

The Scientific, Cultural and Political Editions

Present:

**J. Posadas**

**ON THE STALIN QUESTION<sup>1</sup>**

*A selection of texts 1977-1981*

---

<sup>1</sup> Title by the Editorial Board.

# Presentation

This publication contains 4 texts by J Posadas as follows:

- **On the Stalin Question, 1.3.1981**
- **Why Stalin assassinated the entire Bolshevik leadership, 23.12.1979**
- **The bureaucratic leadership of the Labour Party was defeated in the 1979 elections, 23.12.1979**
- **Stalin, the Workers State and the atomic war, 5.3.1977.**

Comrade **J Posadas** wrote these four texts mostly at the end of the 1970's. In 2015, they may appear outdated - but they are still essential reading because the conclusions from the 'Thermidor' of the Russian Revolution have not yet been drawn in the Communist, intellectual and workers' movements.

The author defines what he calls 'the Thermidor in the USSR' as the process through which a bureaucratic layer, with roots in the rear-guard of the Russian Revolution, snatched away the power of the proletariat, appropriated it, betrayed revolutions and isolated the USSR

The author characterises the mentality of the Stalinian bureaucracy which then developed as that of '**a usurper**' because it confiscated proletarian power in the name of Communism! Behind its pretence of continuing Lenin, it trashed Bolshevik proletarian internationalism. It betrayed the Revolutions like the Chinese (1925) and the Spanish (1936), and kept "Socialism in one country" going by conciliating with world capitalism.

From 1917 until Lenin's death in 1924, the Soviets had been the power organs through which the proletariat and masses actually led the USSR. In the Soviets, the proletariat was able to meet, explain, discuss, enthuse and persuade the peasantry of the superiority of collective organisation.

Whilst the Russian Thermidor put an end to the Soviets, Stakhanovism and the forced collectivisation of the countryside were ushered in; but by taking power, the workers had proven that they did not need to be put to work like oxen in harness, and that through actual Soviets (and not fake ones), they could persuade the peasantry to act for the common good.

The author shows how the Workers State survived the enormous retreat represented by this Thermidor. And it not only survived but defeated the Nazis. in 1943. Later, in 1977, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union voted a New Soviet Constitution which ratified the support the USSR was already giving to the Movements of National Liberation in the world.

In the period when the four texts below were written, the Soviet Union supported the Cuban soldiers fighting in Angola to help defeat South Africa supported by world imperialism. This was Stalin's policy reversed! It was no longer "Socialism in one country"! J Posadas analysed this as part of a "Partial Regeneration" in the world communist movement.

In supporting major struggles of colonial revolution, the post-Stalin USSR became part of a world structure that confronted world imperialism. This continues today, even if the Russian Federation is no longer the USSR<sup>2</sup>.

The legacy of Stalinist thinking in Britain (particularly after the general strike of 1926) granted an un-deserved lease of time to the pragmatist, imperialist, conciliatory (with capitalism) and patronising mentality in the leaderships of the Labour Party and trade unions. Now, this epoch is passing, and Social Democracy is being discredited in every country.

The class struggle nowadays, particularly against austerity, calls for new United Fronts in the world, in Europe, and in Britain. The documents below help to demonstrate that any United Front, national or international, must allow the masses to strive towards their own power organs (Soviet like) and oppose the usurpation of that power by anyone standing above it.

The documents below show also that those who 'usurped' the power of the proletariat, hence the power of the Soviets, did so mostly because they did not believe in the ability of the proletariat and masses to rule themselves. The Soviet experience of 1917 was the first of this kind in history. Now, we have its formidable lessons. In 2015, confidence in the proletariat and masses must be central to the construction of any new national and international leadership.

In 2015, it is obvious that corporate capitalist power can only be overthrown by leaderships entirely confident in the ability of the proletariat and masses to rule themselves. This confronts not only private property, but the lingering patronising mentality of private property. This fight will continue until the complete defeat of capitalism, lasting even for some time afterwards. This gives to the texts below a particularly enduring relevance.

SCPEs - 30.05.2015

---

<sup>2</sup> In 2015, the Latin American & Caribbean countries defend their national sovereignty and right to progress thanks to the support of Russia and China. Russia & its allies help Syria and Iran too, in the teeth of world war.

# ON THE STALIN QUESTION<sup>3</sup>

J. POSADAS

1.3.1981

Extract from

**“The progress of the Soviet union and the function of the Posadist Fourth International”**

The USSR decomposes if it does not base itself on the world revolutionary process. Even with all its bureaucracy, it cannot live on without lending support to revolutionary movements. Stalin could not live with the Revolution, but the Soviet Union cannot live without stimulating the revolutionary process.

The Soviet Union doesn't always lend support at the right time or take the best steps. In the end however, it must lend support to the anti-capitalist movements.

The USSR goes on negotiating with capitalism, but it can no longer surrender any revolution of importance, or of medium importance. The Soviet leaders negotiate with capitalism to keep the status quo, but the condition for the continued existence of the USSR is that it must progress; and to progress, it must side with any movement looking up to it, and encourage there structures tending towards the Workers State. This is the logical condition of history.

We are guided in this matter by the logic of history, and not by the perceived intentions of the Soviet leaders. By 'logic of history' we mean that the Soviet Union can only continue living by impelling the Revolution. It is the condition for its continued existence.

Since its inception, the Soviet Union needed to shore itself up against the capitalist system. This became very marked after the Second World War, but it was only after the liquidation of Stalin that the Soviet leaders gained confidence in this matter.

---

<sup>3</sup> This text has been edited. It is an extract from a dictation by J. Posadas who was now ailing. He was going to die from a heart illness only two months later. Editorial.

It is not very important to know how Stalin was liquidated. Whether he died or was killed, it is history that killed him. His staunch opposition to the development of the Workers State was in the way of history<sup>4</sup>. For one Workers State can only make progress by assisting revolutions and impelling new ones. Not to swallow them up, mind, but to shore up the Workers States' camp in relation to capitalism!

What has changed in today's world (1981) is that the USSR must take world positions that end up imposing their logic on the Soviet bureaucracy itself. This logic weighs much less on the bureaucracies of the other Workers States (and Communist parties) because their usurper way of thinking<sup>5</sup> is not challenged in the same way. The usurper's mentality continues in the USSR too, but to a lesser extent, because the USSR must stimulate the world revolution.

