

# **J.POSADAS**

## **WAR, PEACE, AND THE FUNCTION OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES**

**(vol.1)**

### Notes to the Reader:

**J Posadas foresees** that nuclear war is coming.

About this, he had the following to say: "War, this war, is not the end of the world. It will be a greater destruction than before, but in proportion to the destruction, there is more consciousness and intelligence in the world; there is the scientific capacity to understand that everything can be done and redone, built and rebuilt, made and remade – better than before.

There is a constant and uncontrollable diffusion and transmission of knowledge, on matters of economy, astronomy and physical laws. There is a solid sentiment of security in the world with respect to the future, nature, production and the Universe.

In times past, people experienced fear because knowledge was confined to narrow circles. Today, the Workers States show that everything can be understood. Comparatively speaking, the atomic war will be nothing worse than any other war". J Posadas.

(J Posadas died in May 1981. This Volume contains a short biography of his life.)

**Below, there are 8 texts** by J Posadas on war, as follows:

- The crisis of capitalism, war and Socialism, 16.4.1978
  - The war and the worldwide elimination of the capitalist system, 6.12.1979
  - On the war preparations of capitalism and its historic insecurity, 27.1.1980
  - Reagan's threats and the war preparations of imperialism, 3.2.1981
  - The war preparations in the midst of capitalist crisis, 13.2.1981
  - War preparations and the function of the socialist countries, 22.3.1981
  - On the nature of the preparations for war, 21.4.1981
  - On the inevitability of the nuclear war, (Appendix), 6.4.1978.
- 

## **THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM, WAR, AND SOCIALISM.**

**J. POSADAS**

16<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 1978

War is a necessity of capitalism. It is part of capitalist competition and the accumulation of capital. It does not intervene directly in commercialisation but in production and profit, because the arms industry constitutes more or less 20% of production in the big capitalist countries. In cases like North America, if the manufacture of arms stopped, a collapse would result – not a

crisis, a crash – and everything would collapse. The biggest concentrations of capital in the world are invested in atomic weapons. The state orders them and pays the capitalists. A vast number of private firms in chemicals and atomic energy sell to the state. The manufacture of arms is a major part of all budgets. Up to 25% of total exports of France and Belgium is in armaments.

This creates a whole layer of people who want war and, if they cannot make war between the big countries, they give arms to other countries so that they can fight. They do not invent war, it's a social necessity for the ruling class. Therefore they sell arms and invest as the situations arise. A capitalist crisis would break out if all this stopped. And then, the better-off petty bourgeoisie, presently involved with capitalism would abandon it immediately if it saw it without perspective.

The other fundamental perspective is that the proletariat does not increase in number as a class, but other sectors of the petty bourgeoisie which increase their weight in the economy through electronics, are won intellectually by intelligence because of their function. It is true that they depend on the social regime of capitalism more than on the proletariat. But the social regime has no perspective and so they are increasingly influenced by the Workers States. Automation and electronics are part of the development of the Workers States. The bourgeoisie hoped to gain from the numerical decline of the proletariat, but the influence of the Workers States reduces this gain. Moreover, it is not the 'backward' countries

with little proletariat that decide in the world, but the concentration of the large countries like the United States, Germany, France, etc... and the Workers States. Regarding the 'backward' countries, these are backward economically, but socially they are very advanced. All in all, there is little gain for the bourgeoisie in the numerical decline of the proletariat.

**The technical and scientific petty bourgeois are won to the proletariat.**

Then the strength which is given to the bourgeoisie, the fact that the petty bourgeoisie is replacing the proletariat in the role of production, is not a political advantage – it's only for a very short time – because the process of advance of the revolution is gaining and winning these sectors. It creates the development of the intelligence and understanding of the petit bourgeoisie. Every electronic apparatus eliminates a thousand workers and every technician who controls it eliminates others. But a great number of workers also enter work as technicians because now technical work is not just a specialisation but a routine and repetitive work.

Specialisation existed before, because there was not the scientific knowledge of electronics, of the movement of the atom, the relations of the atom, of movement and energy. But now any worker who studies learns it, and controls very quickly even the most complicated electronic machine. Anyone can control it, that is to say, the petty bourgeoisie itself is not the same category as before, which

was very differentiated. Now this is not so; they feel that they are part of production, of the productive force. Pressing the button corresponds to the machine. There are complexes, so-called because of their enormous quantity and variety of equipment, which only a few workers control. They manage the lot. It means that now the generalisation of the system of production is eliminating the proletariat; reducing and diminishing the number of the proletariat, but also winning the technical and scientific petty bourgeoisie to the ranks of the proletariat.

At the same time as this process develops, capitalism does not have any solution other than war, and the massacre that the war entails is independent of the will of any particular capitalist. The needs of the regime call for war. By 'regime' is meant an economic structure whose essential plans are determined exclusively by big industry, capital and high finance. Being concentrated, these supervise all movements of the other enterprises and smaller finances.

Above all, the function of big business is ever more centralised in the large capitalist countries. Competition acquires each day more velocity, dynamism and force. It is truly phenomenal. It leads to the highest levels ever seen in the concentration of capital and production and, therefore, in the domination of the economy. The sectors that correspond to this economic power of big industry and high finances are obviously those that decide in the fields of the military, the police, atomic preparations etc.

These are the sectors that decide war, and they can launch it any moment without any Parliament or President being able to intervene in any way. It is these that determine the economy and war. You can rest assured that before the revolutionary process reaches such countries as North America or Germany, these people will launch the war. This can only be apprehended by class analysis. Scientists in botanic, biology or genetics, when studying plants, are led to analyse the relationship between the seed and the earth, and the whole development that leads to fruits and flowers. There is no reason why society should not be equally studied. The Communist comrades talk about society but say that this principle is altered and that with society, one deals with 'another behaviour'. Why? What 'other behaviour'? What they express in this is their fear of the atomic war! How has society ever behaved? How was it at the time of Lenin? They answer: 'In the epoch of Lenin things were different. Today we do not have to act as one did under Lenin'. But why? Has the bourgeoisie been made to change conceptions and its own nature?

We take historic examples such as China. China was the greatest place of conciliation, and it had to make war. There is no social change without war. Thus, how does capitalism prepare its conduct? In what form does it show that it is influenced by the progress of history? 'Well, the capitalists are disorganised, and sectors are isolated'. Where is this? How is it expressed? There is not one example. Neither the Communists nor the

Socialists discuss this. They simply say, 'The atomic war is a barbarity, it is the end of the world'. Then they frighten people, beginning by frightening themselves – and yield. Then they seek positions in the territory of the enemy to watch him, to prevent him launching the war, or to control or persuade capitalism to accept changes. It is a mystical philosophy, not erroneous but mystical. It's one of conceiving human behaviour as distinct from its relation with production. The greatness of Marx was essentially to show the fetishism of production and capitalism as a unity. Capitalism without production is no use, but production without capitalism is perfectly possible. Capitalism without production means that it has no strength because all its force of thinking, conceiving and seeing depends on capitalist production.

The fear of the capitalist is different from ordinary fear. The capitalist is afraid because he feels a void in life. People are afraid of a concrete fact because they may feel they are not strong enough, that they do not know enough, do not feel they have the ability, have not succeeded in concentrating the attention to see what to do. But capitalism does not have these sensations. Its reactions are not similar to the ordinary reaction of people in front of events. It's the fear of being dislodged from history that affects them. The capitalists are enclosed in their class interest and maintain themselves in that.

If it were possible for capitalism to think in a humanitarian way and to think that it was going to

disappear and so say, 'We will stop being capitalists: tomorrow things are going to change and history will be better for all', if capitalism could do this, it would give up. But capitalism does not think like this. History was constructed in relation to production and to property – even in some Workers States one still sees the attachment to production and to property – which determines behaviour and attitudes, the way of going, seeing, of foreseeing, and the vision of the future. The capitalist does not see a future in his life. He grabs everything and closes his eyes to what is inconvenient. He does not think about his wife or son.

No big capitalist, important capitalist, has a notion of family, a notion of maternity or paternity. His life is capital. His function in life is to reproduce himself in production, not to reproduce in the family. The joy of a parent with child forms part of the optimistic nature of the future. The tragedy of the bourgeois with a son is the disappearance of the capitalist system. He has no future. How is it possible to believe that the capitalist is ever going to think in opposition to what for him is life and property, with a whole structure. True, we can win capitalists with intelligence and it is very possible to weaken capitalism enormously that way, as it could have been done much more in Chile, at the time of Salvador Allende. This can be done greatly. It can be done with all these Governments that swear by the Constitution, when the Constitution can be seen in all its weakness! Swearing by the Constitution is not a fraud, but a fact. These leaderships go to Government and from there

prepare the working class for a maximum advance. What needs doing at that point is to disarm the army, destroy all its structure and introduce norms that allow the population to intervene in everything.

But the Communist leaderships speak of 'state secret', 'judicial secrecy', 'military secrecy'. All this is a load of lies. It's simply the structure of the ruling class to conduct affairs according to its interest and to use the army, the police, the laws, the judges, tribunals, in accord with its interest. They do not discuss in this way. This shows that much more can be done. And how? 'In Chile'. And how did Chile finish? They speak about Allende but after the fall of Allende, no; they speak of 'traitors' and 'bastards'. They say, 'It was not that it could not be done, but there were traitors'. Thus they falsify the notion of history.

The bourgeois and the army commanders of Chile swore by the oath of the Allende's Constitution, but they betrayed him afterwards. They took the oath because they couldn't do anything else while they prepared the counter-revolution. The duty of the leaders is to understand that it is like this; otherwise they do not use the dialectical method but the enigmatic method to guess what is going to happen, or the pietistic conception of the revolution or mysticism. They do not employ the dialectical method, otherwise they would say, 'All those who had taken the oath in defence of private property and the Government of Allende were lying'. Allende also took the oath in defence of the Constitution, using the margin that the

Constitution did not specify on the count of private property. But the margin which existed did not come from the Constitution but from the working class which gave the strength to go beyond it.

But the Communists do not discuss in this way. They discuss on suppositions, on imagination, not on the scientific conclusion of the behaviour of the classes. Apprehensiveness about the atomic war is not fear. They extend their own apprehensiveness – without being afraid, because I believe they are not afraid – only by feeling themselves responsible that the world is going to be destroyed. It's not like this, the class is not afraid. It feels that there is no other way out.

The war is not the end of the world. It will be a greater destruction than before but, proportionately to the destruction, there is a much greater increase of scientific capacity, of consciousness and intelligence in the world to understand that everything can be done, can be remade and made better than before. There is a constant uncontrollable diffusion and transmission of knowledge, on the economy, on astronomy, on physical laws. There is an immensely greater knowledge. There is an increase in the security of the world with respect to the future, to nature, to production and to the universe. Before, people were frightened because understanding was confined to a narrow circle. On the other hand, now it's the Workers States who show that everything can be mastered. Proportionately, the atomic war will be nothing greater than any other war.

The most important effects of war are not the material destructions. This can be reconstructed whatever the destruction; but the fear which paralyses. The bourgeoisie conjure up a mystical process which arises from capitalist production. But here the Workers States do not develop the necessary confidence in the materialist process of history. Then it's necessary to discuss with all the communist comrades, the Socialists and the Left groups on this phenomenon, we do not want the atomic war. The war is an inevitable consequence of capitalism. Marx, Engels and Rosa Luxemburg wrote a great deal on this, where they show that the arms industry is an inseparable part of the life of capitalism, and now this industry is immensely more advanced than in the epoch of Rosa Luxemburg.

30% of any great capitalist budget is dedicated to war. They conceal it by talking about 'people observing the sky'. There are thousands and thousands of these people who act as a function of war. The Soviets alone have a thousand satellites investigating the capitalist system, which also serve for meteorology, and how many do the Yanks have? The yanks have to investigate the Soviets and their rivals, the French, the Germans and the Japanese.

There are instances when people have no knowledge but no fear either. Take the example of someone who flies a plane. There is the feeling of not knowing what is in front of oneself but no fear, because the map gives the necessary knowledge.

