movement have criticised the Workers State and socialism as if the process of this construction could be accomplished overnight. But socialism is a new society and a new society in construction at this present moment. It begins with all the customs, feelings, individuality, family, individual or particular and partial conceptions ingrained in the character of the people. All this creates corresponding ways of thinking, interests, forms of consciousness, all coloured by this previous formation. This means that the Workers State has the task of correcting all this.

Poland had a large Communist Party but it was denounced to the police by Stalin in 1938, and Poland came out of the war enormously weakened. Two Central Committees of the Polish Communist Party, two distinct leaderships in the Central Committee, were surrendered to the police by Stalin. The last of these Central Committees referred to, was Trotskyist in its majority. The Polish Communist Party developed and reconstituted itself after the war. In the first stage this was done with Stalin who infected a bureaucracy within it similar to the one he represented. The Polish Communists militants have managed to triumph over this. They managed not to be discouraged and they never turned coat. Far from looking back towards capitalism, they remained with the entire Polish working class, firmly united to the Workers State. The Polish workers in this instance have well shown how they are not guided by pure individual interests, but by a Communist objective in the defence of what concerns them individually. This is expressed today by the manner in which they have continued to be Catholics and not necessarily militants of the Communist Party, but at the same time they have been guided all along by Communist sentiments,

wanting justice, better conditions of life and work, and the removal of all the parasites of the State.

This is why there have been no popular uprisings in Poland. For all the money that the Yanks sent and all the world campaign mounted by capitalism, there have been no popular uprisings, because there was no necessity for it. There was no need because there is no division between the objectives of Communism – which in part is fulfilled by the Polish Workers State – and what the workers manage to obtain, which is to understand and learn. There is a complete identity between the two. The Polish workers are learning how to intervene in the leadership of society, and since the previous Party, they are now restructuring it.

In Poland, the formation of a more useful and just leadership – essential to the development of the Workers States in the world – is in process. This level of leadership is essential, above all, in this time of war preparations by imperialism. This is the way in which one has to see the conduct of the Polish workers who have managed to make progress through measures which advance not just their own condition but that of humanity as a whole. This is the true significance of the Workers State. The Polish Communist workers are learning how to lead. It means that many of today's leaders are going to be won over; they will agree that this should have been done a long time ago.

The Polish workers and Communist militants are learning Marxism. They are applying it daily, like the alphabet in children's lessons. They are learning the simple and pure relations of Marxism. They are learning for themselves the purity of Marxism and are teaching the whole world. At the same time, the Soviets receive all this influence. If it were true that the Soviet Union is barbaric and wants to crush all this progress, they would have made an agreement with the bureaucrats of Poland and with the Church. But it is the workers the Soviets have supported!

The most important aspect of the apprenticeship the communists of Poland are making is the appreciation of the value of ideas. They do it in practice. The most important idea that has come to the fore is that Socialism is a process of construction that requires centralisation and planning. It is not

possible to plan without centralisation and the absence of planning is a stupidity which gives room for all manner of competition, as in the capitalist system. In the same way as capitalism, competition ends up calling the tune: who has the most gets the most. Those who have are not always those who have the most intellectual ability, they are the ones with most means. This is the brutality of the capitalist jungle.

The Communist leaders in the capitalist countries who make demands on the Workers States have to understand this. It is vital to draw the line between democracy in the Workers State (Socialist democracy) and democracy in the capitalist system. Capitalist democracy is for the individual, for groups or sectors only. Socialist democracy serves collective interests of advancing the juridical, historic and social structure of the Workers State which is founded on centralisation and planning. All these leaders who support 'pluralism' are breaking from this principle. In the case of war, for example, they may support the need for centralisation, but in the case of social action, they do not. How is it possible to accept centralisation in the case of war, which is the lowest point of humanity, and not accept it in society?

There is simply no comparison between 'pluralism' and socialist centralisation. There is no scientific principle and no experience that leads to the conclusion that pluralism is a necessity. The 'pluralists' are in favour of letting everyone have their own way, but right is determined today by social relations which are determined by the system of production and ownership. This means that 'right' depends on the historic contexts, in other words whether it is a question of private or collective property. This is the logical conclusion of a method of thinking. The reverse of this would be to take history from the Sumerians or the Greeks up until the present day, as something to throw out because these societies did not accept pluralism.

Nicaragua, which in the not-so-distant-past lived in the greatest backwardness, accepts the Workers State, and it accepts it in the same way as it accepted the necessity to confront imperialism and the assassin Somoza. Nicaragua launched itself against the bunker of this assassin with its children, the 12-year-olds, conscious that many of them would perish in

the struggle. The Communist leaderships believe that it is the heroism produced by utter misery, but, far from this, it was the result of the world influences which have taught the child. When the influence of the world process reaches the child in this way, it is because the world already knows revolution is needed and Socialism must be built in order to progress. The people of Nicaragua could not have developed the scientific principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, but they applied these, and they have acquired a practical experience of the principles.

When the children of Nicaragua use the experience of the Soviet Union as a means to advance, who are those who dare speak of pluralism? This means the abandonment of all scientific method. Nowhere in the world is there anyone following this conception of pluralism; it is not applied because it serves no purpose. Anybody who wants to advance has to do it in a Soviet form, with State control, planning, and calling on the masses to intervene.

Poland proves that it is not enough that the masses intervene. A structure of planning must exist also, to allow the masses to intervene. And both the masses and the leaders have to learn how to do this.

The Soviet Union and Poland, engaged as they are in this, are not retreating in any way. The Soviet Union has survived the most dangerous moments in history, because it was not isolated in history: the world working class showed its adhesion to, its confidence in it, its understanding of the Soviet Union's character.

The world working class never confused the Soviet Union and Stalin. This remained so even when Stalin remained the leader of the Soviet Union for historic time. And today, the working class identify the progress of Poland with the Soviet Union and Socialism.

J. POSADAS

26.2.1981

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST VANGUARD IN THE STRUGGLE FOR SOVIET DEMOCRACY

J. POSADAS

14.03.81

The process of the disintegration of the old apparatus of the Workers States, to a greater or a lesser degree – lesser in the USSR – cannot but take the form of Poland. If there had been a political life of discussions, congresses, meetings of cadres, events would have taken another turn, without the strikes and stoppages. The Communist vanguard uses the strikes and stoppages to gain the support of the workers, with the aim of weighing in the Communist Party. It is not a question simply of internal problems in the Party, changing leaders, but fundamentally the general problems of the country and the economy. The Communist vanguard feels that it cannot solve these in any other way. Thus, it looks for support in the rest of the class in order to make these changes.

Workers appear in these strikes and mobilisations with a great determination to struggle. They realise the need for Socialism. They see with their own eyes the sort of role that the trade unions should play. They may not visualise the entire historic role of the trade unions, but they want to use them to solve some immediate problems. Walesa is representative of these people, who are themselves in an alliance with the workers' vanguard. To reach over into the bulk of the working class, the communist workers make a relationship with Walesa. It is in this sense that Walesa is not the result of a selection. He emerges out of world forces as they express themselves, in this way, in Poland. It is correct on the part of the communist vanguard to impel the struggle, to want to cleanse the Party. This started as far back as 1968. It is correct on their part to be looking for allies to help them in this task.

The strikes and mobilisations in Poland are not the empirical actions of inexperienced or independent workers, far from it. The Italian Communist Party, among others, writes as if the workers of Poland were acting solely on their own behalf. But this is incorrect and damaging. The Italian Communists are dominated by their objection to the centralisation of the world communist movement. This causes them to see this aspect incorrectly. If they have so much political ability that they can operate on their own, why don't they say what programme they have against capitalism? Why have they no policy of confrontation with capitalism? They see Poland through the eyes of people who aspire to Euro-communism and empiricism, which amounts to their lack of anti-capitalism. This is what Euro-communism is all about. It is not enough to pose that this company, or that other, must be expropriated. This is not anti-capitalism. Capitalism also is capable of carrying out expropriations, when it suits it. There are quite a lot of instances of this in Italy, or France. Anti-capitalism means the realisation that there will be no solution within the programme and leadership of the capitalist system. Anti-capitalism means that the Communist Party and the Trade Unions converge around the programme of statification (State-ownership), planning and the workers functioning fully as the leadership of society.

The Polish workers vanguard is conscious of all this. It has still not had the time to form itself as the leadership of society, because there was no life of discussions, no previous socialist democracy. Stalin lasted up to 1953, and Krutchev continued until 1964. Krutchev took down all Stalin's portraits, to make the people forget Stalin. The people forgot Stalin...and Krutchev. He was given the boot - and sent to the Museum of Antiques, the Museum that never opens.

These are the reasons why things are the way they are today. These are the reasons that formed the vanguard. It is not possible to seek or make demands as if another type of socialism had to be constructed. It is the same vanguard of Stettin and Danzig that fought in 1970 and gained an increase that it distributed to the lower paid. The Communist comrades should remember this. It is the same vanguard that says today: 'We want to get rid of the bandits'. It is still the same people! In other words, it has not been a struggle against the Workers State or even against the leadership of it, but

against the part of the leadership that was unworthy of a Workers State. This is how the workers saw this. It is in these conditions that the vanguard is being educated and formed.

On the part of the Italian Communist Party, it is absurd and anti-scientific to present the removal of 26 Polish Party leaders as having resulted from the ordinary workers' protests in Poland. The ordinary worker doesn't know who the leaders of the Party are, whereas the communist militants do. Those who have demanded that the 26 should be sacked are not ordinary workers. They are acquainted with the internal life and work of the Party. They are Communists, and not just the ordinary workers.

It is important to insist that it is the communist workers who have taken the initiative in Poland. The ordinary worker who is not in the Party is not in a position to take the initiatives and share in the concerns of the communist militants. The Trade Union 'Solidarnosc' combines both members and non-members of the Communist Party, together with the Catholic workers. This being a fact, it is the members of the Party and not so much the others who push for the greatest changes in the Party. It is them who have the greatest influence in the Party, and Walesa is a bridge between the members and the non-members of the Party.

The instrument for decision has been the Trade Unions. If the active leaders of the protests had been solely Catholic, the movement would have moved away from working class issues. Everything that the protests achieved, on the other hand, shows that they do not depend on the Church. Walesa is a representative of various currents; and it is not he who coordinates and gives ideas. The ideas are given by the Communist Party members, and that means that the movement favours the Party, and therefore favours the Workers State.

There has not been time to make a different Communist Party because in this instance, 'time' has to be measured in light of the possibilities and the capabilities to have done so. In Poland, first there was the influence of Stalin from the USSR, and then that of Krutchev up to 1964. When was there time to make a different Communist Party? If you analyse this logically and scientifically, you consider that half the forces of the Workers

States have to be dedicated to their defence against the capitalist system. One of the worst consequences of the period of Stalin and Krutchev came to Poland with the return of 80% of agrarian property to private hands. The only need to do this has been Stalin's need (and his followers) to create allies for themselves in private property. This stage in the revolution today in Poland is the inheritor of all this.

Up until recently, all the Soviet leaderships remained accomplices of, or participated in, the previous policies of Stalin and Krutchev. It is only today that the Soviet Union learns to act as a leadership, learns to free itself from its past limitations and weaknesses. To do this however, it has to cleanse the bureaucratic apparatus. It must cast aside the remnants of capitalism - the fight against capitalism being the most effective form of elimination of the bureaucracy. For the Soviet leadership, to go against what is left of capitalism is the most effective way of ending bureaucracy. It breaks the pillars from under bureaucratic functioning. And this is what is happening in Poland. The workers are learning to act as a leadership and feel secure enough in the world to advance further.

There are many rascals in Poland, like there were in the previous period in the USSR at the time of Solzhenitsyn, a writer of the bureaucracy. The existence of such people goes to show what sort of apparatus there was in the Soviet Union, only a short while ago, 5 or 10 years ago. The Polish Communist workers see an apparatus like that in their own country, and they win the Catholic workers over to their side in their struggle to get rid of it. It is the workers vanguard that has won the Catholics to this objective, including the priests who say: 'Forward with God and with progress'.

The workers have participated in the strikes and demonstrations in an independent form, and no one has talked in the name of God. After the meetings some workers went to mass; but in the meetings, they discussed politics. At the same time, the Communists have been in the forefront of the strike movement, not the workers without a Party. The present improvements the workers have just won were not gained by Walesa, although he acted very well when he was in Italy. He was asked if 'defence against the USSR was necessary'. He replied 'Why fear of defend against

those who have done so much for Poland?' The drive to continue interviewing was lost.

