

J POSADAS

From Revue Marxiste No. 5 (February 1978)

The world of capitalism has already exhausted its historic right to exist. It survives whilst disintegrating under the weight of its own final crisis, of structure and of regime; also, under the weight of the reinforcement of the Soviet workers state, of the new deformed workers states like China, Czechoslovakia, or Poland; and under the weight of the world development of the colonial and semi colonial revolution.

The Soviet Union is no longer the only country where private property has been destroyed, where nationalised property arises as cornerstone in the construction of the socialist society. In spite of the brake placed on the real development of the economy by the soviet bureaucracy (it usurps and profits from what are the historic rights and interests of the soviet and world masses), nationalised property and the planning of production demonstrate their immense power; and this, in proportions never equalled in history.

In the USSR and China, Czechoslovakia, Hungary or Poland, capitalist power was destroyed by the masses. They did this in the face of the social and economic difficulties resulting from their original backwardness; and resulting also from the usurping role of the bureaucratic leaderships of the communist parties, who still hinder or prevent the masses' conscious action and free initiative. The future of socialist society is ineluctable. This is shown irreversibly by the economic and social development of those countries, and by the socialist consciousness the masses have acquired, resisting the erosion of their social historic conquests.

Socialism can only be envisaged, socialism is only possible, as a world society: a conscious social regime, planned on a world scale, resulting from the free will and union of the peoples. It will bring about what capitalism presently throttles: the unlimited development of the productive forces and the development of the productivity of labour. This is the base for the historic legitimacy of the socialist society. Marxism is the theory and the method of analysis that accounts for the actions of the working class. It is Marxism the working class gets hold of in order to accomplish its historic mission: to lead and to drive the struggle for the destruction of capitalism and for the construction of the socialist society. As socialism can only be conceived and realised on a world scale, a world-wide and conscious leadership is necessary to head the struggle for proletarian power and for the construction of socialism.

What is left of capitalist power constitutes an entity; but this entity evolves with differing degrees and rhythms. It is these which determine what the historic general tasks are going to be, the concrete tasks, the international ones, the national ones; tasks to be accomplished by the proletariat in its struggle for socialism. From the fact of its historic mission of leadership in the struggle for the construction of the socialist society, the working class must need start from the objective reality as it presents itself historically and concretely, using it as it develops and unfolds depending of the perspectives that open up.

Actually, the first condition to succeed in this mission is to gain an overview of the world as history has made it. For instance: capitalism exists alongside countries that are becoming workers states; there is the colonial and semi colonial revolution unfolding; there is the world weakening of imperialism. There is also the existence of countries economically and socially backward like those of Latin America who have not followed the historic path opened up by the industrial countries of Europe and North America.

In its struggle for socialism, the working class of the developed capitalist countries finds that the conditions and possibilities are exhausted for the continuation of progressive measures on the part of the bourgeoisie or from capitalism itself.

In those developed countries capitalism has managed, generally speaking, to supersede the economic and social hindrances it had inherited from previous regimes, and that had blocked its development. Take the colonial world on the other hand, or semi colonial countries like those in Latin America. Even though they have adopted capitalism – in grades and rhythms of evolution going from most backward to most advanced, as in Argentina – they still retain at differing levels the remnants, the survivals and inheritances, social and production forms that are still feudal or semi feudal. World capitalism and local capitalism have not been able of surpassing these. Therefore, the tasks of the socialist revolution of the proletariat differ in rhythms and degrees, even though they do not differ in the socialist finality common to all of the proletariat. In catching up with the advanced capitalist countries, the general progress of the backward ones, their very industrialisation, is hindered and prevented. Was this not the fundamental role of capitalism in history, however, to develop countries in this way, and to link them to the entire world?

The mission of the capitalist regime, indeed, and of the bourgeoisie, had been to develop countries in industry, culture and civilisation. But in every semi colonial country, capitalism has done this only partially: it has advanced neither the economy nor the bourgeois democratic regime. It has left out of the production and consumption processes, out of culture and of civilisation, entire swaths of indigenous populations, black people and peasants.