The essential root of fear is insecurity and lack of knowledge. This arises also when one is deprived of the method by which to understand. Regarding the future, fear has a social root which is very deep, because it is based on individual reactions, individual dismay. One of the consequences of private property is that of having developed individual sentiments in every aspect. Equally, one of the consequences of the Socialist revolution is that of having developed collective interest. The fundamental base of collective interest is the security that we will be able to resolve all problems and do all things. Regarding capitalism, it cannot; but, the Workers State, yes, it can; because it knows Russia passed from the stage of being devastated into the stage of the construction of the Workers States via Lenin and his programme in three years only. Lenin conceded the NEP, but constructed the Workers State.

Terrorism is meaningless. There are terrorists who are quite audacious, resolved, and do not act out of individual interest but they are useless in history. For example, in the middle of war it's necessary to kill the General Staff of the enemy, but then it is not terrorism. It is an action of war, not an individual action. Trotsky explained this very well, as Lenin sought to persuade the anarchists and the terrorists in order to win them, because they were very audacious, resolved and determined. They had no individual interests. The majority of them came from rich families and it was a social reaction against rottenness. In part, Patricia Hearst's story is this, even though the CIA

is involved. She was won in her reaction against the rottenness of capitalism.

It is a reaction against the crushing dullness of their lives where diamonds abound but where they are imprisoned in desperate and wretched solitude, whilst the news of the world tell of such fantastic progresses in science. These people see science as a means of producing cheaper and nothing more.

Terrorism is not a method of progress, nor does it really exist now. Terrorism is what capitalists do. It's the bourgeois dictatorships who employ terrorism as a method of intimidation and of liquidation. In the workers movement, in revolution, terrorism is not necessary. It never was necessary and less so now because it has been clearly demonstrated that all the progress in history has been made by twenty Workers States and without terrorism.

The revolution is not terrorism, nor is it violence; all this language is a lie. Revolution is the necessary method of progress. To impel an objective requires and demands an impulse to force the static character of the process. The static element is one of the forms of movement; otherwise it could not be moved. To advance, it is necessary to move, to overcome inertia. When one is hammering a nail, to make the nail enter does one say, 'Get in nail?' To remove the nail, does one say, 'Nail come out' - or is it done by force? That is what Engels shows. The stage of the seed to the flower has violent forms. A stage is necessary in which the seed passes from the previous form, and

without being immediately visible, a transformation takes place. That is to say, it does not continue being small, it passes from one state to another. The birth of a child is also like this. The process continues and growth is influenced, organised, stimulated and elevated, but the stage of the dialectical leap cannot be impeded in any form of natural or social activity, because that is the form of movement. When a moving process is made to halt its course, what appears interrupted is its movement, but it does not stop moving however. After the cause of interruption has ceased, movement restarts. The process itself never stopped.

In society, what is called violence is the form which the natural movement of society takes at a given moment, just like a train that passes by, a flower that blooms, the wind that blows, or the whirlwind of human relations. Those who use violence in actions of individual terrorism are not the exponents of the dialectical concept of violence – which is the necessary path for the progress of history to unfold – but of intimidation.

Far from intimidating people, the revolution wins them. It does this by showing that what is coming is a superior social, economic stage, superior socially and humanly, opening the road to the Workers State. In being superior, it has no individual interests. It works to raise the whole of humanity to higher economic and social relations, freeing humanity of all forms of fear and imposition. In that very process there disappears also what is called 'violence' which becomes

accepted as a normal motion, which needs to concentrate itself for a period in what appears motionless, acquiring a dual nature out of which the resulting form is a superior one.

The Communists do not discuss this way, and this is why they never refer to the dialectical method. When they talk about it, it is a distant and muffled reference. But it remains that the dialectical method is the true base to understand history. This is why many of these comrades are avowed critics of the dialectical method, whilst in reality there is not one scientist or scientific researcher who is not also a dialectician, even if he does not know it.

J. POSADAS

16.04.1978

---

## **THE WAR AND THE WORLDWIDE ELIMINATION OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM**

**J POSADAS**

6<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 1979

The present process is one of inevitable preparation for war by imperialism. This is going to require time, but war could break out any moment because it does not depend on the military preparedness of imperialism, but on the development of the world anti-capitalist social crisis. And this crisis will crush capitalism from every point of view. Capitalism is going to prepare and enter the war in the midst of revolution.

The Communist parties of the capitalist countries do not discuss this. The workers States have, in part, some notion of these problems. The war is going to be very short, and the revolution very fast. The world revolutionary upheaval will be very fast. All Europe, Asia, Latin America, and a part of Africa are going to emerge as Workers States from this. It is going to be a sweeping world process of development – even if not immediately.

Imperialism sees this. It prepares the war, not only because of its economic crisis but because it sees this process. Even if there were no economic crises imperialism would still prepare the war. A process is coming which will overthrow the whole social fabric of capitalism. And the Communist parties are not used to think about all this. They are used to an idyllic way of thinking, hoping to persuade the capitalists, to displace them, to make them change, or just to annul them. This is the way they think. They have developed a whole layer of compromisers. History, however, will not put up with this because it cannot go forward on that basis. The Workers States do not yet have a genuine leadership; their leadership is bureaucratic, but it comes near to what is necessary even if it does not express this necessity fully. More and more, that leadership will tend to approximate to necessity, eliminating those who are a block in its way or a perturbation to a better integration of people in the Workers States; the depth of Brezhnev's criticism of various Soviet ministers is that these elements separate the population of the Workers State from the plans

and achievements of the Workers States, and not just because they are thieves.

The Workers State necessarily has to prepare for the historic antagonism with capitalism. This arises naturally, and people in the Workers States are educated in the way of antagonism with the capitalist system. They do not feel antagonistic to the people of the capitalist countries, but to the capitalist system. At the time of Stalin it was already like this, in spite of all the limitations of Stalin himself and in spite of the fact that he tried to crush Marxist thought, any thought, even if it was only empirically dialectical. But the element that ended up being crushed was the bureaucracy of the Workers State and Stalinism, which is the assassin side of the bureaucracy. Meanwhile, the present bureaucracy of the Workers State has to impel the revolution. Today the Soviet Union is the natural ally of progress and not a circumstantial one. Its historic objective roots determine that it is the ally of progress. The bureaucracy does not have either the understanding of this or the necessary social interest as yet. But it is not opposed either. This can be seen in the new Soviet Constitution (Adopted 1977 and supporting in principle all the movements of liberation in the world. Editorial).

None of this is discussed in the communist parties, when it should be a fundamental preoccupation for them. Whilst they don't discuss, the mother of Carter wastes no time saying publicly that someone should kill Khomeini! In the face of all this, Brezhnev is telling his ministers that they are only working for themselves, whilst

the people of the country need to have services at their disposal.

In this process, the evaluation of the significance of the working class in the capitalist countries, and the working class as expressed through the workers States – which are the superior forms in which the working class is expressed – has great importance. The Workers State represents the historic interests of the future, and this cannot be done by the proletariat of the capitalist countries, however important it may be. The proletariat of the Workers State represents historic interests, for it has already constructed the Workers state. The proletariat of the Workers State impels the world revolution. There are no discussions of this in the Workers States or in the Communist parties. But, in any case, the proletariat of the capitalist countries is important, because it is the centre which impels the social struggles in these countries and the preparation to bring down capitalism when it launches the war.

We have had confidence not in the strength of one or the other Communist Party in the capitalist countries, even though we are confident that they are going to elevate – this has already started in the Italian Communist Party – but in the proletariat of the Workers States. It is the latter which has authority in the world, not the German, the Italian or the French proletariats. These proletariats have an important function to play, but it is that of the Workers states as such – which includes the proletariat and the whole population of the Workers States – which has influence.

Humanity sees in them a leadership, and it sees the workers States as the proletariat in the form of a world leadership.

Neither the capitalists nor the bureaucracy have the possibility to push history back, because already the necessary intelligence, the world structure of knowledge, the necessary human relations and the knowledge of scientific and technical structure exist for progress. All these can be destroyed, but will be reconstructed, and better! All that is material may be destroyed but the knowledge already reached, the security, the organisations, homogeneity and cohesion acquired by humanity cannot be destroyed.

May 1968 was the expression, at a given moment, of a stage without leadership, but of a resistance to and rejection of the Communist and Socialist parties by an immense number of people who became revolutionaries outside the Communist and Socialist parties. But because they had not received a programmatic response, leadership and policy to go forward, they dissolved. These sectors were neither crushed, nor smashed, nor made to retreat, nor dissuaded, nor disbanded by capitalist repression. They were only limited by the lack of political leadership, programme and objectives.

It is not true that May 1968 is long in the past. The present process is a new 'May', and this means that many sectors which are not organised by the Workers' parties or the trade unions come out to struggle. A part of these are the Ecologists. Society is already mature for changes. Hence the urgency

of capitalism to prepare the war. Society is about to change, change, change.

Imperialism prepares the war in conditions of the resistance of some capitalist countries - not resistance to the use of atomic weapons against the Workers States and the proletariat - but to their weakening as capitalist countries in their ability to compete with the Yanks. Such are the contradictions of the capitalist system which the Workers States do not have.

There is no antagonism or contradiction between China and the Soviet Union. The problem is another one: it is a problem of political leadership. On the other hand, in the capitalist system, that is not so. The latter have the problem of the structure of each separate capitalist country, with each bourgeoisie clashing with the other. In the Workers states, the problem is one of leadership and not of the structure of the country.

On the other hand, when it starts changing, the Chinese leadership is going to change very fast. In China there have been perpetual changes in leadership, from the time of the 'hundred flowers' up to the period of the enormous exaggerations about wheat production which the leadership invented. They made complete reshuffles of leadership because of the lack of functioning structure in the Party. All this resulted from the Soviet bureaucracy itself, and not from the Chinese. This is not a Chinese weakness but the result of the Soviet bureaucracy which strangled the Chinese leadership in its formation, pressurised

and imposed on it to keep it dependent on the Soviets for arms, for military leadership and for all kind of necessities.

The war will be a desperate act on the part of imperialism, which still has the means to launch war because of the limitations of the Workers States and the bureaucratic interests of their leadership, who did not create the necessary Communist currents. The Communist parties of the capitalist countries – with their limitations – are the result of the Soviet bureaucracy and of Stalinism. But the war is the end of capitalism, and this has to be posed in order to educate and win over the petty bourgeoisie. It must be posed also to prepare the working class, the Communist parties, the scientists and the technicians for this period before the war, to help to make the war as short as possible and to allow the most rapid reanimation after the war.

This war will not be like the others. In previous wars, revolution ensued only in the final stages of the war. Today, revolution will break out immediately because the Soviets are going to promote it and support it. The conditions are not going to be as imperialism would like them to be. This is why imperialism seeks to make a 'blitzkrieg' (lightning war). It realises that it cannot maintain itself otherwise. The war is not going to be the disaster which the communist leaders imagine, but will mean a rapid revolution. The revolution is not going to be delayed for four years, as in the last war, but will be very rapid. Moreover, the soviet army and the Workers States have, as a part of

their strategy, the support of the masses. The proletariat of the United States is not submitted to capitalism. In the same way as the Russian proletariat which appeared to be submitted took power, the North American proletariat reacts. It does not have a political or trade union life, but it is learning.

Capitalism is preparing the war, but the capitalist world cannot determine the consequences of the war. On the other hand, the Workers States can decide and are already prepared. The war is going to be very short and it will mean the destruction of the principal centres of the capitalist system, because capitalism will not have the strength to recover whilst the Workers States will recover, naturally. If in the previous war and under Soviet influence half Europe became Communist, now the process will be all the more profound and, in China, this leadership is going to be liquidated.

The war of 1870 brought the Paris Commune in its wake. The war of 1914 brought the Soviet Union. That of 1939 brought twenty Workers States and the war in Vietnam three more Workers States. The war that imperialism is preparing will bring the end of the capitalist system and the bureaucracy. It will not be an automatic progress; this is the programme of history. This is why imperialism would like to do something tremendous and involve everyone. It realises that it cannot just make a war in which its rivals will come out on top, for imperialism does not only have to deal with the Soviet Union but also with its competitors. These are Germany, Japan and the

other capitalist countries. It is true that it is its class interests which will prevail in case of confrontation with the Soviet Union, but capitalism has to deal also with inter-capitalist competition which is a historic problem.