This is what the Catholic workers are like in Poland. This is the Catholicism of a Workers State. It is not even similar to that in Italy for instance. In Poland, the masses have learnt that you don't resolve problems by asking for the clemency of the Heavens, but by improving the Party. All the decisions have come out of the Trade Union and the factory meetings.

This is what is happening in Poland; the Italian Communist Party does not understand it. It does not see that, to form a Communist leadership is a process, and that this process cannot be expected to have fixed stages. Although, the coming war decides the time limits and the stages, and it is important to realise that the socio-historic base of the Soviet Union is neither bureaucracy nor mismanagement. Had imperialism been able to continue its reign of prosperity, the Soviet leadership may have continued as before. But even then, the maturing of the revolutionary world movement would have forced it to make changes. Stalin did not disappear because he fell downstairs, but because he was killed. He was eliminated because he was unnecessary in history. Hence the records in the History of the Soviet Union read like this:

- What happened to Stalin?
- He died.
- How did he die?
- He just died.
- But, it seems that he was killed?
- Look, he died. The important thing is he is dead.
- But, there must be some certificate to say what he died of?
- 'Not necessary in history'.

The bureaucrats consult the file, then close it, and go away in silence. The process of today is very rich. This period in our lives concentrates a series of conclusions about a historic cycle closing. It announces the end of private property and the beginning of the end of the bureaucratic apparatuses.

In the Workers States and Poland, bureaucracy continues through the continuation of its structures. The original reasons that caused the rise of

bureaucracy have been destroyed, but the bureaucratic structures have remained. This makes it that the proletariat has still not been able to educate itself in its actual role in history. This has granted more time for the bureaucratic apparatus to continue. It is from its previous bases, from its previous condition, that the apparatus draws its present strength and capacity.

The result is that the proletariat could not form itself for its role. The important thing is that the proletariat never yielded. It never let itself be intimidated. It was never brought to its knees. It never accepted the apparatus. It never accepted bureaucracy as a fact of life or unalterable.

The proletariat is completely conscious of the force that it has. It knows its own strength and the real significance of the process in Poland.

J. POSADAS

14.3.1981

THE PROCESS OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION IN POLAND

J. POSADAS

05.04.81

The process in Poland is of Permanent Revolution. A Permanent Revolution in which the Political Revolution is also expressed. This process, never interrupted, is now retaking the dynamism of its origins. It advances in the manner of the Political Revolution to finish with a whole bureaucratic layer in the leadership of the Workers State. And it does this whilst retaining the full structure of the Workers State at the same time. This shows the immense confidence (impetus) of Socialism. It shows that Socialism is a necessity of humanity, a necessity of the human mind.

The discussion in Poland is intermittent but not yet ended. The criticisms directed at the leaders, are going to deepen in the future. The PUWP's (Communist Party) Central Committee, decided at the end of March 1981 not to make any immediate change of leaders. This is not so much a decision as the expression of the crisis at the heart of the Party. This discussion will not limit itself to the necessity of changing personnel. Political change is what is needed. And soon, the problems of agrarian production and private trade will surface. These problems are paramount in Poland and they will have to surface shortly. A number of bourgeois journalists comment that there is also private trade in the USSR. This is true but it has less importance there, as it involves a sector of small traders. It is another matter in Poland where we are dealing with not only small traders but with agrarian production, and the land in private hands. The Kolkhoz in the USSR, have a certain importance because the entire bureaucratic sector that resists change comes precisely from there. But the central leadership of the Soviet Union is trying to eliminate it.

An important element of private property in Poland finds its social expression in the formation of bureaucratic cliques that became a new layer

in society. It is a new layer in the sense that it did not exist previously in Poland, or in the first years of the Russian Revolution or in the Chinese Revolution. As the position of the landowners in Poland is not secure, they look for every possible advantage to be derived from their landownership. They instigate agreements and alliances, for instance, between themselves and others in the apparatus of the Party, of the government and in various State institutions. It all works with grants, sinecures and the like.

The private sector in Poland is a bureaucratic layer that the Communist Party eventually incorporated. This sector cannot be eliminated immediately because it is part of a whole structure developed after the war. And it cannot simply be dealt with by removing one or another individual. It represents a structure, a structure that needs continuous erosion from below. One of the reasons why this structure maintains itself is that there are not the necessary people around to replace it. You have here a large number of functionaries, Party leaders and top-post officials with their political roots in Stalin and Krutchev's times. Their complete adhesion to the concept of alliance and conciliation with capitalism makes them cynical towards the Socialist future. Now they make alliances with the dissidents of Communism like Kuron. These people do not agree in everything between themselves – they will fall out soon enough – but they agree to stop Poland going to Communism.

This is Kuron's role. He speaks of 'Trade Union democracy' but proposes nothing for the construction of Socialism. The alliance between Kuron and some Party bureaucrats is temporary. The present situation comes from Poland having emerged from the 1945 war without a leadership. The present bureaucratic leadership in Poland emanates from that post-war period. That was when it created the leading posts that it occupies today. It clings to these now, to oppose any new centralisation for further revolutionary socialist development. To resist this change, it seeks alliances with dissidents and landowners - people opposed to the interests of the proletariat and of the small peasants. This process does not stop at the Party. It goes from the Central Committee to the local Trade Union leaders, to the factory managers, to those engaged in trade, etc.

All these layers come from previous stages. The fact that they have not been removed is a deficit resulting from a lack of political and Trade Union life in the country. A political life where workers' cadres would have been formed.

There is need for political and Trade Union life. The Party and the Unions need cleansing. In these, the present leaders have not been educated inside Party political life. They have only ever learnt at the school of 'the leaders'. Poland needs workers' cadres, leading cadres. And so, it needs to prepare them. This gets done with the intervention of the mass of the people in the leadership of society.

To achieve this, the population needs to be prepared. New leaders have to be trained. The place where to do this is in the political life of the Party and that of the Trade Unions. But how is Poland going to do this if there are no Party cells, no Party and Union meetings, no assemblies, no Party debates? It is on this absence that the Party's apparatus survives. The apparatus depends on there being no functioning in the workers, no discussions, no elaborations or programmes – or perhaps only for elections. The apparatus' only concern is with the selection of bureaucrats. This not requiring any Party life. The entire bureaucratic layer in Poland goes back to the Stalin's chosen few, and those who then proceeded to develop within the framework of Stalinism.

The self-interests of the bureaucrats run counter to the development of the State for the public good. To maintain their positions, they resort to actions opposed to the social-historic development of the State, the Workers State. Besides planning, the meaning of the *Workers State* is State-ownership and the intervention of the workers and masses in the Communist Party.

The policies of the bureaucrats consist in conciliating and making agreements with world capitalism. But you do not need any political life in the Party to do this. Indeed, the bureaucrats want no debate or discussion about it in the Party! This still happens in the Soviet Union too. The Soviet film "*The Bonus*" describes this well; it was shown throughout the Soviet Union in 1975⁴. It shows that in order to confront the structure of the

⁴ The Bonus, Soviet film, director Sergey Mikaelyan, main protagonist: Potapov.

bureaucracy, one has to remove those who represents it. In 1975, this question was not presenting with the urgency that it does today (1981). The relations between capitalism and the Workers States used to depend heavily on mutual agreements and concessions. Now the bureaucracy has been forced – in order to survive – to look for support in some revolutionary processes, although it also needs to cut short these revolutionary processes also in order to survive! The result however is that the bureaucracies that developed under Stalin are left with less support. From a historic point of view, and as a social regime, the USSR had to confront capitalism with a bureaucratic apparatus becoming obsolete.

THE SECTORS THAT OPPOSE SOCIALIST ADVANCE IN POLAND MUST BE SILENCED

Poland is a rehearsal for when the remaining apparatuses will be swept aside. This is going to need some time, because it is not just a matter of throwing people out. Although the throwing out of certain people is necessary too. In the USSR of the 1960's, a number of bent functionaries were sent to the firing squad for corruption. This particular clearance was a great socialist advance at the time.

In events like those in Poland, it is incorrect and even criminal to keep making demands for the freedom of all and sundry to speak. Many organisations take this view in the capitalist countries. They speak as if 'democratic rights for all' were all that is wanted for the socialist progress of Poland. But it is *Soviet democracy* that is wanted, and not 'democratic rights for all'. Soviet democracy in the Party and in the Trade Unions. For there to be a socialist progress in Poland, the pre-condition cannot be that everyone can speak. For the opposite is the case! The sectors that oppose Socialist progress in Poland have to be silenced. It is the equivalent to personal hygiene and cleanliness, essential for protection against infection. The basic health and growth of Poland requires the removal from the Party and the Trade Unions of those who do wish to give to the workers the right to speak.

For their existence, the dissidents of the Workers States depend on the links of the Communist Party apparatus with the system of private property.

This is what stops the Party comrades speaking out. But there are also Communists in the Party. They enjoy the support of the population. That support stops the bureaucracy expelling them all. The Party is also shored up by its participation in the Warsaw Pact and COMECON. These sources of communist support limit the bureaucracy. The latter cannot feather its nest with impunity. The bureaucrats have not been able to expand the private sector very much for instance. They went as far as privatising the bakeries, but not much beyond that. The bakeries do not have much weight in production, but their privatisation allowed those with the same mentality as Stalin to weigh against the Workers State's centralisation of property.

The true progress of Poland does not lie in "the right for everyone to speak". It lies in the proletariat being able to increase the centralisation of the State. And this, as part of the elimination of private property in the countryside. The workers movement of Poland has still not been allowed to intervene.

The dissidents – Kuron among them – do not want this Workers State. They want another sort of State where the trade unions are 'independent', and where people like him are free to make of Poland some kind of Yugoslavia. This is where the policies of Kuron tend to. But the life and the economic organisation of any Worker State is not determined by the Trade Unions. It is determined by the political line that defends State-owned property, the planning of production and an anti-capitalist relationship with the world. Any attempt to alter this is reactionary and counter-revolutionary. Calls to defend wages, oppose price rises and have the workers participating in the leadership of the State are politically progressive - but such calls must not be used to facilitate retreats from Socialism. Kuron and the dissidents do just this. Under the cloak of 'individual freedom', they use such calls to stimulate currents opposed to the Workers State.

What has to be discussed in Poland is not 'freedom' or even 'Trade Union rights' – but how to develop the Workers state in the present stage. This is what motivates the Communist workers, and the Polish workers' vanguard that supports them. Sectors and currents linked to the previous bureaucratic apparatus are still there. They have a certain weight because they are of the

apparatus. These types exist in all the Workers States. In previous times, they had a certain weight in the USSR and in Czechoslovakia.

When the Soviets intervened in Czechoslovakia in 1968, a whole layer of Trade Union leaders had to be thrown out, alongside others who felt suddenly discovered - some committed suicide. That year, the leader of the so-called 'Prague Spring', Pelikan, put forward a programme that was half socialism and half capitalism. Dubcek was a bit more to the left, but not much; his programme was also a mixture of Workers State and capitalist measures. These people had readied themselves for a coup, and had the USSR not intervened militarily, they would have launched a coup. This would have been a huge blow and step backward. In the present apparatus of the Polish Communist Party, you find very much the same sort of people. On a one hand, their presence confirms the great weakness that used to prevail in the leadership of the USSR when the Polish Communist Party was formed. But it demonstrates as well how much the leadership of the USSR has changed. Now it is capable of measures much more adapted to confrontation with capitalism.

Just as had happened in Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia reached a point of return from the socialist principle in 1968. Leading sectors formerly incorporated by Stalin were out to take over. They had not yet gone as far as to challenge state-ownership, but they were determined to make state property serve their careerist and economic interests. In Poland today, these sectors come directly from the private property sector of the economy, and in an alliance with sectors of the bureaucracy.

Pelikan (of Czechoslovakia) produced in his own mind the blueprint for a 'just society'. Not a 'just society' for everyone, one for himself. According to him, the USSR and Czechoslovakia are failures. He hit upon the idea of grafting on to Socialism forces presently outside of it. Forces outside the working class, outside this Communist Party still riddled with Communist fighters. But what are these forces to be grafted onto Socialism? If they come from outside working-class and Party, they lay outside Communism and the communist objective. Pelikan does not mind that. He objects to 'too much centralisation of political power' and 'too much economic concentration'. To his mind, centralisation and concentration violate his

principle of 'human freedom'. To remedy this, he looks for a society half Workers State and half capitalist. There will be two halves, and they will move in a process of free interplay. One half will stop the other from taking over! They will balance each other out!

