

**J.POSADAS**

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

**(vol. 2)**

a selection of texts (1978-1981)

*To the Reader:*

This Volume 2 contains 13 texts by **J Posadas** aimed at showing that the nuclear war - now being prepared by world capitalism - represents its last act. In that war, it is going to be defeated by world revolution. The sentiment of egoism based on private property will be replaced by the human sentiments of fraternity and identification with nature and the universe.

J Posadas died in May 1981. This Volume ends with a short biography of his life.

Editorial.

**The 13 texts by J Posadas are:**

- The installation of the Yankee missiles in Europe and the policy of the soviet Union, 27.10.1979
- On the false alarms for a Soviet nuclear attack, 9.6.1980
- On the military bases in Europe, 19.5.1980
- The final stage of capitalism and the collapse of the capitalist conception of life, 28.3.1981

- US imperialism and the atomic war, 27.9.1979
  - On the Iran-Iraq war, 24.9.1980
  - Function and role of the revolutionary guerrilla movements, 1.3.1981
  - The nuclear war and the fundamental problems of Marxism, 25.12.1963
  - The Communist parties, the war and the function of the Soviet Union, 2.1.1980
  - The Peace movement and the discussion in the Italian Communist Party, 3.3.1981
  - The crisis of capitalism, the war and the world communist movement, 8.3.1981
  - The China/USSR unification is a fundamental necessity to confront nuclear war, 29.12.1974
  - On the socialist future of humanity, 22.4.1981
- 

## **THE INSTALLATION OF THE YANKEE MISSILES IN EUROPE AND THE POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION**

**J POSADAS, 27.10.1979**

Nicaragua, El Salvador, Vietnam, signify that the adoption of the Socialist road is the only way forward; Mugabe has declared as much. These countries and that declaration are all aspects of the world process, showing that the world is very mature. The decision of Vietnam to confront the Chinese indicates the confidence of the Vietnamese Workers State, grounded on the understanding that

further incursions into Vietnam will have unfavourable effects in China, not in Vietnam.

As the world process develops, the crisis of Yankee imperialism deepens. The French, German, Belgian and Dutch capitalists – and in part the Italians – question the decisions of Yankee imperialism. They are not opposed but feel weak. This is the reason why they want to confront the Soviet Union. The Germans as much as the French imperialists show all their weakness in the relation they have with the Soviet Union. There is also weakness of Yankee imperialism because it cannot impose on the other capitalists to break with the USSR: it has to restrict itself to exerting pressure on them to install missiles directly pointed at the European Workers States. Locating of nuclear missiles in West Germany is a very profound sign of war preparations. It may not be for immediate use but it is designed to stimulate German, French and the other European capitalists in general, to stand up to the Communists and the workers' movement. All this has the aim of even greater war preparations. This is what Yankee imperialism is up to.

Imperialism also hopes to gain further advantage in the process of inter-capitalist competition with European and Japanese capitalism. The placing of the nuclear missiles is a way of forcing the European bourgeoisie to make a greater contribution to war costs. This will, in turn, limit

their ability to compete on the world market because the bourgeoisie will have to increase their prices in order to pay for increased war budgets.

All this affects the capitalist system and sharpens the class struggle. It stimulates the masses to support themselves on the Communist and Socialist movements, and the other movements of the left. Measures to increase arms expenditure affect capitalism adversely on the economic level, but the existence of the Workers States leaves it with no alternative.

The Workers States have not increased their armaments very much. What gives them superiority over capitalism is not so much due to their arms but to the relations they have with the world masses. This is the most important weapon in the arsenal of the Soviet Union. Arms are important and essential but what makes them decisive is the world support of the masses. Coordination already exists between the world masses, the development of the struggle of countries which have emerged from backwardness and the development of the Soviet Union. This process is very real, even if it is not actually planned. It is all a unified process even if there is not yet a unified political leadership for it. There is coordination between the interests of the exploited masses and those of the masses of the 'backward' countries and of the Workers States – the Soviet Union in particular. The present world

dispute on weapons overturns the 'SALT 2' agreement signed between Carter and Brezhnev. It is the right wing in Yankee imperialism which imposes this, and so it resorts to means that clearly show that it prepares for war against the Workers States. Inevitably, the Workers States are going to react to this.

The installation of the Yankee's missiles is also an attempt to intimidate the mass movements and the Socialists. It is a measure intended to contain them and to make them clash with the Communist parties. A sharpening of the inter-capitalist competition expresses itself in the Social Democratic government of Germany. The latter has rejected the plans of Yankee imperialism and called for conciliation – over arms – with the Soviets. In so doing, the German Social Democratic government hopes to gain some breathing space.

Imperialism prepares for war. So the Workers States are fully justified to use one capitalist against the other. The Workers States may continue to call for 'peaceful co-existence' or for arms reductions, but they cannot go on believing that these aims can be achieved. This is what matters. It is not the question of what the Workers States say but what they understand. The Workers States have to prepare themselves militarily and, above all, socially. The campaign for the reduction of arms – which the Soviets make – must be accompanied by

a greater development of the anti-capitalist and revolutionary struggle.

The process continues in the direction which Brezhnev indicated when he met leaders of South Yemen. On that occasion he reaffirmed Soviet support for 'any movement which struggles against imperialism and capitalism'. In this statement, Brezhnev made a correct appeal for an alliance of the masses of the world. All this shows the crisis of the capitalist system and the true nature of the relation: capitalism- Workers States.

This crisis will be deepened by the siting of Yankee missiles in Europe. Imperialism could not liquidate Nicaragua or El Salvador. Now it is looking for compensation by attempting to make all the capitalist countries centralise around the power of Yankee imperialism and around the question of increasing arms. Imperialism wants to make the capitalist countries submit to its own military structure and high command. The European bourgeoisie feels that it is not just a matter of missiles or of installing nuclear weapons - and paying for them - but that, in so doing, they are thrust against the workers' movement. They - the bourgeoisie- have to try to contain the influence of the Workers States on the world masses, but they feel that increases in war expenditure curtail their capacity to negotiate with the workers' movement. Yankee imperialism for its part keeps increasing its

own war expenditure, and it has forced the European bourgeoisies to cover an important part of these costs.

The European bourgeoisie goes along – in general – with all this, because it is the capitalist system, as a system, which is at stake and not one capitalist government or the other. It is the system as a whole that prepares for war, but it does not mean that it will succeed. Struggles are going to develop in the whole of Europe.

The Communists, Socialists and Social Democrats, and the movements of the petty bourgeoisie see quite clearly that imperialism is preparing for war. The installation of missiles is not just perceived by the masses as a means of intimidation, but also as part of a preparation for war.

Yankee imperialism prepares the war with a certain caution – and a great deal of indecision and uncertainty. It means that the process of war preparations is not quite overt. Yankee imperialism has to camouflage its preparations and hide them from the North American people because the North American people are opposed to it.

Yankee imperialism cannot really say that they are preparing for war 'against Communist barbarism'. The North American people would reply that 'barbarism is what we have in the United States'. There is not as yet the means of contact between all

the parts of the American masses. But those who have organised movements like the anti-nuclear people, those against the intervention in Vietnam or against the construction of the atomic weapons, have been hundreds of thousands. In spite of the trade union bureaucrats of the United States who are at the service of capitalism, capitalism has not been able to organise a single mass movement in support of atomic weapons or in support of the siting of nuclear missiles in Europe. Nor have they been able to make any movement in the US against 'Communist barbarism' as they call it.

The world process shows the weakness of the capitalist system, the superior conditions for the progress of the anti-capitalist struggle, and a very decided intervention of the Soviet Union against imperialism. The Soviet Union today is not the same as it was under Stalin. Stalin yielded to imperialism and made an alliance with Hitler in the hope that he would be able to defend the USSR against the 'democratic imperialists' of France, Britain and the United States. Today the Soviet Union seeks conscious allies. It does not make alliances with one group of capitalists to fight the other, but revolutionary alliances with the masses.

The Soviet Union cannot be measured according to the agreements it may make with Germany, but in the light of the support it gives to Ethiopia. The Soviet Union impels the revolution in Nicaragua, El



Salvador, etc. If it still takes limited steps, it is because it does not have direct access to revolutions. It does not have the necessary Communist parties through which to intervene. This activity of the Soviets is limited and is not accompanied by a global anti-capitalist policy, but today it supports the revolutionary movements on a world scale.

J. POSADAS

27<sup>th</sup> October 1979

---

**ON THE FALSE ALARMS FOR A  
SOVIET NUCLEAR ATTACK  
AGAINST THE YANKEES**

J. POSADAS  
09.06.80

The Yankees are making war rehearsals as in the instance of the 'black-outs'. They are preparing people for war, and trying to catch the Soviets by surprise. It is folly, however, part of the 'last act' of the capitalist system. There are not going to be other wars after this one. It is the end of a system and, as far as the capitalists are concerned, the end of life, the end of everything. It is the reason why

those who stage such rehearsals today would not have done so in normal times. It is neither Carter nor the big capitalists who decide. There is a team outside Carter and the big capitalists which takes decisions. Those who do this are a gang, and not the whole of capitalism. It is a group which reflects and expresses the madness of the capitalist system. Capitalism has not reached a state of insanity; it is in a constant state of insanity. If all the capitalists were summoned together, what you would see is a mad house.

This false alert, in the same way as the 'black-outs', and the mass murder in Guyana, are rehearsals. All these actions are part of the strategy of imperialism. It tries out, tests and investigates processes which they don't yet dominate to see how to use them. They also want to accustom their own people, and the world population, and to see how it reacts and behaves. Imperialism will make rehearsal after rehearsal, right up to the day when it will be for real.

Take into account that this will not be any old war. First, it is a war with atomic weapons, and from the beginning. Secondly, it is the final class war, the end of the existence of a system. This is what creates malevolent, diabolical sentiments in the thoughts of capitalism, not because they are diabolical but because they do not take into account any of the reasoning of the people. So they think as

a caste, as a class which realises that it is going to be wiped out, and the only thing they can bother about is how to save themselves, at whatever cost. This is devoid of any reasoning, it is devoid of intelligence and even of the small grains of logic which capitalism had to use in order to develop. Normal logic means suicide for capitalism. So, its logic confines itself to this: 'I am in charge, I am the one with the money, and I have the arms'. The logic of capitalism is this. It visualises no further than the fact that the world escapes from its oppression, and a full-blooded realisation of this fact itself would lead capitalism to dissolution. There are those inside capitalism – military people, politicians, and quite a few bourgeois families – who receive this and are influenced by it.

Among those who receive an influence from all this are the North American military. The press reports once again, about the fifteenth time in a few weeks, that an immense number of officers have deserted the US army; they have lost heart and they don't want to know anymore. This is quite a commentary on the fact that they do not see the coming war as the path to glory! This shows the effect on the conduct of Yankee imperialism on its own military who don't think that the war will mean victory, medals and individual advancement. They have already made the experience of Korea, Vietnam, and in Europe they see that it all goes out

of hand. Whatever they do, it goes wrong. The Soviets have sufficient weapons to defeat them, and not essentially nuclear ones. It is the people of Europe who have importance, and the Yankees know this. This is why the French (capitalists) are preparing the neutron bomb now. It is not against the Soviets, but against the French masses. However, and as in the case of all the previous wars, the masses are going to turn their weapons against them. Half the high-ranking officers are going to turn-coat.

There isn't normally such a level of desertions in time of war as there is going to be now. All these types (who prepare the war) act from interest. War is no longer a problem of conscience but one of political consciousness. A very highly placed military layer of capitalism sees that already the war is senseless. This shows in the fact that leaders of capitalist armies have already made public what they think of the war, and they think it senseless. One of these was at the top of the Belgian army in NATO, and he said 'War is a stupidity. I will wage it because I have to, but it is a stupidity'. When they have to renounce their sole means of survival, it is because despair engulfs them all.

**J. POSADAS**  
**09.06.80**

## **ON THE MILITARY BASES IN EUROPE**

**J POSADAS, 19.5.1980**

The imperialist military bases spread over Europe have no value. Today, with the development of atomic weapons, these Yankee military bases mean nothing. And, besides, they are rendered ineffectual by the military bureaucracy, the lack of flexibility and military confidence. It is a little like whistling in the dark for the Yanks. They put a base here and another there, to give themselves a sense of security. But this is worthless. Some of these bases are of use: against the revolutionary movement of each country. But, even then, it is useless because these military people – some of whom have been there for twenty years by now – have lost the war sentiment. Half of them are retired already – in their heads and sentiments. They draw their money and that is all.

These bases have to be opposed and the demand made that they should be thrown out. But the analysis of the case is that they are worthless

anyway. They have a certain use in their counter-revolutionary role of internal repression. But, for the war, they are good for nothing.