For those countries to have developed even from a bourgeois democratic point of view, the land question should have been resolved with reform and agrarian revolution. There should have been the expulsion of imperialism, the nationalisation of the sources of natural wealth and national unity made in some countries; a vast Latin American internal market should have been created, sufficiently powerful to stimulate both its own development and its ability to compete with the rest of the capitalist world.

Today, most of these problems are still waiting to be resolved. But today, in this stage of history, they come up for resolution when capitalism has exhausted its possibilities of existence as a world regime and the masses are already engaged in the struggle to take hold of the destiny of the world - which is their own destiny.

Capitalist leadership and initiative will not resolve these problems history still poses today. For they are problems inherited from capitalism itself; in this stage, they will only be resolved by the struggle of the world masses for power, by the application of the means, measures and objectives that are socialist. Only these take account of the permanent and ascending process

of the world and national revolution.

To pass from the present capitalist society over to the construction of the socialist society, one will have to triumph over these feudal and semi-feudal forms of production, these hindrances, and all the industrial and social backwardness. Millions of Indian people, black people, peasants and indigenous communities, will have to be incorporated into the internal and world market of production and consumption. Surpassing this situation, taking account of the needs and of the possibilities that are both historic and immediate, is only possible through an anti-capitalist struggle united to the struggles of the masses of Latin America, and the world. Finished the time when this could be done through bourgeois democratic means. It can only happen by means of the masses' power, through the workers and peasants government.

The world domination of imperialism and the actual domination of Latin America by yankee imperialism is one factor. There is also the way the backward countries are submitted to the world market; there is the world crisis of the capitalist system, the impossibility for capitalism to spread further, or even preserve its present world markets; there is the subjugation of Latin America to the commercial, financial and industrial power of yankee imperialism; add to this the existence of the proletariat, its struggles, its organisations and its parties, as well as the constant risings of the peasant masses: all these things quite annul the possibility for the development of bourgeois capitalist regimes and industrial bourgeoisies. This is not to say, however, that in countries like Argentina or Brazil there is no possibility for partial results in industrial or economic development.

In a historical sense, the perspectives for capitalist development are zero in Latin America. Only in conditions of the world expansion and development of capitalism could the capitalist market have permitted improvements in these countries; then, there may have been some historic prospects for a few national industrial bourgeoisies - against imperialism and the landed oligarchies, that is. But the road is blocked that leads to the world development of the market and of the capitalist regime.

Agrarian reform and revolution, the expulsion of imperialism, the unification of Latin America, are the problems that will have to be solved in order to see any economic or industrial development. In the present conditions of history, capitalism and the national bourgeoisies are powerless in giving a progressive outcome regarding those needs.

The measures necessary for economic progress, those necessary for the cultural and social progress of Latin America, demand more than the expulsion of imperialism and the expropriation of the large property owners. It demands the struggle for the power of the masses against the capitalist regime and against the bourgeoisies. These bourgeoisies, even the most "progressive", are tied to imperialism and to the landed oligarchies. Their ties stem from relations of common interests and direct economic links. The national bourgeoisies have stemmed and branched off from the oligarchies themselves, as their direct agents in the service of imperialism. Their interests are not opposed to those of the oligarchy in all things. What the national bourgeoisies and petty bourgeoisies of Latin America presume to, and what they generally struggle for, is to rise higher in relation to the oligarchies and imperialism. They hope to take hold of the state apparatus and put it integrally at their service, perceiving that this will

make them better able to negotiate with imperialism.

The petty bourgeois leadership of the MNR in Bolivia is an example. It reached the top of the mass movement and, through it, the top of the state apparatus. Then, it tried to develop the Bolivian economy – on capitalist lines. This amounted to an experiment. It became clear that social measures attractive to the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic masses were going to be needed; this leadership figured this would increase mass mobilisations, exert an enormous pressure against imperialism, sabotaging it. At this point the MNR desisted; and this is how it betrayed the masses that had followed it. It promptly returned on the promises to give land, expel imperialism and expropriate the mines without compensation. It gave up on genuine workers' control and better living standards.

