

*J.POSADAS*

**POLAND**

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

Vol. 2

Selected texts

1970-1981

Scientific, Cultural and Political Editions

# INDEX

<b>Short Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Page</b>
The strikes and the political and socialist revolution	21-12-70	3
Agrarian organisation and the need for collectivisation	20-5-75	24
The workers mobilisations are to gain demands and to advance the Workers State	26-6-76	30
The elevation of the discussion in the world Communist movement and the criticism of the bureaucracy	9-10-77	34
The bureaucracy and the progress of the Workers State	22-12-78	45
On the Pope's visit	14-6-79	53
The advance of soviet democracy	26-11-80	66
The confidence of the Soviet leadership in supporting the advance of Poland	29-11-80	68
The Yankee campaign against Poland	13-12-80	70
On the problem of agricultural production	4-1-81	83
On the formation of a rural trade union in Poland	7-2-81	85
On the debility of imperialism	10-2-81	90
The conditions that formed the workers state and small agrarian property	22-2-81	92
Agriculture and the need for superior objectives in the workers state	14-3-81	100
The changes and the political weakness of the leadership of the Polish Communist Party (PUWP)	22-3-81	103
The extension of the workers state and the changes in the Bureaucracy	29-3-81	106
Once again on the agrarian problem	18-4-81	111

## **THE STRIKES AND THE POLITICAL AND SOCIALIST REVOLUTION**

*21<sup>ST</sup> December 1970*

These events in Poland mark a new and more elevated level of the political revolution. They are not the end of the process but are part of the necessity for change and for proletarian democracy in the Workers State. They are part of the world revolutionary conditions now reaching the Workers State.

It may be that these events are stimulated or used by old Stalinists or semi-Stalinist sectors, in pursuit of their own internal goals. Certainly, some of them would favour a solution both favourable to the Workers State and in keeping with their positions, their functions and interests, as a bureaucratic strata. At the same time, if there was not a climate of discontent, protest and repudiation of bureaucratic imposition, such mobilisations and strikes of the steel workers would not happen. It is a rejection of inequality, of arrogance and bureaucratic management.

The essential impulse for these mobilisations is the world revolution. There are similar situations in all the Workers States, even if they do not run on parallel lines. The recent Hungarian Communist Party Congress discussed norms of democracy, respect for moral incentive, and attacked decentralisation. In Czechoslovakia, they are recentralising the leadership of the economy, and the attacks they make are almost exclusively concentrated against the bureaucratic right wing. This marks the beginning of a new stage in the advance of the political revolution.

The leading bureaucratic layers of the Workers States and in the Communist parties, are now drawn more closely to the world progress of the masses towards socialism, and are to be seen in the eyes of the masses, as the defenders of the socialist revolution, the Workers States and all the revolutionary struggles that harry the capitalist system. All this is the effect of the world revolution. There is a mutual dependency between the political-revolutionary development of the world masses and the social and political structure of the Workers States. They both depend on the world unity of the revolutionary struggle and on the level already reached by the world revolution. On the other hand, the current plans, programmes, management and economic leadership of the Workers States, do not correspond to the level reached by the revolution and the political, social and revolutionary base already established.

The 'teppists' should have been able to have taken advantage of this situation. People like Moczar who have some muscle, do indeed try to use these movements of protests, but they are far from being in the leadership. What they try to do is to channel and contain the process in order to use it in their own internal struggles. However, the consequence of these events, as much politically as socially or from the revolutionary point of view, are very deep and will have an irreversible effect. It will not be expressed immediately, but it will be expressed in the coming struggles in the Communist Party of the country, in the other Workers states, and in the Communist parties of the capitalist countries.

We appeal to the Communist parties and to the Workers States to discuss this Polish situation and advocate the setting up of Soviets in Poland, full proletarian democracy together with further land expropriations to enlarge the collectivised sector. Private ownership of eighty per cent of the land is the source of the agrarian crisis, is the reason why there is backwardness in agricultural production, and moreover it is from these people, either owners or linked to private property that all the teppists arise. All agricultural property in Poland must be state-owned and planned in accordance with the interests of the masses. It must be planned with their participation in organs of Soviet democratic decision making, on the basis of proletarian democracy. An appeal must be made for the strengthening of state-ownership and for plans to be made in the interests of the masses, not to produce more TV sets for the moment but to produce items for popular consumption. The price of consumer goods should be lowered immediately with a corresponding increase in the price of all luxuries. Indeed, the luxury trade should be eliminated and the equalisation of wages undertaken together with the lowering of the salaries of the technocrats, managers and leaders. There must be an immediate increase for the mass of the workers. As an essential part of this, a call should be made for common planning between all the Workers States.

The Trade Unions must have an independent functioning, not in the sense of autonomy because both the workers and the Workers State have the same aim which is socialism. This functioning must certainly be independent so that the Trade Unions can oppose the bureaucratic decisions and orientations. The Trade Unions must be allowed to oppose the instructions of the bureaucratic usurpers in the leadership of the Workers State. What remains to be changed in the Workers State is the political orientation no more, but this must be allowed. The collectivised

and planned structure of property, the economy and production, have to be improved at the same time.

The Workers involved in the mobilisations demand better wages and improved democratic rights, and say not a word against the state. It is not the organised workers who have set fire to shops and looted them, burnt cars and houses. This was done by the teppists who used the movement. These elements come from the most well off layers, the technocrats and the right wing of the Communist Party.

There is the same sort of disorder in Yugoslavia and Tito tried to stop this by proposing a return to some centralisation. However, before this, the masses had mobilised on their own account, to demonstrate their discontent with the socio-economic evolution of the process in Yugoslavia, where the Ota Sik type of tendency was given free rein. The same sort of thing went on in Rumania. It is the same process of reforms, rectification, and the creation of organisms for revolutionary functioning that goes on in all the Workers States, China included.

The declaration of Suslov in the Soviet Union is directed at containing the Kolkhosian private interests. He says that better attention should be paid to the Sovkhoses. All of this means that the world process of the socialist revolution is exerting its influence on the Workers States as well. These events are signs of a mass movement, of the preoccupation of the mass movement, of the living development of the State and of the revolutionary public opinion that seeks to weigh on the Workers States – even if it does not find very much expression outside of the top circles and apparatuses. Partial Regeneration in the Workers States and the Communist parties advances quite slowly but it does advance.

The root cause of such events has to be discussed. The immediate cause is the resistance and indignation of the working class and exploited layers of the population. The people have inferior conditions of life, and so, they rebel against injustice and inequality. It is not a rebellion like in the capitalist countries, against low wages, but a rebellion against inequality.

There is already quite an awareness and understanding of the problem of inequality in the Workers States. As yet, there isn't a revolutionary political functioning in the Workers States, but people have an understanding given them by the very functioning of the Workers States as it stands. The masses see the progress of the Workers State compared with how they lived under the capitalist system. This includes Poland which has managed to make a considerable industrial development, to raise the standard of living and the cultural and social level of all the

population. It has done this from the beginning when they had nothing at all.

The indignation people feel against inequality was already hinted at by the masses in 1956 and they have tried to let this feeling be known, in one way or another ever since. Today, stimulated by the world development of the revolution, they are saying it again. The people are moved by a want of struggle against inequality and they feel indignation in front of usurpation clearly expressed via lower wages and unfair prices. The people also feel the arrogance of the bureaucracy that does not let them intervene. This shows the very great development in political consciousness of the working class in its social level, because the masses want to intervene in the Workers State. They say 'we want a better democracy so that we can take part'. They are not just looking for higher wages but they want to intervene to plan things. They want to decide for whom the plan is made and control and decide. It is an aspect of the political revolution.

There have been various instances of people being killed in these movements, not all in the same place, but one here and others there. This means that there have been quite large uprisings in the cities and, even if they are not the main cities, these are important events pointing to substantial opposition to the bureaucracy. There is a state of protest, of repudiation of bureaucratic arrogance and usurpation. This is very well shown by the fact that they raised the price of meat, bread and coal, and lowered that of TV sets and electrical appliances, which only the bureaucracy can buy. The same was done in the Soviet Union some time ago.

There is a whole climate of protest expressed in various ways, which reaches now the sectors of the population that have the means of organisation. The Trade Unions cannot speak and they do not have an independent functioning from the state apparatus. The protest arises from the fact that there is inequality in wages and opportunities, and there is bureaucratic usurpation. If it was not a nationally felt sentiment, it would not surface in this way. We see that there have been many people seriously injured and some killed in four different cities. This is not something that happens just like that, even if you had 10, 100 or even 1000 people protesting against police repression, it ends up with some arrests. But when it reaches this level, it is because there is a huge indignation of the population.

It is true that many people have used for example the port-workers strike to indulge in plunder, looting and arson. This gives the impression of a

social discontent against the regime, but in reality it is the discontent against the present political leadership. Those who want fascism, the bourgeoisie and world capitalism, are all united in trying to show that there is a state of social opposition against the regime of state-ownership, but in reality what you have is a protest against an unfair, bureaucratic and usurper political leadership. The workers do not destroy property, they do not attack shops and do not commit arson or vandalism because they tend to give their protests a political expression. They have demonstrated this score of times. Those who indulge in this sort of vandalism are the declassed and the teppists.

The Black people of North America during their demonstrations did set fire to things but without robbing afterwards. They burned down 1000 shops but there was hardly any theft and they often burned the contents of the shops. Their intention was not to take things for themselves but to show their disgust and anger against social, racial and economic oppression of the blacks by the capitalist system.

In Poland there is no such thing because there is no need of it. The bourgeoisie presents it all as if it were an uprising against hunger. But what a lie! There is no hunger in Poland. In fact, within ten years of becoming a Workers State, Poland eliminated the misery that was rampant amongst the population under the previous bourgeois Polish Republic. They eliminated all the misery which the capitalist system produced in Poland. The real problem now is something else. It is the problem brought about by the absence of a better economic situation for the population whilst it is not the same for the leaders. The population does not protest that things are worse for them because they are a million time better off than before!

On the other hand the masses of the capitalist countries are not better off than before. What they have has been gained through struggles, and even then there is still hunger, misery and unemployment. There are 5 million unemployed and 12 million people undernourished in North America. There are 25 million Blacks and 12 million Mexicans oppressed there. It is the same in every capitalist country in the world. In capitalist Germany, one of the most developed capitalist countries, there are slums, but you do not see slums in Poland. They have ended slums and hunger in Poland, and Poland started off with nothing at all. At the same time, capitalist Germany is getting subsidies from the whole capitalist world. Poland and the Soviet Union came out of nothing at all. Afterwards, three quarter of their country was destroyed along with half the working and active population. This is the sort of progress that fully demonstrates the power

of the Workers State. It is the political leadership that does not answer and which usurps. This is why the workers rise and protest against.

As a result it is paramount to discuss what is happening and why. There weren't such uprisings in Lenin's time when there was real hunger. Why? Today, there is no hunger in the Workers State, but in Lenin's time there was Trade Union and proletarian democracy, and everyone could discuss within freedom for revolutionary tendencies. At the moment, there is no such thing and this will have to be discussed.

When there are such mobilisations as in Poland today, it is because there is a sense of unease, and that is not a new situation. The people are moved by a sense of protest against existing inequalities, but it is a social protest, not a social uprising against the regime. This is why the port-workers came out singing the 'International'. This was their way of telling the population: This is not against the Workers State but we are protesting against the living conditions and against the bureaucracy. This is what was meant by the singing of the 'International'. Those who went on the rampage in the meantime, far from singing the 'International', went to burn the Communist party headquarters and to commit acts that have nothing to do with the workers or with communism. They were the teppists, agents of imperialism, sons and daughters of landowners who still exist in Poland. We have to remember that 80% of the land is privately owned. It is these people who are responsible for this disorder. They are the petty bourgeois and the right-wing of the Communist party, looking for 'freedom of opinion and of organisation' in the same way as Ota Sik wanted it, in other words, freedom to create a mixture of capitalism and Workers State.

On the other hand, the rebellion of the workers demonstrates their state of preoccupation, and they have had to act in the way of protest because there was no other way for them to make their voice heard. It was not just a question of towns; it was the whole country. This is why Cirankiewicz made a speech in which he said that he was not dealing with a small event. This is true. He came out with reassurances and justifications - warning that communism is in danger and that someone wants to bring the state down. He called for solidarity around the Workers State. Clearly had it been only a few people involved - as the impression was given - he would not have bothered to say this. In fact, he was most concerned by the real and growing malaise triggered by the political opposition to the bureaucracy within the Workers State. The masses are precisely looking for this opposition and they want Soviets, proletarian democracy and to be able to discuss and resolve everything. They want to end the odious differentiation in wages between the worker and the bureaucrat. They

want to plan production to fulfil the needs of the population, and not for TV sets for those who are remunerated enough – the bureaucrats and the Party leaders who live off the others – but products for the population.

Equally, it is not true to say that the agricultural plan has failed because – as 80% of the land is privately owned – there is no such thing as “an agricultural plan”. The landowner produces what is convenient for the market. This means that the economy has to be less under the influence of the market and more under that of Soviets. Everything has to be collectivised. This is the solution!

### *The independent functioning of the Trade Unions*

There has to be a demand for the elevation of the political leadership, for proletarian democracy and the independent functioning of the Trade Unions. The Trade Unions have to be independent from the State, but at the same time, the Trade Unions have the same interests as the State: the developing of Socialism. We are not talking about the Unions being autonomous or independent from the aim of socialism. What we are talking about is the independent functioning of the Trade Unions in order to defend themselves from bureaucracy and from the apparatus of the State. It is in this sense that they have to be independent.

The declarations and interpretations that aim at autonomy for the Unions from the Workers State must be staunchly rebuffed. This ‘autonomy’ is favourable to a policy of competition and struggle with the Workers State. This is a syndicalist conception which makes no sense. The Trade Union must be independent of the State in its functioning but it has the same objective as the Workers State in the construction of socialism. Indeed, the construction of the Workers State, calls for the trade union to combine the ability to function in defence of wages and working conditions, with the intervention of the workers, for them to have control in the factory and outside of it. The Union becomes an authority on questions of prices, production, quality, rhythms of production and costs, as well as on the question of the extension of the revolutionary rights of the masses and the right to intervene more fully. There must be Soviet organs and workers control to allow the population to intervene in all political and social problems. This does not account for less –but for more- participation of the Trade Unions in the affairs of State. We call for this to be discussed in all the Communist parties and Workers States, and for a debate on the difference between independence and autonomy of the Unions in the Workers States. Clearly it must not be ‘autonomy’ but ‘independence’. The Trade Unions in the Workers State cannot have an

objective distinct from that of the State. Why should they? They have the same aim as the Workers State.

The Trade Unions must function independently from the state because their function is distinct from the state. It consists of defending life, work, and production in front of the state bureaucrats and planners. Of course, at a certain stage, the Trade Unions will get rid of the planners. As we have explained in many articles, the masses could get rid of them in less than a year, if allowed. The state planners keep on going however, because of the continuation of a certain market economy, a private usufruct of state property. This is the reason why the alliance between the landowners, the aristocrats with the planners, administrators, managers, a select layer of bureaucrats, is maintained. It is the combination of all these sectors which live from the private use of property, that create the need for planners.

This subject will have to be discussed in the world Communist movement. The Workers States, the Communist parties and the world workers movement, have to discuss this process in Poland. Why not a worldwide discussion, conducted publically on the problem of production, of planning production in the Workers States? On proletarian democracy? On Soviets and the unification of the Workers States? This is what has to come up for discussion.

At the same time as a discussion, there is the need for intervention in these problems as if they were one's own. This has been done in science, art and music. So, why not also discuss politics in this way? Why not draw experiences? Why not do this now when there is so much need for it? Why not consider the problems of the Workers States as one's own and give opinions? The Posadist IV International proposes that all the Communist parties, all the Workers States and all the revolutionary tendencies proceed to debate the present events in Poland, with the aim of organising the world proletarian vanguard and focus its preoccupation so that it starts to intervene on its own account. This would allow the proletarian vanguard to prepare for the task in the period from now to the Workers State and from the Workers state to socialism.

The same must be done for Poland as was recently done by the pledge for the unconditional defence of Vietnam, warning off the US, by China and the Soviet Union. World capitalism wants to use the movements in Poland to pretend that there are assassinations, deaths and hunger in the 'socialist countries' when in reality this is not so, and for what is true, the bureaucracy is responsible for this. On the other hand in the capitalist

countries, there are five millions unemployed in the US alone, there are daily murders and outrages, and 20 millions who live on the bread-line with another 12 million below that line. In neither Poland nor any other Workers State is there hunger. In China, in 10 years of the Workers State (not more than that) they have overcome hunger. Where previously in China 90 million people died of hunger, they have today atomic energy which is used for the benefit of the masses. That is the reality.

What has to be changed in the Workers State is the political leadership. What they call 'socialist democracy' is in fact proletarian democracy. There is no need for 'democracy' in socialism. There will be no need to defend one's own 'rights' against the rights of others in socialism. This is because the rights of some will no longer impinge on others'. In the Workers State however, there is still the need for democracy, proletarian democracy that is, to bring the proletariat's weight to bear on the State, on the Party and on society. At the same time, as the proletariat cannot have exclusive interests of its own, it is the only force that can have the interest of the Workers State completely at heart.

One must demand the setting up of Soviets, the planning of production with the whole population involved in what to produce, how much and for whom. Those landowners still in existence in Poland have to be expropriated and the land collectivised. All the problems of Poland will vanish quite quickly through this measure. This means that the Workers States and the world Communist movement must concern themselves with these events. It also means that there has to be internal democracy in the Communist parties themselves, in order to allow discussion and publication on the problems of the construction of the Workers State. This is not a subject simply for the Trade Unions to discuss, but for all those who are interested in it, the Communist and Socialist parties, the left-wing Christians, the Revolutionary Nationalists etc. In all this, the behaviour of the masses, their consciousness and will, and also the influence the structure of the Workers state has over the masses, are the important things. When they move, the Polish masses make sure that they do not damage the Workers State. The workers protest against inequality and injustice; they reject the attitude of giving less to the workers and more to the bureaucrats. The workers see that whilst it is essential to obtain foodstuff in sufficient quantity, the bureaucrats have TV sets. The workers make the comparison and they are stirred by the injustice of it all, and not so much by the fact that they have less. The problem of the Workers State and how to build socialist feelings in the Workers State are obviously problems to be discussed. The Workers State is the path that leads to socialism, and so, it is necessarily called upon to form socialist

feelings and consciousness. All feelings, consciousness, capacity for action, struggle and organisation to further collective interests, combine to end the old disputes, feelings of competition, antagonisms and contradictions. It's the collective interest that resolves all this. That is to say, all the forces are harnessed to produce planning and a just distribution.

### *Poland influences within the capitalist system*

Long before these events (the workers' risings in Poland) the European bourgeoisie was trying to agitate the petty bourgeoisie against the Workers States, trying to show that capitalism is 'democratic' or at least as good as the Workers State. However they were checked in this activity of comparisons, criticisms and initiatives against the Workers States, by the fact that they could ill afford a destabilisation of the Workers States. At the same time, they are not adverse to mobilisations against the Workers States and their leadership. These are two important aspects.

Each bourgeoisie has to defend itself against the competition of the other, particularly in Europe and the competition of Japan and the United States altogether against the European bourgeoisie. So, each bourgeoisie needs the links it makes with the Workers States. It needs commercial links with the workers states for all these reasons, and also to face the strikes and mobilisation of its own masses, and because there is less and less outlet within capitalism itself. The Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German, the Workers States, are fully aware of this. The bourgeoisie has not made on this occasion the sort of uproar they did previously.

This is because the advantage it could derive has been substantially diminished. The bourgeoisie acts in the hope that Poland settles down again, before other Workers States veer to the left. They are quite aware that this process will release forces favourable to leftwards tendencies in all the Workers States and that this will lead to more disruptions in the agreements between them and imperialism, as much on the commercial as on the social planes. In turn this would be most damaging to foreign trade and bring about more social and political instability in capitalism.

The essential reason why the European bourgeoisies cannot fully take advantage of what is happening in Poland is that the petit bourgeoisie - in the whole of Europe - is already influenced by the development of the socialist revolution. The mass mobilisations or strikes, the large electoral and other gains, influence the petit bourgeoisie as does the social and political progress of the Socialist and Communist parties; the same goes

for the left wing Christian-Democrats. The petit bourgeoisie feels that it is taken along by the tide of socialist revolution. Even in 1968, the bourgeoisie could not organise demonstrations or campaigns of any importance against Czechoslovakia, and now it cannot arouse more than ten people against Poland. Capitalism cannot even use the fascists in these circumstances.

On the other hand, the petit bourgeoisie stimulated by the advances of the world revolution and by the activity of the proletariat, has not made any mobilisation, rebellion or protest against the functioning or existence of the Polish Workers State. On the contrary, it has supported the Polish Trade Union and rejected the Polish bureaucracy. The petit bourgeoisie has been very careful in not allowing capitalism to use its criticisms of the bureaucracy, in order to inflict injury on the Workers State, or justify a condemnation or criminal attack against the Workers State.

In all this, the European proletariat has shown how mature it is, how ripe for socialist revolution, for the taking of power and the construction of its own Workers State. In fact, the European proletariat has worked a little as if it were already in a Workers State. This can be seen in the capacity it has displayed for reasoning. It shows how ready it is to take power and build the Workers State. It is making a demonstration of the level reached by the socialist revolution, the world structure already acquired and the very dynamic influence of the revolution.

*The 'tappists' come from the bureaucracy*

These problems come to light in the way they do, because the Communist Party of Poland does not discuss them. If it did this, solutions would be put forward. In 1956, the people also had to rise, in order to make a discussion and promote solutions because the Party would not allow any of this. This means that all the Communist parties must join in a call for proletarian democracy, and take the first step by applying it to themselves in their respective countries.

When they demonstrate, the workers do so politically with the objective of weighing socially. Those who come out to attack and commit arson and plunder are not the workers. The rage expressed in the crimes and robberies that took place do not come from the Polish masses. There may have been marginal sectors of the population of the population involved, but this is the deed of provocateurs organised by those who have an interest in making it believed that Poland is in utter chaos, and that the regime is useless. These people want to incriminate not just the leaders

but the regime as a whole. These are the sort of people who rise against the Ostpolitik and against the development of the State: the sons and daughters of the rich, of the landowners and top bureaucrats. In this case, these top bureaucrats are not so much of the Party but of the State apparatus.

However, these sectors are not the most important although they would try everything to contain the working class. The significant thing is the state of animation of the Polish masses which – stimulated by the world process of the revolution – want so much to have a say. Even with the absence of leadership, they feel moved. The result is that their actions, empirical as they are, continue in conditions when they have not the necessary means to allow them to organise, to make their discussions and protests directly weigh on the Party. The people are forced to operate in the way in which they do because the necessary mass organisms do not exist. However, the whole history of the proletariat is nothing but the proof that it has nothing to do with elements of sabotage and destruction that would isolate it from the rest of the population. The proletariat seeks (by nature and instantly) a political contact with the population because it needs to show itself as the leadership that furthers progress for everyone, beyond the immediate objective need it has to raise wages for itself. The proletariat is compelled to concentrate and unify the population behind itself. This necessity is clearly at odds with actions of destruction and arson devoid of any political usefulness. The most one can say is that there can be elements of exasperation, but those who went to destroy and set fires to the common goods, were people who wanted to provoke chaos and disorders. This is far from simple exasperation. The instances reported were categorically not the methods of the proletariat or its manner of expressing itself. They were the actions of people who took advantage of the situation to deliver a blow at the system.

The population level of Communist sentiment prevented the appearance of those ‘teppists’ during the Russian Revolution. What milieu, what circles do they originate from today in Poland? Certainly not from the proletariat! Then where? The teppists are against centralisation, against anything concerted, when it means the advance of socialism. They are full of individual interests, they seek pleasure, are moved under the spell of individual satisfaction and they seek it by every way they can. What is the meaning of this phenomenon in Poland and which circle of the Workers State can generate this? In fact, it is the bureaucracy, the technocrats, the chiefs and the bureaucrats of the Party of the State and of industry.

The reason for their existence is no other than the absence of proletarian democracy. Soviet forms of functioning through which the masses intervene would soon put an end to this. This is what is missing. If there was soviet organisation and workers control, there would not be a single teppist because the proletariat would soon put this right. There would be no generation or development of such people whose existence shows the absence of proletarian and soviet democracy. There will have to be such democracy in order to get rid of this garbage.

