

THE REVOLUTIONARY STATE,
ITS TRANSITORY ROLE
AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF
SOCIALISM

J. POSADAS

28 - 29 September 1969

Scientific, cultural and
Political Editions

To the reader:

This text
emanates from
several recorded
Conference speeches
by the author.

The original title of this document is:
**The Revolutionary State,
its transitional role
and the construction of Socialism
J Posadas, 28-29 Sept 1969**

On the main picture on the cover:
Women Workers' Militias in
Venezuela (Caracas 2012).

Correspondence to:
SCPE, Suite 252
61 Praed Street
Paddington
London W2 1NS
Great Britain
www.scientific-cultural-and-political-editions.org
mlsculturaleditions@yahoo.com

ISBN No. 978-0-907694-08-3
NOVEMBER 2014

Foreword ..

From his observations of the colonial and the semi-colonial world after 1945, **J Posadas** foresaw that the Nationalist Revolution in Cuba had all the conditions to become communist. In 1966, J Posadas generalised upon this observation in his text: *From the Nationalist Revolution to the Workers State*. In 1969, he wrote the present book where he characterised the **Revolutionary State** as a stage of transition towards the Workers State and Socialism.

When J Posadas spoke of the *Revolutionary State*, countries like Bolivia, Libya, South Yemen, Mali, Ghana, Peru, Egypt, Congo and others, had adopted - or were adopting - measures and property forms harmful to capitalism. The author insists that the *Revolutionary State* does not alter Lenin's principles. It is a capitalist State, and not a new form of State. In the words of the author, it is "a capitalist State involved in a transition tending to measures harmful to the capitalist system" and "where action favourable to the Workers State is becoming possible".

All the aspects of the *Revolutionary State* which J Posadas characterises in this book are now entirely applicable to Venezuela in 2014. The Revolutionary State is a country that no longer can, or tries, to compete with world capitalism. Its State plays a large and stable role in economic and social development. It seeks the support of Workers States and makes relations with them.

It is important to note that from 1999 onwards - and in spite of the fall of the Soviet Union - Venezuela started building the most advanced *Revolutionary State* ever. Along with the Cuban Workers State today, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador and Nicaragua form a continental structure whose growing integration helps even countries like Argentina and Brazil rebuff the worst of imperialism's violence.

The process of integration between the *Revolutionary States* of Latin America is stimulating the creation of organs of continental collaboration like Unasur, Mercosur, Celac¹, etc. These attract other Revolutionary States, like Iran for instance.

../.

¹ **Unasur**: Intergovernmental body, the 4th largest economic bloc in the world, comprising Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Mercosur: Sub-regional trade bloc comprising Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay?, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Associates: Chile, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. Observers: Mexico and New Zealand. Celac next page.

Celac: Community of Latin American and Caribbean States; formed of all the countries of the American continent except the United States and Canada.

The partnerships between Latin America and Russia-China are a great source of confidence for the revolutionary masses involved of this process.

The Popular Republics of Eastern Ukraine (and Crimea's vote to return to Russia) show that the structure of the Soviet Union and other 'socialist countries' has not entirely disappeared. This creates conditions for the development of new Workers States and *Revolutionary States*.

In the elaboration of the concept of the *Revolutionary State*, J Posadas starts from the conclusion that the capitalist system is in its final and global crisis, with no hope to recover or integrate new countries in its capitalist regime. This is why already in 1972, the author was writing about the possibility of *Revolutionary States* eventually forming even in Europe - in France, Italy or Portugal for instance².

The concept of the *Revolutionary State* explains also the crisis of Revolutionary Nationalism in various parts of today's world. This is particularly the case in Africa and the Middle East, where imperialism - with its wars - seeks to destroy the countries that most progressed along *Revolutionary State* roads³.

The unbending tenacity, resistance and courage of the world masses⁴ partly compensate for the retrogression of the Workers States (USSR and 'socialist countries'). Faced with the third world war that capitalism prepares - and has already started - what J Posadas calls "the unconscious world United Front [of humanity] moving towards consciousness" is in urgent need of a conscious and organic form.

This book on the *Revolutionary State* is an essential contribution to the task of building the "International of Humanity" for the defeat of capitalism's war and the revolutionary transformation of the world.

Editorial SCPE
November 2014

² **Read by J Posadas:** *The Revolutionary process in Europe and the Revolutionary State alternative for the construction of Socialism*, 23.9.1972.

³ **Examples:** Libya, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Syria.

⁴ **As in Gaza** for instance, or in the struggle against war and austerity in the capitalist world.

THE REVOLUTIONARY STATE, ITS TRANSITORY ROLE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM

J. POSADAS

28 - 29 September 1969

In definitions given by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, there is either capitalist State or Workers State, and no other form of State. But in this historic stage, the world revolutionary process advances, and will continue to advance, by creating local and global conditions of power dualities. States and governments keep their capitalist nature and motives, but in some countries, the State must adopt functions, structures, relations and property forms that escape the capitalist system. The fundamentals of those States - or most of the fundamentals - stay as in the capitalist system, but their new norms are not strictly capitalist. Indeed these are harmful to the capitalist system, and there is an internal process of power dualities.

How do you define this evolution in history that Marx and Engels did not foresee? We call it *the Revolutionary State*. We do not say 'Revolutionary Government' because governments change whilst the Revolutionary State does not. The latter challenges the existence of capitalism with property structures, modes of operation and interior relations rooted in conditions that no longer depend on the accumulation of capital. Anyone opposed to it must first launch a counter-revolutionary coup.

Countries like Bolivia, Libya, South Yemen, Mali and Ghana⁵ are *Revolutionary States* - not Revolutionary Governments. It is true that they are part of the capitalist system, but their structures and socio-economic relations cannot keep up with the large or concentrated reproduction of capital. This invites socialist and revolutionary solutions. These do not overturn capitalism, but they help it to disintegrate.

⁵ See details page 118.

Our historic stage is determined by 14 to 16 Workers States, and at least 10 other countries close to becoming Workers States.

There are revolutions all over the world, in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Yankee imperialism is being routed. Impotent and unable to crush the struggle of the Vietnamese, it contemplates its fate through its burial in Vietnam.

THE REVOLUTIONARY STATE IS NOT BONAPARTISM⁶

There is no bonapartism in the transitional period we are living in (1969). The force that is driving change today does not flick forward and back to create structures as in bonapartism. In our case, two established structures already exist.

The first is the capitalist State. It defends profit-making as well as the capitalist system itself, its interests and its reproduction. The second structure is the Workers State. It is led by State-property, planned production and the State monopoly of foreign trade. The Workers State eliminates the commercial interest and the need to exploit. It lays the foundations for Socialism.

Between these two structures, a situation has developed that Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky did not foresee. What happened is that the world revolution kept growing, but the Communist and Workers States' leaderships kept refusing to take power. This explains the 14 to 16 Workers States⁷ of today (1969), with 10 other countries not far from being Workers States.

This has created a world environment highly charged and favourable to revolution. It influences the petit bourgeois layers in the capitalist institutions - army, police, church.

⁶ Trotsky refers to bonapartism in his analysis of the rise of Stalin as part of the quick growth of a bureaucracy that was supporting itself on the legitimate structures of the young USSR. See Leon Trotsky, in *Bonapartism and Fascism*, 15 July 1934.

⁷ See details on page 118.

Today's world environment influences the technicians and professionals of the capitalist system. Up to recently, all these used to be the servants of the capitalist system. Even political parties of bourgeois origins are affected, like the *Christian Democrats*. The revolution seeps deep into the structures of capitalism.

In Bolivia, Peru, Ghana or Mali, the masses do not attempt to take power, but the impact of the world on these countries creates situations bordering on revolution. This is not 'bonapartism' because no masses have taken power as in the Soviet Union. Here, no Trade Unions, revolutionary or mass parties are taking power, and what is more, the leaders originate from capitalism! They speak in the name of capitalism, but they take measures that undermine it. Bolivia and Libya are examples. The nationalist leadership of Muslim origins in Libya wants to hear nothing of Socialism or of Marx, but its policies corrode capitalism. We identified this process long ago, at its start, in South Yemen, Mali and Ghana.

The above-named countries adopt dozens of policies of the kind we have just described. They build no Workers States, but they take non-capitalist steps. The latter do not originate from anything like Workers States' organs, structures or functions, but they still impair the economic and social fabric of capitalism. Their Workers State resembling aspects prevail over their capitalist resembling ones - calling for a definition.

In our⁸ perspectives and prospects, our *Revolutionary State* definition is central. It helps us clarify our own position, and it identifies the forces that the world revolution should be able to count upon against the capitalist system. This is why a definition was so much required.

* * * * *

⁸ Refers to the Posadist IV International created by J Posadas. See the author's short biography page 119.

The Revolutionary State is a capitalist state

The *Revolutionary State* is a capitalist State. It is capitalist in light of its origins and intentions. As it develops however, it makes alterations in the structures of property, triggering an evolution in society and its social functions. Agrarian reform, for example, is an anti-capitalist measure. It was introduced in Peru⁹ to kick-start the internal market, but it kicked the capitalist system instead. Capitalism needs to own the land and finance - and agrarian reform expropriates both.

It is a fact that the policies of the *Revolutionary States* have nothing to do with the proletariat. Their various governments have no connection with the proletariat. What is particular to them is that they cannot keep up with capital accumulation at the level demanded by capitalist competition worldwide. Bolivia, Peru, Ghana or Mali will never compete at that level.

We wanted this situation in history to be defined on a par with dual-power¹⁰. To this end, we identified reliable landmarks and looked into the future. We then crafted a definition to match the objective situation and its perspectives. We wanted the definition to be reliable. It had to be sound enough for the strategy of the world revolution.

The *Revolutionary States* do not stem from events in particular countries. It is a world process of power-dualities that gives rise to them in particular countries. The world process today (1969) contains 14 to 16 Workers States and 10 other countries not far from being Workers States. In that process, the masses of France and Italy¹¹ have power within reach, and Latin America is in constant revolt or revolution.

⁹ **Agrarian Reform in Peru**: The government of Velasco Alvarado started a large process of Agrarian Reform and encouraged the participation of the workers in the new social sectors of agrarian enterprise. (See page 118)

¹⁰ **Dual-power**: “[With dual-power] a class [...] not yet master of the country has actually concentrated in its hands a significant share of the State’s power [...]”. Leon Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution*, Vol 1, Chapter eleven: ‘The overthrow of Czarism’.

¹¹ In September 1972, the author suggested the possibility of a *Revolutionary State* forming in a European capitalist country. Read: *The Revolutionary Process in Europe and the alternative of the Revolutionary State in the construction of Socialism*. (The Carnations Revolution in Portugal was on the 25 April 1974).

Our world is driven by constant crises and fluctuating power dualities. Apart from France and Italy, none of these are led by Communist parties. They are led by Nationalist Movements that the Communist parties have quite simply opposed.

The Nationalist Movements have their origins in the capitalist regime which they used to shore up. Now however, they allow the development of revolutionary forces. They open up to the influence of the Workers States. This is so because they need to plan their economies and eliminate private property. They need to stop State property and large enterprise being used for private purposes.

Mind that the *Revolutionary State* is not a new form of State. It is a manner of transition between the capitalist State and the Workers State. It is the form taken by world power-dualities in specific countries. You could say that it is a form of dual-power where proletarian power does not figure. The leaders come from capitalism, but they can be influenced.

Our *Revolutionary State* qualification applies to countries with a specific structure. Once that structure has managed to shape enough economic relations, modes of development and economic functioning, it can no longer be rolled back. It cannot be rolled back because it will never be able to serve capitalist accumulation again. It is a partial form of capitalist disintegration! It takes this form because the Workers States and Communist parties refuse to take power in this historic stage where the capitalist system can hardly stand up. Our *Revolutionary State* formulation takes all this into account.

Because it owes its existence to world power-dualities, the *Revolutionary State* is neither bonapartism nor dual-power. It still competes with the rest of capitalism, although minimally. It does not question profit-making, capital accumulation or the continuation of private interests, but it creates economic structures no longer dependent on the concentrated reproduction of capital. These structures generate no new layers or sectors of bourgeois class. Instead of this, they generate tendencies looking up to the Workers States, to State-control and socialisation.

THE TRANSITION BETWEEN CAPITALIST STATE AND WORKERS STATE

Our *Revolutionary State* definition acknowledges the tendency of such States towards State-control. Our *Revolutionary State* definition opens new historic vistas, and we experience it as a political and organisational resource. It is based on the recognition that, whilst bureaucracy can still prevent the working class from taking power, the capitalist system is only holding on to its power by the skin of its teeth. Meanwhile, the world revolution continues, and the influence of 16¹² Workers States keeps growing over the *Revolutionary States*.

No-one is taking power anywhere in the world, but the masses challenge capitalist power everywhere. Helped by gigantic world power dualities, many weaker capitalist countries have found a new path to development. Their leaders have no connection with workers' parties, Trade Unions or Communist parties, but they gnaw at the capitalist system. Some even create forms and structures outside the process that reproduces the capitalist system.

The concept of the *Revolutionary State* grants that we are still dealing with a capitalist State: a capitalist State involved in a transition where action favourable to the Workers State is becoming possible. A stage of accentuated transition. A 'stage of transition' we say, and not dual-power.

With dual-power, it is not clear who controls important sections of property or of society; but this is not happening in the *Revolutionary State*. The particularity of the *Revolutionary State* is that the development of its economic structure is no longer favourable to the capitalist system. The proletariat is not yet in power, and there is no dual-power because the proletariat has not yet moved. With our *Revolutionary State* characterisation, the perspective is for much greater revolutionary developments still to come - and soon.

¹² In 1969, *Revolutionary States* like Algeria could sometimes be counted as Workers States.

Our close study of these matters suggested to us that the *Revolutionary State* cannot just be written off by counter-revolutionary coups. The facts are confirming this. The counter-revolution in Mali - or even in Indonesia¹³ - is not achieving much. Careful scientific study gave us this insight, along with the conviction that the stage of the *Revolutionary State* can only be a short transition towards the Workers State.

Our *Revolutionary State* definition recognises that in it, no proletarian or revolutionary movement is taking power from capitalism. The masses do not lead the process that creates *Revolutionary States*. The workers' parties and the Trade Unions are not leading, and more intriguingly, the movers of the process were in the service of the capitalist system up to yesterday. Now they turn against capitalism and stimulate economic measures detrimental to it. This is new in history! And it helps the development of the revolution!

The ruling class and the bourgeoisie have no difficulty in reading here the signs of their disintegration. The normal effect of Revolution is to fragment and demoralise the bourgeoisie. Revolution fills it with pessimism and defeatism. The full force of the hatred of the population impairs the ability of the bourgeoisie to have ideas and resist. It goes on fighting the revolution, of course, but with faded and jaded ideas. It sees the disintegration of the petit bourgeois layers, and this makes it feel alarmed, stranded and dependent on its organs of repression.

In this historic stage, even the bourgeois organs of repression receive the influence of the revolution. You find countries where the bourgeois repressive organs take the side of the revolution directly. The armies of Peru, Bolivia and Ghana behaved in this way at various times - and this keeps happening in parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

¹³ **In Indonesia**, the anti-imperialist and progressive leader Sukarno was toppled by the right wing coup of Suharto in 1967. It took Suharto a number of years and the complete support of US imperialism to withdraw the organs of mass participation from the political process. Editorial.

The bourgeoisie is forced to watch the haemorrhaging of its social support and the wavering of its State organs. And it is forced to note, with added dismay, that this is not even caused by Communist parties or mass struggles! Indeed just the reverse because, for an entire year, the Communist Party of Peru called the administration of Velasco Alvarado 'a government of gorillas'.

The forces that brought about the Alvarado government are not from Peru. They come from the world. They come from the impact which world forces are having on Peru. It is the world revolution that triggers this kind of phenomenon.

As we said, the leaders who create *Revolutionary States* originate from the capitalist regime. They come from bourgeois organisations, bourgeois institutions, the army. The army takes often a leading role in the revolution, because it is often the only constituted power. This is how the *Revolutionary State* comes about.

Our definition of the *Revolutionary State* in no way contradicts, negates or alters Lenin's definitions on the character of the State. All it does is put a stronger emphasis on a particular stage in the evolution of the State.

The huge impetus of the world revolution is crying out for power to be taken, but there are not the conscious revolutionary leaderships prepared to take it.

We reiterate that the general historic concept of the *Revolutionary State* indicates a stage of transition between the capitalist State and the Workers State. It marks a moment in the development of the State. And it eases the progress of the revolution.

This goes for countries where there are no proletarian forces already organised for the taking of power. In the countries where the proletariat is organised and could take power, there is no *Revolutionary State* process. There is dual-power instead, that is to say, a dispute for power between the masses and the bourgeoisie.

**The Revolutionary State
is not a new form of State**

A bonapartist government can create a bonapartist State: the latter leaves off being capitalist and still remains in capitalism. Aspects of this still happen, but today, the existence of 16 Workers States destroys the balance and stability wanted for the formation of such a bonapartist State. Oscillations are still observable in the *Revolutionary State* process. In this case, they affect the form of the *historic quality* of the State, driving it towards measures harmful to the capitalist system. And let's not forget that whenever a bonapartist State existed in the past, there were still only two forms of State: proletarian and bourgeois. No other form.

Bonapartism can happen when a bonapartist government has enough time to stamp its bonapartist character onto the State. Bonapartism is essentially ephemeral however. If you add 16 Workers States to this, and '*the final settlement of accounts*'¹⁴ drawing near, there is no space for extended periods of transition.

The *Revolutionary State* is a new factor in history. This is why Lenin and Trotsky did not speak about it. In bonapartism, the situation evolves waveringly, insecurely. In the *Revolutionary State*, events unfold steadily, and the leaders tend to be sure-footed from the start. You could say that the *Revolutionary State* is no longer bonapartism, or that it has gone beyond it. The dual-power exerted by the masses against capitalism is replaced by the weight of 16 Workers States and the ascending course of the world revolution.

These are all new facts in history. The Communists stopped understanding when they refused to trust the process. Their lack of confidence in the process turned them away from the need to dominate and develop Marxism, and this makes them unprepared for today.

¹⁴ **Final settlement of accounts:** The author uses this phrase to refer to the final confrontation between the world capitalist system on a one hand, and the system of the Workers States and Revolutionary States on the other – i.e., private appropriation for a few, against the objective and collective organisation of the world.

Lenin used to characterise every new phenomenon - and we endeavour to do the same. For when we defined the Cuban Workers State as "*sui generis*"¹⁵, this placed us at the cutting-edge of political reasoning¹⁶.

There cannot be correct policies without exact qualifications. Exact and scientific qualifications are wanted. And what is so scientific about the phrase *Revolutionary State*? The answer is that there are only two forms of State structures - capitalist State and Workers State - but that between capitalist State and Workers State, there can be intermediate States.

Today, any movement that enters revolution ends up being won by it. Consider Velasco Alvarado's actions in Peru for instance: are they revolutionary, yes or no? Yes they are. They are revolutionary in relation to the capitalist system. There is a transformation in the functioning of the State. This is why Peru is a *Revolutionary State*.

**The Revolutionary State
is not a Nationalist Government**

As a phenomenon, the *Revolutionary State* is particular to the historic period we live in. The notion of *Revolutionary State* may sound confusing to persons not very acquainted with the Marxist method or with little access to it. With this notion however, we feel able to follow the revolutionary process in spite of its extremely indefinite and variegated movements. Our aim is to identify there the forces that can be made useful.

Mind that we have not said that the *Revolutionary State* is a 'Nationalist Government'. In a nationalist government, internal struggles can lead to paralysis, incomprehension and outright retreats.

¹⁵ '**sui-generis**': The author explains elsewhere that the Cuban Revolution started off purely as Nationalist, unlike Russia and China where the III International and Communist parties were involved from the start.

¹⁶ '**Cutting edge of political reasoning**': Even before 1959, J Posadas could see that the Castro leadership and the conditions in Cuba were conducive to making a Workers State. This enabled him to take an active part in the formation of that Workers State, and to guide other Nationalist Revolutions.

The anti-capitalist economic and social measures of the *Revolutionary State*, on the other hand, mount up from deep-seated structures that only a counter-revolutionary coup and a confrontation with the masses can hope to reverse. The masses defend the *Revolutionary State* because it is progressive, whilst they do not always stand up for a nationalist government. Our discernment here comes from the scientific rigour we have put behind our concepts.

It is not right to cling to old definitions if they do not explain what is happening. Our historic stage being unlike any other, Trotsky could not have spoken of a *Revolutionary State*. Trotsky could not have spoken of 'the Partial Regeneration in the Workers States'¹⁷ either - for the same reason - but this does not stop a process of Partial Regeneration being at work today in the actual Workers States.

In the *Revolutionary State*, the class character of the *State* is bourgeois. Its bourgeois class character lives on, but it lives on with declining powers, particularly at the base of the *State* and in parts of its structures. Indeed it is mostly from those structures that its anti-capitalist measures emanate - or measures no longer dominated by capitalism.

This leads to changes sufficiently pronounced to justify the characterisation of *Revolutionary State*. We insist that this characterisation does not announce any new form of *State*. The *Revolutionary State* is still capitalist, but it marks a particular moment in the process of transition from capitalist *State* to Workers *State*.

There is a stage of transition between capitalism and Socialism: it is the Workers *State*.

In some countries, the stage of transition between the capitalist *State* and the Workers *State* is the *Revolutionary State*.

¹⁷ **Partial Regeneration:** Phrase used by J. Posadas in reference to the changes he observed in the Workers States, as when Cuba intervened in Africa with the support of the USSR. 'Regeneration' indicates that the bureaucracy must allow the Workers State to advance, and 'partial' indicates that it does this to keep its power.

**The Revolutionary State
is not a Socialist Revolutionary State**

The leaderships of the *Revolutionary States* are weak because they lack theoretical capacity and Marxist comprehension. They are not resolute in matters of socialist progress; but they are concerned, upset and alarmed by the degradation of the capitalist system. On seeing the misery of the masses, their first impulse is to fear the consequences. First they react to this by trying to stop the disintegration of capitalist society, and then, they start mistrusting the capitalist trajectory altogether.