The missiles which the Yankees want to install in Europe do not alter this situation very much. It changes the situation a little, but not much. The European countries who already have such weapons want to install others, to reach the USSR. This will oblige the USSR to liquidate all these European countries, which is very easy because it already has the missiles for it. The interest of imperialism is to ensure that the European countries pay for the missiles. This is why capitalist countries like Germany resist and feel they could do without them. But they can achieve little that way because, as capitalists, they have to confront the Workers States in any case.

This is going to stimulate a tendency in European capitalism to become harder against the trade union struggles, against the Communist parties, in order to prepare the war apparatus. But capitalism, in its stupidity, does not see the difference between the inter-capitalist war and the war against the Workers States in which, although they have repressive means, they will have no support and there will be a very swift uprising because invaders and invaded will unite. As part of its strategy in the war the Soviet Union will need to unite with the country which it enters. It did this in Germany and, this time, it will do so everywhere and throughout.

The European bourgeoisies want Yankee missiles to defend their own particular interests as capitalists, and not because they want to defend or render a service to the Yanks. The Yankee bases are not there only for the interests of the Yankees, but to defend the capitalist system of the European countries. The missiles sited in Europe will be controlled by the Yanks, but to control this entire network from Naples to Belgium they need an instrument of coordination which can only be formed when there is historic confidence in the regime.

This level of coordination cannot be achieved by military command only. It can only be achieved when people have confidence that what is being done is a good thing. But there is no such confidence in Yankee imperialism. Half of those who compose the apparatus are going to run away. They have neither security nor confidence. They are there because they are paid or they have an interest of sorts, but they are moved by the fear which interest induces and have developed the consciousness which is the product of fear. Such a situation does not occur in the Workers States. In spite of all the limitations of Ceausescu, for instance, he has had to declare – in the Congress of the Rumanian Communist Party – that if the Warsaw Pact comes under attack, Rumania will be with the Warsaw Pact. Tito is also going to have to do the same.

Many European Communist leaders feel satisfied when they say, “we have not had any war for

thirty years.” They think that it is the result of the ability of the Communist parties, but they do not speak at the same time of the wars which have occurred in the world where millions have died and they do not speak either of all those who have died as a consequence of the evils of the capitalist system. They say this because there has not been a war in Europe and because they, for their part, have not suffered the consequences of the wars which have taken place elsewhere. These leaders believe that people are frightened of war, but it is imperialism which is afraid.

These comrades believe that it is they who have avoided the war up to now! But it is the Workers States, and not they, who have impeded it. Capitalism has managed to do without the war so far, but now it cannot do so any longer because the crisis is deepening. Now, together with the war preparations, capitalism is also preparing to defend itself from unemployment by lowering unemployment pay, as it does in Italy. It feels that big struggles are to come, and so it prepares the war. This is the combined plan of capitalism: install the missiles and no unemployment pay. If the workers do not work it is not because they don't want to, but because there isn't any work. This is being generalised. It is also starting in France where they have already started to expel the foreign workers back home. The bourgeoisie takes measures which are going to lose it votes, because they prepare for something else: the war. They have all this in mind. As they cannot launch it when they want, or as they want, and above all they feel that this will mean their own liquidation,

they have fears, hesitations, doubts and slowness in going about it. If it wasn't like this, they would have made a militarisation plan a long time ago.

Capitalism seeks equilibrium in the economy to prepare for war. Its crisis advances, advances, advances; and the depth of the revolutionary process increases. Imperialism enters the war in the worst possible conditions. It does not have any real allies in the world: in every capitalist country which is its ally the people are against it.

J. POSADAS

06/12/1979

---

## **ON THE WAR PREPARATIONS OF CAPITALISM AND ITS HISTORIC INSECURITY**

**J POSADAS**

27<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 1980

Capitalism is incapable of measuring the course of history and – above all – it is frightened of measuring it. So it has no idea of where it is going. Yankee imperialism prepares war; in fact, it is already making it but it has to do so in the most hidden and surreptitious way. This certainly does not inspire courage in anyone; imperialism prepares surreptitiously because there is a powerful opposition to the war amongst the North American people. It would prepare war openly if it wasn't the case. Another reason for surreptitiousness is that it feels that it is losing. It realises that it is not simply a question of military

or technological capability, but a matter in which the social historic right of regimes is decisive, as well as their function in history. There is no doubt that capitalism has some idea of this.

A sector of NATO chiefs – and this includes the Secretary – have commented on war preparations saying: ‘The latest measures of the United States are direct measures of war, but it is an illusion to think they are going to win the war.’ This indicates that in the head of these military leaders there is the realisation that this war is not going to be decided just by arms. Arms are going to be employed, certainly, but they are not decisive. The effect of arms is decided by the social regime that uses them. In his texts Marx has said: ‘The arms of criticism and, at a given moment, the criticism of arms’. Today the ‘arms of criticism’ and the ‘criticisms of arms’ are combined. It is not just a revolution which is being prepared, but a historic turning point in the confrontation between the capitalist system and the Workers States. It is not a revolution in one or other country, but a system against system confrontation.

The Second World War brought 14 Workers States in its wake. In the 15-year period that followed, 18 Revolutionary States – from the newest to the most fully fledged – have appeared. The only desire capitalism has is to make atomic war and terrorise people. It thinks that it will be able to terrorise people, but humanity, for its part, is building on the achievements of places like Grenada, where they have nothing, and humanity supports the Soviet’s intervention in Afghanistan.

The fact that Carter prepares his presidential mandate by demonstrating how good his relations are with the Soviets and by making agreements with them, shows the insecurity in which Yankee imperialism lives. Carter poses as the President of coexistence. Then he fights for the presidential nomination as the representative of war. It shows all the insecurity and vacillations of Yankee imperialism.

The Dutch Church was once one of the most secure institutions of imperialism and proud of its role. Today, at least two important theologians in it are calling the foundation of their faith into question. What could the reason for this be? It is, of course, the advance of science. But, more than this, it is the existence of the Workers States which has led these people into doubting and feeling insecurity in their beliefs. These theologians are beginning to wonder if what they are doing is really correct, if it is really God that makes the earth move, or if it is these new countries – developing from nothing – that are doing all this! These people are no longer reasoning on a purely mystical or theological plane. Indeed, something of a materialistic reasoning is beginning to emerge in them, still contained in idealism, but materialist. There is, in addition, a whole movement of priests in the Church that increasingly demands the right to marry, to have children, to free themselves from abject submission. We are not just talking about Parish priests, but about the top strata of the highest levels of the Church.

J. POSADAS

27/01/1980

---

## **REAGAN'S THREATS, AND THE WAR PREPARATIONS OF IMPERIALISM**

**J POSADAS**

3<sup>RD</sup> FEBRUARY 1981

The threats that Yankee imperialism utters and all the measures it takes form part of the war preparations against the Workers States and Revolutions. However, it does not mean that they can launch the war when they like. All these things have been tried before by Truman and Foster Dulles during the governments of Eisenhower and Nixon. But it all failed.

In the midst of this world situation there is no room for the policy of the 'euro-communist' parties that declare themselves to be 'neither with one nor with the other'. There is no experience that shows any possibility of being with 'neither one nor the other', and in the last instance this 'neither with one nor the other' is nothing but alignment with imperialism. The Communist parties, even the most 'euro-communist' of them all, have to support the Soviet Union in the end, although they act as if they were 'independent' of the USSR. The Soviet's criticism of the 'euro-communists' is accurate when they say that the 'euro-communist position leads back to capitalism'. The Soviets have said clearly that 'there is no third position possible: it is either ourselves or imperialism'.

This aggressive stance of the Yankees is essentially aimed at unifying and centralising the capitalist world under their command. With the recent rise in the value of the dollar, they have sought this end. The rise of the dollar does not correspond to any economic improvement, any increase in purchasing power, or anything else. Nothing has changed at all from before. These measures are all financial in character and taken arbitrarily from above to effect some changes on prices or on investments (which exist only on paper). But it does not mean any strengthening of the dollar in the least: far from the overall Yankee national wealth having grown, it is the deficit in its balance sheets that has increased.

Yankee foreign trade is in constant deficit; it receives a great influx of money through interest repayments, loans, returns that come from various imperialist investments abroad, above all from Latin America. From Latin America alone there is a return of at least thirty billion dollars. It is all part of Yankee power but it is power in a vacuum. It is not a concrete power of production, but a question of paper. If at any moment a revolution or a nationalist movement develops, and the interest payments are not made, then the whole thing collapses.

The Yankee structure works like this for the moment; it is very transitory. The more the Yankees depend on devices in the hope of going further, the more the Soviets intensify their own responses. The Soviets have already done so in

warning that it is not possible to return to the 'cold war'. It is another way of telling the Yanks 'You have to be less stupid.' On top of this the Soviets have explained to the Yanks that revolutions are historic events that arise because they are necessary and not because the Soviets made them. The Soviets can make propaganda – and they do – but if the historic conditions for the revolution do not exist, then there cannot be any revolution. Conversely, the 'cold war' does not depend on the wishes of the Yankees. Indeed, it was ended not because the Yankees decided to put an end to it but because they were unable to continue that policy.

In 1960 the North Americans sent a U2 spy-plane over the territory of the USSR during the preparations for the meeting between Eisenhower and Krutschev. The Soviets brought it down without hurting the pilot, who said that he did not know anything about the mission. He added that his trip had been programmed by some US agency and that he personally had nothing against the Soviets. The Soviets did not try him before a military court but in an ordinary court that freed him. It was a sector of the Yankee military leadership which sent the U2, to boycott the Eisenhower-Krutschev meeting. It was an action of the CIA and the Pentagon, taken above the head of the government of the United States. They were already then making preparations that were to lead to the assassination of Kennedy at a later date.

The present situation is the result of a temporary nervousness on the part of Reagan. It is not going to last. Nixon had twice the zeal of Reagan and a great deal more world support. But it all drained away. Nixon had the support of the Germans and the French but this does not exist any longer. Indeed, even the British bourgeoisie is distancing itself from the Yankees and remaking trade links with the Soviets. The government of Thatcher is preparing to take a similar stance, which means looking more towards Europe than towards the United States. Reagan tries to push a war policy and to impose himself, as if imperialism led the world. When the soviets say: 'You have to learn the ABC of life', it is a political reply although it is given in a jocular form. It is another way of saying: 'Poor Reagan, leave him alone; he will soon get tired of running about.'

Three times, the soviets have told the Yanks that the revolutions in the world cannot be created by them. The Soviets respond in this way rather than talking about arrangements and negotiations with the Yankees, because they are quite ready to confront imperialism. The Soviets' accusation that the CIA was responsible for the assassination of Moro in Italy has the same significance. The great centre of power, the multi-nationals, are going to try to stimulate the war but it is not only they who decide. There is a sector of imperialism which feels that if it accepts a policy of opposition to the Soviets it will be isolated, and part of Reagan's military plan is to finance a series of industries which are in deficit.

The capitalist system finds itself confronted with a process it can neither dominate nor control. Twenty one years have passed since 1960 (the date of the U2 incident) and the Yankees have suffered nothing but defeats in this period. Most eloquent is the fact that they were not able to intervene directly either in Nicaragua or El Salvador. The revolutionary process has developed in the backyard of the United States – like Puerto Rico, for instance, where twenty military planes were recently destroyed at the airport. When a revolutionary movement there succeeds in carrying out such operations it is because the military High Command has helped. Obviously time, circumstances, and means (which only 'inside' people have) are necessary for such an enterprise.

The Yankees, in trying to influence and judge the state of the world, can only verify that they are rejected from everywhere. Certainly imperialism can try to move towards war more rapidly than previously, but it is also more isolated than previously. Imperialism tries to prepare the European bourgeoisie to intervene to block the world revolution: it wants to unite the world bourgeoisie under its control so that it can dominate the rest of capitalism both commercially and militarily. The manoeuvres concerned with the increase in the value of the dollar are intended for this.

The increase in the value of the dollar is not the product of economic strength. In the first place, the capitalist market cannot absorb any more

production, and in any case, there is a recession which means a concentration of companies at an accelerated rate. The level of bankruptcies in Europe is extremely high and it is not just a question of small firms and factories, but of enterprises of some importance. Of course, they are all assimilated by the big consortiums, but without being able to develop a greater capacity because there is no market.