Kuron (in Poland) is an agent of these currents. Even if he does not openly say so, the above considerations are also in his line. But today is no longer 1956 or 1968. What happens in Poland today is more advanced than on previous occasions in the Workers States. There are problems of wages and other workers' demands, certainly, but what comes up now is the need to cleanse the Party and the government of the corrupt leaders. Seeing that Communists are helping, the Polish workers are ready to do the cleansing. They want the removal of the functionaries who sit on the fence 'Communism yes, Communism no'. And they want the removal of the officials who are content with a half Workers State where the non-Workers-State's half is the one that keeps expanding...

This is a fruitful experience for the proletariat. These problems need to be discussed in the Soviet Union more than is being done. Over Poland, the Soviets do not take the polemic to the fullest possible extent. They do not want to clash too much with the apparatus of the Communist Party in Poland, and they rather fear the effect this would have back in the USSR itself. Something happens in the USSR because since 1977, they sacked some 17,000 trade union leaders. That was the year when the USSR proclaimed its New Soviet Constitution. In the field of the Workers States, this points to the class struggle sharpening. Sharpening not so much against one capitalist country or the other, as against the capitalist system as such. The leadership of the Workers States, but particularly and essentially of the Soviet Union, can no longer continue to operate through a weak and superficial apparatus. It cannot continue with an apparatus that simply negotiates with imperialism. In the last 3 years, 15 outstanding cases of corruption have been uncovered in the USSR amongst State directors and functionaries engaged in making big money for themselves. In all this, you see the great lack of workers' control. With workers' control, there would have been an immediate investigation and no time for anyone to accumulate in this way. These matters have surfaced partly because of internal struggles and disputes in the apparatus, but this is not the depth of

the matter. The essential reason this came out lies in the elevation of the Workers State as *State*. This elevation demands a clearance. The USSR cannot conduct the Space experiments which it does and keep this type of corruption going.

In the German Workers State (GDR), they are discussing the 'inter-shops'. These are luxury shops where only foreign currency is used. The GDR is richer than Poland, in part because of all its trade with capitalist Germany and with multinationals like Krupps. This kind of trade generates layers of bureaucrats on fat incomes and who get all sorts of bonuses. But there is a much greater proletarian tradition in the GDR than in Poland for instance. In Poland, the peasant sector has a great influence.

THE FORMATION OF THE LEADERSHIP IN THE WORKERS STATE

The process of the Political Revolution in Poland is expressed through the trade union movement. In turn, this is stimulated by the intervention of the Soviet Union which attacked and criticised the bureaucrats at the last Congress of the CPSU - the 25th Congress. This is one of the contemporary forms of the Political Revolution. Even in Poland nowadays, we no longer see so much of the pictures of the Virgin Mary, the Pope and the likes. Today, it is the picture of Lenin that is mostly seen.

Many agreements and truces are arrived at in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Poland, the PUWP. These are settlements after investigations regarding who needs to be thrown out following the workers strikes. The bureaucrats fear for their positions which have become so unstable. The Party is under pressure to reconstruct the government. It has now allowed workers' delegates to come up and speak, and to attend meetings of the Central Committee. This is the result of a very deep struggle. To have workers attend and speak at Party meetings is a Soviet democratic reform. This reform is a little 'à la Polish', because when you have to resort to this, it is because a superior incorporation of the working class is still not in place. If it were in place, there would be no need for workers to come to a meeting like this, to speak and to influence. All the same, this shows that the Party seeks the support of the workers. We learnt that the workers who spoke at one particular Party's meeting posed the

need to give way to the workers, to make certain changes and to throw out the Kuron lot whose friends and supports are in the Party's apparatus – not outside of it.

The intervention of the Polish workers is clearly to be seen nowadays, along with that of the Party and the Trade Union cadres of the Party. The Pope has had to take a step back. All he found to say about the problems in Poland is that 'they are problems to be resolved by the Poles alone'! This is a dig at the USSR, but at the Yankees also. He fears the chain reaction that could be unleashed if the Yankees became involved.

The bourgeois reports on Poland cannot be objective because their sole concern is to instil suspicion and doubt regarding Workers States. The capitalists want to incite in the world a more pugnacious external opposition to the Workers States, to increase the Workers States' difficulties. This is the game of imperialism. All those who criticise the Workers States and Poland reveal their disdain for historic investigation.

The Russian Revolution experienced problems such as the Kronstrat. At that time, Trotsky proposed to Lenin to allow the Anarchists to make the experiment of an independent government at Kronstrat. Lenin said that the White Russians were at the gates, ready to take advantage, and so this could not be done. The whole Soviet leadership discussed this matter. Then they talked to the Anarchists, to see if they could persuade them that their idea was endangering the Workers State. The Anarchists did not want to know, and soon some of them took up arms against the Workers State. These are the problems to be faced when building a new society - Socialism in this case. Humanity has not yet the experience needed to deal with the questions affecting not just the working class, but the whole of humanity.

Whilst the mode of production changed from feudalism to capitalism, the regime or private property remained. But what has grown in our times is the need for an entirely new society. We have reached the stage when the working class must gain the knowledge wanted by this situation, and in conditions where the working class never has had any no previous control over the economy [unlike the nascent capitalist class. Edit]. The working class must do all this whilst watching out against imperialism, still

hampered by immense bureaucratic apparatuses. These bureaucratic apparatuses do not come from outside the Workers State, mind; they come from within the Workers State! See what is expected of the working class in our stage, in the midst of thousands of impediments. And the working class must not only create Workers State as part of the struggle against imperialism but improve those the Workers States through that same struggle against imperialism. In the case of the USSR, it did, it does all this with a leadership formed at the criminal bureaucratic school of Stalin. You see the problems.

And so, humanity learns. The masses of Nicaragua go from the most abject poverty to directly learning how to lead a State. Inevitably a thousand errors are committed. The Bolsheviks also made errors, mostly through lack of experience. But they are lying those who justify private property in Poland by saying that, with the NEP, even the Bolsheviks had to get along with private property. The Bolsheviks did not *accept* private property. They made a pact with the system of private property to progress the economy and give themselves time. They counted on eventually becoming strong enough to tackle the rest of private property. This is not the same as wanting forms of private property in order to let these grow, which is the intention of the 'dissidents'. The landowners of Poland want the return of the whole country to private property. A good 30% of them are rich people embedded in the apparatus of the Workers State. These people are completely opposed to anything coming close to Soviet functioning. Their apparatus is being broken up, and it is the working class doing it. It is not being broken up all at once because those in charge have still got their uses in technology, planning, management; and they contain top people educated by old Stalin teams who make sure that the workers are kept in the dark and uninformed.

Capitalism and the capitalist 'democrats' hurl criticisms at the Workers State to rubbish the process needed to build and develop Workers States. In opposition to Soviet involvement, some capitalists pretend that the Polish workers are able enough to solve their own problems; but the Polish workers do not have the conditions. They do not have the experience or even the means to do it all by themselves. Quite apart from the fact that we are in a stage of war preparations. In its early days, the capitalists had to

devote some wealth to war against the feudalists. But you cannot compare. It was an infinitely lesser amount than now for the new Workers States against imperialism. Today, any developing Workers State is immediately challenged with at least 50% of national income going to defence, war and related. The USSR helps countries like Ethiopia and Cuba just for this. Note that this is also part of war expenditure in the USSR itself, but you see no strike or protest in the USSR to oppose Soviet support to the other Workers States. The USSR hands over at least 5 million dollars a year to Vietnam, and about the same to Cuba. It buys the sugar from Cuba, never mind the going price, often at a loss This is the support that the USSR gives to the other Workers states. Now, the USSR has granted a third loan to Poland.

These are the problems of the construction of Socialism in this stage of history, where there is neither a Party prepared for it, nor the required experience among the masses. The USSR is only slowly recovering from the time of Stalin, and one of the reasons for this slowness is that it has to contend with the war of imperialism. The USSR has to dedicate an important part of what was destined for production and education to preparing for war. But all this shows the huge confidence with which it prepares to confront imperialism.

These events in Poland show the form of the Political Revolution, in which the most profound and important problems are discussed without violence and excellent resolutions adopted. The policy of imperialism towards Poland is neither casual nor abstract. In this case, what historic objectives do those sectors of the leadership of Solidarity that persist with confrontations and challenges devoid of social justification, pursue? The historic judgement has to be made on the subject of whether the Workers State fulfils or not, its historic function. The measures taken by the Polish Workers State are in line with the Socialist function of the Workers State. What do these people seek? There is a tendency in Solidarnosc that would like to make inroads in the Communist Party, in order to weaken its historic objective.

The method, programme and problems of the construction of the Workers State, are being discussed, in Poland. It is evidence that history does not

wander but proceeds firmly. The bullet someone shot at Reagan intended to impel some intervention against the Workers State of Poland. It was a bullet directed against Reagan, the USSR and Poland, to create conditions for direct intervention and pressurise the European government into a posture of confrontation with the Workers States.

It would be absurd and stupid to believe that the Soviets are going to intervene in Poland because they think that Poland competes with them or is a rival! On the contrary, the USSR has to defend Poland, with arms if necessary, to ensure that it remains within the Socialist camp. It would be absolutely correct on the part of the Soviets to intervene in this way, if needed. It would be completely justified, as justified as their intervention in support of Ethiopia and Cuba. We are dealing with the process of the building of Socialism which clashes with the whole structure of capitalist society. What little strength and power the capitalist society feels it still has, is inside the existing apparatuses of the Workers States. It is for this reason that Lenin proposed in that respect that the leadership of the government of the Workers State be made up of Communists. This was maintained until 1924. In these circumstances it was perfectly possible to have non-Communist scientists, technicians and strategists in the Government but they had to be sympathetic to Communism. The upshot of this was that the Party defended and applied policies, and not the Government. This was the procedure during the first 7 years of the Russian Revolution. The way it worked was as follows: the State and the State functionaries had to be responsible for the development of the economy, for regulating economic relations with capitalism, and indexing prices. The Soviet government started with nothing. It had neither the historic preparation nor the experience of how to go about anything. This was at the time when the masses had not been prepared and inevitably, the old bourgeois customs, habits and individualist conceptions were bound to continue. In these conditions, there was a very real danger of the formation of cliques which would become corrupt and amenable to negotiations and conciliation with capitalism. The rule that no leader of the Government could have a leading role in the Party was established in order to prevent this danger from arising. This way, the Party determined the policy of the Government, and it is quite clear today why Lenin proposed all this. In the USSR, they have discovered a fair amount of trafficking between the

commercial apparatus and the outside world. This means that if you let these people lead the Party, they corrupt it.

The Communist Party of Italy in particular, tries to enter the capitalist apparatus and bourgeois government. If it actually manages to enter it, without first changing it with a programme of social transformations and interventions of the Trade Unions, it is certain that many Communists will end up applying a bourgeois policy as the most natural thing in the world. The Czechoslovak leadership, before 1968 – all those of the ‘Prague Spring’ except for two who managed to keep up with events – have all given up Communist aims or any interest in the Workers State. If they had really been militants with a Communist conception who happened to have been sacked from their post for one reason or another, they would have continued to struggle for Communism. However, they all deserted and disappeared. This means that all they were interested in was their position and nothing more. This is why they have nothing to say except accusing everyone else of being their enemy. They don’t say that the others are enemies of Communism, but enemies of themselves. The only grievance these deserters have is that they are no longer in charge.

If in the Soviet Union they have had to throw out 17.000 trade union leaders, how many more are there in the Polish apparatus? None of the people thrown out are Communists with an intellectual conviction. They have no theoretical confidence. In fact, they come from the time of Stalin and they feed on the political barbarism which lingers on in the Chinese leadership, in the errors of the Yugoslavs and in the lack of anti-capitalist drive in most of the world Communist parties. Thus, they remain under the influence of the policy of conciliation with, and contemplation of, the capitalist system. However, a new society is being built in History, and this requires new analyses, new concepts and new sentiments – adequate to the task of eliminating all classes. This task requires a maturity that can only come from the practical experience of the actual operation and leadership of the Workers States. The working class and the masses are now advancing in this experience. A great deal of the criticisms made by the Italian Communist Party against the USSR and against what they call ‘Socialism in practice’, comes from their fear of being absorbed by the USSR and their dread of centralisation. They are so anxious to avoid this

that they end up with one foot in the capitalist system. This is why the Italian Communist Party transposes the bourgeois concept of democracy onto the Workers State and keeps nattering on about 'Socialism with democracy'.

The problems that arise in Poland are those of the construction of Socialism. They cannot be resolved with 'euro-communism' or 'pluralism'. Far from it, euro-communism and pluralism, are not principles and are no more than declarations of an interest in immediate measures and policies. They are certainly not the principles of the construction of Socialism.

