

INTRODUCTION

This 'Report on Organisation' of the X World Congress by J Posadas, makes references to important events and political leaders of the 1970's.

This is the period when the nationalist revolution looks up to the workers state as model for social transformation. Peronism is the nationalist movement of Argentina.

Boumedienne in Algeria and Echevarria in Mexico were nationalist government leaders.

In 1973, there had been the Pinochet military coup. The coup in Argentina was going to take place not long after this Congress. In Argentina around that time, Herreras and Miguel were two CGT trade union leaders who proposed greater measures of trade union democracy, greater participation for the workers in the factories and some economic planning; the AAA was a repressive organisation in the Argentine army that functioned with 'death squadrons', kidnapping left wing militants and leaders, and making them 'disappear'. What Posadas calls the 'charros' is a type of bureaucrat in Mexico.

The Soyuz and the Apollo were spacecrafts sent in a joint USA-USSR venture, as part of what was called 'détente' during the 'cold war'. Elsewhere, Posadas refers to the 'bombe a billes', here translated as the fragmentation bomb.

The reference Posadas makes to famished children reloading a vehicle with potatoes and grain is based on a TV documentary that showed the Vietnamese children helping to send supplies to the Vietnamese soldiers.

To help with the reading of this Report in the English language, the word 'statification' used by J Posadas has been translated by 'state ownership'.

J Posadas refers to the 'Czechoslovaks' in the bureaucracy of the USSR, meaning the tendency in the Soviet bureaucracy that supported the 'Prague Spring' of 1968 and opposed the USSR's intervention in Czechoslovakia. J Posadas calls them 'the Russian Czechs', or sometimes 'the Czechs'.

About the workers states and the USSR, J Posadas refers to what he characterised as the Partial Regeneration.

The Global Revolutionary Process
and the Function
of the Trotskyist-Posadist
IV International

J POSADAS
26 July 1975

Report of Organisation – Xth World Congress Trotskyist-Posadist IV International
(From 'Revue Marxiste' No. 3, published August 1976)

This Chapter on Organisation will cover a series of aspects where we shall include, centrally, some essential questions like party life, party functioning, the experience of the International itself and the experience it makes in intervening towards the communist parties and the nationalist movements.

We will consider aspects of the process in Argentina, Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil and Uruguay. We will do this also for some European countries: Italy and France mainly because this is where the sharpest process of class struggle is happening.

We consider that the organisms of party functioning must aim to prepare the cadres. It must brief them, in such a way that they should be adequate for the task at hand. For them, this means their own political preparation through meetings, discussions, writing resolutions and taking initiatives. The other thing to establish is: what are the aims of the party? For, at every turn, our party must have an objective. This is the way the International has been able to develop on a world scale. Had it not done so, we would not be here today and there would be an immense political confusion in the International.

Our movement is transparent. Even though comrades come from very different backgrounds, they all have the same horizon. It is not the horizon of landscapes, you know, nor is it the one the physicians talk about. It is the horizon formed by the ideas. In physics, they demonstrate that the closer you get to the horizon and the farther away it gets! Our horizon is here, in our heads. Our perspective is to prepare the Party for the tasks at hand. Whilst it goes on preparing, the Party must be able to contribute ideas. It must contribute on Argentina, France, Chile, Peru, Italy, Britain or Spain. The Party must feed and nourish what happens in the process with ideas, advice and experiences. It will have to know how to do this and develop itself, all at the same time.

We are the only organisation with the historic and concrete joy of focusing preoccupation and functioning to examine, observe, draw conclusions. We must organise thought and experiences to be discussed in the world communist movement and in the world workers and revolutionary movement. Here, we will draw conclusions with a view to applying them to the dynamic, though empirical, process of the revolution. It is indeed a dynamic process. Take Portugal. It was one of the most backward countries and yet the Portuguese Revolution arose from some dispute between a general and a soldier. When this can happen, it is because a favourable world process is at its root. There is also the crisis of capitalism, of a kind that it cannot resolve any problem; all it does is keep Portugal tied-down and motionless. Capitalism is not short of economic expedients; it is just that it cannot produce the ideas to satisfy the human needs of today; and this, in turn, is because in Portugal or anywhere, what is wanted is not economic devices and measures, but social change. The spirit of humanity, its experience, has developed intelligence. Humanity is getting ready to resolve all the problems presented by the economy even whilst still inside the capitalist system. Humanity finds solutions via programmes, orientations and conclusions that do not increase the solidity of capitalist structures, even when still inside those structures. This weakens capitalism and removes the ladder from under its foot, rung by rung. To develop, capitalism has nothing to get hold of. It is constantly retreating.