The partial development of the Latin American, African and Asian market is not sufficient to compensate for the needs of big business and for their increase and reproduction of capital. As well as being one of the effects of the present crisis, the concentration of the economy in capitalism is the natural consequence of its functioning and development. The historic competitor and antagonist of Yankee imperialism is the Workers State, but Yankee imperialism faces every day more internal competition and the competition of other capitalist countries against it. Yankee imperialism wants to harness all this process, but it has not the ability to do so. The normal progression in the development of big Yankee capital is through ever greater concentration and the elimination of competitors, even in its own country. Whilst it is busy with this, imperialism has to make some sort of adaptation to the development of the revolution, in order to see how to infiltrate it.

Reagan will have to change because the USSR advances and the world goes forward. It means that imperialism will either have to make the war

promptly or continue to decompose. In El Salvador the Yankees have developed a policy of usury. They support the assassin junta but they don't go into the country with an army large enough to bring things to a rapid conclusion. This is because they know what will happen if they send an army in: it may go over to the other side! They send arms but without the complete confidence that the recipients will be their allies. Today they can only control by putting officers all over the place. Previously, the Yankee army had five or six officers to every hundred soldiers, but today it is eight!

Reagan seeks to increase pressure in order to see what advantage he can gain against the Workers States. The Yankee leadership knows that it cannot carry on such a policy in isolation and that it needs the support of the rest of capitalism in this endeavour, as it does not have the military-economic strength to prepare such a war – and much less the social strength. Yankee imperialism wants to impress and bully world capitalism, to ensure that it does not make better agreements with the USSR – and this is the reason for its threats and screams. Of course, none of this means that Reagan is any more prepared to launch the war than Carter was. It was Carter who proposed a boycott of the USSR over the Olympic Games and an embargo on wheat sales to the Soviet Union. Did he not support the Shah of Iran and Somoza until the last moment?

Reagan will not be any different from Carter. The policy of North American imperialism is not determined by whatever president it happens to

have. The president can weigh in one or other aspect but the general historic line cannot be changed. The Soviets exert pressure on the Yankees and use the dispute between the European bourgeoisie and Reagan. The Soviets tend to treat Reagan rather like a dog that must be allowed to run in the fields until he has learnt how to behave. It is important to take into account that the Yanks do not have the reins of history in their hands; they are in the hands of the Soviets. Besides, the Soviets reply very well to the Yankees when they repeat: 'It is stupid to think that it is we who have created the historic conditions that generate the actual revolutionary process.' In this way they direct themselves towards a series of countries like capitalist France and Germany. In 'Pravda', they write that: 'We do not create a revolution, it is a process provoked by the capitalist system.' This is a situation that cannot be contained by threats, not even when these are uttered by Reagan.

The Yanks think that the National Liberation and Social movements are 'terrorism'. The Soviets are not confused on this point. They say that they are going to support all these movements of National and Social Liberation. These movements are not created by the Soviets but, once they have developed, they are supported by the Soviets. This is what the USSR leadership says.

Capitalism appears to be preoccupied by the events in Poland and an alleged Soviet intervention. In this campaign they have gathered various rotten elements from the Socialists and

Social Democratic movement, and some Communist leaders as well. All these people keep quiet about the murders perpetrated by Yankee imperialism in El Salvador or South Africa. At the same time imperialism has been thrown out of Zimbabwe and is being thrown out of Namibia. In reply to this, imperialism bombarded the territory of Mozambique and Angola, as if it was their own back garden. And these people who campaign about Poland say nothing about this.

The African revolution is landing very heavy blows on the capitalist structure of Africa. Angola and Mozambique support this revolutionary process. They have invaded no one, but logically they support all the armed movements that fight for the liberation of other countries, and they protect them in their own countries. When someone is sick and needs help, cannot help be sought from the neighbours? These are norms of relations, even in capitalism. Clearly it is impossible to prevent Angola and Mozambique from helping other countries that need assistance and ask for it, to advance the revolution.

**The policy of Reagan  
and that of the rest of capitalism**

The declarations and threats of imperialism are really an experiment to measure how far world imperialism will follow behind it. There is going to be a period of reflection after all these threats of Reagan, because these utterances are rejected by the French bourgeoisie as much as by German capitalism, and even, partially, by the British. The

British bourgeoisie is increasing trade with the USSR at the same time as the movement to the Left in the Labour Party goes on unabated.

The advance of the Left within the British Labour Party is increasingly more anti-capitalist, and expresses the dispute between the Trade Union apparatus and the political-parliamentary apparatus. The Trade Union apparatus has more strength, and hence it gains more ground in the Party, and it is also more exposed to the life and pressure of the workers at the base. All the British Trade Unions have taken an acute oppositional stance towards the Conservative government. At the same time, Trade Unions like the Miners, the Steel and Transport Workers have declared themselves in favour of nationalisations. There is a powerful and bureaucratic apparatus in the Trade Unions but, in general, they are apparatuses that combine both Left and Right sectors. The Transport Union is a prime example. Those who want to leave the Labour Party are of the Right. The SDP in Britain is of the Right (Social Democratic Party of Owen etc). If the SDP ever sees the light of day it will have to be in opposition to the bourgeoisie, because if they organize a new party it is not going to take votes from Labour – only those of the Right that either abstain or vote Conservative – but from the Conservatives. These can take up to 20% of the Conservative vote and, in Parliament, they have demonstrated that their policy is anti-Thatcher.

The crisis in the British Labour movement has centred on the general orientation and programme

of the Labour Party. None of this gives the bourgeoisie any advantage, and it is a very great blow against it. Even this SDP wing that has left the Labour Party has to present some programme of improvements with which they are trying to win large sectors of the Liberals and of the Conservatives. Of course, the 'big business' Conservatives stay in the Conservative Party, but it is not true of the traders and leading functionaries who feel that the top Tory apparatus is leading them into direct confrontation with the masses, for which they aren't ready.

The Yanks want to prepare the conditions to unify the capitalist leaderships under their command. What they are actually doing, however, is to emphasise and increase the internal differences inside the Socialist parties and inside the Social Democrats, as much as inside themselves, like in the conservative Party in Britain. Imperialism provokes a division in the bourgeois parties in order to lean on the most reactionary sectors amenable to the interests of big business. This results in a rupture of the links between the Conservatives and the petty bourgeoisie and layers of the workers' aristocracy who are not strictly Conservatives. Imperialism does not encourage this trend because it wants to, but because it has no other way out. It is a policy that tends to break up the whole linkage between the bourgeois apparatus and the petty bourgeois and workers' aristocratic sectors.

The pressure of the Yanks is directed at the big bourgeoisie, and it has some effect. But the Social

Democracy, as a whole, is not composed of leading bourgeois elements. Certainly, the apparatus of Social Democracy contains such elements, but even here there is no homogeneity in supporting bourgeois interests. Twenty-four Social Democratic MPs in Germany have demanded the reduction of military expenditure by one billion marks – to facilitate social reforms and improvements in the life of people. These MPs want the money thus saved to go to help the 'third world'. This is a fundamental anti-capitalist position. It not only opposes arms investments but it seeks to employ the money socially. There is a series of social problems like that of housing in Germany. There are important movements of young people demanding houses and there are also old people who have nowhere to live. When the social situation in the whole of Germany finds such an expression in Parliament it is because it is infinitely more profound in the country at large.

This attitude of the German MPs is a still unorganised resistance to the Yanks, but it shows that they are against military preparations and quite extensive internal struggles are going to appear in Germany that will affect, among others, the Liberals – who are presently allied to the Social Democracy. These German Liberals support the installation of the Yankee missiles in Germany, but the SDP (Social Democracy) goes in the opposite direction. The installation of the missiles in Germany means a very big expenditure for capitalist Germany which, if channelled into the economy, would make Germany much more competitive and efficient. An important sector of

the German bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie understand this. But the military expenditures of the German state increase inexorably, because this is the only thing capitalism can do to sustain itself.

A large proportion of the economic strength of capitalist Germany is constituted by trade with the Workers States: primarily the German Workers State, the Soviet Union and Poland. Capitalist Germany has to maintain these trade relations because there is no more market within capitalism.

The same applies to France; Gaullism in France was the expression of the leading French business sectors which felt that Yankee imperialism was seeking to crush them. De Gaulle appeared after the Second World War when several Workers States were born and Yankee imperialism began to station itself throughout Europe. Previously, Yankee imperialism had only partially established itself in Europe. The policy of Giscard d'Estaing was the continuation to de Gaulle's, and it was designed to win votes. In fact de Gaulle went as far as to refuse to join NATO. This represented the policy of French business linked to the interests of medium sectors of capitalism who found scope in the antagonism between the Yankees and the Soviets. This was not to last long but, from the point of view of the bourgeoisie, it is the most intelligent policy because it allows them to take advantage of the world drift against the Yankees. In other words, it is a policy of survival. The Italian position of giving a certain support to the Yanks on such questions as the 'links between the USSR and international terrorism' is not a very firm one, and

is not openly anti-Soviet in other directions. This is not only because of divergent economic interests from the Yankees, but because of divergent political interests. At the same time, the position of Italian capitalism has no great weight or value in the world, but the world bourgeoisie – as much as the petit bourgeoisie – take note when Giscard d'Estaing speaks. Schmidt is equally important, but no one pays attention to the Italian bourgeoisie.

However much Reagan screams, capitalism cannot resolve the situation it is in. Carter did a great deal more than Reagan. He boycotted the Olympic Games and placed an embargo on wheat sales to the USSR. This last measure was important because the wheat trade with the USSR was an important source of income for the North-American wheat producers; it was a real measure of boycott but which hurt the USA because the US government had to pay huge compensation fees to the wheat growers. Meanwhile, the Soviets had found other sources of supply – and went ahead with the Olympic Games.

The people behind the present policies of Reagan are the main sectors of the bourgeoisie and high finance, which is where the thinking of the leading layers of the bourgeoisie originates. High finance allied to heavy industry like Steel, Coal, the Chemical and Car industries and, of course, the Arms industry, are the decisive sectors that dominate. Their importance is reflected in their newspapers that follow their line. When these sectors said 'stop', the Yankee campaign around the 'Iranian hostages' did stop.

The present policy of Reagan indicates the profound instability of American imperialism. It is an instability of a kind determined by the fact that imperialism no longer dominates the world. Now it is the USSR which is the decisive factor in the world. So, on one hand, there are the Soviets, and on the other, the inter-capitalist crisis which is immense. The threats of Reagan and the noises he makes are those of an actor who does what the director tells him to. They are not the declarations of the leader of a country that feels strong, who is going to fulfil his promises. Carter said 'no' to the Olympics and 'not one more bushel of wheat to the USSR!' The Soviets knew all along that they could buy wheat somewhere else, and this included North America where businessmen made quite a few offers behind Carter's back. World capitalism itself gives credit to the USSR which it would not offer its own competitors, because it knows the Soviets will pay. Where are Carter or Reagan going to find another such fine client?

The 'cold war' was a long time ago, and the Yankees had to stop it. They started it at the time when they invaded North Korea, when McArthur had declared: 'We will spend Christmas at home.' But Christmas came, and the reason why they were home was because they had been thrown out of Korea. In Vietnam the same thing happened; they had to quit. Yankee imperialism threatened to make an intervention in Cuba in 1960 and the Soviets force them to get out. At the time, a North American flotilla surrounded Cuba in order to prevent anybody going in. The soviets sent two

tankers that went straight through. Nobody had expected such an audacity from the Soviets. The Yankees knew that if they stopped these vessels atomic bombs would start to fall on them.

The development of the revolution is irrepressible. Certainly it could not be contained by Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon or Carter. Reagan will be able to contain it even less, precisely because the world balance of forces is increasingly in favour of the revolution.

J. POSADAS

03.02.1981

---

## **THE WAR PREPARATIONS IN THE MIDST OF THE CAPITALIST CRISIS**

**J POSADAS**

13<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 1981

This is the end of capitalism. Its leaderships is devoid of ideas because it has no historic base. The most fundamental thing is that already it cannot use the world as it likes. In the past it could paralyse opponents by force of arms, but now it cannot. The populations of the world, confronted with armed force, now answer by advancing the revolutionary struggle against capitalism. This situation embitters the internal relations in the capitalist system to a level which brings Europe against the Yanks. It is not a manoeuvre but a

contradiction, and a very great one. The attitude of the British bourgeoisie is now added to that of France and Germany; and this is a change in Britain following the triumph of Foot in the leadership of the Labour Party.