The leaders of the *Revolutionary States* eventually realise that there are no capitalist solutions to the ills of their countries. They look about themselves, and what do they see? Socialist measures! Workers States' measures! It is true that they have no Marxist understanding. It is not their intention to make Workers States or Socialism, but a revolutionary determination galvanises their will against the apathy and the barbarism of capitalism. They take the obvious measures required, and these happen to build *Revolutionary States*. In that process, most of those leaders are won to the revolution.

What we have just described is the *Nationalist Revolution*. The origins of the Nationalist Revolution are bourgeois, but its measures, options and positions tend towards the elimination of the capitalist system. The Nationalist Revolution does not drop its bourgeois-class character, and we never said that it stopped being bourgeois. What we call *Revolutionary States* are countries where this kind of revolution happens. It is a Nationalist Revolution originating in the capitalist State and moving in the direction of the Workers State. Mind that the *Revolutionary State* is no more a Workers State than the Nationalist Revolution is a Socialist Revolution! We do not attribute to the *Revolutionary State* any proletarian-class character. This said, the *Revolutionary State* is a State where the revolutionary measures are sufficiently systematic – and not just incidental or occasional – to keep transforming the *function* of the State.

The *Revolutionary State* belongs to our epoch. It does not identify any new category of State, and it makes no new class characterisation of the State. The *Revolutionary State* is a capitalist State: a capitalist State that adopts measures through which it proceeds to negate itself. We call it *Revolutionary State*, and not 'Socialist Revolutionary State', to stress that the State has not undergone any qualitative transformation in class terms. But it is a State, and not a government.

* * * *

Libya and South Yemen are typical *Revolutionary States*. Such countries behave as revolutionary nationalists moving towards Workers States. They are not yet Workers States, but they forge ahead with a great number of State measures. We call them *Revolutionary States* because this is what they are in general appearance and character.

Capitalist and anti-capitalist interests coexist in such countries, but the winning interests are the anti-capitalist ones. The Peruvian government takes measures intended to create an internal market, but what it achieves instead is the partial suppression of capitalism. Peru is a *Revolutionary State* – a *State* that Peron of Argentina never achieved. We repeat that we have not spoken of any 'Socialist Revolutionary State'. We differentiate between *Revolutionary State*, 'Nationalist Revolution' and 'Revolutionary Nationalism', in order to adopt the right policies and stances towards these movements.

Peru is closer to the Workers State than to the capitalist State [1969]. How to define this? In our epoch of transition, this capitalist State has lost its original appearance. It is a *Revolutionary State*! It is not a Revolutionary Government, but a *State*, whose structure is already closer to the Workers State than to the capitalist one. The capitalist nature of the State of Peru has not been abandoned, but its actions come from an entrenched structure beyond its government. Whoever comes to government must start from this structure. Only scientific qualifications can allow this to be grasped.

Agriculture is 80% private in Poland. Is Poland still a Workers State? Yes it is, because it behaves fundamentally as a Workers State. Whether in the Workers States or in the *Revolutionary States*, events must be seen in movement. The policy of the *Revolutionary State* inclines towards capitalist elimination, and this continues as its governments change. In that inclination, nothing qualitative is altering the nature of the State, yet an approximation of such alteration is taking place. A chink opens, offering chances to understand and intervene. This State is not socialist, but it is revolutionary.

The Revolutionary State
is part of the Political Revolution

The *Revolutionary State* is a new phase in the history of the Political Revolution¹⁸ and the Socialist Revolution. It is one phase in a process of steady elevation. The world balance of forces favourable to the rise of revolution creates a very solid and prolific pool of *Revolutionary States*, i.e. States in transition between the capitalist State and the Workers State.

This is not a new stage in history. It is a new form in the process of history. It does not alter the course of history, but it alters the form under which it presents itself. In class terms, the *Revolutionary State* is not a new form of State, but it is a form, however, that its successive governments cannot change or reverse. The *Revolutionary State* has enough weight, volume and structure to impose itself on its governments.

Such is the stage we live in: a 'stage' we say, and not an 'aspect', because its form is so deeply favourable to the revolution. We could not have defined the *Revolutionary State* without theoretical rigour. That rigour told us that we were not looking at a new form of State, but that here was a State different from before! Strong of this understanding, we decided to intervene in this with all our might.

¹⁸ **Political Revolution**: Trotsky analysed that the struggle against bureaucracy in the USSR did not require returning to private property, but simply to elevate proletarian democracy. J. Posadas said that in many Workers States (like Cuba), this kind of 'revolution' could happen without weapons.

The *Revolutionary State* stems from the existence of 16 Workers States and 10 other countries not far behind. The impact of the world revolution brings such a State into being; strong power-dualities in France, Italy or Britain contribute to it. The Revolutionary State is not created by forces of its own. It comes from whirlwinds coming from far and wide, bringing influences from revolutionary advances in North America, France or Germany, or from elements of Political Revolution in the Workers States.

Meanwhile confidence nose-dives within the bourgeoisie and within the capitalist system itself. Willy Brandt¹⁹ and his policy of capitalist survival²⁰ epitomises this, along with Nixon²¹ who retreats, retreats and retreats, just to keep standing.

Capitalism no longer determines the course of history, or of politics. It is going to launch the atomic war, but it will not determine the course of that either. The way it thinks cannot change because it thinks only one way. The existence of the proletariat sends capitalism's priorities flying in all directions, but through its class concentration, the proletariat puts logical order in the priorities of humanity.

The proletariat brings order in society through its discipline. This is why it is not afraid of errors. Its errors never come from incapacity, insufficiency or bad faith. These may come from ingenuousness and lack of experience, or from being provoked into combat without preparation. Constantly under attack, it must always be ready for defensive action, even when on the offensive.

According to our criterion, the Revolutionary State belongs to the process of *from Nationalism to the Workers State*²².

¹⁹ **Willy Brandt**: Social Democrat leader (SPD) 1964-87 and West German chancellor 1969-74.

²⁰ **The Ostpolitik of Willy Brandt** consisted in West Germany competing successfully against the rest of capitalism through important links with the Workers States.

²¹ **Richard Nixon**: 1913-1994. US Republican President 1968-74. (Re-elected in 1972, resigned 1974).

²² This is the title of a document written by J Posadas in 1966. See also Trotsky's chapter: "Backward countries and the Programme of Transitional Demands" in *The Transitional Programme*, 1938.

With the same criterion, we view the *Revolutionary State* as part of what we call 'the Partial Regeneration'²³ and 'the Historic Re-encounter'²⁴. That criterion makes us aware of the existence of an unconscious World United Front progressing towards consciousness. Because we admit that forces exist beyond our own, we can move forces other than our own. We observe the progressive movements of the world converging towards the point of historic re-encounter - point when Marxism will re-enter the Workers States. Meanwhile, there is a process of Partial Regeneration in the Workers States and the Communist parties.

THE HISTORIC IMPORTANCE OF THE FIRST SEVEN YEARS OF SOVIET LIFE IN THE USSR

The Soviet and Communist bureaucracies staunchly refused to become world revolutionary centres - and they still refuse. It is a fact however that any new revolution becomes communist, never mind the leaders who refuse to lead! Any revolution becomes communist because there is no other reason, no other vehicle and no other road in history. Nobody can invent a revolution that is not communist, and nobody can invent an aim for humanity which is not communist.

On the need to have confidence in the masses

A revolution can start with a nationalist or mixed socialist character, but it can only overcome the capitalist conditions of its origins by acquiring a socialist character. This is why there are 16 Workers States. Each Workers State is the reiteration of the fact that human progress necessitates forms and structures that cannot be dodged.

²³ See note 17

²⁴ **Historic Re-encounter:** J Posadas dedicated his life to help bringing Marxism back to the Workers States. The historic re-encounter will mark the moment when this is achieved. Edit.

From no original socialist aim at all, some Nationalist Revolutions end up negating essential parts of the capitalist system. This happens because there are 16 Workers States in the world, and 10 other countries not far behind, as we said. In some major capitalist countries, the proletariat is close to power. It disputes the power of capitalism and stops it deploying its full military might.

The proletariat in Britain and Germany illustrates this. Without its struggles, the German and British bourgeoisie would be equipping the counter-revolution with much bigger financial and military means. As the proletariat hinders this, world social forces draw closer together, away from their origins and development, in search of a synthesis. They move unconsciously towards the aim of ending oppression, repression and backwardness. We do this too, except that we do it consciously. This is the epoch of intelligence and reason²⁵.

The Soviet bureaucracy - the same that squandered the force of the Russian Revolution, reneged on Marxism and frittered away the economic, social and military power of the Workers State - now feels the need to make good some losses. Not by revolutionary means you understand, but by taking advantage of the disintegration of the capitalist system. It would regulate the disintegration of the capitalist system - if this were to leave it unscathed. Since it cannot defeat imperialism, it would regulate its decay... All the same, this unfriendly act towards capitalism does no harm to the revolution.

In this process of evolutions and revolutionary developments, former colonies or semi-colonies proceed with measures tending in a Workers State direction. The leaders do not have the social capacity, the social force or the necessary structures to go all the way, but they keep going.

²⁵ **Intelligence and Reason:** concept developed by J. Posadas to indicate that, with the extension of revolution in the world and the *Revolutionary States*, the Soviet bureaucracy and other bureaucracies can no longer parade as the champions of social change. Now *the idea*, that is to say Marxism (hence intelligence and reason) is being separated off from its Stalinist caricature. The author wrote abundantly on this subject. Edit.

The resoluteness and sentiments of these revolutionary leaders are communist. But with no communist tool, they fail in one capital aspect: they do not believe in the power of the masses. They put their trust in apparatuses and in themselves. They listen to the chief, the intellectual, the administrator, because they do not believe in the creative capacity of the masses.

The leaderships of the *Revolutionary States* are the unconscious creation of historic necessity. They never had the opportunity, or perhaps never saw the need, to study the *History of the Russian Revolution* and other revolutions. Every revolution reiterates the central role played by the masses - and this is the crux of the matter! History needs hardly more than two instruments: Masses and Party. *Masses* for ideas, and *Party* for programme. 'Masses' plus 'programme' equals Marxism.

**No socialist progress is possible
without the intervention of the masses**

Mind that it is not the economy that builds history. This notion is completely false. The economy is *the means* to build history. If the masses did not intervene, there would be no socialist construction. The economy is basic, certainly, and its problems must be solved. It is not true however that humanity needs to tear itself apart in order to live. All it needs is to organise itself! There are more than enough economic means to stop every war and dispute. The conditions already exist for capitalism and bureaucracy to be removed, even if there are still countries where the populations continue to die of hunger.

There is no *economic* obstacle in the way of human progress. The obstacle is the lack of *social organisation* in the use of the economy. The indispensable remedy here is the intervention of the masses. When they are in power, the masses abolish the right to live off labour; and they take away from any bureaucracy the right to live off collective property.

In the midst of their preoccupations, the leaders of the *Revolutionary States* do not see the power of the masses. They see only themselves.

The leaders of the *Revolutionary States* view the masses as followers or props. They do not consider that everything useful in society was once suggested or imposed by the masses. Everything is the result of past mobilisations, actions and acts of control. It is the masses that, over time, have obliged the leaders to think, reflect, apply justice and cut down on the old arrogance.

The economy needs Soviet democracy

The present cycle in human history is rooted in the First Seven Years of the Russian Revolution: the Soviet Years. Through these, the Russian masses showed to the world proletariat that *Soviet democracy* is the social tool to build Workers States. During those years, the Russian masses ruled society directly, and communicated to the future generations the knowledge of how to do it. The world proletarian and intellectual vanguard took note and remembered; this is how we know that the goal of the Soviet masses, in taking power, was human emancipation. A goal worth their every effort to build strong foundations that no one could destroy.

If there are 16 Workers States today, it is due to the Seven First Years of the Russian Revolution. The sentiment of human certainty and confidence that lives on today is rooted in those years. For when the masses ran Soviets, they felt unbeatable. Not because they thought that nothing could hurt them, but because they could at last shape, create and guide life. At last they could build between themselves the inner social relations suited to the unfettered development of the economy.

The cornerstone of an economy worthy of the name is full Soviet Democracy. No form of existence is superior to it. The Russian Revolution was alone throughout its First Seven Years. Now, any population can try to make a Workers State. See how very quickly a country like Libya - coming as it does from the greatest feudal backwardness - takes measures tending towards the Workers State. Here you have an example of the influence that history exerts on humanity, through 16 Workers States in this case.

When a State is on the socialist road, like Congo Brazzaville²⁶, its leaders tend to obsess about the economy: How to get loans? How to attract investments? How to organise production? Such concerns are fundamental, certainly. Capitalist investments are not fundamental, but the way to organise production is. Yet there is something still more important than organising production: it is the social organisation of power. Two things decide who production is going to serve: the social organisation of power, and the functioning of power. The participation of the masses in power, or their non-participation, will determine the orientation of production and its forms. This option is social, not economic. The Workers State derives its particular character from its social form of functioning, not from its economy.

The First Seven Years of the Soviet Union were the years of the Soviets. During those years, the world masses witnessed the social organisation that becomes possible when the masses are in power, when they intervene and decide in society. The bureaucracy arose only after that, and it only got ahead by confiscating the power of the masses.

Trotsky said that the Soviet Workers State after Lenin became "an expropriation of the dictatorship of the proletariat" and "a dictatorship against the proletariat". He never said that this dictatorship was in support of capitalism. In later years, renegades of Communism accused Trotsky of having spoken of "a dictatorship against the Workers State and to the benefit of capitalism". It is true that the dictatorship of the bureaucracy worked against the interests of the Workers State, but not as a direct or historic tool of capitalism. The Soviet bureaucracy wanted to stop the proletariat building its own State, but it could not repudiate, dissolve or destroy the Workers State because it [the bureaucracy] was originating from there.

²⁶ **Congo Brazzaville:** Former Zaire. When the French had 500 kms of railways built from Brazzaville to Pointe Noire in 1934, 23,000 Africans died in the construction! The country became independent in Aug 1960. The government of Massambat-Debat, 1963-68, nationalised a good deal and turned towards the USSR. He was toppled in August 1968 by Captain Marien Ngouabi and a team of army officers, who soon proclaimed the first *Peoples Republic* in Africa. These continued to the Left and formed the *Congolese Party of Labour*. Edit.

A comparable historic complexity surrounds the *Revolutionary State* when you consider how it stops operating as an effective capitalist entity whilst still retaining its capitalist nature and origins. This transformation happens in its State, not in its governments. Its State grows structures strong enough to attract a social base, albeit with no proletarian content. Libya, Mali or Congo Brazzaville are examples.

In such countries, the social weight of the proletariat is minimal compared with the other layers of the population. But on a world scale, the proletariat is a huge majority. The 16 Workers States are proletarian States with organised social and proletarian forms, and this protects a country like Mali hugely. If this were not so, capitalism would have crushed Mali's anti-capitalist economic measures a long time ago.

The *Revolutionary States'* leaderships are not opposed to making Workers States. They just do not know how. They are resolute in the face of difficulties, but they have no theoretical understanding. In the matter of building Workers States, they have no guide, no tradition, no historic antecedent. Their only guides are the existing Workers States. These are very poor guides indeed because they use Marxism inconsistently, crudely and superficially; the masses force them to advance, but their use of Marxism stays uneven and combined.

The existing Workers States use Marxism here in the economy, there in politics, but nowhere as a comprehensive instrument. This takes away from the *Revolutionary States* the historic and solid ground which they need to secure their own progress. Add to this that the leaders of the *Revolutionary States* are from bourgeois, nationalist or religious origins. They have not yet learnt to rely on conscious instruments in preference to material forces, most of these still waiting to be built anyway. This limitation is common to all these leaderships.

This is the epoch of intelligence and reason because the ultimate tool to build Workers States is ideas. The sources and centres that emit such ideas are few and far between, and they are all located outside the Workers States.

Humanity rejects bureaucracy

Our own organisation is one of the sources that help with ideas that build *Revolutionary States* and Workers States. We do not carry the effective and material weight of Workers States, but we have the historic ability to develop the irreplaceable ideas needed to make Workers States and *Revolutionary States*. Indeed, we are practically the only source of such ideas.

The *Revolutionary State* is the product of our historic stage: a stage that the bureaucratic leaderships in the USSR, East Germany²⁷ and China can no longer control. Today, the established bureaucracies no longer have the ascendancy and the social authority to stop new countries taking independent roads²⁸. This is the Political Revolution too! It is Political Revolution on a global scale. Humanity now thinks for itself, makes deductions and draws conclusions. It wants Workers States, certainly; but not those of the kind where the economy can be hijacked, and workers' power usurped. It wants to know how democracy can be unfettered and still serve only the collective interests of the revolution. It is looking for revolutionary democracy.

Humanity is consciously preparing for that kind of Workers State. It is still gathering the necessary tools (Party, antecedents and traditions) but it will not accept bureaucracy. Its past experience and our own intervention have warned to the danger of bureaucracy. In the countries like Peru or Libya which we are studying, the USSR and communist bureaucracies did not create many important bureaucratic centres. And neither did the various bourgeoisies, really, in spite of all their intellectual centres for the dissemination of protectionist ideas aimed at bureaucratising revolutions.

New bureaucracies get formed in the *Revolutionary States*, certainly; but these cannot be compared with the rock-solid stratum of bureaucracy at the top of the USSR, for instance. In the new revolutions, the top social echelons are still forming.

²⁷ **East Germany** lasted from 1949 to 1990.

²⁸ Independent of the Workers States' bureaucracies. Editorial.

The new revolutionary leaders tend to promote persons with intellectual, academic, economic or social credentials. This leaves out the great worker and peasant majority. Life was always determined by minorities in those countries. This is why each *Revolutionary State* starts life with such people in power.

The masses do not yet weigh concretely in the *Revolutionary States*, but the leaders seek their participation. The leaders seek a contact with the masses by encouraging Militias, Assemblies, Trade Unions, mass organisation and forms of popular control. They seek the protection of the masses. They respond to the pressure of an empirical consciousness, itself not entirely devoid of consciousness. We say 'empirical' because these leaders have no order in their ideas. Or rather, their order is not determined by the handling of ideas, or by study. They go by what they have gleaned, which includes some reading, because we know that they read our texts.

The epoch has ended when the education of new revolutionary leaders was contained, determined or dominated by the Soviet, Chinese or Cuban bureaucracy. This is why it is now possible to influence the new leaders, with ideas, guidance and persuasion. The process being global, the force of the revolution in any 'backward' country is the force of the world revolution. Ideas determine the progress of the world. Intelligence and reason decide in that sense - and the apparatuses no longer do.

**Soviet democracy and equal pay
to keep bureaucracy at bay ..**

Humanity is concerned with ideas. It has some practice and experience in Marxist ideas. This makes our publications irreplaceable²⁹. Today, publishing is regaining the compelling force which it had when Lenin lived. Ideas, ideas and ideas are wanted, in a way that harks back to Lenin's epoch. The elaboration, transmission and development of ideas need texts, and these demand political life, confidence, security and internal discipline.

²⁹ See www.quatrieme-internationale-posadiste.org (Spanish, English and French).

Socialist construction needs the two qualities of concentration and discipline. Our historic stage demands a cultural and revolutionary elevation. Our organisation teaches revolutionary theory, discipline and revolutionary internal relations.

The atomic war

Imperialism would have launched the atomic war some 10 or 12 years ago - but it could not! It wanted to do it, but it could not. It retreated instead, retreated and recoiled, in the face of its historic dread of being eliminated. One of the main factors that stops imperialism using its entire military and social arsenal is its historic fear of perishing. This strikes at its historic capacity to decide.

The world revolutionary process advances rapidly. In Bolivia, the right-wing was thrown out eight months only after reaching government; the internal struggles and disputes are not over, but the process is to the left. A part of the government and of the army consorts with the Trade Unions.

In Peru, the process leans to the left also. The new *Ley de Industrias*³⁰ is timid, but it is basically anti-capitalist. The same goes for Chile: Tomic³¹ darts a polemic at Marxism, but he keeps a certain programme to the left. His attacks on Marxism try to attract the petit bourgeois wing of the *Liberal Democrats* of Alessandri³², and of the *Radicals*. He creates circles where he likes to stand as anti-Marxist in order to get votes. But if he wins elections, the country will get at his throat. There is no electoral solution in Chile. The exploited masses want to decide, with or without elections. They are ready for whatever this takes, and a sector of the army supports them. Nearby, there are Bolivia and Peru.

Of great importance too is the process in Cuba where a recent statement officially recognised the need to give a social revolutionary form to the country³³.

³⁰ **Ley General de Industrias**: Created the Comunidad Industrial in 1969 with workers participation.

³¹ **Radomiro Tomic**: 1914-1992, Christian Democratic politician in Chile.

³² **Jorge Alessandri Rodriguez**: 1896-1986. President of Chile 1958-64. Defeated by Allende in 1970.

³³ In 1968-69, **the Cuban leadership** admitted to failures around its "Ten Million Tons of Sugar" policy.

We have been saying this to Fidel Castro these 11 years, through texts, texts and texts. This official admission forms part of the Political Revolution in Cuba, and it is deep! We say that the Political Revolution in Cuba is *sui generis* because it does not need weapons. The original petit-bourgeois leadership of the Cuban Revolution has been won to Communism.

The Cuban leadership was won to Communism, but it never adhered to the communist method. As a result, the Cuban Trade Unions were never allowed to weigh centrally and stop the errors. Had the Unions played a leading role, would Cuba have produced 10 million tons of sugar? It more likely that the workers would have opted for less sugar and more of other things! The lack of application of the Marxist method kept the Cuban leaders within the limits of their own conclusions.

**The role of the Party
in the new revolutions**

For any new *Revolutionary State* to progress - and this applies to any Workers State as well - it needs the Party. Without the Party, it is not possible to build the only social and revolutionary form that can protect the leadership of society from the development of apparatuses. Where the masses participate and there is no Party, it is as adjuncts that they participate, and the leaders feel spied upon. This is not mass control, it is a semblance of it. It wastes much effort and energy, and still the masses do not control.

In the Soviet form of social organisation, everyone participates, from the Trade Unions to the Workers Areas' Committees. This pre-empts bad planning, bad implementation and bad distribution. It also removes the need for quality controls at later stages. Those later controls waste energy. They prevent nothing, and they create layers of officials who think that intelligence shines through their backs because they are in charge. Intelligence may be shining there, but reason needs to shine as well. Mind that we are speaking here of revolutionary situations, and that the leaders are intelligent; but they need to obey reason too.