THE REVOLUTIONARY EVOLUTION OF THE PROCESS, NOT A CONSERVATIVE EVOLUTION

In the Workers States, the conditions for the creation of a new leadership are being developed. The Yankees are quite aware of this and they try to rush in before it is too late. In fact, the Yankees intervene by leaning on the decomposition of corrupt sectors in the Workers States' leadership. At the same time, however, they have to work towards the unification of European capitalism, and for the Yankees, unification of European capitalism means imposing themselves on European capitalism.

What imperialism cannot manage is to intervene against the Workers States and impose on European capitalism at the same time. More, in spite of the existence of very large apparatuses in the Workers States, imperialism has succeeded little. It has not managed to make any leadership of the Workers States follow it. Stalin represented the greatest retreat ever in the Workers States. But even Stalin had to respect the base of the Workers State: state-ownership and planning. He could not really do anything that would have endangered the continuation of the Workers State. Stalin introduced Stakhanovism, which was the most brutal form of capitalist relations and capitalist work conditions being returned in the Workers State. But this was also eliminated.

Stakhanovism was one of the bureaucratic traps introduced by the Stalinist apparatus against the proletariat. It was intended to submit the proletariat to capitalist measures, but it failed completely.

Capitalism is implicated in all this, but it sees quite clearly that there remains the whole basis of the experiences made by the working class, made by the Soviet Union, and even made by important parts of the communist parties. Entire portions of apparatus cease to be apparatus when they realise, or begin to, that the historic solution lies in bringing capitalism down. This is well understood by Brezhnev and even by Kosygin. The latter, however, does not actually mean to bring capitalism down, just dismantling it piecemeal.

The great impetus for revolution in the world, and in the Workers States, lies in the collapse of capitalism. But this has also fed the development of bureaucratic sectors who think it possible to keep advancing against capitalism gradually, bit by bit, and themselves to keep making steps forward without ever reaching the stage of the all-out struggle. It is true, of course, that there is scope for some of this, at least for a period.

A proof is that imperialism has had to retreat in El Salvador. Even the Archbishop of San Salvador made a trip in the world in search of some truce or agreement against the right-wing and the Yanks. As far as the Yankees are concerned, 500 well-armed soldiers are enough to wipe El Salvador off the map. But they cannot move in this direction because El Salvador is not just a country. It is the point of concentration for the revolutionary forces of Latin America, Africa and Asia. Moreover, the world balance of forces favourable to the revolution prevents the Yanks from doing this.

The consternation of American and world capitalism comes from the feeling that the Reagan episode shows all the weaknesses of capitalism and all its inability to inspire confidence and provide security. Even the Junta of El Salvador asked the Yanks: 'Who will guarantee that you will have the strength to be by our side tomorrow?' This feeds a current inside capitalism that seeks conciliation. The decomposition of capitalism is also shown in that even when the Yanks gave all guarantees to Somoza, he ended up with 8 bullets in him, which weren't originating from any old passer-by or guerrilla, but by a gun fired in a dispute between his own supporters and the Yanks, or within the government apparatus of Paraguay.

The Soviets have not only a social but a military superiority. This is one of the most important and decisive factors in the disintegration of the capitalist system. In the midst of imperialism's war preparations, European capitalism gives credit to the Soviet Union for the building of the gas pipeline to bring Siberian gas to various European countries. At the same time, the Japanese make lucrative deals with the Soviets and this indicates that they are also in favour of peace with the Soviets.

The Workers State cannot live if it cannot extend. The support of the world working class is vital for this. In practical and daily politics or in policies with a certain perspective, it is quite legitimate for the Workers States to seek, as they do with France, alliances with the European capitalist countries in order to break the centralisation of the capitalist system. The problem is that the Soviet Union cannot follow these alliances in a complete form given the fact that it cannot rely on mature Communist parties. Of course, the Soviets are partly to blame for this lack of maturity because they have not built these parties in the required way. Imperialism however, cannot use this lack of centralised leadership in the world Communist movement. It cannot use the heterogeneous process within which the Communist leaderships have developed.

In this situation, the Workers States, above all the USSR, find it possible to use the contradictions inside the world Communist movement, and to orientate it as a whole against the capitalist system. Capitalism cannot prevent this because it no longer decides anything of importance. Historically speaking imperialism has ceased to have any capacity for decision in anything related to the survival or simple continuation of its regime.

The internal struggles of capitalism are very sharp and pregnant with war preparations. This is what lies behind the attempted murder of Reagan and the constant reiteration by imperialism that the USSR is ready to intervene in Poland. This is a campaign of imperialism intended to justify to the world bourgeoisie and the North American masses its own desire to intervene in Poland itself. Imperialism uses the excuse that democracy has been violated, but what defence of democracy would the would-be-

murderers of Reagan make in Poland? It is true, Reagan is still alive, but the intention was to kill him.

These events in Poland demand that the Workers States intervene against the capitalist system. The declaration of Brezhnev at the recent Congress of the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) that 'We will not allow any retreat by a Socialist country', is designed to tell the Yanks that 'no negotiation is possible on this count'. It is the exact opposite of Stalin's policies which were based on negotiations. Any attempt to make the Workers State retreat is rebuffed. Czechoslovakia was a case in point. Even in Yugoslavia, they had to go back to seek support from the USSR. Indeed, since Yugoslavia is a mosaic of nationalities, it could only be unified by the Workers State. Once the Workers State unified Yugoslavia, all that was missing was a consistent policy to eliminate the bureaucrats enamoured of regional autonomy.

All it lacks is a social policy for complete centralisation. Tito's lack of culture – not stupidity but lack of culture – led him to believe that he could advance on the basis of self-management and regional autonomy. The process in Poland represents in every way the Permanent Revolution.

Revolution does not always mean resorting to force; it can mean a process in which the stage of insurrection only comes after a lengthy process of evolution. It is precisely the stage of evolution that prepares the conditions for the final stage. In other words, we are really in a process of revolutionary evolution. It is neither a peaceful evolution nor a conservative one but a revolutionary evolution.

Poland generalises this process of Political Revolution. This indicates that there must be leaderships in the Workers States that are conscious of the process of history. These leaderships may not have a scientific political understanding but they have a consciousness, because they have worked out, even if bureaucratically, that Communism is a necessity.

Poland is one of the greatest defeats that capitalism has ever suffered, and it already demonstrates the immense progress of the Political Revolution. So, this has resulted in the development of layers which have confidence

in Communism. This is what is happening particularly and most importantly in the Soviet Union.

J POSADAS

5 April 1981

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY INTENTIONS OF IMPERIALISM

J. POSADAS

07.04.81

The events in Poland are a stage of both the advance of the Political Revolution, and the disintegration of capitalism's ability for decision. It has not only lost the ability to decide how, when and where to start the war – or even belligerent acts – but also what pretexts to use. It trails behind the continuously advancing process. In saying that 'we will not allow anyone to interfere with the internal affairs of the socialist countries' the Soviets show the confidence with which they operate.

Poland is part of the process of the Political Revolution, and its historic significance is that it corrects those leaderships whose past corruption has antagonised the USSR, which is the most developed and genuinely representative Workers State of all. This stage of the Political Revolution represents the necessity for the Workers State to develop, and this means that it represents the necessity of History.

Imperialism is impotent; it is unable to stop the advance of the Political Revolution. All it can do is to tinker with the Polish strikes by sending money, assisting acts of sabotage and talking about 'liberty', without wanting to apply any that particular commodity at home! If Yankee imperialism is so much in favour of 'democracy' and workers control in Poland, why does it object to the United States' workers doing precisely that? The Yanks demand that the USSR leave Poland when in all evidence, the Soviets aren't there. To imperialism slogan 'let the people rule' the people answer 'let them decide in the United States. The only ones however who are screaming all this, are the Yanks, the British imperialists just keep silent and don't really support them. Indeed, the Yanks sent more than one letter to the British, who did not bother to open them.

These are scientific conclusions from the process of History, and ‘process of History’ amounts to the development of the necessity to advance knowledge, intelligence and culture on a world scale. Poland, the USSR and the German Workers State, embody the necessity for intelligence, culture and socialism in the world.

There are still many improvements to be made in the Workers State, but it is not imperialism’s intentions to improve them. On the contrary it wants to destroy them. However, the world has made progress thanks to the Workers State and it is crucial to understand that the Workers State is the essential base for the development of the progress of History. Since the Workers State is such an essential base, it is therefore the leadership rather than the historic form that has to be corrected. The people have learnt this fact. Also, the contribution the present Polish regime has made to history is demonstrated by the fact that whereas only 10% of the population had all manner of good things and no culture before the revolution, now all the Polish population has the right to culture and all other things as well.

The Polish masses know that the Workers State is superior to capitalism. They know that what has to be put right is the leadership. At the same time, the entire world working class has witnessed the changes in Poland, the compulsory changes there, and the ability of the Workers State to improve and develop. It is not a question of everyone all they want but what they need. It is not a question of particular, individual needs, because all the people need the same in the end: ‘Socialism, the end of capitalism’.

There has been huge progress in Poland and an increase of Trade Union influence in the Communist Party which has meant a closer relationship between the Trade Union base and the communist Party. The Peasants’ trade unions are another thing, because they are centres of negotiation between the government and representatives of a bureaucratic layer both in the Party and in the government. They had the same thing in Czechoslovakia and other Workers States.

Imperialism bases itself on movements of the dissidents and small owners. It boosts these people, give them economic and financial support and

means of publishing. Imperialism sent them heaps of publications by which the Polish government had to stop entering the country. The dissidents are the point of support for imperialism in Poland, and this is why it hangs onto their coat-rail. But it does not mean that imperialism supports all and sundry either because it kept very silent about the big strikes of Stettin and Danzig in 1971. It has only recovered its voice because the sectors that are linked to private property - those with a group or sectional interest - have grown since then.

All these people try to disintegrate the centralised power of the State, to weaken the leadership and make it appear incompetent. This suits imperialism fine, which says: 'Let no one touch Poland', in the hope that they alone can keep 'in touch'.

The system of small agricultural properties – dating from the Second World War – provides a base for imperialism. At its inception, the Polish Workers State took most things into state control, but the countryside was reorganised into private plots. Naturally, imperialism favoured this, and pushed for it all along. This is why the workers in 1956, came out openly against the government because of its link with the private property sector. Gomulka was returned to government. At that time, there were direct risings of the workers against these people who followed only their own interests. In Hungary in 1956, there were genuine workers' risings but the Church followed in their wake, making all sorts of demands for the sectors it represented, i.e. for itself, up to the moment when the workers moved to silence it. It also has to be remembered that the workers elected their first workers' representative – a Trotskyist – at that time. The Hungarian government could not do anything immediately; it had to wait for some time before it could get rid of him on the pretext that he wasn't 'the best representative'.

The Polish workers are learning how to construct and lead the Party. Whereas the previous Party was built under Stalin, the present-day Party is such that the working class has a direct hand in it. It is supported in this by the USSR, which favoured the reconstruction of the Party. In turn, this is going to light a fire under the feet of a good many bureaucrats in the Soviet Union itself. This is the way the political revolution advances. It removes

those who oppose and hinder the objective development of the progress to Socialism. The leaders of the Polish Communist Party were precisely such a hindrance and there is a wing of Solidarnosc that seeks to discuss with them, to strike an agreement with these people. At the same time, a sector of the state apparatus and Party looks for a deal with the dissidents because they have common interests. In the same way, we will soon see the emergence of dissidents in Yugoslavia, in agreements with the Albanians.

The working class and the Communist Party are both making an experience. One cannot intervene in this by making condemnations of the Communist Party, or by mockeries, or by calling for 'liberty'. On the contrary, the Communist Party must be shown the way to go forward and correct itself because with all its errors, it is the historic instrument. The same applied to Tito, because – with all errors – he and his team built the Socialist Yugoslavia, which was a tremendous debacle for the capitalist system. The Workers States were formed in an insufficient political and social manner, but they were formed very well all the same, in a historic sense. When we say 'historic', we mean dealing with something based on sound principles.

One cannot ignore the actual course of history. Today, there are French Anarchists who criticise the attitude of the Bolsheviks at Kronstadt. But they are fools who make a show of their individualist mentality and their abstraction from the reality - that of 1919 and of today. If allowed, such people impose a life of everlasting disputes and petty quarrels.

The experience of the Polish masses is for the whole world and for the North American masses also. It may not seem obvious at the moment but these events in Poland mean an experience for the North American masses, not for all of them, but for those who read and understand, which means that important sectors are going to be influenced.