Capitalism has no idea of how history advances, and neither do some Communist parties. But the Workers States have quite a clear idea because they form part of historic progress. The only Communist parties of any importance and power of decision are those integrally fused with the Soviet Union. In the contemporary process, the USSR sustains the revolution everywhere, as it did in Vietnam. When Brezhnev declares that, 'We support Vietnam because it is a cornerstone of Socialism, regardless of whether we share frontiers with it or not', he expresses this progress of the Soviet Union. He added, 'We are a system of Socialist countries confronted with another system, and we aren't going to conceal this. Take care that you do not interfere with any one in our system.' The use of the term 'system' by the Soviet leadership, that speaks as a system, signifies an immense and historic progress. It has made tremendous changes from Stalin to now. Stalin, when confronted with the resistance of the Yugoslav Communist Party to its policies of alliance with capitalism, preferred to abandon it to its fate. He wanted to do the same with China but, in both cases, the revolution triumphed. However, even at the time of Krutchev, the USSR supported Cuba against the Yanks. This was in 1961, and even with the risk of war the USSR sustained Cuba. It was not long after that that imperialism tried the

invasion of the 'Bay of Pigs' and got rolled in the pig's shit.

The Soviet policy of conciliation continued up until the time of Krutchev, and it was then that he had the famous interview with Kennedy in which he held a stalk of maize, saying: 'We will be a great country the day we have the quality of maize you have.' Krutchev had a great dream: the same maize as the United States! It was also he who broke the relations with China as part of the policy of conciliation with capitalism – a policy the Chinese leadership have now – conciliation with the Yanks as a means of continuing to exist as a bureaucracy.

The Soviet leadership at that time had no plan for the future and did not share in the process of the historic progress. But now the Soviets have to support, stimulate, and even intervene in the national liberation movements which are anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist openly. These are profound historic changes and imperialism can't appreciate the depth of this. It sees the disposition of the Soviets and has no idea what to do about it. Meanwhile the internal differences that develop inside capitalism intensify. Capitalism sees that it is going to be wiped off the map. A situation is developing which no capitalist foresaw because they could not foresee. And, even if they did, they could do nothing about it.

### **Capitalism decomposes rapidly**

The world capitalist apparatus is in a process of a very great disintegration, in which every sector

tries to save itself. In the next war they aren't going to be able to unite amongst themselves as they did in the Second World War, when various sectors of capitalism united against another capitalist competitor. Now they are going to war in the most wretched state. In the last war they had the confidence and security that they were going to win. Today they prepare for war knowing that half the population of the capitalist world is going to be against them as soon as the war breaks out.

Hence the present concern of the capitalist system, trying to pretend that it does not want war when, as a regime, it has no other way out. At the same time it feels that the next war is the end of itself completely. This explains why they act in the way they do now. Capitalism cannot have another policy, but the one it has at the moment. It has no choice. The capacity, resources, means and possibilities of the United States, with Reagan at the head, are the same as when Carter was around. The change in political leadership did not alter any of this. The difference is simply that Reagan appears more hot-headed, but he tumbles all the more.

The greatest blow which the capitalist system has suffered is Poland. The crisis of Poland was – after the retreat which Yugoslavia underwent – one of the most profound convulsions that ever shook a Workers State. It happened because the vanguard in Poland makes no mistakes and realises that the bureaucracy is not Poland, and that Poland is the Workers State and the Polish masses. At the same time a better relation is being

established between the Party, the army and the masses of Poland.

The Catholic masses of Poland – as we have already shown – are ‘Polish-Soviet’ first and Catholic after that. They do not pass through history in the company of God; it is rather like them putting God in their pocket like a watch which they consult when they want the time. It is a watch that comes from their ancestors and it has stopped functioning. Are not the watches of today running on atomic batteries? The Polish masses are teaching the masses of the other workers States of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and the German Workers State. This why the people involved in the ‘inter-shops’ in East Germany are furious about the process in Poland.

Capitalism is preparing war in the midst of vacillations and doubts in a very large part of its own apparatus. This situation renders the whole structure unstable and erratic. This is the reason why in this stage capitalism has no decent writer, novelist, film-maker or singer; meanwhile wherever the soviets go, the people rise and take the path of progress.

Capitalism has no idea of the state of the world and hence it has no writer who can deal with the character of this epoch. It is not simply that they have no idea, but they can’t understand this stage of history. They believe that the revolution was the product of the sagacity of Lenin and the other revolutionaries. Lenin, however, declared, applying Marx’s method: ‘The Bolshevik Party is the

conscious expression of the unconscious process of history.' Indeed, the Bolshevik was the conscious expression of Russia and, beyond this, of the world – because it was the world that allowed the revolution to triumph in Russia. Today the situation is even richer than then. Now there are the Seychelles islands and they are the conscious expression of what is now the 'conscious' not 'unconscious' – process of history. It is quite a conscious process we are in, because it is led by the Soviets. On balance, the process of history today has many more conscious aspects than unconscious ones.

Imperialism refuses to believe the actual world situation and it can be seen in the stupid demeanour of Reagan. Imperialism thinks that the Church and capitalism are eternal institutions, and that individual interest or the disposition to accumulate is permanent human features and occurrences. This is the way they think in the US. The result is that the Yankees have no Literature or Art. If they had any Literature worth that name they would have arrived at the following conclusion: 'We are backward compared with the world.' It is absurd that the largest capitalist country has no writer. They are now extensively promoting Nixon's book, which is nothing but a collection of absurdities. This idiot has in front of him twenty Workers States and forty revolutions – like in the Seychelles – but he concludes nevertheless: 'The soviets are going to lose the world struggle.'

The present Yankee government represents the last moments of capitalism. They have not a single idea, except to aid and abet the counter-revolution. The world bourgeoisie feels clearly that, with this leadership, war is on the agenda. It feels that it is going to lose, because it is no longer possible to regard military and economic superiority as sufficient, since life is measured socially. On the social level it is the Seychelles islands that weigh in the world – in spite of their small size – by resolving to do like the soviets.

The Yanks have more than ten million people of Mexican descent born in the South of the United States. They have been there more than one hundred years and there are regions where only Spanish is spoken. They know English very well, because they need it for work, but they do not speak it, as a means of protest. They speak Spanish and force the Yanks to do the same. We are dealing with whole zones stolen from Mexico! In all the time the Yankees have been there, they have not been able to convince these people that they are North Americans. The same is true of the Puerto Ricans. The attitude of the Yanks towards 'Chicanos' – as they call the Mexicans – is contemptuous.

These are the same Yankees who complain about the Soviet Union. Another criterion to judge the Yankees is the actual history of Yankee imperialism. It had to assassinate Sacco and Vanzetti, and it tried, with this murder, to terrorize the workers' movement and suppress its Trade Union demands. In fact North American capitalism

never developed the structure which French, German or British capitalism developed. This structure has a mass of relations with the petit bourgeoisie, the workers' movement, who have a host of leaders who stand between capitalist and anti-capitalist measures. North American capitalism has nothing of this. Reagan is a complete buffoon with not a single idea. He is a cowboy with forty revolvers and no end of bullets who threatens the world.

European capitalism was able to provide political leaders like those it still has now. But the Yanks just produced Reagan. North American imperialism has no social base to produce leaders of any value. European capitalism can count – in part – on the Socialist parties and Social Democrats. But the Yankees can count on nothing like this. They have not the social base for it, not even for a transitory alternative which might last a few years. This explains the function of Reagan, who is no more than a bad actor for any old farce.

### **Capitalism has lost any power of decision in history**

Capitalism cannot decide the historic process when, previously, it did: how, when and where to act. But now it cannot do this anymore. This is because it does not have the historic strength and this change is due to the development of the Workers States. The Workers States decide the course of history. Moreover, the Yankees can't just consider their own interests; they have to take account of the resistance which they find in the

other capitalists. All this completely destroys the capacity of capitalism for thought.

Europe fears to be yet again the bridge to war, with the Yanks remaining outside the principle encounter. The Soviets have made very clear that 'this time there will be 'no bridge''. Even in the leading military circles of NATO this conclusion has been drawn. The French General Sanguinetti said some years ago: 'In 48 hours the USSR will control Europe'. When the interviewer commented that this was impossible, Sanguinetti explained that the Soviet Union counts on the masses of all the capitalist countries in addition to its own forces. He added, talking about the Soviets: 'They have had two Wars and they transformed both into revolutions because these are social necessities.'

Wars are immense commotions that totally shake society and bring out all the latent contradictions. As these contradictions surface they release in the same movement all their inner force, hitherto imprisoned, which is mainly the working class. From imperialism nothing surfaces because it has no inner force. North America has some 'guides' like Kissinger who point towards death. Such people, however, cannot be the leaders of any stable programme for capitalism to live or even survive. Kissinger is no more than a vulgar trader who sells goods to make a living.

The same situation as that which we described with Sanguinetti exists in all the capitalist countries. In Belgium they established special patrol groups of anti-Communists, but even in

these circles they have discovered cells and groups of Officers and soldiers who demand democratic rights, the right to be able to intervene in the problems of the country, and who have declared that they do not want to be sent to repress strikes. This happens in the most select groups in the Armies of capitalism. In Belgium, Officers have declared that the War against the Soviet Union is madness because 'it is not a question of arms but that the Soviet Union represents social progress. Thus there is no possibility of defeating it.'

These Armies are going to war with this sentiment, and in this state of mind. There is a similar situation in the North American Army. One of the reasons for the 'weak' intervention of the Yanks in Vietnam – apart from the resistance of the Vietnamese people supported by the Soviet Union – is to be found in the 'mistakes' committed by the Yankee soldiers and Officers. There is evidence which shows that out of twenty bombs dropped, ten would be out of timing or off target. A great number of North American soldiers actually went over to the Vietnamese. In fact, even amongst top Officers of the capitalist armies, the patriotic military sentiment is being replaced by a social sentiment.

Reagan shouts a lot more than Carter, but this does not increase his strength or means. In the end Carter had to negotiate. One president may negotiate more than another – not because he is a better person but because otherwise he might as well close up shop. The balance of social forces is not determined militarily, but socially.

Capitalism disintegrates at an enormous pace. Indeed, judged socially, the Soviets have half their army in the United States, France, Germany and the other capitalist countries. It is because people are going to act in a way which aids social progress – and social progress is the Workers States. In the middle of its war preparations capitalism has to put up with the arrival of Foot in the leadership of the Labour Party.

European capitalism directs itself at Reagan in order to show him the experience they have in matters of war. Have not the French Fleet rebelled in 1919 in the Black Sea, where half the Officers and soldiers refused to shell the new-born Soviet State? The French have a great deal of experience in these matters. In Algeria, for example, a great many French Officers served in the Liberation struggle of Algeria. Half the French Officers deserted at Dien Bien Phu, in Vietnam. It is this fear that the French transmit to Reagan. In any new war, a war against the Soviet Union, half the capitalist officers will go over to the other side – and the soldiers too. A sector of the capitalist military leadership is already won by progress, and progress signifies nothing else but Socialism. Another and considerable part of that leadership will pass over to Socialism as soon as the War has begun.

These are the decisive factors that explain the crisis in the European Social Democracy. The latter fall back on their 'International' – or any other instrument that they can use – because they feel

left behind by history. It is the first time that they have given any sizeable or consistent support to anti-capitalist movements like those of Nicaragua or El Salvador. They pretend to support Cuba, but it is a manoeuvre. The social Democrats have to give a certain support to progress in order to retain some authority. They try not to be bypassed by the process. The British Labour Party and the German Social Democrats are good examples of this kind of thing. This is why the Labour Left – through Michael Foot – managed to fight its way into the leadership of the Labour Party; and this is why twenty-four MPs of the German SDP have demanded in Parliament a reduction in military expenditure. When twenty-four MPs make this sort of declaration, it means that they have much more support inside and outside their Party.