THE MASSES OF ARGENTINA HAVE ADOPTED POINTS OF THE PROGRAMME OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

Measures for the progress of history are required. This is what the spirit and experience of humanity have demonstrated. Humanity has created organs that enable it to lay foundations for

further development. In Argentina there is no important communist party. Indeed, it is very small. There aren't any important workers organisations but the masses have recently adopted aspects of a programme that emanate from the world workers movement. In France, the socialists are discussing the alternatives facing them; they ask: what is our historic goal? What must we do? Should we go on with the Common Programme? Whilst in France, the socialists are still wondering, the masses of Argentina have managed to get socialist aspects of the working class programme adopted in the workers movement. Yet the socialist movement in France has better conditions than the Argentine workers movement. Argentina is farther behind compared to the class struggle in France. All this taken into account rather diminishes the French Common Programme. On the whole, the Common Programme is infinitely superior, but it is like a mantle thrown over two movements: one socialist - the other one bourgeois.

Capitalism does not find the social support it needs for the measures it would like to take. Its inevitable preparation for war stems from these economic, social, and political conditions. Capitalism has not the means to sustain its power. The experience of humanity is led by the proletariat; the proletariat calls the tune and imposes measures of proletarian power. Anti-capitalist measures have their core in the workers states, in the revolutionary countries and in the struggles of the masses of France, Italy and similar countries. The proletariat in Argentina observes this and gathers it up. The proletariat in the Latin American countries follows the events in Europe as much as the other way round. The proletariat everywhere receives the events of the world and assimilates the experiences made in other places. One can verify this because the implicit message sent to the world by The Whistles in Bologna and The Avalanche of Votes in Italy (1) has been recognised in Argentina. In Argentina, the events of Italy have helped to shape the programme just proposed by Miguel and Herreras.

The proletarian vanguard assimilates the experiences made in the world, and carries them inside the working class. Herreras has not arisen in history by chance. Since the conscious elements and conscious representatives of history are still missing, history invents them. It never happens that history invents what is outside the remit of its necessity. The example of Argentina that we have given above is only a beginning and the rest of the process will tell whether the CGT programme becomes accepted. Either it will be given legitimacy, or it will die away. It is important to appreciate that this programme has arisen in a trade union. It is important to see also its limitations because in its rather indeterminate form, it still runs the danger of being recuperated by the bourgeois camp. The point of this Argentine CGT programme is that it retakes a series of principles from the French Common Programme. So far, so good; now the correct observations it makes need to be acted upon. For example, it says that in order to go forward economically, the state needs to take hold of all the commanding heights of the economy. Elsewhere it says that it is the economy that decides and that economic planning is required; but then, as if suddenly shy about planning, it proposes the most un-ambitious and limited measures. This being said, it is quite a programme, because look at what they are talking about in a 'backward' country like Argentina!

In Chile, the assassin junta hopes to develop the economy at gunpoint. What insolence against history it is for a military junta to grab the economy of Chile with nothing to offer but the empiricism of private property. This assassin band has been able to strike at the revolution because of the erroneous policy of the revolutionary leadership; but this junta wanted to give a

blow to history. It does it by means of stimulating and exacerbating private interest, wielding it as tool for economic development. You know the results: on the one hand, in the hands of the assassin junta both the price and demand for copper collapsed; on the other, the struggle of the masses has increased in determination. They have increased their resolution to struggle and improved their programmatic consciousness. Time will show that for the junta, this is really quite an insoluble situation.

In Argentina, the repression of the AAA has the same meaning. It forms part of imperialist plans. Now the trade unions inject principles of planning into their programmes. These principles are still modest and limited, and in this sense, they can still become useful to the national bourgeoisies. But they allow the development of consciousness within the masses and inside the petty bourgeoisie. This saps the confidence of private property.