This is one of the richest experiences in the life of humanity. One phase of a historic stage goes into another simply with the release of the huge force of the Political Revolution. Poland generalises the process of Political Revolution and it means that there are already leaderships in the Workers States that are quite conscious of the progress of History. These leaderships

may not be completely scientific, they may still work bureaucratically but they no longer simply depend on bureaucratic interests.

J.POSADAS

7 April 1981

THE EMPIRICISM AND ANTI-SOCIALISM OF K.O.R.

J POSADAS

16 April 1981

The process in Poland is acquiring a more precise character; the activity of the militant base of the Party (PUWP) is directed at changing the Party leaders. People inside the Party, naturally not outside it, are doing all this, but the forces for progress are also outside the Party and use this, to demand further changes still. The absence of a democratic socialist life existed in Poland before from the first movement of 1956. Then, a movement of opposition to the government was justified: a number of workers' leaders were demanding democratic control and rights for the population. At the present moment however, a differentiation has arisen between the members of the Party – who understand Socialism and fight for it – and empiricists, careerists, who take Socialism as a gift from God and not as something that has to be built. All this has arisen despite the absence of Soviet democracy, and this differentiation is not fully expressed as yet. The KOR (Organisation of protesters demanding 'democracy in Poland' cannot be eliminated however, simply by resolutions of the Central committee or of the PUWP.

It is the workers who will do this by their attitude. The Polish workers have seen that they have to create Socialist democracy and they are learning to build it. They created the conditions for it without ever harming the Workers state without either abandoning their struggle for the progress of socialist Poland. A Socialist Poland means: The Party, the Government and an alliance with the Soviet Union where all sectional interests – those of the Trade Unions included – are subordinated to the overall interests of the Workers State. A leadership is now being established for this task. It did not exist before, and it is precisely this that allowed such a thing as KOR to appear. In the present conditions however, the KOR gets no oxygen because it has lost any historic reason for being. KOR never was the expression of a historic necessity anyway, but it used to give a response to

a transitory necessity. It grew slightly at a certain time, out of the conditions of no democratic rights and Trade Union malfunctioning.

KOR received support from Trade Union and Party members, but not from the workers. The members of KOR believe that they can mix a little bit of socialism with 'free will' and 'self-management' and become a current in history. This has no future because it does not correspond to necessity. The policy of self-management in itself mitigates Socialist democracy. There was no political or Trade Union democracy under Stalin, but he was pushed aside by history because that was compulsory for the progress of the historic aims of the Soviet Union. The aims of the Soviet Union mean the programme and organisation of the Bolsheviks. At that moment advance in the political sense was impeded in the Soviet Union but it continued to progress in the economic and scientific fields. In other words, the Soviet Union progressed even under Stalin, when democratic rights were absent. Stalin was finally removed and this was done as soon as historic conditions allowed it.

The policy and leadership of Stalin were false. In contrast the present Polish leadership is in the process of rectifying its partially incorrect programme and indeed, there was a good deal of rectifying to do. But KOR neither understands this process nor does it represent the needs of Poland. It represents instead a stratum of bureaucratic leaders whose origins correspond to the workers' aristocracy in capitalism. KOR supports itself on the genuine workers' protests, but it interprets these in a way that suits itself. It would be very difficult to find one single Polish worker absolutely determined to obtain self-management. And conversely, it is obvious that the workers see that progress has been made on the basis of planning centralisation, unified leadership, etc. The problem is the lack of correct leadership for all this, and this is precisely what the workers are engaged in learning how to build. In doing this, they push KOR aside.

KOR is not really being shown the door; it is removed from the historic scene. Previously it had some audience, but this constantly diminishes both from the qualitative and quantitative points of view. It had some audience before, among some circles of the Communist proletariat and in the Party, but now it only has a marginal support. It loses support to the extent that

the process of democratisation advances and the bureaucratic leaders lose their posts in the economy, the judiciary, the military and the Trade Unions; all those who oppose progress in the field of political and state functions. This leads KOR into seeking new friends among those who dissent from the Workers State altogether, those whose disagreement is antagonistic to the Workers State. This is a natural and logical development of this process. KOR has no idea. It has complete freedom to speak and knows not what to say. The demands that satisfy the needs of the workers are not clearly formulated by them, because there is not the type of Trade Union or political life to allow them to do so. The Communist workers are correctly protesting about wages and work conditions. KOR also supports this, which is not difficult. But what the Communist workers want is not just better conditions of life and work, but to eliminate the bureaucrats and improve the internal party life. They want all this within the continuation of the policy of alliance with the Soviet Union. Such a political purity is not represented by KOR. The political revolution advances in Poland without insurrections and through the development of trade Union and Socialist democracy. This disrupts the bureaucratic apparatus and cannot be completed in a matter of weeks or months because it is a process that needs to go to the roots of things over a period of time.

THE COMMUNIST VANGUARD BREAKS LINKS WITH WORLD CAPITALISM

The process of Socialist democratisation in Poland develops as in all the other Workers States at the same time as capitalism prepares the war. In other words, this takes place at the same time as the Workers State has to defend itself from the imperialist war. Capitalism dedicates lots of money to create difficulties and sabotage in Poland. It does the same in the other Workers States, the same as it always did. But in the past, the bureaucratic apparatus in the Workers State was infiltrated by imperialism. Now, the Workers States are removing all this corruption. It is a clearance made by the workers, but fundamentally by the Communist workers, aided in this by the intellectuals, the soldiers, and even by the generals. The process shows, above all else, the superiority of the structure of the Workers state.

Poland is one of the richest experiences of history. It proves that Socialist democracy is an irreplaceable tool for the progress of life. The bureaucratic

apparatus – without surrendering to capitalism – conciliated with it. It never gave in to capitalism for fear of being replaced by it... Now, that apparatus sees itself constantly by-passed by the progress of the Communist workers, the Party, all the newly formed leaders. Those who are by-passed join KOR and become its mouthpiece. In the past, KOR and these bureaucrats used to be worst enemies between them. The old bureaucrats never allowed anyone to give any opinion, not even KOR. Now these same old bureaucrats look up to KOR for support because they are being pushed aside by the Communist workers and by leaderships more adequate to the needs of the situation.

Not all the comrades of KOR are bad comrades, or anti-Communists. Only, they have an empirical conception of Party leadership. They have the illusion of being the representatives of the workers' aspirations. This makes them critical of the old bureaucracy, but they are critical of the Workers State itself, its structure, its planned economy. They propose self-management, which is a diversion to give satisfaction to the individual interests. With self-management, the State does the planning and each factory produces independently. This way to produce is ideal for new bureaucratic apparatuses to take form, and as is currently the case, to take the best for themselves.

KOR was able to survive because of its accomplices in the top apparatus of the State. The top State apparatus used to oppose and hamper them, but it never was motivated enough to do away with them. They kept KOR going to block the advance of the Communist workers, those in the Trade Unions in particular.

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY IS THE RIGHT TO MAKE SOCIALISM

The Polish workers are learning how to organise and operate *Socialist democracy*. Note that we do not just say 'democracy', but 'Socialist democracy'. The important here is the right to discuss all the matters related to the socialist advance of the country, and no such right for what goes against it. You could not do this in previous times because the life the country was not ready for it. And the structure of the Communist Party was not ready either. Today, it is the Party that advances. Today, it is the Party that has to develop cadres, capable people, leaders who correspond

to the situation. *Socialist democracy* doesn't just mean the right to build Poland - but to make Socialism there! This cannot be done without alliance with the Soviet Union; and this, in an increasing centralisation with it. Socialist centralisation does not mean submission; it simply means that all the countries involved create between them the historic ties best suited to mutual support and collaboration. They start depending on each other, certainly, and therefore on the Soviet Union, because it is the world's most powerful Workers State from all the points of views: scientific, cultural, social, economic and military.

The Polish Communist Party is learning to build a team that thinks and assesses in this way. This has not yet found its clearest organic expression because the leaders continue to work in previous bureaucratic modes. But their previous modes of working are becoming combined with having to think in a revolutionary way. It is a mixture of elements that results in ideas not finding an immediate revolutionary political and organic form whilst conclusions are reached no longer in keeping with the old bureaucratic apparatus. The Polish leadership reaches general revolutionary conclusions that will eventually have to become expressed in anti-capitalist organisms in one way or the other.

Those who believe – some until quite recently – that there was the possibility of a new form of democracy and ‘pluralism’ for Poland, can now see that nothing of the sort has developed. There are certain forms of coexistence between capitalist and socialist measures in Poland and they cannot last much longer. The Polish masses, the leadership of the Communist Party and that of the Workers States generally, are learning the truth of this.

The Workers' State is the instrument of history; the members of the KOR want to dismantle it, so as to form cliques or what one could call ‘Socialist’ tribes. Their concept reduces the organisation, activity and struggle for Socialism – which the Workers States represent – to a tribal form; it lowers the scope of activities to what concerns groups of people, and this is the ‘tribal’ aspect. They may aspire to other things but the meaning is the same. Consequently, they visualise history through a group, through group interests and group thinking and not through historic experience based on

Marx. For instance, in building missiles, previous and practical experience is needed, more than speculations and hypotheses. We have to take into account for instance that the structure of the Soviet Union was able to endure Stalin and Hitler at the same time, and then first to ‘settle accounts’ with Hitler and later with Stalin. The dissidents and KOR don’t see this at all. On the contrary what they want is to ‘settle accounts with the Workers State. This makes them open to surrender the Workers State to capitalism. They are incapable of defending the instrument for the progress of History.

The bourgeoisie had 700 years to form itself because the process of its construction doesn’t begin with feudalism but from the rise of private property, which gave it the bases for uninterrupted development from the antiquity up to Modern Times. Certainly, the means of production have changed in all that time (Tribal, Feudal, Capitalist – note of Edit.), but the regime of property remained the same. It is the proletariat that had to change property relations. It began to do it with the Russian Revolution and it managed it in the harshest historic conditions ever.

J.POSADAS

16 April 1981

THE WORLD PROCESS OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

J POSADAS

08 May 1981

This is a speech given by J. POSADAS at a meeting with delegates of the Posadist IV International who participated in the World Congress of Architecture in June 1981 in Warsaw.

There is a new, improved and fuller participation of the Party (PUWP) in Poland, and the next uprising in a Workers State will go farther still than this. The current discussion in Poland is about the need for a better programme of the construction of the Workers State. This programme has to be firmly based on the economic, social and political, and trade union gains already made. Out of these, the most important ones are the political and Trade Unions gains.

The Party leads this process and neither Walesa nor any other movement have any real role. This indicates that this stage in the Political Revolution had been necessary; and that it could be fulfilled without any need for armed uprisings.

This tide of political revolution has seen many uprisings but not one armed against the Workers State. There have been partial – and generally not very full Trade Union rebellions – and this may happen again in other Workers States, but this never reached the level of an armed insurrection against the State.

Poland proves that the Workers State has no need for insurrections. The required changes, transformations and whole scale expulsions can be made without it. What we have witnessed wasn't a revolution but a movement intent on improving the workings of a Party rather than transforming it completely. The process of Political Revolution – in reality it is the cleansing of the leadership – is advancing rather more in the USSR than in

Poland. Indeed, what is going on now in Poland started in the USSR, a fact that demonstrates the unity of the Revolution.

These are fundamental problems which must be discussed in the world Communist movement, but although the papers of some Communist parties are well informed, they show a lack of understanding. They still speculate on whether the Soviets will ‘intervene’ or ‘not intervene’ in Poland. However, it would have been better if they, themselves, had made a self-criticism for having followed the Yankees’ campaign on the lines of: “The USSR will intervene!” or “There they are, they are about to intervene” or “They are now two metres away from Warsaw, eighty centimetres and there are the Warsaw Pact manoeuvres. What is the meaning of the manoeuvres?” This is all the language of imperialism, whose intention is to prevent any stabilisation of thought and political confidence in Poland, and it is also to justify its own intervention.

These Communist papers do not analyse this, and their conduct saps the confidence of their own parties rather than educates them. The Communist base does not give up on its Party, because the workers vanguard has a historic understanding of the function of a Communist Party. It knows it can change its Party the way the Polish Communists are changing theirs.

The Polish events are incomparable in the progress of humanity. Maybe there is some comparison with the Renaissance. There are differences because the starting point for the Polish process was a *principle*: the existence – albeit in a weak state – of a Workers State in Poland. As matters unfolded, the *principle* developed as an instrument of advance, even if not entirely adequately. The conditions to make it adequate exist since it could achieve all this without having to kill. This shows that Stalin has not been a necessity in history, but an anachronism.

This is why the old Trotskyism, represented by Mandel, whose recent book gives the impression that capitalism has a perspective of a few more centuries, has been superseded. The old Trotskyists thought that capitalism would continue in the Workers States until another revolutionary process appeared.