The people who man them – soldiers and officers alike – are demoralised. Some have spent thirty years there, every day the same, always the same work. They go here and go there. Already the class struggle should have been launched against revolution, but they see that in the world the Workers States and revolution advance, and that culture advances in the people. They see whole armies rise up and turn to revolution in some parts of the world. There was news from the United States, a month ago, saying that the Yankee High Command is very concerned by the considerable increase in the number of high medium ranking and low ranking officers who apply for early retirement and get out of the army. This shows the social effect of the progress of the world on all the armies.

Even China is a burden for the capitalist armies. In all the armies contempt was rife for China; China was less than a colony. But, today, China is a power because it is a Workers State. The soldiers see that it is not a military, but a Workers' State power which has developed a social superiority that even its soldiers want to defend militarily.

The capitalists can show no such ability, far from it. The Communist movement has investigated the

state of animation and consciousness amongst the soldiers of the capitalist armies. Half of them, they found, are demoralised, many become deserters.

In capitalist Germany half the soldiers will turn coat when the war starts. They have been used to drugs, beer and good living. Many of them already develop feelings for the population and are influenced by it. No army of occupation, like the imperialist army in Germany, can maintain for long the 'morale' of conquest. Those who are occupied eventually influence their occupiers, and all the more so if their level of culture is superior. This is how the Greeks won over the Romans. The principle we enounce here is social, not military. The military principle has the force to impose, but not always. In this stage, the Workers States tower over the world because they are socially superior.

J. POSADAS

19<sup>th</sup> May, 1980

---

**THE FINAL STAGE OF CAPITALISM  
AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE  
CAPITALIST CONCEPTION OF LIFE  
J POSADAS, 28.3.1981**

In NATO, they are discussing an agreement which would mean that no power would have atomic arms in orbit. They discuss this because they know that the Soviets already have such arms. The Soviets have the capacity to arm and disarm space apparatuses and they can transform equipment with atomic arms which can descend on the territory of the United States in a few minutes. The reply the Soviets have given to the Yanks is: 'You must realise that we are not going to permit the West to have military superiority'. This frightens the Yanks.

The Soviets have a whole arsenal prepared for war, but his preparation is accompanied by support for the revolution. Thus, every button they press is part of the progress of history. In other words, the Soviet weapons are weapons of progress which seek application. This paralyses the Yanks who have no initiative in regard to the Soviets. What initiative can they have when they know that the war is coming and that they – the Yanks – are going to disappear? The French bourgeoisie and the French government (of Giscard d'Estaing) have been alerted to this, and they see that the Soviets have powerful arms capable of making them disappear.

The Yanks have constructed anti-nuclear refuges and bunkers – and these are necessary to protect themselves – but they seek to use them with a mentality of hoping to continue living after the war. Is it not all a little mad and schizophrenic? Their



objective is to defend private property and continue living. They believe that they are going to continue to dominate the country from the bunkers. But once they are in the bunkers, then the capacity and authority of the Yankee leadership to give orders is finished. This is what happened to the Germans in the Second World War. Their defeat began, in part, at the 'siege of Moscow' where the soldiers and officers saw they were receiving senseless orders. This is where the debacle of the Nazi army began. The army saw that there was no objective, no capacity and no perspective.

It only requires the fall of ten sky scrapers for New York, Washington and the main cities of the US, to be finished. These sky scrapers are anti-human. At a certain height the air is rarefied and so is the ability and quality of living. From the standpoint of health and human relations it is anti-human. Those who live in there are apart from the world. The existence of those buildings is the product of the organisation of the capitalist system. Competition and the drive for profit together with the relations the system generates, determine what they build. The sky scraper is not necessary. It is not true that there is not enough space for people to live in. There is physical space, sufficient for 100 times more people than at present.

In 1952, I had the opportunity to read the recommendations made by the atomic centre of the

US for the Mexican army, in case of atomic war. It recommended that, in such case, it was necessary to close the ports, have aspirins available to calm the nerves, not to go near garages, and go immediately to the shelters. In the case of very urgent necessity, it recommended going - to the nearest doctor!

Capitalism does not foresee what it is going to be like before its end. It does not foresee that it will be submitted to the Workers State. Capitalism does not expect this because it does not have any idea of history. Capitalism continues to believe that they are going to frighten people by telling them: 'Look at the vile things being done in Poland and China'. They think that the events in Poland showed the impotence of the Workers State. They do not see that what is going on in the US today is the same as sixty-three years ago, the same misery, crimes and barbarism. Sixty years ago there were crimes and poverty in the USSR but today, there are none. The USSR has, in that period, undergone economic, scientific, cultural and social development. The capitalists have no idea of this. It is not so much that they are not interested in the Workers States: it is that they do not look at them because what they see frightens them.

An example of what capitalism amounts to is this assassin Haig who knows nothing but threats. The Yanks use him to see the effect his declarations

have, and when they see the effect they recall him! The present policy of the Yankee government is decided by neither Haig nor Reagan. It is not Haig who makes the policy; it is the top financial circles who decide what to do. And neither Reagan nor Haig can do anything important without first consulting these people. The high finance sectors – the war sector – has a very great internal opposition. Reagan has already had to say five times that they are studying whether or not to send wheat to the USSR (a boycott). What they do not consider is that the USSR may not want to buy from the US: there are other suppliers in the world like Canada, Argentina and Australia.

Capitalism is incapable of producing theoreticians to provide it with solutions. The best they can do is charlatans like Kissinger. They have no possibility of theory. They have no possibility of having theoreticians. To have a theoretician means to have somebody who thinks, and, if a capitalist theoretician thought, he would shoot himself and the whole capitalist regime would go over to the Soviets. The capitalist regime cannot have, at this stage, anyone who recommends a solution to save them – because there is no such solution. Capitalism has no solution or salvation, so it has to seek to centre world attention on such things as the Polish events. There is, in the top capitalist strata, a process in their physical and mental structure which

generates heart failure and new illnesses that provoke heart attacks. It is a physical expression of fear. It is the fear of people who see that their whole conception of life is crumbling. The capitalists cannot conceive a situation in which they are not the ones to give the orders. The millions upon millions of dollars they have – they do not need – they use to invest. Their brain is structured around this, and for them a million missing is a disaster.

This conception of life has created a structure in the human organism and, above all, in the nervous and cerebral system. The present situation produces in the capitalist a series of sensations which move through the human fibre and produce something more terrible than fear. It is not the usual sort of fear, but the feeling of people who see that their life is coming to an end. They feel that they can still be around and breed, but that life itself is ending. For example, Rockefeller has millions and millions of dollars, but who needs this amount? What can he do with it? Invest it, nothing more.

In this situation a great number of children of the upper bourgeoisie, all over the capitalist world, go over to the camp of the revolution and – although not actually revolutionaries – support the revolutions. Inner sectors of reactionary origins see that the situation today cannot continue. They see that the most backward people in history rise up and move forward.

The capitalists are incapable of creating logical thought in accordance with the necessity of life. Their life is outside the life of the vast majority of humanity. This means that their actual thoughts are outside of life. Capitalism lives more and more cycles of recession and it is beleaguered by history. In the United States, Carter did not succeed in organising any demonstration in his favour. The only demonstrations there have been against him. This situation liquidates them psychologically, and the psychological effect is on the nervous system. This creates a tremendous complex of insecurity and fear.

The Soviets speak with confidence when they say that they will never permit the West to have military superiority. This statement is aimed at France, Britain and Japan. Capitalism cannot resolve any of its problems amongst themselves. The Soviets, on the other hand, can resolve all the problems, and this includes the difference with the Chinese, for example. The problems posed by the behaviour of the Chinese leadership are more damaging to the masses than the consequences of inter-capitalist competition. But, because of the Soviet Union, the policy of the Chinese does not in any way affect the progress of the revolution. It affects the rhythms and stages of the revolution, but not the disposition of the masses to move forward.

Capitalism cannot understand that this is the stage of historic transformations. The capitalists do not see that the regimes of property are circumstances of history. These regimes can last a great numbers of years but they are circumstantial in history. They are not biological phenomena, but human. The plants and the animals do not intervene to modify the environment; the human beings work and intervene consciously, although, as far as the capitalists are concerned, they have much to learn from zoology to raise themselves from the brute.

I would be happy to present a piece of theatre with a dance showing what is happening in the minds of the capitalists. For them, life is falling apart; they have the sensation of annihilation. If the capitalists can no longer accumulate millions, they die. An example of it is the Stock Exchange, which Marx called the 'Lunatics' Exchange'.

Inter-capitalists contradictions are intensifying, European capitalism knows that it does not decide. It is the Yanks who are the decisive factor. The fear of Germany, France, Britain, Belgium, Sweden and Norway, is that they are the first to be eliminated in the next war. For capitalism, a conception of life is now ending. When people like those of El Salvador, who have nothing, rise up and say that they want to construct a Socialist society, it disintegrates all of capitalism.

**J.POSADAS**

**28.03.81**

---

## **U.S IMPERIALISM AND ATOMIC WAR**

**J POSADAS, 27.9.1979**

The defeatism of the US Senators which was expressed in the discussion over the soviet troops in Cuba is important. For when it occurs in a Senate like that of the United States, which is a meeting of 'the select', it means that they are afraid of the war. They see that this time it is not a case of a win for them, for, win or lose, half of the United States will be destroyed. According to the calculations of the North American military, the Soviets can in one blow annihilate 160 million people, while they can destroy less than half of the Soviets. Indeed, the Soviets possess arms similar to the Katushka rocket which they used against the Nazis, which could launch twenty shells at once – but with the difference that this time it would be twenty atomic missiles.

The Yanks are not equipped with such weapons. It is a new weapon which is aimed at one target, and then releases a whole salvo of missiles – and they also have everything to eliminate any enemy objective: hence the anxiety of the Yanks and this

confusion and fear in capitalism, which is more divided than ever. Meanwhile, the anti-capitalist competition and antagonism of the Workers States develops, but capitalism no longer determines the course of history. Also the population of Asia, Africa and Latin America are a potential organised power – if without a leadership – which will play a role in the war. On the other hand, the United States is a country dismembered into a thousand parts where, in case of war, all the antagonistic conflicts – this enormous individualism which also finds expression in Carter's speeches – will break out with all its force. While in the Soviet Union, there is order. During the war with the Nazis, this was tested.

The Yanks think also of the period after the war. Before the last war they made preparations in order to replace the Germans in Europe; but who now are they going to replace? Such thoughts circle in the heads of the Yanks and a great part of their nervous illnesses and heart, kidney and liver problems, have their origin in this. Infections and other complaints, from nervous trouble to heart attacks, are increasing in the United States. Their nervous system is attacked, and this causes all manner of illnesses and stomach ulcers.

The United States belongs to countries where there are the most cancers. But gastritis, ulcers or cancers, do not have their origin in bad diet, although their diet is very, very bad. They are



seized by panic in spite of all their weapons. Their anxiety stems not only from the arms of the opponents, but from the revolution. They fear that the American people will rise up. One has only to recall the US Navy Secretary Forrestal who, uttering the cry 'The Chinese are coming', threw himself out of the window. Now all the process is much deeper. The Yanks are convinced that the Soviets will be the winners, and that leads them to madness. This is no temporary rising of their blood pressure, but a dread which settles in their minds. It is the least curable insanity, for it seizes hold of their nature. Spiritual life develops through human relations, and this has a decisive effect on the functioning of the head – thus insanity strikes them and they become like idiots. In the United States there is an enormous development of mental disorders, for they have achieved a great economic wealth through production but have no military security. They not only fear that the Soviets may anticipate them and unleash atomic war, but that in ten minutes they can be engulfed. According to their calculations, the Soviets can liquidate half their population in an hour, while they could 'only' kill half of them.

They discuss like butchers over cattle, and therein one can recognise the mentality of the leading capitalist class. Hitler tried everything and today it is not he who dominates the world. The Workers

States are led to incorporate the whole population in order to prepare for the war. Also, in the war which is coming, no rebellions or struggles of different groups are to be expected in the situation where everyone is 'next'. There is already the historic experience of the Workers State, whose origin is the Russian Revolution. The war will stimulate the concern with solidarity in the Soviet Union and throughout the whole world. In the United States it will be exactly the reverse; there, every layer which has command and unleashes the war – around twenty per cent of the population – will kill North Americans in order to try to live. Nothing of this will occur in the Soviet Union.

It was that which most disorganised the Nazis. They occupied a territory, shot, killed and crushed. Then, many of them were taken prisoner and the Soviets gave them food to eat. This broke them socially.