One cannot, and one must not, operate on the basis of what the leaderships tell about themselves, or on the basis of what they pretend to be disposed of doing; the same goes for what the petty bourgeois parties and movements say. Instead, one must look at what can be done in the objective conditions of the existence of the capitalist regime, of the proletariat, the strength of mobilisation, the wishes of the peasantry, degrees in class politicisation, levels in the consciousness and organisation of the proletariat, etc.

There is the necessity for the economy to develop; there is the need for agrarian reform; the need for the mechanisation of production as part of the process of industrialisation: all these have one single historic solution: that solution lies in the unification of Latin America – a voluntary and conscious one. There is no other foundation upon which to build the historic organisation of Latin America.

Experience has shown and does show that, taken separately, each Latin American country can only advance very limitedly; and this, only in the case of the already most advanced; and then, only partially. The process of history is clamouring for the planned unification of Latin America to be able to go forth. The separation of Latin America into different countries reveals itself as the true block on its development.

The bourgeoisie was supposed to have effected this unification itself, through its single capitalist market. But it did no such thing. And thereby, it demonstrated all its historic impotence and the limits of its own role in history. Behind it came the proletariat, which developed via its own struggles and its own socialist objectives. It came as the representative of a superior social regime. Today, the unification of Latin America will not be made under the bourgeois form of organisation. It will come under the conscious and willing organisation of the peoples into the Federation of the Socialist Republics of Latin America.

In these tasks and through this sort of activity the proletariat will have to solve the problems of the backwardness it inherited from the bourgeoisie. Neither bourgeois programmatic initiative, nor any bourgeois or petty bourgeois capitalist leadership will do this. They cannot find the solutions and they cannot carry out the tasks called for by capitalist backwardness. They cannot realise the progress of Latin America. The proletariat must resolve backwardness through its own struggle for workers and peasants power; and it won't be able to do this with capitalist measures either: first, because it can't act in the name of the bourgeoisie, and second because

capitalist measures are no good. It is the proletariat that holds the key to the solution. The solution lies within its revolutionary programme, when the proletariat finally places means and aims at the service of the socialist construction of each country as part of the socialist unification of Latin America.

There were attempts at making a "Greater Columbia" between Venezuela, Columbia and Ecuador, at one time. In Argentina, the national bourgeoisie had much hope with Peron, whose aspirations for industrial expansion clashed with Yankee imperialism. Other times, there were agreements, custom-duty alliances and "economic unions" between Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Ecuador. Now and then, these bourgeoisies have called for Latin American unity, thus reflecting both their need for expansion and the objective necessity of the unification of Latin America.

The revolutionary struggle for workers and peasants power in the populations of the world and in Latin America is the practical expression of the necessity for the development of the productive forces. The latter are presently contained and circumscribed by the capitalist regime. This struggle is the expression of the need arising from the productive forces seeking to break out of their present imprisonment. It is the expression of the need for the socialist unification of Latin America as guarantor to its real economic, industrial, social and cultural development.

The more the leadership of the proletariat - and its leading cadres - acquire a high consciousness of the objective necessity of the socialist unification of Latin America and the shorter will be the delays required in overthrowing capitalist power and setting up the workers and peasants Government.

The petty bourgeois currents with support in the masses, the Stalinist leaderships, or the socialists themselves, have not replied to this demand for programme, policy and perspectives in the struggle for socialism in Latin America.

"Marxism is the consciousness of the unconscious process of history". Indeed; and the proletariat through its revolutionary Marxist party is the class that leads the conscious, social activity of struggle for socialism.

The struggle for socialism being world wide, and socialism being conceivable only on a world scale, it follows that an international leadership is necessary. It must have the domination of the process and coordinate, world wide, the struggle for proletarian power and the building of the socialist society.

Without a theoretical endeavour, without an appreciation and clear comprehension of the unity of the process and the struggle on the world scale, Party and class are both left without clear and concrete perspectives. Then they lose their ability to lean towards the conscious outcome; enters confusion - ideological, programmatic and political disarmament; the leadership passes over to the class enemies, or to political adversaries; the revolutionary forces are no longer guided towards a revolutionary outcome, or towards the evident tasks offered up by the situation; even when these tasks were the obvious means by which to rise consciously to a more favourable level of struggle.