This is what our comrades of the Argentine section must learn. They must see how to increase their ability; how to intervene by supporting and defending the fundamental principles that allow the development of the economy; workers control and general planning. They must write and expand on these questions. They must call on the workers movement to take the measure of the CGT's programme, showing in what way it is good and in what way it is also very limited. Our comrades must demonstrate that some points in this programme are of greater benefit to the bourgeoisie than to the proletariat: such a limited programme prevents, detains, contains and hinders economic development, to the point when it rolls it back. Why is this? The reason is that the bourgeoisie develops the economy for its own interests, and in relation to what secures its means of accumulation. It invests, yes, if this it anticipates a profit for itself. But with planning in the general interest, on the other hand, the economy develops infinitely more. The bourgeoisie says: "you cannot remove the boss". But certainly one can! To go forward and progress at all, these measures are needed because genuine progress calls for them.

It is necessary to develop all these ideas in the workers movement, among the communists, and also in the military. It is important to realise that the rules and programmes of the Military Technologists are also some kind of invention by history. These people have free reign for the while. So, there must be additions made in the CGT programme: the fundamental principles of workers control and true workers participation, because this finishes with careerism. From the capitalist point of view, Argentina may be one of the most developed Latin American countries but it goes on being a semi colonial one. It is not the most industrially advanced, but its capitalist economic forms are of the most developed in Latin America: in the countryside as much as in towns. It is a structured country from the capitalist point of view and for that reason, it is important that the army should support the measure of workers control.

It is necessary to intervene showing the need to extend the very limited sort of workers control proposed by the bureaucrats in factories. There must be assemblies and debates where the workers decide who controls and how to control. In places where decisions emanate from workshops or from sections, these must be passed on from factory to factory. This is the way to create workers control; whilst this takes place, workers democracy must be insisted upon. It must be developed so that it presides over the correct kind of workers control and over what to do next. For example, good measures proposed by the trade unions remain under threat of being used for an alliance between union bureaucracy and national bourgeoisies. True, there

are cases when such alliances do not even end up pleasing the national bourgeoisie. In 1946 for example, the trade union leaders in Argentina proposed a 'Production Road Map': the unions would control, and they did: both the workers - and the bosses! Finally, this developed a super-bureaucracy quite independent from everyone. First the bosses did not like this and refused. But when the bureaucrats made the commitment that the said 'workers control' would be exercised by them only, the bosses agreed.

In Mexico, the same phenomenon: the bureaucracy has managed to acquire a certain notion of the function it can be allowed play, not missing out on the possibilities for itself. It has appetite enough for the cake, and the eating of it – that cake Engels talked about. The comrades must intervene to prevent this happening; for, from an idea of control not altogether objectionable, there can emanate a measure of control determined by those at the tops and nothing at all to do with workers control. So, one must insist that the workers intervene. The workers must discuss in the factories and in the trade unions; and indeed, in the whole country. The workers must intervene to determine the course of production, and when they have done this, to spread out the scope of their resolution. It is not enough to worry about how much to produce, and how much the profits. It is a matter of the entire planning of the production. True workers control must lead to the workers deciding on the question of the content of the production.

What activity for the coming stage? What activity is wanted following this congress? The activity of the International and of each of its sections consists in deepening the programme; and in getting oneself prepared, in organising oneself politically with these objectives in mind.

Algeria is a country quite different from Argentina, France, Mexico or Italy. Granted; but these countries do not differ from each other when it comes to their general experience of what it is necessary to do. The gains made in our sections are communicated to the world workers and communist movements, improving the ability of the latter to intervene on their own account. Each section must give itself a plan and objectives: like what do we want in the coming period, what do we aim for?