One should expect, and quite soon, that the Soviets will start correcting their methods of analysis. They may even offer plans of anti-capitalist struggle and start trying to influence the world Communist parties. The latter have retained many of the direct structures built in the epoch of Stalin. Such is the case with the Italian, French and Spanish Communist parties where renovation is particularly slow. This applies less to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) because it eventually repudiated Stalin. First the Soviet Union liquidated Stalin as a figurehead, then it liquidated him as a thought-method and now it liquidates his policy<sup>6</sup>. It has not overcome Stalin entirely, but what it retains of him is no longer representative of the USSR as it has become.

The renovation happening in the Soviet Union takes the very simple and sensible forms dictated by the need to progress. Because the continuation of the Soviet Union as a Workers State depends upon this, the Soviet Union has become the most receptive country in the world to the call of progress. Hearing no such call, the Italian Communist Party carries on mostly with its political manoeuvrings and parliamentary games.

---

<sup>4</sup> This refers to the policy of *Socialism in one Country* through which the Stalin leadership actively organised the defeat of revolutions as in China (1925-27) and in Spain (1936) for instance. Edit.

<sup>5</sup> The 'usurper' here is a layer seeking power for itself, opposed to workers control & Soviets. Edit.

<sup>6</sup> The policy of "Socialism in one country". Edit.

As the USSR must progress, the Soviet leaders themselves feel the concrete need to confront the capitalist system. This leads them to improve the policies of the USSR and to remove political layers of internal opponents.

Those changes in the USSR are still slow, and those in the Communist movement even slower, but they are changes. Such changes modify the manner in which the *Political Revolution* and the *Permanent Revolution* unfold. The principles of Permanent Revolution and Political Revolution are still valid, but they develop differently from before.

The world Communist parties have not yet changed very much. It is necessary to intervene towards them to show them the need to do so. One must expect that the new and major struggles to come are going to weigh on them, stimulate their progressive tendencies and force a fight against their centrists and rightists. We aim at helping these progressive comrades to advance in their parties, and to win. One thing we already say to them is: 'Never break with the Soviet Union! Support its advances!' Some Communists are already discussing this. Pajetta (Italian Communist) spoke as a delegate at the 16<sup>th</sup> Congress of the CPSU along those lines. He also praised Brezhnev for some "good things", which is new.

Helping the Communists to support the Soviet Union is part of our task. We do this with complete patience and dedication. This is why our movement does not grow in numbers, but it grows in authority everywhere in the world. We are not in a hurry, and we are not impatient. Haste and impatience come from a lack of maturity, and a lack of maturity comes from not understanding the process and how it unfolds.

The world revolutionary process has many and varied forms that must be understood. The world revolutionary movements force the Communist parties leftwards. This too influences the Soviet Union, giving it a greater political and organisational security. The reward for the comprehension of such aspects is a deepening level of theoretical security. Comprehension needs the backing of theoretical security, and these two abilities come with *the practice of theory*, so to say. In the practice of theory, one realises that historic truth can only be defended in the moving process. Not the truth in abstract like a placard or an emblem, but truth in the

development where to uphold one truth means to uphold all the truths. The historic basis for doing this lays in reasoning and drawing conclusions. Such is the fight for the harmonious development of humanity, to finish with every form of exploitation, violence and necessity.

Theoretical preparation and practical theoretical application lend the ability to reason and convince against any number of forces, material or numerical. This is the way to build theoretical and political security, starting within ourselves, and as a guide to reasoning. None of this can be done without Marxism. It is necessary to interest comrades in these quite complicated principles, which are also the most profound, and to do this in the simplest possible ways. For my part, I feel that I learn and correct myself as I teach all this.

**J. POSADAS**

1.3.1981

# CONFERENCE ON THE WORLD PROCESS OF THE DEEPENING CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

Why Stalin assassinated the entire Bolshevik leadership

J. POSADAS

23.12.79

Extracts

There is an antagonistic difference between the crisis in the capitalist countries and that in the Workers States & Communist Parties. In capitalism, the crisis is of disintegration. In the Workers States and Communist parties, it is one of re-organization, rectification and progress. This is not a process about to happen later. It is happening now.

The capitalist system has no economic, social or political means to stop the world revolutionary tide. For that purpose, it has only war and military force. It never dealt with revolutions and anti-capitalist movements in any other way, and it always had to admit failure. Now, it must take the blows of the revolutionary process 'on the chin', the world over, in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and even in Europe.

The crisis of capitalism is twofold. Firstly, capitalism must deal with the 'normal' economic and social crisis of having to concede subsidies and unemployment pay to hold back the workers parties and the trade unions. Its second crisis comes having to deal with the Workers States and the mass struggles. The necessary progress of the world takes the form of political, social and revolutionary struggles. This is why the world is full of these. Some are political and social, as in Italy. Others are revolutionary, as in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

**Capitalism can only survive  
by cancelling social life and social wellbeing**

In the capitalist system, technology raises productivity enormously, but this also creates mountains of unemployed. Countless people will never be employed again in capitalism, and this brings an inevitable decline in the capacity of the capitalist market.



You could say that this is the 'normal' crisis of capitalism, but it becomes a crisis of historic dimensions because it eliminates consumers. The more capitalism increases productivity, the less there is of social life and social wellbeing - but there is no such contradiction in the Workers States!

The capitalists increase the use of automation to compete with each other, but they also do this to face the antagonistic competition of the Workers States. Everything pushes capitalism to increase automation. Unemployment keeps growing therefore, and purchasing power keeps declining. This exacerbates the social pressures against the system of production, and then against the system itself - but there are no such problems in the Workers States!

This is why capitalist countries that succeed in making social advances tend to seek agreements with the Workers States. Observe how so many revolutionary and progressive movements end up making alliances and relations with the Workers States.

**Capitalism can only deal with the competition of the Workers States by means of war**

The competition between the Workers States and capitalism is antagonistic. The crisis of capitalism in front of the Workers State is caused by this competition being antagonistic. Capitalism has no answer to this - political, social or economic. It can only hope to resolve this by means of war, and this is what it is preparing to do. Capitalism is preparing for war.

The existence of the Workers States shows to world capitalism that its world economic and political authority is compromised, and under threat. As this causes capitalism to lose even more social power, it answers with even greater war preparations. This causes the growth of more forms of opposition against capitalism - within its own camp included. In the upper layers of the capitalist class, many see and feel politically that the war is the end of them. They feel this socially too, and even scientifically. This throws all the top capitalist structures off balance, and capitalism as well, as a system.