There are many films where military clashes are shown where the Soviets win and take the Germans prisoner, and, instead of ill-treating them, the Soviets give them food. In one such film, there is a scene of a German officer who refuses to take cigarettes, but the German soldiers take them.

This will be the case with many Yankee soldiers and officers. Not with the capitalist ruling clique, but with the soldiers. The defeatism of the US Senators

is important because they sense all this.  
**J. POSADAS**, 27.09.1979

---

## **ON THE IRAN-IRAQ WAR**

**J POSADAS, 24.9.1980**

The Iraqi leadership needs this war in order to confirm its power within the country where it faces a great deal of resistance. This leadership is a bureaucratic apparatus which is unfavourable to the advance of Socialism. It is moving rightwards in internal, as well as foreign, policy. Its internal policy has retreated a great deal from the progress of the revolution; it has killed almost all the Communists. The Iraqi leadership has a programme similar to that of the Chinese for 'a great country'. In pursuit of this, it tries to gain advantage from the dispute between the Workers States and imperialism, and from the weakness of the Communist movement. It hopes for the support of both imperialism and the Soviets. It counts on the fact that neither side will act against it.

The Iraqi action of attacking Iran is an extension of the policy pursued by the Chinese. It is eased by the indecisive and superficial policy of the Iranians who do not move the revolution forwards either. The Iranians proposed to make themselves the

centre of the Arab world, and that is a stupidity. It is not possible.

Neither the Yanks nor the Soviets want an all-out war between Iran and Iraq because it could spread dangerously – this would be very inconvenient to the Yanks, and may force them out of this area of the world. The Yanks are also in competition with France and Germany in the region.

The Iraq-Iran war is the product of the local ambitions of the apparatuses of these countries who want to foster a national bourgeoisie. The Iranians, for instance, have stopped the programme of nationalisations and planning. Iraq bases itself on the weakness of Iran to try to grab land which was part of Iraq many years ago. The Iraqi leadership also fears that a very profound revolutionary flux is swelling in Iran, with an influence within Iraq. The ambition of Iraq to have a 'great economic development' is an illusion. Oil, in itself, is not enough to create a great development. It can develop the country considerably, but Iraq cannot be a great country in capitalism. The country would have to be developed with Socialist forms to become 'great'. Only nationalised property, planning, and centralisation of the economy will develop Iraq. Otherwise, to compete with the capitalist system, Iraq would be a non-starter. Any major capitalist country can produce commodities at half the cost of Iraq's. In other words, if Iraq wants

to follow the example of Iran, it must do it on the basis of nationalisation, planning and mechanisation; this cannot be done in private property. Besides, if Iraq wants to create a national bourgeoisie it will have to de-nationalise, return to private property what the revolution expropriated, and hand over finances to them. In Iran, the same applies; Bani-Sadr is also hoping for a national bourgeoisie based on local manufacturing. But, for the same reasons, this will not be.

All the backward countries have the same problem. Bolivia and Argentina are cases in point. Peron in Argentina developed industry in order to develop the national economy. This was not done at the cost of agriculture and cattle-raising, because Peron truly tried to develop industry. If the present Argentinean leadership wants to develop, it will have to abandon the whole of industry again, and there is no progress in agriculture or cattle-raising. There is no development within capitalism. Any country in this situation, wanting to achieve a development in the hands of the bourgeoisie, finds no place in world trade; it is kept out. The Yanks, the Soviets and the West Germans can assemble cars at ten per cent of the cost and ten times more durability than Argentina or Iraq. So, there is no place in the world market for such bourgeoisies.

The Iran-Iraq war cannot last historically, because it is not a real war. Neither side wants a real war

either. If this war continues there will be a pro-Shah coup in Iran, because the army in Iran still has a completely reactionary character. Also, there will be a reaction, because the left Muslims have considerable weight in both countries. Many Communists and others have been killed in Iraq but the left Muslims have represented a very profound movement since 1968. In the eyes of the present Iraqi leadership, war is survival. It hopes to justify itself and whip up support for itself by saying that the country is in danger. These are bourgeois means and hopes. They say that they are going to recover the territories previously owned and, therefore, start making a 'great country'. It is a completely bourgeois ambition.

The Soviets have no great influence in the region and therefore try to pursue a policy of exerting pressures on both countries to yield. Saudi Arabia supports Iraq, but not totally because of its own internal situation. There have been important opposition movements in Saudi Arabia, like this fight at Mecca. Even if provocateurs were involved, this uprising was genuine in a country which amounts to nothing more than petroleum, and where the people live and work in dirt.

The Soviets are learning to intervene towards these nationalist movements but with considerable slowness, because there is already a well-developed apparatus that blocks them. It is an apparatus in

Iraq of the sort there was in Egypt before. The Iraqi revolution in 1968 was a little before the death of Nasser. The revolution killed the sort of people who are now in the leadership of Iraq. This is the result of the instability of these leaderships. But capitalism, however, cannot use this instability. Previously capitalism called the tune always. Now, capitalism cannot impose itself on either, in that region or elsewhere. There is going to be progress in Iran or Iraq during this war or afterwards.

The Iraqi revolution did not generate an adequate leadership. The Communist were weak and had mistaken policies. This meant that militants and cadres were lost, killed. Also the formation of a revolutionary Muslim leadership remains limited, because it does not have the economic and social principles necessary to develop the economy. The Iraqi process shows what happens when there is no Party. The war Iraq has unleashed is partially to conceal its weakness. It is not excluded that a coup was in preparation against Saddam Hussein when he embarked upon it. The Soviet's policy is impeded by the fact that there is no decisive Communist Party in either Iraq or Iran. The Iraqi Communist Party and the Iranian were quite strong at one time or another, but they have been very repressed.

It is clear that the cliques governing both these countries are trying to form a national bourgeoisie, instead of seeking to unite for economic and social

development. All they are concerned with is their interest. They both have basically bourgeois positions. These countries have no perspective at all under capitalism. They have oil but nothing else. The Shah of Iran had more oil profits than the two countries put together now.

The Soviets intervene with caution, but they have answered an appeal of Bani-Sadr and declared that they were opposed to the Iraqi invasion. This is important because the risk exists of Iraq turning entirely towards the Yanks. They will not find this easy because of the reaction of the masses, the Arab bourgeoisies, and of the Soviets. But the risk exists. Iraq and Iran are both progressive and anti-imperialist countries.

The Soviets have followed a correct policy, but they have given no real explanation of the causes of this war. The European bourgeoisie, the French, German and Italian, are filled with panic at the possibility that it will spread.

Iraq is playing the game of the Yanks although only partially. They do this because it is convenient for them to play in part the role of the Shah. They have murdered Communists but they cannot win the war. They can succeed in occupying part of the territory in dispute but they cannot win the war, and the Soviets will intervene to prevent an issue unfavourable to them.



The present Iran-Iraq war is not going to be concluded in two days. It is an old project of Saddam Hussein of Iraq to make himself 'big' and play the role of the Chinese – in all this he follows the Chinese. It is a completely mad and stupid policy which only the Yanks can support, and do. Thus, the Iranians denounced the Yanks and said that they have been attacked by the Iraqis in zones which only the Yanks knew about from previous relations with the Shah.

The Soviet's refusal to supply any more arms to Iraq is a real blow, because the Yanks cannot supply the Soviet spare parts and they do not find it easy to arm the Iraqis entirely with new weapons, aircrafts and technicians. The issue of this type of war will not be decided by weapons but by reason. If Iraq wins and captures the oil-fields, it will need to spend all the finance it has, and double that, to maintain them. Oil will have to be brought to ports that will remain in the hands of the Iranians. Like the Chinese leadership, the Iraqis cannot see anything objectively. Imperialism partially foresaw this situation and decided not to intervene. The Soviets tend to intervene towards both countries, explaining that this is a crazy war, and that it has to finish because imperialism is the only beneficiary.

There are underlying disputes and problems that come from a long time back – like the problem of the Kurds. These will not go away by one or the

other winning the war, but by the wholesale elimination of the capitalist system. There are Kurds in Turkey, in the USSR, in Iraq and Iran, and as far away as Greece. It is a nationality that extended in all sides and it is impossible to give its problems a national solution. The Kurds are being utilised by both Iraq and Iran as pawns in their struggles, and also against the Turks. National, religious and territorial disputes cannot be entertained and fomented as they were at the time of the British. There are Workers States today which show how to resolve them.

Saddam Hussein launched this attack with the conviction that there was going to be an uprising in Iran against the revolution. But the people of Iran did not do that. The Soviets have intervened and, by their very example, they show that capitalism does not resolve problems. This fact limits the aspirations and pretensions of the Iraqis.

There is going to be no victor or vanquished in this war. Imperialism and world capitalism will try to benefit to the maximum from this situation, but the Soviets will also. There is no great inter-capitalist struggle because imperialism tries to secure oil supplies for itself. This is a pretext of course. What they actually want to do is to occupy militarily and gain the support of the European bourgeoisies for this policy. However, the Germans and, above all, the French are not agreed – because this war is

against their own interests, and if the Yankees gain too much advantage they will use it against the European bourgeoisies.

The structure of capitalist relations is weak and has led to this conflict between two Muslim countries. It is going to continue because the Muslim world is developing more socially than scientifically or politically. But social development will prevail against arms, because social development, and not weapons, is the basis for scientific and cultural development.

This war is an initiative of the Iraqis but it could have been triggered off by anything. It indicates the lack of understanding on the part of these leaderships. At the same time, imperialism is impeded from intervening because it has differences with both countries. It is evident that any attempt at intervention by the Yanks will be rejected by one, as much as by the other. The German capitalists have already said that 'it is not necessary to intervene'... The internal differences in the capitalist system are very serious indeed. It is not a decisive factor in global confrontation between capitalism and the Workers States, but it does limit the capitalists' ability to react and create situations. No such difference beset the Workers States or the Communist movement. On the contrary, Berlinguer (General Secretary, Italian Communist Party) has changed the position of the Italian Communist Party

on Afghanistan. He said that it is justified for the Soviets to intervene 'to secure their borders'. Previously the Communist Party has condemned absolutely the intervention in Afghanistan.

The social structure of every country in struggle has to be considered in order to determine what the position is. It is not always as simple as finding out who the attacker was, and who was being attacked. In social structure, Iraq is more advanced than Iran, and almost all the Iraqi economy is nationalised. But it has a backward leadership of a Chinese type which is seeking to plunder the social structure. It is necessary to remove this leadership without damaging this structure which is close to the Workers State. It is the leadership that has to be eliminated. It has the same ambitions and basis of existence as the Chinese – which is the lack of a centralised world revolutionary leadership. Only in such conditions could a leadership like that of Iraq, or of China, arise.

The Iraqi leadership is murderous, and maintains itself by shooting opponents who seek to advance. This leadership continuously impedes the progress of the left. It is a bureaucracy of a Stalinist type. It murders and assassinates to maintain an apparatus linked to capitalism. At the same time, this leadership fears the actions of the Party and of the masses quite a lot. This is why the Iraqi leadership now talks of the need to negotiate 'without either

the Yanks or the Israelis intervening' when they are actually allied to Israel and when the Yanks have intervened directly in support of the Iraqis. It is all a piece of theatre. This is a bureaucratic apparatus that wants to become the ruler of the entire region, supporting itself on the structure of a country close to the Workers State.

The Iraqi leadership has ambitions which correspond to that of a class, whilst it is not a class. In turn, the Iranians do not give a more profound response because there is no leadership in Iran. However, a leadership will arise in the future because the Iranian masses are learning a great deal.

The existence of these types of movements is the product of this epoch of history. These are no longer dominated by capitalism but are not yet in the sphere of the Workers State. Thus, a number of rather anti-capitalist nationalist leaderships arise, very similar to the leaderships of the Workers States of China and Albania. They have national conceptions close to the bourgeois one, in the defence of national interests, the aspiration to a 'great development' inspired by the possibilities offered by a Workers State or a near Workers State. Although this cannot last for very long, these leaderships arise and follow a national policy submitted to the interests of world capitalism.

The intervention of Iraq against Iran was launched to prevent the Iranian revolution from influencing Iraq, not to recover lands that this same Iraqi leadership had agreed to leave to Iran in a pact signed in 1975 with Khomeini himself. So the land question is a pretext. We are dealing with bureaucratic sectors which have the same social sense, in their formation, as the Stalinist bureaucracy. They developed in conditions very different from Stalin, but ended up defending caste interests, like him. The dream they have, to develop the country, is impossible, even if they are the second oil producer in that part of the world, after Saudi Arabia. There is a very limited development in Iran, limited to the leading cliques. These see the danger of revolution spreading in Iran, and it threatens them. This is the reason why they kill the Communists.