It is quite absurd to find the existence of even one of these teppists in the Workers States. It cannot be the result of the Workers State but of a privileged bureaucratic political leadership. The privileged sectors of planners, administrators, landowners, semi-rich or wealthy kolkhosians are simply parasites on the economy of the Workers State. For obvious reasons, these are the staunchest opponents of proletarian democracy, of state centralisation and planning.

Agriculture in Poland is 80% private but the establishment of the Church does not base its quite large influence on real social forces or possibilities. It bases it on the policy of the Polish Communist bureaucracy which cultivates the Church as a defence against revolutionary tendencies. It is really a policy of conciliation with bourgeois sectors, so that as a bureaucracy it never has to depend on revolutionary politics. This is why the bureaucracy produces programmes and plans according to what is convenient to its relation with the private market economy, rather than in accordance with the necessity of the Workers State.

The market economy is determined by the interest of those who have most strength, the strongest, and it is a true image of the capitalist state. In the Workers State, the economy can only exist on the basis of being in accordance with the needs of the population. There are still prices and wages differences on the basis of ability in the Workers State but the intervention of the State and of the Trade Unions curtails the struggle to acquire by equalising people and by giving more purchasing power to those who are most in need. This policy opens the road to socialism.

The Workers State instils the sentiment for and the awareness of equality. It equalises people through collective activity and this takes place in the very same moment as the Workers State is engaged in abolishing capitalism. The responsibility for the existence of a market economy and private sectors is to be laid at the door of the bureaucracy. This is what has to come to an end.

There was no market economy and no need for it in Lenin's time. Today, because of the policy of the bureaucracy, there remains a market. But the intervention of the Workers State attenuates it via the intervention of Trade Union organisms and organisms of workers and popular control. In this way, purchasing power becomes equalised and this is one of the aims of Communism: to end humanity's dependency on wages, on a life spent merely for the struggle to sustain ourselves.

The 'teppists' arise from the families and friends of this bureaucratic and privileged layer. They are the worst opponents of proletarian democracy, centralisation and planning, and they are in the business of taking advantage of the slightest expression of need by the workers, the slightest movement of protest or of indignation by the working class or the Communist Party militants. They are in the business of creating disorder in every way inside the functioning of the Workers State. They do this in order to stimulate repression against those protests, so as to continue their activity of acquiring privileges and increasing them. They go out of their way to provoke uproar and disruptions. They are out to disrupt revolutionary organisation particularly when mobilisations are advancing towards proletarian democracy and improvements in the Workers State. Driven by caste interests, motivated exclusively by self-advancement, they and their families are concerned to stop the progress of the people – above all when this progress comes close to the setting up of Soviet organs and organs of mass functioning.

### *No need for market economy*

These mobilisations do not happen just in Poland, because they also happen in the USSR. This shows the very deep concern of the masses for the functioning and general plans of the Workers State. At the present moment, the bureaucracy plans, organises or leads depending on what is useful for its own consumption. This is why the bureaucracy produces TV sets, cars and first class furniture or houses, when the people still need basic food supply like meat and other things. Regarding the cars in Poland, these can and must be replaced by collective means of transport.

The Polish economy would have moved forward twentyfold if it wasn't for all these swindles of the bureaucracy. The economy has not had the necessary centralised planning and programming. Therefore, the present discussion has to be veered in that direction. The lack of sufficient planning produces all manner of evils. The reaction of the workers stems from their desire to increase their participation in order to accelerate the centralisation of the State and obtain more equality. The workers want to

decide not simply wages and distribution but revolutionary and world policies. The Polish masses demonstrate to that end.

A correction of the existing priorities in planning has to be made, and also where money has to be invested. At the same time, prices have to be pegged to costs and production reoriented for consumption. To this, the very important agrarian question has to be added. All this has to be recognised. This being so, we can expect that they are soon going to take a whole series of measures in the agricultural field, forcing the landowners to sell up and then, improving production by more collectivisation.

They will have to clamp down on 'liberalisation' and instead increase centralisation. In consequence, there will have to be cuts made in some of the little 'extras' and privileges of the bureaucracy and the rural landowners.

The market economy poses problems that have to be discussed. In the first years of the Russian Revolution, the market was still necessary and irreplaceable. However, in the consciousness of Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolshevik Party, as well as in that of the Soviet Communist vanguard, it was clear that whilst the role of the market had to be suppressed it had first to be harnessed. They could not do away with the market immediately because there was not enough food for a large portion of the population. This means that they had to keep control of the market in order to prevent it from exerting its natural role of dispersion, inequality and competition amongst the people. They worked against the market, through state intervention and the manufacture of the necessary goods for the people (not just those who have money). They fixed the prices according to the purchasing power of people and charged more for goods that interested those who had money. In this way, the market did not work as an instrument of extortion or as a means of competition. The Workers State controlled competition, used it by fixing prices to purchasing power, whilst clothes, housing and food were provided. The Workers state has demonstrated that this is the way to deal with the situation.

However, we have moved on, it's been 50 years since the Russian Revolution and the same problems and excuses do not exist quite in the same way. There is absolutely no reason why there should be a market or a market economy in the Workers States anymore. Production for needs and planning of needs should be the norm today. This is a conclusion that cannot be avoided. The market is not a foregone conclusion, but in this

stage, the empirical consequence of a lack of revolutionary-political life in the Workers States.

It is necessary to increase the cost of luxuries and it is not wrong to make TV sets. However, if a choice has to be made between the TV sets and consumer goods, then consumer goods have to be given priority. Moreover, there is no reason at all for the production of private motorcars and collective means of transport have to be produced instead. The market economy serves the bureaucrats, the planners, the layers of the population that have acquired a higher standard of living in the Workers State. The luxuries produced as part of the market economy, are for them and there is no need for this at all. The state itself should determine the cost of production, that of prices and produce everything necessary.

Why are all these cars being produced in Poland and who are they being made for? There is a need in Poland for collective transport, for trains, for underground systems, buses, roads and avenues. There is absolutely no need for the manufacture of cars but they are setting up car factories all the time. Fiat is one of them.

In general, the capitalists have nowhere safe to invest their money, and they cannot compete successfully against Yankee imperialism. So, they turn to invest in the Workers States. The bureaucracy of the Workers states, naturally, finds this very beneficial for themselves but in this way they also have to make quite a few concessions. The alternative to this opening of the Workers State to capitalism is to create a good common planning between all the Workers states. This planning would triple production in 5 years and, at the same time, would provoke a tremendous crisis in the capitalist system. However, the way it is done at the moment impedes the eruption of an extremely violent crisis in the capitalist system. The bureaucracy sails along with the capitalist crisis, pretending that the Communist parties will come out on top without any need for violent revolution. However, even Corvalan has said that 'civil war is very possible in Chile'.

#### *The changes in leadership in the present conjuncture*

It is quite significant that they have put Gierek who is from a Trade Union and workers origins, into the post of Party Secretary. It is very significant indeed. The fact that they went to find Gierek, a man who had previously retired in order not to take sides, shows that they are looking for someone to keep the balance, whilst they are removing the leadership responsible for the recent price rises.

It is true that there is a struggle of interests, between groups and sectors of lesser weight in the apparatus, and there is a conflict of interest, for example, between the German and Polish Workers States bureaucratise. Walter Ulbricht exerts pressure on the Polish Workers State, in his quest for support against capitalist Germany. At the same time, Poland has engaged itself on a path that is far from convenient to bureaucracy and to Ulbricht. This is going to lead to important changes in plans, orientations and general morale. The leadership of the Polish Communist Party will try to defend itself from this by trying to contain protests, by allying itself with a sector of the Trade Union bureaucracy – but even if they give just a few concessions, it will be a tremendous impulse to the workers. What we are seeing is an aspect of the political Revolution, even though what is visible is still quite superficial. The Political Revolution is not expressed very profoundly at the moment but it signals a new and deeper phase of it in Poland.

The changes they have made come from the conciliation between tendencies. However, the tendency that is linked to the Communist Party and does not want to break from the masses appears to have certain preponderance. In addition, there is the world situation with the threat of the Yanks to renew their intervention in Vietnam, the Middle East crisis, the crisis in capitalist Germany and mass mobilisations everywhere. It is just then that the crisis of Poland arises. This means that the process is so deep that the bureaucracy can no longer hold it back. Moreover, it has come to the point where the bureaucracy has stopped holding the crisis back and now looks to cleanse itself of right wing sectors in the same way as they did in Czechoslovakia and in Yugoslavia.

A discussion has to be made in favour of democratic rights for the Polish masses combined with the question of what to do now? The plans they have actually proposed are not socialist but bureaucratic and semi-bourgeois, with all priorities given to private land-ownership in the countryside. Since there is 80% private ownership of the land already, what has to be discussed is ‘What now? Who is to make the plans? In whose name is planning to be carried out? How is distribution to be organised?’ Certainly, the market economy has to be gradually eliminated...and this has to begin right away. The bureaucratic leadership keeps talking about market economy because it has recently given it more scope, and a sector has arisen from this ‘liberalisation’ which wants to act as if it were in a capitalist regime.

This is what the workers came out against! The workers of the German Workers State, who have given support to the Polish workers, are against

all this too. This is why Ulbricht is looking for some way of patching things up rapidly. He wants to alleviate the pressure that is on him.

Even in the Workers States that respect centralisation the most, there are bureaucratic plans to satisfy the bureaucratic leaderships and the market. Those who can buy the most are those who have the most money. As it is the bureaucracy that has the most money, the most means, they are then the best placed to decide about production and priorities.

The policy for change which has been hurriedly thrown together is intended to contain the masses or, at least, prevent the growth and extension of their intervention. The bureaucracy is trying to patch things up from above. The stoppages, the mobilisations and strikes were an impulse to leftwards solutions. The bureaucracy has managed to stop the process halfway by giving in to sectors of the ruling apparatus of the Party linked to the right wing and centre of the bureaucracy. This also means that some concessions have been made to the Soviet bureaucracy that was pressing them to yield. But all this is utterly transitory.

These actions were intended to contain the process; for all that, it showed who the leaders of the Workers States have to answer to. They could not use tanks, bombs or other means of repression. And then, why did they remove Gomulka? They would have kept Gomulka if there had been no changes. They removed him because they could not cope with the pressure of the masses, and they wanted to stop the process going to the left. So, they set up this provisional government.

This turn of events hints at the possibility of a Party sector trying to seek a better contact with the working class. This will not take long, particularly if they deal with the problem of private property on the land, expropriations and control over prices and the market immediately. It will not take long at all.

The Communist parties cannot grasp this because they have no notion of the structure and functioning of the Workers States. They see everything in terms of manoeuvres. It is true that the resolution to place Gierak in the leadership comes from the apparatus but from an insecure and shaky one. Gierak is an old worker and Party leader rather than a representative of a particular sector of the Party or the bureaucracy. He expresses this. They call him a technocrat because of some job he may have had but he does not represent the technocrats. He comes from the Party and fought in France and Belgium with the anti-fascists guerrillas. He has been in the Party since his youth and his parents were of a worker origin. He may

have become a bureaucrat in later years, but the important thing about him is that he has been a Party leader.

They would have looked for someone sinister to replace Gomulka if events had taken a turn for the worse. And they certainly would not have chosen Gierk. On the other hand, the USSR could not allow Poland to veer to the right because it had already had to remove Ota Sik and Cernik in Czechoslovakia. It is obvious that the USSR has an obvious interest in a solution favourable to the structure of the Workers State which precludes a drift away from it.

The root of all this is a massive pressure for an economic functioning to answer the demands of the economic structure and planning of the Workers State, and for the Workers State itself. This has to cast aside private interests either of the peasantry or others. Moczar only remains because the necessary and decisive force to get rid of him is not yet there. This is nothing new. It was like this before. Gomulka fomented all this. Clearly we are in a transitory situation which can only become even more unstable for the bureaucracy. This Moczar chap hangs on only because there has been conciliation between sectors of the bureaucracy and a deal was struck. Moczar holds on and will keep his post only as long as this agreement lasts.

There must be a call to the whole of Poland, to the factories and to the workers, for an open discussion about these things. In the streets, in the universities, in the workers areas, in the offices, wherever you like, there must be a debate about how to plan for the benefit of all. There has to be a cut to the maximum in the salaries of all the top Party leaders, the technocrats, the technicians and the administrators. The leaders should not receive more than the average workers' wage. Why not move towards the equalisation of wages? Why not produce what is beneficial to the population, and not for a small portion of people who gorge themselves with luxury foods and use cars, have TV sets, whilst there is no need amongst the people? At the same time, the land has to be expropriated and collectivised. The market must be held in check through state intervention and regulation of prices by the state. The simple thing to do in order to raise agricultural production is to plan it collectively, and not to run it through rich landowners.

Certainly, in no way should private property in the countryside be favoured. It may very well be that Moczar has relations of interests with the landowners, but it is not possible that he is the sole factor. The solution lies with the type of leadership and organisation given by the

Communist Party; at present, it is bureaucratic and superficial. There is no mass intervention: no Soviets, no proletarian democracy, and no rights for the people to intervene. It is still an apparatus solution. What conclusion do we draw from this? The simple conclusion is that there must be Soviets, workers committees to discuss everything in the places of work. Why should the factories, the workers' areas and the Trade Unions not have a say?

There has not been in the world a single demonstration against the changes in Poland, but a lot of people have wanted to speak on the subject. The Trade Unions, workers parties, democratic revolutionary movements, the masses, have their eyes fixed on Poland. They have all asked questions: What is happening in Poland? Nobody has called for the overthrow of the Workers State, for an intervention to go and smash it, or even demonstrations against the regime of the Workers State. People have sought to find out what has to be put right, and aspire to see proletarian democracy there. This behaviour shows, and very well, the political awareness of the world masses, which intervene to further the movement of progress. They certainly don't intervene to contain it.

It is the opposite of what is going on in Spain where the people call for the downfall of Franco and the release of political prisoners. People are demanding that the US should get out of Vietnam and that the US should be defeated. Poland is another matter. In this case, the call is for the workers to be allowed to speak because it is they who can build socialism. In all this, the world revolutionary vanguard shows great maturity. This is something that should be noted by the Communist Party leaderships, who have failed to open their parties to a full discussion on all these problems. Why should not all the masses discuss this? Why not a public debate on the problem of the construction of socialism in which all revolutionary tendencies can speak? The IV International included!

All these events open the way for more internal discussions and reforms. It is a process that stimulates the sectors of the bureaucracy most linked to the people, to let the people speak, and it opens all the 'liberalisation' schemes to be scrutinised and criticised openly. The plans that are outside state centralisation and cater for the private use of collective property can be openly challenged.

Moreover, the need for the democratic rights of the masses is also open to discussion. This is vitally important. In fact, it is part of the Political Revolution. The masses want to intervene and decide. Since there is an unequal distribution of wealth, the people ask 'Who is the plan for?',

‘What is happening?’ The masses question the leaders’ ability to plan. The point however, is not that they aren’t able, but that they plan according to their individual conception, for their own satisfaction and of the group around them. They plan with a group’s mentality. What interests them most is to keep all their private links with the proprietors or the semi-proprietors. This is a disaster. These are the problems that must be discussed in the world workers movement.

These events in Poland are going to influence Czechoslovakia, Rumania and all the other Workers States, which are –undoubtedly- in the same situation as Poland. To some extent, Hungary was pacified by some concession the bureaucracy gave, and the same is true of the German Workers State. In the latter’s case, the bureaucracy is scared stiff because there was, in 1953, a movement of people demanding trade union democracy. All this forms part of the world process of the Socialist Revolution.

The world process of Socialist Revolution feeds this in the Workers States, and stimulates people to intervene. It is not a product of the local situation but of the world situation that expresses itself locally.

The call of the IV International to all the communist parties, to all the Workers States, to the worker and revolutionary movement, is to let the discussion take place on all the events in Poland, and on all the problems relating to the construction of Socialism in the world.

**J.POSADAS**

*21<sup>st</sup> December 1970*

## AGRARIAN ORGANISATION AND THE NEED FOR COLLECTIVISATION

*20<sup>th</sup> May 1975*

In an article we wrote four years ago, we posed that agriculture progresses slowly and with low productivity, and that this is not due to any backwardness of Poland or to a lack of industrial development, but to the economic relations in existence at the present moment between the countryside and industry. In a subsequent article, we analysed the Kolkhoz and Sovkhos showing that the problem is not any lack of technical means but a backward form of social organisation in agricultural production. We went on to show that the problems of agriculture are not a sign of any economic or social backwardness of the Workers state at all, but that they are the result of a deliberate policy of the leadership. The leadership is looking for support to itself, in maintaining the bureaucratic apparatus which benefits from this social organisation. It is the same in the USSR and the Chinese have gone in the same direction. One of the essential steps to take in Poland is to end small property on the land.

In Poland there are thousands upon thousands of proprietors who hold 70% of agrarian production in their hand. This is the problem and they have to be collectivised. In this present stage of history, Vietnam has triumphed over Yankee imperialism. There are writers in the Workers State, like this Haraszty, who contribute to this problem. Haraszty has written a book to show the need for change in Hungary's production system, changes in the worker-production-state relationship. In Yugoslavia, there are profound changes and they are diminishing the scope for individual separatist or nationalist interests. This is bound to happen in the USSR too, and it is happening in Poland now. It is happening above all in Poland. The reforms they are making include the setting up of new units of property, to centralise more production and to end the large sector of small holdings, small regions and little domains. In other words, they seek to make 10 units where there used to be 100.

This – if it was completed- would eliminate the sector of the bureaucratic apparatus that has local, regional, provincial or landed interests. This is being gradually overcome in the interest of centralisation. This tends to eliminate bureaucratic power or centralises it. This centralisation produces indeed a higher form of bureaucratic power, which on the face of it, appears as an inter-bureaucratic struggle. This is true in part, but it is also a necessary struggle that tends to eliminate backwardness in

production. What used to be 20, 40 or 100 scattered communities or municipalities with each their own power, are now being centralised. This stimulates production, increases the intervention of the masses and undercuts private property. It is done bureaucratically but it is an important factor of progress.

It does not occur to a Communist comrade to explain why all this lingered on in Poland for so long. Why? It was the same when they criticised Stalin. They criticised Stalin but never explained why. They never explained what gave rise to Stalin. It is certainly not the soviet people who put him in power. If the Soviet people had supported Stalin, he would never have needed to make the dictatorship he made. There would have been no need to demand freedom or the right to discuss, because the people would have simply expressed their support and nothing more. A support for Stalin would have meant that there was an agreement with him, due to his correct perspective. But the objectives of Stalin were far from correct. Also, Stalin did not win the war. It was won by the USSR masses and the world masses. Why don't the comrades question these things; why is there 80% of agrarian production in Poland under private property? The Communist comrades don't question this, but these questions do not go away. To give these answers, it is not necessary to have gone to University. It is a matter of understanding the course of history, and to conclude from its course what is to be done.

The discussion raises the question of the need to concentrate small scattered agrarian properties that impede the progress of production. We wrote about this an article four years ago, as Lenin and Trotsky did before us. The Communist comrades chose to ignore this. Now we see these questions reappear in the current situation. It was us who dedicated a great deal of effort to show that the 'errors' in Poland were not the result of some sort of backwardness in industrialisation but the result of a lack of political life, the lack of Soviet democracy and advance in Communist life or leadership. This is the essential problem even if there is also some backwardness in industrial production. When private property was allowed to thrive, it meant that the bureaucratic apparatus was dominant. We showed that backwardness was a social problem; the Communist comrades are now saying the same thing. They don't say it this way but their analyses mean that. It shows great progress that these changes are proposed in Poland. They will not stop at improvements in production and improvements in the countryside! These changes will have an inevitable effect in the appearance of better social relations between the proletariat and the peasantry, and inside the PUWP. Ideas and analyses are a necessity of life!

Agrarian property is one of the main reasons for delayed development, remnants of backwardness or subjection and obstacles in the way to advance in the Workers State. It is by no means true to say that if you expropriate and collectivise, it will result in an uprising. This is just not true! We said the same thing four years ago, and a year later, the Polish Communists came up with an analysis that proposed that the bulk of peasants' children did not want to stay on the land, were going to the city and became communists. They were the children of the landowners and they became communists. The analysis also said that there were still some old peasant families, but that the children were in the Party. Around 10 to 15 % continue their parents' traditions in landownership but the rest were Communists.

The problems of the Workers states are not just problems related to the economy, property forms or policy, but they are directly related to the degree of socialist-democratic relations in the workers movement, in the peasantry and the Workers State as a whole. The question of the role of socialist democracy with regard to the progress or development of the Workers State is a problem still largely un-discussed. Why not discuss it, like we do? What's the problem? There is enough time, ability, theoretical and political means to do it. Then why not discuss? The bureaucratic apparatuses are forced to make modifications and changes, but they seek to do it without the intervention of the masses. They want to introduce reforms, to organise the economic system and make it more efficient. This is just what is happening now. These reforms eliminate factors of alliance with the capitalist system. It eliminates layers that are the arm of the capitalist system in the Workers state.

These events could only take place at a time when war is being prepared. It is only then that conditions are mature for a very dynamic advance in the development of socialist measures in the Workers State. The conditions are mature because if they were not, none of this would take place.

These measures are not the product of Congresses. Indeed, they were not even discussed in the large Congress of the PUWP. It is only today that these are being talked about, now that the workers of Stettin and Gdansk rebel. The workers wanted democracy, the right to discuss, to change relations in the Party, the right to throw out the bureaucrats, to create equality in wages between the bureaucrats and the workers, and to end all manners of arrogance and of differences. The Communist press reported these tremendously important events, for example: when the workers received an "across the board increase in Stettin and Gdansk". It also

reported the fact that the workers then immediately proceeded to distribute the increase amongst those on lowest wages and greatest need. The workers, of their own accord, made this distribution which corresponds to socialist democracy: “to each according to need” and not according to the ability of one or the other. This demonstrated the sentiment of social justice and the thirst for equality that there is amongst the workers, immeasurably greater than the feelings expressed by their leaders, who continue to distribute to each according to capacity while the workers gave to each according to need. If this was not generalised to the whole country afterwards, it is because the government impeded it, and fixed wages at previous levels. However anywhere the workers have been able to make their position clear, it was to show that they want distribution according to necessity.

The Communist comrades have reported on these events, but they should have commented them, explained them and discussed so as to draw conclusions. They do not explain that the removal of Gomulka was the result of the mobilisations and intervention of the masses, which have intervened to stimulate the Workers State and make it go forward economically, socially and in the Trade Union field. However, it was these mobilisations that did this and brought about a change of attitude in Gierk. It is the workers who discussed and intervened on the question of price increases and wages levels. These are new problems in some way, and we have to take part in them, and remove the limits and constrictions imposed on discussion. All these changes lead to a greater economic development of Poland, higher capacity of competition with imperialism, a preparation for the possibility of war, and to the elimination of objective factors of alliance with the capitalist system, like private property in the countryside.

There is a crying need for a public discussion, a real need for instance to discuss agriculture. Today they say that production has to be centralised and planned. Good! But this cannot be done without Soviet democracy, the development of the intervention of the Trade Unions and a public life of the Party where all the people can take part and discuss all the problems of the economy and of the world! A little less than one year ago, there was a reorganisation in the Soviet Union for instance. They lessened the number of Kolkhozes (collective farms) and increased the number of units that each Kolkhoz covers. In the past, there used to be 380 thousands Kolkhozes with 50 or 60 thousand units in each. Now, they have only 200 thousand Kolkhozes left which have tripled the number of units in each. This has allowed an increase in production without either diminishing or ending individual interests, but it has

regulated the right of individuals to deal with production and sales. It reduced these factors. The Kolkhoz is state land, exploited in a private form and this is the case in many Workers States. In fact, this is the form of exploitation that makes a typical distribution 'to each according to capacity'. Each Kolkhozian owns part of the land and he can always produce for himself. There is a market – black or not- for which part of the land is producing. The black market is for the high and medium level of bureaucracy, and all sort of luxuries, fruits, flowers, vegetables and meat are produced on these parcels of land, to be sold at high prices at that market. It may not be a 'black market' but it functions as such because only those who have money can buy. It is totally unnecessary and alien to the development of the Workers State because it is a market confined to the bureaucracy. It results in a great deal of effort, energy, capacity, human will, being dedicated to a plot of land because it yields more returns than the rest of the Kolkhoz. It means that scientific capacity, technical ability and work are taken away from the Kolkhoz, the Workers State, and used for individual interests. We have criticised all this and have said that it could very well have been ended by now. The Workers State has been pushed to increase support for the Sovkhoz – State farm- and decrease subsidies, aid and machinery hitherto provided to the Kolkhozes.

