

WAR PREPARATIONS AND THE ROLE OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

J. Posadas

22.3.1981

War is a consequence of the development of capitalist society. War does not come from arms production. In the matter of its causes, the part played by arms production is secondary because it is capitalism, itself, that needs war.

The great 'splendour' of the capitalist world has ended. There is a retreat, whilst the revolutionary process in Africa, Asia and Latin America advances uninterruptedly, irrepressibly. Countries that possess the least of everything come out with the greatest determination to progress. Wars are everywhere, but victorious wars defeat capitalist oppression and make the economy serve the populations. In those countries, private property used to prevail. Now they seek State ownership and the development of their economies through the State.

Many countries that used to be economically backward are now freeing themselves in this way. Although their populations continue to live in backward economies, they leap rapidly ahead in the cultural field. People hardly eat, or eat hardly any more than before, but they learn how to progress by observing how it is being made in the rest of the world.

War is a consequence of the system of private property. It is private property that leads to the crises that capitalism used to resolve by means of inter-capitalist wars. Now that there are Workers States, their influence has turned war into a system-against-system confrontation.

The wars of 1870-71, 1914 and 1939 were inter-capitalist wars. They were accompanied by occupations – as when German zones passed over to France and similar things happened in Belgium. There were no Workers States in 1870 and 1914, and war was clearly due to the inner contradictions of capitalism. Capitalism makes war when there is much more production than consumption and the markets do not exist to soak up the excess. War is inherent to capitalist production, to its system of production.

As they compete, the capitalists eliminate each other through war or by creating huge international trusts. Although Germany, Britain and the US have major consortiums in common, they still confront each other because competition persists between the capitalist countries.

There is no doubt that for capitalism, arms production and war preparations are vital necessities. Capitalism uses them both to compete against each other and put down the masses as well. In the war of 1870 between France and Germany, the French bourgeoisie let the Prussians troops enter France to help liquidate the Paris Commune.

War is not down to ill-will or bad people. This exists, but it does not decide. What determines war is the logic of production in the private property regime. Capitalism never stops making war. War is its life. This explains why war is never really an accident, or due to crises getting out of hands. War is the simple logic of the capitalist system. This is also why, of course, it is preparing for war once again.

Besides the big wars, there have always been 'small' big wars. In the name of world capitalism, US imperialism intervened in Indonesia¹ to stop the Social-Democratic government of Sukarno taking progressive measures. First the US helped Dutch imperialism get rid of Sukarno, and then it got rid of Dutch imperialism itself. With that one war, the US stopped both Sukarno and its main competitor in the area; a small participation was granted to the Dutch afterwards, in case of uprisings. Here you have one example of capitalist war.

Another example is the war of Yankee imperialism against Cuba. Cuba was under Spanish domination until 1898, the year when Spain had to concede independence. The Yankees moved in, and replaced Spain. The Cuban masses went on struggling against Yankee imperialism which appropriated half of the island.

This is how the province of Guantanamo is still under US imperialist domination today. Here you have a sample of the most brutal, assassin and criminal means that capitalism uses to stop the world masses making objective progress.

It is for general war that the Yankee imperialists keep a military presence in Guantanamo. The base itself is of no economic value to them, and its military importance is limited. One atomic bomb and out with the Yankees in Guantanamo. They know this of course, but they don't go away. Leaving would be too much of an admission of weakness; it would stimulate revolution in all the Latin American countries. The role of the US in Guantanamo is to keep an eye on the Latin American countries; the military strategic advantage is small, but it is useful to exert pressure

against Cuba and ship arms around. Militarily, Guantanamo is of little historic value to the US: when the atomic confrontation starts, one atomic bomb will suffice to wipe it out.

Strategic places like Guantanamo used to be important, but this is no longer so. Broadly speaking, this applies to the all the navies as well, their remaining role being for general transport and the ferrying of atomic weapons. Although aviation retains an importance, it has also declined in importance. For most important today, and indeed determinant, is the relationship between the populations on a one hand, and the armies that enter their countries on the other. This relationship has become more decisive than all the warships and the warplanes. The Soviets know that they can count on the welcome of the populations. In war, the Soviets will receive bread and water; the Yankees will receive bullets and buckets of shit.

The capitalists make war when inter-capitalist competition fails to resolve their rivalries. Now that they face Workers States, they dare not throw themselves at each other as in the past. This leads them to impose on each other the most devastating levels of economic and commercial dismemberment, without using weapons. They prepare for war on the Workers States meanwhile, hoping that this will stop the progress of history.

War is inherent to capitalism, not to the Workers State

Whilst war is integrally part of capitalism, this is not true of the Workers States. The invasion of Vietnam² by China does not amount to a Workers State making war on another.

The invasion of Vietnam is orchestrated by a counter-revolutionary camarilla³ in China. This is why the latter was not able to send many soldiers, its invasion was half-hearted and its retreat was made in haste⁴.