These military actions are not taken to defend principles, ideas or Socialist development, but the bureaucratic interests of the leadership. Hence the Soviets are taking the position of refusing to sell arms to the Iraqis even though there was a previous agreement to do so. If at times Khomeini attacks the Soviets, it does not negate the fact that the Soviets are against the Iraqi invasion. For the moment, the Soviets do not go much farther than this, but they defend Iran.

The position that answers this situation is to make a campaign for an agreement and call for the unity of the two countries, on the basis of the Workers State.

This war is the result of an absence of world revolutionary leadership. In particular, the Iraq-Iran war concerns problems which are going to be superseded. It has to be seen, also, that the differences between the Arab powers are going to deepen. The problem of religion exists but it is not a question of different gods. It is a problem of different social interests. The Iranian masses have carried out their revolution in pursuance of social improvements, and not to follow Allah.

Iraq has nationalised almost everything, but there is a clique in its leadership similar to that in China. However, in both cases, there are profound internal conflicts. In 1968 the Iraqis nationalised practically everything – the oil fields, in particular. The small industrial sector also belongs to the state in Iraq and most of the land. There is still the social weight of remaining land-owners; it is quite considerable. But, as a whole, Iraq has a structure that is moving towards the Workers State. The leadership does not correspond to it – it is as murderous as that of Stalin. They have arrested and killed thousands of Communists, and they did the same to all revolutionaries and opponents.

In a general sense, problems like the Iran-Iraq war are the result of the intensification of the world crisis. Capitalism, having decided to launch the world war, has not been able to do so. On the other hand, the Workers State camp does not have a sufficient policy to inspire the emergence of the necessary leaderships in the revolutions. But the Iraq-Iran problem divides the capitalist world, not the Workers States. Capitalism is united against the revolution, but the Iraq-Iran war increases its divisions and its insecurity. All the capitalist countries should have been united against the Workers States in accordance with their historic interests; every day that they do not unite means another revolution. Any revolution, even when it arises from a superficial structure, without any material resources moves towards Socialism and Socialist objectives. This shows that capitalism has no authority in the world.

The advance of the world revolution cannot be contained. The development of leaderships does not correspond to this advance, and this is why such wars happen. If there is not a conscious leadership, then limited and local interests predominate, limiting the scopes of the revolution. This is true of the present Iraqi leadership. If the world Communist parties developed a programmatic and political life, they would help the creation of cadres throughout the world, enormously.



The joint declaration by the Iraqi and Iranian Communist parties for the end of the war and against the intentions of the Iraqi government is very important. It represents a progress because the Iraqi Communists now confront the bourgeois interests of their leaders, of Hussein. In other words, it is against the interests of the bourgeoisie and its government. Previously, the Communists supported the local bourgeoisies – but this present resolution takes objective progress into account and not the interests of the national bourgeoisie. Still, this resolution does not say what to do to end the war, and afterwards. It is necessary to expel Iraq from Iran to start with. This is true but insufficient. An appeal must be made to the masses of both for unification against the bourgeois objectives of the war.

The two Communist parties must appeal to the masses of their own country, and of the other country, for the struggle for Socialism; it is not essential to attack Khomeini in Iran, and one must pose instead how to struggle for Socialism, how to unify in Socialism, and give explanation as to the reasons for the existence and nature of these problems.

The European capitalist countries have opposed the intervention of the Yankees in the region. It is partly because they fear that, if the Yanks impose themselves, they will have the upper hand in the oil

trade – diminishing the ability of European capitalism to compete. Partly, they fear that an intervention of imperialism will accelerate the stages towards the war. They would like to survive, because the war is the end of all bourgeoisies. They want to believe that they can go on without war breaking out.

In the Iraqi leadership, a retreat takes place in the team that emerged in the 1968 revolution. They proceeded to liquidate those who fought for the process that brought them to power, various ministers among them. This is because they do not want to move towards the Workers State with which they feel no sympathy. These leaders took the structure built by others, socially and economically, as an instrument for the furtherance of their own sectional interests. As there is no developed bourgeoisie, they take over the function of the bourgeoisie without being bourgeois. Their problem remains that, in order to support and sustain themselves, they must perpetuate nationalised property whilst they seek to increase privileges and make more and more concessions to imperialism.

These are problems which will be repeated elsewhere. For example, if the Rumanian leadership had more internal confidence, they would do the same as the Iraqi leadership has done. This leading sector in Iraq can appear where there is a very high accumulation of wealth and little bourgeois social

base. We are dealing with technocrats of the state apparatus. If the proletariat had more weight, it would stimulate sectors among them. But the proletariat has no such weight. In Latin America, for example, this may not happen because there is no such acute accumulation of wealth, there is a very great social separation and a tradition of anti-imperialist struggle. So there are not the ingredients to repeat this experience in Latin America. But, in the Arab countries, the revolutionary antecedent is very recent, and this is another factor why a war like this has arisen between Iraq and Iran.

The nature of these problems has to be analysed and understood. Iraq is closer to the Workers States because the main centres of production are nationalised. This nationalised structure of Iraq must be defended, but the leadership of Iraq has to be overthrown. Iran also has quite a lot of nationalised production, and a bourgeois leadership. The Iraqi leadership will have to come closer to that of a Workers State, because of the structure upon which it rests. It is the same in China. In China there is a gang of assassins comparable to those in Iraq. But they are at odds with the state they rest upon, and they are therefore bound to fail. An assessment of the character of these leaderships has to be made in order to understand what they represent. Socially, the Iraqi leadership rests on a

structure more favourable to be changed in favour of the Workers State than that of Iran.

The Iranian revolution has moved forwards very much, but there is a violent internal struggle in which they try to obliterate all traces of Communists, Socialists, and the left in general, and create a bourgeoisie. As they cannot have a bourgeoisie, they are drawn into utilising the Ayatollah. However, he does not represent the authentic content of the Iranian revolution because behind the Ayatollah there is a process that goes towards the Workers State – not towards the capitalist system.

The Iranian revolution is a revolution stopped by internal conflict - and the hope of Iraq is going to abort it in favour of a pro-Shah movement. The Soviet Union made agreements with Iraq because it had achieved a structure generally in line with a Workers State. These agreements were correct, and it is essential that they are maintained. However, it is also essential to overthrow the present leadership in Iraq. Since there is a progress in the social and economic structure in Iraq, this must be maintained – it is the leadership that has to go. Iran, on the other hand, is more distant from the Workers state. It is a revolution in process, and a situation in which the Communists and Socialists are being suppressed. However, it is also a situation in which the revolution still advances. The Iraqi leadership

has to try to contain the process in Iran because, if not, there would be progress in the Iranian revolution with all the consequences this would have in Iraq.

Iran has also nationalised a lot of its economy. It means that the passage to the Workers State in Iran will not be very difficult. This is why right and centre factions try so hard to contain the process, prevent it from going farther. An appeal must be made from Iran to the Iraqi masses, calling for the overthrow of the Hussein government, the defence of nationalised property, and making an agreement to unite the economies of both countries on the basis of the most progressive economic forms, which are those of Iraq.

An appeal must be made for a programme to deepen the process of nationalisations in Iran, and to take over the land. The big bazaars have to be nationalised also, whilst the smaller ones may remain in private hands. In Iran a bourgeoisie is not being formed. In capitalism, a bourgeoisie was formed on the basis of production and finances. The development in Iran is on the basis of the bazaar, which allowed some concentration of capital but there is no great production of finance sector. Hence what capitalist development there is is based on the bazaar and the land. The bourgeoisie has nothing else. Large scale production is in the hands of the state, and only small factories remain outside.

There is no room for a bourgeois development in Iran.

The Iraqi attacks have to be opposed with appeals for unification aimed at the masses of Iraq, the parties of the left, and also the government. It is necessary that the masses see that appeals are being aimed at the government as well. Appeals have to be made to the Arab world to intervene, proposing a struggle for the most elevated progress: nationalisation and planning in both Iran and Iraq. Syria and Libya also have most of their economy nationalised, and they support Iran. This frightens the Iraqi government, because Syria and Libya have an immense influence in Iraq. An appeal must be made to open the discussion, with appeals to the Arab countries for a United Front on the basis of nationalisations and planning, with full political freedom for the progressive parties.

**J. POSADAS**

24.09.80

---

## **FUNCTION AND ROLE OF REVOLUTIONARY GUERRILLA MOVEMENTS**

**J POSADAS, 1.3.1981**

The guerrilla did not originate with the outbreak of the war against the Nazis but during the Second

World War. Guerrillas started from the anti-Nazi and anti-capitalist liberation movements: Polish, Czechoslovak and Yugoslav. They expanded in 1943 after the Soviet Union informed the world that the victory of the masses at Stalingrad was 'the work of Lenin'.

The defeat of the Nazis began at Stalingrad. The guerrilla movement of the Second World War was a direct consequence of the struggle of the Soviets. The initiative came from the Soviets, and this gave the impulse to organise the anti-Nazis resistance movements in each country of Europe.

The guerrilla movements in France, Italy and Yugoslavia were not the first of their kind. The first impulse came from the USSR. Afterwards, guerrillas formed in Yugoslavia under Tito. Tito, with very few people, formed a guerrilla movement supported by the Soviets. This was the role of Tito. He organised the guerrillas, not to defend just a country, but to smash capitalism and build the Workers state of Yugoslavia.

The guerrillas were animated by the social-historic sense of the necessity to transform society, and this, under the influence of the Soviet Union. In France, and above all in Italy, there were guerrilla movements of resistance to the Nazis, which acted rather in the name of the bourgeoisie. But their effect, particularly in Italy, changed greatly after the

war. The Italian Constitution contains a series of conquests obtained by guerrilla struggle. The important thing to understand is that these movements, and the resistance to the Nazis, came about through the intervention of the Soviets without whom there would have been no such resistance.

The guerrilla movement after the war did not come from the particular or local conditions of each country. It appeared after the victory of the Soviets. The heroism of the guerrillas was very great in spite of their few resources, but the experience of Naples and the uprising of the guerrillas started from Stalingrad, not before it.

The most important guerrilla movement began in the Soviet Union against the Nazis. The Nazis had millions of men in the USSR but they were eventually surrounded. The German soldiers were terrified to stray a few yards because they saw a whole population mobilised against them. This gave the cultural and social basis for the creation of resistance movements in all the other countries.

**The soviet masses  
demoralised the Nazi army**

The Soviet resistance produced some of the most moving events in the history of humanity. The



mother with six sons, dying from hunger, kept food for those producing arms. There are scenes not depicted in any film, theatre or poem, which became the inspiration of the guerrillas. The actions of the children, mothers, sons, fathers, brothers and grand-parents of the Soviet Union inspired the world's people. It was necessary to choose between eating and giving food to the guerrillas. The Soviet people gave food to the guerrillas and the soldiers of the Red Army without argument. There was no water, but the little there was, was distributed fairly. When wounded fighters were lying a few yards from the Nazis, the children went to fetch them. The Nazi High Command was frightened of the influence of the Soviets on the German soldiers. The German soldiers knew that, if they were made prisoners, they would be very well treated and were not afraid of it. Many German soldiers were glad to be made prisoner and gave themselves up with a laugh. When they were captured it was a kind of going over to the Soviets; the Germans had had enough of the war. At the end of it, German soldiers captured by the Soviet population were given cigarettes and food. This absence of rancour on the part of the Soviet people, who were short of food themselves was a feature all through the war and it had an enormously demoralising effect on the Nazi army.

During the siege of Stalingrad, a large number of German officers began to doubt about the war. The Nazi commanders had to shoot officers who did not want to fight and rebelled against this social madness, killing millions because the Soviet people were liquidating fascism. The base of this influence came from the Soviet people, who had demonstrated the quality of human confidence like giving help to the German soldiers at the same time as showing absolute determination to fight to the last. This destroyed the Nazis from within.

The resistance movement in the Second World War originated in this experience of the Soviets. Tito in Yugoslavia organised a guerrilla movement but with a Communist principle.

There are very fine aspects of the life of Tito when he was a guerrilla fighter. The guerrilla was indeed established by the Yugoslavs themselves, but the Soviets intervened to support them; it is not true that the Soviets did not. The Soviet Army launched direct attacks against the Nazis, as well as actions in neighbouring areas, in order to divide the Nazis and help the Yugoslavs. Stalin did not like Tito, but the High Command of the Soviet Army – not Stalin – saw what to do militarily, and acted as a function of what had to be done militarily.

Tito received an immense support from the very poor Yugoslav peasants, but the triumph of Tito is

the result of the existence of the Soviet Union. In his turn, Tito incorporated the boldness, the sense of strategy, military capacity and political ability of a small nation that was determined to confront the Nazis, where the bourgeoisie – directly allied to the king – was no better than the Nazis.