The war is the end of the capitalist system, and not the end of the world. In the capitalist countries, the bourgeois owners are in a state of constant anguish. They live anguished lives, and express it in a thousand ways. They cannot refrain from making war, but they are also terrified by it, sensing that it is the end of them. They know that they are wrong. They feel hated by the masses; they have no hope of victory because no one accepts the capitalist system, or the continuation of it.

**Why did Stalin  
assassinate the entire  
Bolshevik leadership?**

Communist historians make assessments of the Stalin's epoch. They make analyses about Trotsky, Stalin, the Soviet Union and various Communist parties; but none of their work recognizes plainly that Stalin assassinated the entire Bolshevik leadership. There are passing references, but no actual recognition that Stalin killed all the Bolsheviks who made the Russian Revolution; and that Stalin followed this up by hounding, persecuting and having assassinated those who, like Trotsky, continued to support the Bolshevik program. The Communist historians have simply given no reason why Stalin had to assassinate the Bolsheviks, all their followers, and Trotsky.

Some Communists refer to "the errors of Stalin". They say nothing however of Stalin's assassination of all the leaders of the Russian Revolution – an action that cannot be classed as an error! If it is true that the Bolsheviks who made the Revolution became traitors, as Stalin said, the Communist historians have to say so.

The Communist historians must say: "All the Bolsheviks turned out to be traitors". This claim, of course, would need some explaining: How did it happen that the Russian Revolution threw up an entire leadership of traitors? When did the people who made the Revolution start becoming traitors? Has such a process got a name? How does it unfold? The Communists do not say.

The notion that the revolutionary leaders of a Revolution can all become traitors is a story outside history!

It takes a lot of capacity to make a Revolution, as well as a great deal of scientific and political intelligence. It takes even more of these qualities to lead a successful revolution like the Russian one. Only leaders with a towering grasp of the historic process could have achieved this feat in Russia. It is absolutely impossible that people of such mettle were no more than potential traitors!

If the Bolsheviks who made the Russian Revolution became traitors after the Revolution, why was it that they were not traitors before the Revolution, or during it? They had no reason to wait for years to become traitors under Stalin - if this is what they were. It was under Stalin's rule that they became "traitors". Did they become traitors to the revolution, or traitors to Stalin's rule? How can Communist writers raise these matters and not answer those questions? Their silence is double in the sense that they do not even ask those questions.

**The programme of Trotsky's  
Left Opposition saved the young USSR**

Like the bourgeois historians, the Communists leaders have kept silent on the questions we have just asked. How should Communists assess Stalin? What is the way to do it? The way to do it is to consider two essential factors: Stalin's policy (of throwing out the Bolshevik program) - and Trotsky.

Stalin did not think that Trotsky would continue fighting as long as he had life in him. Trotsky commented about this: "Stalin didn't understand, otherwise, he would have killed me before." Persecuted, and all his comrades assassinated, Trotsky fought back by elaborating the *Program of the Left opposition*. That was not a program to defend himself. It was an economic and social program for the development of the Soviet Union.

Stalin had a program exactly opposed, but he had to retake the major points of the *Program of the Left opposition*. Since he could not maintain the economy of the Soviet Union with his own plans, he retook the points of Trotsky's program - but not before having killed nine million peasants! How did the Soviet Union manage to survive this?

The Soviet Union survived this thanks to the *Program of the Left Opposition*. No one refers to this now. When the Communists speak about that period, they speak of the sagacity of Stalin; but it is a fact that Stalin retook the *Program of the Left opposition*, and that this action saved the Soviet Union. Stalin threw everything at the *Left Opposition* to make it perish, but the *Left Opposition* prevailed because its Program saved the Soviet Union. It is enough to read the documents to see this. The bourgeoisie knows this. The Communist leaders know it too, but they all keep silent.

**Italian Communist leaders  
criticize Stalin - but to oppose Communism!**

On the occasion of the *Centenary of the birth of Trotsky* in Italy this year, speeches were made by Communist leaders who were invited. None of them referred to the assassinations perpetrated by Stalin. They criticized Stalin, but they used these criticisms to condemn the Soviet Union of today (1979). And not content to attack the Soviet Union in general, these Italian Communists attack the Soviet Union now that it has started supporting the world revolution again.

The communist speakers on this occasion denounced the failings of Stalin that did not relate to his actual crimes. "Stalin did not allow democracy" they said; and "he did not let the people speak". This way, they did not have to deal with the fact that Stalin decapitated the leadership of the Revolution. The leadership that had made the Revolution! The leadership that gave to the Revolution the program of the first Workers State! This was the leadership that built the foundations and the structures that started the first Workers State!

**It was not to advance Socialism that  
the Stalin leadership fought the Nazis**

In the history of the French Revolution, there was a stage called Thermidor; but Thermidor also occurred in the Soviet Union. What is Thermidor? It is when the leadership of a revolution changes course. It retains most of its original leaders, but these no longer represent the will of those who made the revolution. The leading cadres of a Thermidor start representing a social layer other than the original one. In the French Revolution, this other layer was the bourgeoisie. In the Russian Revolution, it was the bureaucracy. Thermidor has been clearly identified as a historic process; it was given a name, and it has distinctive social forms. It is unclear however whether any communist historian ever refers to it.

We reiterate that the actions of Stalin were not political errors. They formed part of a policy representative of the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy. The Soviet bureaucracy could only shore itself up against the revolution by making an alliance with world capitalism. If the Stalin leadership used the inter-capitalist contradictions (between the Nazis and the 'democratic' capitalists) during the Second World War, it was through the need of the bureaucracy to survive that war, and nothing more.

The bureaucracy of Stalin did not fight the Nazis in order to develop and extend Socialism. Indeed Stalin fought against the extension of the revolution, and the latter did not spread for a number of years. It was for its own survival that the Soviet bureaucracy fought in the Second World War, and it could only do this by leading the war against the Nazis. This brought it face to face with the necessity to organize to smash capitalism, but those who genuinely responded to this necessity were the Soviet people and the Soviet soldiers. They proved it by their conduct. This had never been in Stalin's plan!

**Stalin wanted Mao and Tito  
to give up Socialism, but he was rebuffed**

What had been in Stalin's plan, if he had one? It had never gone beyond the need of the bureaucracy to survive - and to do so *alongside* the capitalist system.

The implementation of the notion of surviving alongside the capitalist system carried neither the tactic nor the strategy of revolution. Only, the war aroused the broad masses and they became involved.

The Soviet masses stood up and united closely in self-defense, alongside the Soviet army which they saw as part of themselves. Together and through their joint actions, they broke the spine of the capitalist system, i.e. the Nazis.