Reason needs tools of its own, and it is a fact that the tools of reason do not exist outside the social organisation of the Workers State. Lenin said so.

Through its social form of organisation, the young USSR kept its Soviets operating for seven years. Some people said to Lenin: 'But the workers don't even know what electric light is!' - 'So what?' said Lenin, 'once electricity is installed, try taking it away!' The same happened with soap. Lenin said: 'Let's send soap to the peasants', but others objected: 'Look here Lenin, just forget the soap. They've never used it in their lives!' Lenin insisted: 'Send soap; if they've never used it before, they will now'. Soap was not sent for a month, and a letter arrived: 'SOAP!' Lenin rubbed his hands: 'The revolution grows!' he said, adding: 'Electricity plus Soviets Equals Socialism'. When somebody said: 'Ah, but it is necessary to produce', Lenin replied: 'But this too is to produce!'

The leaderships of the *Revolutionary States* do not think the masses can intervene. They are intelligent leaders, and dedicated, but they surround the masses with apparatchiks. Gaddafi of Libya³⁴ for instance, faces adversity bravely and travels the world as a well-intentioned man who wants the progress of the Revolution. But he runs everywhere instead of making mass organisations in Libya with the right to weigh and decide socially. What can he lean on, then, for support? An apparatus! An apparatus with two billion dollars a year.

These leaderships have not learnt to absorb the Marxist principle of trusting in the masses. They have not acquired this notion, or been preoccupied to do so. 'To trust the masses' is not the same as assuming that they know everything. To trust the masses means to rely on their sentiment of objectivity, equity and fairness. For the masses are indeed objective. When they build a Workers State, it is not to get more money, to live off the State or to live at the expense of Socialist construction. When they lead society, they contribute everything that is required, and without expecting immediate improvements for themselves.

³⁴ Muammar al-Gaddafi, 1942-2011. Leader of Libya 1969-2011. Horribly assassinated by imperialism.

Peru is not a Workers State. But the miners of Peru have recently made a historic experience as great as any in the Soviet or the Chinese workers' movement. The miners of *Cerro de Pasco* work 8 hours a day³⁵. In reality it is 11, because one should include three hours to go down and up again - an appalling slowness. They spend 11 hours at the mine, out of which 3 are unpaid. Now they are asking for a 6 hour/day and a raise. They want travelling-time paid too, and clocking-in to start from arrival at the pithead. But these miners, the same who want less hours and a 40% raise, said also: "If Alvarado nationalises the mines, we will work 12 hours a day. It will be hard, but we will do it for the whole of Peru". By "the whole of Peru" they meant all the people. This idea is socialist. They adopted this as a resolution at their Lima *Congreso Minero*. This Congress was socialist too, because it was unofficial, and the miners made it official by filling the stadium.

The masses seek power-forms and Soviet functioning

The leaders of the Revolutionary States must count on the masses. They must create assemblies where the masses are effectively in charge. The leaders must not pretend that the masses are controlling if this control is only nominal. No, no! The need is for mass organisms that deliberate, discuss, resolve, implement and control. This is *the Soviet form of functioning*: multiple, complex and simple. 'Complex' because it involves a quantity of sub-committees and roles. 'Simple' because localities link up between themselves, and upwards. The resulting central power-organs represent the will of the people below and the burgeoning power of the masses.

Even with forms less precise than the *Soviet* of the Russian Revolution, it is already possible to create committees that come close to it. The masses have an objective tendency to act in this way. The above-mentioned experience in Peru shows it.

³⁵ **Cerro de Pasco**, highest city in the world, with much dampness and cold. The copper pit, owned by *Volcan Compania Minera* was nationalised in 1974 by Velasco Alvarado.

Something similar happened at IKA-Renault Cordoba³⁶ in Argentina. There, the workers dismissed the top Trade Union bureaucrats and voted a new Union leadership composed of every existing tendency. Today, there is no in-fighting between those tendencies because they are committed to workers' rights and workers' democracy. You could say that a small Soviet has achieved this, or that the workers' assembly adopted a *Soviet form of functioning*. The same happened in a textile company in San Martin, Buenos Aires: the workers occupied the Union's Regional Headquarters, called an assembly where 150 textile workers came, and threw out all the top bureaucrats. They elected a new Union leadership with proportional representation for all tendencies. They drafted a programme of demands and sent it to all the workshops for ratification.

The masses seek consciously what amounts to Soviet forms of functioning. They know this unifies them. Due to divisions and divergences, they cannot have a full cultural, scientific, intellectual and political view of this matter. They are also at different cultural, political, industrial and social levels, but when they unite and coordinate, they create a Soviet! In the Soviet, the forces of society find a complete instrument of coordination. This is why Trotsky said that humanity will not easily find something better. Indeed, it is difficult to see what could be superior to the Soviet in the stage we live in. The Soviet responds entirely to the needs of today's social structures. Trotsky was right.

The revolution has not yet managed to triumph throughout the world, but capitalism is steadily disintegrating. This opens a space favourable to *Revolutionary States* and to social forms close to Soviets. It is consciously that the masses want to agree. They want everyone represented. They want everyone working for the common good, and not just for some people! The Soviet coordinates and harmonises the common interests.

³⁶ **Cordoba 1969:** In May, the masses waged a popular revolt along with the Cordoba car workers led by Agustin Tosco. The Trade Unions were strong at Fiat and Sitrac-Sitran; with the students, they demanded that Ongania (President) should break with the IMF, nationalise the monopolies and stop repaying the external debt. There were many experiences of workers control, and huge advances against the Trade Union bureaucracy.

The Soviet form is rather new. Important precedents came with the First International and the Trade Unions, but Trade Unions are only for workers, whereas the Soviets are for everyone - working class, petit bourgeois, employee, soldier, the police even. In Rosario, Argentina, it happened that the police, called against an occupation, joined the sit-in and staged an uprising!

The leaderships of the *Revolutionary States* are not used to consider this. They view the Soviets as special or complex agencies, for workers only, likely to make mischief. But the working class gives constant proof that it is the most sensible and intelligent class in history: 'intelligent' because of its capacity to see, observe, perceive, concentrate and coordinate resolutely; and 'sensible' because it is the class that does all the tasks that need doing. The working class is aware of its limitations, but it is also aware of its inexhaustible capacity to create, find the means, and take initiatives. This persuades and attracts the rest of the exploited and oppressed. The natural and historic gift of the working class lies in its ability to persuade. This quality comes from its self-confidence, its concentration and its resoluteness. The other sectors of society feel this and are drawn to it. Soviets emanate from the existence of the working class and Communist Party.

In the countries we are studying here, the Communist or Trotskyist parties are few, but there is always a working class. The latter tends to be slight in weight, organisation and tradition, but the world course of the revolution makes up a lot for it. Such is the revolutionary experience of today. In Cuba, the working class has a minimal weight. It is concentrated and has revolutionary traditions, but Cuba has a minimal proletarian weight and a large petit bourgeoisie. You see this in the fact that the Communist Party did not lead the revolution, in spite of its importance. The Soviet bureaucracy and the degeneration of the Soviet Workers State stopped the Cuban Communist Party developing into the Party of the Cuban Revolution. The Revolution was carried out by a nationalist petit-bourgeois Party that could only make progress by becoming communist. There is only one way to build history - and it is the communist way. This example shows that it is not possible to dodge the communist pathway of history.

Any working class in the world, any handful of resolute and militant workers, seeks the guide of Communism. Not the guide of the Communist Party, the guide of Communism! The working class is the class that studies history to see how things get done. It does not study by sitting still, but by hammering away and studying at the same time, to see how to hammer better. The working class moulds the tool of its militancy, and guides it as well, in the very act of using it.

The revolution needs norms and forms. What norms? The Party! For without the Party, the masses cannot organise the country. What forms? The Soviet forms of functioning! To what end? To concentrate the force of society! Soviet plus Party equals daily control by the masses. The daily control of the masses maximises economic efficiency and minimises pilfering, loss and abuse.

The workers who achieve this are penetrated by a feeling of cohesion, security, harmony and mutual trust - and this feeling spreads throughout society. Disputes lessen around matters of economic targets, wages and conditions, because each individual seeks the very best for the progress of Revolution. Such is *the Soviet form of functioning*. It made the Russian Revolution quite unbeatable for seven years, and it garnered a fund of historic confidence from which all the other Workers States were built afterwards.

In the first two years of the Russian Revolution, people were dying of hunger in the streets, by the thousands. The Bolshevik Party and the working class were sickened and heart-broken by this, but they did not hold back impotently to lament, explain or console. Nothing could be done but to plough on. They did their utmost to help, and among the thousands dead, they erected the historic structure of the Soviet Union.

This was then. Now, no new Workers State will ever come about for the first time. The USSR was the first, with the whole of the capitalist world at its throat, and no previous experience to refer to. Russia had been the most backward country of Europe. War and civil war decimated its Bolshevik leaders, left its economy flattened and the wealth of generations destroyed.

The great change today is that the counter-revolution and imperialism can obliterate an entire economy – of Peru, or of Cuba – but it cannot obliterate the [experience of] the Workers State. The dreadful historic stage of the first Workers State absolutely alone and forsaken is behind us. It cannot return.

**The Party is the tool
to build society**

In the *Revolutionary State*, the government can investigate new possibilities of development with a light touch, because the appropriate instrument of socialist construction is the Party. The Party is the tool to build society. It is part of the masses and it mobilises them. Its strength and authority come from having the masses participating and imposing themselves on the government. Spurred on by the masses, the government elaborates the necessary policies against capitalism and imperialism. The government plays an important role, but the most important role is played by the Party.

It is down to the Party to have an economic programme and to act upon it. The best economic programme is not the one that organises the economy; it is the one that organises the creative forces of the country in order to develop the economy. 'Economy' is not 'the production of consumer goods' but the production of the wealth needed by the country. The greatest wealth of a country, therefore, is *its policy*.

Of course it is important to produce sugar, melons, cars, cotton or oil, for use and for interchange. However, this must not be done independently of a *policy* aimed at the true development of the country. When production is for the satisfaction of interests independent of the country, there is no development. An overbearing layer of bureaucracy arises, perverting the aim of the revolution and liquidating it.

This stratum links up with similar elements in the world, and together, they form an administrative apparatus that cordons off the revolutionary forces, to stop them having an effect.

It is not true that the masses are ignorant, do not learn and do not react. The revolutionary nationalist leaders of Mali who criticise the masses for not having risen on behalf of Modibo Keita³⁷ are incorrect. Why should the masses have defended his government? This is what the leaders must ask themselves. What reasons did people have to defend that government? Were they even in a position to defend it? With Trade Unions and some freedom of action, they might have possibly done so – in spite of Keita's policies! But there were no such means. The organs of power in Mali are run by bureaucrats, crooks, careerists and capitalist agents. The masses wanted to come out and mount a defence, but with what tools, and to defend who? If all they could do was to defend careerists, they had no reason to take an interest.

Had the masses of Mali owned organisations under their control, they would have expelled the invaders who came from abroad to overthrow the government. This would have spurred on the revolution! This is the way to discuss. There is no individual way for the masses to represent themselves. They need committee-like organs that concentrate their voice, that express their will. The task is to build such organs.

In Cuba, Fidel Castro says to the masses: 'Intervene!', 'throw out the useless ministers!' but the masses want to say: 'Fine, and how?' This is no way to organise socially! Social organisation must allow the masses to train their creative capacity to control and lead. If this were happening in Cuba, there would be fewer ministers to throw out, and many more to mandate! When the masses lead society, a minister is a simple executive who shapes the decisions; finished the time when the minister decides, and the masses can only agree, disagree or abstain. The masses need social spaces where they meet, deliberate, take decisions and carry them out. Social organisation exists when the masses deliberate, resolve, control and implement. There is nothing more democratic.

³⁷ **Modiko Keita** was overthrown by Moussa Traore with French imperialist support in Nov 1968. See brief outline on Mali page 118.

**Organisms of the masses for
the construction of the Workers State**

No room is left for the development of a bureaucracy when the masses lead society through their own power-organs. When this happens, no one can live off the labour of others, or take a cut from what the masses produce. Because human development requires mass power, the Socialist Revolution is a necessity therefore. Socialist Revolution does not happen because some civilian or military intellectual had a dream. It comes from a historic imperative that human consciousness has become aware of, thanks to the existence of Marxism.

The masses need to control, but they cannot do it without social organs where they start by training their social intelligence and participation in the running of society. This is a requirement still unfulfilled in the Workers States themselves, where leaders can sometimes be heard saying that the masses are passive, unintelligent and self-centred. False! The working class is always socially intelligent, quite apart from its being individually intelligent too.

There is no individual way to assess a class. The latter can only be evaluated socially, and through its function in history. There will always be a group of workers more able than another, but it is socially - in its social organs like the Party and the Trade Unions - that the working class expresses its concentrated ability and intelligence. Its social organs are its only means of expression. Its most complete organs are those where it discusses, deliberates, decides and implements directly what it decides.

The working class is a social class and not a group. When we say that it is intelligent, we mean *socially*. People vary individually, but it is socially that the working class weighs in history. It cannot weigh through individual forms of organisation. To express itself, it needs social forms of popular control, which we have called here 'organs': Trade Unions, Soviets, Neighbourhood Committees, Factory Committees, Housing Committees, etc.

Within its class organs, the working class shows unprecedented levels of historic superiority and objectivity. The other classes that developed before the proletariat never needed objectivity.

Because it cannot be other than objective, the working class is different from all the other classes in history. The working class is objective, or it does not exist. Its objectivity is formed of two immutable factors: it can only advance as a class by suppressing itself as class; and whilst all previous classes impelled some progress by elbowing their way forward, the working class can only impel progress by ending all injustice.

**Intelligence is
social and collective**

The historic capacity of the working class and masses does not depend on individuals; it depends on social organs where the ability of one individual makes up for the limitations of another. Absolutely incapable of doing this, the bourgeoisie is in a permanent state of inferiority in relation to the proletariat. Indeed, the bourgeois class is essentially impotent and stupid. It commissions ideas from intellectuals, 'reasoners' and philosophers, because it cannot produce any idea of its own.

The working class has its feet firmly upon the ground. Doesn't it build everything, organise everything, and even score the goals³⁸? It is the engine of human progress, whilst the bourgeoisie is nothing of the sort. It is the working class that has confidence in the future. It is positive, self-assured, resourceful and full of ideas. Its deep interest in history is devoid of any wish to keep for itself the human gains that it won, over time, through its struggles.

There is no division or conflict between the working class and human progress. Between the necessity of human progress and the necessity of the working class, there is an uninterrupted and complementary relation. This entirely objective relation is an infinite source of ideas.

³⁸ J Posadas when young had been a gifted footballer.

The working class is objective because it thinks collectively. This cannot exist in the bourgeois class, in the bureaucracy or in any apparatus. The apparatus thinks as apparatus: selfish, rudimentary, conservative. When the political Party of the working class operates correctly, it stops being an apparatus and becomes an instrument. One must always differentiate between the two.

The apparatus is rigid. It does not base itself on the preoccupation of the masses, on their ability to think, on their confidence, their passion and their calibre. It only thinks in relation to itself, trusting nobody. Trotsky writes magnificently about this in his "*History of the Russian Revolution*" and in "*My Life*". He shows the dead-hand of the apparatus as opposed to the boundless creativity of the Party as instrument. The Party as instrument is a most complete and inexhaustible fount of ideas. Nothing compares with it in the history of humanity. And nothing ever will, because there will be no Party in the future. The Party is for today. It is the coordinator of all the forces and ideas that motivate and organise people. The confidence of the Party dissolves all sorts of egoistical, conservative and individualist sentiments.

**True democracy is
Proletarian Democracy**

The intervention of the masses is a necessity. Their social intelligence needs tools where to train and become organised. In some revolutions, the leaders replace the intervention of the masses by 3, 4 or 5 workers who they promote in ministries; but this cancels them as workers, and feeds the bureaucracy.

The working class cannot but intervene on the social scene. It plays its class role by intervening on the social scene. This is how it influences society, develops its own views and measures the new situations. After each of its actions, it makes comparisons and decides upon tactics. It cannot possibly get a feel of itself without intervening. This is why it always ends up creating Committees, Trade Unions, political parties and the like, wherever it can.

To the leaders of the Workers States - and of the *Revolutionary States* - who think that production will suffer if Trade Unions and Party intrude on the shop floor, we say that no! Production will triple instead! The Chinese, Soviet and Cuban bureaucrats do not admit this, but they know it is true. This is why self-critical tendencies are appearing in Cuba and China ⁽¹⁹⁶⁹⁾ to say that more mass participation and control is needed in their countries.

In our epoch of intelligence and reason, any further element of human progress depends on organs of mass power.

In the *Revolutionary States*, the leaders must give up the tendency to place groups of workers - or persons of a worker's origin - in the ruling apparatuses of their countries. The promoted workers just stop being workers. Their new position cancels or perverts them as workers. They leave off being workers and become apparatus people.

We accept however that there are exceptions to this. Imagine a Party where the leaders decide to introduce workers in the Party's leadership, either to resist an apparatus or to let the life and control of the class enter the Party. In these cases, the co-opted workers have a chance to bring to the Party the creativity and staunchness of the Trade Unions and organs of mass power.

Where this succeeds, the Unions, the Factory Committees and the other class organs are stimulated. They discuss better than before, and deliberate more; they become more resolute in the face of controversial decisions.

Socialist Democracy and its achievements do not come ready-made. They get built, and this is the way to do it. Is there another way? How else can a *Revolutionary State* guard itself against imperialism and its agents, prepare to liquidate them and develop its economy? For this particular task, democracy needs a particular form. What form? Socialist democracy! This kind of democracy does not defend individual rights. It defends the right to develop and elevate the whole of society.

Trotsky³⁹ called socialist democracy 'Proletarian Democracy' because there is no need of democracy in Socialism. He was right; the Soviet bureaucracy uses fraudulently the 'Socialist Democracy' phrase to pretend that it has made Socialism, and that Communism is just round the corner.

ON THE MARXIST CONCEPTION OF LEARNING AND TEACHING

Scientific and technical mastery are aspects of knowledge, and knowledge is above all the form given to it by the use of intelligence. The leaderships of the Workers States view Universities much as in capitalism, as places to educate cohorts of students. In China however, recent educational experiences show that this is anachronistic. The manner and scope of the Chinese education system have limitations (1969) but they have been progressing in these matters.

What is the University for? It teaches how to use the experience of the past and how to transmit it. Granted. But are Universities needed for that? Is a University-mode of teaching required to achieve this? Why not a Factory-mode of teaching instead, or a Neighbourhood one?

In the Workers States⁴⁰, the leaders generally consider that University education is best delivered by bearded and bespectacled professors. This highlights a lingering submission to capitalist pressure and oppression. This tells the students: 'Stop! You want knowledge? It is outside you! We have the power to give it to you, in this Learning Centre, this ten-storey building'. But why this particular building? Why not a field with two trees, if these could suffice? What do the ten-storey teach?

³⁹ **Leon Trotsky**: 1879-1940. Leader of the Russian Revolution with Lenin. Founder of the Red Army.

⁴⁰ **The Workers States** in 1969 were the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, and the 'Socialist countries' of Eastern Europe mostly. See page 118.

Teaching must not be divorced from *what it is for* - that is to say, from the actual *use* of science and intelligence. The Workers States are places where science and intelligence are really in use because what people are taught is in their direct interests. This makes people feel that they contribute to, and determine the development of society. This is why they learn in one week what takes years in other parts of the world.

In China and Cuba, people learn in one year what takes years in capitalism. If the Workers States were to push this advantage more fully than they do into the teaching of science and technology, they could remove all administrators, magistrates and managers. For all those people live off the masses.

There is no need of administrators, magistrates and managers; their roles can be played by Factory Committees. This was started in some enterprises in China, but the subsequent development of that country stayed patchy when this most advanced experiment failed to generalise. As the Communist Party did not spread it sufficiently, the uneven and combined aspects of China's development were allowed to prevail over the generalisations made by the Party.

Divide knowledge from status

In the building of society, whoever focuses solely on *productive capacity* ends up making a taboo of production, as Marx says; but productive capacity is entirely a matter of social capacity! This is why technicians and scientists are very much better formed on the shop-floor than in Academies.

Faculties and Universities inculcate the notion that the individual stands at the centre of the relationship production-society-individual. It is the wont of institutions not to trust in the ability of the masses, only in their own.

Even in the Workers States of today, technicians and leaders move with an arrogance rooted in a sentiment of property.

The technicians and leaders of the present Workers States continue to value *status*, and they look for it in their functions. They defend their property, i.e. their knowledge and status, which they sell. This warped comprehension blinds them to the fact that what they learnt at the University, the workers can learn in one year, one week or one day.

The Soviet and the Soviet Plan of production⁴¹

In Revolutions where weapons cannot be got hold of, people create these. In the Russian, Chinese and Cuban Revolutions, the working class proved to be utterly resourceful and ingenious in that way, with an inexhaustible capacity to find ways and means. The working class is quick-witted and versatile in the handling of elements, machines and weapons. In every revolution, the working class proves that it can bring down everything, and re-build everything.

Why is it, then, that the workers are not doing more of this in the daily life of the Workers States? The reason is that their leaderships divert the course of their intervention, regulate it and make it fall in line behind managers, foremen and administrators. What are all the managers, foremen and administrators for? What do they do? What do they know? They coordinate production, but this is not needed because the workers do it on the shop-floor.

With *Soviets* and a *Soviet plan of production*, it is easy to centralise economic planning, and even easier to decentralise. It is the reverse in capitalism where the application of concentrated capacity is wanted in both cases; there, the managers, administrators and overseers protect private exploitation at all times. They are not after best returns on the productive effort, but best returns on the outlay on wages.

⁴¹ **Read by J. Posadas:** *What is a Soviet* - “The masses are unable to express themselves in capitalist society. Parliament prevents them from doing so because it is a ruling-class instrument. The Soviet represents the will of the exploited masses. It is the organ of the masses. In it, people discuss, decide and apply their own decisions”, J. Posadas, 10 Oct. 1968.

In a Workers State where there is workers control, the effort to regulate and plan production decreases to the extent that the technical and scientific ability of the masses increases. A serious Factory Committee that improves daily soon becomes irreplaceable. At this point, who needs managers and administrators? They become unnecessary, redundant.

