

J POSADAS

April 1966

In this stage, any nationalist movement has to expand, rise up and look deeper into its purpose, regardless of the degree of its initial revolutionary inclination or commitment. Any nationalist movement quickly by-passes whatever capitalist hopes it might have entertained at the start. This happens practically every time, even when the movement does not succeed. It happens even in the cases where - unlike Fidel Castro's movement in Cuba - it fails to take power.

Let us assume that a revolutionary leadership arose in Brazil with nationalist support or predominance. If the nationalist revolution were to start there, at whichever limited point of departure, the question of the workers state would rapidly be posed. The need to adopt socialist revolutionary measures would spring up, compelling and imperative, even before victory - even before capitalism was overthrown or expelled.

In the Congo or in Angola, the revolutionaries have adopted measures of a socialist type on the march, even though they do not call them socialist. In the Congo, Mulele's programme does not propose socialist measures: it makes references to the socialist revolution, but its economic and social points of programme are not socialist. They correspond to the programme of the bourgeois revolution. This does not prevent the Congolese revolutionaries from resorting to measures of the socialist revolution as they get on with the armed struggle.

Any such movement, providing it is healthy and growing, has to resort to the economic and social measures of the socialist revolution. It has to do this, if only to stabilise itself and acquire a sufficient social authority. In the last period, nationalist revolutions regularly announce measures of statification and of land redistribution. Today, not a single nationalist revolution is able to continue on the basis of a pure nationalist programme. Nationalist revolutions turn into socialist ones.

When a nationalist movement is in full swing, it inevitably attracts the masses. So, on assessing such a movement, one cannot be detained by what it says or by the programme it claims. It is a movement of changes: as soon as the masses enter it, immediate differentiations arise, precipitating a leadership crisis. The result is the adoption of socialist measures.

This is a phenomenon specific to this stage of history; and it goes on increasing. Any revolution with a nationalist thrust is inevitably led to preserve the support of the masses. It has to do this if only to continue as a movement. At a given point, the masses press ahead. They rise in order to obtain their socialist goals. In the face of this, and if only to keep going, the nationalist revolutionary movement starts nationalising the economy.

We do not speak here about 'State Coups' such as those that are brewing in Argentina or Brazil. A nationalist revolution is not a 'State Coup'. It is a movement that attracts the masses and proposes to change society.

We must get ready to intervene in this important process of the nationalist revolution. From its very start, we must bring up conclusions conducive to the development of the revolutionary forces within it. The fact these do exist at the beginning of the nationalist movement is revealed by its refusal to be guided by the Soviet leadership's idea of the 'pacific coexistence'.

The leaders of the Chinese workers state, on the other hand, are impelling the colonial revolution in the world. We must support and encourage them wholeheartedly. The firm declarations of various Chinese Generals against Yankee imperialism have a big influence over the world revolution, giving it all the more force and confidence. In turn, this lends extra weight to the resistance of the heroic Vietnamese people whose struggle inspires and orientates the world revolution. Speak of courage, of true forcefulness, of pure determination; speak of the human historic capacity to overcome – and you speak of the Vietcong!

We foresee that any nationalist revolution in its rising phase will inevitably tend to the socialist struggle; and that its economic measures will be of a socialist type. If this conclusion is not entirely new, we must expect it to apply to all the revolutionary movements now. We had already observed before that revolutions starting as nationalist were ending up with programmes of the socialist revolution – but that was when they were taking power. Now, we observe this before the taking of power. Nationalist revolutionary movements tend towards measures of a socialist character – on the march and in the course of their struggles: Peru, Guatemala and Santo Domingo are examples. This is becoming general.

Conversely, the Congolese revolution which did not undergo such a transformation, keeps finding for ever more obstacles in its way. This happens a lot in Africa. If it has not happened in Kabylia (Algeria), it is because before the nationalist struggle started, there were already forms of state control and organisation. There were communes of some kind and cooperatives. There were types of collectives alongside small property holdings. Though these were a tenuous and tentative start, it was enough to help the trend becoming generalised.

We must intervene with this foresight in mind. In practice, it means that we must provide from the start of a movement, the slogans and the ideas best suited to the socialist objectives. At the beginning of their implementation, even average steps taken in that direction have an immense effect. They shorten the stages towards power, they weaken enemy forces and stop them reorganising. Such measures increase the struggle of the masses in the world, and in the capitalist countries particularly. When the nationalist revolution starts statifications (state control) and other socialist measures, this exercises an irresistible power over the masses both internally and in the world. If it is perfectly possible to do this, it is because the masses of the world are certain capitalism must be overthrown. The organisation of their will is squarely based on that knowledge: today, every strike is a challenge to capitalist power.

Vietnam is the most elevated expression of human heroism. There has never been anything superior. We reiterate what we have said in every one of our articles on Vietnam. This struggle is the most elevated expression of the human capacity to resist a military power infinitely superior. The compelling force of Vietnam does not just reside in the courage of its masses or in their unflagging determination; it resides essentially in their political certainty that victory will be theirs'. They know China is by their side, with power enough to keep imperialism at bay. Without

the presence of China, imperialism would prevail. Indeed, it is thanks to the Chinese that imperialism faces defeat in Vietnam. The Soviet leadership tried to make Vietnam conciliate with the US through negotiations and the like - and it failed. If it failed, it is also because the Chinese intervened.