As they rose and smashed the Nazis, the Soviet masses forced the Soviet Communist Party to support. They made the Party follow them, although Stalin worked hard after the war to try and reassert his will.

The major capitalists were the United States, France, Germany and Britain. Stalin's post-war settlement with them went against the victorious anti-Nazi masses of the Soviet Union and elsewhere<sup>7</sup>. Stalin demanded from Mao Tse Tung (1947) that he should hand over power back to Chiang Kai Shek; and he demanded from Tito of Yugoslavia that he should return the power to the king! Tito and Mao repudiated these policies, and turned their back on Stalin.

**The world masses  
defeated the Nazis  
to make new Workers States**

Where is the communist historian who discusses this? The Communists themselves do not discuss this either, and very few bourgeois historians think it is important. All in all, no-one is discussing it. Worse still, the Communists avoid this problem by hiding it under the adulteration of facts, deceits and misrepresentations.

When you come to realize all this, you cannot but marvel at the power of the Workers State! In the end, it was the force of the Workers State - Chinese and Yugoslav included - that prevailed over Stalin; he could not repudiate the magnificent defense the Soviet army had put up, along with the Soviet people and other mass movements, like those around Mao and Tito. That part of history was led by the multitudes, not by Stalin.

How decisive was the role of the Soviet bureaucratic apparatus at that moment? The answer is: the Soviet masses smashed the Nazis, not the Soviet bureaucratic apparatus. Deep down, the conduct of the Soviet masses was moved by the necessity of the Soviet Union to extend; and by its own momentum, that necessity created the conditions for the extension of the Soviet Union. Fourteen new Workers States came out of the Second World War, some having started to form during the war itself.

---

<sup>7</sup> In Greece, the guerrilla army ELAS (led by the Communist Party) held 2/3 of Greece in 1945. Markos Vafiades, its leader, led the struggle to win the whole country against the Stalin-Truman plan to restore the monarchy in Greece. Stalin accused Vafiades of being an agent of British intelligence and of Tito. He arranged for Vafiades to be expelled from Greece and exiled. In the subsequent civil war, where Truman sent \$400 million to the Greek royalists, Stalin weighed for the total defeat of ELAS.

Many more details are to be gleaned from Churchill's diary on the subject.

The formation of 14 Workers States during and after the Second World War proves several things. It proves that the world masses fought the Nazis to defeat them. It proves that they wanted the further development of the Soviet Union, and that they actively defeated the Nazis in order to create new Workers States.

**J. POSADAS**

23.12.1979

# **THE BUREAUCRATIC LEADERSHIP OF THE LABOUR PARTY WAS DEFEATED IN THE ELECTIONS**

J. POSADAS

23.12.1979

Extracts

The method of reasoning that emanates in Britain from the structure of the workers and political movement is rooted in 'practicalism', pragmatism and the convenience of the moment. As these aspects were given further force by Stalin's policy and the errors of the Communist parties, the result in Britain was a Stalinist method of analyzing history.

'Practicalism' had always been present in the British workers' leaders. The latter were drawn from social layers motivated by immediate interests who could pass as representatives of the workers movement and revolutionary policy. Later, this tendency was accentuated by the Stalinist policies of the Communist parties which inclined in the same way. This greatly reinforced the pragmatic and practicalist limitations of the British workers' movement.

The absence of big workers' victories from 1926<sup>8</sup> onwards created trade union currents where the practicalism of the workers' leaders rejoined the practicalist interests of capitalist layers. The workers' movement had to endure this situation without the tools of Marxist knowledge, tradition and experience. The proletariat had no other guide, and the 1917 Russian Revolution came to be seen as betrayed by Stalin.

Such was the situation in Britain then, with the aggravating factor of having - in Labour and the Trade Unions - a Stalinist bureaucracy even before Stalin. The difference between the two is that Stalinism defended the interests of a Workers State's bureaucracy; but both coincided in regular alliances of interests with capitalism, and against the process of the revolution.

---

<sup>8</sup> 1926: The British general strike, and its betrayal by the Anglo-Russian Committee of the TUC. Edit



Such is the historic background to our struggle against bureaucracy and to stimulate revolutionary currents in the Labour Party. It is not that the situation in Britain is impossible, but that such is the situation that developed under British imperialism.

### **The 1979 electoral results in Britain**

It was not the Labour Party that was defeated in the elections this year. The bureaucratic leadership of Labour was. Within a short time of the Labour electoral defeat, the masses started new trade union struggles against the Tories' threats and repression. Had the elections meant a political defeat, and not just an electoral one, there would have been a retreat, a lack of trade union resolve and a retrenchment behind individual solutions.

One must not forget that 20% to 30% of the Tory vote comes from people of no social value - judges, sirs and idiots. While in the masses, all those who play an active part in the development of the country and in trade union life vote with the working class.

The preparation of imperialism for war arouses and increases a cultural concern in the Labour vanguard. There always was a Labour vanguard, although its life and traditions were conditioned by the bureaucratic structure of a Labour apparatus. This kept its political, cultural and programmatic level inferior to that in France, Italy and Germany. Today however, the Labour apparatus finds less ground for accommodation with capitalism, and the pressure of the masses from below is very great.

The Labour Party leadership was defeated in the elections (1979), but the masses and the trade unions opposed the dismissal of Derek Robinson<sup>9</sup> from his job at British Leyland. Thousands went on strike to defend not just a Communist leader, but the right of the trade

---

<sup>9</sup> Derek Robinson was a member of the British Communist Party and of the AUEW (Amalgamated Union of Engineering workers). In 1975, Robinson was convener at the Longbridge Plant of British Leyland. He defended the principle of workers' participation. He insisted that productivity should not lead to sackings, but to improve pay and conditions. In Nov 1979, he was sacked from his job for having added his name to a document critical of management. The TGWU (Transport and General Workers Union) supported him and demanded his reinstatement. It called a strike that involved 40,000 strikers and others laid off - but the leadership of the AUEW did not support. A sector of that leadership agreed instead to a productivity deal and sackings. When the AUEW itself backed away slightly from this position, it was too late. The employers had already imposed closures. A mighty opportunity to increase workers participation and control had been lost, through the class collaboration of Union leaders, but most of all through the class collaboration and cowardice of the Labour Party that never called on the rest of the class to support..

unions to weigh in the leadership of the country<sup>10</sup>. Even if the Communists are not entirely correct and lack the preparation to use this situation, the masses support their leaders and oppose the capitalist system. This goes against the Labour leadership too, worsening the conditions that capitalism needs to prop itself up.