There is going to be a very rich discussion soon in all the Workers States. This is particularly true for China, where they made the great experience of the Commune. The Commune is obsolete today in China; it does not correspond to what is needed anymore because the Commune meant both great progress and a great apparatus. The absence of sufficient proletarian weight allowed the development of military and peasant sectors with a great deal of political power in the Party. This was expressed in Mao's statement: "Let the hundred flowers bloom"! They called on the Chinese capitalists to come back, and later, they had to remove some of the 'flowers', but Deng Tsiao Ping had already 'blossomed' and that is quite a commentary on the bureaucracy we are talking about.

The economy has to cast aside all the obstacles, all the hindrances that prevent its development. Now what hinders it is the private use of collective ownership in the Workers State. Private use leaves the economy without strength; it restricts it and shackles it because it cannot expand. The economy demands freedom, and presses for the end of the obstacle of private property and the private use of collective property. The kolkhoz is one obstacle. The economy needs to harmonise the relationship between countryside and industry. It needs to end the differences between the two that still linger on. Trotsky called this

difference the ‘scissors’ and these have to be closed. Industry has to be made to fulfil the needs of the countryside. The countryside has to develop and the level of the peasants has to be raised. This is the way to close the ‘scissors’. This question of ‘closing the scissors’ is a concern, even for the capitalists. The problem of the difference between the city and the countryside continues to be a fundamental one in the process of the construction of the Workers State. There are a lot of peasants in the Workers State, and the agrarian sector is the most backward one in their economies.

The communist comrades are faced with all this. It forces them to discuss a little, but they do it in a bureaucratic and superficial way. They do not have bad intentions and they are not interested in defending bureaucratic conceptions as such. However, they go on with bureaucratic notions of resolving things in a way that maintains or stimulate bureaucratic interests. None of them mentions the need to allow the workers Trade Unions speak on the economic reforms proposed. What then is the role of the Trade Unions, what do they do? In the time of Lenin and Trotsky, when Lenin and Trotsky discussed economic measures, they were fundamentally preoccupied by the role of the Trade Unions in industry and the countryside. It is the apparatus of the Party that determines the changes at present. In general, these measures are important ones, and we are in favour of them –but not in this form. It is a progress but it has to go hand in hand with the progress of the intervention of the role of the Trade Unions. This is an essential factor for the economy of a Workers-State.

Now the bureaucracy feels the need for more solid support and it needs firmer props in society. All these peasant sectors the bureaucracy rests on are insecure; they represent a bridge with the capitalist system, and this is insecure. It is not simply a matter of the experience made by the Soviet Union – with the policies of Stalin – that allowed the Nazis to invade, but a sense that this time round, the Workers States are dealing with the final settlement of accounts, and not just with one capitalist state. They sense that this time, it is a matter of being prepared as the Workers state was under Lenin. This is why all the reforms being introduced in the Workers States have so much importance.

*20<sup>th</sup> May 1975*

**The workers mobilisations are to gain demands and to advance the Workers State.**

*26<sup>th</sup> June 1976*

(This has been written after a workers protest in Warsaw and Radom factories and some other cities, against price increases in essential products. The workers stopped trains and explained to the passengers their reason for the strike – Editorial note).

What was most outstanding about the recent events was that the masses, in protesting against their leadership have worked in a way not to harm the Workers State or its leadership. It was not a movement of “teppists” or a disorganised event, but quite organised. The workers rose with the full consciousness that they were dealing with their own state, the Workers State. It does not have the same significance as when the masses strike and make movements in capitalism because in capitalism, nothing binds them to the regime. In the case of Poland, the masses are conscious that it is the errors of the Workers State that must be corrected because the workers have the state very much at heart.

The reason why Gierek climbed down so rapidly in front of the workers was not because he was scared, but because there was an important sector of the Party that was waiting for just such an event. This is why there was unanimity when the crunch came, at that moment, they gave in without delay. It is an absolute lie to say –as the capitalist press does- that they were scared of repressing the workers, as they did in the past. They did not repress because they did not plan to repeat what Gomulka had done. Moreover, the repressions under Gomulka had not been carried out by him, but by the right wing which decided over and above him. At the moment, the intervention of the Soviet Union has to be taken into account. It will come to light, as it did last time that Brezhnev told the Polish leadership that it is better to give in.

This process cannot be interpreted as a concession motivated by fear but by the emergence of a better relationship with the life of the masses. In these circumstances, the leadership of the Communist Party could do nothing else but yield. We have to take the instances of Bulgaria and Hungary where the leadership conceded a lot without any mass movement at all. In this, the masses of the Workers states proved the point that they are far from passive or submitted. They live politically, in an uninterrupted way, and this is why the uprising in Poland today does

not impede or damage the Workers State. It is a marvellous example of how the political-organisational level of the Workers State rises daily.

The masses came out singing the “International” in 1970 carrying banners, in order to defeat reactionary groups. On this occasion, these reactionary groups had neither the time nor the means to raise their heads. This workers’ movement was, from one point of view, infinitely superior to the movements of an earlier period, in that this time the workers stopped the trains running for an entire day, so as to explain their conduct, make the people see that they weren’t after the government but wanted to give their opinion about the unacceptable price rises.

If it is necessary for the masses to take a cut in their standard of living, it will be accepted but not unless it is discussed. At the same time, wages have to be equalised. The President, the Generals and the rest, must all receive the same remuneration as the best paid workers. There must also be a sliding scale of wages which, in the Workers State, has not the same meaning as in capitalism. In capitalism, the sliding scale of wages goes absolutely against the capitalist system. In the Workers State, it is simply a means of the equalisation of wages at the level determined by general production and consumption. Why not let the masses intervene there? Why not promote public meetings in the Trade Unions, in the workers areas where the Trade Unions can talk about the prices increases, the wages and the standard of life? Why not? In this way, the world will see how the difficulties experienced by the Worker State are being dealt with. It will be a powerful example of democracy for the entire world, and particularly for the other Workers States.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the masses do not want to harm the Workers State, but they are advancing it by the progress of Soviet democracy, the most complete form of Political Revolution. The masses are very well aware that difficulties exist in the Workers State, and this is why we proposed that they are allowed to discuss in order to resolve them. An obvious difficulty is the fact that 80% of agricultural production is in private hands. The need for the advance of collectivisation has to be pointed out, not as an immediate aim, but simply the need to progress towards it. At the same time, the decision that housing and baking (bread) are to be returned to private contractors has to be rejected - even if it is cooperatives taking this over. In this case, why not allow the Trade Unions to take over? These private sectors are small, but they have petty bourgeois motivations and an interest in maintaining social differentiations. Why not let the Trade Unions do this? Of course, if the state feels that it cannot undertake this task, let the state do it with the aid

of the Trade Unions. The Trade Unions must intervene in housing, house construction, the distribution of bread etc. in the Workers State. And the solution of the agrarian problem and high prices is the business of the Trade Unions too. A discussion on the black market through which a large part of agricultural production disappears to satisfy the bureaucracy has to be raised with the involvement of the trade Unions. Of course, this amounts to criticising the bureaucracy for their fat salaries and privileges. Prices had been increased without any corresponding increase in the workers' wages.

This is going to have repercussions in all the Workers States. It is the same as what happened in Stettin and Danzig, but this time, it is superior because there is a profound process of Partial Regeneration and a very obvious advance in Political Revolution in all the Workers states. This situation in Poland is an aspect of the Political Revolution.

This has to be discussed in such a way that the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries understand and draw the conclusions: Poland has moved from being one of the most backward countries in the world – still with elements of backwardness due to capitalism – to a level of human relations infinitely superior to that in any capitalist country. They have to draw this conclusion rather than taking advantage by criticising the 'lack of democracy' in Poland.

At the same time, it has to be said that there must be no increase in food prices, but an increase in wages and the opening of a public discussion, in which the Polish population can debate publically wages and prices. There has to be popular organisms, similar to those that existed in the beginning of the Russian revolution, and they have to be allowed to intervene and decide.

One of the motives for the Polish leadership conceding to the workers movement is to avoid the limelight being turned on these problems. This goes to show that it is not just a matter of price increases but one of the structure of the economy itself. Why is there still private property? Why give the private sector the task of building houses and distributing bread? In reality, it is intended to strengthen a bureaucratic function, precisely the one that has to be finished with. It may be that the problem of building houses and bread baking and distribution, is not of prime importance, particularly in view of the fact that these people aren't allowed to reach the point of real capital accumulation and re-investment. But it stimulates the petty bourgeois layers with the idea of making

agreements with capitalism rather than actively supporting the world process of the revolution.

The Polish Communist Party must be called upon to discuss the agrarian question and the need to end private ownership of the land, to let the children of the peasants and the population speak. At the same time, the benefit of collective ownership has to be highlighted; if the means to show this do not exist, then there has to be a movement towards acquiring it.

The question of something like 20% of the parliamentary representatives coming from a bourgeois layer has to be raised also. They are not really bourgeois in a capitalist sense but they represent private elements and interests to give help and support to the limitations and timidity in the revolutionary progress of Poland. At the same time, they go along with all the policies of privileges and usufruct of the bureaucracy. This being so, we propose that all the communist parties discuss the need to end this practice which limits Soviet democracy in Poland. It means an investigation of the characteristics of Poland and the specific lacks and defects of the Polish Workers State. If such a discussion took place openly, it would have an immense impact.

*26<sup>th</sup> June 1976*

**J. Posadas**

**J. Posadas**

An analysis of Partial Regeneration:

**The elevation of the discussion in the world Communist movement and the criticism of the bureaucracy**

*9<sup>th</sup> October 1977*

The criticisms formulated by Gierek about agricultural production, during a meeting of the Central Committee of the PUWP, are not levelled against low production but against corrupt social organisation. Let us not forget how much Poland has progressed since 1972. The mobilisations there did not lead to immediate effects because of the sort of life that lingers on, the absence of workers' organisms or tendencies, the absence of life tendencies etc. The mobilisations do not have immediate results, and those that we see are very muffled, precisely because there isn't a political life or the organisms or movements to make it any different. But there have been two movements since 1972, and quite a crisis in the leadership, and now, this present situation and discussion. The crisis two years ago about the children of landowners abandoning the land, going to the city, whilst asking their parents to return the land to the state in exchange for a pension, repeated itself last year. At that time, something like 20% of the small landowners, handed over their land to the state. They were given a pension and they accepted that their land be taken over by 'production committees'.

All these measures are limited in scope and effect but, if you consider them as a whole, they are going to have very important repercussions. They eliminate bureaucratic elements, the matrix of capitalist conciliation based on private ownership. It is a process in the countryside that splits the family up from property. The children of the landowners go to the city and become Communist Party militants where property has no meaning anymore. Meanwhile, the new system whereby the former owners receive a pension has produced an increase in production – via the unification of various small parcels of land. More than this, this change has increased the capacity for historic understanding in Poland, emphasising that a collective method of organisation based on state-ownership is superior in the context of planning. What the workers of Stettin and Danzig initiated did not have an immediate effect but the ball reached its goal. It did not “go into touch”.

The situation in Poland has to be taken as a gauge of what is happening in the other Workers States. In spite of the conciliatory policy of the Communist and Socialist parties, changes in the capitalist system advance rapidly because the working class is directly involved in a struggle against the capitalist system. In the Workers State, it is different because mobilisations by the masses are carried out by sectors, not by the whole of the masses. This makes the consequence of the actions of those sectors slower. Not all the population participates because it does not always have the motive to do so, and it does not want to harm the Workers State. So, we cannot expect the movements of the Workers States to have such an immediate effect or scope as in the capitalist system. Capitalism does everything it can to ensure that anything that moves in the Workers States leads to disorder, because it has counter revolutionary interests against the Workers States but the workers aren't going to allow this.

The mobilisations of Stettin and Danzig in 1972 led to considerable changes and quite a reaction of the Government. Now we can see further changes but the motives for the present changes come from before – from at least three years ago – and only now do we see pressure being exerted on the private peasants. It may be that they have produced too little or badly, or because they have produced too much for their own benefit, sending it to the black market. But the shift is that something is being said about those peasants now. The leadership of the Workers state still poses the problem without qualifications as one does when one is not prepared to confront the problems and to take action. However, it all means that there is an elevation in the centralisation of the state, which goes against private interests – and against the groups and layers that oppose the centralised interest of the state.

This discussion isn't insignificant; it is not a partial event without consequence. It is in fact very important. It goes hand in hand with changes in the Soviet Union, Hungary and Yugoslavia. In Rumania recently, they have posed that Marxism has to be the official text of the country. In Rumania, it is compulsory to study Marxism. It shows that the communist leaders of France, Italy or Japan, who are looking for a Workers State as an accomplice of "Euro-communism", can keep looking...It is becoming increasingly less likely to ever finding one!

An important discussion is appearing in the Italian Communist Party on the "Youth". The comrades say that they must revise their conception of the Youth movement, because the Youth are not all motivated by rioting and agitation, but by the need to act. This is a fundamental conclusion even if the comrades do not pose how to intervene, with what aims and

programme. The communists are now saying that in the 30's they did the things that the Youths do today. This does not explain the significance of the actions of the Youth, but it shows that there are very good historic reasons for the Youth to act - as it does today. The basis of discussion and of interpretation is changing in the Italian Communist Party. We have intervened in this progress of the Italian Communist Party through our texts.

The discussion now going on in Poland is going on in Yugoslavia, in Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. Hoffman has been re-instated as a Minister in the East German Workers State. In the Soviet Union, Kutnezov has been made Vice-President. He is not strictly of the new layer arising now in the USSR, because he still represents the old bureaucratic layer, and has been put in this post rather to contain things. It is said that he is an old leader linked to Brezhnev from 1950 but he was also part of Stalin's apparatus. This does not mean very much however, because to be anything in those days, you had to pass through Stalin's school. Kutnezov has been put in this post to conciliate Brezhnev's tendency with another, while they look for someone else. He is there to fill the vacuum left by the removal of the right wing. Thus, he is not a man that could be absolutely of the right, in favour of complete conciliation with capitalism; he just keeps things going with capitalism. It shows that we must expect new changes and wait for new and deeper discussions, like that on the Constitution. The election of Kutnezov is transitory. It has not been decided by the New Soviet Constitution, the Supreme Soviet or even Brezhnev. It is part of an agreement to "paper-over" internal disputes, which will also be transitory. It resolves nothing economic or political. We have to expect a new and more profound struggle of tendency.

There is a heightening of the struggle in the Soviet Union in which bureaucratic power has been partially increased; at the same time, this has to lead to a better cohesion in order to confront the capitalist system. The settlement in Poland – at the moment- comes at the same time as changes in Hungary and Rumania. Complete or continuous news about these changes are not available but we must pay much attention to what we get to know. The new Soviet Constitution itself was a means of containing. Each day, they go deeper in this process of trying to contain; it is very deep there and in Poland or Hungary – even if it is more attenuated. All this is shown better in the changes and discussions in Poland. We analysed a long time ago the crisis in agriculture in Poland, as much as in the USSR. We showed that it was not due to the inability of the Workers State or to a lack of material means. These countries do lack material

means and technicians. But that is not the reason. The real reason is the form of social organisation, the limitations of social organisation. This is precisely what the meeting of the Central Committee has posed. There is no doubt that the lack of machinery has its effect but machinery can be obtained. Now Gierek has underlined the fact that production has been decentralised, a lot of agricultural land has been put to individual use, big incentives and credits have been given, and in spite of it all, there has been no increase in agricultural production. When he comes up with this, it is because a sector of the Communist Party is asking questions. It shows that sometimes in the future, they are going to do something about this. It all goes against a very important wing of the Party bureaucracy, which is responsible for this situation and who have helped the recipients of the subsidy to produce for the black market.

However, this sector of the bureaucracy cannot engage in the capitalist market. There may be one or two cases of this, but generally it is impossible. They have to keep producing what the State asks for and the prices are fixed by the State. So, here we have private property in production, but not private use of production because that is decided by the State. These producers cannot produce just what they like and sell it at the price they like. The State fixes prices and is the sole purchaser. The snag is that the private producers are free to produce largely what they like and sell it at the price they can get on the black market. This means that they dedicate precious little time to production for the State and most of their time is spent on their own plot because they are well paid for doing so. In other words, they dedicate their time to production for the black market, which is the market of the bureaucracy.

The problem with individual plots of land shapes in part the relations within the high circles of the bureaucracy and the structure of the bureaucracy as a whole. The struggle we see now is partly expressed in the government reshuffles. There was also a black market in the early days of the Cuban Revolution. The Yankees published lists of people who benefited from production for the top bureaucracy. Escalante was one of these and he was subsequently thrown into jail.

### *The discussion in the world Communist movement*

This situation has to be seen as part of what is happening in Greece and in Spain, where the Communists have less and less choice between Communism and “pluralism”. The present discussion in France favours neither Mitterand nor Marchais, but Communism. It is a discussion that transcends all the momentary situations because the problem of

programme, tactics and aims, is being posed in France. They are forced to discuss programme and objectives over the question of candidates for the elections. These discussions arise not in isolated instances but in various places all over the world.

The cultural level of the debate is being raised in the communist movement. The programme scope of what they are discussing is not going very far but the discussion is rising. Now, they have to abandon the purely clique or group preoccupation and interest and to tackle the objective interest of the class struggle. The way they do this is still limited by individual interests, but discussing in this way and at this level means that there is no possibility of retreat. Neither capitalism itself nor the Soviet leadership have the strength to hinder this debate. Moreover, the Soviet leadership has a growing interest in seeing this discussion reach a world level. In other words, even though the soviets eliminated any discussion in the area of Revolutions and transformations previously, now they pose the need to reopen the discussion. They do this with the limitations that one would expect. They try to see that the discussion does not go too far, but the process itself will not allow this because the historic class against class confrontation is drawing closer. The proof of this is what they are concerned with in the Italian Communist Party now. They try to understand the Youth movement and this means that they are trying to pre-empt other people in the Party who wish to go even farther to the left. In one week alone, a leader of the Communist Party of Italy put pen to paper in order to attack the 'leftists', to call for a strengthening of the 'democratic state', whilst another leader comes out justifying the actions of the Youth. It is we, who have written about the Youth. We have written with all our love and appreciation of the beauty of what it means that the Youth struggles objectively and disinterestedly to impel History! It is the wrong methods of the Youth that have to be put right, not the Youth as such. How is it possible not to see this? When the Italian Communist Party revises its opinion, it is because a sector begins to understand that they were wrong about the Youth in the past. We have to intervene with redoubled force because all this is reaching levels from which there is no retreat. A significant and riveting expression of this process is shown in the speech of Brezhnev in the Supreme Soviet, calling for the approval of the New Soviet Constitution; he referred specifically to the fact that "as yet, we cannot apply the principle of 'to each according to need'". In other words, Brezhnev was saying that we weren't against the principle itself but that it wasn't the moment. He made no attack against those who had proposed to include this in the New Soviet Constitution. These people have a substantial weight in the political apparatus of the Soviet Union. So, the election of Kutnezov as

Vice President, taking place immediately after this discussion, shows that a transitory figure in this post – someone of the right but who cannot exercise a right-wing role – was needed just then. What decides things is not Kutnezov but the apparatus he is part of. Podgorny was also of the right but he had to make a tour of Africa.

This discussion in Poland does not have its roots simply within the boundaries of that country. We have to see all the depth of this process, and derive an immense joy from it. Even with all the bureaucratic built by Stalin – and it is still in place in the USSR, it still thinks bureaucratically – the process of History forces them to think, under the impulse of the masses, as reasonable people. They are made to have no more fear of the objective course of History, not looking at History as individuals but as human beings who form part of the progress of Humanity. This bureaucracy is the result of previous relations. It thinks individually and within the confines of the relations built previously, but today, there is progress in the world, in which the 8 year old Polisario or Angolan child, forms part of the removal of the fear of the bureaucrat.

The bureaucrat sheds his fear, fear which made him always think of himself first, accumulate or reason only for himself. No one was born a bureaucrat. Bureaucracy arose within certain human relations. If we are capable of winning over large sectors of capitalism – like the high ranking generals – how will it not be possible to win over a layer of the bureaucracy? It is not a matter of convincing or persuading them; they, as a layer, are going to throw off the fear generated by individual egoism, and join the collective effort and comprehension.

The bureaucracy that had so firmly closed the Soviet's Union door is now pushed into reopening it, and to lead a discussion as a Soviet Union more than as a bureaucratic sector. It has to tell the world proletariat that there is no misery or hunger in the Soviet Union. The USSR has solved the fundamental problem of the Women; it is the country where there are the least accidents at work, and where the longevity figures are the highest.

### *Partial Regeneration*

This discussion in Poland must be understood as one of the points of preoccupation to raise theoretical and political ability. We have often said that our objective is to stimulate the leadership of the Communist parties, amongst them the Italian where we have a great deal to teach. However, we have to wait for a better level in the revolutionary process – at which

point the comrades will see that they have much less to fear than they had anticipated.

The Communist comrades are not cowards. Their fear is not cowardice. Indeed, they have already shown that they have a lot of resolve, but the problem is that they do not quite believe it all. They are animated by their own individual egoism, their own interest of country and of sector. Nonetheless, the overall process stimulates them; for instance, the Soviet bureaucracy functions within the margins of a team that grows smaller daily. The Soviet leadership has to remove the lower and middle sectors of the bureaucracy in order to keep going. In so doing, it undercuts its own base of bureaucratic support and gives way to the sources of pressure to make the Workers State advance. The reasoning of these sectors penetrates and their strength becomes greater.

The bureaucracy has developed into distinct layers where the top sectors need the middle and lower echelons to feed on. Now, the world process forces them to break links with the most individualistic sectors that are most open to public scrutiny and criticism. It is precisely these latter sectors that have attacked the speech of Gierek.

The top bureaucracy has to continue to eliminate its own middle strata, and in so doing it weakens itself because it removes bases, structures and apparatuses on which they all rest. The result is that the top bureaucracy is also quantitatively and politically weakened. This process also allows a greater entry of the workers, Trade Unions or Party sectors, whose opinion was not taken into account before.

None of this process results from scientific or objective conclusions reached by the leading sector of the Party. It is the economy that produces this! It may not have had to be this way, but the ripening of the process brings about all this. This process of maturing expressed itself through the economy, because it found neither the necessary political instrument nor the necessary Party or structure to answer its needs. It did not have to develop in this meandering, ambiguous, indirect and rather degenerated way. If it had been developed and expressed politically, this process would have led to an overall plan of correction. As it is, it surfaces through a restructuring and correction by means of the disintegration of the previously stable infrastructure of the bureaucracy.

The changes in the bureaucracy measure the level of historic maturity where the bureaucracy no longer has continuous and stable points of support. Nowhere in the world has the bureaucracy got stable points of

support. The bureaucracy has lost them precisely because capitalism itself no longer enjoys them. The solid support for bureaucracy was the rock on which Stalin rested. The world process shows that this solid support no longer exists.

Raymond Barre comes out to take votes from Mitterand because he sees all the danger that lies in Mitterand. He sees more danger in Mitterand than in Marchais. He tries to contain a whole layer of petty bourgeoisie previously influenced by capitalism, which is about to be gained by the struggle for social transformations. Barre fears Mitterand more than the Communists because in the context of the class struggle, Mitterand has something of the programme, objectives, content and perspectives of the class struggle. It is possible to measure the infinite weakness of capitalism by this.

All the conditions that we analyse now existed when the Polish workers launched their first movement. The workers did not just rise for wages. On the contrary, they expressed the malaise that the bureaucracy underlined by making some progress in economic development. The workers were stimulated by economic problems – but this was because they did not have the organisms through which to formulate ideas politically. They could not express themselves through the Trade Unions either.

The dissidents who say that ‘nobody can speak’ in the workers States fail to mention the present discussion in Poland. In fact, the Polish State itself has criticised its own abnormalities and elements of corruption. Has any capitalist state have ever made an appraisal which corresponds to the one the Polish state is now making? If anything resembling this arises in the capitalist system, it is because the capitalists are all in competition with each other and denounce each other in order to get rid of competitors, not with the aim of correcting the situation. In Poland, they throw the bureaucrats out and allow the workers to intervene more in public planning. It may all be limited but it is an entirely different situation from the one the dissidents talk about when they say that there is oppression and that they aren’t allowed to speak.