In 1963, we already said: "Vietnam will be Khrushchev's undoing". Indeed: the Soviet bureaucracy tried to conciliate (over Vietnam) but to no avail. What was this but an objective united front of the Soviet bureaucracy with imperialism? As a matter of fact, neither imperialism nor the Vietnamese masses could yield, and this front was defeated because the masses of the world took Vietnam's side. They supported Vietnam with the view that it should win. The resistance of the Indochinese masses not only inspired the masses of the world, they communicated to them the certainty of victory. In this, you can see most clearly underlined the immense weakness of world capitalism; and conversely, you can see the formidable power of the masses of the world that nothing at all will stop from triumphing in the end.

To return to the point we raised about the Soviet bureaucracy. Khrushchev first, then Brezhnev, and then Kosygin – all tried to sell Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh. But this failed. The crisis that simmers now inside the Soviet administrative apparatus is also fuelled by the fact that the Soviet workers state could not possibly support, or even desire, an imperialist invasion of North Vietnam, or of China! This explains the warnings sent by some Soviet marshals around this question. The resistance inside the USSR is such that when Shelepine (First minister of the USSR) went to North Vietnam to advise it to start negotiating with the US, the USSR did not stop delivering arms to Vietnam. And then, the majority of the Vietnamese masses, the North Vietnamese Communist Party and the Vietcong – replied with a resounding: 'Yankees Out!' Not only the masses remained unflinching before the terrorism of imperialism and its nuclear weapons, but they stepped up the fight and made a big show of marching on.

The Vietnamese masses have an immense effect on those of the world: on those of Santo Domingo for instance. A glance at the map and you see Vietnam and Santo Domingo, two puny countries, central to the world revolution! If the Yankees are so very powerful, why don't they wipe them out from the face of the earth? They are certainly not short of the atomic might required! But this is it: war is not just a matter of weapons; it is also a matter of public opinion, a matter of the North American people's opinion. If Yankee imperialism could count on the consent of the North American people, it would have wiped out Santo Domingo long ago. If it was not in dread of mighty difficulties within, imperialism would launch nuclear war this minute and not later. It has realised, however, that its invasion of Santo Domingo was costly enough in terms of its loss of authority.

Meanwhile, the North American people are opening up to the world revolution. There is no end of opposition to the Vietnam War in the US – with transport strikes, students' and car worker unions' resolutions, and the like. The number of opponents to the Vietnam War is each day more staggering among the workers, the students, the teaching professions and the petty bourgeoisie; and among the Black people of the US.

If the Black people in the US have not yet come out to say so, it is because the petty bourgeoisie amongst them is not keen to collide with imperialism. It could easily do it and join

the White proletariat and poor petty bourgeoisie against the Vietnam War, if it chose. If all these sectors were united under the banner: 'Down with the Vietnam War', they would achieve at once a United Front that would hold together the poor White petty bourgeoisie and all the working class. Then, who would still come along and talk of white and black skin, eh? But there is a problem. The Black petty bourgeoisie does not wish to oppose imperialism; it demands Civil Rights in a manner that fears to arouse the class struggle. Ultimately, it only seeks to gain a share of national recognition and income for itself, as a petty bourgeoisie.

In the case of the masses, it is different. They want to be heard through the class struggle. The Black masses who intervene in Civil Rights have an interest distinct from that of their petty bourgeois leaderships. The Black masses have not yet come onto the stage. In the class struggle, they have not yet let their strength of twenty millions people be seen and heard. Unlike their leaderships, they are not after abstract democratic rights. Behind the Civil Rights campaigns, they know there is the class struggle. If they remain comparatively motionless now, it is because their class brothers, the White workers, have not yet started moving. When the latter join the struggle, the Black workers will show that between the class struggle and the fight for Civil Rights, there is no difference.

The Civil Rights movement is part of the class struggle, for sure, but it is not its most elevated aspect. Black people are mostly exploited workers; when they enter the struggle, they will see fully that their plight does not stem from being Black but from being proletarians. They are bound to feel it already, because they live it. There is such an influence of world revolution in the US that the Black petty bourgeoisie tries to keep the Black workers at arms length. Hence, you see only small mobilisations as around Pittsburgh. The Black workers are a great part of the twenty millions and, in some areas, they are the crushing majority. Their understanding of the situation goes very much beyond that of the all the White and Black petty bourgeoisie put together. The Black workers are not impressed by the petty bourgeois leaderships, even when the latter are rather more active than the White workers. As far as the Black workers are concerned, they are aware it is a class question.

The onwards process from the nationalist revolution to the workers state is moved by two factors: the first is the world revolution and corresponding pressure on various leaderships. The second is the nationalist bourgeoisie itself, because it is every day more certain that it will fail if it remains a part of the world capitalist market.

Take Argentina: there are rumours of 'Nasserite' movements in the Argentine army. This means that the matter of nationalisations is being raised. We know that Guglielmelli and other Argentine generals believe that steel production – key to the economy – should be under state ownership. This comes from the army, and more than this, from the upper echelons. Guglielmelli, the Director to the Superior Military School said recently that 'private property must not be the main spring of the economy'.

In Brazil, same thing: in the coming period, it is likely that military teams will come forward; young officers perhaps, stimulated by the world revolution and determined to get on with nationalisations. In that country rebellion or civil war are always latent. A small spark may be enough. There is an increasing climate of civil war in Brazil. Castelo Branco tries to apply the

brakes: he tells the army to make concessions lest it should lose control in a civil war situation.