The laws to victimize immigrants show that capitalism is locked in a reactionary and protectionist mode. Such laws show how much capitalism has become confined. The fighting disposition of the Labour masses has not declined however, and there is a scientific elevation in the political discussions on the left.

British imperialism seeks to insulate the Labour and trade union left from the political influence of world forces confronting capitalism. Because imperialism is preparing for war, the Labour Party and the trade unions tend to be more systematic in their political opposition.

British imperialism is the right arm of Yankee imperialism. It fears that a tendency, even small in number, may turn into a centre of political advance helpful to a more systematic anti-capitalist struggle.

The limitations in the trade union leaderships exist for a series of reasons, the most important being the policy of the Soviet bureaucracy in Stalin's time, but now the situation has changed.

Capitalism is in a very great crisis. Competition is fierce between Britain, France, Germany and the United States. They are all united by their class interests in opposition to the USSR, but this unity contains many complications. This allows the Soviet Union to gain time and attract the masses.

Capitalism prepares the war in the middle of growing unemployment, repression and rising prices. Its repression has no real effect because it does not stop the revolutionary movements of the world. On the contrary, the latter pick up the challenges and win.

---

<sup>10</sup> This should have been made easier by British Leyland having been recently nationalised.

**In the coming war, the world masses  
will not support capitalism**

Capitalism prepares the atomic war in the worst conditions for itself. It knows that in its confrontation with the Workers States, half of the population of France, Britain and Germany will side with the Workers States. It feels that the masses are going to rise against it at the very start of the war. The decisive force in each country is its progressive vanguard, not the bureaucratic layers in the trade unions!

Note the caution with which capitalism moves in the preparation of the war. This is because the world masses oppose it. In the other wars, capitalism did not face the opposition of the masses. It attracted them nationally against the external enemy which was also capitalist. Now, there are Workers States, and the world masses have seen that it is in the Workers States that the masses liberate themselves.

**J. POSADAS**  
23.12.79

# **STALIN, THE WORKERS STATE AND THE ATOMIC WAR**

**J. POSADAS**

5.3.1977

---

The reason for the rise of Stalinism was the absence of scientific thought, absence of Marxist application, absence of Marxist comprehension and absence of Marxist education. Although these interests had material bases, one must remember that they emanated from social layers which had come forward during the revolution.

Stalinism perverted scientific thought; it destroyed it and put bureaucratic thought in its place. Concrete and material interests motivated this perversion, certainly, and they emanated from the Workers State. They were not the sort of direct and counter-revolutionary interests you find in the capitalist system, but they came from the Workers State. What gave them birth was the contradictory functioning of the Workers State. Bureaucracy is an intimate part of the contradictory functioning of the Workers State.

## **The Stalin leadership arose from specific circumstances**

What makes the Workers State partially revolutionary is State-owned property, planned production and the State leading society's activities. Beyond this revolutionary foundation however, the bourgeois type of distribution perpetuates bourgeois social relations. Here lies the contradictory character of the Workers State.

In today's USSR <sup>(1977)</sup> distribution continues to be through the wage, i.e. through 'to each according to their ability'. The latter is a bourgeois relation between the workers and between people which the bureaucracy preserves to guarantee its continued existence. The existence of the bureaucracy depends on the perpetuation of

this contradiction. As far as the Workers State is concerned, this contradiction is an abnormality. It may eventually become antagonistic to the Workers State, but it stands also a chance to be overcome by the Workers State adopting a superior form of distribution. In the USSR, this contradiction has persisted to this day, but it did not roll back the Workers State.

Stalin could develop the Soviet bureaucratic apparatus because the circumstances of history allowed. The Stalin question is one of historic circumstances. Stalin himself could not possibly have created such a bureaucracy. To view Stalin as the maker of the Soviet bureaucracy is to grant him a genius and ability that he did not have. It would have taken a genius to do such a thing. Had Stalin been so intelligent, he would have supported the revolution, not the counter-revolution. Intelligence seeks out progress and rejects retrogression.

Stalin's rise was helped by historic circumstances that he did not even foresee. The Bolsheviks had foreseen the process, but not the forms it would take. With the first Workers State, history took a leap never taken before. It was the first time. Stalin took command, but the world forces allowed this first Workers State to continue. Indeed it was because it continued that a bureaucracy sprouted, developed and determined the character of the State.

As the lone Workers State settled down, bureaucratic swindle grew, and then Stalin weakened it further by assassinating its Bolshevik leaders. For indeed Stalin eliminated the whole Bolshevik leadership. He persecuted his opponents, threw them in prison - even right-wing ones like Bukharin - and murdered the revolutionaries. He buried the revolutionary past of the Russian Revolution; and in the Party, he suppressed all the Marxist means of theoretical and political life. This tore the Workers State away from its original revolutionary aim. If careerism grew, it was not because hidden parts of society were now sprinting forward to become bureaucrats. It did not happen that way because the bureaucracy is a social consequence. As the conditions became favorable to bureaucracy, social layers developed for the role. A bureaucratic body like that around Stalin could only form because a limited, nationalist, Russian and Russophile mentality had persisted. Here was the raw material for Stalin's bureaucracy.

If the Bolshevik Party became bureaucratic, that was because the Bolsheviks leaders were thrown out, and then killed. Mind that this isolated Stalin too, because he became dependent on the bureaucracy.

As far as the bureaucracy was concerned, it was in its interests to liquidate Stalin; it had reasons to wish to put in power one of its own to negotiate away with capitalism. So why did it keep Stalin? It kept him because he had been a Bolshevik. Stalin was the link with the past. Fearing the proletariat, the bureaucracy needed this link with the past, to use as a crutch. The bureaucracy feared the workers' reaction should it throw Stalin overboard. It felt that such a break with the past was too great a rupture, and beyond the pale. And so it kept Stalin. It kept him as a bonus to the workers: Here is your Man with the Bolshevik Past, although it is past...

Stalin was the first to eliminate the dictatorship of the proletariat. He was the first to put 'plurality' in the place of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hadn't the dictatorship of the proletariat become old-hat? It was not needed any more. Times had changed. Communist parties were no longer as necessary as before, and there was no longer any need for Russian Revolutions; anyone still attached to superior ideas should place them under Stalin's banner. But today, in 1977, have not times changed again? To the Communist parties that seek 'euro-communism' and 'pluralism', we say in our turn that these notions are now old-hat and not needed any more.