The Chinese leaders boasted of having “taught Vietnam a lesson”, but they had nothing to teach, and were themselves taught a lesson: the war on Vietnam was stimulating internal rebellion in China. Had this not been so, they would not have withdrawn so fast.

The Chinese leadership sent troops against Vietnam, but it became scared of the internal opposition this was stimulating in China. These Chinese leaders wanted to avoid above all a Soviet intervention that might start supporting the opposition in China, encouraging it, helping it to grow! The Yankees understood this. They told China to get out.

The crisis of capitalism is evident in production, finance, capital accumulation and capital exports, but it is also expressed in the ever increasing concentration of multinational capital. Marx and Kautsky described the inevitable war of capitalism decades in advance. They saw that war was not due to bad capitalists, although they are bad, but to the capitalist system. The Workers States do not need war. They are not governed by capital. The war of China against Vietnam was the deed of a counter-revolutionary camarilla in China, not of the Chinese Workers State.

Yugoslavia had many conflicts with the USSR's leadership but the USSR never invaded it. We are told that imperialism gave guarantees of protection to Yugoslavia, but the reason why the USSR never invaded Yugoslavia is that the USSR's Workers State structure was opposed to it.

During the Second World War, the US and Britain gave guarantees to Hitler should he wish to invade the USSR. Churchill secretly proposed to let the Germans invade the USSR, to crush both exhausted sides afterwards. The US rejected this, seeing the folly of the US and Britain drawing against them the united anger the European working class.

This example shows well how the capitalists must combine their internal contradictions with their antagonism towards the Workers States.

The Workers State has no need of war. When it develops a leadership with counter-revolutionary and bellicose traits – as in China – its aggression does not come from the Workers State but from its counter-revolutionary leadership. This happened under Stalin when he assassinated the entire Bolshevik leadership. That action was not needed by the structure of the Workers State but by its assassin leadership that had usurped the power of the working class.

To live and make progress, the Workers State needs the reverse of war. Indeed it cannot develop without logical relations prevailing in the population. Capitalism needs war because its system is based on profit-making, but the Workers State has no base in profit-making. To exist at all, the Workers State must not only develop production⁵, but science and culture as well. This is what the USSR instituted. This is why its progress in the scientific and cultural fields has been immense from the start, as well as in the economy.

Production for need creates superior social structures

Inversely to what happens in capitalism, the Workers States do not develop through the war of each against everyone. The Workers States do not need competition. The ultimate and logical necessity that unifies them is their comparable economies and social relations, their scientific discoveries and their cultural attainments. This is hindered by the limitations of leadership, but the progress of the Workers States has been immense since 1945. It ended unemployment and hunger.

The Workers State can only continue on the foundations left by the capitalist regime. The Workers State is on the way to create its own foundations, but this needs time. As it embarks upon the socialist road, it must start from where capitalism left off, in the economy, technology and social structures.

The Workers State makes improvements in social matters because these depend on political leadership, but its material base is pre-determined by inherited capitalist technologies. The Workers State is perfectly capable of surpassing those technologies, but it can only do it by creating more elevated social relations.

The way the Workers State creates more elevated social relations is by making the economy produce for human need. The more it does this, the more it leaves behind the social models it inherited from the capitalist system.

Capitalism cannot exist without making profits, but the Workers State cannot exist without making social development. The challenge is to leave behind the economic and social structures of the capitalist system.

The USSR has had only 60 years to learn how to surpass capitalism; this is short, particularly if you consider that it had to co-exist with capitalism throughout, i.e. dedicate some 50% of its resources to war instead of development. Had capitalism been liquidated 60 years ago, the ability of production to satisfy human need today would be overwhelming.

Capitalism started developing its technologies way back in feudalism, but the Workers States must start from the technologies of capitalism. The USSR had to develop in hardly any time at all. More, it had to do so under assassin leaderships and bureaucracies like those of Stalin and Khrushchev. These curtailed development, and sometimes even prevented it.

Khrushchev did his best to stop the development of China, amongst other things. He took China's side against capitalism, but he did not want it to develop and become a competitor. It was not China's economic or commercial development that he feared, but the competition of China's social development. For China had become a world revolutionary focus in the world, well able to exert a strong influence back in the USSR.

If the Workers States do not make more headway today, it is for lack of the necessary leaderships. The USSR is the second most important country in the world, and in many aspects it is the first. It is superior to capitalist Germany in the technological and industrial fields.

The latest USSR's achievements in space travel are outstanding. Its training of the Soyuz' cosmonauts points to a high-grade industrial capacity; the latter does not focus on the production of consumer goods because it focuses on the production of goods that edify intelligence. In due time, this type of production will eliminate the other.

The way to finish with war is to finish with the capitalist system

Capitalism has had hundreds of years to develop, and its scientific structures started way back in the feudal regime. The Workers States, on the other hand, have had to do everything at once and very fast. This does not stop the USSR making a huge contribution to all kinds of endeavours useful to human development, like Space travel. In so doing, it beams confidence to the world. It reinforces the knowledge, and the certainty, that life on Earth will have to link up with the Cosmos in order to continue.