Workers control is an economic conquest because it produces the best possible for the workers; but it is a social conquest above all, because it eliminates inequality. Workers control is the only way to eliminate unequal appropriation and unequal distribution. Where this is achieved, the sentiment of justice spreads among the masses. The equitable distribution of what has been produced fills society with a deep sense of justice. This actually happens in the world. Where it does, it leaves a mark that no power or fury can erase.

Soviet functioning allows cross-training in any technical branch, no matter how specific. The workers cannot know all about mathematical equations, vehicle-building, steel-making or architecture, but give them a month and they will. Construction workers are very good architects even when they don't know all about gravity, weight, force relations and material resistance. Formal knowledge alone does not stop houses falling down!

The workers learn the theories quickly, the way they learn everything. Of course knowledge and study are needed, but simple studies. You only want for basic knowledge to lead a factory. Besides, technical and scientific ability are much better acquired at work than at a University. Why train only groups of technicians and engineers? To exploit knowledge! To place these people above the common cut. The training of student cohorts, instead of training for everyone, stimulates the private incentive. It promotes the private sale of knowledge and the sale of existing knowledge.

The solution is to bring these trained persons into socially useful schemes. Since they are bound to be with us for some time, they must be enrolled in tasks that raise the level of everyone until the general level of society overtakes that of the Universities.

The role of the Party⁴² in education

Since Universities and Learning Centres are bound to be with us for some time, one must oppose the *in cathedra* modes. The Party must intervene in what they teach. It must open its functioning to the students, and organise them militantly to stop the practice of studies chasing after status in particular branches of the economy.

The end-of-year students' assessments must rest on the repudiation of the private use of knowledge. They must value the students who show the disposition to put their knowledge at the service of the whole of society.

The capitalists educate categories of individuals destined to fill posts in the capitalist bureaucracies. These individuals are encouraged to feel above the rest, to help partition society and segregate it. The more socially backward they are, the greater their tendency to exclusivity. They end up living off the sale of their knowledge, or deriving profit from collective assets.

Organisms of mass control are the remedy to this. In all the workplaces, social organisms are needed where all the branches of science can be studied by anyone, and where all the problems can be discussed scientifically! One must take care also to spread this to the countryside.

The Chinese Workers State started this kind of transformation. It became able to train surgeons in 6 months. And good ones, capable of operating! And if you think that 6 months is short, the Vietnamese managed to do this in 2 days! This can only happen in a society socially convinced that surgery is as simple as it is necessary. It is society that prepares the conditions for a surgeon to acquire the two necessary qualities of *determination* and *ability to concentrate*.

⁴² By 'the Party', J. Posadas generally refers to the Communist Party. Depending on context, he may be referring to the Party of the masses in a given country, or to the need to build a Party that aims at the creation of Soviets. Edit.

The task of the surgeon is to observe properly, and then - the most delicate part - to make the correct incision at the right place and time. In simple operations not requiring much anatomical knowledge, the Vietnamese⁴³ created surgeons in 2 days. This happened because the State supplied template, confidence and social acknowledgement. For the student, all the rest was a simple matter of learning.

Capitalism creates groups of the selected few, and to the masses it says: 'Pull back! Careful! Not this way! This is a mystery!' But scientific advance creates growing layers of people who tear all this down. Scientific progress takes the edge off egoism; it inspires sentiments other than the wish to exploit and usurp. It invites the love for calibre, the wish to be objective, the desire to impel the progress of humanity. This can be observed continuously in the workers and peasants, in their political life, mass organisations, demonstrations, public meetings and assemblies.

The *Revolutionary State* must set up simple socialist means of education to explain the socialist programme. People will respond to this, but they need social 'organs' where this can be done. It is true that the masses can take to the streets without those organs, but they generally do this thanks to rights and historic conditions previously conquered. Even then, their lack of social organs keeps them dispersed and slows down their unification.

One must not live in the expectation that the masses are going to suddenly rally, support and intervene with a miraculous spontaneity. They need prepared organs for that purpose - organs with an impact on power. They need to have considered the possibility of themselves intervening and deciding in society. The role of any revolutionary is to help them set up relevant organisations, starting with Trade Unions. The Trade Unions must operate independently from governments, and the idea of mass action and mass power must figure in their programmes.

⁴³ Vietnam was at the centre of actuality when the author elaborated this document.

The Trade Unions must support the Workers States and the *Revolutionary States*. In countries where Trade Unions operate, they need workers' plans of production, distribution and control; let the Unions call demonstrations and assemblies for the purpose of electing their area representatives! Let each Union link up with wider workers' organisations, in the cities and in the countryside. And in the Unions themselves, let there be a constant life of deliberation and consultation to stimulate the Party, to make sure that the Party has cells, and that these cells live politically without interruption.

This is the true University, the Faculty of Humanity.

* * * * *

In order to intervene in society, the masses need the means to discuss, deliberate, decide and apply. Their decisions are never unjust. Their mistakes are few and they quickly self-correct. For each of their mistakes, the bureaucrats make millions because apparatchiks are basically stubborn and stupid.

Conservatism, incompetence and individual interests blind the bureaucrats to reality. Far from this, the working class and masses are objective. Their lack of vested egoistical social interests makes them objective and curious to know. The Soviet Union came about because the working class is a class that learns. No previous class in history has ever learnt as much as the working class does.

It took only 53 years for the Soviet Union to become the greatest power in history. The USA still dominates the economic and military scene, but it is the Soviet Union that decides in matters of human progress. Even the economic and military power of the Soviet Union trumps that of the United States because its superior social base fires the peoples of the world.

True power is not with weapons and riches, but with those who can make populations stand up for themselves. The Soviet Union can make people stand up for themselves, and the United States cannot.

It is indispensable to read *The History of the Russian Revolution, My Life* by Leon Trotsky, and *The Ten Days that Shook the World* by John Reed. The Revolution triumphed in China, Poland and Czechoslovakia through organic forms, although these were not the same from country to country. The Polish and Czech masses prepared for victory in the anti-Nazi struggle, which they kept separate from the bourgeois class. They kept at a certain distance from the Communist parties too, but their independence from the bourgeoisie was complete.

These events need to be discussed because they explain today. To know how to intervene at any given time, one must investigate history and learn how to reason. For reasoning is an apprenticeship! Its tool is the Marxist method, and the handling of that tool demands a revolutionary preparation in constant elevation. In our organisation, we do this through texts. This is why our texts are necessary.

The traditions that illustrate how to handle Marxism do not get much airing these days. The bureaucracy of the Workers States (and of the Communist parties) does not use Marxism and opposes the spread of it. This leaves very few Marxist sources and models to guide those still interested. This is how the scraps of 'Marxist' analysis reaching us from various Workers States often pass for Marxism, or Marxist interpretation.

The coordination of the historic process, its necessity and its harmonisation, pleads for a logical and dialectical method of interpretation: a method free of imposition. The bureaucracies are still strong in the world workers' movement, but they are weakening. They are being overtaken by new revolutionary forms now in need of Soviets and Workers Parties (as instruments and not apparatchiks) in order to go further. The compelling necessity to reason turns Marxism itself into a compelling necessity. History encourages those who use Marxism confidently. It favours the leaders who champion the Marxist method and create secure Marxist teams⁴⁴.

⁴⁴ This is what J. Posadas himself contributed to history.

Workers States exist where Communist leaders try to retake elements of Marxism; but they too suffer from the lack of guides and previous examples. This makes them insecure. They go some of the way along the Marxist road, but not far enough to notice its landmarks and norms. Take *Revolution* for instance. It is a landmark and a norm. Its norm is that power must be taken by the masses, arms in hand.

HOW TO ORGANISE POWER SO THAT THE REVOLUTIONARY STATE BECOMES A WORKERS STATE

Every revolution reiterates that power must be taken arms in hand, but in the wake of the Russian Revolution, the Soviet bureaucracy adulterated this conclusion. It then settled for the notion, which it glorified, that power can be taken by gnawing at capitalism through the gradual advance of workers power in factories, communities and administrative organs.

This bureaucratic adulteration is a form of opportunism and conciliation. It upholds a revolutionary evolution within which power is still to be taken, but by gradual means. Its tendency to suppress capitalism does not go through revolutionary methods, and in not going through revolutionary methods, it does not organise the power of the masses.

The new *Revolutionary States* get hardly any historic guidance beyond this 'revolutionary evolution'. This keeps the new revolutionary leaders in confusion, but they continue anyway with methods and measures that tend to capitalist suppression. The problem is that nobody shows to them how to organise workers power - and to organise workers power is the crux of the matter.

How should power be organised to build a Workers State and Socialism? This problem, and task, need reasoning out.

In the so-called backward countries we are considering, the proletarian base is often very small. There are high levels of illiteracy, economic backwardness and dependency on the army. The individuals who come to prominence tend to be intellectuals, with links either to the army or to ex-ruling class sectors tied to imperialism. As these historic problems have no immediate remedies, the revolutionary leaders resort to administrative solutions. By 'administrative' we mean that they do not resort to the masses. The idea of 'resorting to the masses' is not widespread in those countries because there are not many instances of its practice. It is not that the revolutionary leaders ignore or reject the masses. Only, they need examples. Any new revolution needs historic examples.

Although the leaders of the *Revolutionary States* lack Soviet forms and historic examples, they help the formation of mass organs and their actual functioning. They cannot ignore the masses, and they do not wish to. They need mass support against the old capitalist and administrative apparatchiks.

Soviets: the Single Party of humanity

It is necessary to discuss Lenin's *State and Revolution*, and in this stage, to discuss it alongside 'The Revolutionary State' and 'From Nationalism to the Workers State' by Posadas. Those last two texts deal with the historic factors that broke the continuity of Marxism.

Planning the economy is not an economic question. It is fundamentally a social question. Isn't it up to society to decide the character of its economy? When society has chosen its economic system, then yes, its economy becomes an economic matter. It is true that the economy determines existence, but who determines the economy? How is the economy organised? Who leads it? The economy determines existence, certainly, but there comes a point when existence stops depending on the economy. There comes a point when conscious humanity stops depending on goods and wares and says: "Let's organise socially, let's lead society!" The actual implementation of this creates a Soviet power form, or an outright Soviet.

Lenin spoke of *Soviet power forms* in reference to assemblies open to everyone. The Soviet is a creation of the Soviet Union. It is the most complete sort of United Front. There never was anything superior to it in the whole history of humanity, and it is not about to be surpassed soon. Trotsky says that humanity never stops progressing and may still find a better way, but not for a long time. Indeed, the Soviet resolves every question because all the social layers are represented in it, their differences respected. The Soviet is the most complete coordinator where the effort of each individual contributes to the common good. Is there another place, besides the Soviet, where this can be done?

The engine of Soviet coordination is the common good. The social groups involved in it are hugely disparate as they come from every walk of capitalist life. In those groups, the capitalist norms of education and of functioning have divided people into grades, categories, classes, regions and the like. The Soviet reunites them all on the basis of their common concerns. They do not easily agree at first, due to the varying levels of comprehension and social interests. This eventually improves as people realise how much the norms of capitalism had influenced them, and the extent to which their feelings are the result of private, semi-private and collective interests. Is there a place, besides the Soviet, where this can be done?

When a society decides to be ruled by the common good, all the human efforts need coordinating. The Soviets do this. No one is suggesting replicating the Russian Soviets - but just about any gathering can become a Soviet. Any assembly can be a Soviet if everyone is represented in it, with the right to speak and the right to decide. The inclusion of everyone in the Soviet means that all other power-organs cease to exist. In the countries where there are no Soviets, legislative and executive organs compete and interfere with each other. In the Soviet, on the other hand, all the power-functions are in it: it discusses, takes decisions, controls and implements its decisions. The Soviet marks the end of the separate power-forms competing and interfering with each other.

One must discuss Soviet organisation, its historic origins, its necessity, its characteristics - and the reason why Soviets keep recurring in history. The need for Soviets emanates from the partitions that divide all individuals and social sectors. The Soviets annul the differences. They do not reconcile the differences or arbitrate between them: they annul them! When they work, the Soviets articulate the necessity of humanity to be its own master. They form the Single Party of humanity.

It is Lenin who said that through the Soviet, humanity creates the Single Party. He was not proposing to suppress the Communist Party because the Communist Party was still the conscious guide of humanity at the time. The Bolsheviks were holding fast to the Party because it compensated for the backwardness of the country and of the peasant condition. But through the Soviet power-form, Lenin was already catching a glimpse of a future with no need for parties any more.

The peasantry of the Soviet Union understood the reason for collectivisation and the Kolkhoz⁴⁵, although it was not so clear about the need for the Party and its industrialisation plans. It did not see why revolutionary policy should turn the USSR into "a beacon of Communism to illuminate the world"; and it did not agree that the interests of the USSR should be subordinated to those of the world revolution.

The proletariat understood this and submitted consciously to it. This was not the case with the peasants, but they supported the Soviets and the land policy of the Workers State. Through the functioning Soviets, Lenin then set out to build bridges between the different levels of comprehension, interests and abilities. He used the functioning Soviets to let the proletariat - with its elevation, coordination and harmony - iron out the gaps in the resolve, cultural understanding, economic interests and social interests of the different social layers.

⁴⁵ **Kolkhoz:** Soviet agricultural enterprise owned collectively between several households. These operate on State-owned land, and are paid by the State according to success. In 1927, private holdings were expropriated to give way to Kolkhoz. In 1935, they were allowed a private garden plot.

Sovkhoz: a Soviet State-owned farm. Created in 1920 on confiscated large estates. Its employees receive a regulated wage. It is still in use in Belarus today (2014) and in parts of Russia.

**Paternalism suppresses
the creative capability of the revolution**

The organisation of humanity is determined by those *in charge* of organisation. But what are the historic and social credentials of those in charge? In whose name do they organise? If not the proletariat, who? In the *Revolutionary State*, the leaders tend to be intellectuals. They have intellectual qualities, but they are insecure. If something is not done by them, they reckon that it cannot be done. Their judgement rests on their individual or group observations, leading them to empirical conclusions, not to logical ones. They grant no existence to forces beyond their control, and this is how they view the proletariat.

It is not true that the forces of the proletariat are mechanical or brute forces of production. They are thinking forces! See how ably they impose themselves, create ideas, take control and organise. Where the workers are in charge, they reject the plans that serve individuals only, groups or regions; they immediately impose collective organisation, be it in the economy, the army or the apparatus of State. Of course they need their own power-organs to control and decide in this matter! The smaller a *Revolutionary State*, the greater and more urgent is its need for collective organisation. This is so because small countries have a comparatively greater number of groups and sectors who think that they own the place.

Many well-intentioned leaders of *Revolutionary States* desire Socialism, but they know little about the quality and fibre of the proletariat. Hence they behave paternalistically. Easily disenchanted, they do not raise their social sights to where revolutionary leaps could be made, if only the masses were allowed to decide. This limitation can lead them to a partial policy towards pushy individuals, or towards social layers still tied to the pre-revolutionary past where little liking is to be found for the masses and their militancy.

In Cuba, the leadership of Fidel Castro and his team has the best of intentions; but its paternalism has led it to suppress the creative capacity of the Cuban Revolution.

This shows in the policy that devoted Cuba - this blockaded country - to sugar production. To set up production in this way amounts to not seeing beyond Cuba, as if the world were limited to Cuba. This is driven by the view that the economy is a field apart, and quite separate from the perspectives of historical development.

This is a far cry from Lenin and Trotsky. All the texts of the Communist International are based on a world perspective. All their calculations on behalf of Soviet development are based on global revolution which they realise cannot be separated from global war. Two factors impose their law on the *Revolutionary State*: Political Revolution is one, and the world war of capitalism is the other. For the war of capitalism is inevitable! One cannot foresee its delays, its starting date or its course because capitalism plans nothing, but it is inevitable.

Forty million Americans support Vietnam

Political Revolution and global war are the two essential factors in history today. Of course they impact on the world Socialist Revolution. The phrase 'Socialist Revolution' exists in all languages because the first liberating step of any country, however economically backward, is towards Socialism.

The world revolution suffers greatly from the insufficient development of the Political Revolution today, but there are still important aspects of Political Revolution taking place. We have seen some in Cuba, and there are some in the Soviet Union too. Twice Brezhnev⁴⁶ told the French and Italian Communist parties to 'take power' instead of advising conciliation with capitalism as usual. Such things need explaining to the leaderships of the *Revolutionary States*.

The world process concentrates so powerfully that the solution to the problems it raises wants for qualitative steps forward, no longer quantitative ones.

⁴⁶ **Leonid Brezhnev**, 1906-1982: Gen Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1964 to 1982, followed by Andropov and then Gorbachev.

Take Cuba for instance. What is Cuba in the world? What is its place in Latin America? Why is Cuba so important? Or how does it happen that the USSR - with all its conservative policies - arms Cuba to the point of confrontation with the US? The Yankees admit that wiping out Cuba is not an easy proposition. It is not entirely excluded that Cuba may one day dictate terms to the US at Guantanamo. The US policy is senseless and hollow. It is a policy of retreats.

Nixon's policies highlight entrenched weariness and pessimism in the United States⁴⁷. The right-wing Republicans fling all the mud they can at Nixon, but some attack him because they fear his war-drive. They agree with him that the US should make world war, but they are afraid. The overall picture is that of a power apparatus in decomposition. This fairly sums up North American imperialism!

The glimpses of crisis we catch around Nixon show deep-seated insecurity in the US. A confident leadership would have stopped the in-fighting. Roosevelt⁴⁸ used to boast that "to the outside world, we are all North Americans". All "North Americans" perhaps, but with differences! Proof is the 40 million North Americans who support Vietnam. Social explosions will occur in the US, for there is no democratic life there, no revolutionary Trade Unionism, no mass revolutionary Party. Behind the present partial outbursts, conditions are brewing for a mighty upheaval, when popular opinion and anger find their voice.

* * * *

⁴⁷ **Richard Nixon**, 1913-1994: Republican president 1968-74. On 5 September 1969, the US army brought murder charges against Lt William Calley concerning the My Lai Massacre (1968). Still in that month, 71% of US citizens approved of thousands of US soldiers being withdrawn from Vietnam. In May 1969, *The New York Times* broke the news of the secret bombing of Cambodia. In June, the magazine *Life* displayed the portraits of 242 dead US soldiers.

⁴⁸ **Franklin D Roosevelt**: 1882-1945. President of the United States 1933-1945.

LINK THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY STATES WITH THAT OF THE WORKERS STATES

Some *Revolutionary States* are keen to attract capital from the European Common Market⁴⁹, but this brings little progress. Borrowing from West Germany for instance comes with elements of political control, restrictions and less choice. The profits are real, tangible and concrete, but the German capitalists repatriate them, whilst the borrowing country sees its commercial orientation drift away from the Workers States. It is a thousand times preferable to strike economic accords with the Workers States, even at the cost of short-term commercial disadvantages. Since risk is involved either way, better make concessions to a Workers State than to a capitalist one. And there is always the chance that Political Revolution intervening, the Workers State will improve the deal. Risk with a Workers State is an investment. It is never the case with a capitalist State.

It is necessary to draw lessons from the experiences of the small countries we are considering. Their lack of political instruments and parties is bound to cause backlashes, rebellions and struggles. Such things spread mistrust, insecurity and fear. But there are remedies.

One such remedy is mass assemblies; mass assemblies with the intervention of the Trade Unions! It may be that whole periods need to be dedicated to encouraging the Trade Unions in the role of revolutionary educators. Meanwhile, meetings can be held in the factories and the countryside as part of normal life. One must learn to do this. As soon as you hold an assembly, people will ask you why you talk about Socialism. Your task is to show it in practice, with concrete steps that bring equality, suppress exploitation and suppress oppression.

⁴⁹ The EEC. Became the European Union (EU) of today.

To those in the top jobs:
Top responsibility, not top pay!

What we say above is completely feasible. It is true that our Posadist organisation has not the means to bring economic equality to people, but we carry its seeds in our heads. Here are slogans to prove it: 'No minister to earn more than what they need to live on', and 'top responsibility for top job - not top pay'. This way, and wherever we are, we always make a start in the matter of equality.

Lenin was the one with the least remuneration and the greatest feeling of responsibility. He showed it with his life. He never let go of the preoccupation to observe, revise, view and review to improve things. He had no salary and lived most simply. He recognised that social organisation is about revolutionary responsibility, not rank or grade. Lenin was not the secretary of the Bolshevik Party. He was the leader of the Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union - a Party based on the masses. Lenin based himself on the will of the masses. He made them intervene, and with him, they weighed and took the decisions.

In a *Revolutionary State* where the Party is in construction, the Trade Unions can compensate for the lack of a functioning Party. They can educate, set up literacy classes, hold debates, explain the Socialist Revolution and Socialism. The leaders who vaunt equality must show it in practice by letting everyone speak and intervene. Why must everyone intervene? Because this ensures everyone learns to speak, to discuss, to form opinions and to give opinions. When this happens, people do not just learn to read and write. They build the Party.

Organising
the Party of the revolution

In the *Revolutionary States*, the lack of solid proletarian base makes it difficult to organise a Party. There always was a lack of Marxist preparation, and there is a lack of revolutionary Marxist life. This lessens the impact of the world revolutionary events upon the country, leaving a lot of power to intellectuals.

The intellectuals of the *Revolutionary State* can be honest, but they generally promise more than they deliver. Why this discrepancy? This is partly due to their lack of scientific preparation. The main reason however is that the proletariat is too small to communicate to the country the revolutionary impetus of the world. The intellectuals try to do it, but they do so in their insecure, superficial, timid and inconsistent way.

The weight of intellectuals in the leadership of the *Revolutionary States* is evident in the field of diplomacy. They tend to see the diplomatic activity of their countries as an elite function. With Lenin and Trotsky, the Soviet diplomats did not own ties. Only two might go out because there were no shoes for the third. There was nothing to eat. Lenin ate like everyone else, taking a small lump of sugar at breakfast like everyone else. This went on for years. The Soviet diplomats spent nothing on taxis and went about on foot.

Because there is no conscious leadership, the construction of the Party is bound to take some time in the various *Revolutionary States*. This creates a particularly hurried, impressionistic and impatient type of leadership. It feels it must get on because it is leading, but it does not know how. It feels the need for progress, but it is unsupported by the force that brings progress. And when it tries to make a Party, it tries to make an apparatus.