It is essential to orientate the discussion and to intervene on the stages in the process of Sovietisation and the elevation of the democratic Soviet functioning. It must be shown that this phase of the process of Permanent revolution is one of transition rather than just beginning or just ending. This phase is one of both amplitude and depth. With very large strata of workers, the military, intellectuals and professionals linked to the Party and seeking how to intervene, all feel the need to advance Soviet democracy.

The economic programme they have has not been proved yet, and they still discuss the generality of 'democratic rights'. They have still to say which programme of production should be adopted in relation to the economy, agriculture, private ownership in the peasantry, the banks, and the leadership of the economy altogether. How is intervention in these problems to be made? The need for this type of programme is going to arise shortly, and the fact of having broken some of the apparatus of the political and Trade Union leaderships isn't going to be sufficient. It is going to have to be extended to the apparatus that controls the organisation of the economy, the factories and planning.

The Soviet Union has an interest in advancing the revolutionary process in Poland. It seeks to sweep aside a part of the bureaucratic apparatus, without – if at all possible – any major political upheaval. The USSR will avoid a political struggle if it can, but if it can't, it will face the situation in Poland in the same way as in the USSR itself and in the same way it faces the problems posed by the Chinese (leadership). The interests of the bureaucracy have reached such a level that their positions, programmes, world economic relations determined by the economic apparatus, are themselves dominated by the political apparatus. This is the way things are in the Soviet Union.

The process in Poland has a far deeper historic significance than any struggle of cliques in the top leaderships. It has yet to reach its peak, but it will shortly. As yet, they have not touched on economic planning, production, control of the economy because they are still involved on the level of selecting leaders.

We have to form our cadres in the context of the Polish experience, and in a more elevated activity of ourselves. We have to combine this with the activity in various sections of the Posadist IV International and possibly towards other Workers States. The process in Poland is very complicated because of the tremendous internal struggle of tendencies, but, even then, we can intervene. We will be able to give orientations with a great deal of authority in this situation which the Communists do not understand because it is new. We are going to give guidelines, taking into account that their general tendency will be to retain their old methods of drawing conclusions, combining a little bit of truth and political correctness with the habit of the strongest imposing on others.

Today's Poland represents a new course in history because it combines reasoning with the elimination of fear. Stanislaw Kania - Prime Minister Sept 1981. Replaced Gierek and Pinkowski. Soon followed by Walesa - is playing the role of cell member, President and Commissar of War without there being a war. He is some sort of 'Commissar of the process of the progress of Communism'.

This is a new and much more elevated situation in a process that capitalism misunderstands completely. The capitalists keep warning against "the 'Russians'" because they wish ill on the USSR, but they cannot understand anyway. Their understanding goes no farther than their interests, and they have no one to analyse this situation for them.

Partial Regeneration has reached a fairly high level in all the Workers States, Albania and China included. It is an unequal process because of the lack of internal political preparation. If there had been this preparation, capitalism would have been finished long ago, and the Workers States would have been eliminated by now. But the leadership of the Workers States still lack in the vital knowledge and direction. They have to have the programme, policy, Party preparation for this: it is the first time that the Party is being educated for this activity.

The Communist workers of Poland, the Trade Union leaders, members of the Party, of the Party cells, the members who have a life with the Party, they all have developed in the Party a confidence with the Marxist method

of reasoning. They still make some mistakes but they try to use Marxist reasoning and the Party leadership grows to accept this, reluctantly but it accepts the principle.

This is a historic event that goes forward not with guns and bullets but with reasoning. All the significance of this cannot be overlooked! Poland is far from small; it has a greater economic, social, political and even military importance than either Bulgaria or Hungary. It is not a small country and it has one of the most disciplined and capable armies in history, an army made up of very brave people. On top of this, it has the backing of the Workers States, which give to Poland's army and armaments an even greater quality.

The programme for a development in this activity has to be accompanied by cultural discussions. The Communists have yet to acquire an understanding of the dialectical method. In practice however, they are forced to apply it in part, not consistently, not all the time, but they have to apply it. What they have not, is a scientific dialectical preparation. Therefore, they apply the dialectical method limitedly and in one of the most complicated situations ever, the situation of Poland. Poland appears on the surface as one of the most confused social processes with a good deal endurance on the part of, in fact, the old Stalinists.

The old Trotskyist movement – and the Communists – have always been guided by comparisons 'better than Stalin' or 'worse than Stalin'. Why better? Because they let me speak! The dissidents are also like this. It is 'better' when they are allowed to speak. The Communists and the old Trotskyists all think well of the dissidents. They think of Communism as what lets everyone speak, all the seeds of all the plants. For them, all the 'seeds' must be allowed to sprout. They cannot understand that all seeds do not have the same origins and significance.

This process has very large historic scopes and it is relatively new. We are the only ones to analyse it and it is why our cadres must have both the ability to intervene in each country and in the Workers States.

History is not characterised by the anti-capitalist struggle in each country, because the struggle is no longer centred in Germany, Japan, etc. It no longer takes a separate form or forms which combine between them. History is characterised by the development of the Workers States, which in turn form the basis of the struggle against the capitalist system. In other words, it's system against system.

THE IMPOTENT FURY OF CAPITALISM

Capitalism tries to maintain a climate of war by using a state apparatus prepared for war, because it cannot launch the war in this moment. Kissinger's attacks against Communism have a great political importance. It means that the Yankees see the danger represented by the Italian Communists. This is why he says: "Don't give any credence to the Euro-Communists; they are no less than Communists". He made this remark with a furious tone of voice.

This declaration of Kissinger amounts to an appeal for the exclusion of the Communists from the Italian government, and as such could have been reprimanded for interference by a diplomat in the internal affairs of another country. He was interfering indeed in the high policies of Italy. The communists did not see this. When Kissinger said that anything impeding the Communists entering the government was 'a good thing', he was calling for a Pinochet type of solution, in Italy! The Communists should have proposed his expulsion immediately for having called for a coup against the Italian government. The comrades did no such thing.

Imperialism has the distinct tendency to provoke movements and 'coups' like the attempted one in Spain, the declarations of Kissinger in Italy, etc. What Kissinger did in Italy was to exert pressure on the bourgeoisie. The same significance has to be attached to the attacks, threats and insults hurled by the assassin Begin at Schmidt of Germany. This shows the weakness of the Yanks. The conduct of Mitterrand, although conciliatory towards capitalism, does not fill them with confidence. It is not about Mitterrand but about the pressure he is under. Capitalism distrusts him intensely and the same goes for the Italian Socialist Party where the left has made progress and reached a part of the leadership. In fact, this process

in the Socialist Party means a concession to the Communist Party and a rebuff for Craxi (General Secretary of the Italian Socialist Party. Ed).

The declaration of Kissinger, against all diplomatic norms, could have caused a storm. It means that imperialism has to resort to this, because it has no other remedy to impose itself on and influence the European bourgeoisies.

It is a brutal crisis for capitalism and, on their side the Soviets obtained all sorts of advantages, including agreements with a sector of the Reagan administration itself. At the same time, another wing of the Reagan administration is furiously opposed to this happening and it is these people who have placed a bomb under one of the Spanish Generals.

Another aspect the Communist parties don't understand is the meaning of the agreement Angola has just started with imperialism. They think that Angola is leaving the soviet camp. How stupid! On the contrary, Angola is weakening the capitalist system a great deal. It has no technology, no machines, no capital, nothing, whilst it is one of the richest countries in the world. It uses these agreements to draw a capitalist sector into opposition against South Africa. On top of this, the USSR does not have the means to develop it.

Under Lenin, the USSR had the same situation as Angola with the capitalist system, except that Angola can benefit from a much greater degree of inter-capitalist competition. The latter leads capitalism to invest in Angola a great deal, whilst it will not be able to take much away from Angola. Let them invest!

The same goes for El Salvador, where with only a handful of guerrillas, the world bourgeoisie has to keep on pushing the Salvadorian government and the Yankees into making concessions. They know very well that Cuba benefits much from it all. There is a song of the Cuban, Nicolas Guillen, which goes: "I don't know what you think, soldier whom I hate". This song is going to be sung again, a little altered in the form of an appeal to the soldier and to the population.

All the old Trotskyists should feel joy to see that the forecasts of Trotsky are at last coming true. It is he, who gave us the means to interpret all this. And there is the same programmatic need to interpret the Political and Permanent Revolution today, as there was in Trotsky's time. This is simply needed in a different form.

The old Trotskyists have been taken back by all this; they have no idea or understanding of any of it. The reason for this is not a lack of theoretical and political ability – even though they also lack this – but it is to do with their individual interpretation. Personal ambition has grown in them all. You only have to read a little of what they write to measure all the personal ambition they have and this means that they don't see through objective eyes. It is not just that they are wrong, but that they don't see what is going on objectively, so they cannot understand because they always measure according to their personal ambitions. They go on talking about the 'bourgeois revolution' in Nicaragua! They have the same attitude towards Angola. They continue to wonder whether Cuba is a Socialist country or not, and all this, at a time when the world is so mature.

THE WORKERS STATES LEAD THIS STAGE OF HISTORY

The conduct of the USSR is having an effect in Poland and in China. The Soviets don't harm the Chinese whereas the Chinese do harm the Soviets. If the Soviets acted like the Chinese, it would be a real catastrophe for the world revolutionary movement: imperialism would have the upper hand. In this case, doubts, weakness and a feeling of giving up or giving in, would spread in the Communist movement.

It is the Soviets – and not Deng Xiaoping – who by their attitude, inspire in people the feeling of confidence in Socialism. This is new for the Soviets. This is not what they used to do in the past. Stalin would have made an agreement with imperialism against any Communist Party. There was nothing today to stop them using imperialism against the Deng leadership. The Soviets are not doing this however. They do the reverse by seeking an alliance with China against capitalism.

This does not stop the Soviet leaders clashing strongly with the Chinese ones. They do not agree with the conceptions of the Chinese leaders regarding the role of the Workers State. Although there is no clash between

them on the level of the economy, trade or production, the USSR clashes with the Chinese leadership over the role of the State, of the Party, of the masses. All this has to be discussed.

The Workers States' leaders can no longer negotiate their differences outside the Workers States' camp. Negotiations now take place within this reality and capitalism has to accept that it is the capitalist countries that make agreements with the Soviet Union. The USSR exports its gas to many of them, and it is the capitalists who provide the money and the technicians for the pipelines. The Soviets simply deliver the gas.

Capitalism has to accept all this, and by this activity, they admit publicly that they depend on the Workers State. The Workers State guarantees stability therefore, and the future. Capitalism guarantees none of these things. It happens also that the Workers States that have deviated the most from the Communist programme are in great difficulties. Yugoslavia, China, and partially Albania are cases in point. Albania has developed economically more or less according to the programme of the socialist development of the State, but the Albanian political leadership doesn't correspond to this programme.

The advance towards Communism goes through a contradictory form, not an antagonism but a contradiction between economic progress and lack of political progress. In China, this is most marked. There is a contradiction there between social progress and the lack of economic and political progress. Of course, we are dealing with the experience of the construction of a new society, and this looks for a centre for its development that still doesn't exist. We form part of that centre and our cadres must learn to form part of it.

This process has no comparison with any other in history because we are dealing with social transformations, the moment of change of both the property regime and the system of production. This is happening at the time when a leadership has not yet developed its own centre, to unify all the forces that advance to Socialism. In turn and at the same time, this is coupled with the lack of world experience that the masses for their part, have acquired in this process. However, there is still all the confidence of

the masses that this is the way to advance the confidence of the masses that this is the way to advance.

The crimes of Stalin and the errors of the Communist parties have not discouraged the masses. The masses show this by never turning to support the capitalist system. All the countries of the world advance towards the Workers States whilst there are increasing numbers of pro-Soviet tendencies in the Communist parties. This is the measure of the intelligence of the working class. The working class is not dismayed by one error or another, or by the disputes and the catastrophic conduct of the Chinese leadership. It is not affected by the capitalists' cries of: "Look at that Communism! They row and invade each other! See the Chinese invading other countries (Vietnam)!". The masses understand these matters. They have an immense ability that the leaderships of the various Communist parties neither use nor rely upon.

As Poland shatters all this, it lays the foundations for similar advances in all the Workers States. This is not an entirely new process because a few years ago, thousands upon thousands were thrown out of the Soviet leadership. But it is not the same thing either, because in this case in Poland, the workers have been allowed - and with support from the population - to intervene and make changes in the Communist Party.