The necessity that forced the Workers States to live alongside the capitalist system kept the road to their full development blocked. They had no choice but to create the new leadership of history in such conditions. And what is more, to do it immediately after periods like those of Stalin and the 1939-45 war that destroyed half the world!

Capitalism is war, Socialism is peace. This is not a phrase, a maxim or a slogan. It is a logical conclusion. Capitalism generates war because it needs war in order to live. It is a fact that the Workers State needs peace in order to live. The

leaderships of the Workers States do not proclaim this truth. They deaden this truth, but they cannot invalidate it. One proof of this is that China had to quit Vietnam, and another is that Vietnam did not seize the occasion to butcher the invading Chinese or retaliate against Chinese populations.

There was nothing to stop the Vietnamese sending planes to bomb in China, but they simply let the Chinese leave. They had no wish to attack China. Some of this reality lurks also behind the way the Chinese retreated, because in no way can the Chinese Workers State have the same criminal motives as imperialism. The Chinese leadership backed down for fear of a Soviet intervention, or rather, for fear of a Chinese internal opposition where the Soviet Union might start to play a role.

To assess the present state of capitalism, it is enough to look at capitalist Germany. The right to a job is one of the greatest conquests of humanity. Even in capitalism, a job is considered a right before being an obligation. Capitalism must provide work. This has been accompanied by other rights, like the right to vote, to be elected, to be protected by the law and to be involved in the leadership of society. Germany however has two and a half million workers with no political rights, not even at municipal level. These foreign workers have no rights, and their children born and living in Germany do not automatically qualify for citizenship. Such is the capitalist system. There is nothing comparable in the Workers States.

The Workers States had only a few years to get started

Private property is thousands of years old. It sprouted one system after another, but its property regime remained unchanged, from one system to the other – from slavery to feudalism, from feudalism to capitalism. It was only the system of production that changed. As capitalism pulled away from feudalism, it stood for ‘the right to universal suffrage’. Why then are the foreign workers still not allowed to vote in capitalist Germany? Two and a half million workers without the right to vote, and why shouldn’t their children vote?

The Workers States are the representation of a superior society. Their leaderships may not be fair, or up to the task, but they still represent the necessity of the Workers State. As leaderships, they may not have the necessary capacity and policies, but one must not forget that this is the first time the working class has attempted to lead society.

The USSR showcases the security that has accompanied the first attempt at building Socialism. The Soviet masses had to put up with Stalin and Hitler, and when Hitler got to power, world capitalism stimulated him against the USSR. The idea was to exhaust the USSR and Hitler, by making them confront each other. Capitalism thought the Soviet workers would rise against Stalin, but the Soviet workers reasoned: “First we will deal with Hitler, and then we will settle with Stalin”. This reasoning came from a confidence that can only be conferred by a Workers State. And this is why Hitler lost in the end. It is not the intervention of the United States that defeated Hitler.

It is the working class of the Soviet Union that defeated Hitler. In this, it was supported by the masses of the world that made a strong defence of the USSR against Nazism⁶. In the USSR, Stalin was subsequently shown the door, and history went on progressing.

Production for need is required – not ‘democratic liberties’

The Soviet Union became what it is today (1981) in spite of having started from nothing. This could only happen because it was creating a superior society: State ownership, planned production, the development of science and culture, and a powerful rise in the political level of society.

The USSR is not contradictory. It is a society that learns to lead itself. Since its inception, it made uninterrupted progress. You cannot say the same of Germany where two and a half million workers still have no political rights, on top of all the unemployment, housing shortage and rise in living costs. You cannot have democratic rights in that situation. So much for capitalist Germany’s constant bragging about ‘liberty’.

‘Democratic liberty’ is not a cornerstone in the USSR. Its cornerstone is State-owned property, economic planning and support for all the anti-capitalist struggles in the world. Soviet society rests upon these principles, and for these principles to shine as brightly as they should, Soviet democracy is also necessary. This is the role of Soviet democracy.

After the Second World War, capitalist Germany did not develop through a capacity of its own. World imperialism poured millions upon millions of dollars into it, to make it a showroom against the Workers States. This is the main

reason why Germany developed as it did. It did not have the force to do it by itself. The Marshall Plan financed its transformation into a bastion to block the advance of the Workers States.

Today, Germany is an occupied country. The British, the French and the US are occupying it. Germany depends on French and British imperialism, and US imperialism above all. It has no democratic rights or military capabilities of its own.

Capitalist Germany is a subjected country, forced to keep the Workers States down, and its own independent economic development as well. Had it been allowed this independent development, it would have made another war by now.

The elimination of the capitalist system is the answer of course. This is the way to put an end to hunger, war, unemployment, the exploitation of the migrant workers, and that of the workers in every country. The way to finish with war is to finish with the capitalist system.

J. Posadas, 22.3.1981