In Bolivia, there are also signs of civil war that could come in short delays. In Chile, Frei's (first minister, christian democratic) declarations are clear: 'Either we get on with agrarian reform and some state control over copper production for a better standard of living, or there will be revolution'. In Peru, even with all the anti-guerrilla repression and the killing of their leaders – like De la Puente and Lobaton – even then, government crisis goes on and reforms are increasingly being conceded in order to contain the revolution.

Nowhere – from Asia to Africa – has capitalism been able to stabilise its hold on power. The world crisis of imperialism deepens and it is Vietnam and Santo Domingo that beat imperialism up! In spite of its huge economic and military arsenal, world capitalism is made to retreat. Its economic and military power is undeniable, but its ability to contain the masses keeps decreasing and its social authority is constantly plummeting. Meanwhile, what is growing is the influence of the colonial revolution.

In the colonial and semi colonial countries of Africa and Latin America, there is a galloping capitalist crisis. The masses, arms in hand, are each day more determined to intervene. In this process, the field of intervention of capitalism is diminished. What are the possibilities for the development of bourgeoisies in all these countries? Let us look at Algeria as a clear illustration. When Boumedienne took power with a 'coup' in Algeria, he intended to make sure the Algerian revolution should not stray too far from capitalism; but now, it is him who goes to the USSR in the search of support against the Yankees. Fidel Castro who had called Boumedienne a 'fascist' and Bouteflika 'a fascist agent' will now have to rethink this over. How comes the Soviet Union makes deals with this 'fascist'? How comes it deals with the government of this 'fascist'? How comes it does this - against the Chinese? All this begs explanations. Fidel Castro will have to tell us who is on the side of the truth right now; Castro had demanded that Boumedienne's actions should be debated in public before the Algerian people. Would it not be more to the point that Castro should let the Cuban masses discuss what happened to Guevara? And explain why he does not let the Trotskyists and the Chinese address the Cuban masses?

In Indonesia, a bourgeois nationalist wing has managed to make a 'State Coup', thanks to the weak policies of the Communist Party; and thanks also to the weak policies of the Chinese themselves. Four months on, however, and there is not the slightest step taken back to capitalism. The reactionary wing of the army with its links in the right-wing bourgeoisie, financial groups and large landowners, is still unable to crush the masses. Indeed, it is making concessions instead. This does not go without repression: this right-wing bourgeoisie assassinates routinely, and by the thousands, the communists and the revolutionaries. But the fact remains that the bourgeoisie is not managing to put forward the slightest scrap of conservative programme or policy. But who is stopping it? The masses are: and, as an indirect means of expression, they lend their three million votes to the Sukarno nationalist opposition which has an anti-imperialist outlook. And so it is demonstrated that there is no retreat, even in this case. The nationalist revolution takes on new forms, and keeps going.

In Algeria, Egypt and Syria, the revolution has not yet found economic and social forms but it has advanced generally in a political sense. In Egypt and Syria, several counter revolutionary

attempts have been made, but the counter revolution has failed.

The nationalist movements most tied to their purely bourgeois origin, see no economic or social achievement made in the world by rolling back the proletariat or socialist advance. There are no instances that could provide them with a justification for a similar policy in their own countries; one reason for this, is that they cannot compete with the power of the major capitalists; the other reason is that they cannot hold their own movement back; it keeps slipping away from their grasp, away from intermediate stages and away from their purely bourgeois origins. On it goes, towards new types of nationalist revolutions.

The colonial revolution in its strictest sense no longer exists. In the countries that had been colonies, the aims of the revolution have long since stopped being those of bourgeois democracy. They have turned to the socialist revolution. There is no democratic bourgeois revolution that can triumph now. A good illustration of this is given by the Congo where the Mobutu's regime, after having assassinated Lumumba, became steadily more decomposed as it kept enforcing the bourgeois democratic solution over a number of years.

We are in the habit of talking about the 'colonial revolution' but we mean to refer to the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa where revolutions started from nationalist movements and evolved towards the socialist revolution. Such revolutions are started by revolutionary nationalist teams that have a social support, and therefore, they have force and authority. But if these teams do not tackle quickly the task of the socialist revolution, they decline and decompose. This happened to Peronism in Argentina, to Brizolism in Brazil and to the MNR in Bolivia (Revolutionary Nationalist Movement). There is the positive example in reverse offered by the MR13 November in Guatemala, which started off amid a deal of disintegration for lack of programme; and which improved when a leading group started to hold fast to the ideas of the Trotskyist programme and permanent revolution. This example is limited, since this revolution has not yet triumphed.

The nationalist revolution cannot keep going indefinitely. This is because it starts bending towards the socialist revolution straight away from the start. There are bourgeois sectors within it coming from the beginning of the revolution, sectors that accompanied it and were impressed by the achievements of Vietnam and of Santo Domingo. But after a while, they start feeling intimidated and by-passed by the mobilisation of the masses. At that point, other tendencies come to the fore, those who think well of the mass mobilisations and who accept the role of revolutionary leadership. For them, the mobilisations of people are an encouragement.