For these tasks to be carried out, therefore, the mass Marxist revolutionary party is necessary. The same goes for the theoretical education of the worker cadres in the proletarian party. They must become conscious that those tasks are necessary, together with the corresponding programme and policy. Programme and policy must be of the sort that will enable them to orientate consciously the peasant and petty bourgeois masses towards the historic goal for Latin America that forms part of the World Socialist Federation.

Stalinism always started, and still starts today, from an erroneous programmatic and political concept regarding the tasks for socialism in Latin America and the world. Stalinism has not been, and is not, a world leadership proposing to wage revolutionary struggle, to take power and make socialism. Its line consisted essentially in serving the diplomatic aims and particular interests of the soviet bureaucracy – interests that were opposed to the revolutionary interests of the soviet and world masses. Even now, Stalinism applies to Latin America its false conception of the process of history, whereby it justifies its whole policy of conciliation and of alliances with sectors of the ‘radical’ or ‘democratic’ or simply ‘progressive’ Latin American bourgeoisie.

Stalinism has distorted the Marxist method and historic interpretation of Latin America. Accordingly, socialist currents claiming to be anti-imperialist did the same. From such erroneous interpretations and concepts have arisen programmes, policies and perspectives just as erroneous. Stalinism holds that the backwardness of the countries of Latin America is due to the fact that imperialism has wilfully prevented those countries from developing; and so that, consequently, there is yet a stage to be undergone in Latin America: the stage banned by imperialism: that of the development of the industrial bourgeoisie and its bourgeois democratic regime. In short, that the proletariat must now ally itself to bourgeois leaderships.

With such concepts, the Stalinists - and the socialists after them - idealise the ‘democratic’ bourgeoisie. They allow it to be hoped that the bourgeoisie may still acquit itself of a progressive historic role; that it may one day agitate, and press on in favour of the economic, social and democratic development of Latin America.

The countries of Latin America were formed and incorporated to the civilised world via the Spanish empire. Spain was still immersed in feudal backwardness whilst the world was taking a capitalist path. First under British and then under Yankee imperialism, there was already the rise of industry and of world finances. And it is these two who shaped and structured the countries of Latin America, submitting them to themselves, namely to the law of the most advanced capitalist countries.

In its ineluctable historic trajectory, Latin America became the result of the world division of labour. There was no other way for this continent to enter the historic stage. This is a process that shows well all the limitation in the progressive role of capitalism. The reality is that capitalism has not been capable of developing the countries of the globe. The development of capitalism, Free Trade, and imperialist capitalism afterwards, could only emerge upon the basis of large industrialised metropolitan countries finding their sustenance in the exploitation and subjugation of the colonial world and the semi colonial countries.

The consequence of this limited development in Latin American and semi colonial countries is only because it suited interests, needs and agreements initiated by capitalism in the metropolitan countries. If this allowed the development of bourgeoisies and petty bourgeoisies, it was only through the kind of interests that were complementary to others' in the metropolitan countries, and imperialism. True, in the large movements for bourgeois emancipation against Spain, that were financed for a great part by Britain, the Latin American bourgeoisies managed to obtain a formal kind of independence; but the property owning, the commercial and financial bourgeoisies that arose from commerce, finance and investment, could only do so by keeping their own interests tied up with those of British imperialism; and later, with those of Yankee imperialism.

The world development of capitalism, then two World Wars followed by the crisis of capitalism, rendered possible a certain development for capitalism in Latin America. This was quite pronounced in some countries. But this was happening as capitalism was entering agony and decomposition; just when there ceased to be historic possibilities for the capitalist development of those countries. One of the reasons for this lies in the fact that the proletariat was being formed at the same time as the capitalist system was rising. According to the idea of the Stalinists, Latin America is singled out for a special historic destiny and a pre-ordained development, outside the destiny rendered possible by the flow of history. But one cannot expect such bourgeoisies and petty bourgeoisies in the region to be capable of leading forward a task like the industrial development of Latin America, under a bourgeois democratic regime; for they could not possibly have the strength; or the possibility, because the historic conditions are opposed.

