

J POSADAS

16 April 1978

For capitalism, war is a need. It forms part of competition and of capital accumulation. War intervenes directly in production and margin-setting, less so in commercialisation. The armaments industry represents about 20% of production in any of the big countries. In cases such as that of North America, a sudden stoppage in arms production does not spell crisis but melt-down. The greatest part of world capital is invested in atomic weapons. States come up with the capital but the industry is private. Myriads of private companies are involved in products and components, or in such things as chemical and atomic processing; delivery is to the State. The manufacture of ordinary weapons takes the lion share of all budgets. In countries like France or Belgium, arms sales represent easily 25% of their exports.

This situation creates a whole layer of people who want war. When they are prevented from kindling war between the large countries, they hand weapons over to small countries for them to fight. These types do not invent war – the latter is a social need, as much for those in power as for others defending themselves. When the warmongers sell arms, they choose given situations and invest accordingly. Should this come to a stop, the crisis of capitalism would reach bursting point. There are well-off layers of the petty bourgeoisie over whom capitalism has a great control; if these stopped believing capitalism has a future, they would abandon it.

There is another fundamental process to take account of: the proletariat does not increase as a class, numerically. Instead, there is an increase in the economic weight of other sectors, as in the case of petty bourgeois sectors, through a greater use of electronics. This function educates their intelligence. As they become aware of their fundamental role, they also perceive their dependency upon a futureless social regime. They receive the influence of the workers states. If automation and electronics are on the rise, so are the workers states and their constant progress.

This is not happening quite like this in the economically backward countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia, which are often very advanced socially. In those places, the proletariat has just been formed. Even though it increases in numbers, the weight of the proletariat of those countries can never be enough to compare with the concentrated force of the workers states, or that of the big capitalist countries like Germany, the US and France.

However, if the bourgeoisie draws strength from making the petty bourgeoisie replace the proletariat in production, this advantage is short-term. The rising curve of revolution gathers new forces all the time and it instils in the petty bourgeoisie both intelligence and comprehension. An electronic machine may cancel out 1,000 workers, and one manipulating technician may replace so many others. But since technology becomes less a matter of specialisation and more one of routine work, a large number of workers can, in their turn, become technicians themselves.

In the past, there was a restricted generalisation of knowledge about science, electronics or the

atom – as well as for what regards the relation atom-movement-energy. But now, any worker who wishes to do so can tackle the subject right away and quickly handle the most complicated electronic machine. As a category, the petty bourgeoisie is no longer so readily identifiable: it feels more and more part of the product it creates, on pressing the button. What is called an 'industrial complex' is an enormous expanse upon which are created varied products and where three workers may be enough to run an entire factory. Automated production systems progressively eliminate proletarians by decreasing their numbers; conversely however, they add to the ranks of the proletariat a technical and scientific petty bourgeoisie.

Somewhere in all this, capitalism has no other solution but war. It will decide war and whatever massacre - and this, quite independently from the existence, or the will, of one capitalist or another. The economy is structured so that the operation of its essential plans is determined in the spheres of high finance, big capital and high industry. These hold everything concentrated. They are able to determine the economic movements even of other enterprises. The resulting economic concentration is each day more important. In the capitalist countries, the function of big capital is always more centralised, whilst competition is quicker and more dynamic than ever in history. This competition signifies also more concentration of capital, more production and a greater domination of the economy. In the large capitalist countries, the big industrial sectors are those who control the army, the police; they are those who make the nuclear tests. They decide on the war question. They can start war at any moment, without any parliament or president. They dominate the economy.

To grasp this, one must rely on a Marxist analysis and not on what the capitalists have to say. Is it not normal, when studying the development of a plant, to deal with its seed, its flower, its life-cycle, its relationship with the earth – establishing the unity of it all? This is what they do in botanic and in genetics. But when it comes to the study of society, where is this done? A good few communist comrades themselves tell us that, in society, 'behaviour is different'. Different, in what way? They also say that 'in Lenin's time, one had to act differently from today'. Is it the fear of the nuclear war that makes them talk like this? Why else do they say this! Is it that the bourgeoisie has been made to change its nature and its views? What has changed since Lenin to show that the bourgeoisie now rejects war; and that now, it feels obliged to stop waging it? What historic examples are there?

As for the historic examples, let's look at them. China was the theatre of the greatest (class) conciliations. But the Chinese masses had to make war in order to impose social change. How did capitalism organise its behaviour in that instance? Where has it given a proof that it was disposed to let the progress of history influence it? Nowhere has a capitalist class been seen ready to cancel itself out; nowhere has its decisive sectors shown themselves disposed to give up their power. Of this, there are no examples.