The basis of the guerrilla movement in the Second World War was not patriotism but love for humanity, which was influenced by the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Elsewhere, Mao Tse Tung had organised the Chinese guerrillas and the 'Great March'. Regardless of what political differences one may have with Mao, it must be said that this was one of the greatest feats in history and that, without this, there would be no Chinese Workers State today. One may have all manner of differences with Mao, but the fact is that the guerrillas of Mao defeated British, Yankee and Japanese capitalism.

At a later period, the guerrilla movement of Fidel Castro came to form part of the most moving experiences of history. In the first place, it was started with people with a wealthy background: Guevara, Fidel and many others. They were sons of landowners, proprietors, and business people who were won to a scientific understanding. The life of the Cuban guerrillas in the Sierra Maestra was a beautiful expression of Communist sentiments. Even when they were surrounded, Batista was incapable

of motivating his army to enter the sector held by the guerrillas, who often escaped. These events form part of the history of the guerrilla movement. In Europe, they do not think this is so and, in Italy, they treat the Cuban experience as if it had nothing to do with the guerrilla experience previously made in Europe.

The structure of the process of history rests on the social aspiration of the people to overcome; this is obtained by means of social transformation. In China, for example, the people did it in war conditions, by means of the guerrillas seizing the land. One cannot talk of 'guerrillas' in the abstract. A guerrilla is defined through its historic role; it has a base of support in social transformation. Even though they did not pose this in the beginning, the guerrillas meant social transformations anywhere where they arose in the world. From 1927, everyone knew in China that Mao's guerrilla movement meant to change society. Fidel Castro supported himself partially on the experience of Mao, but also on the military leadership of Trotsky and the Bolsheviks – although Castro himself does not have a clear notion of it. The Cuban guerrilla movement was not a mad escapade, but something rooted in these experiences.

The discussion on the guerrillas is important to understand the manner in which society is transformed. The guerrilla movement is not an

abstract thing, but part of a historic finality. There are no more bourgeois guerrilla movements. Those who have bourgeois objectives, like UNITA in Angola, are nothing more than counter-revolutionaries with no worth and no support. The Chinese, after the Bolsheviks, are the most experienced in guerrilla warfare. But, when they tried to use this against Vietnam, they failed miserably. No guerrilla can work against the grain of historic reason. 'Historic reason' means people understand and see the course of progress.

The experience of guerrilla struggle is not something to contemplate or recollect. Every historic process, either of the past or the future, needs to be considered specifically. The function of thought is to seek how events were, and how one can learn from them. If Trotsky were alive today, he would act infinitely better than he did in the Civil War, because the conditions are easier today. But things had to be the way they were because, in their times, the Bolsheviks had no bullets and they had to make the most audacious actions to get weapons and bullets for the war.

We analyse history to prepare ourselves for a continuation of this process which occurred with the Second World War. Conditions are not the same now, but the historic bases have the same roots as before: popular action to transform history. Actions become less popular, in the sense that they are

increasingly directed by leaderships, but they are 'popular' when they receive popular support. The populations intervene, and the intervention of the guerrillas shows that the populations want to intervene in social transformations. When leaderships and parties are allowed, they expropriate the population so that it can no longer intervene. When this happens, the apparatuses of the parties exclude the population and control instead of it.

In the coming war, however, there is not one apparatus that will be able to contain the intervention of the population. It's enough to consider the experience of the First and Second World Wars. Each time round, the apparatuses have lost against the capacity of humanity, and the greater depth of its understanding. The people have acquired a greater consciousness.

When the children of Nicaragua and of El Salvador come to lead the revolution, it is because the conditions have improved since the 'Four Days of Naples'. All the children have some 'Neapolitan' blood today. But the blood of Neapolitans was Soviet, meaning that the children were not strictly the result of Naples.

**From 1917, war between classes  
became war against the ruling class**

Guerrillas have existed since the origin of humanity. One form of it developed in Europe as a resistance of the peasants, and later of the bourgeoisie, against feudalism. In Latin America, there were guerrillas operating against the Spanish and British occupation. However, the guerrilla movements of today are different. Today, these movements must struggle for social transformations which eliminate every form of private property. The intention of the other guerrilla movements was to transfer property from one sector or the other. The struggle today is to throw out private property altogether.

The guerrilla movement is an indispensable part of historic progress. In origin, the guerrilla movement may have various objectives. But those who are important seek social transformation and represent the necessity of the population to progress. In part the guerrilla movement was created because there was no other way. Wars are the medium through which problems were resolved against top sectors that dominated society. But the war the Soviets wage is not a common war, it is a form of the revolution; the Soviet Union, when it defends or when it attacks, does it to impel revolution. You cannot judge an uprising or a guerrilla in itself, but through their objectives. When two capitalists make war, it is justified to be

opposed to both, unless it is convenient for the progress of history to support one against the other!

The progress of human history is accomplished through the class struggle, either directly between classes or within one class. Starting from 1917, war between classes led to war against the ruling class. This is one of the essential fundamentals of history in this stage, which has never happened before. The existence of the USSR has transformed history, and the wars have changed in character. History was one thing without the USSR; it is another with it. This was clear in 1939 and it will be completely clear in the next war.

In 1939 Stalin did not see this and vacillated. This led him to exert pressure on Tito and on Mao Tse Tung to conciliate with capitalism; they both opposed him. Then Stalin made the Yalta and Teheran agreements in the name of the Soviet Workers State, but the latter carried on advancing. This led to the defeat of the capitalist system.

The original objective of the Second World War was not to damage the capitalist system, but it created social contradictions between the capitalists which went on developing up to the antagonism of the Soviet Union with all the capitalist countries. The populations united with the USSR, and overthrew capitalism in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In the next war,



despite all the atomic bombs that will be used, humanity is going to rise against capitalism. Even people who are victims of radiation will continue to be concerned for the progress of history, for as long as they will survive. They will not withdraw within themselves to preserve themselves, but act in this way because humanity has already reached the level of consciousness that the progress of history is Socialism.

Some guerrilla movements at the service of reaction are no longer guerrilla but armed gangs. The guerrillas are united to human progress. The historic significance in this stage of the guerrilla movement has changed because it has the Workers State as a starting point. Stalin did not think that the Workers State would spread to other countries during the Second World War. But Trotsky foresaw it. In the next war, there is going to be a guerrilla movement, a hundred times more powerful than the last. In the next war, which the Yanks are preparing, the population will organise guerrilla movements instantaneously.

**The guerrillas are  
instruments of social transformation**

The experience of the guerrilla struggle in Vietnam represents its most elevated phase. Before this, it happened in China. We must have a great regard

for the guerrillas of Mao, because China was one of the most brutally backward countries – where people had no right whatsoever and, in spite of it all, Mao organised the guerrillas to transform the country. The guerrilla movement today, on the basis of Vietnam, incorporates guerrilla actions with a clear programme for social liberation. In other words, the objective of the guerrilla today is no longer purely one of armed struggle but of social liberation. Take, for example, two types of guerrilla struggles, Algeria and Vietnam. In Algeria, the idea of social liberation was not the aim at the beginning of the struggle. Vietnam, on the other hand, had a guerrilla leadership prepared with guerrilla methods, because there was no other way, but its aim was social liberation from the start.

The guerrilla movement – revolutionary guerrillas for social transformation – is an indispensable part of human activity. This is expressed, above all, in times of war, when the population rises. The guerrillas stem from that. The next guerrilla, in the nuclear war, will be the way in which revolutionary power will be expressed. However, the most elevated form of struggle for human progress will be the way in which revolutionary power will be concentrated in the Soviet Union. In 1917, it was already the most elevated form of struggle, which combined forms of the guerrilla struggle with revolution and war. It was all combined, because

there was the political leadership which had an objective and knew how to reach it. A great part of the capacity of that political leadership was the ability to persuade and win part of the enemy. The behaviour of the population, the superiority of revolution, and the heroism of the workers - together with the objectives proclaimed - deeply affected the consciousness of the soldiers and all those who saw the appalling backwardness of Russia. The activity of the Bolsheviks was aimed at this.

The Czar, as Somoza in Nicaragua later, wanted to maintain power by force and the imposition of military dictates based on fear: stimulate individual egoism and instil fear. But the result was that the sons and daughters - who saw their mothers being killed because they were revolutionaries - continued to struggle instead of being struck rigid with fear by such a deed. The reasoning of those children was no longer informed by the sentiment of the property of 'my parents' and it was the same with the parents regarding their children. They developed the sentiment of the human being as part of humanity, and no longer regarded each other as property. Capitalism cannot understand any of this. In the next war which capitalism even now prepares, millions of people will display this type of behaviour, in action, every day. People will be guided by human sentiments and not by those of being a

woman or a man, a son or a father. It is not that people will have abandoned these sentiments, but that their capacity of decision will be based on something superior to it but which includes it. They will act not as members of a family but as a result of seeing the necessity to change life.

J. POSADAS

1 March 1981

---

**THE NUCLEAR WAR  
AND THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF  
MARXISM**

**J POSADAS, 25.12.1963**

(Extracts from: *'The Fundamental Problems of Marxism'*, 23.12.1963)

The class struggle generates revolutionary struggle. This makes it possible to foresee, organise harmoniously the destruction of capitalism and the construction of Socialism. Capitalist society engenders the proletariat as a force it could not do without, but the proletariat was in contradiction with capitalism. Capitalist society did not welcome the idea, but it could not negate the proletariat without destroying itself. The proletariat developed with the development of capitalism. The existence of the

proletariat – a contradictory force – is an intrinsic necessity for the existence of capitalism.

At a given moment, the actual numerical weight of the proletariat ceased to be the only factor in opposition to capitalism, when the conscious factor was created; whilst the proletariat, as a class today, develops less than capitalism it acquires the consciousness that it is possible to do without capitalism. Then the consciousness of the proletariat becomes a more powerful instrument than its strength in numbers.

Who is going to win in the struggle between the proletariat and capitalism? Capitalism has the material force, but it is a contradiction between its class and society, and the proletariat and productive forces. There is a contradiction inside the structure of production, the regime of production and the regime of property. More precisely, there is a contradiction in capitalism between a regime of production that has become 'socialised' and individual appropriation. This puts a definite limit on production. This historic contradiction has to be resolved in the way that either the collective, 'socialised' form dominates production, or individual appropriation becomes the decisive factor. There is no contradiction in history that has not been resolved but by the triumph of one or the other of its opposing poles.

This essential contradiction has to be resolved. Capitalism harnesses every means it can to resolve it in its favour. It produces laws, repressions, persecutions and, above all, wars to this end. The first act of capitalism is always to eliminate its competitors. This, of course, resolves nothing in relation to the contradiction between social production and individual appropriation. This essential contradiction goes on and grows; it creates the bases for an antagonism to develop between capitalist society and the working class. This contradiction does not go away because neither one – the bourgeoisie – nor the other – the proletariat – can be eliminated whilst the capitalist system continues.

The contradiction, we refer to, eventually leads to antagonism. Thus, capitalist society is contradictory and antagonistic. The antagonistic factor lies in the existence of the working class. This continues to increase during a short historic period until the inevitable conflagration explodes between the antagonists who had co-existed with each other. A solution is found to the original contradiction if one or the other – capitalism or the proletariat – triumphs.

The precise moment when antagonistic forces enter the final collision is called 'revolution'. Marx

and Engels were able to elaborate the principles of the Party, the International, programme and revolutionary policy, and to visualise the construction of Workers States (Socialist Countries) because they understood this process and dominated its dialectical evolution.

The socio-historic conditions exist to enable us to envisage all this, starting from the basis of the existence of the Workers States. The major hindrance is the bureaucracy in the leadership of the Workers States. It is a factor that creates an immense confusion in the working masses of both the Workers and capitalist States. If the processes of nature are not completely dominated today, it is mainly because the Workers States cannot exercise all their influence, their strength and authority in the world. This is the result of bureaucratic obstacles.

Nevertheless, humanity is no longer dominated by the forces of nature or of production. Today, we harness nature sufficiently to create the forces of production necessary, and we could – if we wanted to – control the weather. In the very near future, after capitalism has been eliminated – at the cost of the nuclear war – humanity will begin again on the basis of all the knowledge it has acquired. Humanity will not start again from zero.

The most important Marxist-materialist conception applies not simply to the class struggle but to the construction of Socialism and to the confidence of the human being and human society in themselves. The continuity of historic human thought concentrates itself, and is called 'confidence'. This confidence arises from the extent of humanity's knowledge of the environment. Class society developed on the basis of the need to defeat the contradiction between providing for all, and the possibility of doing so. Lack of knowledge meant that the human being was limited in relation to nature. This is no longer the case today.