It is logical that no Marxist education exists in the masses. Originally, there was no such thing in the Soviet Union either. The Bolsheviks made up for this with campaigns of mass education through the Party. The Party stood as the conscious voice of the masses, all its actions governed by the interests of the masses. It was not a large organisation. It was a small nucleus organised and disciplined to pass on to the country the security of its ideas. It linked Soviet life with the life of the world. It showed people how to understand, how to reason, how to dominate the world of politics and revolution. It created secure layers of revolutionary workers, peasants and intellectuals in the population. It turned the Bolsheviks into poles of attraction, not magnetic you know... but conscious, utterly in tune with conscious necessity.

The masses cannot keep evolving and gain understanding in abstract. They learn how to act when faced with having to take measures themselves. They need time to get their footing, discover their qualities and develop their abilities. And what they need above all is the Party, because this nucleus connects the country's problems with those of the rest of the continent, aware that the true revolutionary force of the country lies in the world. For one must understand the world to unravel all the national problems. This is Lenin.

The Russian Revolution and the other major revolutions triumphed because they understood the world through the Bolshevik Party. We insist that power can be taken without a Communist Party, but that a Bolshevik Party is necessary to build the Workers State. The economic problems recurring in the Workers States are not *economic* ones; they emanate from limitations in the *social* functioning of the Workers States, i.e. the absence of Bolshevik Party. The problem is there.

In the Workers States, no problem is purely of an economic order. 80% of agricultural property is private in Poland, but those who own the land are not in power. They weigh on power, but they are not in power. Power is with the proletariat through the Communist Party (1969). There are no agrarian problems that the Polish Communist Party cannot resolve by allowing Soviet forms; the proletariat and the peasants will then work collectively, and say goodbye to the problems.

The Polish communist leaders are scared of parting company with the layer of rural private owners which they created themselves. Private land ownership in Poland is not a logical continuation of agrarian private property in that country. It is a social bureaucratic form. It was to find allies that the bureaucracy kept it going. That form of ownership was not a logical necessity of economic development. It was a social necessity of the bureaucracy. It was not a necessary requirement of the economy, but a necessary requirement of bureaucratic power in need of a base of social support in countryside.

A similar thing is happening with the Kolkhoz in the USSR today (1969). The Kolkhoz is a stupid anachronism. It has no reason to continue. The USSR has no shortage of machinery, technicians, engineers and tools. What it lacks is social organisation. No more than five years of Soviet forms in the countryside would double production there. It is remarkable that both the USSR and China performed this feat in the past, and in infinitely worse conditions than today! It is true that the Chinese exaggerated their figures, but they did double production. This success depends on social forms - and not on economic projects limited to who leads, who administers and who enters the ledgers. The problem is one of social organisation.

The Bolshevik Party has been the greatest Party in history, and it will remain without equal. Our epoch creates millions of revolutionaries, but there were not that many in Bolshevik times. The Bolsheviks built the greatest Party ever known because their members were drawn directly from daily struggles in factories, offices, the countryside and the army. They were selected for their political views as well as for their revolutionary morality in debates and in actions. When such a Party is in power, no apparatus can become formed, let alone come up with plans running counter to the development of the country, its potential and its interests.

Bolshevik functioning
is required in the Revolutionary States

In the *Revolutionary States*, the economic programmes are made to depend on the bureaucratic concepts of apparatchiks. These are groups reliant on Soviet-Chinese aid, or on German investments. They do not enlist the capacity and support of the masses. They count on the development of external trade, not on the internal development of the population.

The Bolsheviks did the opposite. As soon as they took power, they put economic development at the service of the population. This struck a blow at external trade, certainly, but it improved people's lives, stabilised the revolution and triggered new economic plans.

The economy must not be treated as a separate field. One must always ask: Who benefits from what our economy produces? Who are we producing for? What ethics and values justify the way we are producing?

There is no doubt that the economic priorities of the Bolsheviks impaired the world trade position of the USSR. Within the USSR however, they brought huge improvements in the economic and social relations. The organs of bureaucratic-capitalist power suffered, like the military, but the organs of revolutionary power blossomed, and the revolution became quite unbeatable. The Chinese acted similarly after 1949. Cuba never did because the USSR was mentoring it and because there were already 12 Workers States in the world.

Of all the revolutions, the most authentic are the Russian and the Chinese. It took only 20 years for the Chinese Workers State to wipe out 2,000 years of backwardness - and this, by retaking a lot from the Soviet model.

We live in a historic stage where room must be made for organs of mass power. The task is to allow these organs to weigh in favour of the Political Revolution and the Socialist Revolution. One must not only hand over the scene to the masses, but build the Party at the same time. The Party for today must be cell-based, with cells in the countryside, the factories, the army, etc. The revolutionary leaders involved in building such a Party must not expect instant or immediate results. They will need consistent plans of self-organisation and development, because a Party with a Bolshevik functioning takes time in the making.

In the *Revolutionary States*, those who shape the economic programmes must keep an eye on the historic perspectives, because imperialism looks to the atomic war for its survival. It has no hope of winning that war, but it will resort to it! The other aspect to remember is that the economic projects of any country must be continental in scope. No economic project can succeed on a strictly national basis.

HOW TO TRANSFORM THE APPARATUS OF THE CAPITALIST STATE

You cannot measure a revolution, its quality and its importance, by giving it a school mark. For its quality may well amount to its historic importance. And its historic importance is separate from the quality of its leaders, who are always capable people.

Revolutionary countries like Congo Brazzaville are actors of an immense quality. Africa is a boiling cauldron. It took imperialism 300 years to colonise it and consolidate its power there, but the revolution drove it out in 20 years flat. The big anti-imperialist struggles started in the 1950's. Not because Africa is special, but because there are 16 Workers States.

It is true that the contribution of a country like Algeria⁵⁰, still unacknowledged, has been extremely important in its own right. Were it not for Algeria's struggle, Africa would be a very different place today. This is not to laud particular States or movements, but to assess correctly the quality of their roles in this stage of history.

Revolutionary leaderships are forming throughout the Middle East and Asia. They all owe their existence to the world revolution, but they differ a lot due to their differing starting points. In all of them, there is the same need to organise a Party that educates its own members, a vanguard and the masses as well. This calls for all the tools and texts of Marxist education available. It calls for all the possible examples of Marxist application. Since the task is to transform the apparatus of the capitalist State, a start can always be made by tackling the functioning of the country's diplomats!

⁵⁰ **Algeria:** Ben Bella was commander of the Armed Forces and president from 1962-65. He nationalised all properties left vacant by French imperialism. He was toppled by military leader Houari Boumedienne in 1965 who gave power to the *Council of the Revolution*. Boumedienne introduced large-scale State planning and industrialisation. He nationalised oil and gas, and increased national output with the revenues.

In most of today's Workers States, the diplomats are functionaries who take no part in the life of the countries they are posted to. Then, how can they represent anything? They move in bureaucratic and bourgeois circles where intelligence and reason are left outside. When the USSR was formed, the proletarian diplomacy of its first seven years was revolutionary. It sought contact with the masses in the host countries. Its diplomats led simple lives and behaved as revolutionaries; they did not need ties, suits and cars, and they saw nothing wrong with walking everywhere.

There is no justification for Workers States' diplomats to live the bourgeois life of comfort and fine clothes. The Workers States need to organise fewer embassy receptions and more commemoration-days for their Revolutions. Let them use those days to call on the masses to take power! The Workers States need to be defended by revolutionary diplomats. The behaviour of those diplomats must be a prolongation of the Workers States themselves. The obligation to mingle with the bourgeoisie is no reason to submit to its mores and practices.

Life in the embassies of the Revolutionary and Workers States must not amount to parties, cars and luxuries. The embassies must be run by trusted and convinced revolutionaries. This does not solve everything, but the rise and spread of bureaucratic influence are given fewer opportunities. And then more contacts can be made with people useful to the development of revolutionary tendencies.

The diplomatic salaries must be proportionate to what is needed to live on. Luxury must be abolished, civilian and military. As for military parades, down with them! The fact that these continue in the USSR does not justify them. A military parade is a power show. It contributes nothing to human ability, to knowledge, revolutionary culture, the revolutionary institutions or the mass organs. Why is this happening in the *Revolutionary States* and the Workers States? A parade is the bureaucratic expression of internal struggles where those at the top exhibit their power. That's all.

Let's have Trade Union parades instead! Let's have demonstrations and workers' marches that always end in discussions and debates, with resolutions and votes taken. If millions turn up, let the millions speak! Let them all discuss and demonstrate. Mobilise all the means of information, and bring these to the spot where the population holds meetings, rallies and assemblies.

**The military must defend
the interests of the revolution**

Soviet functioning must be introduced in the army. Party cells must be created among the soldiers to discuss all the problems regardless of grade or rank. Trotsky said that the military function is not determined by grade or rank, but by whether the army, the State and the Party work in harmony⁵¹. The same applies today: if the military is not controlled by the population, it cannot defend the interests of the *Revolutionary State*. In that case, its role is detrimental. Party cells must be created in the army, and all the problems must be discussed inside them.

Discussions and projects, if constantly widened, elevate the population's capacity to judge. The masses discuss, decide, resolve and lead. Is there a means of class education superior to that? Once people intervene and make the decisions, they control society! They promote the leaders of their choice. Finished the time when promotion was for the relatives and the friends of the State officials.

When the factories have functioning Party cells, when the Trade Unions hold assemblies and mass demonstrations, the best leaders are easy to see and the masses can choose from among them. It is only in the absence of Party, of cells and of movements, that the apparatchiks manage to put themselves in charge. They take the commands and promote their own people – something they always do by leaving out 80% of those who might have joined the Party.

⁵¹ **Party and State in harmony:** A striking example of this is Venezuela, where the PSUV was formed because none of the existing parties were prepared to support the *Revolutionary State* of Venezuela and Chavez. Edit.

Should it become necessary for the *Revolutionary State* to mobilise militarily, this can be arranged at no economic costs. All that is needed is forms of Militias, or Territorial Militias, with an inner Party functioning that no longer recognises ranks, grades and hierarchies. This brings military organisation in line with the political and revolutionary aims of the country.

The Soviet Union triumphed by throwing professionalism out of the army and out of its functions. China acted similarly by different means. An army with no recognised socio-professional status loses all political influence. Soldiering becomes a simple activity like hammering nails or planting apple-trees. Such an army goes on defending the country, but it combines this duty with the economic and social defence of the Revolution.

The revolution faces one of its greatest dangers when it sprouts structures and power-organs opposed, or half interested, in its objective development. Half-hearted leaders like to cast doubt on every revolutionary measure. Their reluctance comes from their belief, which they share with many administrative and military sectors, that the masses are incapable of development. They cannot imagine the masses in the role of historic decision-makers or champions of human progress. In the view of those leaders, decision-making is for them - and the mass is there to be utilised and condescended to.

The *Revolutionary State* places a question mark above all the forms of bureaucratic power, starting with the military and the administration. But only a Party can deal with all this. That Party needs to build itself from within the life and the intervention of the masses, in the neighbourhoods, the enterprises, the Trade Unions. It must do more than call assemblies, meetings and discussions; it must take action as well. It must chose topics for mobilisations where people will feel secure and confident. A good example is the fight for the *elimination of pay differentials*. Those who call themselves revolutionaries but support pay differentials must not be trusted. Nowadays, the slogan against pay differentials is normal and routine. It has become part of the struggle for Socialism.

**Propose the elimination of
army ranks and pay differentials**

There are enough solid and persuasive arguments to mobilise people against pay differentials. Revolutionaries who accept pay differentials look to the revolution for self-advancement. Not so the masses! As far as they are concerned, the end of pay differentials is a historic necessity, and a blow struck for the collective wellbeing of the world.

Steps like *the elimination of army ranks and pay differentials* could be implemented right away! Only, these simple steps lead on. They tear at the bureaucratic agreements and alliances. They root out the power-organs of social differentiation that keep society fragmented into groups, sectors and bureaucratic layers.

One must treasure the method of Lenin and Trotsky. There was only one Workers State when they lived. Many things have changed, but the historic structure of today is the same as when they lived. Their method consisted in building the *Party* and *mass organs* as part of the world development of the revolution. This necessity has not changed, but this task today cannot be separated from the atomic war which imperialism is preparing. Do not create the illusion, the belief or the notion that, from now on, the revolution is going to advance very much more on the economic level. This is not going to happen. The social development of the revolution can still forge ahead, but its economic development is going to be difficult.

* * *

The industrial capability of the *Revolutionary States* has its epicentre in the USSR, and indeed in all the Workers States. This way of thinking comes from Trotsky who says in the thirteen points of *The Permanent Revolution*: "Our industry is in Germany". And when he refers to the large peasantry of Russia he says: "The proletariat has not enough strength in our country, but in the world it has". These are Marxist concepts.

Lenin and Trotsky placed each of their observations carefully in its world and revolutionary context. This did not lessen, but increased, their objective ability to assess their country. Today, it is equally as part of the world revolution that the new revolutionary leaderships must learn how to discuss, how to reason, and how to apply their intelligence and reason. This is how they need to consider the particular situations, the resources and the actual situations of their countries, both historic and concrete.

To do this effectively, those revolutionary leaders need to animate a strong Party life and strong Trade Unions. The Party looks for support in the Trade Unions, and the Trade Unions communicate with the rest of the population. As purely working class organs, the Trade Unions cannot replace the Party in the population. What they create however, is a base of support and solidity that beams confidence to the rest of the population. The Trade Unions are not the key to everything, but they are basic to everything. As for the Party, its creation requires a certain amount of preparation. This can be coupled with initiatives of revolutionary literacy for instance.

**The urgent need for
Soviet forms of functioning**

The conditions exist to step up the process of Political Revolution in all the Workers States. Our epoch of intelligence and reason is taking matters in hand. It removes from the various bureaucracies the right to be the only ones allowed to deal with problems.

It is not by chance that references to Soviet structures are still being made in the USSR, at least formally. Organs of mass power are lacking there. There is little life in the organs that exist, but the leaders still talk of 'Trade Unions' and 'Soviets'. The Soviet bureaucracy tries to make light of its historic rupture with the traditions of the Russian Revolution. It is not brave enough to admit to having done this, and indeed it cannot, as this would expose all its spin and posturing. The result is this adaptation to a caricature of Soviets.

The Soviet bureaucracy worked similarly when it expropriated the dictatorship of the proletariat. It did this, but it kept the Workers State going. This is why the Partial Regeneration is possible today. Anything less was the counter-revolution.

The USSR is the only Workers State that makes references to Soviet social structures. No other Workers State does that, not even Cuba. This is why the changes observed in some Workers States tend to be slower, and have less transcendence than in the USSR. There was a debate in the Konsomols⁵² recently. A resolution was voted for the right to control, elect and decide the leaders. And Brezhnev, who was attending, was moved to support. He did this to keep some contact with the masses, but this event is still deeply indicative of Political Revolution.

In Hungary, Lukács⁵³ made a defence of Trotsky and praised the Soviet as a power-organ. This only became known because it was published in Varga's testament⁵⁴ where the latter talks of the need to rebuild Soviets. These writings propose nothing concrete; they are less inspired by consciousness than by a perceived need, but they are important nevertheless. This is the sort of thing that proves that when history wishes to speak, it uses the voice of whoever comes close. Doesn't compressed steam spurt out of the nearest hole, or bursts the boiler? Same with the Political Revolution: its pressure seeks out the nearest valve. When the structure of the bureaucracy was solid, it could silence the Political Revolution. This is changing now, because bureaucratic leaders must converse in public, and welcome ideas from within the Workers State's structures.

Although one should not expect instant revolutionary upheavals from this weakening of the Soviet bureaucracy, the latter has less and less possibilities to stay strong. Its internal reshuffles have become defensive, unlike when its conciliation with capitalism used to make it assertive and secure.

⁵² **Konsomol:** Communist Party Youth organisation in the USSR.

⁵³ **Lukacs:** 1885-1971. Marxist philosopher and Communist politician in Hungary. Participated in the Imre Nagy government in 1956.

⁵⁴ **Varga Levgueni:** 1879-1964. Russian politician and economist of Hungarian origins. Specialist on world economic matters inside the Communist International.

It is to hold itself together that the Soviet bureaucracy expels right-wing tendencies now. Such events do not result from changes in its political comprehension. They come from historic relations favourable to the revolution.

Although this evolution is encouraging, one must not forget that the atomic war is inevitably approaching. In the *Revolutionary State*, the way to take this on board is to avoid idealistic projects that ignore the coming war, or that do not strive for Soviet forms in the internal structures of mass power. These structures are unlikely to emerge as pure and simple Soviets, but they must soon operate on a Soviet basis. This is the only way to have every sector of the exploited and oppressed represented, along with all the social layers that contribute usefully to the development of history. You have Soviet functioning when these assemblies deliberate, discuss, resolve and apply. The Party is not negated because it is needed in the Soviet (or the Soviet form) to lead and guide.

The Party gains authority by attending and leading all the mass gatherings. The Soviet form – or maybe another form – marks the start of a United Front of the masses. Once the masses have achieved this level of cohesion, their creative ability allows them to assess, decide and control. The leading role of the Party is still needed because the 'Soviet form' (or similar) can only reach the above results by defeating the old power-organs. For these are still around! They fight to destroy mass power. They reject all this socialist aspiration of society.

The progress of the peasantry

The Party must built itself for Soviet purposes. It must be based on cells, and those cells must intervene and weigh in all the organs of society. Do not expect the Party to become very large anywhere, particularly in our epoch. In the economically less developed countries, the masses are not very keen on Party organisation. Their raised comprehension is real, but it comes from the existence of 16 Workers States (and the other States not far behind). The masses will only accept the leadership of such a Party if it is objective and equitable.

The Party built for the Soviet purpose will only attract the masses if they can discuss everything in it, organise through it and decide freely. They will not stand for directives and hierarchies. They will reject squabbles about politics, power or money. What they want is an organisation through which to discuss together and resolve all the problems.

Our historic stage is bound to be transitory and short because people want progress. The peasantry did not use to act collectively in the past. Today, the sweep and influence of history educates and incorporates it. It has become part of the Socialist Revolution, even where it still lives in great backwardness. Many countries prove this in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

In India, the peasantry adopts collective forms of organisation in spite of the proletariat being small. There are proletarian concentrations in the big cities – and in the more developed States like Bombay, Madras and Calcutta – but these are tiny compared with the rest of the population. Although the masses are overwhelmingly peasant, they are communist. Pro-Chinese movements exist and get elected. What we call ‘the influence of history’ is a real force. It brings comprehension and intellectual development to the peasantry. The world’s peasants are casting off their individual and egoistical ways. They pass *from Nationalism to the Workers State*. They leap directly from tribal organisation to Socialism.

We reckon that in Congo Brazzaville⁵⁵, the objective situation is favourable to the revolution and works against Mobutu in Kinshasa⁵⁶. This is partly acknowledged by the actions of the revolutionary leaders⁵⁷. They signed an agreement with Mobutu, but they did not surrender to him. Mobutu signed to hold them back, but they signed to contain him.

⁵⁵ Congo Brazzaville, see note 26 and page 118.

⁵⁶ Joseph Mobutu, 1930-1997. Ruled Congo Kinshasa from 1965-1997. After the anti-communist Kapenda Tshombe arranged to have Patrice Lumumba executed with Belgian support (1960), Mobutu waged a military coup against Tshombe and took power in 1965. In 1967, Mobutu created the *Democratic Republic of Congo*, and in 1969, he was training his soldiers with the support of Israel, the United States, Belgium and others.

⁵⁷ The revolutionaries of Congo Brazzaville, under Captain Marien Mougabi, and a *Peoples Republic*.

This tactic could succeed if the leaders of Congo Brazzaville explain the advantages of the Socialist Revolution, and call on their own masses and on those of Kinshasa to create organ of mass power. This can be done! We appreciate the problems and difficulties, but the way forward is with mass organs.

**Let the masses
lead the economy**

There is impatience in the way the revolutionary leaders deal with their economic problems. The economic development of their countries is very urgent, but the need for the masses to lead the economy is even more urgent. An economy uncontrolled by the masses is in constant need of re-adjustment. This happens even in the Workers States: there is hardly one Workers State that has not changed economic tack at least 20 times. In Bolshevik times, the economic plans were firmly rooted in the capacity of proletarian intervention; the plans emanated from the social needs of the revolution, not from the availability of raw materials or the capacity of engineers. The economic plans relied entirely on the *social* capacity of the USSR to produce and intervene in support of the world revolution.

Leaders who keep the *Revolutionary State* separate from the world revolution give a limited, local and egoistical turn to the revolution. This reinforces the organs of bureaucratic-administrative power, and these soon raise themselves above the revolution. A *Revolutionary State* that supports the world revolution, on the other hand, lends to its inner forces the strength to stop bureaucracy growing and crystallising.

To link one's own revolution with the world revolution is a logical enough step to take. Above all else, however, it is the right way to build a Workers State!

This is not a conclusion of communist morality. It is a necessary conclusion.

**Rest the Revolutionary State on
its masses and the world revolution**

A *Revolutionary State* that disengages from the world revolution is soon internally cheated by administrative groups and conservative apparatchiks. The way to defeat these is to support the world revolution. This wins the collective and objective heart of the masses: they rise to decide and make the revolution invincible, lifting the country by the force of their ideas. They may not have much in the way of an economy, but their social determination creates one⁵⁸. To get to this point takes discussions and stages; but when it is reached, a socialist sense of uprightness motivates each individual to act for the common good. This is eminently possible and humanity is working at it. It is gathering the means to do this.

What is the economy? What is trade? How to shape production? Trotsky said that, up to a point, the workers will tolerate penury today for the sake of Socialism tomorrow. This was when he lived, when there was only one Workers State. The 'up to a point' was also contingent on whether the USSR was still a Workers State, otherwise there was no point; but with 16 Workers States today, there is more than a point!

When the dispute broke out over Czechoslovakia⁵⁹ last year, it was US imperialism - and not the USSR - that announced its decision to intervene there. Choosing to by-pass the United Nations, the US leaders said to the USSR that they were on the side of Socialism - "democratic Socialism" - in that country. The Soviet leaders, who were themselves meddling with imperialist interests elsewhere, told the Yankees to stay out. What gave them this firmness? The world revolution! The Soviet bureaucracy has no firmness of its own, seeing how it routinely conciliates with capitalism. It wants to go on conciliating too, but the Yankees are getting wary.