We are dealing with one of the phases which concentrate significant changes, not all accomplished but about to be. Indeed they are in the process of being accomplished. We return to qualify the function of Stettin and Danzig. We already analysed it in 1972. The effects of the process cannot be immediate and they will show after a period of time. When the workers demonstrate in defence of the Workers State and expel

all the sectors alien to the Workers State, it is because they are involved in advancing the progress of the State.

It is of the utmost importance that this discussion has opened up in the Central Committee of the PUWP. They have started to discuss the need to liquidate private property without conflicts. They do not discuss this very well because they have not called on the workers with meetings and demonstrations to help in this. There are no assemblies or rallies on the subject. However, even then it indicates that the bureaucracy cannot confirm its power, and then instead, it has to continue to weaken its own base. It would have made the sort of rallies that tended to strengthen its bureaucratic base, if it had been able to... When there are no rallies at all, it is because they have been unable to do this, and have been pushed in the direction of ending private property. They hope that this can be done without too much uproar! They hope that there will be as little fuss as possible about it, but they are thinking about it. In the past, they repressed and killed. Now, they have had to admit that strikes are legal. Of course, in part, they allow this because they have to and to criticise the lack of the right to strike – as they see it – in the Soviet Union. The Polish government however, repeatedly made the point that they did not criticise the workers for using the right to strike, but for having ‘threatened the State’.

This is apprehended only with a better theoretical and political understanding. The world is no longer just preoccupied with electoral problems, economic and Trade Unions disputes. The masses and their leadership now have to visualise the process of system against system, as part of a global process. This can be seen in the level of the discussion in Spain and France. The leadership of the French Communist Party did not quite expect this level of discussion, but it is not going to strengthen the reformist wing of the Party, but the wing of the Party which responds to necessity. They deal with the situation partially, but they are on the correct road because the consequences of the present situation in France are going to be great.

Whole strata of Communist leaderships are not really motivated by individual interests comparable to those of the bureaucrats of the worst kind. Of course, there is a layer of bureaucrats in the Communist Parties but there are others who are simply fearful. Take Carrillo for instance. He is not a bureaucrat because he has not the social interests, the ties with economy, of the bureaucrat. What he has is a reformist conception of the class struggle, and this means that he cannot be dealt with in the same way one deals with the Soviet leadership. We have to learn how to

politicize and wait for the time when the process brings him the conviction that there is no reason to fear, and that he has been wrong in the past. At the same time, we must go forward without just waiting for him.

This is not a struggle as it was before, against the right wing of the Communist movement. Many of the leaders of today in the Communist parties will be won over. They have to make their own experiences because they come from a past when Marxism was negated. However, they have now returned to a certain Marxist understanding. It is not a question of a Marxist movement that degenerated, but of a movement that never had Marxism and which has now to learn to be Marxist.

Conditions do not exist in the world for the Communist parties to completely rid themselves of Marxist principles. Social-democracy could organise itself when there were historic reasons for it to do so. They supported themselves on a process of advance of the capitalist economy, based on the colonies and so, Hilferding, Bernstein and Kautsky arose.

They united in what appeared to be a trilogy of an economic reality, theoretical foundations and practical activity. Kautsky wrote “The agrarian Reform”, which was a reformist and conciliatory document, but the first half of which was very good. The second half, produced later, was in counter-position to the first. Now the Workers movement cannot have the perspective or programme that the Social-democracy established. Capitalism no longer offers such perspectives, and socialism is not making it easy for the bureaucrats. We built our confidence on all this, not just in principles and theoretical ability, but also in practical experience - based on the knowledge that a large number of comrades can be, and must be gained in the Communist parties.

### *Poland breaks links with private property and capitalism*

The Communist party is the instrument of History; there isn't anything else. The war is just around the corner. Evidence of this is the discussion on the neutron bomb and also –let us not forget- the discussions in Poland. Considering what is happening in Poland, it is obvious that there is no future for the Communist right wing or centre, to re-embark on a stable policy of conciliation with capitalism. There is no perspective for this, and there is no perspective for the right or the centre to slow down the process, in the hope of being able to constitute some kind of new apparatus in Poland, currents conciliatory to capitalism again.

There is no perspective for this because there is no basis for it. The capitalist economy is forced to confront and reject any sort of progress. Meanwhile the class struggle sharpens all the time. These are the elements that prevent a historic retreat of the Workers State. The Social-democrats were not born reformists. A whole series of historic events unfolded which made them think in terms of the policy of conciliation. The level necessary to provide a firm theoretical base for revolution did not exist then, and they didn't have the confidence to acquire it. Today, these impediments do not exist. No doubt, a retreat is not excluded. But the necessity of the economy supersedes any attempt to retreat. There is already a very important understanding amongst humanity, which has developed a great intelligence.

We have analysed with passion the development of "Ancient Civilisations". In those days, civilisation was the expression of the development of the ruling classes and this meant that achievement was essentially limited. The ruling classes were the only one that could progress because they had power in their own hands. This study shows all the limitations that private property signifies, and in those days, all the lack of scientific development. However, history was what it was, and it cannot be adorned. Now, scientific and technological progress is infinitely superior but the working class is comparatively more wretched than the poor of those days. It is more so if you compare the condition of the working class and masses, with the progress achieved on the scientific level.

However, those who have tried to make History retreat have only succeeded in small things because that was the best they could do. Now, Humanity has more confidence and the Workers States have given it even more confidence, by showing that all the problems will be resolved. Historic confidence forms part of what is called patience. It allows us to appreciate that the process had to take this path, and to know how to wait and organise.

*9<sup>th</sup> October 1977*

**J. Posadas**

## **The bureaucracy and the progress of the Workers State**

*22<sup>nd</sup> December 1978*

There is one of the greatest bureaucratic layers of all the Workers States in Poland. This is because of the very backward peasant sector that has been left in place deliberately. In 1970, I already explained how there was no need at all to maintain private property in the countryside: "It is a bureaucratic measure that comes from the time of Stalin". After this, Krutschov allowed the continued existence of this sector because he wanted it as a point of support. The existence of private property in Poland is not a pre-ordained problem but the result of the bureaucratic apparatus. There is in Poland a nationalist petty bourgeoisie, and it is quite numerous. But it is also fairly remote from the population. There is a large number too of students who are revolutionaries, and who oppose the tendencies of private property. Indeed, there are many children of the peasants who oppose private property.

There was a recent article in UNITA which recognised that there was no need to maintain such a level of backwardness in agricultural production in Poland. This is quite new because the Italian Communists up until recently defended private property on the land, in the name of its 'pluralist' endeavour. Now they say that this is not needed... In this article, they demonstrated that the problem in agriculture did not come from a lack of means but from a bureaucratic apparatus based on private property, itself the result of the interests of a bureaucratic clique which Stalin favoured because it suited him.

Indeed the aspects of backwardness in Poland are leftovers from the time of Stalin. They are the result of a limited leadership, which, because of its bureaucratic structure, had no idea of how to advance. The problem of Poland is one of leadership and not of land... Capitalism tries to influence both the Polish and German Workers States, as it did with Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and others, through the black market and other means. It is true that the black market cannot manage to determine the political or economic course of the Workers State. But about half of those employed in the black market turn out to be Government civil servants, sectors of the State apparatus and... the right wing of the Communist Party. This is why this particular game has an importance. In spite of this, there has been great social, political and even economic progress in Poland. If it is not greater on the economic plane, it is because the leadership is incapable. But what will determine in the end the development of the economy is politics and nothing else. The

development of the political level in the Workers State is very good and deep in the working class, in a large part of the petit bourgeoisie and also among the children of the landowners who are won by Communist influence. If the economy had a greater strength, it would have a decisive effect on the political plane. At the time of Stalin, there was a large black market in the USSR, and there is one large today in the German Workers State, called the 'intershops' – a form of black market made public, to stop it being clandestine.

In general, these leaderships in the Workers States do not represent the working class which is not allowed to intervene yet. However, the working class cannot intervene in the abstract, without some instrument. It needs concrete organisms for its own intervention which are its Party and the Trade Unions. It is through these organisms that the working class advances, and with all their limitations, they cannot be a complete block to its progress. If they were a complete block, the conduct of the proletariat towards them would not be one of impelling. It would be another problem. All the popular uprisings that took place in Poland, in Germany or in Hungary have shown progress on the part of the organisms of the proletariat. None of these Workers States have returned to Stalinism or to capitalism. They were all made to advance and this is what the proletariat has been doing all the time.

These problems arise from the lack of political leadership – a problem that goes back to Stalin. The bureaucracy substituted for the Communist Party in the construction of the Workers State, but in all this process, the bureaucracy has not managed to grow, to increase itself or develop its power. Far from it, it has diminished. The strength and power of the proletariat on a world scale, has immensely increased its weight. The proletariat means the working class of the world, the Communist parties, and the leaderships now developing in the Workers States.

The bureaucratic layers in the Workers States have continued to weigh, to function and lower the conditions of life in the Workers states, through the 'intershops' and the black markets. This has gone on for a whole period, but they have not been able to develop as a bureaucracy, or increase their strength and power. On the contrary, they have continuously declined.

Poland has been, and goes on being, a centre that capitalism tries to attract as it did with Yugoslavia and Rumania. It tries to use it against the rest of the Workers States. This attempt, however, has failed. Imperialism nursed the hope – based on the existence of bureaucratic interests – of

being able to develop oppositional sectors in the Workers State. But the growth of the economy, and above all the social development of the country, forced the bureaucracy to confront capitalism. There was never any perspective or conditions for capitalism to find a social support of any force in Poland.

Poland is not religious! Russia before the Revolution had many religions, but all the religious people in the USSR today, defend the regime of State ownership. In fact, these people are not religious even though they still believe in God. The living experience of the Workers State makes them support it rather than God. They only refer problems of lesser importance to God.

In comparison with the other Workers States, Poland has more religious adherents and practice. But it is also one of the countries where the peasant youth go to the communist Party. Let us not forget that Poland still has the right to form bourgeois political groups and the bourgeoisie can still have M.P.s. Capitalism uses this in order to try to develop, and it constantly fails in this. The reason for this failure is that there was not any basis for a bourgeois development because even with the small landowners, the majority of them do not have any interest in really changing the situation. They don't want any change because they would lose from it, but they want the economic advantages offered by the Workers State, which they are quite sure they would not get under capitalism.

In the days before Poland was a Workers state, there were no doctors, no hospitals, and no means of transport in the countryside. But today they have all these things. They know that this comes from the existence of the Workers State, and that they could not get it under capitalism. All this creates a process that favours the appearance of a sector combining interests in the Workers State with private interests. These people mix all this up, but nevertheless the predominant interest they have is in the Workers state. Naturally, it is still possible to find entrenched private interests here or there, but as a whole the Workers State is respected because the Workers State provides for the peasants. The peasants see and feel that what they gain does not come from capitalism, but from the existence of the Workers State.

A French journalist from LE MONDE, who is critical of the bureaucracy of the Workers States, reported on what he saw in Poland. He said that out of 100 peasants, he could not find more than 3 or 4 of them opposed to the present State and ready to go back to what it was before. The others

said that they wanted more say, more development, but that otherwise, things should remain as they are. This journalist even had to report that the peasants told him that before, there were no schools or hospitals but that now, they had all this and universities in the countryside. In other words, there is no base of support for capitalism, because if there was, it would have already developed.

What has to be changed therefore is the bureaucracy but not the Workers State. There has to be changes in the Party leadership, and even then, not all of it. The proletariat is not very strong in the Party; it has a social weight but not a political one. This is shown in the fact that there have been two working class movements: one in 1956, which was a mighty one, and another one later. These movements pushed Poland towards the left, without finally bringing down the political programme of the bureaucracy. The problem is that, on top of the problem of leadership in Poland – as in practically all the Workers States – there is the added one of having to organise a process for which they aren't ready. They have to develop the economy and acquire a Party prepared to lead at the same time. Besides they still have to compete against the capitalist regime. The root of all their problems lies in the absence of a Party as such. There is indeed a mass Party, the Communist Party, which defends the Workers State. But it isn't a Party that lets the masses intervene as leadership. It does not let the masses control the economy. This is not allowed. The same goes for most of the Workers States. This leads to even greater problems and limitations because the bureaucracy impedes the organisation of the Party. However, as time passes, the bureaucracy has to yield in such a way that it brings its policy closer and closer to what is necessary. This is not to say that the bureaucracy actually does the necessary thing, but that it moves in this direction, because the essential problems aren't economic but in the field of social relations. This is what is expressed in the Workers States where there is the greatest weight of bureaucracy.

### *How to criticise the Workers States in this stage*

It is not good enough to criticise the Workers State, even to improve it, if one does not have ability, ideas and experience. Aspects of the Workers State can be criticised. But not the totality. Those who criticise wholly the Workers State cancel the historic role of the Workers State. The Workers State is something that actually works. Its organisms have bureaucratic aspects – conciliatory and selfish – but the historic function of the Workers State is not determined by these aspects but by the fact that it stimulates the struggle for socialism.

We base ourselves on this, absolutely. There is room for criticisms and objections against bureaucracy, but the fact remains that the historic role of the Workers State towers over all its bureaucratic limitations. We are not blind to these, but we seek to formulate our criticisms and judgements in such a way that we impel the movements towards a change and improvement in the leaderships of the Workers States. This is not a fight against bureaucracy so much as a process of constructing the necessary leadership for the progress of human history.

We cannot be blind to the limitations and weaknesses of the Workers States, but the fact remains that the bureaucracy is forced to play a historic role in spite of itself and this tends to organise the advance in the struggle for socialism. The economic structure alone puts this responsibility on the shoulders of the bureaucracy, forces it into a struggle. The bureaucracy cannot evade this.

Therefore, any criticism has to be made in such a way that it leads to a discussion of the insufficiencies and of the way in which to correct them. A criticism of the Workers State can never be made in a way that damages it. Let us take the example of the protest movements of the workers in Stettin and Danzig. They did nothing to harm the Workers state and when the sons and daughters of the bureaucrats mingled with the workers in order to confuse the situation, the workers made it clear that these people had nothing to do with them.

When we take a position we are sure that the Workers state is an instrument of history. This is a scientific conclusion. The Workers State is still very limited but it is a necessary historic instrument whose limitations are determined by the conditions that exist. There could be other conditions: for example, if humanity could immediately supersede and eliminate the class struggle, and therefore eliminate the bureaucracy as well, science would advance a thousand fold immediately. As social impediments are eliminated, human intelligence will be raised and the level of science will also be raised. Instead of having one Newton or Copernicus, there will be such people everywhere.

The Workers State has to be considered as an instrument that has to be developed and protected. It is a little like a tool which is useful but not completely up to the mark, or a machine that needs repair. What is necessary is to repair it, not to throw it away. Poland is an instrument of history and the same applies to Copernicus in his epoch. History is an impersonal thing that develops in this form. We insist that there are things to be put right in the Workers State, but that the Workers State has to be

protected. It must not be crushed. This means that we must not dispute or struggle to remove the leaderships of the Workers States to replace it by oneself. We have to know how to stimulate them. By impelling the Workers state, we bring about corrections and in learning to do this, we also learn to discuss the function of progress, but not as a struggle of antagonistic interests, interests of fraction, of group or of tendency. This is the way it happens in the Cosmos. The bodies of the Cosmos pass close to each other but never clash. Hundreds of thousands of highly electrically charged bodies circulate in the Cosmos without coming into collision. In Poland, Czechoslovakia and the other Workers States, there are queues in front of the shops. But in Italy, there is a queue in front of life. People in the capitalist countries must queue in front of life whilst in the Workers States they do not always queue for the products they need, and the very same people struggle for the rest of the world. The Polish Workers State is hardly 30 years old, and in those 30 years, it has had to rebuild after the war, build a complete functioning State and train people to the task of leadership. All this from absolutely nothing. On top of this the bureaucracy was formed. The main reason for the limitations of Poland is that it is a country that had to be set-up in those conditions. All those who keep criticising the bureaucracy, say nothing about how it arose and even less about the previous situation of the country. What are the causes of the backwardness of India, for example? India did not have a Stalin. So, what are the causes? There is no shortage of people who talk about the backwardness, lack of freedom and queues in Poland, but what was Poland 30 years ago? It was a country completely destroyed, not by the bureaucracy, which is a problem that came on top of this and is part of the consequences of the war. However, the Workers State has shown its superiority even with the bureaucracy it has. It has worked as a basis of the construction of Socialism and it has built the modern Poland where there is great progress. What of the bureaucracy of India or of Italy, then? They are no more than common thieves who steal every single thing and leave the population naked. It is nothing like this in the Workers State.

The Workers State is an instrument of history and there is no other. This instrument which was created in conditions of war and the most phenomenal backwardness which included Stalin has to be improved. Nonetheless the Workers State is the regime that has taken Poland out of backwardness in just about 30 years. Clearly, there isn't plenty of food, but there are universities, hospitals and doctors. In Italy there is quite a lot of food for the bourgeoisie but the people have very little and neither have they hospitals or doctors in anywhere near the sufficient quantity.

What we seek is that all the possibilities of the Workers State are developed. Capitalism seeks the opposite. It tries to compound the problems of the Workers State; it lies and distorts information about them in order to damage the authority of the Workers States over petty bourgeois or even bourgeois sectors, scientists etc. , who are moving into the camp of the workers movement.

Mandel wants to correct the capitalist system and the bureaucracy, so that he – and people like him- become the new leaders and are given room to live. These people are professors whose articles are printed and reviewed in the press. This shows all the ingeniousness, egotism and individual ambition that animate them and their lack of understanding of the process of history. Capitalism gives them authority, fame; it gives them the possibility to make analyses and put forward their arguments. So, these people support capitalism. In turn, capitalism uses the old Trotskyism as represented by people like Mandel, and gives them the appearance of genuine Trotskyism. Stalin indeed was an old ‘Bolshevik’ but this is not sufficient ground to support him. Being ‘old’ can mean worthiness or worthlessness. There is a process of very great focus in the world.

There is great process of focus in the Workers States. This is because all the decisive factors in the historic process, the economy and its forms of development, the decline of individualism and of individual forms of thinking based on private interests have finally come together. As part of this, there is a constant, uninterrupted advancing movement in human intelligence and understanding that the causes of all human ills come from human relations that don’t correspond to necessity. Even common illnesses form part of this. This grasp is not always absolutely clear but it is deepening all the time.

Our defence of the Workers State is intransigent. Our criticisms have the aim of improving the functioning of the Workers states. We are essentially preoccupied by the fact that we are dealing with an instrument of history. On a world scale, the proletariat knows full well that the Workers State is the instrument of history. The proletariat knows this! They have seen the Soviet Union triumph over the Nazis and Stalin. Then the USSR went on to make tremendous progress. The progress is such that the children can walk about the streets by themselves, without anyone imagining that any harm will come to them. It is exactly the opposite of human relations in the capitalist system, where a child alone in the street is considered to be abandoned.

We have to consider that the struggle in the world is between one civilisation, capitalism, which has lost its right to continue in history, and the new civilisation, represented by the Workers States, which has yet to form its conscious leadership. This is the stage the world has reached.

Eating better is not the aim of the class struggle. That struggle is about entering a new level of civilisation which arises out of the class struggle. Weapons are not what make history but history is decided by means of weapons. There comes a time when to the 'arms of criticism' is added the 'criticism of the arms'.

The leaderships of the Workers states are in the process of feeling the need for ideas, for analyses, judgements, organisation of new tendencies. This is a symbol – not yet something tangible – of the increasing dissatisfaction of these leaderships with their actual apparatuses and policy. The apparatuses no doubt prepare new bureaucrats, but the Workers state for its part, must prepare new executive managers who are quite certain of the superiority of the Workers State. They may develop conceptions that still make them usufruct the Workers state, but they also have to defend it. So the bureaucracy can no longer be characterised the way it was under Stalin. The bureaucracy of today is the same one who tells Carter that: 'One split second after having learnt from our sources that a Yankee attack is on its way, the United States will disappear'. This is the bureaucracy of today. It is not the same as under Stalin. One cannot appraise the Workers States merely through their bureaucratic limitations in functioning, but through the role they play in History.

*22<sup>nd</sup> December 1978*

**J. Posadas**

## **J. Posadas**

### **On the Pope's visit**

*14<sup>th</sup> June 1979*

The essential aspect of this trip of the Pope is that he goes to a Workers State, acknowledging its existence, historic importance and worth. All the concessions the bureaucracy may have made have less historic significance than the fact that the Pope has gone to a Workers state where he launched no attack, made no derogatory comparisons and no call against it. None of the participants in the ceremonies made any statement in opposition to the State or to the USSR.

The Pope took no position against the Workers State. He spoke about the rights of religion, but even these were not favourable to the capitalist system. He certainly did not make any statement against the State or suggest that life there is not good or that people are worse off than they were in the past. He did not suggest that there is any social, cultural or scientific retreat. Had there been any such thing he could have spoken about it. But he simply went and spoke in the name of religion and nothing could be found against the State on the social or economic or human plane of relations. The masses did not miss this. The thousands who went to listen to him could have raised their voice but none did either and this, in spite of all the religious influence over them. Moreover, there wasn't one single word in favour of the dissidents, not one word of attack against the Workers state and nothing to suggest that the Polish people are prevented from thinking or living, or that the people are being strangled. This will induce these stupid dissidents to measure the opinion of the Polish masses. What a golden opportunity for them to have disclosed all their disapproval and discontent! However they didn't say anything. The masses of the Workers state live the life of the Workers State and the perspectives of history, the trajectory of the advancing process, all lead to Workers States and not to Catholicism. The human relations of a Workers State can only be achieved in a State that has done away with private property and hence the road ahead is not religion but Socialism.

It is exactly for that reason that the Pope did not launch a Church crusade against the Workers State. The perspective is no longer religious but economic and social. The people who live in Poland and who went to listen to the Pope are in the habit of being guided by economic and social

conclusions that stem from the Workers State. They see the phenomenal social and economic advance that the present State represents, compared with the previous social situation of Poland. This is why there have been no complaints against the Workers State. All those awaiting a new spate of workers' strikes have been disappointed. There was nothing to stop the workers from launching a strike, if they had a motive to fight the State. They did not strike because when they do it is for political reasons. Their actions came from an opposition to the political leadership they had – but as part of an action in defence of the Workers State. This shows how the Workers State educates and elevates human social consciousness in defence of a historic and social development, which is far superior to all the religious ceremonies or actions. In this event, the Workers State is making a complete demonstration of its superiority. It is religion that has been forced to adjust to the Workers State and not the other way round. These are the conclusions from the Pope's visit.

It could also be seen that the dissidents have no authority or capacity. They represent only their own personal grievances and protest against the collective process. Millions of people went to see the Pope without having a word to say against the State. None of them said that they defended the dissidents who had been repressed, and there was not a single attack against the Workers State. The Pope himself did not attempt to do this. He took a conciliatory path. The bureaucracy of the Workers State in turn conciliates with religion, but their conciliation is immeasurably less than that of the Pope with the Workers State. He had to adjust to the development of the Catholic masses that defend the Workers State at the same time as remaining Catholic. The masses have yet to reach a conscious understanding of the problem of religion in relation to the Workers State.

It is not even really a question of religion, as opposed to the Workers State. The Church adapts to the Workers State which has not submitted to the Pope. The economic process and social programme of the State continue to advance. The support the State lends to the revolutionary struggles in the world elevates. The Church went to Poland to seek a point of support in order to acquire some sort of future. It is rather like a drowning man clutching a straw; it expresses all the crisis of the Church, in as much as it weakens its links with capitalism.

When the Pope declares that “The Church is not imperialist”, he makes a criticism of the capitalist system, not of the Workers State. This declaration shows all the enormous authority of the Workers State and the crisis of the Church itself. The Church sees the mess the capitalism is in,

as opposed to the advance of the Workers State. At the same time, the pressure exerted on the Church by the Catholic masses, forces it to come out in defence of the Workers State.

### *The Catholic masses defend the Workers State*

It is a very rich experience for the Communist Party and the Communist parties of the world like the Italian one, which has a large Catholic base. The Catholic masses do not just believe in God. As in Poland, they believe in social progress. They do not inform their social conduct on the basis of religious precepts, but on the basis of the social experience acquired within the progress of the Workers State. If they continue with religious belief, it is because the policy needed to educate them and to win them, has not been developed. Another factor in this is the lack of historic time in which to do this. However, the acuteness of the collision between Catholic thought and the new State has been considerably lessened. The Polish masses are Catholic and they defend the Workers state. The crisis of the Church comes from the realisation that the capitalist system no longer offers it any stability. This is why the Church looks to the Workers States.