Undoubtedly, nuclear war will destroy a very important part of the scientific achievements of humanity, but it will not destroy the confidence of humanity. This will be the most important factor in historic continuity. Machines will be destroyed, and they will be re-built. What will not be destroyed is the historic confidence accumulated by the process of human thought.

Human thought is the most important and perfect instrument. This is why it cannot be destroyed; it is also why capitalism is filled with fear and foreboding. Indeed, Krutchev, feeling this, has told them: 'The war will be the end of capitalism'. The bureaucracy means to add to this declaration: 'War will be the end of us all', but this is to contain the masses. This is the bureaucracy serving its own



interests. But, then, bureaucracy is idiotic, and has no future.

The masses of Africa, Asia and Latin America live in what amounts to nuclear war now! In Africa, the annual income per head is 15 American dollars, whilst it is 2,500 in the United States. The African masses face continual blows, tortures, oppressions, by all imaginable and most inhuman means that can be thought of, but, in spite of this, they heap defeat after defeat upon capitalism.

The masses do not fear nuclear war. This is the main factor that ensures the continuation of humanity regardless of the numbers that will remain after the nuclear war. There will be a good many people left alive after the nuclear war, and humanity will rapidly make up for the lost time. The nuclear war is the price to be paid because capitalism has no other recourse. If we had to wait for thirty or forty years before advancing to Socialism, in order to avoid nuclear war, we would do it. Unfortunately, it does not depend on us, because capitalism has no other recourse but to war.

Marxism is a synthesis of the class struggle. Its basic tenet is that historic interests motivate how humanity behaves. Nothing in the world can invalidate this conclusion. There are leaders in the USSR and in China who think that imperialism's plans are not the result of their historic interests.

They believe that it is possible to dissuade imperialism from pursuing its class interests and using its nuclear weapons. It is not Marxist to reason in this way. Capitalism must be brought down.

The situation in the Workers States is improving, and the latter intervene increasingly to help the rest of the world to make progress. Behind the Marxist understanding however, and the solutions which it offers, there is the knowledge that what is left of the capitalist system must be brought down. The task therefore is to help with the formation of cadres; to favour the direct intervention of the masses, and to contribute to the formation of mass power organisms. All at once, this demands from the Workers State that it supports the socialist progress of other countries, and its own. Such are the fundamental problems of Marxism today.

The relationship, masses-society-leadership-revolution-nuclear war, is made of elements that cannot be overlooked, separated, or ignored. This is a fundamental problem of Marxism today. Society will not advance further – not even in the realm of scientific knowledge, let alone social knowledge – until it resolves the problem of the continued existence of capitalism. Eighty per cent of all energy and intelligence, and all fruits of thought, are now devoted to the destruction of humanity. Capitalism has reached the point where its sole aim is to

prevent the progress of humanity. The Workers States have no choice but to put all their efforts into defence. All in all, 80% of the energy of humanity is wasted.

Humankind does not advance further in its domination of nature, science and productive forces, because it dedicates the larger part of its strength to military ends. In these conditions, going to the moon responds less to social needs than discoveries in the medical field.

We do not criticise the Soviet Workers State for going to the Moon because this highlights its huge capability. Only, the drive behind such attainments is forced back by the Workers State's need to prepare for the coming conflagration of the final settlement of accounts. The steady approach of the final settlement of accounts swallows up an increasing mass of Workers State's capabilities, scientific, economic and social.

Capitalism concentrates all its forces to secure the first strike against the Workers State. This limits capitalist society too; it stops it developing; not that it was developing very much any more, but now even production in capitalism is stalled.

The Soviet Workers State pours all its resources into defending itself from the world nuclear war that capitalism prepares.

Such are the fundamental problems of Marxism today.

J. POSADAS

25.12.63

---

**THE COMMUNIST PARTIES,  
THE WAR,  
AND THE FUNCTION OF THE SOVIET UNION  
J POSADAS, 2.1.1980**

The final crisis of the capitalist system sharpens, and so also in the Communist parties and the Workers States. But, whilst the capitalist crisis decentralises all its power, in the Workers States it does not. Capitalism has to confront the Workers States but cannot choose the moment in which to concentrate and strike. In the Workers States there is very great progress in centralised planning. In the Communist parties and the Workers States there is a very great progress towards understanding this stage of history. They fear the war, they want to impede it and avoid it, but, at the same time, they put forward programmes and conceptions tending towards the conclusion that war will mean revolution and social transformation. The world masses reason in the same way.

There is a growing process of integration between the Workers States and the world masses. The masses know that the capitalist system has to be brought down. They see that small countries, like Grenada or Nicaragua, are advancing from social, scientific, technological – and even cultural – backwardness to economic and social development: on the basis of the fact that this has already been done in the world. This knowledge is a dialectical leap.

There is a centre that arouses in all the countries the will of the masses to effect progress. It is the Workers States. The consequences of the crisis of the capitalist system, together with the progress of the Workers States, make the masses of the world mature, mature and mature.

The process is so mature and there is such progress in it that the Soviet Union can no longer remain indifferent to any revolutionary, or even democratic, process tending to historic changes. The USSR says it in its New Constitution. Stalin removed from the Constitution any reference to supporting the world struggle for Socialism and emphasised only 'Socialism in one country'. But the present Soviet Constitution stipulates that the USSR supports all the movements of a national, independent character for national and social liberation. The Soviet Union really has the aim of world Socialism!

The Soviet Union does this to extend itself in the world as a logical necessity. This is what decides the course of history. What decides the course of history is not the atomic war of imperialism, but the logical necessity for the Soviet Union to extend itself in the world. The masses of the world feel and perceive it, and this is the base for their world sentiment of confidence.

The Communist parties continue with an electoral, parliamentary and chauvinistic policy. They do not understand the tactic to adopt, but in the future they will have to. If they do not, the soviets or some other Workers State will have to do it for them, because it is a logical necessity. In the same way as social progress in Bolivia means transforming Bolivia, for the Communist parties social progress has to be the construction of Workers States. They want a national Workers State that will be 'independent', will have nothing to do with any country in the world – they call this pluralism – but they will have to construct the Workers State such as the Soviets or the Chinese have done: a Workers State like all the others. This is the only transformation that will allow the bases for economic, scientific, cultural and technological development.

It may be that the Communist leaderships will then try to detain the process, impede or hinder it; this may be. But they will not be able to oppose it historically. And today this is even more true, because there is already half humanity in Workers States, representing an immense progress and showing how to make progress. Humanity already knows this. Each war is a big impulse to the world experience of people, because it is then that they can intervene.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky showed how revolutions and wars develop acute qualities in the population, of human resolve, love and capacity. These things are not fostered by daily, ordinary life. The revolution develops in the population 'instincts' that are not instincts but sentiments and the basic ingredients for reaching most elevated qualities and scientific level sentiments.

This is the inexhaustible capacity of revolution. The whole population throws itself into action because it feels capable of intervening to organise, decide, construct and lead. It does not intervene to grab, dispute power or take the reins of power, but to organise.

The Communist leaderships do not understand this. The people are going to develop a million initiatives and this has already started in the world. The children of Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, and

particularly of Vietnam, have given the proof that they have the capacity to organise life, that they want to participate and create. They have given the proof already. The war preparations of capitalism are, therefore, at the same time the preparations of human kind to overcome rapidly the most important obstacle in the way of progress: the capitalist system.

This conclusion already exists. The Communist parties should all be discussing it. There are thousands of places and opportunities to discuss this instead of saying 'No' to atomic war. The war will be extremely short. We cannot tell if it will last one month or two, or only a few days or even hours. If it turns out, as the Soviets have said, and the United States are demolished in forty minutes, that will be the duration of the war. There will be a total sense of catastrophe in the world bourgeoisie and its military. However, as this is not imminent one must discuss now and see how to prepare the workers' parties for the ascent of this stage, impelling for example, United Fronts between the Socialists and the Communists in France and Italy.

Capitalism prepares the war in an accelerated way in the midst of its crisis. It is necessary to elevate the political life of the communist parties, and plan out what to do in each country. Not just defending the USSR in the abstract but proposing what to do in each country, impelling the intervention of the



masses in the plans, the leadership, and the discussions of the Party. This way they will learn what to do. This, too, will develop their confidence and, in turn, the masses will learn to make a separation between what a Workers State is and the conduct of its leadership. They will learn to defend, sustain and construct a Workers State whilst fighting, at the same time, for the best possible leadership in it.

It must be shown that the Workers State is not characterised by whatever leadership it has but by its social and economic structure. The Soviet Workers State has had leaderships as distinct from each other as Lenin and the Bolsheviks, and Stalin. But it maintained itself as a Workers State all the way through. The first seven years of the USSR generated the actual structure of the USSR. The masses of the world see and have an idea of all this. What is lacking is a literature of the Communist parties about this. However, in spite of this, the masses have an intuition of it, and they do understand it.

The stage of Stalinism educated the socialist and Communist vanguard in the belief that Stalinism was the logical result of the Workers State. There is no time now to start educating a new world vanguard to see that it is not so. But, yes, there is time enough to educate a part of the Socialist and Communist leaderships and make them see that

historic conditions – not the Bolshevik Party, centralisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat – led to Stalinism.

If the dictatorship of the proletariat generated people like Stalin, it would mean that the USSR was destined to fall to the counter-revolution. But, then, why did this not happen? The Communists don't wonder about this. They remain on a superficial level; even worse, they reach conclusions so bad that they are not even superficial. They do not stimulate scientific conclusions. If the Workers State managed to shake off Stalin, what was the force that allowed it to do so? If the Bolshevik Party was the reason for the rise of Stalin, why did not the USSR return to capitalism?

There are no explanations of this from the Communist leaderships. They have no scientific preparation. Their sentiments and method of analysis are materialist-idealist and even, in part, metaphysical-idealist. None of this prepares them for the war. Those that come closest to the dialectical-materialist method are the Soviets. They have to be so, because they represent the Workers State.

The Communist leaders do not see the real importance of the Soviet vanguard and proletariat. Who took on the Stalin stage? Who prevented counter-revolution? Counter-revolution was

prevented in the USSR by the proletariat. If the proletariat had not resisted, counter-revolution would have come. It did not happen because of this and because Stalin was scared of revolution.

There is a process in history known in literature and science and recognised by the big parties, which is called Thermidor. In a Thermidor, the leadership that made the revolution develops a wing that contains the revolution and starts going backward. The event that brought about the name of 'Thermidor' was the rise of Napoleon on the tail of the French Revolution. In the Soviet Union there were all the necessary ingredients for a Thermidorian process. Why, then, is it that the revolution did not retrace all its steps? A force impeded it. Napoleon, too, was impeded, and he even had to maintain some conquests of the revolution.

So, Thermidor is not the full process of counter-revolution, but a step towards it. Who impeded the Thermidor in the USSR? Who prevented those that got hold of the top posts of the Communist Party from going all the way to counter-revolution, taking all the fruits of revolution for themselves? During the war and the Revolution, a huge layer of technicians and economic experts took command of the Communist Party. Who was to prevent them from getting on with the Thermidor? It is the strength of the Revolution that did it, together with

the weight of the proletariat. Reaction could not continue with Thermidor. Unfavourable world relations of forces allowed Stalin to start the Thermidor process, but the presence of the proletariat stopped him going all the way to counter-revolution. Thermidor is not a counter-revolution; it is an intermediate stage which opens the way to the counter-revolution. This is a scientific analysis.

But the Communist leaders write abstractly. They do not explain anything and some have even reached the conclusion that Stalin resulted from there having been a Bolshevik Party!

All these positions will be superseded because they go against the analysis and evidence of history.

J. POSADAS

02.01.80

---

**THE PEACE MOVEMENT  
AND THE DISCUSSION IN  
THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY  
J POSADAS, 3.3.1981**

The presence of Minucci (one of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party) in the recent Peace Demonstration represents a shift in a wing of the Party. The Party as a whole does not have a programme for this activity, and showed little interest in it. This means that the anti-capitalist sentiments in the Party run very deep and Minucci is obliged to come to this demonstration. These sentiments are expressed in the anti-capitalist opposition and against Yankee imperialism. There must be a very great crisis in the Italian Communist Party (ICP) because there are, in the Party, sectors that support NATO completely!