Stalin liquidated everyone, and then he was liquidated. Observe how the Soviet Workers State endured all this and continued to develop! A whole layer of old Bolsheviks - a very large layer - supported the return of the Workers State to its proper role, but all these people are now gone. It may be that there are still old Bukharinists, Trotskyists or similar revolutionaries in today's USSR, but such sectors could not possibly have survived as organizations.

Stalin held the Workers State down, isolated it and weakened it further. Yet capitalism failed to roll it back! So strong were the pillars of human confidence and doggedness that the Russian Revolution had planted through Lenin's program, Lenin's policy and Lenin's methods. Around this, a tradition was born of the undying and gripping sort that ties irrevocably the future with the past.

The tradition of the Russian Revolution cannot be erased because it goes on answering the conclusions, the consequences and the methods necessary for the development of the revolution.

The leadership of the Russian Revolution was beheaded, along with the Bolshevik Party of the epoch of Lenin. As the latter will not return, another Party is necessary. There was a time when the policy of the Fourth International sought to regenerate old parties<sup>11</sup> through "entryism". The expectation was that our development *within* these parties could help them regenerate. The reverse happened in the sense that the world process brought about this regeneration from the *outside*. The world process rose to the task of regeneration, so to say, proving that entryism had not been the way. And it is logical, really, that things should have happened in that way.

**Capitalism cannot regenerate,  
but the Workers State can**

Capitalism cannot 'regenerate' because private property will never be collective. Any attempt at the regeneration of capitalism raises storms of antagonistic contradictions that destroy those who try it - bourgeois people included. To the reverse of this, attempts at regenerating the Workers State do not destroy those who try. The Workers State is contradictory, but it can 'regenerate' precisely because it is contradictory.

The Soviet Union preserved *collective ownership, planned production* and *State control over foreign trade*. These are the essential principles of Workers State development. In preserving them, the USSR kept itself open to regeneration. It kept the ability to produce leaderships open to the eventual reanimation of those principles and their further deepening.

**A Partial Regeneration  
is taking place in the USSR**

As we said above, and elsewhere<sup>12</sup>, a Partial Regeneration is taking place in the Soviet Union.

---

<sup>11</sup> Communist parties and others.

<sup>12</sup> See "Partial Regeneration, the historic re-encounter and the Permanent Revolution in this stage of history", J Posadas, 27.8.1971. Obtainable on demand.

The *forms* of this regeneration are shaped by the way the original Bolshevik Party was beheaded, and is now dead and gone. In the USSR of today (1977), its *forms* can be guessed at behind economic and national policies; but they are absolutely clear - although still incomplete - in the world policies of the USSR. It is true that no Soviet political current is leading any return to Lenin, and we have seen no writings on this subject. This does not stop it happening however, and it is very clear in the world policies of the USSR. This process draws the USSR closer to the genuine role that it should play in the world as vital center for revolution and social transformation. Fertile ground for the development of a new Party!

The manner of this regeneration is expressed in a very fragmented way, and we hear of no political tendency discussing it. Maybe it is too early, or not enough people are drawing conclusions from what the USSR does in the world; but a process of regeneration is taking place, and most particularly in the Soviet Union.

**The contradiction within capitalism  
cannot be compared with that in the Workers State**

The Workers State is contradictory because its state-owned and planned form of property eliminates competition, but not the market. It mollifies the market, but it does not eliminate it. The capitalist market is the direct consequence of competition. It makes the capitalist class avid for profits, competition and sales because this is how it materializes the surplus value.

In any country and internationally, economic competition is a battlefield. On that battlefield, the 'multinationals' have taken over from yesterday's trusts and monopolies. Now the world role of the multinationals amounts to that of imperialism, economically, socially, militarily.

The multinationals are more concentrated than the monopolies they gobbled up, and they are also more ephemeral. They appear and disappear in a flash because it is not in their role to grow the economy. This was the case with the monopolies too, but this is now more systematic. The multinationals are feverish, fleeting, uncertain and transitory; but they own entire operating networks, from the raw materials, to armaments, to the war preparations.



Capitalism and the Workers States are antagonistic because their property regimes are opposed. Between the two property regimes, there is no common ground. Between them, there is no eventual possibility of agreement. The contradiction in the capitalist regime comes from the fact that each capitalist must destroy the other in the market-place. They all have the same interests within the capitalist State and private property, but they annihilate each other in competition. Considered as a whole, capitalist infighting destroys at least 30% of global production. The 'overpriced' goods, i.e. those that are not sold, are discarded and destroyed. The least competitive capitalists are eliminated too - and let us not forget the huge social effort made on top of this, and also gone to waste.

The total cost of all these losses finds its way in the price of the goods that are sold. If you said that all the prices of the world put together represent the sum-total of all labour-power, this would still include the immense competitive waste that we have just mentioned. This contradiction is inherent to capitalist functioning. It is insoluble within capitalist functioning and makes capitalism perfectly antagonistic with human need.

None of this can be said about the Workers State! The contradiction of the Workers State is due to State-property and planned production being in contradiction with the bourgeois social relation of distribution through wages. As we said above, this can be ended by the Workers State adopting a superior mode of distribution. Nothing like this applies to the contradiction of capitalism. Competition being at the base of capitalist functioning, the contradiction of its system cannot be overcome. Within it, the antagonism between capitalism and human progress is intractable - but none of this can be said of the contradiction of the Workers State!

**Up to Socialism,**  
**the working class will be essential and pivotal**

Competition and a market economy still exist in the Soviet Workers State. Prices are determined by the hours of work, but also by elements of continuing competition. This no longer has the same force as in capitalism because State planning and ownership allow the State to fix prices that consider human need. The market is no longer the brute that rules over production and commerce. Its power is blunted because the State can restrain and limit it.

Indeed this is why the Workers State survived Stalin and the assault of Stalinism. It is also why the working class went on to build the USSR in spite of Stalin and his monstrous deeds against the Bolsheviks and the Party. Let us not forget that the working class created the Soviet Workers State in four years flat, 1917-1924! This could only happen because the working class assimilates the best of all experiences and leaves the rest behind. With the partial regeneration that we now observe in the USSR, the working class opens its arms to the future, leaving *Socialism in one country* behind.

This applies to the world working class too. Indeed it is the world working class that assimilates most completely the experiences of the world. The proletarian class does not draw its culture and knowledge from academies. It draws these from the role which it plays in production and society. The function it plays there highlights its importance and makes it aware of its reality as essential and pivotal. This is so because up to Socialism, production will remain essential and pivotal.