⁵⁸ **In 2014, Venezuela** is a *Revolutionary State* that helps create continental structures of economic development with Ecuador, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Cuba and others, against imperialist predation. (A picture on the cover shows the leaders of these countries holding hand). Edit.

⁵⁹ **Czechoslovakia**: In August 1968, the troops of the USSR and Warsaw Pact intervened there to topple the government of Alexander Dubcek whose Prague Spring sought the re-introduction of private property forms.

We analyse everything from a world perspective. This is a necessity that the revolutionary leaders themselves cannot ignore. This requires the Party, however; the revolutionary Marxist life of the Party. Without this, the new revolutionary leaders can only go by their direct observations, their immediate concerns - and the existing apparatchiks; the latter subordinate the economy of the *Revolutionary State* to the world trade priorities that benefit them, but not the population. Where bureaucrats are in charge of the economy, they sprout bureaucratic apparatuses.

The Communist International
is 'world revolution' in a concentrated form

The USSR has strength enough to quash capitalism, but it does not do it ⁽¹⁹⁶⁹⁾. This keeps the world revolutionary forces separate instead of joining them. These do not retreat, but they disaggregate. They do not disappear, but they fail to meet and act together. This is how you find one revolution here, another there, and yet another somewhere else.

The Communist International is this process reversed. The Communist International is *world revolution* in a concentrated form. It is the scientific tool to generalise every concrete and material Marxist advance. Marxism is not just a concept or a means of interpretation. It has concrete material forms! These are *Revolution* and the *Workers State*. Ideas that do not have expression in the material world are useless. The material expression of Marxism is the Workers State.

* * *

Our Posadist International is about *function* in history, not personality. This goes for all the pillars of humanity, like Lenin, Trotsky, Marx and Engels - with Lenin as the builder of the pillars. Lenin is the essential master of history and our guide in everything. Trotsky edifies us through his conduct, morale, mastery and fidelity to the revolution, but in the field of organisation, our teacher is Lenin.

We had to learn the craft of using our own forces. Historical epochs and force relations intervened, and we did not always find what we wanted in Lenin. We learnt to appreciate however that all new ideas are variations on old themes. One of these is constantly asking: 'how do we organise the force relations?'

Our texts do not aim at struggling or disputing with others. We make texts because they are necessary. That was Lenin's way. When Lenin made the Russian Revolution, he made the texts necessary for the Russian Revolution.

EDUCATE THE REVOLUTIONARY CADRES THROUGH MARXIST THOUGHT

The new experience which we are making with our International requires a constant elevation of functioning and ability. For ever more political and organisational capacity is needed to understand better and gather better means. To use all the forces is an apprenticeship. In the revolutionary leader, this essential quality gives the power to influence.

Socialist construction is done on the basis of the world idea, i.e. the synthesis that Marx represents. Marx is the concentration of all the best ideas. With Marx, Socialism is a conception of history, and it is the only viable concept based on reality.

We are part of the world struggle for the construction of Socialism. This struggle takes varied and heterogeneous forms, but has only one aim however, because history has only one objective. Many are those who spent years looking for their own national roads, and who now take the only road there is, the single one, the road that leads to the Workers State.

Observe how all the *Revolutionary States* end up making links with the Workers States. This is new! It is a departure and a principle. It hints at more unity and planning in the future.

It is empirically that the revolutionary leaders adopt the new position of coming close to the Workers States. We say 'empirically' because they are not aware of the pressing need to use all the possible forces. They have not formed any new theoretical or political view on this matter. They just make this change as a matter of necessity.

As *Revolutionary States* and Workers States draw closer together, the idea of their fusion is being vindicated. Correct ideas have no boss, country or prison. The revolutionary idea is a scientific acknowledgement that history heaves towards the creation of the more advanced form of human society, called Socialism. And there are not any two forms of Socialism.

Building Socialism needs Marxism

Socialism is a social relation, not an economic system. It is neither an economic structure nor an economic relation. Socialism is a *social relation* where exploitation, commodity-trade, surplus value, etc. have been suppressed. It is a social relation where oppression and repression have been suppressed. It is not an abstract state of mutuality. It is the collectiveness of existence, of the human sentiments above all, where what is in the interests of one is in the interests of all.

There is no other Socialism outside this conception. Because the leaders of the *Revolutionary States* have no Marxist experience, this conclusion is entirely new to them. Because of this also, they mix ingenuousness and revolutionary enthusiasm in their Marxist-leaning ideas and measures. It is not that their interests are bureaucratic, but that they do not know what to do. And it is true also that yes, behind them, others are waiting to take advantage, eager to reduce and contain the scope of the revolutionary measures.

The Paris Commune in 1871 was the first attempt at worker's power. It differed from 1905 in Russia, and 1905 differed from 1925-27⁶⁰ in China, for instance.

⁶⁰ **First attempt at Revolution in China.** The Communist International under Stalin advised the Chinese Communists to merge with the nationalists of Chiang Kai Shek who promptly liquidated them. Edit.

Each historic phase depends on particular force relations – those between bourgeoisie and proletariat, others within the proletariat itself, etc. The only tool that does justice to this complexity is Marxism. Hence Marxism has always something objective to suggest when new situations arise. It is useless to copy the past. Don't do it! Handle Marxism instead. It will teach you about history, about other people - and about yourself. Marxism leads to self-organisation and discipline. Those without discipline cannot progress, whereas Marxist discipline broadens individual intelligence, personal ability and self-assertiveness.

The leaders of the *Revolutionary States* are not used to discuss in this way. It is not in their traditions to seek objective answers through Marxism. This situation is made worse by the existence of bureaucracy in the Workers States and by what happened to Lenin's Party. And then, there are events like the declarations of the Chinese leaders who recently accused the USSR of being "the worst expression of imperialism". All this strikes at the confidence of the new revolutionary leaders. It invites them to let go, to abandon the struggle, to stop feeling responsible and capable.

The existence of bureaucracy in the Workers States is dispiriting for persons whose confidence needs building, but this is not so in our case! The impact of bureaucracy upon us has no power to drive us to moral laxity or indiscipline. For in this regard, we have passed the most challenging historic tests; isolation was one - this most trying of all the trials in the whole of history. Years passed and we did not develop as a mass movement, but we managed the historic feat of maintaining the cohesion and the continuity of Marxism. This way, we learnt to deal with any struggle, any reverse, any internal upheaval.

We are determined to intervene as a public good of history, and we do, whatever happens. We are a public good of history. No one has assigned this task to us, except yes, our own consciousness, patiently matured. This is the way humanity behaves: its concern is not guided by the economy, weapons or food, but by its collective consciousness, patiently matured. We make our moves with the same consciousness.

The leaderships of the Revolutionary States lack in means and traditions. This is made worse by the bureaucratic and arrogant behaviour of the Workers States' leaderships who coddle their national and group interests. This is a great adversity for the new revolutionary leaders, but they make things worse for themselves by focussing so exclusively on economic matters. They do this quite unnecessarily, as we have seen, but this is how they are. This is why we propose Marxism to them. Marxism has everything to offer them. As we do not expect them to suddenly start studying Marx, or join our International, we show them the practice of Marxism. We do this by accompanying their experiences directly, and in writing. They have a difficulty with Marxism because the empirical sweep of daily life is more reassuring to them than the concentrated and synthesized experience of the written text.

We must intervene much more in this process. It is not enough to lead debates 'on the economy' or 'on the Congresses of the Communist International'. We must show how to discuss, when to discuss. Some revolutionary leaders want a new Workers Party in Congo⁶¹. Since there is already the *Congolese Party of Labour*, this points to a struggle, or to a sector wanting to control. Is this a dispute, or something deeper? It may be an empirical response to the workers wanting more control.

There is never any need for two Workers Parties. Who wants this in Congo Brazzaville? The government's ban on the Trade Union paper indicates that some revolutionary leaders fear the independent action of the masses. They do not fear overthrow, but the masses taking the revolution beyond limits. They react empirically because they have no Party or conscious political instrument. They are alarmed by the elevation they observe in the masses. A Trade Union paper means commitment and consistency, hence a better revolutionary organisation. As empiricists, the leaders resent the masses developing qualities that they do not have. Shutting the paper is a way to control the development of the revolution. And with the idea of another Workers Party, they also seek a way to control.

⁶¹ Congo Brazzaville.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PARTY AND THE ORGANS OF SOVIET FUNCTIONING

Wherever you look, a Bolshevnik Party is needed, based on Trade Union functioning. In the first years of the Russian Revolution, the Bolshevniks were a Workers Party based on the strongly unionised working class. Through the Trade Unions, the Party communicated with the rest of society like the intellectuals, the exploited petit bourgeois, etc. The Bolshevniks expressed themselves through their social and parliamentary activities, their paper and the Soviets; but it was through the Trade Unions that they communicated with their worker and peasant social base.

Whether the Party calls itself Communist or Revolutionary, it must be rooted in the Trade Unions. If not, it stays weak and at the mercy of the unpredictability and insecurity of intellectuals, petit bourgeois people and peasant layers. Organisations that aspire to revolution - even when they do not entirely know how to build the Revolutionary Party - must build themselves from the Trade Union base, and help that base to become decisive.

How to grow the revolution

Gaddafi spreads his mystical views around the world (he is touring just now) but he is not indifferent to the influence of the world revolutionary process. Trade Union functioning in Libya is small, but the masses show signs of wanting to build class organs⁶². One must expect more upheavals in that country, and reverses for the capitalists. The Libyan revolution is having a crisis of growth. Gaddafi is not opposed. Only, he wants to contain and set limits to the revolution. The latter overflows however, triggering a crisis in the revolutionary leadership.

⁶² **Gaddafi:** In Sept 1969, the Libyan Revolutionary Command Council (RCC) abolished the monarchy of Idriss, and enacted the new Constitution of "Freedom, Socialism and Unity". Gaddafi was soon at the head of it. There were mass meetings and assemblies. Free public education was instituted for both sexes, and housing for all. The RCC supported the Palestinians, Mandela, the IRA, the PLO and Polisario. See page 118.

The Libyan Trade Unions are small, or just forming, but they already exert a pressure on the Gaddafi leadership. Public debates discuss the aims of the revolution, the world situation and the limits of leadership. This pressure brings to the fore the most important economic questions, like the building of dams⁶³. With dams, serious agricultural development can start. Energy will become available to transform the raw materials, get supplies and distribute the goods. We propose that no outside help is sought to help in the building of the dams.

Any new Revolutionary State must start by transforming its raw materials. It must make of this the essential plank of economic development. This creates new foods and goods, better textiles and the like. The working class grows numerically, and in becoming aware that it is the decisive factor that builds the country, it grows qualitatively as well.

Countries very dependent on agriculture must not delay in transforming their raw materials. This raises the level of consumption and brings immediate improvements. If the leading group shows itself effective in this matter, it is a short step to the elaboration of a plan to transform production. Feeling needed and valued, the population wants to play its part and intervene. This is the way to grow the revolution.

Economic growth needs the Party

Together with the necessary economic programme and measures, the other requirement is the Party. The Party must operate on a democratic-proletarian basis and seek links with the world revolution. It must have publications, and bring the mass of the population into popular committees with Soviet characteristics. By this, we mean that everyone must be allowed in them, with the right to deliberate, decide, implement and control. The first such committees may be very different from Soviets, but they will soon adopt Soviet characteristics, as this is the only way to stop bureaucratic layers forming.

⁶³ One of these dams was the flood protection scheme of Wadi Gattara.

The role of the revolutionary leader is to use every possible means to stimulate the participation of the masses. When the masses organise themselves and society, the measures they take are always in the general interest. They realise that they are the true movers of history. On the housing estates and in the workplaces, they soon create Soviet-forms, or even outright *Soviets*. At local level, these committees have simple forms. They are more elaborate at city and regional level, but in every case, their 'Soviet' characteristics teach political ability to the multitudes, who then block the formation of profiteering layers.

Historically speaking, the working class and the exploited masses are never wrong. They make mistakes, but never fundamental ones. The role they play in society and in history guards them against mistakes. Over and above any question of intelligence, their class position makes them socially objective. Every revolution must base itself on the intervention of the masses because they are anti-capitalist. Capitalist exploitation has perfected their class instinct; it has given them flair, historic anchorage and anti-capitalist assertiveness. When they intervene, they develop the country, not individuals or groups.

The working class cannot speak without class organs of its own. It should not be expected that the masses are suddenly going to start running society. Conditions must exist first. The revolutionary leaders must help create organs and conditions, by stimulating a consistent political life in the country, workers' meetings, demonstrations and political discussions.

No leader must expect that one or two public meetings will attract the working class, or even a part of it. Systematic political organization is required, continuous demonstrations, meetings, discussions and political initiatives. These actions must focus on the factories, the enterprises, the peasants and the employees. Where there is illiteracy, writing classes are useful around the political documents. In the assemblies, the discussions must allow all problems to be raised, from the economy, the world, socialist construction, religion, the natural world, life, death and everything. Every meeting must make a point of attracting the women, the children and the elderly.

The development of political life in the workplaces need not stop production. Where there are no machines and very few tools, one works with the tools that exist, or by hand. It is right for a *Revolutionary State* to ask for machines from China, the USSR, Cuba and the other Workers States, but the revolutionary leaders must not wait for these to arrive. When the population sees that every problem is being tackled whether there are tools or not, it becomes confident and wishes to take part. This kind of leadership stimulates the political and objective involvement of the population.

**The Workers State
is the way forward**

From within their activities in the *Revolutionary States*, the revolutionary leaders must keep an eye on three things: the revolutions in other parts of the world, the Political Revolution in the Workers States, and the inevitable war that capitalism is preparing. It is through weakness and not strength that capitalism prepares for war, but it goes on preparing. It cannot launch the war just when it likes, for it would have done it long ago otherwise. It has back-pedaled on this plan for years, each time losing historic opportunities and capabilities. Now it still retreats, but it continues to prepare.

Capitalism pulled back many times from launching a new world war, but this did not facilitate or improve matters for the revolution. See how capitalism used every postponement to increase its atomic power of destruction! Its political and social dithering does not lessen its power of destruction, far from it. It constantly upgrades weapons and places the power of using the atomic bomb in ever fewer, more concentrated, hands.

If capitalism were capable of turning back and disarming, this would vindicate the Stalinist policy of peaceful coexistence; but capitalism cannot turn back and disarm. It is constantly arming and concentrating in preparation for world war. As a system, it has nowhere else to go.

We insist on the fact that it is harder and harder for capitalism to decide *when* and *how* to launch the atomic war. Among other factors, the North American masses stand in its way, hindering it. We wrote many articles over the years to show that the North American masses, in this very matter, have become part of the world revolution.

The Workers State is the most advanced human conquest to date. It is the way to Socialism. No new experiment or road to Socialism needs to be sought. The Workers State is here, let's improve it! Some workers and revolutionary leaders express the wish to find new forms, new combinations and new roads to Socialism. But all that they express instead is the extent of capitalist influence still bearing upon them. Their mistrust is in the Socialist measure itself. This phase will pass.

One of the greatest achievements of Marxism in its entire history consists in the growth of its influence in the Arab world. Although very attached to Allah, Arab populations are now drawing a little closer to Marxism. This is one the most important events in the history of the construction of the Workers States and Socialism. Hundreds of Arab publications publish articles that take Marx, or retake him, instead of claiming Allah and Mahomet as the spiritual guides of 'Islamic Socialism'. They do not quote Marx, but they mention what he says, and the experience of the Workers States.

**Socialism cannot be built
without Marxism**

Marxism is '*the idea*', and Socialism cannot be built without it. The way humanity produces programs, policies and tools for social change is no vagary of history or casual expedient. It derives from intelligent analysis. It summarizes what has been learnt from the study of economic necessity, from the examination of the laws of human behaviour and those of social relations. Because Marxism encapsulates all this, Socialism cannot be built without Marxism.

In their respective countries, the leaders of the *Revolutionary States* focus on the problems of the day - problems which they must solve without a Marxist dominion. This robs them of the historic patience and confidence which they would have if they took the side of the proletariat and accompanied its triumphs.

The human brain is not large, but its receptive capability is enormous. The entire world is infinitely smaller than the ability for thought. The latter encompasses all that exists, in capacity and volume. One particularity of matter is that a match-box figuratively filled with just atoms would weigh tons. Another aspect of it is the way it works the brain! The human mind is the most efficient, dynamic and powerful form of matter. Left to themselves, atoms combine by chance. In the brain, they make every necessary and possible connection.

Marxism previews the future social organization. Marxism is *the idea* that shows how nature works, and how the human being can fuse with it. Ideas are the means to beat back ignorance. They are the first to see what stands against progress.

Through the idea, the fear of nature and of the universe has been overcome. Through Marxism, the idea overcomes the fear of the social question.

The Marxist idea rests on the material existence of the working class, now backed up by the material force of 16 Workers States⁶⁴. The Workers State is the living proof that every problem has a solution. To build a Workers State, nothing more than social organization is required! Only, this needs a leadership representative of the whole of society. When this is achieved, the new order eliminates human dispute.

Down with human dispute and up with common accord! This is the battle of the millennium! Dispute is going to stop shaping the human sentiments, and common accord will do that instead. Common accord is a logical necessity, not an imposed one, as simple as raising your hand to hold an object.

⁶⁴ Some Workers States remain in 2014, like Cuba. They constitute a breakthrough, regardless of numbers. Edit.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE TRADE UNIONS

Communism is not the result of an economic relation. It is the result of a social relation. The economy can provide for everyone. The need is not for more technicians or engineers - it is for order in the economy! Should all the technicians run away, humanity would replace them. China and Vietnam did it.

Order in the economy could be achieved straight away because human ability and knowledge are so extensive now. Knowledge used to be for the few. Now, the partitions between the social roles have grown thin (workers, bankers, administrators) and many intermediaries and parasites no longer exist.

It is remarkable that the process taking us to a new society is still taking bourgeois forms. The reason for this is the continuing existence of the Soviet bureaucracy. Bureaucracy hinders social transformation with its notions of 'market economy' and 'investments', and its economic models wrapped around the individual interests of leading apparatchiks.

In Lenin's time, it would have never occurred to the leaders to plan the country for some people only! In those days, the plan gave priority to the defense of the world revolution, which meant confronting the imperialist war. The plan aimed at the development of the world revolution through the development of the USSR. Had the Bolsheviks not acted in this way, the young Soviet Union would have perished.

These are fundamental principles, entirely valid today. No Party for Socialism will succeed outside those principles. No Party will be revolutionary without them. Outside those principles, even a Party 'based on cells' will become paternalistic. First the Party will marginalize political life, and then it will start fearing any free debate.

**Workers' power in the Workers State
strengthens the world revolution**

We call for the independent functioning of the Trade Unions in the *Revolutionary States* as well as in the Workers States. It is not that the Trade Unions should ignore the State - which is a social conquest, but that they must have the autonomy necessary to defend that social conquest.

The role played by the Trade Unions in the Workers States includes protecting the workers' salaries and their interests; but it also includes improving production as it passes increasingly under their control. The Unions shield production against pilfering for instance. These actions strengthen the Workers State, and in strengthening the Workers State, they strengthen the world revolution.

The Soviet bureaucracy does not grasp this. Its leaders never refer to the Trade Union polemics between Lenin and Trotsky in the early days of the Russian Revolution. They do not mention the *Brest-Litovsk* Treaty either⁶⁵, except where they can show Trotsky in light of a traitor. They do not scan history for what it has to teach. They do not refer to Bolshevik history for the quality of its debates. *Brest-Litovsk* has been a turning point in the history of the construction of the Workers State. The Bolsheviks had no material means and very little time to make a decision. Yet they proved competent in this complex situation where any error could be fatal to the young revolution. Feats of that sort that are few and far between.

The present USSR leaders show no inclination to learn from that historic phase. It is not that they are short of ideas, for they have plenty when it comes to discussing Churchill or Chamberlain. But they ignore the discussions between Lenin and Trotsky. They do not learn from the Bolshevik leading group, and they have not learnt how to study history. We call on them to do so; to learn from the Bolsheviks, and from us.

⁶⁵ **Brest-Litovsk**, peace treaty signed on 3 March 1918 between the Bolshevik government and the 'central powers' of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey. The young Workers State lost territories but could withdraw from the First World War.

Lenin studied the fundamental historic features of his epoch. He looked for answers to questions posed by oncoming revolution. His genius resided in his ability to admit to the genius of others. In those days, the best ideas were rather limited and partial. He grasped them however, aware that history summarizes human capacity. He knew how this capacity is determined by the social regimes, by the use of property and of human relations. He knew that social structure depends on, and also determines, the property regime and its economic relations.

**Society keeps advancing
through Marxism and its ideas**

The economy has stopped progressing, but humanity still progresses. This happens because the idea, i.e. Marxism, is seeing through the economic relations of the private property regime. The 'idea' towers over the essence of the human relations. It sways and dominates them. It persuades them to serve human progress. The creative capacity of human progress, now based on ideas, breaks the confines of egoism and individual interests. The economy has stopped progressing, but the creative capacity of ideas inspires social advance.

The study of the *History of the Russian Revolution* and that of *the III International* gives to their readers an irreplaceable and concentrated mastery. These texts are pillars upon which we have built our ability - helped in this by our determination to study them, learn, and bend our will to our historic role. The working class does this also, through its historic patience, through its class ability and through its role in history.

Architect of the Workers State, Lenin defended with intransigence the independent functioning of the Trade Unions. It is not correct to say that the Trade Unions of the Workers States should be independent of the State. What one must defend is their independent *functioning*. What is the independence from? On what basis? The Unions must be able to *function* independently of the State apparatus. This is a limited sort of independence, relative to situations and their forms, and relative also to the struggles that unfold.

When a Workers State moves steadily towards Socialism, its Trade Unions proceed towards their extinction in the same way as the Workers State itself. Had the Soviet bureaucracy not clung as it did to the State apparatus, we would already be seeing signs of such a process in the USSR.

The extinction of the State apparatus entails the extinction of the Trade Union apparatus too. The process of socialist construction depends on how this unfolds. Like all social organizations, the Trade Unions evolved throughout history. In capitalism, they fight the boss. In the Workers State, they fight bureaucratic power and become also the leaders and coordinators between society and its production capacity. The ancient *Feudal Corporations* were Trade Union precursors, and in the Workers States, the Trade Unions are precursors to the *Schools of Communism* that Lenin spoke about.