The policy of the bureaucracy towards the Church is incorrect, even considering that there is, relatively speaking, a widespread Catholic population. In fact, the bulk of the people have ceased to be Catholic – except for Italy, Spain and Poland perhaps. The case of Lithuania keeps being raised. We are told that people cannot speak, or hold religious masses. But the fact is that in reality there are precious few Churches there. Also, there are no priests anymore because the Church can no longer recruit young priests.

However, thousands of people become workers' leaders in the workers States. Lithuania – where the Church is said to meet with untold difficulties – is a new country born out of the most abject under-development. The Soviet Union, the Workers State, is what has made of it what it is today. The Lithuanian masses are not fooled. They may have no priests to say mass but they have hundreds of leaders to give the population, social, scientific and historic guidance in progress: Socialism.

The Catholic masses unite religious belief with the dialectical method of Marxism. They see that the development of their lives, of human relations, of the economy, society, science and culture, acquire a tangible form. This generates in them a sort of materialistic thinking. This attracts them away from the metaphysical. They gain confidence in the dialectical

method of thinking, reasoning and making decisions. The future meets the road of socialism and not that of religion. As the masses believe in both at the same time, the contradiction between religious thinking and Socialism is not antagonistic because the masses acquire increasingly more confidence in the dialectical method of thinking.

This progress is not accomplished as if someone was rejecting a poison from the body, or having an exorcism. It is made through a social, political and scientific progress which includes the masses of Poland. People are moved towards dialectical thinking by the fact that they can prove to themselves that all the progress they have made has been accomplished by them. They did it by intervening socially, by raising human sentiment through eliminating private property. The sentiment the masses have generated is an antithesis to religion. Religion submits people to mystical thoughts but the Workers State generates dialectical ideas, based on the fact that people can do everything. It may well be that not all the people visualise what 'dialectical materialism' means, as a formulae. But they put it into practice. They practise it even more when they acquire the conviction that everything can be overcome by themselves, through scientific, dialectical acts and method, here on Earth.

The population of Poland is 34 million. The bourgeois press speculate that something like one million attended the departure of the Pope. Even then, it is a minute proportion of the people considering the eminently Catholic past of the country. It shows how much the influence of Catholicism has dwindled and to what extent materialistic thought, induced by the Workers State, has advanced. It has advanced by the simple method of showing people that all things are done by reasoning, foresight and the organisation and participation of the people. All this is in spite of the fact that capitalism has invested tens of thousands of dollars to pay people, and to organise this visit in order to harass Poland.

Religious influence is in decline and the Pope had to go running to try to save the remaining props of religion. In doing so, he neither extended religious influence nor won any new sector. The only real effect was to show people the great social and economic development of Poland compared with what it was. This progress came through the ability to forecast, to make analyses, to elaborate plans on the basis of calculations and through the people's intervention in the development of new experiences. The people are engaged in material activities, allowing their intelligence to intervene and using the materialistic method of Marxist analysis. This represents a formidable advance, a leap forward for humanity, in which the Church has played no role at all.

The capitalist press keeps saying “Look at all the Catholics in the socialist countries!” But in reality, it is the other way round; it is a question of looking at these socialist countries – the Workers States – that used to be Catholic countries! Bureaucracy policy, the lack of a sufficiently socialist-democratic development, the lack of participation of the Trade Unions and the absence of cells in the Communist Party, allowed a good many religious beliefs to remain as a tradition. In turn, this allows elements favourable to mysticism to remain. People are not seeing enough the application of conscious planning at the service of all the country and the Old Catholic movement goes on unhindered by the bureaucracy which allows the Catholic Party – devoid of any idea for progress whatsoever – to continue without any justification. The Catholic Party is nothing more than a nest of interests in the defence of private property. The only reason it goes on is precisely that.

What we must emphasise above all, is that Poland was eminently a Catholic country that has now become eminently Socialist. Neither the Pope nor anyone else has managed to attack the Workers State or make derogatory comparisons between the present Poland and the old. No one has made unfavourable comparisons between the present Poland and the capitalist regime. There has not been one single word in that direction, and there is a very good reason for this. Poland was a miserable country, and now it is a country of progress with very high moral standards and human relations. The religious people themselves support this. People continue to believe but they also believe in Socialism and in the measures that one has to take to make Socialism.

So during his visit, the Pope had to justify himself by saying that “We are not imperialists”. At the same time, he did not think of saying to the Workers State: “You are exploiters”. It was of imperialism that he spoke of and it was the capitalist system that he was aiming at. This was an attempt to get closer to the Workers State whilst maintaining a base of religious support within it.

The masses, the intellectuals, the religious peasants and even some religious proletarians, still hold onto their religious beliefs, whilst developing social thought in a dialectical materialist form. However, at the same time, they keep their thought related to private property. Of course the majority of religions have considerable links with private property. But the practical experience of the people is contrary to religious belief and does not lead to a growth of it. Practical experience has proved that Poland progressed on the basis of nationalisations and planning of the economy, with the intervention of the Trade Unions and

the Communist Party. So, the people have seen that what permitted progress in the economy, was political leadership based on programme and method of analysis. In the end, a situation appeared when there was no longer any contradiction between this conclusion and religious fervour.

It is the layer of proprietors who maintain the power of the Church that has disputes with the Workers State. But they have no longer any authority amongst the people. Practically all the children of the landowners have become Communists. They no longer believe, or if they still respect the religion of their parents, that does not stop them from becoming Communists.

These aren't problems to be solved by persecution or condemnation of Catholics, but by demonstrating that human progress comes out of ideas, programme and a socialist conception of history. This is precisely the way the Workers State was built.

The population of Poland is about 34 million and only something like two and a half percent went to see the Pope. What stands out in all this is the way in which the people who were so Catholic could be won in its majority to the Workers State. It also stands out that people who are Catholic do not have motives to attack the Workers State, or to present it as an oppressor or a murderer. They try to conciliate the State and religion, but the Socialist conception of life advances and people move away from religion. There is no need to condemn or hunt the Catholics. There is no need to stop them practising as long as the State demonstrates its own conception clearly. There is no reason to stop the Catholic people having their own customs and creed. The decisive thing is for the Workers State to be able to demonstrate its moral, material, scientific and social authority. The Church dare not oppose it in the name of religion. Indeed, the Church seeks conciliation, concessions, rights and the best it can get for itself. It can't do anymore than this. In fact it has no weapon to oppose the state with. When the Church has to make some social qualification of the regime, the only thing it can say is: "The church is not imperialist". If anything, this was an accusation against imperialism and capitalism, not against the Workers State.

*The Church has little confidence in the future of capitalism*

This visit of the Pope and all his activities, are directed at seeking relations with the Workers State, in order to allow the church to survive. This means that the Church is quite aware that its power over the masses

in the capitalist countries dwindles. As the masses advance in the class struggle, in socialist progress and experience, they feel that social problems are resolved through their own intervention, and that the world makes sense when seen from the point of view of the materialistic conception of history. This causes the church to feel its weakness, to feel its loss of influence, and the loss of influence of capitalism too. Meanwhile the Workers State expands, increases its force in the world. Now, any progress takes the shape of the Workers State, of state-ownership of property, the planning of the economy, the elimination of individual interests and the construction of medium and large enterprises in agriculture and industry. The church for its part sees that this process robs it of strength, removes its props and deprives it of its spiritual dominion over the people.

The Church now seeks to co-exist with the Workers State and the visit of the Pope is in this general line. It is not that the Pope thinks that the Workers State represents the progress of History, but he has to acknowledge it as a material force that has the capacity to inject spiritual, mental, intellectual and economic vigour. Above all, he has to accept that the Workers State has the ability to bring about progress in the sphere of human relations. It is the reason why there was no attempt at expressing hostility to the Workers State during the whole of the Pope's visit. No one attempted to express hostility towards the Workers State during the Pope's visit. There was no criticism or complaint. And even the dissidents said nothing.

The Catholic masses are still Catholic but they understand the Workers State and support it. The favourable sentiment of the masses towards the Workers State increases constantly. Of course, the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie who have vested interests in the capitalist system do not develop such feelings. These people have their own social and economic interests. The flame of their religious fervour is fuelled by these interests. But it is not like this for the Catholic masses who welcome both religion and social progress, and who, when the time comes, are drawn to social progress much more than to religion. The Pope has understood this and he runs ahead to put himself in the path of history, not to be left behind.

The Pope made no serious attack on the Workers State and declared that the Church is not 'imperialist', as a means of saying that the Church wants to conciliate with the Workers State. At the same time, he kept silent about the massacre perpetrated by Somoza against the people of Nicaragua; he had nothing to say about the crimes committed by Yankee imperialism inside the United States itself. There are 28 million black

people in the US and 10 to 12 million of them are hungry. Amongst these people there is a huge rate of unemployment, exploitation, as well as political and social discrimination directed against all the immigrants in the US.

The Pope sails past all this. He refers to the so-called ‘dissidents’ of the Workers States, but these people have no importance because they do not contribute to the development of society, the economy or the world. What we must be concerned with are people like Somoza, and to call for the crushing of that dictatorship which prevents the development of life in Nicaragua, just as it prevents the development of life anywhere. In the same way, this system prevents the development of life in the United States.

The Pope tries to use the current situation in order to conciliate with the Workers States. In so doing, he shows how little confidence the Church has in the capitalist system. Imperialism prepares for war; all the agreements they pretend to sign with the Workers States cannot hide this fact. The Church feels that capitalism is on the losing side. The Church can see no perspective for its own future within the capitalist system. So, it has to conciliate with the Workers States, as it conceives the Workers State, which is in fact the bureaucratic apparatus. In this way, the Church tries to stay linked with the historic trend.

In turn, the leadership of the Workers States accept this, trying to influence the Church so that it will influence the capitalist system. This policy isn’t adequate but it is not against the interests of the socialist development of humanity either. It does not go against the development of the anti-capitalist class struggle.

The Pope’s visit is not simply the visit of a Catholic who seeks to influence other Catholics, but an expression of the insecurity, the lack of confidence of the Church in the future of capitalism. This is why the Pope tries to make links and conciliate with the Workers States. The phrase “the Church is not imperialist” means that the Catholic masses are undergoing a deep process of social influence. Such situation shows that one has to talk to the Catholic masses with the aim of influencing and winning them in order to raise them above their present level. It’s no longer the time – as it was in the past – to make a struggle against the role of the Church or of Catholicism. It is true that the contradictions are not yet completely resolved, but we are in a much more elevated and simple situation because the Catholic masses want the progress of humanity. The Catholic intellectuals and scientists also want and seek human progress.

What is still missing is the leadership that understand this process and is putting forward an adequate policy. This leadership is still missing in the Workers States to attract and win these sectors.

In attempting to attract the Catholic masses, the progress and immense authority of the Workers State, the struggle of the world masses and the big and powerful Communist parties are a real force. But this does not make the necessity of programme, policy and anti-capitalist struggle any less. It must be continually explained and demonstrated that the United Front of the Workers States, of the Communist parties and the left movements of all sorts with the Trade Unions, can resolve the problems of the capitalist society. So, an economic, political and social programme has to be put forward to lead to this. The Pope went to a country that is developing precisely this, and even if this is not done completely or as much as it should be, it does develop this programme, and that is head and shoulders above what the capitalist system will ever do.

The masses have kept a close watch on the Pope's visit. They have in their immense majority socialist sentiments and a desire for human progress. The huge majority of the Catholic masses, the workers, peasants and petty bourgeoisie, all those who live and work – and thus have a certain cultural level – consider the Workers State in a good light and have welcomed the Pope's visit. They welcomed the Pope's visit precisely because he comes to approve and recognise the existence of the Workers State.

In order to win the Catholic masses of the world, a firm and secure policy has to be seen from the Workers States, from the Communists, Socialists, the Left Movements and the Trade Unions. A United Front of workers and left parties, with a programme to transform the society and making appeals for the direct intervention of the people will do this.

The Pope did not intend to make an alliance with the Workers State against the capitalist system, but he tries to conciliate with the Workers State because he feels unable to decide or impose, or resolve anything himself. The Church has become devoid of power because it has no economic, social, political or philosophical – or scientific- ability. The Pope tries to gain what he can to keep the Church going. The bureaucratic apparatus of the Church has its own interest. It does not mean that it breaks from the capitalist system, but it is freeing itself a little from the subjection to it. The Pope distances himself from the capitalist system, but partially, so as to paddle its own canoe. But of course, it is only partially. The Pope did not make any declaration to please the capitalist

system and had to say that the Church is not imperialist. This was intended to demonstrate that the Workers State and the Church can get along with each other.

The visit also indicates that important sectors of intellectuals, scientists and masses are generally probing deeply into the function of the Church. These people continuously push the Church farther away from capitalism. The reactionary Catholic circles on the other hand, like Strauss in Germany, do not manage to build any new movement in support of capitalism against the Workers States. The masses have not missed this and have already acquired the sort of education that allows them to combine religious practice with the social, economic, moral, as well as scientific and cultural ability, allowing them to sustain the progress of the Workers State in its revolutionary intervention in the world. In the same process, the Catholic masses have learnt, and are now conscious that any economic, social, cultural or artistic progress is the result of human intervention. This confidence gives the masses even more confidence in their own organisation, their own activity, feelings and movements. They trust in intelligence and measure through the level of human relations. They do all this without submitting to any outside force seeking to dictate how they should behave practically in society, how they should relate to nature. This level of consciousness and confidence is inherent to the great power of the Workers State. It is the Pope who has to affirm that the Church isn't imperialist. It was a way of signalling that the Church could make agreements with the Workers States. In this way, they try to save themselves particularly at a time when imperialism is striving to live on. The Church feels that it must speak up for itself and to coexist with the Workers States on its own account. You can see in this the expression of the social progress of humanity, at the level of Church matters. A huge number of Catholic workers and peasants realise that the progress of the world lies in Socialism. Many petty bourgeois and intellectuals realise this too. They aspire to Socialism and tend to be attracted by socialist movements, the movements that mean social progress even when they hold on to their religious beliefs.

*Religion can no longer be “the opium of the people”*

The Communist and Socialist parties must pay attention to this process without discarding dialectical materialism. They have to understand that it is easier to incorporate the Catholics now, without submitting to the religious beliefs of the Catholics. There is no need to go back to religion. It is a matter of allowing the Catholic masses to participate increasingly in everything. In so doing, they learn how to lead by their own intervention with an anti-capitalist programme and through the organisms – of popular power- even when they do not actually abandon religion.

Marx’s conception that ‘Religion is the opium of the people’ is still valid. Capitalism still has the intention of using religion as opium, but religion is no longer just ‘opium’, it is simply a creed. Capitalism uses it as ‘opium’ to fuse the interests of religion with those of capitalism, and to police people’s minds. This is the use capitalism wants to make of religion, but religion no longer has the power to fulfil this function. What has changed is that the people no longer conceive it like this. The masses conceive religion as part of their craving for progress. It is the absence of a correct policy that allows religion to still play the role of ‘opium’ in a partial way. A correct policy entails developing a programme of social transformations and letting the masses, the population generally, play a decisive role in the economy, the formulation of policies, in culture and science, and in the leadership of the country. The more the masses are allowed to intervene, the more they learn from experience and acquire the notion that they, themselves can resolve all problems. At that point, religious influence loses all power of intervention because it no longer compares with human progress.

Religion today can no longer exercise the function of ‘opium of the people’ even though the intention and structure of the Church –as a sector of capitalism- is still the same. The Catholic masses no longer submit their social, economic and scientific life to their religious beliefs. They retain belief but are orientated by practical experience, life itself and by what they see of the enormous progress of the socialist countries. Vietnam, Cuba, Mozambique, Algeria, and Angola are all examples of this.

The Pope’s visit is an expression of the limitations around capitalist power and around the power of the Church. In no way does it show any increase in the power of religion, far from it. It is enough to see that a minute proportion of the population went to see him, and none of them went to attack the State. The Pope said nothing against the State, and this

is because the broad masses have no difference with the Workers State. They are Catholics and they agree with the Workers State.

This is important because the Pope chose a country where there is a relatively large Catholic population and it has shown that it defends the State, the Workers State, in which it lives. This means that the immense majority of the people who are Catholics are also socialists. This is also a State where there are quite a few elements of private property remaining. These elements are basis for religious beliefs but even the children of the peasants owners have ceased to aspire to property and to believe. They have joined the ranks of the Communist Party, and in conditions where there has been no attacks launched against Catholics. It is social development – not power – that wins more and more of these people. The Pope not only tries to conciliate with the Workers State, but with this process which we are analysing within the peasantry. He does not want to be left out... and this shows that he does not trust in the future of capitalism.

The crisis of the Church is very deep and a large number of its leaders are influenced by the Workers States, the struggle of the masses and the need for scientific, cultural and economic progress. Those who most faithfully maintain the Church as ‘opium of the people’ are the most reactionary sectors. But in religious gatherings today, you see more and more ‘third-world’ tendencies, more and more sectors that support the people struggles. This shows that the essential base of the Church – particularly the Catholics – feels that the source of progress is in the Workers States and socialism. It is for all these reasons that religion is no longer ‘opium’. It can no longer be what it was at the time of Marx. The high circles of the Church are still trying to make it ‘opium’ but there are important layers of middle and lower layers of the Church itself that want to be with the struggles of the masses. It is the struggle of the people that influences them and not the passivity of the Church. Now, they have to accept the intervention and participation of members from Africa and Asia in Church Councils. Even in Europe, the faithful put forward very daring positions, seeking social and economic progress and even anti-capitalist proposals. They do not talk of class struggle or of ‘capitalism’ but they interfere with the structure, existence and unity of the system.

The advances of the Workers States, the balance of material power favourable to the Workers States, in the world, together with the struggle of the people, represent some of the elements that determine the conduct of the Pope, as much as the struggles of the Communist, Socialist and Left-wing parties. The Pope tries to contain the enormous pressure that

permeates at all levels in the Church. For example, the Pope made quite an experience in Mexico when 480.000 people hissed and whistled him when he declared that serenity and peace of mind prevailed in conditions of poverty. He had to withdraw some of this the following day, because the masses were not taken in by this 'opium'. They want the church to form part of social and economic progress and this cannot be done outside an anti-capitalist context.

A large part of the influence which can be exerted over the Catholic masses now depends on the Workers States and Communist Parties. It depends on them putting forward a policy of explanations at the same time as providing a lead to the anti-capitalist struggles.

*14<sup>th</sup> June 1979*

**J. Posadas**

## THE ADVANCE OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY

**J. POSADAS**

*26 November 1980*

The old Trade Union, which existed before Solidarnosc known as the official Trade Union, is still in existence. The leadership of this official union is saying that the government is not giving it enough importance. These people insist that they represent the Party and the workers. But the government has made it clear that it is against them. A Government Minister who went to Moscow returned with a statement opposing these old Unions. Not surprisingly the old Trade Union apparatus did not like this. This is no more than a nest of bureaucrats. This Government Minister who came back from the Soviet Union declared that fresh changes are now needed in the Polish Communist Party. He said that clearances in the Polish Communist Party are needed, which means that Moscow is clearly in agreement.

Sectors of the German Workers State and Czechoslovakia have shown fury at all these changes in Poland and clearly, there is a tremendous apparatus in all these countries. The Soviets are partially responsible for this because they have often removed anti-Communist and then – in the same breath – they have started new agreements with the old bureaucratic apparatus. However, the bureaucratic apparatus of the other Workers States is most upset by the changes in Poland because these are unfavourable to them.

The German and Czechoslovak Workers States closed their boundaries with Poland. It shows that they oppose the present Polish Government. However, we must be wary of the press reports according to which the USSR is also annoyed by the changes in Poland. These journalists are unable to make the distinction between facts and lies and they lie directly, putting their own thoughts into the mouths of others. They attribute their own thinking to this or that other leader. There have been instances of interviewed people denouncing the printed report afterwards. Clearly, the press agencies only care for what they like, and erase all tapes that incriminate them. However, if you look at the Soviets' declarations, it is clear that they have not objected at all to what is happening in Poland, and, far from it, they have received a Polish Minister. It wasn't Kania who went to Moscow but even he, has accepted the need to make concessions. The official newspaper in Poland, has printed articles in

support of the strikes and of the workers' demands. They have said that the strikes are correct and the demands just and necessary.

There is a continued progress on the road to Soviet democratisation. Today, they have again yielded a little more to the workers. What the workers are saying is received as fairly logical. Recently a worker's leader was detained because anti-Government papers were found in his house. When it came to the trial, even the judge found justifications for the worker, and said that even if the document had been found at the worker's house, it wasn't the worker who had forcibly written it. So, the worker was accused of being in possession of the document, but this led to a much lesser charge. Later, the official Polish papers said that it wasn't a crime to have papers in the house. All this shows how far the strikes and protests continue to correct the apparatus. What the movement is saying is that it wants to change the priorities of the leadership in order to make it more able and just. When this has been achieved, the movement will no longer have differences with the leadership. At no point have the workers proposed a strict independence and freedom for the Trade Union.

*26 November 1980*

**J. Posadas**

**J. POSADAS**

## **The confidence of the Soviet leadership in supporting the advance of Poland**

*29th November 1980*

We are entering a stage of the process in Poland which expresses in a simplified way all the depth of the discussion that is going on in the Workers State. Poland cannot be the end of this process; it is rather the beginning of a new one. The reaction of the Czech and German Workers States give a measure of how they feel, in circumstances where they see that this process is soon going to catch up with them.

Bureaucratic apparatuses were formed in all the Workers States and these developed their own market – in reality a black market – for the bureaucracy. Meat, vegetables and a whole quantity of select products were made available to this market. Part of the production of the Kolkhoz in the Soviet Union is dedicated to this production. A sector of the land produces for this layer of people rather than for the state. The beginning of a discussion in Poland about who produces for whom, has led a whole layer of the Workers State to feel affected because first of all, they see that there is a danger to the special products they used to enjoy, and secondly they see that a rectification is coming. There is no bureaucratic apparatus which will have the possibility to contain this progress of history, or even the conditions to contain it. The Soviet Union can do little else but come to clash with the capitalist system, as the leadership – which it is really – of the Workers States. The confident manner, in which it confronts capitalism and stimulates the world revolution, shows this. Whilst it is true that the Soviet Union does not make proclamations, and does not agitate through the Communist Parties and Trade Unions of the Workers States, it does intervene in one way or the other, indirectly. It intervenes by means of military assessments, sale of arms etc. It also intervenes directly quite a lot. The Soviet leadership can no longer avoid intervening. Today, it seeks agreement with the revolution, as opposed to its previous policy (under Stalin) of seeking agreements with capitalism. The confidence of the Soviet leadership comes from the fact that the scope for the actions of the Workers State enlarges, and the advance of the revolution leads to more and more Workers States.

The same process as applies to the Soviet Union creates divisions in Poland, which mark the start of a new stage of clearances in the workers States, as a whole. We will intervene on these problems because they

announce the start of a much deeper process which has much more profound perspectives.

*29<sup>th</sup> November 1980*

**J. Posadas**

# THE YANKEE CAMPAIGN AGAINST POLAND

J. POSADAS

*13<sup>th</sup> December 1980*

With its campaign about the imminence of a Soviet invasion in Poland, Yankee imperialism tries to weaken the Workers State and rouse the dissidents into a state of outrage. The aim is to create difficulties through claims, demands and suppositions implying that with more private property round, “it would be better than State property”. This is what imperialism presses for, but finds difficult to justify. Mind that the Pope has the same intention. This is what he wanted to say during his visit in Poland. The Gierek leadership had made promises to him in the belief that some agreement with the Catholic leadership could be arrived at.

## *The Yankee campaign against Poland*

The present campaign about a “Russian invasion of Poland” is fundamentally led by Yankee imperialism. It is not the Germans, nor the French, nor the Japanese who do this. It is the Yankees who do, because they are the vital centre of preparations against the Workers States. This is why the Yankees sent two hundred thousand dollars to Poland. Why didn't they send this money to a country like Ethiopia that has no food; or to Cuba that needs it so badly? This money was sent to Poland – to the dissidents that is.

The other reason why the US sends this money is to make it believed, by the North American people particularly, that Poland needs ‘democracy’ and that North America is actually helping “democracy” in Poland.

A great many dissidents in Poland are directly linked to the world capitalist system. Capitalism is in the business of giving them support and stimulating them to provoke trouble, particularly in the economic structure of state-property, basing themselves on the private sector that lingers on in the Workers State. But the historic outcome will be that private property will be eliminated; either it will be expropriated or it will come under greater State control.