This is why we say that it is necessary to pose that the nationalist movement, right from the start, must adopt socialist revolution measures and start functioning by means of socialist democracy as soon as possible. This is the way to give the revolution its full chance. The Chinese army provides the example: in the revolutionary army, there must be internal democracy and the elimination of ranks and grades; finding oneself in leadership through military capacity, must never confer an automatic right to political leadership. Military leadership must confer no social privilege whatever.

As this is done, the weight of bourgeois elements in the revolutionary leadership is lessened.

Take Brazil for instance. Goulart and Brizola were scared of going too far. Brizola was a capable person, but he was scared of being by-passed. He was always very much at a loss regarding political and ideological matters. His fear was not of a personal kind, as this is a man of great courage (he is still around today); but he does not have the political ideas required to give him the extra firmness and solidity he needs. So, he does not break out from the circle where he got into, in which socialist packages are bound together with bourgeois tape, so to say. He never did trust the masses - that was the problem; and this, even when the masses gave him ample proof of their ability to create and organise: indeed, they repeatedly demonstrated their ability to defeat every bourgeois wave of opposition against him; they also showed a tremendous determination to fight for the socialist revolution, in the teeth of both imperialism and capitalism.

Just now, Brizola's foremost task should be to organise a party around an anti-imperialist programme, proposing statification and agrarian reform. Sure, the bourgeoisie is not going to like it; but the masses will support. In the Brizolist movement, we propose that all the experiences made in Algeria and in Indonesia are discussed and learned. Nothing serious must be expected from the Goularts or Kubitscheks of this world. Same goes for the various bourgeois oppositionists.

As for Brazil, the recently constituted parliamentary opposition to Castelo Branco has only one thing in mind: to make a profit from the popular movements of resistance and hatred. It is trying to use the peasants' protests and the workers' strikes in order to advance itself for the greater defence of bourgeois interests. The bourgeoisie behind the back of Branco is not unduly worried by him. It realises that things cannot stay as they are. It feels that some sort of intermediate plane of conciliation should be found and that Branco may just be the man. In the end, even this conciliation will be useless, because in Brazil, there is no margin left for a bourgeois outcome to the crisis.

Right from the start of a nationalist movement, it must take measures to allow the democratic intervention of the masses, thus enabling them to exert their authority and power of decision. As regards the above-mentioned bourgeois leaders, they want to make revolution in the tops and without involving the masses.

Let us consider Brazil's case: there is a small Brazilian group in exile at the moment. If it does not decide to intervene soon, it will be swept aside and left behind by the masses inside Brazil. For, it is inside the country that matters of revolution are decided. It is true that it is easier to think from a place of exile, but it is in the country that revolution is made. In exile, one's thought tends to become more conservative and set in its way. Inside the country, programme, policy and ideology are sorted out, whilst far from the field, conservatism descends upon leaderships.

If it does not decide to intervene soon, this group will be left behind by the new emerging leaderships. So, it must intervene without delay with the relevant programme to mobilise the masses, proposing measures of expropriation and of land distribution. It must agitate on behalf of the right to have trade unions; and for the right to strike, to occupy factories and get wage rises. It is necessary to denounce, for instance, the responsibility of capitalism in the recent flood disasters which hit the poor people hardest, and not the rich.

People live in slums, because there is nowhere else for them to go to. These floods have instilled in people a strong anti capitalist feeling. The masses cannot formulate it directly but they are convinced that these catastrophes can be avoided. They see across the way from the slum area, the rich suburbs where the strong houses have resisted to the floods.

The masses see also what happens in Vietnam and in Santo Domingo. The Vietnamese people have even less weapons than they have in Brazil. And yet, not only are they rising up in the defence of their rights but they are winning! In Vietnam, children of ten years of age know how to capture, try and dispatch the imperialist cops. In Brazil, the masses have stored up a formidable hatred against capitalism. They are not going to wait for Brizola and his movement to organise them. They will do that themselves, and they will do it in Brazil, not outside.

A workers state that emerges from the nationalist revolution is constituted in the same way as the workers states resulting from the proletarian revolution. The difference resides in that the proletarian revolutionary movement has a pre-existing programme ready for immediate application after power. This remains an advantage even in the case when, in the course of the subsequent revolutionary struggle, the leadership does not implement all the socialist economic and social measures that were in the programme.

On the other hand, even a heavily nationalist movement is driven to adopt revolutionary measures because it sees, in the course of the process, that this lends it stability, strength and confidence. The movement realises that socialist measures are offering possibilities and hope of success. The farther the nationalist movement goes on that road, and the more strength it gains. Eventually, groups and tendencies start growing inside it, forming a core of people who find sustenance in concrete socialist realisations. These tendencies acquire a greater weight in the movement, turning it into a socialist one.

Take the example of Argentina: at the moment, it is necessary to support the Peronist sectors who agree with the idea of nationalisation. Inside the Peronists, there are groups which come close to socialist ideas and programme; all the more so for having just found out how much more they can achieve by simply going further in that direction. But characters like Alonso, Vandor and Co, (trade union leaders), keep away from the matter of nationalisation; in fact, they rather dread it and it scares them. They are not disposed to struggle for socialism because they are in the habit of simply disputing from the bourgeoisie a greater share of the national cake.

In revolutions, there are indispensable measures to adopt: democratic rights for the workers, workers control, and militias; these are the pillars of socialist revolutionary development. They are also the means by which people start acquiring confidence in themselves. For, in this process, they need to feel ideological certainty and assurance. They need to open themselves up to the influence of the world revolution to the maximum possible level. Ideological confidence and reassurance are necessary for people to feel confirmed in their resolution, and above all, they need to feel that they are part of the same advances in the world, part of the world revolution.