The French and German resistance to the Yanks expresses the impotence of imperialism. The various capitalists of the world want to survive, not be engulfed. The German population prepares to expel the Yankee soldiers (who occupy their country) as soon as the war starts. Besides this, half the Yankee soldiers will go over to the other side, or stop fighting. Because they do not believe in what they are doing, there is a great number of drunkards, drug-addicts and common thieves amongst them. In a written report, a North American soldier denounced the conditions in which the US soldiers have to live in Germany. He remarked: 'We have been here twenty years, and not allowed to bring our families. In Germany

nobody wants us, and what we are doing is not worth the little which we earn'.

The whole structure which serves capitalism, and which is necessary to it, is disintegrating: primarily the Army and the Church. Without having actually transformed the principles, the behaviour of the religious masses today is not strictly religious. In places like Poland it is a Bolshevik-Soviet behaviour. Capitalism sees that it cannot change this. The Polish Catholic Church is not the Church of Pope John Paul the Second, but a Polish Church. The Russian Orthodox is, in some way, similar. Who could convince the Soviet masses to believe in God? If some priest comes to ask the people to listen to the word of God, the answer he gets is: 'My brother, we listen to the voice of the Central Committee, and God is in agreement.'

On the side of capitalism there is a continually deepening and enlarging crisis of bourgeois policy. This is because it cannot find a policy for applying the conception of defending capitalism at the same time as preparing War against the Workers States. The fact that the United States changes its policy from one day to the next is an expression of this crisis. They changed from Carter to Reagan, but if there were a comprehensive policy of the ruling caste then whoever is president should continue the policy. When they have to change personal as they do, with opposite policies from one moment to the next, it is because capitalism does not believe it is going to keep for much longer.

Even Reagan is not quite sure how much longer he is going to last. Hence the declarations he makes and the measures he announces are no more than efforts to blackmail, pressurise and force the capitalist world to follow Yankee imperialism. These events occur when there is no confidence or stability in the capitalist command or in its ruling class. If it were otherwise it would not have to make this policy that divides and tears apart capitalism so deeply. Although it goes inexorably to War, capitalism does so with a thousand divergent interests – even on the count of what to do about the Soviet Union. This is a product of the final stage of the capitalist system.

All this has consequences in the Communist and revolutionary movements, because it leaves no room for any policy of conciliation with capitalism. One good instance is the collapse of the policy of conciliation of Tito in Yugoslavia. What is the actual weight and importance of Tito? None. Not just because he passed out, but because before doing so he was not contributing anything. The last meetings of the 'non-aligned' where he took part, steadily aligned themselves in defence of the Workers States. They did not specify 'Workers States', but they launched attacks and made condemnations only of capitalism. The support that these sectors have given to the *Revolutionary and Liberation* process represents an objective alliance with the Workers States. There is no longer any place for 'neither one nor the other', as Tito himself used to say.

The partisans of 'self-management', the capitalists themselves and even the 'non-aligned' are each day more by-passed by the objective necessity of dialectical materialism. Humanity has already made the experience of how to progress in life: statification (state control), planning, workers' control, the intervention of the Trade Unions, and the fact that a Workers State must sustain and defend other Workers States as a condition for its own progress. Humanity knows that it is necessary to uphold any movement of progress that forms the basis of the Workers State.

The strategists of the capitalist armies now know that the next War will not just be a matter of winning through missiles and atomic bombs. The War is going to mean a great disaster for humanity, but the triumphant factor will be the necessity for social progress. The masses of the world already know that progress is the Workers State. The masses already have made the experience that progress means Poland, the Soviet Union, Cuba, and the Workers States. Eighty per cent of the Cuban population was illiterate before the revolution, but now it has a modern army with a very great military capacity, and, besides this, it has an army of pencils, blackboards, and exercise books. Before being annihilated, Somoza\* cried: 'Look, they are invading me!' Answering someone who asked him where the foreign invaders were, he added: 'The pens, the exercise books...'

All the forces of capitalism are in disarray. The contradictions in capitalism arise from the antagonism of capitalism/Workers State. They are

not the contradictions produced just by internal dispute, but of the sort generated by the historic antagonism: capitalism/Workers States. The inter-capitalist contradictions do not substitute for the principle antagonism of systems, but they combine with it. A very great chaos arises from all this, and it signifies an enormous reduction in the capacity of imperialism for War.

World capitalism prepares War in the throes of a very great decomposition through which symptoms of outright capitulation can already be detected in large parts of it. The Workers States, as opposed to this, enter this state of War preparations with the most profound rectification ever to happen in the history of the Workers States, as expressed in the process in Poland.

J POSADAS

13.2.1981

---

## **WAR PREPARATIONS AND THE FUNCTION OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES**

**J. POSADAS**

22<sup>ND</sup> MARCH 1981

This article was written in preparation for a Conference to a Group of Ecologists in capitalist Germany. (Editorial).

The war is the consequence of the development of capitalist society, not of arms production as

such. Indeed, as a cause of war, the role of arms production is secondary. It is capitalism as a system that needs war.

The great splendour of the capitalist world is behind us and there is a retreat. But, on the other hand, there is an uncontrollable and uninterrupted advance of the revolutionary processes in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Emerging from nothing, many countries find the will to progress. In all these countries there are wars; those who triumph are those who free themselves from capitalist oppression and seek to organise the economy in accordance with the needs of the population. The prevalent form of property in previous times was private property, but now the countries that free themselves do so on the basis of statified property, whereby the State leads the development of the economy.

These countries in the process of liberation have economically backward people who were kept culturally backward also, in a general sense. But, of all their progresses – social, economic and cultural – it is in the cultural aspect that they advance most rapidly. Although they do not have anything to eat, or eat hardly better than before, they know how to see and learn from the world and find their way to progress.

War is the consequence of the system of private property. Private property stimulates the crisis and, in previous stages, war was the solution to problems between the capitalist powers. But today, however, because of the existence of the

Workers States, there is a process of confrontation system against system.

The Wars of 1870-71, 1914 and 1939 are examples of inter-capitalist Wars, not only of wars but of occupations. Areas of Germany were occupied by France, and Germany occupied parts of France. The same took place in Belgium. These were wars between capitalist powers, back when the Workers States did not exist, and when the USSR was alone and could not decide. In other words, it is not the existence of the Workers States that motivates capitalism into making war; there have always been wars in capitalism.

Inter-capitalist wars were motivated by the contradictions of the capitalist system, in which a time comes when production is superior to the level of consumption and there is no market to absorb the surpluses. This point of crisis is the result of the capitalist system of production which leads to these crises: then the capitalists fight among themselves and launch wars to eliminate each other. Competition leads to the formation of large world trusts. Even though Germany, Britain and the United States have common consortiums (multi-nationals) they continue to combat each other because competition between them continues unabated.

The preparation for war and the production of arms are the vital necessity of capitalism, because it uses these activities both in inter-capitalist struggle and against the masses of the world. The 1870 War between France and Germany is an

example, in the course of which the French bourgeoisie allowed the Germans to enter France to liquidate the Paris Commune. War is not the result of bad intentions or because people of ill-will lurk about. Clearly these do, but they are not the determining factor of war – which is the logical conclusion of production in private property.

War does not originate simply from present circumstances, but from conditions built in the past, as a consequence of the natural life of the capitalist system. It does not arise by chance or through the decision taken by someone. It is not the result of imponderable factors of crisis but the logical consequence of the capitalist system. This is why capitalism prepares for war. At the same time the capitalist system needs to develop to the maximum its ability to compete. In other words, it needs to increase its capacity to produce even more in an ever-shorter unit of time, so as to accumulate more profits to further modernise production and, in consequence, to eliminate more competitors. When the capitalists see that they cannot eliminate some competitor within the framework of economic competition, they make war. Hence there have been three major wars between the capitalist powers in 1870-71, 1914 and 1939.

As well as the Great Wars there have been an number of smaller ones, like the intervention of imperialism in Indonesia. Indonesia had the Sukarno government, a Social Democratic government which sought measures for the development of the economy and of the country.

World capitalism gave support first to Dutch imperialism to overthrow Sukarno, and then threw the Dutch out! If they allowed Dutch imperialism a degree of participation afterwards, it was to prevent uprisings. This is just one instance of the various forms of capitalist war.

Another example is the war of the Yanks against Cuba. Cuba was under the domination of Spain until 1898, a year when the Spaniards had to concede independence. But the Yanks did not allow this, and invaded. The masses continued the struggle against the Yanks, but the Yanks annexed a part of Cuba – and Guantanamo is still under the domination of the Yankees today. This is the most brutal, murderous and criminal form of impeding the objective progress of the population. The Tanks have military power in Guantanamo, and this is what they use it for. Economically, Guantanamo is of no value to them, and it has very little military value either, because one atomic bomb would resolve the matter. So why Guantanamo? The Yankees know this, but they are not leaving it because this would show up all their weakness and stimulate the revolution throughout Latin America. This is why they stay. Besides, as it is a military base it can be used to intervene directly in various parts of Latin America. However, from the military-strategic point of view, Guantanamo has no value. Imperialism holds on to it in order to exert a pressure on Cuba, to send armies and soldiers to various places. But, historically, when the atomic confrontation begins one small bomb will suffice to deal with the Yankee base.

All the strategic sites which were important in another stage of history have no value today. The same goes for the Navy which has no importance generally speaking. The Navy is useful as a means of transport and to carry atomic weapons, but it has lost any military value apart from this. The Air force is useful to capitalism, but the relation between the Army and the population of the countries it comes to occupy is more valuable than all Navies and Air forces put together. The Soviets know that their Army is welcome by the populations, and know that they will give it food and water, whilst the Yanks will get shit and bullets thrown at them.

**War is a necessity of capitalism,  
not of the Workers States.**

War is inherent in the capitalist system but not in the Workers States. The War which capitalism is preparing against the Workers States has the objective of trying to block the development of the progress of history. War is the result of capitalism. There is not a single war amongst the Workers States. The invasion of Vietnam by China was not a war between Workers States, but the action of a counter-revolutionary clique in China against the Vietnamese Workers State. Hence, in the 'invasion' of Vietnam by China, China could not send more than a limited number of soldiers and it had to withdraw extremely rapidly.

This retreat was not due to the Chinese "having taught the Vietnamese a 'lesson' " - but to the fact

that the Chinese army had to get out of Vietnam before being thrown out, and before internal rebellion started raising its head within China itself. There was great turmoil inside China at the time. There was also the possibility of a Soviet intervention; a Soviet intervention would have encouraged the Chinese opposition, and it would have established, besides, ties between China and the Soviet Union! That was a 'no-no' for the Chinese leadership. This is why it withdrew. Seeing danger in such links between the USSR and China, the Yankees advised the Chinese leaders to get out; to get out before the Soviets could take an even greater advantage.

The capitalist system, through the logical necessity of its existence and mode of production, leads to war as it leads to the crisis in which you now see capitalist Germany engulfed (\*). In this stage of history, the nature of war between capitalist countries has changed. They make war between themselves without arms, through the economy and trade. This is because they are now confronted with the Workers States which impede them from all-out war among themselves.

The crisis of capitalism is expressed, however, in production, in the field of finance, accumulation and capital export. At the same time concentration is the norm in the multi-nationals. Marx, seventy years ahead of time, and also Karl Kautsky, foresaw the inevitability of war in the capitalist system. They analysed this was not the result of the capitalists being bad – although indeed they are – but because their system leads to war.

The Workers States, on the other hand, have no need for war. The war the Chinese launched against Vietnam was not a war of Workers States but the tentative initiative of a counter-revolutionary clique which does not represent the Workers State of China in any way. Yugoslavia, in spite of all the confrontations it had with the leadership of the USSR at one point, was never invaded by the Soviets. This is not because Yugoslavia was defended by capitalism, but because the whole structure of the Soviet Workers State is opposed to making war with Yugoslavia. It is totally false that imperialism was the guarantee of Yugoslavia's security. Had the Soviets wanted to enter Yugoslavia they would have done so.

Also, in the Second World War the Yanks and the British gave guarantees to Hitler so that he would invade the USSR. Churchill proposed to let the German (imperialists) invade the USSR with the aim that afterwards capitalism would go in to smash both. Before the end of Second World War Churchill was proposing war against the USSR, and the Yanks were opposed because they saw the madness of this enterprise that was going to create opposition in the whole of the world and of the working class; and that was going to strengthen Europe against the Yanks. These are the contradictions of the capitalist system, and its antagonism with the Workers States.