As things stand, one must expect new attacks against state ownership, and it is to this the Yankees are looking forward. They instigate all manner of activities of the people who are tied with private property in Poland. We already said this at the time of the Pope's visit. “The Pope went to cheer

up the internal resistance that exists in the Workers State, but he failed utterly.” The Pope did not go to Poland with religious aims in mind. He made use of his title to foster internal reaction. The latter however, is not organised around a programme, because it has no confidence in itself. But abetted by imperialism, these people revive their claims to property, demand more rights for the dissidents with the objective of obtaining more rights to property later.

Brezhnev has declared in all clarity however: “We are a Socialist system. Whenever our system is threatened, we will intervene”. This was a way of saying to Carter ‘whether you like it or not’. If the Yankees had anywhere near the necessary weapons and internal cohesion to win the war, they would have already launched it. But it is not their lack of cohesion that is decisive in this because even without it they could impose the launching of the war. By far the most important factor that impedes them is their inferiority and their fear of the conduct of the masses after the war. They feel that if they launch the war, they will have to dedicate a disproportionate amount of their military effort to control their own masses in their own country. Let us be clear that they will not be able to count on their police or their armies because the huge majorities of these will join the masses.

Led by Yankee imperialism, world capitalism is faced by untold difficulties because not all the capitalist countries are ready to accompany them in the measures the Yankees want to impose on NATO. The German and French bourgeoisies are linked to the Soviet Union through a series of agreements like the gas pipeline between the USSR and Europe, and the provision of Soviet petroleum cheaper than the Arabs. These European countries are not interested in breaking these agreements that allow them to maintain their ability to compete through a lower cost of production.

Imperialism seeks to block the influence the Soviet Union has developed the world over, and very particularly over the Communist parties which imperialism seeks to keep separated from the Soviet Union by every means. But there are neither conditions nor means to reach this goal, because the objective process goes against it. One instance shows it: the Left of the Labour Party has come up with a resolution adopted by the actual leadership of the Party in which there is not a shadow of any criticism towards the USSR. Far from it, it attacks Yankee and British imperialism. Clearly the masses of that country are not anti-Soviet and are not all worked up about Poland. They look at Poland and see there the

development of a process favourable to Soviet democracy supported by the Soviet Union. They do not live in fear of a Soviet intervention.

There is no reason why strikes in Poland have to generate a fear of a Soviet intervention. If there are motives for the Soviets to intervene on the other hand, it is precisely because some people want to make Poland retreat and yield in front of capitalism. For this reason, the declaration of Brezhnev was not at all directed against the strikes in Poland, but in defence of the ‘socialist system’, and against the tendencies which seek inside Poland to take advantage of the situation to orientate the process in an anti-Soviet direction and propitiate a return to private property. These tendencies want to play state ownership against private ownership in a way that favours more private property. If capitalism insists on “liberty in Poland” and forbids a Soviet ‘intervention’, it is because it is working through some sectors inside Poland – Church and private property – which they stimulate against the Workers State. However, not the whole of the Church in Poland supports this; far from it. There is even a large sector of the Polish Church that feels integrated into the Workers State, and it is only a small layer of Church people who would resort to any old thing to attack the Workers State. In the lower rungs of bureaucracy there is also a sector that would not mind a certain return towards private property, but, contrary to what it used to be, it is no longer the whole of the bureaucracy that looks for this.

The warning of the Soviets and of the Polish leadership is not an abstract declaration. It is aimed at the leaders of the apparatus who have links with private property and Church. This warning regarding the “Socialist system” is obviously not an attack on the workers, but yes, and attack on those who, inside the bureaucracy, want to drive the car backwards because they see that the car is leading a profound process indeed. The sectors of the bureaucracy that are least linked to the Workers State and do not hesitate in seeking alliances going as far as harming the interests of the State, in order to contain the process, are those under attack in this warning of Brezhnev.

As opposed to this, the sectors most linked to the Workers State say: “Socialism will not be rolled back in Poland”. Whom is this against then? It is certainly not the workers who endanger socialism or who want to make state property go back to private! They do not ask for less planning: so those who pose this are bureaucratic layers who suddenly surface now, and who have obviously a certain power in the apparatus.

Conspiracies against the Workers State are not a new thing. This also happened in 1956. In those days, those who had denounced the rotten elements were the Trotskyists. They denounced those who wanted to make the Hungarian Workers State retreat. In Hungary, there was a real conspiracy between the Church and managers of enterprises. The Trotskyists gave their names and branded them as counter revolutionaries. Later, the bureaucracy got everything mixed up, accusing the Trotskyists of being also counter-revolutionaries, but later on still, they were released quickly while the bad elements were made to stay in prison. There is one moving example of these struggles in Hungary. The workers launched an operation to release their jailed leaders – among them were some Trotskyists – and when they had them out of jail, they put them in the leadership of further workers’ struggles. Many of those leaders were former members of the Left Opposition of Trotsky.

Imperialism through this present campaign shows quite clearly that it is preparing against the Workers States, starting with attempts to make them retreat towards private property. Hence, this warning of the Soviets is important: “Here, there will be no going backwards”. The capitalist governments see what the Yankees are up to, and want to stop them. Schmidt hears himself telling the Yankees that ‘it’s naïve to believe that the Soviets are going to move into Poland, when the Soviets have no need or intention to do so’. The French and German bourgeoisies try to contain the Yankees because they see that this cannot remain at the level of supporting four dissidents, but that it leads to mounting provocations against the Workers States. “Solidarnosc” has made it clear that it is not against the Workers State or Socialism and has asked about this question of ‘invasion’: “Why are you inventing all these stories?”

But the Yankees have to try to justify themselves and for this, they try to drag the whole capitalist system behind them. NATO has quite a weak conduct all around. One of its main leaders managed to declare that the Soviets have no motive for moving into Poland and that one should not expect it. Inside the capitalist system, such differences are rife. We are no longer in 1956 when imperialism was also attacking the Workers States.

### *The historic significance of the changes in Poland*

Moczar is back in the Central Committee but one cannot measure Poland through this fact. It is true that it is him who launched an attack on the workers of Stettin and Gdansk in 1970. But in any case, it was not him who had taken the decision to repress. He obeyed orders and later he apologised for having given such orders. The same thing happened in

Yugoslavia where the government under Tito ordered the repression of a students' demonstration. Tito blamed the Minister of Interior for it, but it was the Communist League that had instigated this and carried it out. Mozcar now declares that anyone in his position would have had to do the same as him because the Party decides and the Party had given orders. What counts in Poland today, is that transformations are taking place in the Party.

These events are mightily important on a historic level and not only in relation to the immediate organisational changes. We are dealing with a far deeper process than changes of structure or of leaders. Poland represents changes of orientation politically and programmatically. A part of the future is being shaped through this in Poland, a future in which a very important aspect lies in the fact that the working class is learning how to lead the whole of the society.

When the working class has no Party, it intervenes only very indirectly in the construction of Socialism. If it is deprived of a Party that represents its capacity, its comprehension and historic function as a working class, then it cannot intervene. With regards to the bourgeoisie at the time of its formation, it could pass very simply from feudalism to capitalism, via the role it played in the economy which was its umbilical cord to life. Thus the bourgeoisie was formed and gained strength. As for the proletariat, it has to form itself within the class struggle but with no part at all to play in the economy. It must defend itself against capitalism in order to live as a class and build a new society. In order to be able to do this, it needs the Party which must educate it. The Bolshevik Party is the Party that has educated the working class the most, and it is also the Party that had to do everything 'en route', in the midst of Revolution. It is a matter of completely new problems, not only in History but in Life itself. Life hitherto evolved as part of customs determined by property, by production. Socialism on the other hand, is determined by culture and consciousness. Historically, the economy has represented the base of the process, because it has played a fundamental role in human development. However, it was not the economy that has been decisive if you consider development from a historic standpoint.

But the working class is made to intervene at this precise historic stage of transition. Even when it is deprived of a Party, it is impelled world-wide by the world balance of power favourable to Revolution and by the Workers States. The working class in the Workers States exerts a particularly large influence pushing the bureaucratic leaderships forward and confronting these leaderships in the way it does it in Poland.

The opposition the working class of Poland has made against bureaucratic forms of distribution within the Workers State has had much resonance. But the most important thing now arising is the process in the Communist Party. Up to now, strikes were part of a process that remained largely outside the realm of the Party, even when they were led by Communist workers. Now it is in the heart of the Party that we begin to see the struggle for an improvement in leadership. It is also there that the resistance will be most pugnacious, and this includes resistance originating from sectors in the Soviet leadership – but it will be resistance and nothing more.

The Polish working class has made a very important experience in the apprenticeship of leading the economy and society. It has not - and does not - intervene solely for a better distribution of riches but primarily for the application of a more rational functioning of the whole economy. The press of the capitalist countries, and that of the Communist parties, tell us that the workers have struck for more money. This appears to be so at first glance. But the historic goal of that movement was not just to get equality or justice in distribution. It was aimed at putting a greater order into social relations, as well as obtaining justice.

This is why, when the workers of the shipyards, obtained a pay rise in 1970, they proceeded to distribute the increase amongst those workers who needed it the most. All those who have written about the events of 1970 have eluded this bit of news. To these people who report, the fact that at the same time as Reagan only gained 25% of the votes the Workers State is capable of erecting a memorial to those killed in previous repressions, has no importance. However the significance and importance of this fact, is that the leadership is affirming publicly that this will not happen again.

The tribute paid to the dead workers fallen in 1970, with the participation of the Trade Unions, the Government, the Party and the Church, represents an immense step forward. This monument is a tribute to the struggle the workers made for equality in remuneration, equalisation of wages and to give more to those who need it the most. It is certainly not a tribute to the dissidents from the Workers States and the Government. It is a tribute to the workers for Socialism who are once again impelling progress today. The events in Poland are not just an advance of the Revolution but an immense historic progress which is going to spread to all the Workers States.

The movements of 1970 and 1980 have been accomplished in the same spirit as power was taken. It's the same workers who defeated Nazism whilst they had nothing and in spite of Stalin. While the Nazis were bombing Warsaw, the Soviet army was detained at the town's gates by Stalin. Stalin hoped that the Nazis would destroy the whole Communist Polish vanguard. In the end, it is the Soviet military high command and the impetus of the Soviet masses that imposed the subsequent Soviet intervention. It was in such conditions that the proletariat had to impel the Workers State.

The strikes the Polish workers have had, and will go on having, the effect of correcting the leading bureaucratic apparatus. This correction is well on the way, even if bureaucratic interests continue to thrive and even when they return former leaders whom they had rightly got out of the way in 1970. There is a big struggle in the bureaucratic apparatus of Poland. Moczar is brought back as a guarantee to the bureaucratic layer that fears to be eliminated. This return does not mean that new repressions are going to be ordered. Moczar was the instrument for the implementation of orders in a precious époque, which is gone. He comes back now after having made a self-criticism.

The revolutionary movements, the Communist Parties for instance, must discuss what a Workers State is. When they talk about it, they call it 'socialism'; this is clearly a false description. In Socialism, there will not be any problem of strikes, or scrambling for wage increases. Such problems will have been eliminated because distribution will be to each according to needs. This in itself signifies that the dispute for wages will be ended. In giving to each according to needs – independently from whether one works and how much one does – the essential problem of the individuals and of society will have at last be resolved. Clearly the Workers State is not this, and therefore, it is not socialism. Socialism cannot exist where distribution based on norms of property, of individual capacity still goes on, with the entire juridical superstructure this entails. These countries, named 'socialist countries', are in fact just Workers States.

Poland itself must initiate discussions about all this and pose the problem of why there has not been a better development in Poland, or at least critical analyses. It is not that the plan was a bad one, or the leadership wasn't capable, even though this also exists. But the essential reason is that 80% of production is still in private hands in the countryside and this is what raises the cost of production. Besides, this situation continues to create conditions of sharp competition between the State and private

property. The whole previous bureaucratic layer, many of whom still remain, are tied up with private property and increase their ties according to how much they feel under threat from the workers' onslaught.

We appeal for a public discussion about all these problems. In the construction of socialism, private property has to be ended. Lenin proposed the N.E.P. for the Soviet Union because the country was being strangled economically. But now on the other hand, the Soviets are telling the Yankees that this 'is a socialist system' and that 'no one is going to alter this fact'. Lenin was not in a position to say this in his time. They did not even have bullets to put in the guns. So, one cannot make a comparison between the situation in Poland today and that which led Lenin to introduce the N.E.P.

*The Communist leaderships aren't prepared for this stage*

The actual development of the process of History encompasses a series of factors which did not exist in previous times. One of these factors is that the Soviet bureaucratic apparatus itself is forced to act as a conscious leadership. As it goes on being an apparatus, it combines conscious action when it has to resort to it with the conduct of apparatus. Today, of the two things, it is conscious action that overtakes the apparatus conduct. This is shown in the fact that the USSR impels the system of the Workers States, supports the world revolution, and opposes the capitalist system. All this is done under the guidance of an apparatus, but it is being done.

Another aspect that makes this present stage distinct from any other, is the interplay between the last acts of the capitalist system and the transformation of the leaderships of the Workers States, which makes the passing from a bureaucratic apparatus to an increasingly conscious leadership quite a unique experience.

The Communist leaderships have not prepared themselves for all this. They are confronted with the conduct of the present Chinese leadership which is counter revolutionary and invades Vietnam. They see Vietnam intervening in Cambodia, the condition for the progress of both. They witness all the progress of Ethiopia. But the Communist Parties like that of Italy have so far supported the Eritreans openly. Suddenly however and without explanation, such parties start discussing with the Ethiopian Government, and start denouncing quite rightly the so-called victories of the Eritreans whose feats amounted to the occupation of four uninhabited mountains.

All these problems are new in the Communist Parties precisely for the reason that they had been expecting a gradual development, a process of continuous changes within the capitalist system, through which they would supersede capitalism. These are reformist conceptions in Parties otherwise revolutionary in origins and essence.

To justify their old policy of alliance with the capitalist system, the Communist parties have been made to break with the world in Revolution. In spite of this, however hard they try to break with the world the world does not break with them... Once mutual links have been built with the process of History, it takes mutual efforts to break them and there remains to see if the process of History is agreed with breaking them loose...

Through Buffalini – and not Berlinguer – the Italian Communist Party has informed the world that if the Soviets enter Poland, it will ‘break relations with the USSR’. The urge to make such a declaration is prompted by the anxiety to please the bourgeoisie, and it is discarding the proletariat altogether. It intends to show how faithful the ICP will remain to its alliance with the bourgeoisie and the ‘historic compromise’. If it was not for this aim, this declaration would make no sense politically, organisationally or practically. If it was a general declaration, it would not have this reckless aspect. The Italian Communist Party visualises as intolerable any sort of dependency on the Soviet Union, but not so for dependency on the bourgeoisie. This is why they have invented a ‘national’ socialism, of a local nature, a parish sort of socialism, to justify not having to depend on the whole of the Workers States.

These leaders have an essentially limited grasp of the historical process. They have become experts in acquiring MPs, Senators and why not Presidents? Now, they realise that it is not enough to be an MP to decide, they are quite taken aback because everything is moving around them in another direction than the anticipated one. So, they haughtily declare that “we will break with the Soviet Union if it moves into Poland”. There was no objective motive for this declaration in the first place. The Soviet Union hasn’t intervened and has never propounded the intention to do so. But it was the Yankees who sought this, and it is they again who have put all sorts of rumours out there to justify what they were up to and to exert a pressure on the Communist Parties whilst they were helping the dissidents within all the Workers States.

The Yankees have no prerogatives in Poland and the capitalist sectors that linger on there have no power. They have relations with the state

apparatus in the way it was in Stalin's time, but that is all. Stalinism went very far backwards. They built enterprises for the manufacture of French looking 'bonbons' for the bureaucrats. Krutchev's wife was wearing dresses from Paris. Now, all this has become quite unacceptable and there is a struggle against it. This struggle is taking the form it does, because of the lack of a previously prepared leadership to unleash it in the best way.

Capitalism is building up a whole campaign in which to show Poland on the verge of catastrophe. It keeps on telling us that a bloody confrontation between the people, the Government and the Party, is on the agenda. Imperialism wants to spread confusion in the world, and uses the Communist parties to this end. It is quite an asset for capitalism when the Communist parties attack Poland; this allows the pressure against Poland to be greater, it gives more scope to the dissidents and they can have more influence. Beyond this, this policy weakens very much the Communist parties of the various countries where they do this, particularly such a large one as the Italian Communist Party. It creates inside of their ranks certain instability and makes it more difficult for the Communist Party to attract the rest of the population.

As for the petty bourgeoisie of the capitalist countries, it is influenced by the feelings of the working class, which grasps very well the progress of the development of Poland and the significance of the strikes. The working class see that people are discussing in Poland and that the decisions that are proposed by people are applied.

*Wherever the USSR intervened it has impelled progress*

The difficulties of Poland do not just stem from a bad leadership, but also from a lack of economic development. One cannot lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with an emerging country and social regime, which is forced to dedicate half its production to defend itself from the social system it has just dislodged historically. The system of the Workers State is forced not only into an economic, technical or scientific competition with the capitalist system, but it has to displace it socially and historically. To build the new society, it has to defend itself from this regime which collapses and employs what is left of its wits to prevent the emergence of the new regime. Amongst all the means used by capitalism in this endeavour, there are the dissidents, the property owners and the lower rungs of the bureaucracy.

Imperialism broadcasts its utter concern that Poland's problems should be resolved by Poles alone. Meanwhile no one resolves the problems of the

Black people or of the Chicanos in the United States. The Soviets have intervened in Czechoslovakia, and how does Czechoslovakia fare today? The Soviets intervened in Afghanistan and how is Afghanistan today? In full development. The Yankees have intervened in Puerto Rico: how is Puerto Rico today? How are the Black people treated? The answer is that the population is enslaved.

This is the way in which the comrades of the Communist parties must discuss and analyse. The campaign against a “Soviet invasion of Poland” is false. Buffalini threatens to break relations with the Soviet Union in the case of ‘an invasion’. But instead of all this, the Communist parties must declare that any attempt against the structure of the Workers State will be met by staunch opposition. If the Communists act in this correct way, they will start to educate the masses and particularly the petty bourgeoisie. People are then made to learn to discuss. One does not debate whether one has the right to enter the neighbour’s house to come to his help and one concentrates on the question that it depends on what one enters the house for. The Soviet Union has not intervened in Czechoslovakia or in Afghanistan to prevent the development of those countries, far from it. Today, almost all the leaders of the so-called “Prague Spring” thrown out in 1968 in Czechoslovakia have become agents of capitalism. So, one must wonder who these people were. Let us recall this famous –or infamous- “Pelikan” that could not take off. There is a practical similarity between people like him and the leadership, which is not got out of the way in Poland. They are similar in the fact that they have no notion of what socialism is or any intention to push it through. For them, Socialism is no more than a stepping stone, to make their business as usual, like the mafia in Italy. It is a real mafia with no feelings, no consciousness or preoccupation for socialism, people incapable of any analysis in either a concrete or a historic sense. These leaders tell the masses: with capitalism you had half a loaf a day, we will give you two. These were the leaders and this was their notion of socialism.

The Communist parties that give credit to the world capitalist campaign regarding the probable Soviet ‘invasion’ of Poland, must reason and become aware that capitalism is against any progress in the direction of Socialism. Hence, when capitalism is so concerned about ‘liberty in Poland’ what do the Communists think capitalism is concerned about? Liberty to build Socialism? Or is it concerned for liberty to fight Socialism and provoke a regression towards capitalism? Which of the two? The Communist comrades must reason to avoid being diverted by appearances.

The reasoning of the workers of Poland and even of the leaders of Solidarnosc is not against the Workers State. They have not raised any demand that goes against the Workers State. But there is a gang looking for trouble against the Workers State. It is the birds of the same feathers as Pelikan, the former leader in Czechoslovakia. Pelikan has deserted the Workers States now. It took only two years for him to enter the Italian Socialist Party, become an MP and openly propound that private property is a good thing. This fact alone suffices to show who these people were, and it explains why we called them ‘the birds that could not take-off’. They flew low and crashed to the ground. All these people belonged to the layers of bureaucracy generated in the time of Stalin.

The Soviets have not intervened in time to correct this and obviously they have to be blamed for not having done so. But the Soviets cannot be judged just upon this matter, because the existence of their own apparatus has prevented them from doing so. But as the process unfolds, they intervene more and more. One cannot expect a complete intervention from them precisely because they have all this weight of apparatus themselves. However, this is the way the general line of progress develops, and it is really happening. If progress must not take this form, which other form must it take? Capitalism had an answer to that: it was Pelikan and Ota Sik.

Ota Sik endeavoured to write a book, which is a capitalist one. He prescribed that countries must have half of their economy private and the other half state-owned. This way “things are fair for each”. A minimum of historical ability to analyse shows that social systems are the result of economic, cultural, and class struggle developments. Social systems arise from this conjuncture, but Ota Sik believes that you can call social systems into being, and naturally do so according to your own whims and interests.

All these people may not end up necessary like Althusser but there is a little bit of Althusser in every one of them. This is bound to show some day or another. They want to shape themselves ‘the perfect social system’ – no doubt best suited to their cravings and aspirations developed at the school of Stalin and his murders. They think that this is what Communism is about. For them, Communism means a better distribution, a greater development of the economy and more advantages, particularly for those who manage to get them. They have never understood where the process of History is going. They carry on believing that a great layer of ‘intelligentsia’ has been discarded and wasted when it was thrown out of

Czechoslovakia. They are blind to the enormous progress Czechoslovakia has accomplished with Soviet support. None of these people have any notion or the slightest interest in learning in what way the Workers States are progressing today, and how the masses are learning to build socialism.

*13 December 1980*

J. Posadas

*J. POSADAS*

## **On the problem of agricultural production**

*4<sup>th</sup> January 1981*

The outcome of present events is for progress. It is not a victory for the workers as such, but an advance for the country. The workers have taken the country forward and the bureaucratic leadership is learning. The fact that the leadership is learning shows that it is not strictly bureaucratic. It is learning how to take the intervention of the masses into account and to reason on this basis. It certainly wasn't like this in the past, and it represents a deep change.

A great majority of the smaller landowners are in favour of the socialist regime. They are not really trying to extend their own plot, but to obtain guaranteed prices, and to hold on to their plot of land. The problem is that not every one is a small owner: about 20% of them have middle size holdings. However, all this is going to be discussed, and naturally the solution will emerge that the Sovkhos is the answer. Not the kolkhoz, but the Sovkhos. The problem does not lie in the existence of the small proprietors as such, but in the political power that comes from the existence of private property. It is this political power that forms the basis for an immense bureaucracy.

The production from the small landowner is channelled into the black market publically and in large quantity. This means that select products are destined for a specific layer of bureaucrats all over the country and for export to the other Workers States' bureaucracies. The German Workers State is one of them. These bureaucracies are interested in leaving things as they are because they know full well that any change will go against them.

The small landowner has to sell his products to the State which, in turn, fixes the price. This does not bother the small landowner because he has a small turn-over, but it pays the large landowner to put a sizeable part of his production into the black market. So, the large holdings sell some of their products to the State, and the rest goes out to the black market, to satisfy the bureaucrats. In other words, the problem is not the continuation of private property as much as the use that the black market

makes of it. It is a black market and every one knows it. In the Soviet Union, they have actually removed some of these people and their privileges as well. In Cuba, they have done this too. There used to be quite a black market, organised particularly by the Old Communist Party. When Fidel Castro made the Revolution, they did not have a Party prepared and they had to depend on those Communists existing before. This meant a truly gigantic bureaucracy. Instead of producing fruits and vegetables for the people, they produced the popular fruits for the black market. The Workers States should have utilised the Trade Unions to put an end to this, but it was impossible because the actual Trade Union apparatus was – like the apparatus of the State – precisely the one with its fingers in the pie. It was like this in practically all the Workers States. This is why the USSR has had to remove 5000 leaders of the Party who had up to then decided everything on the basis of their own interests.