Through its position in society, the proletariat develops a towering notion that its class role is unlike that of any other class in history. As it cannot become a new proprietor, and never will become one, its social choices are always objective.

Even if it is not in a position to formulate such ideas, the Soviet proletariat is entirely part of this. For the proletariat to formulate such ideas, it needs the proletarian functioning of its own meetings and congresses. There are communist Congresses in the USSR and other parts of the communist movement, but these are top-down affairs, with the line often decided in advance, sometimes a whole year in advance - perhaps not so much as a year these days, due to the return of certain aspects of political and theoretical life.

### **The irreplaceable role of the working class**

The Soviet Union must allow the confidence and concerns of the Soviet working class to be specifically expressed. The working class needs this, if only to take a measure of the world for itself, and communicate as a working class directly with the world.

The working class of the Soviet Union wants to give its own opinion. It wants to participate. Given half a chance, it would tell the world Communists to drop Euro-communism, to defend the dictatorship of the proletariat, to defend the Soviet Union and its Communist Party (CPSU). It is not that the Soviet workers follow the CPSU blindly: they do not! They put pressure on the leaders. They use their workers' organizations to bring more class reasoning and ideas to the Party, and they do not reckon that their class organizations need to be smashed and rebuilt. They do not think that this is necessary at all.

In the USSR, the Soviet working class knows how to impose changes because it does it all the time. See how it imposed changes on Stalin! The bureaucracy did not topple Stalin for fear of the reaction of the proletariat. Stalin came, but the working class did not allow itself to be smashed by him. It continued to press ahead instead.

**It was the Soviet proletariat  
that defeated the Nazis – not the Soviet bureaucracy**

No Communist Party has spoken about what we have just explained, or takes it into account. But the USSR must take aspects of it into account because it has the most complete proletariat in the world. Most complete and youthful; its entire life-experience was made in the Workers State, which includes Stalin's stage. It is the Soviet proletariat that defeated the Nazis! It crushed the Nazis because it had to be done, not to claim victory. Hitler had to be crushed, and it did it; and when it became necessary to finish with Stalin, the Soviet proletariat did that too.

In the Second World War, twenty-three million Soviet people died, of which seven million women. Countless numbers of orphans spent weeks-on-end without food, but they did not surrender to self-pity. With their entire family dead, seven-year olds picked up the grenade and threw it back. It was not that these people were special, but that the Workers State had given them consciousness. Such is the effect of revolution. The Paris Commune (1871) and 1905 in Russia were no exceptions.

The revolution does not raise consciousness by hectoring, but by opening the gates to the intervention of the proletariat and its complete capacity to change society.

What the revolution brings to the proletariat in return, is the consciousness of its historic role and the realization that it has the objectivity to play that role. Apart from the proletariat, no other class can change society.

What a limited role the Soviet proletariat is allowed to play in the Soviet Union today! The Soviet Trade Unions make statements, but muted and belated ones. The communist leaders make pronouncements, but not the workers themselves, however keenly the latter want to do so.

By the nature of its role and resolve in history, the Soviet proletariat is fully alive to these matters. Why then is it not participating more? Can't it make its opinions known? Why does it not weigh in the world - addressing the CGIL in Italy for instance, and the CGT in France? Why does it not speak in favour of a Trade Union Center in China, which does not exist? Why does it not direct itself to the Trade Unions of the United States, recommending unity and workers control? The answer lies in the fact that Stalin was liquidated, but the consequences of Stalin remained ...

#### **The need for Soviet democracy in the Workers States**

The old Bolshevik Party was destroyed and there is nothing left of it. We believe that a new Party has to be built in the Soviet Union because the bureaucratic structure of the CPSU is made of careerists who stop the Party reasoning, communicating, processing experiences and living dialectically internally.

We believe that a new Party is wanted, and that this can only come from a whole new experience in the Soviet Union. In any such process, the Soviet masses, the Trade Unions and the Soviet proletariat will want to intervene, give their opinions, participate, and hold meetings in order to be heard.

In the speeches of some Soviet officials, and in certain public announcements in the USSR, we see hints that the working class is exerting a pressure. The CPSU recently reproved middle cadres and leaders for not discussing with the population, not trying to find out what people think and not responding to their concerns.

This news took the form of a CPSU resolution that was published this year. It is a bureaucratic resolution, but it tends to correct mistakes that hinder the development of the USSR.

We grant that this change is still very partial. It is a fact however that those changes are getting more frequent and almost constant, whilst the world intervention of the USSR increases markedly. This progress is still partial, but we believe that it will continue, and take more open revolutionary forms.

The essential sweep of history points in the direction of Soviet Democracy. In today's USSR (1977), rights are granted to the working class and not to the maverick and anti-communist dissidents. The working class of the USSR needs more than this however. It needs to be actively and decisively involved in the running of the country. Only this can truly encourage and influence the working class of the world. Should the Soviet workers be allowed to weigh and intervene in the USSR, this would sway the workers of Japan, Germany, Britain, France, Italy, Portugal, Spain – and most particularly those in North America, Britain, Germany and Japan. With democratic Soviet functioning, the USSR would not only act in solidarity with the workers of the world, it would overcome its own contradictions. Because this is not happening, bureaucratic management is allowed to minimize the development of the USSR.

Capitalism has no prospect of continued life, and it has no perspective through fascism either. It is bound to fail, whatever it chooses to do. In 1939, Trotsky posed that a victory for Hitler, should it happen, could only be for a very short time. Fascism is always in a position to launch coups. Some of these can last, but many collapse almost as soon as they start. Capitalism no longer has the historic strength to succeed in this manner for very long. There are 14 structured Workers states, and with others less formed ones, there are at least 20. These others are like Somalia, South Yemen, Algeria, China, Vietnam, Laos, Angola, Mozambique; they are already Workers States without having all the structures. Where humanity already solves its problems through Workers States, there cannot remain much room for fascism in history. This is not a socially interested pronouncement. It is a scientific conclusion.

Humanity already knows that social problems are solved the way the Soviet Union did it; it sees that the USSR endured Stalin and still continued to progress. How believe that people are stupid and have not noticed these facts? Those who believe this are not being objective. They may not be badly intentioned, but their lack of objectivity stems from a fear rooted in their lack of theoretical security.