Social democratic sectors grew in Latin America through the tendency of making a national policy of opposition to imperialism; but generally speaking, they did so by becoming identified to national bourgeois interests. And so it happens that they, too, are running behind the national bourgeoisies, to whom they grant a fair amount of support and development consultants.

These socialist currents give a wide berth around the correct conception of the world historic process of capitalism. They keep well away from the internationalist concepts of class struggle and Marxist method. They believe neither in the revolutionary capacity of the proletariat to construct a leadership, nor in its revolutionary capacity of assimilation. This necessarily drives them back into the more or less direct service of the bourgeoisie, or sectors of it. In Latin America, they confuse the tasks of the struggle for socialism with their activities of historic conciliation, activities that are totally detached from any idea of the world unity of the struggle for socialism.

To direct those tasks, however, the Marxist revolutionary party is necessary, conscious of programme and policy; conscious that the perspective, being for a workers and peasants government, is only part of the unity of the world struggle for socialism. Such a party must form part of an international leadership, so that it can play a coordinating role in the world struggle. In Latin America, it must combine two tasks: the specific one for proletarian power wherever, and the long-term one to help build the world socialist society. It has to educate its cadres for this. Its militants, and the workers movement, must be given the historic consciousness of the unity between world aims and the national ones. This consciousness will lead achieve the following:

the determination to create a workers and peasants government, and this latter, as part of the struggle for the Federation of the Socialist Republics of Latin America.

The powerful mass movement which developed in Latin America in the post-war period was derailed, for a great part, by bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaderships. Hundreds of thousands of peasants who had left the countryside, had become politically active. They had sought to play their part in solving the class and national problems but, unfortunately, they were not followed by the workers parties. The actions of the workers parties were not of the kind to win the confidence, or the support, of the peasants. Firstly, this was because the latter were masses only recently awakened and incorporated into class politics; they were still backward politically or they mistrusted the workers parties. And secondly, the workers parties and the trade unions failed to draw them closer. The workers parties had not educated their cadres and their militants in the idea, the policy or the objective of the workers and peasants government. These cadres did not think of making bridges over the gap between them and the peasants. Besides, they had in general no firm links with the rest of the workers; so, they missed the correct national and international goal, from a class point of view.

Backward masses were left to tag along, in a diffuse anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist spirit, behind the bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaderships. This is how those movements happened to make their political experience – and still do. This is where and how they are still learning about class politics.

Today, there are still large mass movements in Latin America behind the bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaderships, or behind social democratic ones; even behind Stalinists. They are movements engaged in their own political experience and this is the way they become politicised. We must show these large clusters of people how to become detached from the petty bourgeois leaderships. We must help them to mature their political and programmatic consciousness regarding the need for the workers and peasant government and the Federation of Socialist Republics of Latin America. One must help them also to create left-wing currents in the communist parties and the social democrats, with the view that these, of themselves, will find a path towards this revolutionary programme and perspective.

The pressure of the objective process of the disintegration of imperialism plus that of the triumphant world revolutionary struggle becomes added to the live experience and politicisation of the masses. This encourages the Stalinist and social democratic movements. These movements will increasingly want to struggle so that their own parties should support the workers and peasants government and the Federation of the Socialist Republics of Latin America.

To help pull the masses away from the bourgeois orbit, the necessary instrument must be offered them: workers parties of the class, and of the masses. This is a necessary step for the acquisition of the consciousness to be derived from experience and politicisation. It also gives them the consciousness of their own strength and class interests. One must help the Communist militants and cadres – and in social democracy also – in developing their own experience in the tasks of building mass Marxist revolutionary movements.



In their mobilisations after the war in Latin America, the masses of many countries followed and supported bourgeois and petty bourgeois movements. Because there was a shortage of workers parties that they trusted, the masses started to support and form large organisations and big trade union centres. In Argentina and in Bolivia particularly, they did this in order to find a base of defence against their own, bourgeois leaderships.

The rapid development of trade unions and workers centres testify to the fact that the masses were looking for a general class instrument. In some countries, it is just from the trade unions that arose directly the bases for the building of workers parties; and this, in direct opposition to the bourgeois and petty bourgeois mass leaderships.