The process of clearing rotten functionaries from the Workers State is – so far – a step forward, but still a limited one because when a leader is removed the apparatus continues to work in the old way. It is important to discuss all these aspects in the Communist Parties and to demonstrate that the real problem is not so much one or the other leader, but the bureaucratic apparatus. It is this that holds back the advance of quantity and quality in production. A part of production is channelled into the black market. In other words, a certain number of working hours are given to the State, and the rest is dedicated to production for the black market. This means the production of luxury items and so, instead of having a production of as many tons of what is necessary for all the people, the State will receive only 100 kilograms. This is what happens in the Kolkhozes: a large number of peasants – above all the leaders themselves – have small plots of land on which they produce intensively for their own profits at the cost of the productivity of the collective or state farm. Clearly the solution is to produce in those farms on the basis of planning where the Government and the Trade Unions have a say. This is inevitably going to happen because one day or the other the question of producing for all will be a public affair. If people do really work 6 or 8 hours a day – everyone can see what this effort generates. In the USSR recently, they discovered that corruption against the State was happening in a big way. Some people were exporting caviar but declaring that it was ordinary fish, and pocketing the difference. This goes to show that the same thing must be going on in other spheres of production. It also means that further clearances will be needed. This is precisely what we can foresee is happening now in all the Workers States.

*4<sup>th</sup> January 1981*

# ON THE FORMATION OF A RURAL TRADE UNION IN POLAND

**J. POSADAS**

*7<sup>th</sup> February 1981*

The changes that have been imposed in Bielsko-Biala have been engineered by a sector of the Communist Party. They have removed four important civil servants for corruption and bad administration. The Workers' protests and strikes have been generated by a sector of the Communist Party itself, in order to clear out the right wing. It is a struggle inside the leading circles of the Party and it is supported by the Soviet Union. In some aspects, it is true that the Soviets do not want this to go too far, but the concern of the Soviets in that direction is much less than the bourgeois press is suggesting. The very good reason why the Soviets have not much to fear out of the process in Poland, is that they have already made some of these clearances in the USSR, particularly if you remember the instance when they sacked 5000 Trade Union leaders a few years ago, and brought high ranking administrators before the firing squad for corruption and robbery of the State. These latter people were leaders of various regions. At the same time, factory managers were dismissed for their activity of 'thieving'. The Soviets are in a constant state of renovation and it is this which led to the removal of Kossyguin some time ago. Kossyguin was a state civil servant, and a defender of alliance with capitalism. He was not an agent of capitalism, far from it, but he represented a certain level of alliance with it. Now, he is out.

The Polish workers are fully involved in intervening to cleanse the Polish Unified Workers Party. The fact that the government is yielding shows that there is an internal struggle; a tendency of the Party supports the workers' struggles, and bases itself on them in order to kick out the right. It is not a situation in which the Party makes concessions and yields because it is weak in front of the workers. It is not like this at all. Indeed, it is the Communists themselves who are pushing for all this to happen. The base and middle sectors of the Party are disgusted by the bureaucrats in the leadership and they help the workers to get rid of them. The Communist militants are using the Trade Unions of Poland as a means to cleanse the Party because it was not possible to cleanse the Party directly, via discussions in the Party. There is not the kind of life in the Party to allow them to decide this directly. This is why the Trade Unions have come into this.

Another proof of this can be seen in the fact that the workers who do not belong to the Party do not know what is going on in the Party. If there are changes in the Party, it is the Communist Workers who effect them, not any old worker. The Communist workers are those who know who the bureaucrat is, who is to blame and should be removed, and who should replace him. It is the Party worker and no one else who can do this. It is clear too that there are high ranking Party members who help this cleansing. But it is the Communist workers who impel this process, who name the person to be removed, who raise the reason why he should be removed, and who make proposals for the replacement.

Capitalism would have liked to make Poland a centre for its attacks against the Workers State, but it did not work. It is not all settled yet, but settlements are already being made on a line that goes against bureaucracy and the quite large anti-Workers State sector that there is.

Of all the Workers States, Poland is the one with the greatest internal resistance to the State, because of all the private property in the countryside. This opposition inside Poland cannot do very much because it is only based on small parcels of land. The majority of these people are proprietors of about 5 hectares or so. This means that they cannot be compared with big capitalists on the level of production. As the properties are so small, it tends to tie the peasants-owners down to the Workers State.

However, this form of agricultural exploitation is such that the small proprietor needs to look somewhere for benefits. Therefore, he seeks additional production over and above that fixed by the State. So, they produce for the bureaucracy's black market which feeds the top people. In many cases the small agrarian producer has to depend on larger trading concerns to market the products. About 20% of the land is in the hand of medium-size producers strong enough to control marketing through agreements with the smaller ones.

Since the small proprietor has to cater for State demands and also work extra for the satisfaction of the black market, his life and work are brutalised. It means that either the level of production has to be increased or the quality of the product adulterated. As the bureaucracy itself controls production and gives the necessary qualifications, as it is the buyer, it sees nothing abnormal in any of it.

The peasant-owner is not in the same position as the Kolkhosian in the USSR. There is private usufruct of State property in the Kolkhoz, but the land itself is owned by the State. In Poland, it is a question of the land being private outright. If you multiplied the size of the plot by 100 or 1000 the cost of production would sink immeasurably, and there would be an immediate increase of revenue for the peasant together with a substantial economic progress. There is absolutely no economic reason for parcels of land of 5 or even 20 hectares. What gain is it for anyone? The only reason why this goes on is that the proprietors are a base of support for bureaucratic sectors in the State apparatus. This creates in turn, a very deep-rooted and antiquated social relation in which they all depend on each other. The proprietor supports himself on the apparatus, and the apparatus looks after his private interests.

This must be discussed. It is not possible to give the right to 'freedom of exploitation' as some Trotskyist groups have come up with. This is completely mindless: two things have to be considered: the agricultural workers in the countryside and the landowners. The landowner in the Workers State will not have the same conception of property, or the same individualism as in the capitalist system, but the role played by these people is the same. What is sure is they can't have the same power but their function is the same. They look after the bureaucrats, they establish bridgeheads inside the central State organisation and they create a whole structure dedicated to maintain individual i.e. backward agricultural production.

The landowners have no right to suggest a 'Trade Union' for themselves, because they aren't exploited. There is no doubt that they can be granted certain rights, as they do in the USSR with the Kolkhosians. However, any of these rights has to be well defined, and the workers who work for them must be organised. What is most important of all is that these workers working for them must have the right to oppose the landowners.

These landowners produce particular and luxury commodities not for national consumption but for the bureaucracy and select individuals. In this case, it cannot be said that these people need Trade Unions and rights like the workers do. In reality, these people are bosses. Very soon, a discussion on the rights for workers and the rights for bosses is going to appear in Poland. When this happens, it will come out to light that we are not dealing with the same situation as with the Kolkhoz in the USSR.

These proprietors cannot have Trade Union rights because this would mean a defence of private property. All those in the world Communist

movement who have dealt with this problem show their complete lack of understanding of what they are dealing with. It is not possible to say that there should be organisations in defence of private property in the Workers States. The motive of these landowners is to defend private property. What else? Even if it is small, their property is private.

If an autonomous, independent organisation for these owners is conceded, then, the beginning of an anti-Soviet and anti-Workers State centre is also conceded. Notwithstanding the fact the people behind these proposals have no clear intention of going that way, the proposal itself leaves the door wide open for the possibility of it being used for the interests of private property and capitalism.

Even when the owners defend the Workers State, they still cannot be allowed to set up an organisation of defence of private property in the Workers State. This is the dictatorship of the proletariat; the demand for rights for proprietors amounts to demanding the right for links with the feudal regime at the time when capitalism was breaking from it. In the areas where capitalism developed completely, it eliminated feudalism. It is only where capitalism was weaker that it had to make agreements with the feudal people. These sorts of agreements however, go back to the time when capitalism did not have the necessary strength to completely eliminate the old regime. But the moment it was strong enough, it wiped feudalism out.

It would have been another matter if there had been a very upright leadership in Poland. In these circumstances, there could have been a peasant Trade Union, but in the present situation where there is no leadership, an organisation of peasant bosses would become a centre, a vehicle for sectors that are against the Workers State altogether.

It is not completely wrong to allow such an organisation for owners, if their freedom of organisation goes hand in hand with an increase in State ownership of agricultural land, possibly with some compensation.

As for the smallest peasants, one motive for their desire to organise among themselves is their need to defend themselves against the larger proprietors. This is not against the interests of the Workers State in any way. The smaller owners are forced to sell their foodstuff on the existing black market for all the bureaucrats and they have to sell to the larger producers who act as a pooling centre which is linked directly to the State commercial apparatus. In these circumstances, it is possible to imagine that these small proprietors need a means of defence. In this case, it is not

correct simply to deny them the right to find independent means of organisation. Therefore, this has to be discussed.

In a short time, there will be discussions on the agrarian situation in Poland. The workers movement, no doubt, will declare that what is best for the peasants is that they be allowed to produce most for the least effort. The need for a greater concentration of property as a superior regime of production will be obvious, because everyone will be able to compare the difference in productivity between a 5-hectare-farm and a 100 or 1000-hectare-one! This idea will raise the consciousness of the peasants and improve their relationship with the Workers State. This is a very rich experience in the process of construction of the Workers State, and it has to be discussed in all the world Communist movement.

**J. Posadas**

*7<sup>th</sup> February 1981*

# ON THE DEBILITY OF IMPERIALISM

**J POSADAS**

*10<sup>th</sup> February 1981*

As Prime Minister, General Jaruzelski is a man of authority in front of the workers and he is pro-Soviet. He studied in the USSR and was opposed to the repression of the workers during the 1970 strike. All the Polish people know this.

Imperialism would like a bloody repression and a massive confrontation in Poland. It tries to divert the conclusions that flow from the strike movement: the conclusion is that the movement seeks to improve the Communist Party, and imperialism instead, wants more difficulties for the Party and the Workers State. Besides, imperialism seeks to exert pressures on the capitalist countries to stop them trading with Poland. Imperialism tries to prevent bourgeois and petty bourgeois currents in the capitalist world from being influenced by Poland. It also wants to maintain its domination over these sectors by repeatedly telling them that what is happening in Poland, may happen in France or Germany – if these took the road of Poland. It is all a game and whistling in the dark, to feel confidence. This is obvious to the whole world.

Capitalism is driven into this blind policy because it has no policy to respond to this stage of History. The action of the workers divides and fragment imperialism. Capitalism would have launched an attack on the Workers States, if it had felt that it could do so. But the world advance of social development and revolutionary progress divides the imperialist camp, removes the sense of confidence in it and make it waste historic time for itself. This tears it apart. It is not true that capitalism will act as a unified force or system in front of the Workers States. It is not true that they will forget their differences. Certainly they are going to unite in a certain way, but it will be the unity of bandits. In other words, the capitalists are going to grapple with the Workers State, using one hand - the most important hand – and with the other, they are going to grapple with each other. They act in this way because none of them quite knows what comes next. But the Soviets will change some ministers – without great modifications – and will remove all the corrupt sectors of the Party that impede progress. That is all!

Poland has one of the most bureaucratic histories but it is not by any means the worst. When they will start a process of clearance in Hungary, we are going to witness something enormous! There is in Hungary a truly enormous apparatus. It is no great surprise that it took revolts and uprisings of the masses in Hungary, Germany and Poland, to move all this rubbish. In recent years, the German Workers State has made quite a few improvements, but what remains of the apparatus there is quite scared of all the current events in Poland.

**J. Posadas**

*10<sup>th</sup> February 1981*

# THE CONDITIONS THAT FORMED THE WORKERS STATE AND SMALL AGRARIAN PROPERTY

**J POSADAS**

*22<sup>nd</sup> February 1981*

It is necessary to take into account the way Poland was formed and in what conditions. Poland is one of the Workers States which appeared after the Second World War. It came out of a process of total war, like the other Workers States around, and with a small Communist Party. However, these small Communist nuclei were sufficient to gain complete authority and impose a Workers State. In this they had the support of the Red Army. Stalin lived another 7 years after the war, and in his time he wove a whole bureaucratic apparatus at the head of Poland. This apparatus spread its tentacles in the organisation of the population, particularly in the peasants. This allowed the development of a regime of agrarian production based on plots of 7 or 10 hectares. This represents an enormous cost of production by any standards. There may be some logic in plots of 5 hectares for much specialised production, but there is no reason for a specialised production in a Workers State. If such a thing exists, it is for the benefit of the bureaucrat. The form of property that exists in the Polish countryside was created by the Stalinist bureaucracy who used it as a support against the Communist revolutionaries. Today of course, the process is exactly the reverse to what existed in the time of Stalin.

The workers and popular uprisings in Poland and Hungary in 1956 were huge, and they followed an uprising in the German Workers State in 1953. Hungary, Poland and Germany had formidable and very brave Communist parties. The Hungarian Communist Party was the most persecuted and repressed. It had the highest proportion of militants assassinated. However, it maintained itself all through the worst conditions of Nazi repression. The struggle of the Hungarian masses influenced even the Feudal people. There is a story of a Hungarian feudal Lord who held a meeting with his peasants, signed a document agreeing to the distribution of the land, and returned home to put a bullet in his head. This was an expression of the impact of the social heroism of the

Hungarian people on the Feudal sectors. This social heroism instilled a feeling in the aristocracy that the Monarchy was defunct.

The present situation of the Polish Communist Party (PUWP) does not express a lack of confidence in Communism. There is a certain lack of confidence within the Party, but it is important to recall the way in which the Party was formed, and how it subsequently developed. The Party could not organise itself with freedom of thought and action because it was set up under Stalin. After the war, there was still 7 years of Stalin, and a few more years had to be spent with Kruschov following the same line as Stalin. It is during this time that all this apparatus we see today was built. It was only when Brezhnev came in the leadership of the USSR that the dismantling of this apparatus began. It began then, because it corresponded to the point when the confrontation between the Workers States and the capitalist system developed in a big way.

This confrontation began to escalate in 1960. At that time, imperialism adopted a policy of “brinkmanship” with Foster Dulles. His line was one of war threats designed to deter the Soviet Union from fostering revolutions. Reagan now wants to do the same thing, but it was tried before Dulles, and he was more successful in the sense that he did go around Europe kindling fires against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union however was quite capable of pouring water all over them. This Dulles died from stomach cancer...a political cancer. In the human organism, some parts like the head and the digestive organs are particularly vulnerable to the impact of the revolution.

The important thing to understand is that the limitations that still exist in Poland are not the product of the structure, the existence or the organisation of the Workers State. They are the result of the social composition of the State. When the revolution arose in Poland, the Communist Party was small, and it had to organise itself at the same time as the Workers State was being constructed. This particular difficulty is not just one that happened in Poland. However, even under the weight of all these problems, Poland managed to develop, particularly on the industrial plane. There are still considerable problems in the countryside but quite a lot of technology has been introduced, resulting in a large increase in production.

The weaknesses of Poland are not the consequence of the Communist Party, but of the form in which it was built. At the same time, Poland represents an experience from which the incapacity of capitalism can be well measured. Capitalism was unable to liquidate the Workers State

when the conditions may have allowed it. It did not find the strength to do it. However, it is logical that nests and groups of opposition to the Workers State should continue to exist. It is perfectly logical that intellectual groupings and groups in the Trade Union who want a return to capitalism or who want a mixture between the Workers State and capitalism, like self-management, should exist in Poland. Kuron is part of this. He does not actually say he wants to return to capitalism, but he wants an economy based on some form of self-management.

The fact that the group of KOR and Kuron put this policy forward is a logical consequence of the absence of a real Communist Party in Poland. It is the logical consequence of the absence of a Party formed on the basis of principles and programme. The Soviet Union has been able to free itself from the worst consequences of Stalin, because it had a firmer base of principles established during the First Seven Years of the Soviet Union. These principles were established by Lenin and Trotsky, who applied them strictly. The First Seven Years gave the Soviet Union a structure which wasn't one simply of organising the workers' vanguard, but the technicians, the administrators, the bureaucrats and the population generally as well. All of them saw that the way it was, allowed the development of the Soviet Union. It was a structure initiated by the Bolshevik Party and the Bolsheviks allowed Russia – country where wheat was crushed with stones – to come out of backwardness and build the highly mechanised country we know today.

Poland did not have the initial structure that the Soviet Union had. It was the same in Czechoslovakia, where, after a few years of the Revolution, leaders like Masarik were thrown out of the windows. A few years after this the same happened in Yugoslavia, except that in this case, it was the factory managers who were thrown out of windows. It was from this moment onwards that the bureaucracy decided to always meet on the ground floor, and if possible, in rooms without windows...

All the events in Poland form part of the limitations of the Communist Party in a previous period. Today, the workers are stimulating the necessary Party; they are proposing many demands in Poland, but never in an antagonistic way. The most important aspect of this is the intervention of the Trade Union "Solidarity" which remains under the leadership of the Communist Party whilst fighting for the interests of the Union. It is important that the workers have gained the possibility to speak on the radio and television, and to write in newspapers. But this demand is inferior to the demand of the workers for the removal of all the thieves.

The resolution to remove the thieves and parasites does not come only from the Trade Union, the Union leaders or the ordinary militant. It comes from the militants of the Party who, through the Trade Union, exert a pressure that could not be exerted through the cells of the Party, or at work. This means that they had to make advances and changes through Solidarity. The fact that they made a very long list of bureaucrats to be thrown out indicates they knew who they were. They also knew what these people had been up to. The removal of up to 20 leaders was recently put forward, and later on the Government added a couple more. This has been one of the greatest events in History. This is what we said in our first article on the subject of Poland: “The solution to the strikes in Poland, a historic experience and progress for the construction of Socialism”. The Polish working class shows that it pushes its Party forward. The most important aspect of the Polish strikes is that it’s a process of cleansing the Party. The attainment of the right not to work on Saturday is much less important than the removal of the bureaucrats. It is less important because the removal of the 20 bureaucrats is a proof that the working class is perfectly capable of cleansing the Party and of imposing new leaders. All this is going to be a great impulse to further discussions in the Party and in the Trade Union meetings, in the factory councils and in the various organisations of the masses.

There is no parallel in any of the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries, to what is happening in the Polish Party! The leaderships of these Communist Parties want no part in the Polish experience; they don’t want to know about it! They are part of the bureaucratic apparatuses that do not want to learn from this historic experience. This is why they all interpret these events in different ways. Neither Lama, leader of the Italian Trade Union Centre –CGIL- nor any of the other Trade Union leaders who had so much to demand when the Polish strikes started, in terms of the need for ‘democracy’ in Poland, have anything to comment about Poland now that the bureaucrats are being removed. At the same time, the campaign that capitalism launched and which was supported in part by some leaders of the Spanish and Italian Communist Parties, against a ‘probable Soviet Invasion of Poland’ has come to an end.

If the Soviet Union intervened in Poland however, it would not be an invasion but a contribution to cleansing the Communist Party, a task started by the Polish workers. It would be a contribution to a process the workers have sparked off. In one go, they removed 20 top bureaucrats. If they intervened, the Soviets would not make the Polish State go back to private property... It would not break the centralised planning of Poland.

The Soviets would not push back the advances made by the masses. In all probability they would impel the process of returning all small private holdings in the countryside - particularly those of 5 to 10 hectares - back to the State! This is undoubtedly what the Soviets would do. These small holdings of 5 hectares or so did not exist before the Revolution in Poland. It is under the Workers State that this was set-up. In the early days of the Workers State, the land was distributed to the peasants; previously, the form of organisation was large tracks of land owned by Feudal landlords. There is no doubt that the Soviets – if they intervened – would solve this agrarian problem and correct the Workers State of Poland. The Soviet Union would follow the trail laid by the Polish workers.

Poland, together with Yugoslavia, has a large number of counter-revolutionary groups and agents. This is because of the initial weakness of the Communist Party that came out of the war very weakened. Indeed, the Communist Party went to power with the support of the Soviet Union. It was with Soviet support that they managed to expropriate the land and to distribute it in the form of small private plots. It was an error to do so, however, and this was the result of a weak Communist Party, the impoverished conditions the Workers State found itself in after the war, and the imposition of Stalin. At the same time, there were all the efforts of world imperialism to impose itself through Stalin. It was the ‘allies’ who forced Stalin to redistribute the state owned land of Poland, in private plots. Now capitalism wants to mount an offensive against the Workers states, using these small parcels of private property. The Polish peasants, however, are not against the Workers State, they want to continue with this type of property, but they have nothing against the Workers State. In fact, the peasants have learnt that they can live under the regime of the Workers State, whereas, if they went back to capitalism, the land would be returned to the same people and for the same form of production as existed in the semi-feudal period before the Revolution.

The peasant development in Poland is the result of the political and programmatic weakness of the Communist Party; it is also the result of the fact that the Communist Party was submitted to Stalin. In reality, it was Soviet troops that decided the formation of the Polish Workers State, but in this process, Stalin imposed his own line. He wanted to impose it also on Yugoslavia and China, but in this, he failed. This process in Poland came after the Teheran and Yalta’s agreements, and one of the clauses agreed upon in these meetings, was precisely the return of the land to private hands in Poland. As it could not be handed back to the landowners who had been defeated together with the Nazis they were allied to, it was decided to divide the land and distribute it to the peasants.

This is part of the backwardness of Poland today. It went through the Revolution with a very small Communist Party that had very little social support and even less political life. The Polish Workers State was imposed after the Second World War, with the support of the Red Army, a part of the Polish Army and afterwards, with the Polish Revolutionaries. Poland is the country that came out of the war with the most dead, where the most Jews had been slaughtered by the Nazis in their hundreds of thousands...

In other countries, the Nazis were limited by the strength of the Revolution. In Poland, the Resistance managed to organise itself later on. It had less weight than in most other countries, and on top of that, Stalin has quite a responsibility in the slaughter of the Polish people. He delayed the order for the Red Army to cross the Vistula, to smash the Nazis. Stalin delayed in the hope that when he would arrive, the Nazis would have destroyed the Polish Revolutionaries first. But this failed! Indeed, in the event, the Red Army received the order to intervene when the Polish Communists had pretty well defeated the Nazis. In fact, such a force was brought against the Nazis that half the German Army turned their coats. They had begun to confront their own officers. A considerable proportion of the German army refused to continue to fight. The struggle of the Young Polish Communists against the Nazis was truly heroic. It was this that pushed forward the small Communist Party, small but with great determination. We should always remember that up until 1938, the Polish Communist Party had a Trotskyist leadership.

It was in 1938 that Stalin betrayed this leadership to the Polish bourgeois police and army. The result was they were all murdered. Stalin left the Polish Revolutionaries to be decimated by the Nazis for the same reasons. Stalin only intervened, after the masses had defeated the Nazis in any case. The Nazi army in Poland worked with complete insecurity thanks to the Polish Youth.

The present conditions in Poland, with the existence of such a weight of private property on the land, is not the product of the weakness of the Workers State but the result of the initial weakness of the initial structure of the Communist Party, a Party that had been made to adopt Stalin's conception of private property. This conception of private property in the countryside was imposed by Stalin. In Yugoslavia, Stalin wanted a bourgeois government with the participation of the Monarchy, and in China, a government with Chang-Kai-Chek. In every case, the land was to be handed back to private property. These were the plans accepted by

Stalin at Yalta. However, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union itself started to raise its head, to put up an opposition, and later, to oppose the Yalta agreement outright.

The limitations that linger on in Poland come from the continuation of bureaucratic conceptions, the idea of alliance and manoeuvre with capitalist methods of leadership. The bureaucracy was imposed by force. In the majority, the leaders who are being thrown out are not so much old Communists, as Communists built in a hurry. All this should be discussed, and in this way, by the world Communist Movement. But such a discussion is avoided because it would force them to make an assessment of all the consequences of Stalin. It was Stalin who put all these people who are now being thrown out or who are resigning, in the leadership of the Communist Party in the first place.

The Communists who entered the Party in this way and particularly at that time, have a hybrid conception of Communism, a conception that mixes individual, family or group interest with a certain tendency to promote capitalism inside the Workers State. This applies particularly of course to the sectors involved in trade with capitalism. In the Soviet Union, a short while ago, they tried and shot some administrators who were implicated in foreign trade of products that did not have any internal market. They were selling expensive fish to the foreign market, pretending that it was very cheap fish, and then pocketed the difference. These are sectors of foreign trade or linked with it and with private property, in the Workers State. Intellectual sectors and the Church are also involved in this. They are all very small layers but they are very motivated and dedicated in their support of bureaucracy. Kuron and people like him can be included in this. Kuron does not actually speak in the name of capitalism; he rather serves as a means of corrupting the Workers State.