In Columbia, an important movement of guerrillas operates in the zone of Marquetalia. It is necessary to set up a small workers state in this area, and to hold it up as example to everyone. The masses of the whole region will understand, followed by those of the whole country. The ideological impact of this would be very great and raise the level of the revolution to the point of creating socialist consciousness in people.

Experiences such as that in Columbia are very important to influence the peasantry and fill it with the wish and the confidence that there must be expropriations of the land, land redistribution and that power can be taken. In the colonial and semi colonial countries, the peasants are a capital factor in the revolution. Land distribution is the essential thing for them. It helps them to struggle in a less dispersed and individual manner. In their minds, they start feeling less remote from the towns, they loose their feeling of uncertainty and they acquire more socialist consciousness.

The historic matter of the town-country relationship is fundamental in every revolutionary process. Normally, the conditions of life for the peasants dissuade them from collective thought and from the idea of unification/collectivisation. Living in those conditions, the peasants have tended, up to now, to want to struggle only for themselves and their families who are their workmates. But today, it is precisely amongst the peasantry of the world that the colonial revolution makes huge advances.

This shows that the peasantry has acquired confidence in socialist ideas and collective action, by wholesale land expropriation, statification and the struggle for the taking of power. As they started doing this, the peasants have come out of their isolation. The peasantry of the world has broken out of the age-long idea that one is alone in the historic battle for the land, and that private property is the only way.

China provides us with an extraordinary example of this. One of the great limitations of Fidel Castro lies in not having applied to Cuba this experience of the Chinese revolution. When it comes to this matter, there is no new road to be invented now. The knowledge already exists about what is to be done: not only the road is open but it is increasingly being trodden, as we can see in the case of the Vietcong. Today, proletarian consciousness matures quickly, because there are such things as revolutions and workers states. The type of action required to implement the programme of the socialist revolution helps people to mature very fast. And this is how it happens that any nationalist revolution is brought to the socialist road, and is made to progress along it. Because indeed, it cannot retrace its steps, for when it does, it dissolves and disappears. And so, it can only go forward; forward to socialist measures; and when it is engaged on this path, it sprouts revolutionary shoots and becomes part of the world revolution.

Let us render homage to the action of the Vietnamese masses and the Vietcong. We shall never honour them well enough. The same goes for China, for the part it takes in Vietnam's struggle. Both the leadership of the Chinese government and of the Communist Party of China, receive in this matter of supporting Vietnam, the unflagging support of the Chinese people. In China, for instance, there are 200 million people enrolled in the People's Militias, and this is a formidable force for the Chinese government. We invite Fidel Castro to look for support here, if only to see what else goes on in the world besides the Soviets. The Soviet's economic aid to

Cuba, for all its immense necessity and importance, cannot cloud over the example of the Chinese people and militias. The militias in China are a brake on the tank of bureaucracy as well as an engine of the revolution. The authority of China over the Vietcong is immense. The peasantry of the whole world has the eyes on this.

Each passing day, there are greater layers of petty bourgeois people, of students and technicians, who are won to the socialist revolution. At first, the radicalisation of these sectors led them onto the road of nationalism. The reformism and conciliatory policies of the communist parties – as well as of the socialists and the trade unions where they exist – failed to show them a better way. However, having taken the nationalist road, the radicalised sectors were taken forward, led onwards, and in some cases, they managed to impose socialist measures.

Let us look at the example of the Carupano barracks in Venezuela. Gripped by democratic enthusiasm, the soldiers looked for a way to get on with democracy. They decided to join up the ranks of the revolution, and disposed themselves to receive the influence of the socialist revolution. They did not manage to achieve this however. Neither the communists nor the socialists, nor even the Cubans, intervened to show them how to get on and do it; worse still, some went as far as opposing these soldiers! The latter, therefore, decided to look for progress down the bourgeois democratic garden path. Of course, they failed. Had they called on people to organise in support of the programme of the socialist revolution, had they appealed for land occupation from the peasants, for the workers to occupy factories; had they mobilised in support of statification, they would have transformed even their own movement and would have given a socialist leadership to their revolution. This example points to the necessity of transforming a nationalist movement very early on; and rapidly turning it into a socialist one. This is true also of the students whose movements are particularly sensitive to the advance of revolution.

When a nationalist movement starts struggling, groups and teams within it start developing differences in terms of comprehension and political consciousness. It is necessary to realise that already at this point, large layers of people can already be won to socialism. This is because as far as the broad masses are concerned, nationalism is not what they are aiming for. In Latin America, the masses support nationalist leaderships and programmes in the expectation of the socialist revolution. The masses put their feet in the nationalists' footsteps, but they do not admire the nationalist plan.

In these conditions, the independent action of the Party of the working class must be maintained. If not, the possibility of the revolutionary ideas to weigh and take the lead is hindered, or cancelled even. The revolutionary ideas give way to the nationalist leadership that has only wavering and irresolution to offer. A nationalist leadership has the permanent disposition to be timid; it always gives the enemy time to re-arm. The masses, for their part, have the permanent disposition to go forward. This is why it is crucially important that the action of the working class should remain independent from the nationalists, free to attract the petty bourgeoisie and influence it.