The weakness of the Italian Communist Party is great, for most of the problems of this stage they have no answer and no policy, no programme and no preparation. The leaderships defend themselves and, in so doing, they impede the Party. They do not want the Party to understand, discuss or be influenced, because the problems of the day are taking them all by surprise. They did not expect things to turn out the way they have. A few years ago, UNITA (paper of the ICP) published on its front page an article of Lucio Libertini which said: 'Say what you like, we have managed to go thirty years without war.' Actually there have been something like seventy wars during that period! But he was writing about Italy and there had been no war in Italy. Clearly the wars in the rest of the world did

not concern him, only Italy. There have been – and there are – nothing but wars in Latin America, Asia and Africa today. These leaders do not take these into account. They have no idea or conception of history. By ‘conception’ we mean a grasp of the fact that, in order to develop, any country has to resolve the problems generated by the subjugation to the capitalist system. These Communist leaders aren’t worried about this. They want to proceed step by step against capitalism but, in the meantime, it re-takes the ground lost - in another form – ten times over. Capitalism, particularly in Italy, has to do so because it is in such a crisis that it cannot have programme, policy or remedy. As to the question of the missiles, capitalism has forced the Italian government to invest the equivalent of triple the income of the country in the purchase of arms. Of course, there is an enormous resistance of the masses. The same is true of capitalist Germany.

There are divisions in the German Social Democracy (SPD). If Germany starts spending all that the Yankees demand of them on arms, it will unleash a very big internal crisis. Vetta (secretary of the German trade union centre) has said that the workers have to be allowed a much greater intervention in the economy, increases in wages and a more equitable distribution. The Yanks, of course, want to block this completely and make Germany invest something like 30,000 million dollars in

armaments. On top of these expenses there is the cost of arms storage and policing, and creating a structure of command for it. In other words, all the apparatus necessary to keep these arms on German soil has to be paid for by Germany. It considerably curtails the capacity of Germany to compete on the world market, and this is exactly what the Yanks want. In this, as in all other things, the Yanks want others to pay for the consequences of the war.

In the midst of the missile debate, the Germans are discussing the need for an agreement with the Soviets, and they plan a gas pipeline. Countries like Italy and Holland will also benefit from it, and the finances will be provided by various capitalist countries. The Soviets have offered to cover their own costs by supplying additional gas. This gas is very cheap and good.

The Communist parties do not discuss any of these problems. They live encircled by fear and they are paralysed. The most resolved of all the large Communist parties is the French; France has a very resolved, political proletariat which is full of initiatives. It is not the same in Italy because the Party has not had the time to return to necessary policies. It is not that the Italian Party is very much different in its origins from the French – Thorez and Togliatti were about the same sort of people. The major difference between them is that, for a whole period during the first stages of the Russian

Revolution and a few years after 1917, Thorez was to all intents and purposes a Trotskyist. In that period, all the great Communist leaders were. They did not understand the programme and the objectives completely, but they were largely Trotskyist. One of the weapons used against Thorez by Communist dissidents was that he had been a Trotskyist; effectively, this was true. The same is true of Togliatti in the first years of the Russian Revolution and for a few years afterwards. These Communist leaders were attracted to Trotsky because they saw revolutionary purity and continuity of thought. It is afterwards that they lost their nerve. All in all, the French Communist Party is one of the most resolved because of a combination of all these factors.

The fact that Mitterrand does not exclude the possibility of Communist ministers in his future government is important. Moreover, he opposes Giscard d'Estaing effectively, and Giscard d'Estaing is an old ally of the Yanks, even though he kept them away in the economic field. His policy was to prevent the bourgeois public from supporting Mitterrand. The workers and the petty bourgeoisie stay around the parties of the left, but the bourgeoisie can be taken away. There is a large sector of the bourgeoisie which will vote for Mitterrand because they fear that, otherwise, there is no possibility of 'recovery' and that the Yanks



may launch the war. The war will be death for the bourgeoisie, and they know it.

The whole policy of the bourgeoisie is conducted as it has always been: against the Communists and Socialists. They do not see that things have changed. Today, they have to confront the Communist movement and the Workers States and, at the same time, confront the competition of the Yanks and of Japan. There is a saturation of the markets, and capitalism has to beg the Japanese to stop exporting cars to the United States. The Japanese continue to do so and have started to export to the whole of capitalist Europe.

There were several thousand people at this Communist Peace Demonstration. It was almost a clandestine demonstration because the advertising campaign had only started the evening before. UNITA (organ of the ICP) printed an article about it in the inside page, in the smallest type. There was no real preparation for it because sectors of the leadership were staunchly opposed and scared at the idea. This sector is more frightened of the Soviet Union than it is of the war. They are insensitive and inflexible. They have no idea of history. It corresponds to the attitude of the Social Democrats who thought that the war would not affect them. On top of this, this sector of Communist leaders does not understand the function of the Soviet Union. For them, the USSR is

just another country – and another capitalist one, in fact! In spite of this, a sector of the Party took the initiative to make the Party demonstrate in public for Peace and it was very well attended, considering. The Party remained, at best silent, at worst opposed.

**What is meant by  
the 'independence' of the Italian Communist Party:**

One of the great boasts of the Italian Communist Party (ICP) is that it is 'independent' of all the super-powers. But this is untrue! They may be organically independent, but they are not independent at all. What decides everything – the ICP included – is a world process with Workers States and imperialism in it. In the matter of Communism, it is the Workers State that decide. To keep saying 'we are independent' is imbecile. There is no room for independence, even if it were a good thing. The process is a one-way street, and at the end you turn left or right. This is the street of the class struggle; it turns either to capitalism or to Socialism. And somewhere along the way – sooner or later – there is the war.

In these circumstances, how is the ICP 'independent' from all the 'super-powers'? If these super-powers were all capitalist, it would be correct to be independent of them. But this is not the case.

We are dealing with the Workers States and capitalism. We know that not all the Communists agree with this, but it is a fact that, where the Soviets intervene, they advance the struggle for progress. So the Communists who want to justify their policy of 'independence', need to hide the struggle for progress. This attitude is doing untold injury to the Italian people.

In spite of this, a demonstration such as this one is anti-capitalist, not anti-Soviet. Peace movements like that of Pasti arise from the Communist Party. This indicates how mature the situation is, and that the problem is the leaders.

It is incorrect to talk about 'super-powers'. This characterisation has been invented by the petty bourgeois sector of the Communist Party and is aimed at the petty bourgeoisie in general, and at a sector of the 'democratic' bourgeoisie in the Christian Democrats in particular. This characterisation indicates the absence of scientific principles in the Communist Party. What the ICP has to say is that they are independent of imperialism, and not of the Soviet Union! This is because the Soviet Union is not a 'super-power'. It is the Soviet Union. The present leadership of the ICP still talks about the Soviet Union as a 'super-power' – which implies a country that dominates and uses its power to crush. The Soviet Union is the country that freed fifteen countries from subjugation – and Italy was

one of them. Many Communists still insist, despite this, that the Soviet Union wants to dominate them and force the 'Russian' language down their throat. They are like a common fellow whose sole concern is his own: his interests, his household affairs. This indicates a Communist leadership alien to the process of history. They aren't prepared. History has already rolled over the idea of 'class struggle', like a strike for more money or better working conditions. The conception the Soviets have of it is infinitely closer to logic and to the thought of Marx.

When the Communist leaders think about the class struggle, they think about wage increases and improvements in work-conditions; Marx talked about 'class and revolutionary struggle'. The class struggle generates revolutionary conditions for the transformation of society. But today's Communist leaders have been by-passed by the process of history. The Communist base, the-rank-and-file, are miles ahead of their leaders. This is why Pasti generated a movement inside the ICP that is against imperialism. Of course, the ICP treated Pasti as an outcast – but when it saw the support he was getting, it sent him a note of support! The ICP finally went along with this Peace Demonstration, and Minucci – of the right wing – turned up to speak. This indicates what is going on inside the Party. Now those who previously insulted Pasti have to keep their peace.

This Communist demonstration was, in part, a competition with Pasti's movement. It is quite a weak response but it is a little like climbing a stair or two to meet Pasti rather than bringing him down. The Communists really have no choice but to attack the Yanks, not the USSR.

In his speech, Minucci kept on reiterating the 'independence' of the communist Party but, when he came to expand on the theme, he had to take a stand against imperialism. In part, the Communist Party had to call this demonstration to prevent Pasti from doing it instead. The ICP wants to keep Pasti within its orbit in order to keep the Party members away from him. However, there was no attack against the USSR during this demonstration. This indicates that the struggle within the Party goes favourably for the USSR. In turn, this will have an effect on the Italian Socialist Party.

A very important development, amongst others in the Socialist Party, is the refusal of the Socialist left to accept sharing state posts and responsibilities with the right-wing leadership. At the same time, the right-wing and part of the centre came to realise that they must keep their links with the left, otherwise they have no attractive power, no political or programmatic justification. This is why they keep their links with the left.

The recent election of delegates to the Socialist Conference was a farce. They operate very much like the Christian Democracy. An investigating judge recently made the accusation that a list of names for thousands of members of the Christian Democrats was eight pages of the telephone directory. The Socialist Party works very much like this. It is quite impossible that the Socialist Party of Italy gained 64% of the votes – whatever Craxi may say.

In all this, the changes in the Italian Communist Party are of prime importance.

J. POSADAS

03.03.81

---

**THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM,  
THE WAR AND THE  
WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT  
J POSADAS, 8.3.1981**

In this stage of imperialism and its war preparations, we must seek to understand the crisis of the Communist parties and the elevation of the world struggles. Remember that imperialism cannot launch that war just where, when and how it likes.

In 1951, Foster Dulles was already preparing for war against the Soviet Union. Before 1945, during the Second World War, French and American leaders accused Churchill of looking for a pact with the Nazis in order to attack the Soviet Union. They were already discussing this question. The Americans opposed that pact at the time, because the last thing they wanted was a stronger Europe competing with the US. They had an interest in the destruction of all Europe, Germany included. They could not know that the Soviet Union was going to develop hugely. For them, the pre-1945 USSR was no immediate danger. It is only when the revolutions developed in Europe, after 1945, that the United States quickly set out to propose the Marshall Plan. The US understood that capitalist Europe should now be shored up against the pressure of the Soviet Union, against the new Workers States of Eastern Europe and against the rising colonial revolution. The United States seized the occasion to take Europe under their 'protection'.

Then capitalist society developed a sense of uncertainty in the future. Its own contradictions and class antagonisms are the cause of this insecurity. When the Workers States were created, the essential aspect of capitalist uncertainty was class antagonism. It was no longer a question only of strikes and struggles but of the construction of a

state – the Workers State – which demonstrated its superiority over capitalism.

According to this logic, the capitalists should have immediately agreed to destroy the Soviet Union: something which they have not been able to do because every capitalist country wanted to destroy the Soviet Union individually and obtain all the advantages of this destruction for itself. This is why they let Hitler attempt to smash the Soviet Union. Hitler hoped that Britain would do it, but the Soviets confronted them all – and triumphed as a historic necessity.

The present stage of history is different because the world is ready for Communism. It is the leaderships who are not yet ready. But, as the world is ready, it is going to find the leadership it needs. This is our function in history. It has an immense perspective and demands the most elevated collective preparation in history, comparable to the preparation of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks. It is necessary to develop this quality. We already have links with, and an open influence on, all the Communist parties of the world.

We seemed to be quite mad a few years ago when we affirmed that conditions were ready in the Workers States to distribute according to need, but recently, the Congress of the CPSU approached this problem, and Fidel Castro also last year. This



example shows the fundamental importance, at this stage, of theoretical capacity and the capacity of the practical organisation of thought to orientate the Communist parties, and make them see the immense perspectives there are. They have no idea of this, because they think that the conditions for change are created in a routine way, as part of the natural wear and tear of the capitalist system.

The Communists see that there is no other way than confront the war capitalism is preparing, but they do not see that war is a logical necessity of a system which 'vomits' war in its agony. This is what we call the atomic 'quagmire' which humanity must traverse. They believe that it is possible to continue to contain imperialism as they did until now, through a mass of compromises. But that is not possible. Much time can pass before capitalism launches itself into war because the Yanks are not alone in deciding, and a section within the heart of American capitalism is afraid. It sees that the war is going to lead to their own end as a system. Capitalism is led by an obscure, blind and fatalistic sentiment, but also by the terror of the real world which is developing, moving forwards and liquidating them.

The big capitalist, above all, thinks as an individual, only thinks of himself and not even of his family (except when it's a question of inheritance), and feels he is the representative of life and of the

world. This mentality is brought about by power and money, establishing all human relations through power. He has the obsession that the world is him. He thinks of himself as a superior being because he leads a life made of money, of investments, of accumulation, and of the increase of capital. He has thousands of properties. What does he do with it all? He cannot live in them all. All his thoughts revolve around the question of money and his life is organised so as to get more. The capitalist has a particular gaze where one reads all his preoccupation for money.