The concessions the Polish Communist Party has made were the result of all this weakness which is the constant source of the present difficulties. A very large sector of counter-revolutionaries is trying to take advantage of that situation. The Communist Party of Poland is worried about this and understandably so. There is the same thing in Yugoslavia where you can find anti-Communist groupings, who support themselves on the dispute there is between the various nationalities. They love getting involved in these disputes. In Poland, it is a whole layer linked to private property which does the same thing. They are people who come from Stalin's epoch and who, since then, have been stimulated by the Church. However, a very important wing of the Catholic Church has already integrated into the Workers State. This wing is a pro-Workers State

Catholic sector. It is made up of Catholics who no longer simply depend on the Pope, and this is why the Pope is not moved to make outright attacks on the Workers State.

The AFL-CIO admits having sent 200.000 dollars in supporting “Polish Solidarnosc”. When they admit such a figure, it is probably nearer to two million dollars. There is real counter-revolutionary ferment and there are many counter-revolutionaries, but they aren’t the majority and they cannot do much against the Workers State. They can support people like Kuron, but even he has never said clearly that he is against the Workers State. He is in favour of weakening the Workers State, which is what the idea of self-management means. The group of KOR aspires to develop a privileged layer inside Poland.

The Polish workers, however, go on learning how to lead. The difficulties they have don’t stem so much from the poverty of Poland at the time of its inception – a difficulty all the Workers States experience – as from the difficulty of having to put up with Stalinism, all the difficulties of making a leadership. Indeed, Stalinism meant a theoretical and political perversion. The poverty of the country is one thing, and is a big problem, but one can overcome poverty. What is far more difficult to overcome is theoretical and political perversion, which creates managers and develops leaders within its mould. It is a perverted political conception alien to the Workers State, and even directly against it. This is what is being overcome today, and it is being done very well.

**J. Posadas**

*22<sup>nd</sup> February 1981*

# AGRICULTURE AND THE NEED FOR SUPERIOR OBJECTIVES IN THE WORKERS STATE

**J POSADAS**

*14<sup>th</sup> March 1981*

Seven years ago, I Posed the agrarian problem as it arises in the Workers States, which is being superseded by forms of agrarian production in the USSR and in China too. The Sovkhos is a form that tends to supersede the problem and to make the Kolkhoz decline. This process has become more marked. There was something like 350.000 Kolkhozes in the USSR and they have reduced more or less by half. That means they concentrated them, and the result was an increase in production, and, together with it, a decrease of production costs and a better diversification. What still goes on, however, is the private use of the collective land, not in the way private property does, but in the sense of the private use of property for a camarilla. This has meant clearly that, as production increased, these circles have also increased but then, so have the agrarian proletariat and it is opposed to all these people.

The increase in agricultural production is not a problem purely of a better technology, better coordination, mechanisation or better use of labour. The fact is that increase in production stems from a superior technology, undoubtedly, but this also implies the use of a plan for superior objectives. The base for such a plan – for superior objectives – lies in each one being motivated, and in what he or she is doing. Each person wants to be a delegate, an inspector, a controller, a director, a manager, a worker, an employee, a father, mother, son or daughter. All these things can be one thing, and this is what the Workers State can do. There is not a single machine that provides humanity with this. All the machines that are being used to this end are inferior to this complete human condition.

The machine is the result of the hand, having originated in the head and from the head to the hand. So the hand, not the machine has made technology advance. Technology has also made intelligent attitude advance. Intelligent attitude is then prompted by the hand, the fingers, which generates impulses or a coordination of impulses, each of which is the sum total of a thousand different things.

The most important thing in agricultural labour is certainly not the increase in technical ability produced. What is important is the social objective of production. A big part of Soviet production goes to satisfy the circles of high bureaucracy from the local, district or regional sectors, all the way up to the big bureaucracy of the various Republics. A very high percentage of production – I evaluate it at around 20 to 30 percent – falls into the hands of these circles through what is called the ‘black market’. It is not the same black market today as it once was, but it still goes on.

This creates a rupture in the chain of production and twists its process so that a part of the effort has to be dedicated to necessary production while the most important labour is clandestine! Meanwhile, all this generates social divergence which is expressed naturally even in the plan of production. These social divergences are between what the workers want and what these leaders seek.

There are also differences between the Sovkhoses’ workers and those of the Kolkhozes. The Kolkhosian has no choice but to sail along if he sees that the Trade Union is making no opposition to this. If, on top of this, there isn’t a political life in the Trade Union, if there aren’t any normal, regular or weekly meetings, the workers see no means of venting their feelings, because there is nowhere where they can propose improvements and rectifications. So, although reluctant, they start making their own arrangements outside the Trade Union and outside the place of work. In this case, they start working outside agricultural production, work for themselves and become a small enterprise. Agricultural production is more like an enterprise today, an enterprise in the countryside. There aren’t any ‘peasants’ in the true sense in Poland. The people employed there are no longer peasants but workers who operate in the countryside, in much the same way as the workers in the factories. The two rejoin through the Trade Union.

In the Soviet Union, these workers do not have a political life. This is why, in all the changes recently in the USSR, Brezhnev insisted that ‘Trade Union life in the Kolkhozes must be elevated, and in the

Sovkhoses too'. By an increase in Trade Union life, one must mean the right of the Union's representatives to intervene in the technical means and production itself. This declaration of Brezhnev is an attempt at getting rid of a camarilla that cannot be anything but ferocious and gigantic. The bureaucracy has always been careful when dealing with these problems because when you touch these problems you touch the body of the bureaucracy, not at the foot but at the centre. However, they will have to embark on doing this soon.

In China it is better in the sense that the Commune Mao Tse Tung favoured was a real invention, and permitted China to defend itself against such people as Krutchev. When these people disappeared, they left a structure behind. They disappeared because of a lack of Party life and proletarian base in China. The Soviets managed to supersede the limitations imposed by Stalin, because they had a proletarian base and also such an army. In China, there is also an army but without a proletarian life. The Communists who are members of the Chinese army have proletarian connections. They do not lack in Communist understanding and conviction, but they do not have a practical Party life. It will not take five years to put this right, not because they will suddenly correct it but because there is already progress bound to continue. The Communes of Mao will return but not in the form of Mao's Communes. They will return with the richness of the experience that the masses have made up to now.

## **J. Posadas**

*14<sup>th</sup> March 1981*

# **THE CHANGES AND THE POLITICAL WEAKNESS OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE POLISH COMMUNIST PARTY (PUWP)**

**J POSADAS**

*22<sup>nd</sup> March 1981*

The Director of Polish Television has been dismissed. People like him accumulate second residences and material goods. They are all birds of the same feathers as Solzhenitsyn of the USSR. When they are removed from their jobs, they inevitably complain that there is no 'democracy' or 'freedom'. But they never suggested letting the workers speak. All they wanted was their own 'freedom'. There used to be many such people in the USSR, but in recent years, the USSR started to throw them out. Imagine what it must be like in Poland, if there was all that corruption in the USSR too! All these people were in the leadership. It was not an oversight and neither was it by oversight that they were allowed to remain. However now, they are gradually being expelled.

This clearance proceeds slowly. It is not due to practical difficulties like having to choose the time or not having other leaders to replace them with. It is not due to a shortage of material means, like not having enough garbage bags to put them in... Far from it. This slowness is due to the fact that many people – from Government Ministers to Party and Trade Union leaders – are embroiled in this structure of apparatus. In my article "The Solution to the Strikes in Poland, a historic experience and progress for the construction of Socialism", I said that it was incorrect for some Party leaders to support the old Trade Unions when Solidarnosc had been set up, with the support of the workers. I also said that if Party leaders kept on supporting the old Union, it showed how much bureaucratic interest remained in the Party.

The process acquires this form because of the lack political leadership and political life of the Party. There are no Party Cell Meetings and no Party life as such. This is because the apparatus remains in the hands of all these bureaucratic layers, which –in turn- do not let the comrades of the Party express themselves. However, the Communist worker intervenes through Solidarnosc. This shows that the workers are full of ideas, confidence and political understanding. The ordinary non-Communist worker could not have acquired such a confidence as that

displayed by the Communist worker for such a struggle against the apparatus. Only the Communist workers have the confidence to do this, they are the driving force to cleanse the Party. This generates great progress in the Party, and gives the Party a great deal of authority within the working class.

It has now transpired that the factory workers are not in agreement with the many strikes called by Solidarnosc, and they blame Kuron and K.O.R. for them. But we have to wonder why Kuron and KOR are still around, and why Walesa himself had to say that 'a lot of people in the Union have bad intentions towards me'. The 'hard-liners' in the Communist Party who do not want change, who are motivated by profound bureaucratic interests, oppose concessions to the workers and are keen to make an agreement with a sector of Solidarnosc. On the other hand however, a different tendency in the Communist Party wants to conciliate with the workers and is opposed to these 'hard-liners', because the latter obviously flirt with Kuron and are animated by empirical and ambiguous motives that drives them ever closer to imperialist sectors backed by the Yankees. These groups in Poland, close to imperialist sectors, are a new phenomenon. They did not exist before.

The AFL-CIO - Trade Union Centre of the United-States – has to be denounced for all the money it has sent to these people. At the same time it is not just a matter of denouncing the bureaucrats of Poland but of seeing all the difficulties that have led to this situation in previous Polish society. The previous political leaderships of the Communist Party managed to bring about progress through a programme, and state ownership, despite all the weaknesses. This fact tends to be concealed. The previous weakness of leadership therefore, was apolitical one. It resulted from a lack of time to develop a leadership which had to arise from bureaucratic origins, from the start. In the aftermath of the Second World War, Poland had little chance to develop a leadership, but even then, a leadership developed of sufficient programmatic conception to make the leap into a Workers State. Kuron wants to hit all this, but Walesa has shown that he opposes KOR and those who want to harm the Socialist structure. He has given no support to anti-socialist elements that help those who uphold bureaucratic interests in connivance with highly placed bureaucratic layers in the leadership and beyond it.

A whole series of civil-servants have been dismissed for corruption in the USSR and they were all people who were hatched in the bureaucratic nest previously built. This clearance in Poland is more obvious, because Poland emerged from the Second World War without a real Communist

Party, and so, there was more rubbish to clear out. No doubt Stalin limited the Communist Party of the Soviet Union too but it was a real Party from the start. Poland never had a real Party.

These changes in Poland will not signify it's a disaster for the country, far from it! It will lead to further progress. This is already shown elsewhere. It shows in the fact that the Hungarians have decided to introduce the 'Five-Day-Working Week'. This will happen in the German Workers State shortly. But there is a tremendous bureaucratic layer there also. These bureaucratic people are not a capitalist sector because they live in a Workers State. But they live in outrageous luxury, accumulating houses, consumer goods etc. In the GDR, this sector was also formed at the time of Stalin.

On the other hand, the Soviet bureaucracy has to get on – by necessity – eliminating the bureaucratic apparatus and the remnants of bourgeois structure, because the USSR has to confront capitalism head-on. It is not the same for Poland or the other Workers States. The other Workers States have developed a bureaucratic growth, as part of a process of rather uninterrupted relations with capitalism. As regards to the USSR, it was forced to stop this. Nevertheless, the important thing in Poland is that they are now taking the road of the USSR against bureaucracy. They are doing so, even if still in a limited way. The PUWP is no longer submitted to the bureaucrats; it is learning – and very well – to concede to the workers and ally with a sector of the workers' leadership. Kuron and his like are birds of a feather with the old apparatus, which is now being pushed aside.

There was no repression, torture or beatings when the police entered an office of Solidarnosc, and arrested some of the leaders. They removed them and nothing more. It was done in a harsh and arrogant way, but it was a provocation directed by the police against the Government more than against Solidarnosc. Nonetheless, all they did was to remove these people and nothing more.

All this happened at the time when the Government of the Federal German Republic (Capitalist Germany), which is a more important State than France or Britain, is opposing any break of relations with the Soviets and any closer relationship with the Yankees. It is a very important process that must be watched with care.

**J POSADAS**, 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1981

# **THE EXTENSION OF THE WORKERS STATE AND THE CHANGES IN THE BUREAUCRACY**

**J POSADAS**

*29<sup>th</sup> March 1981*

The policy of the USSR and of the Workers States originated from Stalin, that is to say, a product of the mind of the bureaucratic Stalinist clique. It did not stop the Workers State from going forward, but it gave a deformed shape to its internal relations. It also put aside the weight of the proletariat which was then impeded from exercising its function, as the ruling apparatus endeavoured to stop it by supporting itself on the peasantry. Stalin moved from the killing of six million peasants to supporting himself on the rich peasantry...

The programmatic, theoretical and practical measures for the construction of socialism must be investigated further. Theoretical understanding does not amount to preconceptions to be applied come what may. True theoretical grasp means something that progresses alongside practical experience. This way theoretical conception can and must be measured against the actual experience, like the experience of the Soviet Union which had to put up with Stalin or Krutchev and ended up getting rid of the policies of Stalin and Krutchev. Even Krutchev had to support Cuba because it was a necessary condition to allow the USSR to keep going. It was Krutchev who fought for Cuba in 1960 and it shows that something had already changed in the Soviet Union after Stalin. Then, only four years after the Cuban incident, Krutchev himself was thrown out. This means we are dealing with a process of swift ascent in the construction of the Workers States which is laying the foundations for the elimination of bureaucracy altogether.

In the USSR, there is a whole apparatus coming from Stalin's time. Krutchev reinforced it. It is a whole structure that ranges from the factory leaders all the way to top ministers, and it is costly to put it right because you have to reach the higher inner circles. In spite of this, the political function the USSR plays, no longer gives any scope for the most selfish type of bureaucracy that existed at one time. Today, the bureaucracy has to unite its own future to that of Socialism. This shows how confined and circumscribed the bureaucracy really is. The bureaucracy is not at liberty to do what it likes and this means that it has to take into account the Socialist future of humanity and not just of its own scientific, cultural and

political limitations. The bureaucracy can no longer have the same structure or goals it had under Krutchev even. The apparatus continues to live with its parochial mentality, the narrow vision of those who have never seen the world, who do not know anything beyond their area, their neighbourhood, and do not want to know either. But the leading apparatus is forced to organise itself on the basis of the need to continue to exist, in conditions of the development of Socialism in the world. This is what instils in these people a feeling of confidence in the goal of Communism, and in the objective conditions created by Communism. Sensing this ambiguity of interests in these layers, imperialism keeps trying to corrupt them, to buy them off, to stimulate their private interests.

The world process is ripe for continuous progress and for the Workers States to go on progressing, influencing the capitalist countries, and disrupting the stages that go to war. To do all this and be influential at the same time, the Workers states need a policy free of lies and inconsistencies. It is the bureaucratic apparatus that put difficulties in the way or sabotages policies; this is precisely why the Soviet leadership has to continuously remove people who are corrupt. The very top of the bureaucratic apparatus of the USSR depends on the world extension of the Soviet Union in order to live on. Stalin used to cling to the coat-tails of the USSR and hide under them, but at a given moment, even he had to adopt the policy of the Left Opposition which had systematically opposed all what he had done. Trotsky posed that planning of industrial production had to be part and parcel of agrarian planning and Stalin had to come round to accept this, even though he never admitted that it was Trotsky's programme.

In Poland, just as in all the workers States now, there is a whole process of confrontation against the capitalist system. Far from being motivated by an economic or political competition with it, it is the final settlements of accounts that move all this. The bureaucracy for its own sake needs to be able count on secure people, managers, and solid members from within the Party structure. It needs all the security there is and so it has to expel the corrupt sectors, because when confronting imperialism it cannot rely on weaklings, people who inspire doubt and a policy of conciliation. If the Workers State allowed this, it would surrender or yield advantages to imperialism. This also goes to show how mature the process is, when it forces the bureaucracy to start defending Communist principles, if only to keep going as a bureaucracy! Today, the leaderships of the Workers States have to defend their States, and to defend their extension in the world. This goes counter to their bureaucratic formation and habits.

The Poles are preoccupied in making changes in the communist Party, but there is a lack of programmatic political life. As this will have to come at some stage, they will have to make further alterations. As yet, they have not allowed the agricultural workers, for instance, to say anything. The workers who labour on private land have no voice but the proprietors themselves complain that their own sons and daughters have gone to the city and joined the Communist Party! In Poland, all this process is quite so but it is happening. One of the essential problems to put an end to in Poland is private property in the countryside. There is this problem in the USSR too with the Kolkhoz, but they are modifying the Kolkhozes, and getting rid of them. Now, there is only half of the original 360.000 of them remaining. There is a better focus and increase of production that way. It also diminishes the weight of the Kolkhozian social power. Similarly, the Sovkhoses have been concentrated. The new Soviet Constitution says that the "Trade Unions have the right to function and participate together with the workers in the Sovkhoses and the Kolkhozes". This means that the Soviet Constitution, approved in 1967, has introduced changes in the USSR 'a la polonaise', by letting the masses have more say against the privileged Kolkhozians. These are solutions that need thoroughly to be extended, but soon you will see reports of this taking place in Hungary and Yugoslavia.

In Yugoslavia, they have all these problems compounded with the problems arising from nationalities and nationalism, which is the worst thing of all.

It is important to see that in his speeches, Brezhnev always refers to the "trade unionisation of the Kolkhozes". This is a definite blow against the higher spheres of the Kolkhozes where you find very privilege layers indeed.

The liquidation of Stalin was characterised by the old IV International leadership and Pablo, as a process of "thawing". But this wasn't a well founded or representative characterisation, because the going of Stalin did not remove the layer of bureaucracy and big apparatus that he had constructed. That layer could not be removed because it was based on other sectors that needed to be removed first. So, what appeared on the surface as liberation was in fact a huge inter-bureaucratic fight. The sector that wanted to advance represented the Socialist interest of the Workers State better than others. But Krutchev wanted to keep it subjected. He did so via an agreement with the Yankees, and it is then that the world heard his phrase: "That will be the day when we have as good maize as the Yankees".

However, to live and sustain itself, the soviet Union has to progress, and if not, it dies. This is the first and essential step. To exist, the Workers State has to measure up against the capitalist system, and to measure up to it, it has to impel the revolutionary struggle in the world, to increase its own social weight and its own social qualities. As all this finds its expression, the Workers state expands. This in turn increases the internal social quality of the Workers State. By this, we mean that it improves social relations internally, increases socialist relations and becomes more prepared for the final settlements of accounts. This is well on the way now. The final settlement of accounts in that sense has already started! It is like a lift that is going up and has not reached the highest floor yet.

The Workers State necessitates, at the same time, a world relation with the progress of history represented by the struggles in the world, the social conquests of the masses of the world, and this also means social transformations. All these things are totally inseparable from the necessity of the Workers State to breathe, necessity shared by the bureaucracy not because the breathing of the bureaucracy represents that of the Workers State but because - in a general historic sense - it represents the need for expansion of the Workers State, which cannot remain motionless. It has to expand and in order to do so; it has to impel the world revolution and prepare for the final settlement of accounts. This is a logical conclusion, almost a mathematical one. It is not Einsteinist but Leninist... It is a mathematical conclusion without which the Workers State would have been engulfed.

Capitalism has little notion of the precise situation we are depicting because it has neither means nor ability to generate the consciousness and capacity to see this. What capitalism hasn't got, in the end, is historic right, so it cannot think objectively. It cannot say: "What a brute I am, I should pack up and go". It cannot eliminate itself and so, it has to keep going and seek the ways to survive. All it does now is this: survive.

The greatest imperialism in the world, the Yankee, can no longer guarantee to any capitalist country or anyone else that they will not fall prey to the Communists. This lack of guarantee stems from the fact that it no longer has the historic strength to do so - not even inside its own system - because all its contradictions prevent it from doing anything about it. Capitalist contradictions are not about conflicting and competitive interests, or competition between different capitalist countries. They are about the fact that capitalism has to depend on investments, on buying and selling with the Workers States in order to

survive, whilst the masses of the capitalist countries support the Workers State. All this is in the nature of an antithesis: capitalism lives a stage of antagonisms expressed in the form of contradictions. The problem for capitalism is that it is no longer the sole and unique system in the world, because there is the USSR and the workers of each country, who are opposed to capitalism. There is the disastrous economic situation of the capitalist system, and the need for science, culture and art to progress. It is like air: you can compress it in some container, but as soon as you make an opening, it expands again... The Workers State is not quite like that - but the Workers State needs to expand, and it does.

Capitalism cannot expand anymore. The capitalists who try to expand nowadays are told by other capitalists to 'get out'.

It is the Soviets who have the capacity to say: "Here I am, and here I stay". The result is that the contradictions inside capitalism increase instead of reducing, while the antagonism between capitalism and the Workers States keeps growing.

Capitalism wants to stop the chariot of history by imposing itself on the Workers states. As it cannot do that, it has to keep going - in agony.

You will see the day when the White House will have changed its name to 'Mad House', and anyone entering as president will end up insane.

**J. Posadas**

*29<sup>th</sup> March 1981*

# ONCE AGAIN ON THE AGRARIAN PROBLEM

**J. Posadas**

*18<sup>th</sup> April 1981*

The peasant-owner association represents a specific layer of people engaged in production, even if they call it a Trade Union. Even so, it has accepted the socialist nature of the State in order to be officially recognised. This association has agreed to comply with the State, and with the Party that leads the State. This is something that it previously opposed. It is a big defeat for Kuron and the likes of him who wanted to make it appear that the process in Poland is all a reverse for the leadership of the Communist Party. However, it turns out to be just the opposite: Kuron has been defeated instead, because he and his kind reject the leading role of the Communist Party in the construction of Socialism.

The fact that this 'Agricultural Trade Union' discusses the character of the country, and who leads it, is of great importance. This too is a defeat for those who wanted the 'independence of the Trade Unions', meaning by this a way not to trouble about the country and who leads it. They wanted to institute 'self-management' as they call it, which means for them a small step away from 'management' pure and simple - and for the self. This is a complete failure for all those who wanted this.

In an economically backward and socially poor country, the most advanced cultural, scientific and social influences tend to express themselves more rapidly. Poland is no exception, where the scientific and economic advances express themselves socially. Poland has gone from the most brutal state of backwardness to making the peasant-owners recognise and accept the 'Socialist State'. Far from opposing the State, the peasant-owners continue to support it and accept its authority.

In Poland, the forms that unfurl the process are varied. They are very unequal, but the process is vigorous. It is not a catastrophic situation like its enemies pretend, as they speak of chaos to blame the economic system. Should elements of catastrophe exist, they don't come from the economic system but from the social relations. This may be coming from a situation that questions whether one retreats, or continues forward. Not much of a catastrophe this. In the economy, there is always the option to refuse to service the foreign debt or to change the currency. The problem is that the Polish Workers State is a new society with very little guidance in how to build socialism. There are no norms around. The USSR itself is

not socialism. It is only a Workers State. It gets called 'Socialism' or 'Socialist State', for short, but it is only a Workers State. Socialism is a form of society - it is not a State. The term 'Workers State' accounts for a social form which is still based on bourgeois foundations or relations - bourgeois or capitalist - with structures and relations of private property up to and including private property.

In the Workers State, the social relations are still based on elements of private property and relations. Proof is the continuation of distribution through the wage. In this unequal situation, wage distribution adds yet more inequality. Economic inequality generates social injustice, and this gets expressed all the way up, as into the Judiciary for instance.

The Polish peasants are not workers, they are not waged: they are mostly masters and owners who have had to accept socialism. Their property is not very large because only about 20% are large holdings; the bulk of Polish agriculture is made of small plots. This inevitably leads to the need to concentrate. A single unit of 20 plots (themselves of 5 to 10 hectares) can easily triple production. Diversification becomes easy. The human effort gets enormously reduced and quick changes can be made to what is grown. The result is more foresight, more planning and more produce for the same effort. The waged workers who get hired on larger tracts of land can easily become involved in their running. The Polish Workers State has inherited the problem of the small plot, and the latter has its roots in the distant and not so distant past. Not so distant is the epoch of Stalin. It is true that new problems came up since Stalin, but the small plot harks back to the time of formation of the Workers State, when Stalin was making the decisions.

We live in a new stage now. Elevated conditions have appeared to give Poland the ability to improve its internal relations, to become a more fully developed Workers State. At every step towards deeper socialist measures, Poland becomes more of a Workers State. In so doing, the Workers state incorporates its own advances into a process of Permanent Revolution that proceeds in leaps.

I will return to explain this. This is an incredibly rich process. We are now totally engaged in a new stage of history. No one apart from ourselves has analysed this and it is part of our function in History.

**J. Posadas** - *18<sup>th</sup> April 1981*

Editor's note, J Posadas was going to die of heart failure on 25 May 1981.