The communists and the socialists do not discuss this. All they say is: 'war would be an atrocity; it would be the end of the world'. They spray their fear about them, starting with frightening themselves – and this makes them yield. They make themselves believe that, from some foothold gained in the enemy's camp, they will be able to keep an eye on the foe and stop him making war. As if this could be depended upon to control or persuade capitalism into welcoming change! This philosophy is simply mystical. It is not an error they are making. Their

methodology would have them believe that human behaviour is independent from its relationship with the production process. The greatness of Marx resides essentially in having defined the 'fetishism' of production in capitalism; and in having demonstrated the real and material basis upon which rests the existence of capitalism. Whilst capitalism has no function without production, production is certainly serviceable without capitalism. Capitalism draws its strength from production, deriving from it also its way of thought and its perceptions.

The fear felt by capitalism is not of the ordinary sort. It fears, because it perceives a void in life. People can experience fear in a difficult situation, wherein they do not feel strong enough; or they feel ignorant or unable to concentrate enough attention to unravel it. The fear of capitalism, however, is alien to what lays at the root of such sensations. Its reactions are not those of the people generally: it is the dread of being dislodged from history. It is brutally influenced by this fear. This causes it to close-in upon itself - having secured first a firm hold over of its class interests. If capitalism could think humanely, if it could comprehend what it represents in history - in itself, and as a class - it might be tempted to give up and go away. It might even decide that with itself gone away, things will be better for all. But have you ever seen capitalism reason like this? The history of humanity is that of its relationship with production and property. Humanity's dependency upon this relationship is so great that it informs its whole manner of seeing, of foreseeing and of visualising the future; it does not even disappear with the workers state.

Capitalism does not see a future in life; and so, it runs away with what it has. It does not bother with wife or child. The big capitalists have no such notions as family, maternity or paternity. Their role in life leads them to reproduce via production, and not in a family. The ordinary joy of a father in front of his new baby forms part of the natural hope in the future. Instead of this joy, the big capitalists feel a sense of tragedy in their relations with their children; a sense that the future is blighted for them with the disappearance of the capitalist system. And really, how can one expect the capitalists to think in a manner opposed to what, for them, constitutes their lives, namely, property? Haven't they built all structures upon it?

If it is a fact that intelligence can win over many individuals, it remains that the world of the capitalists, as a structure, is impervious to this. One can weaken their system as the Chileans did. One can be elected to governments, swear upon Constitutions and show their limits. It is possible to reach office and prepare the (working) class for maximum advance. However, even before any of this can bear fruit, one must disarm the army. The (state) structure in place has to be brought down so that the norm of popular intervention can prevail.

The Communist leaderships speak of such things as 'state secret', 'judicial confidentiality' and 'military secrets'. But these are lies. They have been created by the ruling class as a means to look after its affairs, to use the army, the police, the law and the judges for the defence of its own interests. The Communists do not discuss in this way. About the Allende's government (in Chile) they say that Allende could have gone much farther if only there had been less 'traitors'. But this is a false account of history! When a military or a bourgeois type swears on the new Allende's Constitution, it is only to betray it in a minute. Indeed, if he swears at all, it is because he cannot see what else he can do. Meanwhile, he plots the counter revolution. Revolutionary leaders have the duty to understand this. If such leaders fail, it is because they do not use the

dialectical method: instead, they keep fingers crossed about what is coming next. They use an enigmatic method, cloaked under a pious or mystical belief in the revolution. On using the dialectical method, a leader would say: 'This bourgeois is swearing, but he does not mean it. He swears to support the Allende's government but he is after private property'. It is true that Allende's himself swore on a Constitution that did not quite challenge private property; but he had kept on his side enough room for manoeuvre, thanks to the strength the workers movement had lent him.

The Communists discuss from suppositions, or from things they imagine; they do not discuss as a function required by the scientific conclusion to be drawn about the behaviour of classes. They refer to 'the fear of the atomic war' – but who is frightened? It is their own fear they are looking at, not wanting to bear responsibility in a destruction of the world. But the working class has no fear. It feels that there is no remedy, as if saying: the war will be terrible; but what do you say about the latest train crash in Italy where 40 people are already dead and so many more are going to die?. There are plenty of such examples. The war is not the end of the world. It is going to mean greater destructions than before, but along with this, there is the very great increase in the world's scientific capacity, consciousness and intelligence. It is now established that all can be built again - and better than before. There is an ever greater grasp regarding the world's economy and physical laws. This leads to a firm sense of confidence regarding the future, nature, production and the universe. In the past, people lived in a great state of insecurity because knowledge was confined to a very small circle. Today, on the other hand, the workers states demonstrate that all can be surmounted. As for the atomic war, one must say simply that it will be more destructive than the war before.

Since anything at all can be made and remade, the most dangerous effects of the war do not lie in the material destruction. They reside in the fear – overarching and paralysing fear. In the case of each previous war, the class to regain power had always been the bourgeoisie, permitting it to resuscitate, each time, the mystique of the process of capitalist production. Today no longer: the workers state is there; it has the effect of immediately conjuring up a dialectical sense of confidence in the materialistic process of history.