The attractive force of the socialist revolution is going to spread much faster than the ability of the various bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaderships to hold it back. So, one must intervene wholeheartedly with the view to let the socialist and revolutionary tendencies flourish in their

own movements, where they will oppose the bourgeois sectors. The political impetus obtained will lead, without delay, to the struggle for statifications, collectivisation, the setting up of Cooperatives and Communes, etc. All the while, one must insist on socialist democracy in all the organs of power, and above all, in the army.

As the revolutionary tendencies rise, one must insist that internal discussion should be on everything and for every militant, as the Vietcong do. The result, as shown by the Vietcong, is that every militant becomes capable of being all at once Chief, Soldier, Worker and Leader. It is necessary to intervene to this effect, right from the start of the movement. This boosts the revolution greatly. It impels it forward so well that it becomes soon capable of setting up elements of the workers state. This way is also best for another reason: it increases to the maximum possible level, the collective handling of ideas, creativity, intervention making and problem solving. It does away with internal squabbles; it lends the movement a greater homogeneity that favours a greater socialist development of the economy. Everyone starts gaining confidence in action. Each person develops the ability of ten.

These must be the norms for any colonial revolution. Conversely, as long as the masses are kept at bay, and they do not intervene socially and politically, their achievements are stunted – in the economy as much as on the plane of political initiatives, organisation and leadership.

We reiterate that any colonial revolution has within itself the potential conditions to start building the workers state. This is why one must defend most vigorously the principle of the independent action of the working class Party. If this is lost, what is lost with it is the working class' ability to give the political leadership of its revolutionary ideas; worse even, these are frustrated and even cancelled out. In that case, the working class is made to remain dependent upon whatever hope might be placed in a given nationalist leadership. In every case, the timidity and indecision of the nationalist leadership gives the enemy time to re-arm, to regain positions and sow confusion in the working class. This is why the independent action of the working class is paramount, so that it may be in a position to influence the petty bourgeoisie.

Argentina provides a notable example: when the proletariat shows its strength in general strike, it draws the petty bourgeoisie behind itself. But when there are elections, this does not happen. This is because in elections, the proletariat is made to compromise with the Peronist bourgeois leadership. When the proletariat differentiates itself from it, it is no longer seen as an agency of Peronism. It can then be seen for what it is: the centre that can both confront the bourgeoisie, and triumph over it.

Another notable example is provided by Santo Domingo: there, the population is still led by radicalised petty bourgeois sectors struggling to dislodge capitalism, even without having yet adopted a Marxist programme. This struggle leads objectively to the overthrow of capitalism. All the more so because the population has started intervening directly and now escapes the control of the bourgeois leaderships. To struggle against imperialism in Santo Domingo amounts to liquidating the one and only form of power capitalism can ever have in that country.

The slogans to put forward in Santo Domingo, therefore, are the following: a national constituent assembly, a workers and peasants' government, the setting up of Communes in the

countryside, street committees in the towns and trade unions in the factories. Soviets must indeed be organised so that the national assembly may impose a workers and peasants' government; there must be land statification and the collectivisation of production; statification of the banks and state monopoly of foreign trade. We call on the Cuban Revolution itself, to appeal for this. Accusations of evildoing by imperialism, however well founded, will not do. There remains the task of overthrowing it, which simply means that the struggle must be organised around such a programme. The nationalist revolution will quickly take on a socialist character in its next stages, and in spite of their trepidation, the nationalists will be led to create teams of people around this programme.

The experience of the Soviet Union's Soviets must be divulged and followed. To start with, there must be political discussions and courses, given about the socialist revolution. The problems of the economy and of the power of the state must be discussed by all; everyone must discuss how the economy and politics are linked. The debates must reach deep into the army. In the army, there must be the elimination of the grades and ranks, and the source of the political power which weighs on the army must be revealed. The Bolsheviks in their time, and the Chinese today, have gone through this, and their experiences must be made known to everyone. This is the way in which to prepare the conditions so that socialist democracy becomes common practice.

The Soviet is a form that allows the development of other organisms for democratic power and socialist democracy. What the Soviets are, how they function, is what one must explain. They will serve in setting the workers state up. The active participation of all the masses is quite indispensable for the development of the revolution. One must do this at the same time as conducting the armed struggle or the necessary war. One must be able to do the two things at once via a permanent political activity, never stopping the holding of assemblies and of political debates.

At the same time, there must be independence for the workers' trade unions, and it must be upheld. Whilst the (nationalist) leadership contains petty bourgeois and bourgeois revolutionary tendencies as well as proletarian ones, it is vital that the independence of the proletariat should be maintained. The proletariat must have its own political and trade union organs. This is because the united front which was established in the revolutionary struggle is of a kind that needs to remain under the constant pressure of the independent action of the masses. Meanwhile, one must look for the way to incorporate the peasantry. One must reach deep in the least developed sectors and bring these into the debate and political intervention. This may start in localised ways, and then, these sectors should be seen as taking, and exercising, their power.

Soviets and Communes are foundation organisms. The peasants must see with their own eyes these organisms in operation. This is what will make them understand their importance. The peasants today have broken free from the yoke of their national and local isolation. They have opened up to the socialist revolution and have walked up to the proletariat. The radicalised petty bourgeoisie throughout the world feels the influence of the world revolution. In response, imperialism is increasing its military might and economic stranglehold, but it is constantly losing in capacity and also in social and political authority. Every day that passes, sees it loose more

points of support in the world, so much so that now, it trusts only in its military power and atomic weapons. Feeling this, a formidable boost is given to human audacity, that quality which is requisite when the nationalist revolution passes into the socialist one, whatever the point it started from.