Generally speaking and without entering quite into the analysis of each country, our aim in the next stage is to develop our party so that it should function organically, with an aim; it should have progress forecasts in the activity of influencing the world communist movement, for example, or in gaining members to the International. There are countries with small socialist, communist or nationalist predominance where we must aim at winning a current that prepares itself consciously. Ours is not an activity we have plucked out of thin air and about which we propose to go out and see how it fares. In our activity, we must use the means of forecast and prepare ourselves according to it. We are going to develop cadres to the capacity of each, and the individual preoccupation of each. This makes a selection; not a selection arising from what one or another says in a meeting, but according to methodical behaviour.

One of the greatest gains from regular functioning is that it lends method to the cadres. Method is the indispensable tool. One must prepare for action without improvisation. One must learn from the errors committed and the blows that will come. We do not fear the blows for we have the necessary consciousness to keep going. This Congress is of the most logical expressions of the progresses we have made: now, let us get ready – not to receive blows, but to go forth!

We must get ready for inexhaustible openings to come. The whole workers movement offers possibilities for our development. Argentina is a case in point. In Argentina, imperialism had figured that with the AAA and the Isabel Peron's government, it could land a pretty discouraging kick on the workers movement. The reaction of the masses through the trade unions shows that this did not work. They have not been cowed; they have gone on following national politics and feeling part of the world. Had there not been the recent struggles in Italy that led to the Bologna Whistles, and The Landslide of Votes, had there not been the Popular Union in France, there would not have been such a reaction in Argentina. We are not saying that what happened in Italy and France determined what happened in Argentina! It does not mean that the one movement was pre-requisite to the other! It means that such movements nourish each other, creating a given level of determination in the world proletarian vanguard. In turn, the vanguard finds the ways and means to communicate with the rest of the population. This is not done verbally but via propositions, resolutions, combats and organisms.

Our attention must focus on fundamental events; priority must be given to such in our discussions. Our ideas must develop around the experiences and around the tasks at hand. This is simple in principle; but it gets complicated by the way events present themselves and by our lack of sufficient forces. For example, when intervening in a movement where the leadership is nationalist and the base is working class, one requires the programme as set out in our document "From Nationalism to the Workers State". Essentially, this type of movement is nationalist because of its economic and social objectives. If the workers are supporting it, it is because they hope to push it forward. We must apply ourselves to see how we can accompany the experience such a movement makes, because it is in that experience that the workers are maturing and fighting. This is what we must do now in this present stage of Peronism in Argentina. It demands from us that we present persuasively the necessity for the best programme. To do this, we must dedicate ourselves to the consistent study of this process and really understand it.

THE DIALECTICAL AND MARXIST METHOD OF ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED IN BUILDING THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP

The hybrid nature of the world process generates hybrid consequences: meaning that, the world revolutionary movement goes on swelling with programme, confidence and optimism, even though the leaderships still remain bourgeois. The bourgeoisie can neither shake off the working class, nor can it really remain itself strictly on its own bourgeois terrain. This demands from us that we should learn how to operate without either being sectarian on the one hand, or without being 'suivist' on the other - meaning following behind. We have to be judicious in the choice of slogans. Certainly, this is rather complicated, but one must learn this. Aren't we doing other things equally as complicated? And another thing: we are talking about a historic process that is not going to be led by ourselves! But then, when did history need to be led? By 'history', we mean that the economy, by its very nature, must needs to unify itself, and this, on a world scale. Its very nature is the cause of this; it is a world necessity. The idea represents it, foresees it and organises the natural channels in which it will flow. The idea is not the force of the process of history. It is its representation. The economy tends to unify and it needs to become centralised. This cannot happen all of itself: the party must be there. Where the party does not produce the timely slogan, if the lead is not ready in time, it cancels its role; it regresses or it

dies.

In 1917, had Lenin not been there, the Russian Revolution would not have happened. Trotsky cites ten reasons for the triumph of the Russian Revolution. Point nine is Lenin; this is not a number that positions Lenin; it means to show where Trotsky placed political leadership in chronological order of importance. Without Lenin, the Revolution could not have triumphed. In Latin America and Africa, the leaderships are made of tendencies that come from the nationalist bourgeois or bourgeois camp. Our intervention must be timely, with ideas and slogans, with programmes and agitation. Inside the nationalist leaders, we must help develop their capacity to generalise from experience. This capacity will permit them to keep going forward. They must be shown how to be confident and certain that the way ahead of them can only be revolutionary. Without us doing this, there will be no success from those leaderships in Latin America, Asia and Africa. This is so because, coming as they do from the bourgeois or the nationalist camp, they have no perspective of their own. They have no perspective because the intermediate economy they seek between the bourgeois one and that of the workers state - does not exist. History has not found the way to render this possible. Indeed, there are only two ways for economic development: the bourgeois way, or the workers state way. Thus, there are only two ways of thinking this, two ways of thought about it, and only two definitions.