The Workers State does not need wars. When there are such counter-revolutionary activities on the part of the Chinese leadership they are not the

deed of the Workers State but of the counter-revolutionary leadership. The same happened under Stalin who murdered the Bolshevik leadership. This was not the deed of the Workers State because its structure does not need murder. Assassination and warmongering are the activities of a political leadership in the Workers State that usurps power.

For the Workers State to live and progress it needs the reverse of war, because what it feeds on is the development of logical relations between the people. But in the capitalist system it is the reverse – for it is a system based on profits. The Workers State, far from being based on profit-making, needs the development of production, science and culture. In the USSR there is an immense development which is not only economic, but also scientific and cultural. The Workers States do not develop within inter-Workers States competition or through their mutual opposition, but through the fulfilment of their logical necessity which tends to unify their economies, their social relations, as well as their scientific and cultural abilities.

If the existing Workers States do this quite limitedly still, it is because of the limitations of the leaderships. But, even so, the progress which has been made by them since 1945 is immense. There is no unemployment or hunger in the Workers States. They manage this in spite of having had to start from the structure of production that capitalism had lain out in the past.

All the Workers States have had to proceed from the structures that capitalism built in the past. What they did was to change it, of course. At the present moment, they cannot advance more in quickly because technically speaking, they are still dependent on the structures they emerged from.

The Workers States must all be built from the capitalist economic and social structures that used to exist in their countries before. They cannot but emerge from there. In Eastern Europe, they managed to make much headway against the old capitalist social structures; this could be done because it depended on creating superior forms of social organisation and leaderships. But when it came to the further economic progress of their countries, it was not so easy. They faced the material structures of production and the productive apparatuses of the capitalists and their production technologies. All the Workers States have this difficulty to start from. It is true that they can acquire their own technologies; but for these to perform better than capitalism, they have to improve relationships between themselves, and accomplish within themselves superior levels of Workers State development.

**The continued existence of capitalism in the world limits the capacity of the Workers States.**

The Workers States have inherited the structures of capitalism; but to survive as Workers States, they must proceed to the entire annihilation of the previous regime. As they are called upon to fulfil the needs of the population, they must do it at least as well as capitalism. Where capitalism does

this through profit-making, they must do it through social development. Sixty years is a very short time to supersede capitalism in this way! On top of this, those Workers States must cope with the proximity of the capitalist system around them, which means that 50% of their resources must go into preparing against the world war of capitalism and defending themselves internally from it as well – a huge amount that cannot go to development.

If world capitalism had already been defeated, the development of production would already be immense in the Workers states. As it is, the latter must do all that we have said, plus set-up their own socially-based technical means of production; capitalism has already all its own structures, it had centuries to build them since when it emerged from Feudalism. The Workers States had to do all this, which we mentioned above, plus face murderous and bureaucratic leaderships like that of Stalin; and then a series of others like Krutschev's.

China had to confront Soviet leaderships that wanted its potential either negated or pared down. Krutschev sought to limit the Workers-State-type of development in China. He wanted it as a buffer against capitalism, and most of all, he wanted to stop China competing with the USSR. He was not afraid of China's ability to compete commercially or economically, but what he feared was China's socialist competition. What Krutschev wanted least of all was the development of revolutionary

tendencies inside the USSR influenced by the Chinese Revolution.

If the Workers States did not progress more, it is because the leadership did not exist for this level of challenge. In the world, the USSR is the second country, and in many aspects the first, in terms of production. It has developed a superior technical and scientific capacity, even in production. Superior to that of capitalist Germany in every way. The *Space Voyages* that the Soviets have been leading for years show the immense superiority of the USSR well beyond production. The way the Soviets create and launch cosmonauts shows their sophistication in production as well. Their production does not simply deliver consumer goods. It delivers human intelligence. The production of the Workers State is human intelligence – basis from which to start eliminating all destructive forms of production.

Capitalist production started from the scientific structures built within feudalism. In our case of the Workers States, they must build their own forms of production entirely. By their very nature, the Workers States are concerned with human development. See how they fulfil this task and develop *Space Voyages* as well. This fills the world with a great sense of confidence and security; it allows everyone to see that life on Earth, in order to continue, must become seriously linked with space and the cosmos.

As long as capitalism survive, the Workers States are forced to co-exist with capitalism. This

weakens their technical and operating capabilities. As they fight this off, their task is also to create the new leaderships of history. See how the USSR had to bear the brunt of Stalin's stage, and WW2 that destroyed it again, and destroyed half the world.

Lenin said that 'capitalism is war and Socialism is peace'. This is not a declaration or a slogan! It is a completely logical conclusion. Capitalism needs war in order to live. To the pole opposite, the Workers state needs peace in order to live. The leaderships of the Workers States help to limit the reach of this conclusion. They help to limit it, but they cannot stop the Workers State – as a conquest - reiterating the full value of it. This is why China had to get out of Vietnam!

The Chinese leadership had to abandon their attack on Vietnam and during the invasion itself the Vietnamese did not take advantage to bomb or massacre the Chinese population – a thing that they could very well have done: nothing prevented the Vietnamese using their planes to bomb the Chinese population or the Chinese retreating troops. But they let them go instead. This is not because they were scared of doing so, but because it was not the objective of Vietnam. War against another Workers State is not the objective of any Workers State. Furthermore, and in part, the withdrawal of the Chinese is due also to precisely that conclusion. The Chinese Workers State cannot exercise the same criminal function as imperialism. Moreover, disagreement was rife within the Chinese Army itself: not just for fear of the

Soviets, but because of the internal reaction of which the strength of the Soviet Union is a part.

**The workers state represents a superior society.**

In order to understand the present state capitalism is in, it is enough to look at what is happening in capitalist Germany. One of the greatest democratic conquests of humanity is that work is a right before being an obligation. It is a right in the system of private property; they have had to give work. The condition of being obliged to work comes after that because otherwise one dies. This is a conquest that has brought with itself other rights: the right to vote, to be elected, to be protected by law, and to participate in the leadership of society. However, capitalist Germany has two and a half million immigrant workers who have no political right, not even the slightest municipal one. Their children, who are born in Germany and live there, do not become Germans. This is the capitalist system! There is no point of comparison between this and the Workers State.

The Workers state is organising itself and capitalism has had hundreds of years of existence. The system of private property has had thousands of years of experience. It passed from one sphere of functioning into another in history, but the system of property (private) was maintained all the way through. Slavery, feudalism, and capitalism have all in common the regime of private property. Their system of production differed. One of the conquests the bourgeoisie made against feudalism was universal suffrage,

but the immigrant workers do not vote in Germany! Are they not two and a half million? Why should their children not vote? This is oppression – the oppression of the capitalist system.

The Workers State is a representative of a superior society. It is not to say that it necessarily has the most suitable leadership, but it has a leadership that represents nevertheless the necessity for this society. It still does not have the necessary capacity and policy. But the most important fact is that the working class, for the first time in history, is on the way to lead society.

An example in social confidence in Socialist construction is the USSR. The Soviet masses triumphed over Hitler and Stalin. When Hitler came on the scene world capitalism tried to use the USSR as a shield against Hitler, hoping that Hitler and the USSR would exhaust each other and the workers would rise against Stalin. However, the workers said: 'Let us deal with Hitler first, we will deal with Stalin after'. The masses displayed in this all the consciousness that the Workers State had generated in them. Hence Hitler lost, not because North America intervened – but because the workers of the Soviet Union and the masses of the whole world concentrated themselves together in defence of the USSR and against Nazism. Afterwards Stalin was ejected from the Soviet leadership and the USSR progressed.

The USSR has managed to come from nothing, to what it is now, by means of a society formed as it is now: which is based on state owned property,

the planning of production and the development of science, culture and the political level of society.

The USSR is not a contradictory society, but a society which is learning how to be led and where there is an uninterrupted flow of progress. In capitalist Germany, on the other hand, this is not the case: there are two and a half million immigrant workers with no political rights. There are problems of unemployment, lack of housing, and a steady increase in the cost of living. This demonstrates that the basis of society which world capitalism tells us is 'liberty' is devoid of democratic liberties. As opposed to this, the basis of society in the USSR is not democratic liberties, but state-owned property, the planning of production and the development of the struggle against capitalism world-wide. This is the basis of Soviet society and, to bring this to its peak, Soviet democracy is called for. Soviet democracy is for that end alone. Brezhnev himself has posed the need for Soviet democracy, even if a little limitedly.

Capitalist Germany developed after the Second World War, but not through its own abilities: imperialism devoted millions of dollars to develop Germany so that it would be a bulwark against the Workers States. This is the essential reason for the development of capitalist Germany. It is not that, after the war, Germany had strength of its own. Where did it get the capital from? Imperialism handed over enormous sums through the Marshall Plan, dollars that would develop Germany as an opposition and an obstacle to the Workers States.

But today Germany has become a country occupied by British, French and North American imperialism. It has neither democratic rights nor its own military forces, but depends on Yankee, French and British imperialism – above all on the Yankees. It is a subjected country that has been turned into a fortification to confront the Workers states, and also to impede its independent economic development which would have given it military and social rights. If Germany had developed militarily there would have been, yet again, another war with France or Britain: not with the German Workers State but with France and Britain.

The way to finish with all wars, with unemployment, with hunger and with the exploitation of the foreign workers, is to eliminate the capitalist system. There is no other way to avoid war.

J. POSADAS

22<sup>nd</sup> March 1981

---

## **ON THE NATURE OF THE PREPARATIONS FOR WAR**

**J POSADAS**

21.4.1981

The process, which is unfolding in the world, points to a strong resistance by humanity to the war preparations of imperialism and its counter-

revolutionary sabotage to the Workers States, particularly of Poland. It also points to the slowness of some Communist leaderships which tend towards a decentralisation from, and an opposition to, the Soviet Union. The workers and the Communist cadres, on the contrary, do not distance themselves from the Soviet Union and do not oppose it in any way. When they make criticisms of the USSR it is as a normal thing over one event or another, but no more than this. The Soviets have already learned to accept this type of criticism.

This is the stage where all the component parts of what constitutes progress come together. The centre of this process is the Soviet Union. As things have turned out, humanity has one centre, and this is the Soviet Union: it is a social centre, first and foremost – and, after that, it is a military centre. The prime importance of the Soviet Union is social. The North American masses have their eyes on the USSR not because it has atomic weapons but because it does not have the aberrations you find in the United States. There are no killings of children or adults in the USSR, neither of Blacks or Whites, Japanese, Russian, Italian, or any other. There is no such thing in the Soviet Union but in North America it is happening all the time, starting with their Presidents. Have you ever heard of murders in the Workers States? No! It is in the United States that you hear about this, and about them killing presidents.

In capitalist Germany there is an immense resistance to the Yankees and it reaches the high

layers of the petit bourgeoisie: the latter feel that Germany is occupied – and Germany is indeed occupied: occupied by the Yanks. The German bourgeoisie also feels occupied, and its wings clipped in as far as competitive ability is concerned. The bourgeoisie keeps its mouth shut about this because the Yanks are there to protect it, but it expresses its resistance to occupation in other ways: such as when it demands compensation from the Yanks. This happens inside various military circles in Germany and amongst people linked to the Defence and the Foreign Affairs Ministries. They feel that their dependency on the Yanks negates them and that they cannot develop their own bourgeois roles.

Capitalism has been ready to go to war for thirty years now, certainly from Foster Dulles onwards. Since 1951 the War could have broken out at any moment. In the event, imperialism has had to continue to postpone the War, but today it spends 60 to 70 per cent of its income on making new weapons, throwing out old weapons in order to make continuously newer and more modern ones. If there had been such an accumulation of weapons in previous times, War would have broken out almost automatically. Today, imperialism has enough weapons to make twenty wars, but they have to discard them. This continues because we are not dealing with war as it was in a previous stage of history. What we are dealing with now is the final class War, in which a whole cycle of history – the cycle of private property – is coming to a close.