**Since the war of capitalism cannot be stopped, it must be defeated**

Fascism is going to try its hand again, but it will fail. It is necessary to say this! The Posadists want to avoid the war as much as anybody, but can it be done? Who can believe that Lenin, or Marx, did not wish to avoid war? The position is that it is not possible to prevent the war. The war of capitalism stems from the relations of its system. It does not come from warmongers, but from capitalism. "Capitalism is war", just as Marx said, and Lenin. The Communists say that capitalism "can make war" but not that "capitalism is war". They must say that capitalism is war, because competition and antagonism are war. Bourgeois relations boil down to war. The capitalists seek to smash each other and are easily resigned to let people die. Seveso<sup>13</sup> is an example of the way capitalism is war.

It is necessary to assert that the atomic war is coming, and to prepare for it. This does not mean just to don helmets and prepare the atomic weapon. It means to acquire the theoretical security that capitalism is going to make the war and that it will be atomic. We call this war "the atomic charco" to mean that it will be extremely devastating but also very short. There will be millions killed, and we cannot stop it. It does no good to close one's eyes and not see it coming. Closing the eyes to historic and concrete analysis will not prevent the war. Can capitalism have a solution other than this? Will it allow itself to be dislodged from history? Can we convince it? Impede it?

---

<sup>13</sup> Seveso: On 10.7.1976, the poison gas TCDD escaped from a chemical manufacturing plant - killing 3,300 animals almost immediately - near Milan in Lombardy, Italy. A week passed before the dioxin leak was admitted, and another week before the evacuation of people was started. Another similar example is to be found in the thousands of fugitives who drown in the Mediterranean as they flee the imperialist-triggered mayhem in their countries of the Middle East and Africa.

The only way to impede that war is to take power everywhere. This could do, but capitalism will make the war *before* we take power everywhere. Should Spain and Italy start making Workers States, capitalism will hasten the war. At least it will try fascist attacks in those countries. Can the Soviet Union, then, let Italy be transformed into a fascist bastion to be used by imperialism as a base for total war?

**Partial Regeneration,**  
**the possibility to take power**  
**and the need to take power**

Cuba sent soldiers to Angola which is quite a long way. This could only be done with the support of the Soviet Union. With its satellites, Yankee imperialism kept checking the number of Cuban soldiers arriving each day, but finally it did not stop them. US imperialism was not short of the material means to stop the Cubans! What it felt short of was the social support to do so at no costs to itself. From this experience, it is necessary to appreciate the weakness of capitalism even within its war preparations.

The Soviet leadership too is afraid because it is coming face-to-face with the fact that it is not the genuine and integral representative of the progress of the Soviet Union, or its development. Usurper of the Soviet Workers State, and living off it, the bureaucracy feels unrepresentative and afraid. All its observations and conclusions being subjective, it is entirely incapable of objectivity. One needs to draw such conclusions!

Cuba's intervention in Africa shows that it is possible to advance in the anti-capitalist struggle without capitalism launching the war. Observe therefore how capitalism cannot launch the war when it wants, where it wants and how it wants. These are principles and conclusions it is necessary to derive from this experience.

The fact that the Soviet Union was behind the Cuban intervention, and in such a public manner, is going to stimulate the North American proletariat. It is going to stimulate the North American masses to intervene, prepare and organize with the proletariat. The proletariat of Europe is ready to take power. The elections, the great strikes, the trade union concentrations and the growth of latter, show that the proletariat is ripe for capitalist overthrow.

There have been periods of very important strikes in Germany during which the German Communist Party stopped its attacks on Trotskyism. The pressure of the masses caused that change. The question of the Partial Regeneration needs the intervention of Posadism. It needs the circulation of the texts of Posadism. The Trotskyists-Posadists intervene in this process.

**J. POSADAS**

5.3.1977



## ***About J Posadas ...***

J. Posadas was born in Argentina in 1912 and died in Italy in 1981. He started his activities as a Trade Union leader in the shoe industry. He soon adopted the ideas of Trotsky and joined the IV International. He then developed as a writer, theoretician, political leader and revolutionary organiser.

In view of the process of Peronism and revolutionary nationalism, he created a movement in Argentina and in Latin America based on texts such as: '**Five-Year Plan or the Permanent Revolution**' (1947), '**Peronism**' (1963) and '**From Nationalism to the Workers State**' (1966).

Those who belonged to the leading group of the IV International in those days greeted his ideas with incomprehension. J. Posadas separated himself from them as they were abandoning the Marxist principles needed to analyse the Soviet Union, the Communist parties and various mass parties like the Labour Party. In 1962 he organised the Trotskyist-Posadist IV International.

A flurry of his fundamental texts followed, such as: '**The Construction of the Workers State and from the Workers State to Socialism**', '**Partial Regeneration, Historic Re-encounter and the Process of the Permanent Revolution in this Stage**', '**The role of the USSR in History**', '**The Living Thought of Trotsky**' and '**The Revolutionary State**'.

In the more general field of Art, Science and Culture, J. Posadas has left many other writings. They incorporate into the Marxist analysis subjects ranging from 'human relations' to 'the Communist future of humanity'. It all forms part of his **History of the Human Civilisation** which remained unfinished due to his unexpected death.

The works of J. Posadas and the example of his life champion the confidence and security of humanity. As he used to say: "*Socialism is not only a necessity of history, but of life itself*".

His following last words give food for thought: "*Life has no sense without the struggle for Socialism, whatever the consequences*".

**Quote from the author:**

“One must consider that the historic nature and function of the bureaucracy deprives it of the ability to change. It can learn many tricks but it will never acquire revolutionary culture. Bureaucracy is not interested in revolutionary culture, because revolutionary culture runs counter to its interests and function. Not only the bureaucracy sees no need to educate itself, it is opposed to it. The objective process rolls right over its capacity to foresee or to understand anything.

The revolution has been stronger than the bureaucracy. If revolution did not triumph worldwide, it is because it failed to form a leadership in time. What it produced, nevertheless, is a situation that forced the bureaucracy to transform itself partially.

Meanwhile, the world process has gone on gathering and developing the forces of the revolution. We cannot say how these forces will evolve in the future, but they will have to play the role of leadership for the *Political Revolution*. These forces are emerging from a process that combines the struggle within the Workers States, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist countries, and the revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America. [..]”<sup>14</sup>

**J POSADAS**

In the chapter: *Partial Regeneration, Historic Re-encounter and the Permanent Revolution in this stage of history*, 27.8.1971

---

<sup>14</sup> From the book : « *L'Union Soviétique, son évolution de Staline à aujourd'hui* » J Posadas, collection de textes, 1971-1981, Published in the *Edition Science Culture et Politique*, No. 31, June 1984, p92.