The role of the revolutionary Party is paramount also in this process. In the countries where there are no political revolutionary tendencies and Trotskyism is a small minority, it is necessary to look for strength in the centralisation of the masses in the trade unions. Our Party must maintain its own independence throughout. It has to be consistent and intransigent in its activity, and yet it must know how to support allies in the struggles even when the allies do not quite appreciate this support. At the same time, one must not cease to observe and criticise the limitations of the nationalist allies. One must show them in what way it is possible to go farther still. We must seek out the nationalist base and make explicit the socialist character of its aspiration.

When the revolutionary leadership of the nationalist revolution is bourgeois or petty bourgeois, the revolutionary Party such as ours must direct itself to the base of that movement. It must teach it to take its distance from its leadership and criticise it. Our Party must retain its right to independent action, operating at the same time in a way best suited to make those leaderships understand the necessity to struggle for the socialist revolution.

Let the masses exert their control, without delay, and everywhere. This is what will allow the nationalist leaderships to receive the full effect of the determination and socialist consciousness of the masses. Had Fidel Castro raised this slogan for Latin America, half that continent would be workers states now. Had he understood from the start the need to let the masses intervene, the influence of the Cuban revolution on the Latin American masses would have gone infinitely deeper.

Conversely, the Vietcong did this. It developed an immense influence among the masses of the world. This comes from having shown them where the road was that brings down imperialism and dislodges capitalism. As opposed to this, the “four classes” theory of the Chinese is cutting right across this immense achievement. Instead of the ‘entente’ of “the four classes” extolled by the Chinese leadership, the Vietcong must immediately apply agrarian reform in each zone it has newly occupied. There, it must liquidate capitalist power and call for wholesale nationalisations. The Vietcong must do this, and the Chinese too; they must all appeal for this to be done. What a formidable stimulation this would be for Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Thailand, and the rest of Asia where revolution is on the march. This would have a huge effect in decomposing capitalist power. The Vietcong leads this policy in some way, but without generalising it. It also goes along to a certain extent with the so-called policy of the “four classes”. Why should not the Vietcong masses take the lead for a United Front in all South East Asia? With land expropriations and Militias as its flag? Imperialism would be very quickly thrown out.

We reiterate that within this revolutionary nationalist process, the working class Party has to remain independent. It must seek to increase its influence, its authority and ability to act – all at the same time. If the nationalist revolution is to progress and turn into the socialist revolution,

the development of the proletarian Party cannot be substituted for.

The workers state is something that needs preparing for. Measures of expropriation of capitalism require also the setting up of the means for the masses to intervene. The latter must feel that they are irreplaceable. They also must feel that they are master of the economy. Besides, this ability to intervene is what fills them with confidence. They realise that power does not depend on one leader or other. They verify that it lies in their own intervention.

To firm up the advance of the nationalist revolution towards the workers state, there are requisite measures: the statification of the economy, insistence on socialist democracy via Soviets and Communes; permanent political functioning in the army and trade unions. More than this, one must seek to organise and unify the various revolutions between different countries. The strikes that take place today in Latin America, Asia or Africa, or the military risings that occur in this stage, have the concrete opportunity of being as many factors of development for the socialist revolution.

We must base everything on the centralisation that the masses achieve in the countries where there are no organised revolutionary tendencies or people. For example, in the nationalist revolution, the trade unions must intervene as organising centres. They can and must turn themselves into a working class party. This gives a Workers Party Based on the Trade Unions (POBS= in Spanish partido obrero basado en los sindicatos) with the programme of the socialist revolution. That the POBS should adopt the programme of the socialist revolution is quite essential if this sort of party is going to find the necessary support for action. In some countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the trade unions can have a role both of organisation and of centralisation of the masses. The guerrillas who are active in those countries must put themselves at the service of the nationalist revolutionary process and its needs. The masses need political poles for their own unification. In this case, the trade unions can offer this, and they do play such a role in Peru, Bolivia, Argentina and Brazil.

If it stays under bourgeois or petty bourgeois management, the nationalist revolution does not draw up a clear political roadmap. It remains incapable of achieving the spontaneous transformation conducive to the independent action of the masses. Indeed, in order to fulfil this role, the trade unions must be brought into play, and this, without interrupting the course of the development of the revolution. The exploited masses need to feel centralised, and they do so in their trade unions. They create class organisations from which they feel empowered to go forward towards the POBS. With these organisms, the masses can introduce land expropriation, communal use of the land for the peasants, a workers' and peasants' alliance and the statification of all imperialist property.

We say that, wherever there are guerrillas, these must contribute to help the masses in their trade unions. If the guerrillas do not turn their hand to this task, their forces wither away, and they are forced to disband. It is a fact that the masses are not going to leave the centres where production takes place and where they feel organised, to go into the Sierra. The guerrillas can have a role, albeit a transitory one, in helping to weaken or decompose the class enemy. This also can serve to stimulate the intervention of the masses. But this does not alter the fact that the vital centres of production are what counts.