Various capitalist leaderships are aware of this process. They aren't actually conscious of capitalism being totally cornered – not because they can't think but because they are unable to draw such a conclusion that is as good as committing suicide. As capitalism cannot remain motionless and as it cannot think in terms of having no future at all, then it makes a virtue out of necessity by trying to organise its survival. This leads it to play for time in the stages that go to the War, and this has reached such a degree that it is difficult to tell when the War will actually break out. Certainly they are preparing the War under Reagan more feverishly than they were doing before, but it is changing nothing.

Those who trust the Yanks to protect them are plain fools, but even they can see that the Yanks have no superiority of any kind: the 'space shuttle' included, with which they are preparing to put atomic weapons in space – obviously not to protect anybody!

The Soviet Union is far ahead in relationship to space exploration and, if it wanted to, it could very well take advantage of its superiority to actually put atomic weapons into space when it liked and in whatever quantity it decided. The Yankee 'space shuttle' is a very unwieldy vehicle but the Soviet Soyuz is agile and capable of carrying atomic weapons of such capability that three of them suffice to wipe out the United States. This is precisely what Brezhnev told the Yankees (when Carter was still around) – at a time when relations were as bad as they are now – when he said: 'One

minute after we receive the warning that a weapon is directed against us, the United States will disappear.' Carter did not respond by saying that this wasn't true, or that the Soviets could not do it. Indeed, he did not even think of saying: 'You will disappear yourselves.' He just said that it was an 'exaggeration'.

Imperialism should have launched the War many years ago from the point of view of its own interest, but it is still preparing it and it has now completely lost the ability to decide when, where and how to launch the War. The Yanks have to launch the War, and it is sure that they are going to launch it, possibly after a coup d'Etat in the United States. But it is not easy these days to launch coups d'Etats just like that, and anyway coups d'Etats are not the best preparation for war.

The anguish of the capitalist world is expressed in its internal divisions. We are dealing with the final settlement of accounts and, in these circumstances, capitalism should act in exactly the opposite way: it should be united like rats in a trap. The capitalist world is thoroughly desperate; they shout insults and abuse at each other and exacerbate all internal antagonisms. The War preparations are not taking place as in the last War which was an inter-capitalist one. The USSR did participate in the last War, but it was essentially an inter-capitalist war. The Soviet Union started to decide the character of the War towards the end of it. But the War was an inter-capitalist one in character and the various capitalists took the USSR for a puppet which they thought they could fight

each other with. In the end, of course, it turned out that the puppet was the stage director who decided upon the creation of 14 more Workers States! Capitalism was able to decide nothing. According to the plans of capitalism, the USSR was going to be the scapegoat that would pay all the costs and would be turned on by all the thieves in the end. The result, finally, was very different. The Soviets came on the scene in full command and defeated the Nazis. This War, the coming War, will be a class War from the very start, unlike the last one which was primarily inter-capitalist.

Capitalism is unable to decide when it is going to launch it. This is why we have repeatedly said: 'Capitalism prepares the War. It will launch it tomorrow if it can, but it has no idea of how, when or where to launch it. In the first place, capitalism has to launch the war in such a way that the Soviets will not be able to retaliate instantaneously. The Yankees would have to launch a total spread of weapons simultaneously in order to give them the guarantee of no retaliation. But the Soviets have the necessary retaliatory weapons and, more than this still, they have other types of weapons which the Yankees have not and cannot have. The Soviets have half the masses of each capitalist country, half the armies, and half the Military High Command of those countries. Neither Yankee imperialism nor Spanish, French or British capitalism – indeed, no capitalist of any country – can count on such a support. But the Soviets can.

The soldiers in the capitalist countries know that the War is stupid and senseless and that the other side is bound to win, because it is right. It is really something like a play in which the actors are not preparing to play their set roles but want to play the parts they have learnt in the streets. Vietnam was a real saga of utter incompetence on the part of Yankee imperialism. This incompetence was the result of the activities of the North American people and the Soviets. Of course, it was essentially the Soviets that stopped the Yanks, but the North American people also helped because it rejected the war. The conduct of the North American people found its expression even in the High Command of the Yankee Army. People in the High Command were saying things like: 'We remember Dien Bien Phu; it was a lesson for the future.' However, capitalism was very much stronger – infinitely stronger in fact – at the time of Dien Bien Phu than when the Yanks bombed Vietnam. The Vietnamese, the Soviets, and also the Chinese (who participated too), obliterated the French Officers' Corps at Dien Bien Phu. These were wiped out, and the French Officers' Corps wholly decimated.

The people and a sector of the North American military who think as soldiers respect this because they realise that they are confronted with an organisational ability and a relation of forces, superior to their own, which they do not know how to defeat. It makes them feel helpless, and this is what prevented the Yankees from sending more and more soldiers, more and more troops into Vietnam in order to continue to perpetrate their

atrocities. They would have liked to return to Vietnam and burn it all; to spread poisons in countryside and forests in order to prevent the Vietnamese from ever growing anything at all. But the Vietnamese have repelled all this, and recently there have been reports of their successes in reconditioning the earth and making the land arable again.

The Yanks tried everything, but they were defeated; and one of the reasons why they were defeated is that they were not able to employ their full force – the North American people would not have allowed them to, neither would the Soviets nor the Chinese. Even various bourgeoisies – like the French with their indelible memories of Dien Bien Phu – are opposed to a renewed Yankee military intervention. The French bourgeoisie have been taught some of the most complete lessons in history: first in Dien Bien Phu, then in Algeria! These will remain historic examples for all to learn from.

French imperialism was at one time one of the most powerful imperialisms in Africa, but it lost everything and there is hardly anything left of its power now. French imperialism has to embark on a course of making retreat after retreat. This was the result of the historic decadence of imperialism and of the up-hill progress of the Workers States.

The people of the world and many capitalist military circles have been able to see for themselves that progress and the existence of the Workers States are inextricably bound up with

each other. Progress and the Workers States are united. The capitalists try to use Poland against the Workers States and they may have more tricks up their sleeves, but the fact remains that people have reached the conclusion that progress and the Workers States are the same thing. This is why one must expect the Yanks to launch the atomic War at any moment. This was the reason why they promoted Reagan as president and also why they have recently demoted him with a bullet!

J. POSADAS

21.4.1981

---

APPENDIX:  
**ON THE INEVITABILITY OF THE NUCLEAR  
WAR**

6<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 1978

The Soviet Review in Italy, 'URSS OGGI' (USSR TODAY), writes of 'those ideologists of Trotskyism who look for a Socialism built on atomic ashes'. It is not like this, even if the Review says so. The Soviet comrades make a mistake in writing such things. What we have actually said is that war is inevitable and that capitalism is going to launch it. And that, regardless of the destruction, Socialism will be constructed. Socialism will be constructed because it is a necessity of the development of human history, science, the economy and of, above all, human intelligence, in which the function of the working class is paramount.

The atomic war is going to cause many deaths, it is going to kill hundreds of millions of people, but it is only going to destroy the material expression of progress and not the level of intelligence and ability already reached that has produced this level of progress. There can be no retreat from this level. The war is going to destroy a great many people, buildings and machines, but not the level of ability, experience and confidence that humanity has already attained!

Socialism is not going to be constructed on the ashes of the atomic War. It is not a question of wanting the atomic war ourselves, but of capitalism resorting to the atomic War before it is finally eliminated from history because it has the means to do so. Of course, if capitalism did not have these means it would be even better, but unfortunately it has. We would be content to wait another thirty years to avoid this, but capitalism has no other way out but war, which is inherent to private property. It goes to war in the same way as it proceeds in the market, in competition. There have always been wars between capitalists, because they compete amongst themselves commercially and financially, which leads them to outright wars amongst themselves.

The Soviet comrades who refer to the 'ideologists of Trotskyism' who want to 'construct Socialism out of atomic ashes' are using a phrase of Pablo (which was first published in 1959 in the last issue of 'Revista Cuarta Internacional', Fourth International Review). This phrase was directed against Posadas and it was: 'Those deluded

fanatics who want to build Socialism on the atomic ashes...' The 'fanatic' was Posadas, but ample proof exists to show no delusion in this. This phrase of Pablo was later repeated by Maitan and then by Mandel.

It is a fraudulent interpretation. We do not want war, atomic or otherwise. War is the consequence of the capitalist system and we simply interpret the fact, in the same way as we interpret capitalist competition, unemployment, inflation, and the situation in which there is 'over-production' whilst people have nothing to eat. These are the consequences of the capitalist market which lead to antagonism with society, to inter-capitalist competition, and hence to war. A simple glance at the history of private property and capitalism is sufficient to see that the most obvious activity of the system of private property is war: war after war, after war!

So it is absolutely incorrect to come and tell us that we want to 'build Socialism on atomic ruins'. Our interpretation is that capitalism will launch the War and that, in spite of its launching the War and in spite of the ensuing devastation in human life and wealth, Socialism will be constructed just the same. Socialism is already a conquest of the human consciousness and intelligence and there is not a single inhabitant of any remote part of Oceania, Iceland, Africa, Asia, Latin America or Europe, that has not heard of Socialism.

The economy is no longer a mystery for humanity which has reached the understanding

that private property plays no role in history and that intelligence is the product of the development of human relations on the basis of the economy. When you add to this the fact that the proletariat, having become a ruling class which, in order to progress as a class, has to free the whole of humanity and then disappear as a class altogether, you have there the instrument that represents the progress of history. These are the historic conditions which the Soviet comrades do not take into account. We are not hereby producing a political resolution but making an analysis and drawing conclusions from the process of history as it actually is.

Capitalism prepares for War and it is going to launch it. We only have to consider the fact that capitalism dedicates 40% of its wealth to overall war preparations. Not just in the construction of arms, but in war preparations – which include all manner of expenditure on counter-revolution, the Secret Services, the police etc.

J. POSADAS

6.4.1978

---

### **About the Author...**

J. Posadas was born in Argentina in 1912 and died in Europe in 1981. Theoretical and political leader, as well as revolutionary organiser, he started his activities as a trade union leader in Argentina, quickly adopting the ideas of Trotsky

which made of him the most prestigious leader of our time. Analysing the nascent process Peronism and nationalism as the expression of the process of Permanent Revolution, one of his first writings is 'Fifteen Year Plan of Permanent Revolution' in 1946. Twenty years later he wrote 'From the Nationalist Revolution to the Workers State', in which he demonstrated the impossibility for any anti-imperialist movement in Latin America, Asia or Africa, born out of the crisis and agony of world capitalism, to prosper within the confines of capitalism.

The abandonment of Marxist principles by the Group of the IV International, led Posadas to separate himself from it. He founded the Posadist IV International in 1962. From that moment his fundamental works on the beginning and development of the changes in the Workers States appears in 'Partial Regeneration, Historic Re-encounter and the Construction of Socialism' and in 'The living Thought of Trotsky', where he synthesised the ideas which allow an understanding of the process in the leadership of the Workers States, showing that this leadership no longer has the structure or the aims it had under Stalin, and that it undergoes a process of regeneration that elevates the political role of the Soviet Union as the centre of the world revolutionary process.

This qualification of the process of 'partial regeneration' is one of the most important contributions to Marxist thought in this stage. It is the conclusion that allowed Posadas to analyse the

process of political revolution in the Workers States, already formulated by Trotsky, but that Posadas made more precise in its actual significance - fundamentally in the fact that it is now happening without blood being shed. This characterisation is demonstrated and deepened in the works of the author on Poland recently published under the titles: 'The Advance of Socialist Democracy in Poland and of Socialist influence in the World' (two volumes) and 'Soviet Democracy and the Actual Form of the Political Revolution in Poland'.

Indefatigable defender of the Workers States, he supported the Soviets' intervention in Afghanistan, Vietnam's intervention in Cambodia, and qualified the invasion of Vietnam by China as counter-revolutionary.

He has left behind innumerable writings on science, art, the education of children, which are an incorporation of Marxist analysis into the field of human relations and, above all, into that of the Communist future of humanity. These form part of his work on 'The History of Human Civilisation' which has been left incomplete due to his untimely death. He has contributed to giving security in the Communist future, as much with his work as with the example of his own life. It is important to record his words before his death: 'Without the struggle for Socialism and all it entails, life has no sense.'

*Editorial*

END OF VOLUME 1.