The result of it all is that the Party profits from it, it doesn't lose. This is a new experience for the masses, which in Poland have moved into a new world without fear or harming either the Party or the Workers State's structure. At the same time, there is no profit in this for the capitalists, the Pope, or the Yankees. The only consolation for imperialism was in warning the Soviets that if they attacked Poland, they would stop talking to the Soviets. Imperialism threatened to cut all credits if the Soviets intervened in Poland, but while the Yanks were making these threats, the other capitalist countries were already asking the Soviets how much wheat they wanted.

This is the world balance of forces. It shows itself to be ripe for similar advances in the other Workers States. This isn't brought about by the various Communist parties. It is brought about by the world balance of

forces. It is timely therefore to call for state-ownership, production planning and the intervention of the population in the leadership of the countries. Poland shows this maturity clearly, better than any Workers State, and in all its aspects. It was the same in the USSR at a certain stage, even though it had a great shortage of means and had to give way somewhat. In spite of it all, the USSR maintained the intervention of the masses in the economy, in the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, in the Trade Unions, and also in the army where they used to have cells.

This process marks a higher stage for an intervention in which we, ourselves, must give guidance regarding the fundamental aspects under this historic process. In that process, one of the fundamental aspects is the Workers State. We must intervene in the crises of the Communist Parties to help them understand. We need to educate our cadres in this experience and the discipline of it.

We are dealing here with a very elevated process that demands a discipline of the mind - not in the sense of repressing thought, but in the sense of ordering thought to increase its scientific ability. We wrote many articles about this and are planning many more. About the Workers State now, twenty or forty articles are needed just on this topic. Trotsky wrote when there was no great curiosity regarding this matter, but today the process of change in the Workers States demands articles and articles. If you compare our articles of the 70's with our present articles, you will see no contradictions; you will see a continuity of thought.

There came a time in the recent struggle in Poland when the KOR prepared to attack the offices of the local Communist Party. The conduct of the Communists and other workers present reached an important summit in our human history as they confidently intoned 'the International'. KOR was thrown out, and the workers passed in front of the building still singing the 'International'. In the background, KOR could be seen attacking parts of the building, an action that clearly linked them to imperialism.

This is a very elevated stage of progress toward Communism and Poland is one of its greatest influences today. To understate it all, capitalism presents the matter as a fight between bureaucrats who everyone knows

always fight each other. Kissinger went as far as to say that such problems also exist... in capitalism, but this, he said, does not mean that capitalism is more “unstable”. It is Communism that is “in a mess”. He expanded a little on ‘the mess’ but at no time did he mention the level of economic, scientific, social, cultural and sporting conquests of the Workers States. He admitted to be supporting the capitalist countries because the problems in the capitalist countries ‘are better’.

Each day it becomes more gratifying, beautiful and harmonious to watch this process becoming part of the experience, of the capacity for thought and reasoning in countries that lay the foundations for Communism. We see ourselves to be part of this activity, which is not simply to resolve the problems of the economy. Although we have also intervened in the fundamental problems relating to the economy: many years ago, we said that the problem of private property in the Polish countryside had to be solved. We were not suggesting forced expropriations or massacres – the way Stalin did it in the 30’s against the peasants’ resistance. We propose to explore ways to depend less and less the private ownership of the land in the Polish countryside. Proposing Trade Unions for landowners who have to be allowed to live politically, organising so that the agricultural workers are allowed to influence the landowners. As we are not dealing with a capitalist country, we are not dealing strictly with a worker/owner relationship, and therefore the problem is not difficult to solve. Seventy per cent of the landowners can be won.

The owners themselves see that they are far better off now than they were before. Before the formation of the Workers State, they had hardly a five hectares property, barely sufficient to grow enough potatoes to keep body and soul together. Now they are part of a massive cultural-scientific-artistic development, particularly from the angle of culture and science. The proof of this is that their own children become Communists. These landowners can be won from within, particularly as they are now part of a Workers State that is much influenced by a system of 20 others. We are no longer in Lenin’s time with only one Workers State! The small owners can be won over without any imposition.

The fact that 80% of the land is in private ownership – of which 20 to 25% is made up of properties of 28 hectares – is not necessarily a base of support for capitalism. The latter has not managed to use this against the Workers State. These small owners are clear about the progress that the Workers State has meant in comparison to when they had nothing under the previous regime. They see and measure all this. Their own children become Communists. This is different from the time of Lenin and Trotsky. There are possibilities now that did not exist then. We have been the only ones to interpret this. It is the same thing with Ireland, where problems aren't posed in the same way as 40 years ago.

Poland's problems have to be seen in the context of the war in perspective, and the liquidation of capitalism in the very near future. The agony of the capitalism system, which Kissinger expresses, has to be highlighted. Kissinger himself is on the way out, and all he can say is: "Well, capitalism is also in a mess, but it has a future, as opposed to the communist countries which have no future". It is the first time that someone like Kissinger speaks in this system-against-system way, admitting that capitalism has problems, qualifying these as 'better problems' than in 'the communist countries'. He is de facto saying that capitalism is going to hell, but that it suits him better to be in capitalism. When he admits that capitalism is going to hell, it is because it is an obvious fact, and it is no longer possible to fool people about it. The level of culture and knowledge is too high for fooling people who indeed reject the leaders who don't admit to this. All that Kissinger has to say is that "it is better in capitalism" for the capitalists. He expresses more than simple agony, he has the face of a cynic and of a degenerate.

THIS IS A NEW PROCESS IN HISTORY

This is a new stage in history. It means new problems, and this applies to problems of Party organisation. They aren't the same problems as before. The crisis of growth of the Workers States, and the crisis of internal collapse of capitalism are combined processes. The result is that in the midst of the antagonistic crisis of confrontation between capitalism and the Workers States, Chirac and Giscard d'Estaing of France, are at daggers drawn, and they aren't duelling like gentlemen at all. They castigate each

other and they both feel that the other should be put down. They sneer at each other like small children.

This is a new process in history that none of our masters could foresee, because they did not live to see it unfold. Trotsky foresaw the reach of history in this stage and gave the general programme that corresponds. In 1938, he said that “In 10 years millions of revolutionaries will move heaven and earth”, which they did. But he could not tell exactly what would happen or in what way. The new leadership and programme of history still have to be built. The programme of the Bolsheviks no longer suffices. Trotsky’s programme served to formulate demands for a transitory stage, but it does not serve anymore when a general, social and historic programme is required. We have used Trotsky’s programme for the sliding scale of wages and the shorter working week for instance. But these demands have become less important to the extent that the Workers States have overtaken them in importance. Faced with this, we decided to dedicate ourselves to the process of Partial Regeneration in the Workers States. In its turn, this demands a better preparation than before and a capacity to understand the process of Partial Regeneration, its progress in the Workers States, in each of our sections, each leadership, each of us.

We have been the only ones to make the most accurate and logical qualification of this process of “Partial Regeneration”. We said that Vietnam had undergone the “complete regeneration” from the military point of view. This means that it did not let itself be smashed, it did not yield in front of every possible adversity, in front of every bureaucratic complication, and fought on against the capitalist system. The result is for all to see: wherever the Vietnamese army went, in whatever country, it made a Workers State there, and what is more, it encouraged political life there as well. Laos and Cambodia bear witness to this. It is in such conditions that Angola and Mozambique learn how to deal with capitalism and calculate their relations with it. Capitalism tried to confuse everyone by suggesting that these relations meant a distancing from the USSR, but the opposite happened.

Our theoretical and political preparation is a fundamental part of this. It demands increasing levels of participation, practical included. We are

making it so that practical participation takes nothing from political preparation. Theoretical preparation is becoming relatively easier to acquire because people understand more. We must intervene with theoretical preparation and practical application. This has to be done carefully and continuously.

The world Communist movement and the large Communist parties of France, Italy, Japan and Portugal, are still guided by the old idea that the fundamental problems are those of their own countries. It is not precisely like this because some of them begin to realise that a centre exists on the scale of the world, located in no particular country, but somewhere in the confrontation between the Workers States and the capitalist system. In these circumstances, the struggle in each country tends to be seen as secondary to what happens in the Workers States. Any advance of Socialist Democracy in the Workers States - even when it does not reach the level of strikes - has an infinitely greater effect than 20 strikes in the capitalist countries. Any socialist advance in a Workers State magnifies the influence of the Workers States in the world. It stimulates the organisation of revolutionary and political thought.

We must be prepared to intervene in these problems because there is no one else, apart from us, preoccupied with this. The Workers States make some efforts in this direction and there are comrades preoccupied with this in the communist parties, the Italian Communist Party included. The New Soviet Constitution (1977) declares that the aim of the USSR is Socialism. It says: "We support all the processes of national and social liberation". The turn of phrase is slightly muted to save clashing too much with capitalism, but we have reached a stage when the Workers States are decisive. It is only the Workers States that give security, confidence and decisiveness to human thinking now. A great deal of attention must be given to one's theoretical, political and organisational preparation for this process. There are many more changes to come in the communist parties of the Workers States and outside it, following these events in Poland.

The Communist workers of France, Italy, Portugal and Japan, are going to base themselves on what they have witnessed happening in Poland. In their respective countries, Poland is going to stimulate them in their own struggles. It is going to contribute to the unified and continuous process

that ties revolution, the USSR, the Workers States and the national communist parties. If the communist parties influence the Workers States it will never be as much as the other way. This is what makes Kissinger declare: “Don’t be fooled, the Communists may make a thousand promises but they remain Communists” - and when he says ‘Communists’ he means the Soviet Union!

The same goes for the Latin American Communist parties. They will have to follow more than before in the footsteps of the Workers States’ communist parties. They will have to learnt to do this more often. The world masses have realised that progress means the Workers State, i.e. state-owned property, economic planning and the intervention of the masses. Poland shows that an autonomous Trade Union is not and cannot be independent from the Workers State. By ‘autonomous’, it is necessary to mean ‘exercising the role of a Trade Union in an enterprise or a factory, free from the influence or power of management’.

There is still a certain influence of capitalist relations in the Workers states. This does not necessarily have the vices of the capitalist system, but the bureaucratic apparatus tries to maintain its pre-eminence in status, bonuses, salaries, production. This does not have the solidity you find in the capitalist system, however, because it has to yield. In the capitalist system, those who appropriate derive the profits and maintain the system at the same time. The bureaucrats of the Workers State are in a different position: they are stopped from regenerating the bureaucracy beyond a certain point because this would lead to the restoration of capitalism. So, there comes a point in the Workers State when this contradictory process stops being viable. This is precisely what happened in Poland.

What happened in Poland shows that the Workers State needs more than to stop the bureaucracy. It needs to overcome the lack of political, cultural and life in the Party. In the revolutionary process of Poland, many drawbacks, obstacles and delays have resulted from the sequels of war, and from Stalin’s policies; but the cure for all this is in the development of political life, cultural life and Party life in the country. The workers are not hesitant or demoralized by the shortcomings. They correct the Party and they push it forward.

It is most important to overcome the shortcomings in the Polish Workers States. These weigh more in Poland than in individual communist parties, although the communist parties do not lack in importance. We support a lot of what we do on the communist parties. Had George Marchais (French CP leader) won the elections in France for instance, this would have had a very great importance. Had this happened, it would have been thanks to a world balance of forces determined particularly by the Workers States. This might not happen, but should it happen, it will express the world relations of forces in this stage of history.

This process in Poland is full of lessons on the basis of which we (ourselves) try to intervene and influence in the countries of North and Latin America, Africa and Asia. These countries may not have to take exactly the same road as those in Europe. They must go from being very 'backward', like Nicaragua and El Salvador, to being the most advanced. Their problem lies in the absence of the Party that educates politically.

It isn't at school that the masses get the required education - literature and culture included. The masses get educated through their participation in the construction of the economy, particularly in the aspects that they have to deal about. The mistakes the masses make are of little significance, they are no impediment. When they are allowed to intervene, the masses start communicating directly and immediately all their new learnings, their objectivity and their love for the progress of humanity. This is definitely something that no bureaucrat can do.

The best bureaucrats, those who support the Workers States, can only think in a limited way. Only the masses can think objectively. When the masses of a Workers State are allowed to operate freely, they influence all the countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia. The most powerful influence on the world masses is that of the Workers States, because there, a structure exists that serves as a guide to people. It offers examples, it convinces people, it accompanies them in each of their advances.

J. POSADAS

8 May 1981

THE RIGHT OF RECALL IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY

J. POSADAS

2 May 1981

In this article, the event referred to is a resolution proposed and passed by the Congress of the Polish Communist Party - but whose implementation was suspended by the Central Committee.