We must discuss these questions with all the Communist comrades, the socialists and the left. It is not us who want the war: it is inherent to capitalism. Marx, Engels and Rosa Luxemburg have written much about it - Rosa Luxemburg particularly. She wrote very good texts showing that the war industry cannot be separated from the life of capitalism. Today, this industry has come to occupy an immensely more central place than when she wrote.

Any large capitalist country dedicates 30% of its economy to war. This is camouflaged in a thousand ways behind types who 'observe the skies', who 'look at the stars', and the like. There are scores of such people doing their bit for the war. If the Soviets have 1,000 satellites for surveillance and meteorology, how many more must have the Yanks to enable them to watch not only the socialist countries but their French, German and Japanese competitors?

Insecurity, ignorance, uncertainty in the method of thought – these are the essential bases for fear. But even then, one can suffer from a lack of knowledge without necessarily being afraid: An airline passenger who does not know what country lies in front of the plane consults a map,

and the worry is gone. Unlike this ordinary fear, say, of a machine, the fear of the future has much deeper social roots. One of the consequences of private property is in having developed individualism by the means of which to tackle these things. As opposed to this, one of the greatest conquests of the socialist revolution is in having developed instead the collective interest. This collective interest has its foundation in the sense of confidence that we (humans) can do anything at all and resolve everything. Capitalism is not capable of this. The workers state is. The Russia of 1917 was a proper ruin. Lenin created the programme via which, even with the NEP on the third year, the workers state was built.

Terrorism is meaningless. There are indeed very audacious terrorists, very resolute and not always motivated by individual interest. However, what they achieve is of no use in history. There are instances when a terrorist act may be useful as a means – but it is useless as an end in itself and cannot be a programme. There can be the need to blow up the HQ of an occupying power. But then, this is war and not terrorism. Trotsky shows well how Lenin was trying to explain and persuade the Anarchists and the terrorists of those days. Lenin wanted to win them over because they were very audacious and disinterested people. Most of them came from rich families; they were expressing their social disgust at their rotten milieus. There is the case of this very rich woman in Germany who had killed her lover because she was so fed up with the sort of life with him, and who said simply: 'it had to be done'. This is a little like what happened to Patricia Hearst. There must be more about Hearst than we know because the CIA was involved behind her group. Nonetheless, it was easy to observe both Hearst's revulsion at the rottenness of life around her, and her desire to smash the crushing monotony of it. Even though these people kept offering each other diamonds at the drop of a hat, they were each living a life of utter solitude – and this in a world where not a day passes without the report of some immense progress in science! Such people are cloistered up inside their world. When they take an interest in science at all, it is only to see how to produce at a lower price!

Terrorism is not a way forward and there are no more such 'terrorists' in fact. However, those who still come up to the definition are the capitalists and their bourgeois dictatorships. It is them who employ terrorism, as a means of intimidation and of liquidation - to massacre people. In the workers movement and in the revolution, terrorism is not necessary. It has never been necessary; and now less than ever, because the proof has been made that the progress of history has been delivered by 20 workers states without any terrorism. The revolution is not the same thing as terrorism. It is not the same thing as violence either: it is the method that progress itself makes requisite.

To move an object, the nudge you give it dislodges it from its static state. The static state is simply a form of movement. If it was not, one would not be able to budge it. To the nudge, capitalism has given the name of 'terrorism'. But one has to move obstacles and cast them aside in order to achieve any aim at all. As a nail cannot be commanded, it will have to be hammered in; or a screw will have to be unscrewed by the force of a tool. Engels speaks of the seed that becomes flower through various violent changes: he explains that, at a given moment, the course of a progression leads to a transformation; it leads to a new stage which he calls the dialectical leap. The birth of a child is a good example. We cannot expect to be able to follow quietly along processes, because we must need influence them, organise, stimulate, increase them, etc. The one thing we cannot do is to prevent the stage of the dialectical leap. This

applies to social activities as much as to the natural world. This is the form that movement takes! And as for movement itself, when its procedure is suddenly stopped, it becomes interrupted. It is not stopped, it is interrupted; it keeps hold of the conditions to start moving again, when allowed.

The process called 'violence' is the form which the movement of society takes. Violence exists in nature as much as in human relations. Those who employ the violence of terrorism do not coincide with the due process of history; they mean to intimidate people. For its part, the revolution does not do this. It does not seek to intimidate. When it wins, it is because the social and economic forms it offers are perceived as superior. It wins precisely because it shows itself capable of lifting off the yoke of apprehension and of removing every kind of imposition. What we call 'violence' today will disappear, because it will come to be recognised as the normal evolution of movement. Part of this, is the time when, after a great concentration of movement upon itself and a pressure of contradictory trajectories, it takes a superior form.

You do not hear about this among the communists, who never raise this matter of dialectics. And when they do it, it is to highlight some point of detail about a secondary matter. But the dialectical method is the base for the understanding of history. In consequence, many communists are sceptical - and even critics - of the dialectical method; whilst even the scientists of today are all dialecticians, though they may be ignorant of the fact.

J.POSADAS  
16 April 1978