**To change society,
the Party has to be revolutionary**

Each stage of history has its organs of social functioning. The Trade Unions and the Party are such organs. The Party is superior to the Trade Unions, but just like the State, it is bound for extinction. Party and Unions still play an important role, but they will disappear. Hints of this can be seen in the *World United Front* and *Historic International* already partially operating today. Isn't the role of the Revolutionary Party to build a world Party? This world Party already exists! It is not a mass Party, but humanity behaves increasingly as if it were.

Marxist analysis demonstrates that humanity aspires to this level of comprehension. Had it proceeded consciously and deliberately in this matter, the delays in building Socialism could have been shortened by 50 years. The death of countless human beings could have been avoided, and probably Hiroshima too. This needs discussing.

In the *Revolutionary State*, whether a Workers Party is formed, or a Communist one, there is only one way to change society - and that is through the participation of the masses.

The Party must be revolutionary for that reason, otherwise society cannot change. Society can only be changed by making a Workers State.

'To change society' means to place the function of society above that of economy. At present, it is the other way around. This is the essential task. Considering that the masses are not used to intervening, one must create organs where they can discuss and deliberate. There, they should be able to discuss the economy and everything else they think important.

It is interesting that in China, 30% of the managerial and administrative posts were recently eliminated in the textile sector. Large savings were made on salaries no longer paid to dawdling managers and office idiots. This kind of measure improves production, wages, working conditions and the quality of the products. A similar step was taken in the USSR as well, where managers' posts and ministerial departments were closed for being unnecessary.

**Workers control and the need
to eliminate the managerial layer**

The role of the Party and of the Trade Unions is to make sure that the masses lead society. In the *Revolutionary States*, the leaders must not just 'consult' the masses. The masses must lead! If the revolutionary leaders think that the masses cannot lead society, it is because the Soviet bureaucracy perverted the notion. Bureaucrats do not think that the masses have any business discussing anything or giving opinions. But the masses must discuss! They must give opinions! They must intervene! What they have to say may be tentative or timid at first, but they improve when they see that their views count. Then, they want to learn, to study and to contribute. This kind of education produces technicians, physicists and professionals with a formation infinitely above university level.

There are important instances of workers' participation in the world, and many conclusions to be drawn. In some factories of Argentina and Italy, workers have been incorporated into schemes 'to improve the production methods'.

The bosses have developed mixed feelings about these schemes in Argentina and Italy. They realize that the workers want to improve the production methods, and brush the boss aside as well. When the masses decide, they learn rapidly. Because they are interested in what they learn, they assimilate in one week what takes years of studies in other conditions.

Why can't geometry, physics and chemistry be studied in the factories? When the workers come across a topic that they can apply usefully in production, they learn about it quickly because they need to. It is then that the managers and the administrators can be removed; for these types are bloodsuckers who feed off the economy, an economy already wrapped around their individual conceptions.

STATE PROPERTY, DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT AND THE SOCIALIST OBJECTIVE

In the *Revolutionary State*, or in the Workers State, where does the individual conception of the managers and administrators come from? It comes from not thinking of the proletariat, not thinking of the masses and not thinking of the revolution. Such people think *markets* and *customers*, like any bourgeois or bureaucrat. They adopt the plans and policies of the private motive. It is the private motive that shapes their social consciousness.

Where is this privately-based social consciousness coming from in the revolution? It cannot be from the factories, if these are collective. It cannot be from the working class whose historic interests are on Socialism's side. No! This private mentality is rooted in the private use which they make of the common property or amenity. In the USSR, every problem on the Kolkhoz has to do with the private use of collectivized land.

Trotsky highlights this very well in *The Revolution Betrayed*. Where land has been nationalized, it cannot coexist with private property; but in the early days of the USSR, the State granted the private use of collective lands. Like War Communism⁶⁶, this was meant to be a temporary measure. Regarding the land measure, the bureaucracy eventually made it definitive and permanent. It made a tool of that measure, shaped it and used it against the masses and the Revolution.

The bureaucracy made this private property concession, but it did not retreat on the principle of collective ownership. The land of the Kolkhoz stayed public; only its use became private. Still, amongst those working there, a private mentality and consciousness developed. These workers became keener on private gain than on the socialist future.

* * * *

The use of Kolkhoz land being private, those employed there see what they produce as a private property to be privately traded for the greatest return. These workers are not moved by the struggle of the world proletariat, and they do not reckon that a day's pay should be sent to the victims of the recent earthquake in Peru. They do not see the importance of such acts of solidarity in raising the profile of Socialism in Peru.

The economic performance of the Kolkhoz is superior to that of the capitalist system because the Workers State super-imposes its economic relations. Left to itself, however, the Kolkhoz generates market relations outside the central plan.

The leaders of the Soviet Union have a policy of sending aid and support in various parts of the world; but from their social bases in the Kolkhoz, they receive no encouragement to revolutionary actions or ideas. They continue to send Soviet support to places of particular need in the world, as in Peru, but they no longer do it to stimulate the world revolution.

⁶⁶ **War Communism**: name given to the Bolshevik policy between 1918 and 1921 in conditions of immense penury and destruction. Distribution was organised to feed first those fighting in the civil war, and war.

The dictatorship of the proletariat stimulates the world revolution

Mass 'organs' are necessary. Not only do they impel the socialist struggle, they impel it on a world scale! In the Russian Revolution, these organs were *Soviets*, and they continued operating throughout the first seven years of the USSR. Why is it, then, that the USSR is not playing a greater revolutionary role in the world today? This failure must not be laid at the door of the Workers State or of Communism. It comes from the fact that State-owned property has survived in the Soviet Union without its indispensable accompaniment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

'Dictatorship of the proletariat' does not mean violence or terrorism. It means that the State implements all the measures that serve the socialist goal. This fairly summarizes the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In various countries, the Soviet Union creates industries, and large works like dams. This brings progress because those countries can transform more of their raw materials. But that progress is minimal if everything stays in the hands of bureaucrats and State administrators; and it is a retreat when compared with the missed opportunities. The workers and masses see that goods are being made that did not exist before, but that the enterprises act like capitalists who keep the workers out. The masses cannot give their best if they are not integrated. Economic capability is not 'quantities of produce'. There is effective economic capability when the ideas and the suggestions of those who do the work have the power to remove all bureaucratic roles and pathways.

In the capitalist system, competition is the normal and irrevocable condition of the economy. Competition forces capitalism to destroy some 40% of the productive forces, whilst it wastes another 40% on administrators. The administrators compete against the necessity of workers control, that is to say, against the necessity of Socialism. The last thing capitalism wants is the masses intervening!

The elements of economic competition that continue to exist in the Workers States restrict the intervention of the masses. With no overview of production, the masses can hardly suggest ways of improving it. This shows in the fact that, when they win the right to intervene, the masses immediately remove all the obstacles and dangers facing the Workers State. What obstacles and dangers? The managers! Them and their bureaucratic plans! When the masses take control, their first act is to oust the managers. This saves money, and production improves⁶⁷. The whole structure of managerial power can then be dismantled, a structure that had the task to track down progressive ideas and exclude them. When the managers were making plans, it was to justify their roles, not to welcome the idea of sacking them! Same goes for the technicians and their pet projects. This is how the masses learn to intervene.

In the Workers States' factories, the elimination of the bureaucratic managerial layer wants only for the masses to discuss all the operations, from production to management. If some technicians must be kept, the workers must study what these have to teach, and share it between them. When this shared knowledge becomes a common patrimony, it stops being a factor of social differentiation. The old power divisions fall away. Allowed to have ideas and to apply them, the workers want to be more involved. The range of their scientific, cultural and revolutionary abilities expands without limits.

Workers and Peasants, Unite!

The Bolshevik experience is the most beautiful one in human history. It is then that the peasantry became a fundamental tool of Revolution. The peasantry had tried to do this before. Its participation had been decisive in the Zapatista Revolution in Mexico of 1910, as well as in 1905 in Russia, and again in Mexico between 1910 and 1917 although without success. It finally succeeded in 1917 in Russia because the Revolution was socialist. Only with Bolshevism could the peasantry make the historic leap from Czarism to Socialism.

⁶⁷ It improves for the workers who can now produce what they need. Editorial.

In the Bolshevik Revolution, the peasantry was drawn to the proletariat, and the proletariat stood with the Bolsheviks. The peasants recognized the honesty of the young Workers State. This brilliant social structure, objectively dedicated to human wellbeing and Socialist Revolution, won their hearts. They felt the historic objectivity of the Soviet State and that of the Bolsheviks.

The Bolsheviks were obviously not trying to re-create a ruling caste with self interests. The peasantry was witnessing this, checking it, feeling it. It could see the Bolshevik militants going about administrative tasks in a revolutionary way, and the Party sending around the country hundreds of militant-cadres to start a public service. These new public functionaries were paid the same as the workers and peasants. They did not benefit personally. Their job was to serve the common good.

The peasants supported the Russian Revolution because they understood this. Their support was not motivated by a thirst for land or anything else. The poor peasants did not calculate what they stood to gain. They simply adhered to the dictatorship of the proletariat, won as they were by the honesty of the young Soviet State; won also to its moral superiority over capitalism. Even before they could fully appreciate the socialist objectivity of the USSR, they were already feeling it in their bones.

**The 'dividends' of investment
in people are beyond compare!**

The Chinese have recently installed an industrial complex for the production of textiles in Congo Brazzaville. Those in charge are getting together a bureaucratic group opposed to Socialist development. Conflict is bound to come from the fact that this leading, bureaucratic apparatchik is not going to accept any measure challenging it. For it clearly defends its own interests and will produce for its own interests. It wants the cloth for itself, and not for the population; but it is the population that needs it.

One must intervene in this matter in Congo. It is necessary to lead mass debates, and demand that the cloth produced by the Chinese in that particular place⁶⁸ is for the masses; and at prices accessible to them.

The managerial posts must be eliminated, the workers must get an immediate raise and cohorts of workers must be shown how to run the place. This must be done right away, since this initiative is only starting.

The Chinese acted in a revolutionary way during Mao's Revolution, but the Chinese bureaucrats hide this fact. They hide also that the Bolsheviks led by Lenin and Trotsky had been handing factories over to the workers in the young USSR, to be run under workers control. The Chinese leaders never mention the fact that this happened well before Mao.

What does running a company under workers control entail? Handle raw materials and machines? Any worker can learn this in one week. Keep the accounts? Anyone can be shown how to enter figures in ledgers. Two crucial questions remain: 'What do we produce?' and 'Who do we produce for?' Answer: We produce to profit the population and not to make profits! We change the meaning of 'profit'. We take down the signs of 'capital accumulation' and 'capital reproduction', and hang up: 'Service to the Population'.

'Profit' is what profits the population. It is Marx who said so. This kind of profit does not reproduce capital, but it reproduces Socialism. It no longer *accumulates* capital, but it accumulates confidence and security in the socialist future. It no longer *reproduces* capital, but it reproduces socialist consciousness and human steadfastness. This accumulation and reproduction pays dividends. Big dividends! Beyond compare! The biggest ever paid in history, because it eliminates exploitation, repression and war!

⁶⁸ This may refer to the Textile Combine at Kinsundi in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) [Brazzaville], in August 1969, a Sino-Congolese venture, eventually nationalised by the DRC.

THE ROLE OF THE PROLETARIAT IN PARTY FUNCTIONING

The Party organizes the capacity of the population. There is no longer any need for the restricted, small or clandestine type of Bolshevik Party that past conditions imposed on Lenin. Any Communist Party today can draw strength from the communist confidence already in the proletariat. Where no local proletariat exists, strength is available from the experience of others in the class forces, and internationally. Those forces already attract and convince intellectual, peasant and revolutionary sectors to the communist perspective. The Party adds to this the discipline, the security and the reassurance of having found an instrument based on the proletariat and its experiences.

The Communist Party - or whatever name happens to be given to the Party of the *Revolutionary State* - must have the clear aim of building Communism. We live in a historic phase that demands clarity of aim and program. The Party's aim is Communism, and its program is public ownership under the control of Soviet functioning. The Party looks for support in the swell of revolutionary tides, but primarily in the organisms of the proletariat. The above is a general guide to Party edification.

Any such Party trains the working class to become the leader of society. See how the workers already work, study, hold assemblies and demonstrate - and do all these things at the same time. See how keenly they follow the news of their countries and the world. In the *Revolutionary State*, their constant concern for the needs of the revolution leads them to wonder how Workers States are made. Indeed, how are Workers States made? It is the role of the Party to relay to them the revolutionary experiences of history. The Party must tell them about the Russian, Chinese and Cuban Revolutions. When it is well informed, the proletariat feels that it can lead not just in the factory, but in the Party, and in society too.

From the factory upwards, the proletariat transmits to the Party the inviolable rationale that, in order to suppress exploitation, it [proletariat] must suppress itself as a class. It cannot aspire to a regime where it is in command because it can only aspire to a regime that has done away with every type of command. For that reason, no other class or social sector can have the quality or historic comprehension of the working class. Still many people come close to the working class, thanks to the existence of 16 Workers States. These beam revolutionary confidence far and wide, even where the workers are in a minority.

The Party is indispensable

These conclusions will organize social life if they are relayed to society. The tool to do this is the Party. The Party must have cells that meet weekly in the neighbourhoods and the workers' areas. The cell is a space where the population should be able to express its social discontent, as well as exchange opinions and make political and cultural proposals.

The Party's cell does not replace, but extends, the functions of the family, the clan or any other less advanced form of social organization. In the first stages of the Chinese Revolution, the Communists encouraged children as young as six to attend the Party, its cells, and wider society. This interesting experiment was dropped after some months, because parents complained that their children were criticizing them⁶⁹. In reality, the bureaucrats of the Communist Party stopped the experiment, resentful of the criticisms mounting towards them.

The Party must not be a formula of cells, central leaderships, regional organizations and the like. The Party is about how to organize, how to operate and what to discuss. The cells must discuss all the problems of the country, such as: What do we produce? How do we produce? On the basis of what programme and for what aim? Everybody must discuss those questions.

⁶⁹ In the Cultural Revolution, 1966-1976 people were encouraged to criticise institutions, parents and teachers.

**The need for Workers Militias
in the Revolutionary State**

Defense against the counter-revolution must be of constant concern, and the masses must be equipped for it. Special Party organisms must exist - like Militias - that discuss all military matters and involve closely all the rest of the population. This is the persuasive way to stimulate individual initiatives, and it is also the way to avoid clashes that could endanger the State. It all works on the basis of the communication of ideas.

The *Workers Militias* are part of the revolutionary functioning of the masses in the Party's cells and elsewhere. They are organs where all manner of individual initiatives can be proposed. When agreed, these are ready for immediate implementation. There is no bureaucratic office or functionary to consult. No one has to wait for the chief, the principal or the secretary.

It will happen that, in some place, the bureaucrat will refuse to carry out measures needed by the local population. This could occur around a matter of running water for instance, or sanitation - or about holding a public meeting to discuss the problems of the world. The bureaucrats will say no, because they are in charge, but the masses will still meet and decide.

**The masses are passionate
about justice and equality**

When the masses discuss all the problems, they create a cultural and revolutionary stability. Their growing awareness of their centrality in history boosts their confidence. Finished the time when they were adjuncts or mere props. Their influence spreads throughout the population, reaching the leaders themselves. These realise that they must progress or step aside. Finished the time when people could only say 'yeah' or 'nay', or plod along behind the leaders. The cultural and revolutionary experience of the masses toughens them. They may not know everything, but they know what they want. And what they want is justice and equality.

The reasoning of the masses is firmly underpinned by their thirst for justice and equality. Their basic rejection of oppression and repression predisposes them to communist relations and sentiments. When the leading group of the revolution starts feeling the same, it imposes less and starts yielding to the pressure and intervention of the masses. This happened during the first seven years of the Soviet Union.

The USSR underwent phases that deserve attention. During its first seven years, it was an isolated revolution that depended on the task of organizing the world masses, to pluck them out of Socialist and reformist parties, and build Communist parties. Such a process needed time and stages. It needed above all a prodigious effort, as big as any ever made by the original revolutionary parties.

This is all behind us now. This enormous effort was made. Sixteen Workers States exist, along with nationalist and religious movements that can end up in Communism because they have nowhere else to go. In its collective mind, humanity has registered that the communist way is the correct way.

Factory Committees and workers control

The Party must be built for this task. It must have workers in its cells in each zone and region. It must have workers at all levels, because these are not afraid of intervening. Mind that this is not always a guarantee. Some workers want a career of bureaucrat or workers' aristocrat. The Party must rest on the workers who represent the political and Trade Union struggle.

In the *Revolutionary State*, it should be in the power of the Trade Unions to control the factory and make it as efficient as possible. When the workers take control, they stop fisticuffs, petty pilfering and managerial misappropriation. In that very struggle, the managers are replaced by Factory Committees. Where managers or administrators need to be temporarily retained, they must earn the same as the workers, and spend no more than one hour a day in the office. The rest of the time, they must work like all the other workers.

The Factory Committee calls general assemblies to decide how the company, production, science and technology must be run. A period is needed for all the workers to be involved. Much can be discussed after hours, but the whole workforce is quick at getting along with no managers. The Factory Committee eliminates the waste, of time included, caused by managers whose leading roles never went beyond an extremely partial interest in what was to be produced, for whom, and how.

The end of the managers' posts breaks the administrative monopoly of management. At last the revolutionary culture of the working class can rule, transform the enterprise and transform society. Note that production never stopped during this transformation. As it became possible to know and discuss all the problems of the company, and indeed of the country and of the world, workers control increased steadily. Some assemblies, discussions and debates had to happen during working hours, but this was also possible after work or during breaks. When the workers feel increasingly part of each other, they grow in self-confidence and class comprehension. Their liberated creativity fills them with ideas, ideas and ideas.

**The way forward is the
Workers State - as Cuba did**

The way to build the Party is with ideas, programs and the organisation of all available forces. Party organisation must not be left to small bureaucratic cliques. This narrows the vision of the Party and diverts it from its goal. When the Party organises the whole of the population, like the Bolsheviks, its vision deepens and broadens entirely without limits.

There is no country where two Workers' parties are required, although one often finds several parties coexisting. Whatever the situation, the task is to stimulate the Revolutionary Party, or to create it. It may call itself 'Communist', or not. The nature of a Party does not always shine through its name, although the name should be explicit, if possible. If the program of the Party is Communist, the Party will end up calling itself 'Communist', as happened in Cuba.

In the *Revolutionary States*, it is not always possible to avoid several Workers parties existing together. The Communist parties have always insisted on staying separate from the revolutionary parties, and for that matter, our Posadist IV international kept separate from the Communist parties. Today, we look for less separation, because we observe movements in the historic process, some of them which we have called 'the historic re-encounter' and 'installed entryism'⁷⁰.

We kept our Posadist functioning separate from other parties, to acquit ourselves better theoretically and politically. This did not stop us participating in the practical activities of the Communists and revolutionary parties. When we did this, we always sought to give them the best of our conclusions, of our ability and of our confidence. We believed that when they understood better, we could even fuse with them.

Postponing Socialism means yet more atomic weapons

Some Chinese bureaucrats said that one thousand years of contradictions lay ahead of us⁷¹. These people are obviously not in a hurry. That, or they have no notion of history! They do not see time passing as a chance to get a better grasp of history and its phases. Even an elementary grasp of history shows that time passing means swathes of humanity being destroyed, more atomic weapons, and the atomic war. Time passing means more misery, hunger and oppression. Since Socialism is the answer, yes, we are in a hurry to get there! Our haste is not individual but social. We cannot wait to see humanity liberated and its creativity shooting up into the sky.

The bureaucratic notion that 'there is time' is rank stupid and criminal. There is time!? How?

⁷⁰ **Historic Reincounter**, see note 24. **Installed Entrism**: A form of united front aimed - in the case of the Posadist IV International - at encouraging the Communist parties to take power.

⁷¹ **This refers to a speech of Lin Biao** on 25 Oct 1966. His exact words were: "Naturally, antagonisms between old things and new things will continue to exist in future society for [...] one thousand years, or even ten thousand years".

Take science: Are we, or aren't we in a hurry to develop it? Isn't it urgent to eliminate hunger and disease?

There is a great hurry to get to Socialism! And indeed we feel it! We do not hurry for our own sakes, but to end oppression, terror, repression and misery. To save millions more from being decimated by war and hunger.

**Soviet functioning is required
for the survival of any revolution**

The Party is a simple thing. Its central committee, congress, political bureau, regional committees and cells must be adaptable. As it builds its theoretical and practical skills, the Party must live up to its goal and respond to the concrete conditions. The goal is the same as it always was: the taking of power. As for the concrete conditions, since they change, Party building cannot have many fixed rules. There are a few however, like the Party must have cells. And its leadership must never be allowed to drift off, all by itself, uncaring and out of control.

When the masses intervene in society, they learn to organize, control and lead. They do this by discussing all the problems and by creating the social organs of their power. In these organs, they develop the cultural, scientific and technical capacity needed to lead society. And in those organs too, the Party and the Trade Unions must bring their revolutionary and cultural knowledge. This knowledge soon reaches the rest of the country, and the world. The role of the Party and of the Trade Unions is to connect the *Revolutionary State* with the world process of the revolution.

In Congo Brazzaville, imperialism has just failed to stop the formation of a *Revolutionary State*⁷². This lessens imperialism's ability to start war or a counter-revolutionary coup. To continue to exist, however, the *Revolutionary State* must go forward.

⁷² The President Marien Ngouabi chose Pierre Nze, his Minister of State for education and culture, to participate in the Revolutionary Council. Together, they made links with the Workers States. Editorial.

The *Revolutionary State* can only survive by taking greater revolutionary measures. This needs world solidarity. Congo Brazzaville must call for world solidarity; the world masses will respond if they see the Trade Unions playing a leading social role, and the Party holding large-scale democratic debates with the participation of the whole population.

Let the whole of Africa hear that the masses of Congo Brazzaville hold assemblies where everyone can take part, young and old, to discuss everything. Let those masses - that capitalism so despises - be seen discussing, resolving and leading! This will revolutionize the other Congo, Kinshasa, and help the struggle there against Mobutu. Mobutu has the army and the means to repress, but this is not what holds the masses back. They are held back by uncertainty. Not enough Party and Trade Union instruments create uncertainty.