The revolutionary struggles of the masses in Bolivia, Guatemala and British Guyana have been many. In Argentina, the masses persisted in their support to Peron. Their resistance to imperialism was unshakable; they decisively rejected the yankee plans for war and colonisation. Meanwhile, the various Latin American bourgeoisies and governments were failing in restoring some balance in the economy of a kind that would be acceptable to the masses. All this offered possibilities for stepping forward, for the masses to become active and politicised and for the creation of class workers parties.

The objective process still unfolds in a sense favourable to the struggle for proletarian power and for the workers and peasants government. Yankee imperialism goes on trying to bind Latin America to its plans for counter-revolution and world war. Not a day passes when it doesn't try to take some measure in that way. The aim of its world war is to attack the development of the revolution in the colonial and semi colonial countries; it is also to slice through the development of the USSR and the other workers states. The Caracas Conference has shown conclusively what is on the agenda: to submit the lives of the Latin American people to the monstrous counter-revolutionary plans of yankee imperialism.

But the revolutionary struggle of the masses of the colonial and semi colonial countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America does not cease. They do not allow themselves to be intimidated by the threats and the terrorism thrown at them by yankee imperialism and its capitalist associates in the world.

The Stalinist concept that binds it to the perspective of 'peaceful coexistence' between workers states and capitalism is false. It is equally false to lull the masses in the hope of a possible peace; as if, by this means, imperialism could possibly be tamed and contained!

The objective conditions in the world are such that even imperialism is powerless in handling them. This hurries it along towards war inexorably and in short delays. Indeed, there are increasing dangers for the survival of that system, dangers against which it does not extricate itself: danger from the revolutionary struggle of the masses in the colonial and semi colonial countries; danger posed by the masses of Europe - France and Italy foremost; danger from the rise and reinforcement of workers states that crystallise the anti-capitalist world forces. And another danger: the ever concrete possibility of an economic crisis marching in.

The perspective offered by the Stalinist and socialist leaderships is false about these points.

And false indeed it is, for all matters regarding the interpretation of the historic development of Latin America; the related tasks and the imaginary development of bourgeois democratic regimes in Latin America. The positions they take disarm the proletarian vanguard, cutting it off from the necessary historic perspectives, as well as from the programmatic and political ones. These leaderships cause the vanguard to come into collision with the objective process that, for its part, points persistently to the revolutionary solution of the workers and peasants government and the Latin American Federation of the Socialist Republics.

Without the consciousness of this programme and perspective, the action of the vanguard is slowed down; it staggers about and veers off. There arises a perversion regarding the historic outlook. And so it happens that one does not value the reality of the revolutionary process; one let pass the opportunities that had been offered by the contradictions within the bourgeoisie and imperialism. More: one starts becoming uncertain about of the inevitability of the war which Yankee imperialism is preparing; instead of urging forward the struggle of the masses towards the workers and peasant government, one ends up shunting the strength and the actions of the proletarian masses behind aims and policies of conciliation with the bourgeoisie or fractions of it. It all becomes an operation of collaboration. The enormous possibilities that could have eased the struggle of the masses towards their immediate and historic objectives are given up.

The masses of Latin America, even beset by those difficulties, manage to surpass their political backwardness. They demonstrate that they want to be the masters of their destiny. In practice, in the mind of the masses of Latin America and in the mind of the world masses, the capitalist regime and imperialism are already on death row. Daily actions by the masses give them the practice they need, and this has become written in their consciousness.

Roads are being opened leading to the workers and peasants government with forms of organisation which themselves tend to the Latin American Federation of Socialist Republics. The more this road becomes recognised as an absolute necessity, and the more the consciousness of masses and workers vanguard shall ripen towards the realisation of the corresponding tasks.

The mass revolutionary party and the class revolutionary party are necessary. The fundamental revolutionary mission of the Marxist party is to organise and lead the struggle of the masses. It must use the objective process as it arises, and organise the activity of the masses towards the workers and peasants government, as part of the Federation of the Socialist Republics of Latin America.

Marxism in Latin America must be developed and applied consciously, and we are ready to contribute to this.

J POSADAS – April 1954