The Communist parties do not understand this process, for they have not been prepared for it. It is necessary to help them understand, to have the quality to learn how to understand. We must accompany them, whatever their attitude towards us. History is arriving at the end of a cycle, and it is necessary to accompany the Communist parties and the Soviet Union, for they are all instruments of history – in particular the Communist parties of Italy, France and Portugal. Also, whatever the leadership or the errors they commit, they must accomplish their historic function – which consists in aiding the transformation of society. Let them say what they will; it is what they must do. Perhaps they will pass through new Communist formations, but their structure is united to the progress of humanity. The Communist militant sees the Soviet

Union is the progress of history, having triumphed over the stage of Stalin. Stalin betrayed revolutions, whereas the present Soviet leadership support revolutions even at the risk of war.

The Soviets now say almost unanimously that the war is possible: 'We do not want it, it is not completely probable, but it is possible.' Even Pajetta (of the Italian Communist Party) expressed himself in this way recently. Before, he said only: 'No to war, it is necessary to struggle for peace'. We also agree, we struggle for peace, but it is capitalism which does not struggle for peace and we cannot force it to do otherwise. If we were able to force it to do that, we would be able to liquidate it as a class.

The Communists, while continuing to say: 'Let us fight for peace', are in process of seeing that war is possible. Berlinger himself repeats this all the time. They say this now without the shame of recalling that they condemned the militants who spoke of the possibility of war even recently, and that they regarded Posadas as a mad dreamer. The Soviets do not pose it as a catastrophe but as the end of capitalism. The North Americans cannot reverse the argument.

We must participate in the communist movement, giving it ideas, tactical and strategic orientations. In this way, we accomplish the function that the

Communist parties do not fulfil and which is absolutely necessary to give a theoretical and political orientation, so that programmatically it is clear what has to be done.

It is fundamental to understand the precise tactic and perspective for this stage. The essential quality of the theoretician is to be able to foresee where the process is going, and to organise it on the basis of the important symptoms. One of the symptoms which is most evident is that imperialism is preparing the war without being able to launch it when it wants. Reagan spits out his missiles, and the Soviets take them on and render them obsolete. This process of crisis of the capitalist system begins to attain its most acute form: confrontation between imperialism and the Workers States. Imperialism wishes to arrive at a confrontation to make the Workers States retreat and win historic time to prepare the war with less risk. This is the imaginary objective pursued by the gang which leads the United States.

Such is their plan, but nothing is less certain. It is not excluded that they will intervene in El Salvador but, when an uprising occurs in a country, the Soviets support it without reserve, while the Yanks are full of doubts. Forty-five Senators have already said: 'Leave El Salvador alone; better to lose it than lose the United States'. Kennedy basically said the same thing: 'We have to look at the longer

perspective to try to save ourselves.’ The greatest imperialism in history, the ogre that ate everybody, has to say to the Soviet Union – like a rat which tries to save itself – ‘Do not hit me’.

We must not overlook the relation of military forces between imperialism and the USSR, but it is the historic necessity of progress that decides, and not weapons. Arms can momentarily stop progress and make it retreat, but this is only transitory. On the eve of the Second World War, Trotsky said that, in the case of a defeat of the Soviet Union and of a victory of capitalism, a retreat in history would occur which would go further back than feudalism, but for a certain time only; he added: ‘In ten years all the internal contradictions of capitalism will emerge again.’

In the regime of the Workers state there are no historic class contradictions. There are contradictions between the need for progress of the Workers State and the interests of the bureaucratic apparatus, but it is the Workers State and not the apparatus that wins. On the contrary in the capitalist regime, nobody wins in the contradictions within the system. They all lose. They have no other logic in upholding their power than brutal violence and force. But what characterises this stage of history is that people decide their destiny and that children intervene massively in revolutions.

J POSADAS

8.3.1981

---

**THE CHINA – USSR  
UNIFICATION IS A FUNDAMENTAL  
NECESSITY TO CONFRONT THE NUCLEAR WAR  
J POSADAS, 29.12.1974**

*(Extracts from The Function of the Working Class, Marxism and the Construction of the Workers State, same date)*

Capitalism prepares the final settlement of accounts; it prepares to resolve the question of the final confrontation system against system by means of the nuclear war.

The tasks then is to combine the preparation of oneself for that war, with the expansion of the world revolution and the development of Soviets everywhere.

One slogan and central preoccupation, as the most fundamental necessity of humanity, is the unification of China, the USSR and all the Workers States. Let the masses of China, the USSR and all the Workers States discuss this matter. 90% of their masses will opt for unification.

The division between the USSR and China is not inevitable. It is the apparatuses that are divided. The masses are not. Of all the apparatuses, the Chinese proves itself to be the most pernicious and the most backward. It is leaving no room for the active participation of the masses. There is a much greater participation of the masses in the USSR. Also, in the Soviet Union, there is a tradition of participation and a real objective and active intervention of the masses. This is one reason why the USSR intervenes in the world process of the revolution, and even in China.

When the Soviet Union made declarations to influence the Chinese, the Chinese (leaders) said: 'The Soviets speak to defend themselves'. We said that it was a lie and that, if there was a morsel of truth in this, it was entirely secondary. The Soviets intervene because the Soviet Workers State has reached a structure that demands a world in its own image, if the Workers State is to exist and progress. When the world has become a Workers State there will be no room for bureaucracy. It is absurd to think that bureaucracy can construct the world. Stalin was eliminated, and the Workers State progressed all the more for being rid of him. The world today shows that the changes for the better continue, in spite of bureaucracy and, indeed, that bureaucracy itself can no longer be strictly

bureaucratic and has to react in a partially correct manner to historic necessity.

The Workers State had degenerated from its origin, but this degeneration did not go as far as destroying it. It is a degeneration resulting from Stalin's policy and the interests of the layer he represented in appropriating power. This paralysed the Workers State, and kept it aloof from any important activity in the world class struggle during that epoch. But capitalism did not have the strength to destroy the Workers State. Today, it is all the opposite: the Soviet Union returns to intervene – albeit limitedly – in the world class struggle.

If the Workers State has survived, and kept going, it is because capitalism was too feeble to destroy it. Even when capitalism used the USSR in its internal struggle (the Second World War), it could not destroy it because – among other things – capitalism has an insane mode of thinking. Its political and social leaders believed that the USSR was going to collapse because it was isolated and Nazi Germany could finish it off. As capitalism believed this, it hoped that the onslaught of Germany would suffice and that, once Germany has exhausted itself, it could become the other capitalist's prey. It turned out otherwise. Nazi Germany was destroyed, and thirteen other countries, besides the USSR, became Workers States.



Stalin thought himself omnipotent. But he and Stalinism were eliminated. The Workers State showed all its historic might when it continued to develop and progress after Stalin.

Rest assured that Soviet committees (power committees of the masses) are going to come back in the revolutionary process. One day, everyone will recognise that the Workers State had been a stage of transition towards a society governed by Soviets.

At least in the main revolutionary centres of the future, and even before the production apparatus has become adequate, people will start imposing the equalisation of salaries.

The conditions already exist for the Soviet Union to intervene as the most decisive factor of anti-imperialist struggle in the world. The conditions exist for the Soviet Union to support the revolutionary movements already fighting to bring down the capitalist system.

J. POSADAS

29.12.74  
(Extracts)

---

**ON THE SOCIALIST FUTURE  
OF HUMANITY**

## **J. POSADAS - 22.04.81**

(Extracts)

All science and art express the development of the human relations – relations between the humans, as well as between them, nature and the universe.

Science and art are limited by the limitations in the social development of humanity. Even the most elevated human intelligence – that of Marx – is the result of human relations in the world, in countries or in localities.

Human intelligence goes beyond the limits of human relations because it foresees. It sees beyond the immediate. It draws conclusions and makes deductions infinitely wider and deeper than the immediate. Intelligence foresees. This is indisputable in mathematics, physics and chemistry.

When it comes to art, imagination combines with foresight. Imagination is an essential part of human sentiments. In the future, art, poetry and human relations will be one. There will no longer be divisions between comprehension, behaviour, activity and conduct: these functions will be united although each will preserve its separate role.

The division between human behaviour and human intelligence is determined by the fundamental divisions of the class struggle. When humanity unifies with itself, human intelligence will reach an

immense depth and height. Depth because it will see into past history, and height because it will see thousands of years ahead. Confidence will be the way of people to move and their life span will lengthen. The human being will keep drawing closer to nature and the universe. Longevity and the density of human life will triple, at least.

When the human sentiments are led and organised by intelligence, they soar endlessly and create limitless relations. Here you have the true definition of progress. More cars or neon-lights will no longer measure progress. Human progress will measure itself in terms of its incorporation with the cosmos.

This should be the way of things in 50 years, or so. When we reach that level, the human voice will acquire an infinite capacity. The most exquisite melody will be crude compared with the human voice. There will be physical modifications in the vocal chords, no doubt. The human voice will modulate the scope and the depth of human existence. If the human voice does not manage this, it will look for the aid of music.

With the elimination of the human dispute, the function of the voice will change. It will be on a par with that of Karl Marx today. The voice will transmit the wholeness of sentiment and persuasion. It will feel like musical notes. Then language, gesture and manner will supersede the musical note. Each

movement will convey what a book does today. Intelligence, comprehension and experience will concentrate in human capacity; and this will not be a synthesis either.

All the computers together will not achieve one per cent of what will be achieved by the smallest part of our brain. There will not be any need to press buttons. The gaze will effect movement through its ability to see thousands of years ahead and in the past. This does not mean that people will see in the future, but that all future progress will be foreseeable. The way ahead will be uninterrupted progress, with no need to think of wars and disasters.

The seed of all this came about with by Soviet Union. Not to see this is a crime. It is a crime not so much against people as against history. The Soviet Union is the instrument of history. To oppose the Soviet Union is to act like a backward tribe that destroys horse and wheel-cart to demonstrate it is still the best at travelling. There are those who would destroy the USSR to demonstrate that they are still the best at everything.

Those who think that Poland should be partitioned have better think again. Stupid idea. To want 'independent trade unions in Poland' is a stupid idea too. Even more so. People who have nothing to do with Communism and everything to do with their

own selves, would have Poland partitioned! They have no idea about history. They view the historic process through their individualism, but such a limitation never transcended in history. The Assyrians and the Sumerians showed a great scientific objectivity. The Greek and Egyptian civilisations draw attention to the objective progress of history. Where Archimedes came out of the bath shouting 'Eureka', our modern individualists would have simply declared that they don't like water.

The search for objectivity draws people to explanations where the individual feels part of itself, of nature and of the Universe. This is the significance behind the stones at Stonehenge in Britain.

The interests of private property limit the scope, the development and the dynamic of intelligence because those interests feel threatened by the ideas they don't control. This has applied to any capitalist, any boss or any proprietor at any time in history. Socialism needs objective knowledge instead. This is because human development needs it. And Marxism is the means to interpret all this.

For a whole historic period, Marxism will be needed as the method to interpret human conduct in its environment. Up to the first Workers State, human conduct was determined by property and the human relations generated by property. Marxism interprets

this. It is not a Bible, but a method to interpret human conduct. There is no doubt that human conduct determined by property is set to continue, certainly, but the human being and society continue to develop. Those who seek progress want to be free of the obsession of property, sex and war. With the present growth of human self-assuredness and confidence, the human sentiments influence behaviour more readily than in the past. This is the historic base for Socialism. As human confidence grows, the act of killing in order to live becomes less and less acceptable.

Egotistical sentiments arise from the isolation that private property generates. If sentiments more elevated than egoism manage to break through, it is because life needs them, and needs to impose them. The human sentiments exist where private property does not reach. They are necessary to human life and human relations. Some of this exists even in animals.

The human relations develop with the development of intelligence, and this is how music came about. Music dies where human relations are denied. Music did not grow out of sounds, it grew out of the human relations.

The conditions that have led to the organisation of society have also led to classes. This is how the working class emerged as a class distinct from all

the other classes in history. Well before the working class could give its own form to society, it already had an immense impact on human conduct. The fact that the working class makes so much difference in history proves that humanity is mature for Socialism. If the proletariat has not managed to influence society more fully, it is due to its lack of leadership. After the towering heights that it reached through the Bolsheviks, the stage of Stalin caused a deep retreat in this matter.

There is the Polisario Front<sup>1</sup> in the world; there are Cuba and Vietnam. Humanity is mature for Socialism. These countries represent distinct categories of achievements, but they also show how human progress can already defeat capitalism, oppression and war. What is missing is the instrument of Marxism, and the Party to shape this instrument.

**J. POSADAS**

22.4.1981

End of Vol 2.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Polisario Front proclaimed the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic in 1976 against Morocco.