Trade unions and guerrillas have different roles. The motive force of the masses is their peasant and workers' trade unions. So, the guerrillas must turn to the masses, appeal to them, occupy the land for them, help them to set up peasants and workers' unions and protect these. This way, militia and guerrilla become a complement of each other in struggle, a complement of organisation that the proletariat and peasantry dearly need. The struggles coming up in the next period in Latin America will proceed along those lines.

The guerrillas tend to become militias these days. This is because when they do not, they become stagnant as in Peru, Venezuela and Columbia. But in the case of the MR13 in Guatemala, the guerrillas made headway on the basis of the programme of the socialist revolution – namely by adopting the Trotskyist programme. In Bolivia, there are some workers' militias, but they have little dynamism because they have not chosen to dispute power from capitalism. However, in cases where the guerrillas started the fight for power, they have shown themselves capable of beating the regular army. But as soon as the guerrillas stand still, they disintegrate because they fail to raise their sight as high as is required to impose effective workers' power over the whole country. The Bolivian militias are a conquest of the masses and for that reason, they will not disappear. With the support of the masses, the Bolivian militias are those who presided over the nationalisation of the mines; it is they who came to defend each local area conquered by the working class. This was the time when the proletariat should have been made ready with the programme to go further: the taking of power, the workers and peasants' alliance, land expropriations and socialist cooperatives. But this was not done; and as it was not done, the militias dropped the idea of power taking, concentrating instead on their own unity and self-defence. These conclusions about the Bolivian workers' militias must never be forgotten. At the time when they were organised, we called on the masses of Latin America to support them.

This is how the Bolivian militias did not take power. But this is not a failure story because they did not have the programme for taking power; they did not fail for the good reason that they did not try. If these militias did not go further, it was because they did not have the programme for capitalist overthrow.

In the next stages, the Bolivian masses are going to remember their tradition of successful militias, and the programmes of Pulacayo and Colquiri. They will remember the fact that workers militias had been created in the Bolivian factories and mines, and peasants militias had been set up on the land. These are modes of struggle bound to reappear in the future, and when they do, they will aim at capitalist overthrow! Rest assured that this experience has not been useless for the Bolivian masses. There will be new stages, militias will come back, and this, with the express purpose of overthrowing capitalism.

The present guerrillas of Columbia, Venezuela, Peru or Guatemala, must heed this experience. It is a fact that guerrillas are a transitory form of struggle, whilst militias are permanent. They represent workers power organised militarily and in the workplace. The workplace is indeed where the masses feel that their strength is quite formidable. It is where they realise that the economy depends on them. It is at work that they feel sufficiently well placed to use militias as a tool for social transformation. The guerrillas, on the other hand, are more removed from the production centres where social decision making takes place. This is not to deny in any way that

they can be quite instrumental in the initial phases of a struggle.

In the coming period, those who will be instrumental will be the militias. As the nationalist revolutions turn into socialist revolutions, it will be quite indispensable to organise militarily in the form of militias, because they will help the revolution in going forward. In any such struggle, there is the need for territorial militias at the point of production where they can impose socialist democracy. This is fundamental to put the nationalist revolution on the road of the socialist revolution.

The Chinese must intervene in the world to contribute to a greater knowledge about revolution; to help nationalist revolutions presently led by petty bourgeois leaderships, so that they learn how to become socialist revolutions. The intervention of the Chinese already takes many forms, like the supply of arms, money, goods and instructors.

Imagine how important it would be if Castro intervened in the world to contribute on this question! However, just now, the most important thing is that the Chinese should give the world the example of militias functioning in China. The most important is that these militias be seen in the act of imposing socialist democracy, spreading Communes, Soviets, applying socialist democracy and waging an open struggle against the Chinese reactionaries. Imagine the effect in the world, if China was a hive of debates on this question!

Such a campaign in China, when it happens, will have monumental effects. It will lay the social foundations and historic bases for a gigantic rise in workers' organisations and workers militias all over the world. More than arms, goods and instructors, this is the kind of aid that is required. It is the most complete form of aid. It is also the most important. It is this which the Chinese revolution can give to the nationalist revolutions the world so that they may become socialist.

The Posadist IV International calls for all manner of support to be sent to help the cause of the nationalist revolutions. No one must refrain in any way whatsoever from sending support on the ground that this may cause imperialism to launch the war. This is because right from the start, the war is subject to the development of revolution. One must not forget that the North American masses will have a part to play in that war. When revolution starts, they will know that its sweep operates in their favour as well. Already, the North American masses feel united to the masses of the world. They are not going to impede revolution or rise against it! When it can be seen intervening against the colonial revolution, US imperialism demonstrates how it throws its huge weight against the progress of humanity: and the North American masses know this.

In turn, imperialism is well aware of this. It is truly one of its greatest fears. When it bombs Vietnam, it hides the fact behind its rhetoric of the "defence of democracy and of liberty". But why on earth does it bother? It is because it still has a certain social base in the petty bourgeoisie and in a small proletarian sector. Imperialism is therefore wont to camouflage its true objectives, seeking to present itself as the Knight of Democracy in Shining Armour carefully concealing the sword of reaction. It fears that the masses that still lend it support will oppose its counter revolution should they see this kind of weapon in its hand.

Imperialism tries to gain historic time and contain the uprising of the North American masses.

Meanwhile, it goes on with its preparations for atomic war.

Imperialism acts with great awareness of having no historic future.

J Posadas
April 1966.