The Polish Unified Workers Party (PUWP) has just passed a resolution through which no leader of the Party – this includes the First Secretary of the PUWP – can be elected to a position of leadership twice running. This is done by means of a rotation of leaders.

This is an attempt to overcome an ongoing difficulty, but it is not correct. A capable leader must be able to remain. The construction of the Workers State must respond to the organisational necessity of centralisation, the ability to centralise. It is not a question of equality or fairness, but of finding the person suitable for the post. It would have occurred to nobody to have Lenin recalled from the leadership of the USSR.

This resolution underlines the current limitation in leadership formation, and also a certain fear. The arrogance of the old leadership provoked such indignation that it led to this. But it is also symptomatic of a certain regression in another way, because this is taking place at the same time as a Trade Union for landowners has been allowed.

The PUWP wants to prevent decomposition in the leadership by rotating the leaders. But decomposition and bureaucratisation do not come from a lack of rotation; they come from an insufficient political life and incorrect policies. A correct policy produces the kind of organisation that leaves no room for degeneration because it lets itself be corrected. If limitations, timidity or empiricism appear in the conduct of the leaders, or in groups of leaders, then the Party puts them right.

The experience of the Bolshevik Party has been the most remarkable in history. A few days before the taking of power in 1917, Lenin had to face the opposition of most Political Bureau members. They did not stop him however. He went forward and won. He carried the day against the opposition of a considerable part of the Bolshevik Party, and then he reaffirmed the need to take power.

Lenin was alone, but he demonstrated the meaning of 'leading capacity'. Nobody would have suggested that he should be in his post of General Secretary only for two years! Lenin acted with the certainty that events would allow him to win back those in the Party who had not believed in the need to take power.

Those who had opposed Lenin were criticised. They admitted that this had come from fear, and nobody was put on trial. Their fear had not been an individual fear. It had been the fear of possible failure. They were daunted by this decisive step, not surprising seeing that this was being done in history for the first time. It was the first time the working class would dare to replace the class which had always dominated property.

The working class achieved this through its Party, but the circumstances were full of doubts and contradictions. On the eve of taking power, Trotsky started smoking again. And the warship 'Aurora' was unable to fire when the time came. All this expressed not so much fear as the sentiment of responsibility in front of the new historic step that was being taken.

Lenin and Trotsky understood the indecision, the lack of resolve in all these leaders who were not traitors. These had felt a certain fear because it was the first time that such a responsibility had to be taken on. It wasn't like building a house. The task was to take power in one of the most backward countries of Europe.

The proposal of rotating leaders every two years seeks to give reassurance and confidence to the workers, the Party leaders, the membership. This way however, one gets the opposite of the intended because it makes people insecure. This measure wanted to prevent bureaucratisation and degeneration, but it will not do this.

Still, the very fact that such a step came to be seen as necessary gives an idea of what the previous apparatus had been like.

J. POSADAS

2 May 1981

ON THE VISIT OF SUSLOV

J POSADAS

24 April 1981
Extracts

Suslov (of the Soviet Union) has gone to Poland to assist the wing of the Polish Communist Party that wants internal reforms. His intention aims also at containing, but not in a reactionary sense. It is rather like wanting to be sure the Polish Communist Party does not concede too much. The Soviets are mindful of the need for rational concessions to be made to the workers in conditions where the Polish leadership is seen to be impotent, incapable, unable to keep up with events. That the Polish Party had to renew more than half of its entire leadership gives a measure of the level of degeneration that had set in.

Humanity learns how to lead itself. It does it through the proletariat in spite of all the obstacles. The Workers State had to deal with the obstacle represented by Stalin earlier on; now it must develop in a world where the capitalist regime forces it to dedicate half its income to military and economic defence against capitalism. Even with all these impediments, and with the lack of a world leadership formed in time to coordinate the construction of Socialism, socialist progress continues to advance. There is no force in the world, no atomic weapon that can alter this conclusion, because humanity has seen that this is the road to progress.

Not to see this is as stupid as to ignore the fundamental change brought to history by the Wheel; it is as stupid as to say that humanity was going to accept working by hand for ever. History proves the opposite. The most remote people adopted the Wheel - never mind which place invented it first. No one knows who spread the knowledge, but the sure thing is that humanity adopted the Wheel. Then, who is going to keep saying that "there is no democracy in the Workers States" when the world has already verified that capitalism means war, deceit, murder and desolation? The Workers States do not and cannot live with such things!

‘There is no democracy in the Workers States’ they say. This stupid thought is produced by capitalism as a logical consequence of its existence today. Previously capitalism wasn’t so stupid, but as its crisis deepens, so does its state of idiocy. Its crisis gives rise to an internal regression. Capitalism keeps going but the component parts of its social fabric retreat because they are made to defend a structure that has no time for the progress of science, art or culture.

What the Soviets do in Poland is stimulating the development of a better participation of the masses, even if within limits. The Soviets are not opposed to the changes in Poland. Indeed, they stimulate them. It results that this progress in Poland is a progress for the whole world. It is totally false and stupid – and on the part of capitalism it is ill intentioned – to say that the USSR goes to Poland to put down the progress made. The opposite is the case.

The USSR supports all the changes that have been made. This is so because the changes in Poland are vital to the development of the USSR itself. The present progress of Poland is going to allow a more logical development of the Polish economy. It is going to lessen the wastage caused by the bureaucracy and its apparatus. And this will help eliminate many of the factors that have hampered the Workers States in their world relations with the capitalist regime.

The Soviets have sent Vietnamese, Mongols and Cubans into space, and they do this in preparation for the development of superior human relations with nature and with the Cosmos. In this case “superior” means to be able to grasp that we come from nature, from the Cosmos, and that we are going there again. Consequently, the existing relationships on Earth are nothing but transitory.

Economic and social regimes are also transitory, and will be, up until the time when human beings have learnt how to lead themselves. Humanity learns to rule itself through the apprenticeship it has already acquired in the economic, cultural and scientific development. As for the capitalist economy and the bureaucracy of the Workers States, all they do is make

economic, social and scientific development more difficult. It is not just social development that they hinder, but to the natural and normal development of life itself.

Capitalism has neither the understanding, nor the capacity or time for progress. Whatever measure it takes is in opposition with the necessity of life because – by its very nature – it can only accumulate, concentrate capital, and produce for competition. The capitalist concentrates power against everybody, even against the other capitalists. This is how Karl Marx characterised the capitalist system, and this is the way it is.

On a world scale, the working class, the peasantry, the petit bourgeoisie and even sectors in middle layers of the petty bourgeoisie, have already acquired confidence in the process of the construction of Socialism. It is not possible for capitalism to increase its power now; it is absolutely excluded. It may make political gains in one election or another, in one country or another, but it cannot alter the world balance of forces one iota.

There can be momentary electoral successes for capitalism, but the feeling of defeatism which engulfs the United States is far more powerful than anything that capitalism may still achieve as a system. There are highly placed petit bourgeois layers, not always economically well-off but with a certain social position, who have developed vices in life - vices which determine that they can't understand anything.

Now, demoralisation and defeatism have set in among the upper petit bourgeois layers and the bourgeois class itself. This is not the case in the lower petit bourgeoisie where layers linked to technology understand better than before. These are more easily won to the struggle than before. In France, the Communists and the Socialists have their base in the best technicians of the country, often well remunerated folks. Capitalism does not attract these people any more. It can be seen increasingly clearly as a hindrance, an impediment and a murderer. It kills endlessly and needs to murder the progress of history too, in order to prolong its own life.

This is where things are going, and everyone can see it. In their progress, the Workers States enrol the women, the children and the elderly who

intervene in development. In contrast, wherever capitalism goes, it eliminates those who slave away to produce the goods. It treats the smaller producers and the artisans in the same way, sweeping them away in its continuous process of concentration. Capitalism justifies its concentration by saying that this is for progress, its own of course.

J POSADAS

24 April 1981

THE FIRST OF MAY DEMONSTRATION IN POLAND

J. POSADAS

3 May 1981

The tens of thousands who demonstrated on the First of May in Warsaw had more political weight than five million people. All the vanguard attended this demonstration. The vanguard of the Communist Party (PUWP) attended alongside the vanguard outside the Party which has matured much in the last period. They all went to tell the Polish government: “We support you, forward!”

It was not one more meeting. It was a gathering to draw political conclusions. Had there been a sentiment of resistance or of rejection towards the government, there would not have been such attendance; it was led by the workers’ vanguard, the cadres of the scientific vanguard who have ideas and give confidence, those who organise thought. They were all there. The PUWP’s leadership is going to feel much stimulated by this. It is going to see that changes can be made without any catastrophe to fall on the country, or even on the leaders who have been removed.

This is one of the richest experiences in human history. For the first time, the preoccupation, the thought and the will to build a socialist society are finding an actual form of organisation. That form of organisation is led by the workers’ vanguard and the workers’ way of thinking, all present in this First of May.

The communist vanguard is learning how to intervene in this problem - one of the most complicated ever - the problem of overcoming the limitations that exist in the Workers State without harming it or disrupting it. The

communist vanguard faces this in Poland. This First of May raises the level of objective communist thought. It edifies those who are objectively communist, or can be, or on their way to the leadership.

This May Day demonstration in Poland is an important marker in the advance of socialist organisation in the world. It shows how much the working class has learned to take the lead in the matter of handling the State. This demonstration came as an unpleasant surprise for capitalism which had expected only a handful of Communists to attend.

Capitalism had imagined that only the selected few would be there, those obligated, the faithful who attend rituals. The situation showed the opposite. This demonstration followed a process of confrontations where the Polish proletariat and leadership succeeded in demonstrating their capability and competence. The result? A demonstration of tens of thousands, a defeat for capitalism, and a defeat for all the bureaucrats in the communist parties and in the Workers States.

Like Lenin, the proletariat learns to manoeuvre without bringing harm to the Workers State. Lenin was the greatest tactician in history. He went back to Russia on the German train, with the firm intention to run his own train later. He created the 'technique of tactics'. His tactical ability allowed him to surmount the opposition of the Bolshevik leadership to the taking of power, up to the last! He did not expel, crush or kill any of those Bolsheviks. He reasoned to himself: 'They feel weak, leave them alone until they realise what a fine job we have done - then they will change'. At all levels, Lenin's tactic consisted in doing everything possible to keep the Party going forward, taking power.

This First of May in Poland points to a concentration in a process which has not yet reached a final conclusion, although it tends towards an improved situation. The process is already well defined, and these tens of thousands of Communists have the importance of millions. The Polish proletariat is teaching its communist leadership to stop being bureaucratic.

Solidarnosc did not stand in the way of this First of May. It tried to have its way with other plans, but it gave them up. Showing one thing: the

process is in the hands of the Communists. This is so because the situation amounts to either advancing to Communism or going back to capitalism. There is nothing in between. Reagan weighed to have the Soviets confront Poland, so that capitalism could follow up with an attack. The plans of Reagan have gone out of the window.

The Polish Communist Party has around 800,000 members and some 100,000 persons joined this demonstration. This means that the Communist Party is the instrument of history. The workers understand that the Party is an instrument, even if their understanding has not yet reached its full historic depth. They support the Party, they develop through the Party. In calling this demonstration, the Communist Party acted as the instrument of history, and not just because the workers were pushing for it.

The communist parties are instruments of history and this conclusion cannot be altered. There is no historic time for it to be altered, and neither is there any room for an alternative; least of all in places like Poland. In other words, only the Party can act today as the instrument of progress. Our historic understanding and confidence, our conduct towards the communist parties, is firmly rooted in those facts.

The PUWP has suffered many crises. There were all the attacks of capitalism against it, and attacks from some communist parties themselves. It is a formidable progress when the PUWP, in spite of the crises it has suffered, can still call such a meeting attended by the tens of thousands!

This proves conclusively that the only thing that needs putting right in the Polish Workers State, is the leadership of the Party and of the country; and that there is absolutely nothing wrong with the structure of the Party or of the country. Elements in the structure have to be put right, but not in the sense of a historic rectification.

The structure of ownership in agriculture needs to be altered, but this can be done without suppression. It will be a good thing when the largest properties start to be concentrated, those between 5 and 20 hectares. But one must start from where history is at. The latter does not call for any

wholesale suppression of agrarian property in Poland, but for a progress on the basis of the forces and the means that already exist.

On this First of May, the Polish proletariat went out to inform its Party that Poland is communist. And that this is to remain so, in spite of all the difficulties. Nobody will prevent it from staying communist. The workers have criticised the Party - partially - but they have come out on this May Day to reaffirm that they are Communists, and that it was as Communists that they criticised the Party.

J.POSADAS

3 May 1981