The lack of Party can always be partially surmounted. Take the masses of the United States: they have no proper Party or Trade Unions, but this does not stop them meeting, uniting against the war on Vietnam, and hitting hard at US imperialism. Their behaviour shows that they hear the world clamor for progress. They feel part of the world revolution. On the international stage which they follow keenly, they oppose the reactionary doings of the Yankee governments.

THE WAY TO DEVELOP THE ECONOMY IS TO RAISE THE CAPACITY OF THE MASSES

There is another important aspect to consider. How should the *Revolutionary State* be organized to improve its economic performance? Human development has reached a certain level in the world - the Soviets have an orbital station in Space for instance - but entire populations still live with candles and flint stones. They need an economic program based on their productive capacity and their own natural resources.

Egypt⁷³ has been building the Aswan Dam⁷⁴ these last 20 years. But 20 years was time enough to transform the whole of Egypt! A dam is good, but the building of it should not bleed the country white! Had Egypt counted on the democratic participation of the masses, with Soviet-type organs, Aswan would have been a drop in the ocean of Egypt's economic achievements. As it turns out, the Egyptian leaders have gone no farther than the dam. Had they counted on the masses, they could have developed agricultural production, made some industrial improvements, and built the dam as well. The Chinese did this in the past. One cannot just depend on a dam! A war, or a bomb, and goodbye the dam! For the Egyptian people, the quality of life has not developed in line with the conditions that brought about the dam.

Where the productive capacity of the population leads society, economic development is guaranteed. This is Communism. This is what the Soviets achieved. See how the Russian Revolution transformed the peasants! The latter passed from their narrow attachment to a land parcel - and the sale of their children in order to live - to being leaders in production and in society. They made their own ploughs and started producing immeasurably more than before in less time. They understood Socialism. They worked for society, not for personal gain. It was not 'soap and electricity' that won them to the revolution, but their active participation in the construction of society.

**The Workers States must invest
where Revolution is the dividend**

Any Revolutionary State has riches in its potential to plan production and transform its own raw materials. The fruits on the tree have no value until they are picked. Marx showed how the human hand turns the raw materials into riches, and that all riches come from the human hand. Added to this, the *Revolutionary States* have an extra resource in the existence of 16 Workers States.

⁷³ **Egypt:** Gamal Abdel Nasser was Egypt's president when this was written (from 1954 to 1970).

⁷⁴ **The Aswan Dam:** was started officially in 1960 but would be fully functional only in 1976.

The 16 Workers States of today have enough accumulated wealth and advanced technologies between them to be told by the *Revolutionary States*: "Support us!"

This call for support will achieve more by implicating the Workers States than by waiting for a reply. The Workers States must help the *Revolutionary States* to produce and build infrastructures, waterworks, etc. The *Revolutionary States* must hold mass assemblies that send resolutions to the USSR, China and the other Workers States. The latter must respond positively and 'without strings' because the best investment they will ever make is the one that has *revolution* as dividend.

Lenin used to guffaw at idea that the USSR 'was generous' with international aid. "Why do you laugh so, comrade Lenin?" – "Because we are not 'generous', we are communists". Bolshevik aid was an investment, certainly, but it was driven by the hope for Socialism. It was not for immediate returns. The Trade Unions of the world must meet and pass resolutions addressed to the Soviet Trade Unions. The latter must be asked to strike and demonstrate in solidarity with the working class of Spain, France and other places. The Soviet Trade Unions need to take a direct interest in the progress of international revolution. They they must send delegations and technicians ready to work in the conditions of those other countries.

* * * *

A *Revolutionary State* can use the differences between the Chinese and the Soviet bureaucracies to obtain aid, machinery, weapons and funds; but this aid will be as nothing compared with what the *Revolutionary State* stands to gain by calling on the USSR and China to unite. For the vector that pulls the Workers States closer together is the same that draws the *Revolutionary States* towards the Workers States.

The most complete form of aid is the unification of the USSR and China.

Meanwhile, as we said, the 'aid' of the Workers States must be disinterested.

The Russian Revolution sent help to Turkey, Japan and Morocco. This took bread from the mouths of the Soviet masses, and this sort of thing still goes on today (1969). This is not generosity but communist consciousness. It is not generosity but the conscious way to stimulate the world revolution. Communist consciousness tells the communist leader: "Do this! The progress of history needs it".

**Independent Trade Union
functioning from the State apparatus**

The Trade Unions in Congo Brazzaville have the potential to shake the whole of Africa. The reactionary governments of other countries will protest and intervene, but with difficulty. Since Ben Bella⁷⁵ was thrown out, Algeria has been awash with progressive ideas. Ideas of Socialism - not Mahomet's. In his recent *First of May* speech, Boumedienne⁷⁶ repeated several times that the aim of Algeria is Socialism.

In his polemic with Trotsky, Lenin explained very well how the independent functioning of the Trade Unions must be upheld in the revolutionary process. Further socialist advance depends upon it. This principle was discarded by the bureaucracy of Stalin whose only concern in this debate was to present Trotsky as Lenin's antagonist. In reality, there had been two solutions to the Trade Union question, and Lenin's had been the most complete. The same happened over Brest-Litovsk.

Lenin understood better than Trotsky the role of the Party. For Lenin, the independent functioning of the Trade Unions in the Workers State was the essential instrument to put a brake on bureaucracy. In the Workers State, Lenin said, this allows the Trade Unions to operate as "schools of Communism". He said of Trotsky that he had been rather "administrative" in this matter.

⁷⁵ **Ahmed Ben Bella**, 1916-2012: Liberation fighter against French imperialism in Algeria. Prime Minister 1962-63, President 1963-65. More nationalist than socialist; started relations with the Workers States.

⁷⁶ **Houari Boumedienne**, 1932-1978. Military leader in Algeria and 'President du Conseil de la Revolution' from 1965 to 1976. He toppled Ben Bella and declared the aim of building Socialism.

Trotsky was a great organizer of the Workers State, but not so much of the Party. Lenin was the one who organized the forces of the Party - hence of the working class - so that it could learn from 1905 and lead the revolution in 1917. It was he who knew *What is to Be Done*⁷⁷.

**Every revolution
needs the other revolutions**

In the *Revolutionary State*, Trade Unions, Party and social organizations in the workers' neighbourhoods is a necessity. The children must be included at every level. The Party must set up schools and literacy projects; its proposals must always be attainable and drive towards a clearly stated social aim. When the masses are sufficiently involved, they feel the need to call on the Workers States themselves; for it is absurd to work by hand, as in the fields, when the USSR could send machines by the dozens.

The Chinese leaders laud the ideas of "being self-sufficient" and of "depending on nobody" - but these are false concepts. One must depend on the others! Every science needs the other sciences, and every Workers State needs the other Workers States. Workers States are called upon to defend the socialist cause, and not just their local interests! A Workers State that refuses to depend on the other Workers States stays glued to individual and regional interests that hold it back. This individualism comes from a bureaucratic concept that resents scientific and technological improvement, as well as Marxism itself. The idea of "depending on nobody" is rooted in this bureaucratic concept.

⁷⁷ Title of a book by Lenin.

CUBA'S ROLE IN THE PROGRESS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY STATES

We propose to the Cuban comrades that they turn the 26th July *Cuban Revolution Celebrations* into vast discussions on the theme of the world revolution. Let these assemblies discuss what policy, resolutions and appeals to send to the world's revolutionaries and progressives. The Bolsheviks did this on each anniversary. Since the Cuban Communist Party and Trade Unions are part of the world revolution, it is in their own names that they must address the world masses.

Commemorations within national confines hamper the Revolution. If the Cuban Party and Trade Unions do not address the world's masses as a matter of course, the influence of the Cuban Revolution on the world is limited, and this limits the influence of the world masses on the Cuban Revolution.

On similar occasions, Lenin and Trotsky would go out and listen to the opinion of the Party, of the masses, of important circles. They sought in the masses the disposition for change, and brought it to the Party. In a vortex of debates, the Party was in full growth. This is the greatest Bolshevik lesson.

The Cuban leadership needs to cultivate the political preoccupation of the masses. There is a lack of political life in the Trade Unions and Communist Party of Cuba. This leaves them open to empirical change instead of them initiating conscious change. The fear of losing control, or of being superseded, instills in the leaders a bureaucratic wish to contain. This is how they make statements on production and society without responding to concerns in the workers movement. They acknowledge the workers' selflessness and laud "the communist conduct of the Cuban worker", but they draw no political conclusions from it. Hence they do not show the origins of such political conclusions⁷⁸ or where they are leading to.

⁷⁸ **These conclusions** probably refer to the historic role of the proletariat, with Marxism as the originator of such conclusions, and not Marti. Editorial.

The Cuban masses aim well above the limits set by the leaders. Fidel Castro speaks of "changes soon coming in production and machine-use", but without referring to the mass organizations or further political debates. Surely these changes must be discussed and resolutions taken! There must be assemblies in the factories, the Trade Unions, the neighbourhoods. As things stand, it is the Party's apparatus that decides, not the masses. In these conditions, the best results are minimal compared with the potential which there is.

A measure of Cuba's potentiality is given by the world. The USSR and China have disputes, but they make agreements too. Through recent accords with the USSR, the Chinese leaders try to improve their standing in the world communist movement. Finished the time when they could use the Chinese Revolution as their personal refuge! They realize too that their attacks on the USSR win them no sympathy or support in the world masses.

Cuba displays most important symptoms of Political Revolution. For one must never forget how far away Cuba lies from the life of the other Workers States. One must remember also that Cuba has to deal with the constant pressure of Yankee attacks, in conditions where it needs to improve relations with the Latin American bourgeoisies as well.

There are aspects of Political Revolution in the USSR too. We have detected some, although less direct, behind Brezhnev speeches. In a recent meeting of the Communist parties for instance, he called on the French and Italian parties "to go to power". He did not recommend revolution, but yes, a step towards power. This is the same old 'compenetrative' policy, but it ends a phase when the bureaucracy was always agreed with capitalism. A step towards power being a degree of suppression of capitalism...

CONCLUSION

We fully endorse the concepts as set out by Lenin in '*State and Revolution*'. It is now necessary, however, to incorporate the new elements of history into them. Lenin was writing with one Workers State before him, at a time when the profile of the capitalist State was neat. Today, that profile is no longer neat: in the *Revolutionary State*, the army no longer has the force, the status and the transcendence of the army in a full capitalist State. Here you see categories of distinct phases of the State in need of definition. We call these *Revolutionary States* because, under the spur of the revolution, they gradually let go of the *capitalist State character*. The structure of their relations, institutions and juridical functions continues to be that of capitalism. They maintain that structure, which is capitalist, but they do so under leaderships who declare themselves contrary, and take measures against capitalism.

It is still necessary to destroy this capitalist *structure*, for it is a hub of counter-revolution in constant renewal. It contains the mechanisms of State that defend capitalism: army, church and juridical functions. The right to defend capitalism is vested in these institutions, whose task it is to defend private property in production and distribution. The State represents the apparatus of an administration that ties together the Bank and the interests of the capitalists, big and small. Should this fail transitorily, or lose control, the State concocts a coup with its other mechanisms - generally the army. This is why the first task of any Revolution is to dismantle the army.

A basic lesson from the experience of Cuba:

The revolutionary leaderships flinch from starting campaigns against the capitalist structure of the army. They recoil because this means they must break from people who supported them from the start.

In the first phase of the Cuban Revolution, the Castro leadership went on conciliating with Urrutia⁷⁹, to keep him 'on board'. It took a wave of mass factory and land occupations for the Cuban leadership to break with Urrutia. It was not that Fidel Castro had ever opposed the masses or disagreed with them. Only, the masses took the lead. They took charge of the speed and rhythms of the revolutionary process. And to Fidel who kept talking of "moralizing capitalism" they said: "Quite right, let's moralize it. This way!"

Where we happen to lead a debate, we must always draw on historic experiences. This Cuban one is an example. It proves that the State apparatus needs transforming, that mass power is the means to do it, and that mass power needs 'organs' to guarantee the advance of the revolution. In debates of some intellectual depth, one must not lose sight of the role of social interests, and the irreplaceable social role of the proletariat.

**Capitalism needs
fascism, or it collapses**

You can always find a worker who wants a career, but as a class, the social interest of the proletariat is always objective. This is 'the historic function of the proletariat' that Marx speaks about. Within that function, the proletariat cannot be but objective. It cannot but serve the progress of history. The Party needs to incorporate as many proletarians as possible; and when it accepts intellectuals, these must be won to the proletariat. In the countries where there are few proletarian organizations, and not much political life, one must organize these rapidly, and build the Party at the same time.

The Chinese have no program. This is why they do not intervene in the world. They made their revolution under the generic banner of Communism, but with opportunistic and conciliatory conceptions. The Chinese Revolution subsidized and compensated the capitalists. To do this may not always be objectionable, depending on aims and historic conditions.

⁷⁹ **Manuel Urrutia Lleo**, 1901-1981, served as President under Fidel Castro in 1959 for 6 months. Went to live in the United States after that.

As a rule however, compensating the capitalists has never avoided civil war, nor has it ever saved time to humanity. Every historic experience illustrates this.

The concessions that Lenin made to capitalism with the NEP⁸⁰ threatened the Workers State's structure because they kept alive the system of capitalist reproduction. This was balanced out by the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat and more working class weight in government. But things are different today. In the present structure of 16 Workers States, the capitalists have investments and play some role - but none of them believes in the renovation of the capitalist system.

Capitalism is bereft. It cannot unite within itself because it can have no initiative or program. It has no means to resolve the crisis that is facing it. The expectations of the imperialists (in the US, Japan, etc) are not vested in expansion programs - only in plunder and the hope to subsist. Since they cannot wage wars of direct plunder, they prepare for the final war, the war of the final settlement of accounts⁸¹. This purpose forces imperialism to concentrate to the point of closing in upon itself. In each capitalist, the effect of this is to magnify fear. The capitalists are at a complete loss.

It would take a fascist dictatorship for capitalism to sustain the European Common Market (ECM) and the present concentration of capital. A fascist dictatorship or it all collapses! As this cannot be done, a Willy Brandt⁸² springs up - standing against the fascist concentration of power - because he defends the interests of the German bourgeoisie against the others. There are no possibilities open to capitalism, or to the ECM.

* * * *

⁸⁰ **NEP: New Economic Policy.** Adopted in 1921 by the leadership of Lenin. It aimed at stimulating the economy devastated by 3 years of civil war and imperialist encirclement. Foreign investments were allowed into the country to boost industrialisation, produce more goods and supply the towns.

⁸¹ **Final Settlement of Accounts:** the final confrontation between capitalism and the forces of Socialism.

⁸² **Willy Brandt,** 1913-1992, President of the Federal Rep of Germany. Made the Ostpolitik with the USSR.

Change the currency.
Break with imperialist finance!

For any *Revolutionary State* to maintain itself and progress, it must break the military and judicial apparatuses. It must educate the working class and increase working class participation at the level of political leadership. This needs a Party: a Party and organs of the masses like Trade Unions, Workers' Areas Committees and Enterprise Committees. The workers must be encouraged to decide as a body. The task is to break the judicial, financial, repressive and military machinery of State. The banks must be statized and the currency changed. The Bolsheviks did this. On Day 2 of the Revolution, they created the *New Rouble* to stop international speculation bringing them down. After a period of isolation, international relations re-started ... initiated by capitalism itself!

The same happened when the Chinese Revolution (1949) kept its currency outside the IMF's⁸³ loop. The international capitalists fought hard to keep each other out of the Chinese market, something which they could only achieve by each wanting a slice of it! The Mao government had no problem re-starting trade. Fairly recently, China passed an accord with Canada involving \$1,200 million. China honored it without problem, in dollars - its own currency still non-convertible.

The act of changing the currency gives time to reorganize the economy and production. Once the latter are on their feet, the new currency has no difficulty in becoming convertible again. The change of currency breaks the country's dependence on capitalist and imperialist finance.

The new money has little value at first, but this does not last. Money is a viable symbolic representation if it has a true base in the economy. Each *Revolutionary State* faces the need to reorganize its structures and economic leadership. Once this is done, any interchange between *Revolutionary States* – let us say Congo, Angola, Gabon and Mali – creates the conditions to give value to the money.

⁸³ International Monetary Fund. The author says 'statize' and not 'nationalise', to stress the notion of planning.

When the countries we just named manage to cut their financial ties with the Franc⁸⁴, they will be free from the economic, financial and social pressure of French imperialism. From their inclusion in the *Zone Franc*, imperialism has structures even in the governments. Such countries are caught in webs of economic, financial and cultural interests that need dismantling. Those who advise “not to break with the Franc” have an interest in the country staying under the yoke of French imperialism, but that yoke needs breaking!

Proletarian democracy:
Tool of social transformation

Some countries have succeeded in breaking their dependency on imperialism. They are the Workers States. It is obvious that the continuation of this task in the *Revolutionary States* needs the support of the Workers States.

A *Revolutionary State* that breaks from imperialist dependency gets no credit from the capitalist world, but it gets credit from its masses. The external trade of such a country may hit ground zero, but its internal life goes up many floors. Capitalist accumulation may stop, but social accumulation fills the revolution to the brim with confidence and steadfastness. Such was the feat of the Bolsheviks!

As Lenin and those around him attended international conferences without neck-ties, the capitalists mocked them as “idealists who know nothing of the economy and even less of diplomacy”! But the Bolsheviks knew how to move the heart of masses! They were in complete communication with the masses of the world!

The *dictatorship of the proletariat* is the democratic instrument of working class intervention. This turn of phrase means that the working class, through the organization of the State, has the full power to implement the measures that lead to Socialism.

⁸⁴ French money before the Euro.

The forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat can change: They can take forms of imposition, or be based on persuasion, without any need for violence. In no way does the designation 'dictatorship' refer to the use of imposition or of armed surveillance. It refers to the working class carrying out the measures needed by socialist construction and the removal of all obstacles in the way.

Through the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian State passes laws, leads and controls, with the will to see to the implementation of every measure required by Socialism. We insist that the forms can vary. They can be more or less violent or military. Where military action continues unduly, you no longer have the dictatorship of the proletariat. Where a proletarian government and State truly enjoys the support of the masses - and the masses truly decide democratically through their power organs - there is no longer any need for a police and an army.

Where military action needs to continue on behalf of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this is done by the Workers Militias. Militias that no longer form part of the revolutionary and cellular functioning of the masses start acting in the void. They undergo a transformation which turns then into separate bodies, even if they are not yet bureaucratic ones. They form a separate leadership with a functioning of its own.

Military professionalism :
A power-base for bourgeois and bureaucrats

The reason for eliminating the professional role of the army is to stop it acting politically. A professional army exerts a political influence, and this is greater where mass organization is less developed. The army throws its weight about, gravitating towards where economic administrators are busy, in import-export for instance.

Be it in capitalism or in the Workers State, the administrators administrate in their own interests. Trotsky analyses this in *The Revolution Betrayed*.

The bureaucracy could do this freely in the past, but this is no longer so. This is not an optimistic conclusion. It is a logical and tangible one. Due to the advance of the revolution, the bureaucracy can no longer act as before. Proletarian democracy plays a very important role in the construction of the Workers State. It is not enough that the proletariat intervenes to make proletarian democracy, but it is part of it.

J.POSADAS

28-29 September 1969

Examples of Revolutionary States in the 1960's and early 70's:

Bolivia: On 26 Sept 1969 (2 days before this text was elaborated), General Ovando Candia of Bolivia - Commander of the Armed Forces, and a group of officers - carried out a military coup. Their government proceeded to improve the life of the masses and nationalised the US *Gulf Oil Corporation*. They brought left intellectuals into the government and declared support for the principles of Alvarado of Peru, and Torrijos of Panama. This anti-imperialist stance deepened in 1970, with Juan Jose Torres.

Libya: Colonel Muammar Gaddafi and 70 young officers launched a military coup on 1 Sept 1969. As Gaddafi became more prominent in the RCC, he adopted an Arab interpretation of Socialism. See notes 62 and 34.

South Yemen: On 30 Nov 1967, South Yemen became independent from Britain. The *National Liberation Front* announced the "*People's Republic of South Yemen*". In June 1969, Marxists in the National Liberation Front formed the Socialist Party of Yemen, developing ties with the USSR, China, East Germany and the Palestinian PLO.

Mali: Modibo Keita ruled Mali from 1960-68. He imposed measures of State control in the economy and over foreign trade. Collective farms were created in every village and the State bought all their produce. Keita replaced the national assembly by a *Comite National de Defense de la Revolution*. He received the Lenin Prize for helping to end the war between Algeria and Morocco. He was overthrown by the military coup of Moussa Traore (with French support) in Nov 1968, but Traore continued to try and develop the country.

Ghana: Kwame Nkrumah had been President of Ghana from 1957-1966. He created "*the First Republic*" for his country and gave it the aim of "the socialist transformation of our economy through the [...] development of the state and cooperative sectors". He stimulated many improvements in mechanisation and industrialisation, diversified agricultural production, and created the *Convention Peoples' Party*. He imposed State control over foreign investments, insisted on the "local processing of the raw materials", and on "the utilisation by Ghana of its natural resources". Overthrown on 1 October 1969, a few days after the elaboration of this text, the new administration of Busa and Addo eventually continued with efforts to better distribute drinking water and electricity, improve hygiene and education and the like. That *Second Republic* lasted until 1972.

Peru: Velasco Alvarado, President of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, ruled Peru from Oct 1968 -1975 as President of the Revolutionary Government. The army took control of the oil fields of the *International Petroleum Company* in the North of the country. He presided over a very important process of Agrarian Reform.

Egypt: In March 1969, Gamal Abdel Nasser (supported by Jordan, Syria, Iraq and Palestinian elements) allowed Soviet pilots to fly combat patrols over parts of Egypt. This is one of the many instances that demonstrate how the Revolutionary States must link up with the Workers States, so as not to be crushed by imperialism.

Congo: See notes 26, 56, 57, 68 and 72.

In 1969 there was the very elevated *Revolutionary State* of Tanzania. with Julius Nyerere, its president from 1962-1985). Not all the Revolutionary States of that time are on this list.

Examples of Workers States during the same period:

At the time when J Posadas wrote on the *Revolutionary State*, the major Workers States were: USSR, China, Cuba, East Germany, North Vietnam, North Korea, Mongolia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania. Algeria and others, could be considered either a *Revolutionary State* or a Workers State. Hence this list is not exhaustive either.

The Editors.

About the Author ...

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 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*".

March 2014