One must intervene in this process however, and learn. The communist leaderships do not interpret the revolutionary process. To the extent that they originate from previous bureaucratic stages, they are not the standard bearers of the revolutionary struggle for socialism. And so it happens that the workers state is a contradictory thing. Its structure, foundations and roots are in socialism but its political leadership is bureaucratic: distribution in the workers state of the USSR remains bourgeois - namely to each according to ability. What are then the prospects for advance in this conflict that takes the form of a contradiction rather than that of an antagonism? What is the bureaucracy? One thing is certain: it is not the genuine and conscious representative of the process; it does not represent the ideas, programme or policies necessary for the progress of the workers state. To the extent to which this is so, how is it that bureaucracy keeps going? It does, because it is obliged to. Any step forward it may take is imposed upon it by the needs of the economy, of science and of the masses. Thus bureaucracy does not represent, or even reflect, the formidable process below. Quite the reverse, it contains it. It tries its best to throttle it. When, as happens now, the Soviet bureaucracy appeals for help and for the preservation of some proletarian ideology, it is because it knows imperialism prepares for war and can launch it any moment. Besides this, the bureaucracy feels the constant danger represented to its survival by the existence within it of the 'Prague Spring' types, the Russian 'Czechs', who come from a previous stage. Faced with this, the bureaucracy appeals for some measures - but the latter are no longer appropriate. Meanwhile, the 'Czechs' take all dispositions necessary to foil the advent of a new 'Lenin'. As a result, the bureaucracy proceeds uncertainly, torn between its determination not to give in to the masses, and its concern to save itself from its opponents. To the extent to which it can still identify with this stage in the development of the workers state, it is forced to associate with one revolution or two in the world. Whilst in the corridors, there lurk types like Solzhenitsyn.

The communists do not understand this process. It is not that they lack intelligence, but that they come from a movement and a process where the methodology is neither dialectical nor

Marxist. Indeed, bureaucratic interest has governed their way of looking at reality for so long that they can only see part of it. Now, the necessity of history marches on, and forces them to look again. For our part we must not wait, but intervene to help the formation of communist tendencies, supporting those that go forward and preparing for the day when some will come and start weighing importantly in the world communist movement.

If we try to develop ourselves outside the communist movement in the nationalist, catholic or military ones, it is still with the idea of becoming able to weigh in the communist movement. Impulsions can come from anywhere but the decisions are made in Moscow. This is not because Moscow is more venerable or strong. It is because Moscow saw the most complete revolution, the one with the most complete historic base, the most necessary base; and the most complete proletariat in history.

To all those who mock the soviet proletariat by asking: "but where is this soviet proletariat?" we reply: "do not go after the soviet proletariat, go after Stalin and Nazi imperialism". This is the way to tackle the question and the reply comes direct from the mouth of the soviet proletariat. If the soviet proletariat is not standing out more towards the front where it can be seen clearly, it is because its leadership is not letting it. But even far from view, one can tell it is not keeping quiet. The proletariat intervenes and weighs in soviet society, defending in the most wholehearted and concentrated way the economic, scientific and centralised advances of the Soviet Union. Had this not been the case, Solzhenitsyn would have become chief of the Moscow 'Czechs' by now.

Though having to improve ourselves every day, we already trust in our ability because we represent a progress for history. Of course, we represent only a part of it; the whole of progress means the masses: the Soviet, the German, French, Czechoslovak, etc - not to forget the North American masses, in a historic sense. For, if the North American proletariat had been doing nothing but sit and admire Yankee imperialism filling its pockets, the war would have been launched long ago. One of the reasons, though perhaps not the most important, why Yankee imperialism has not yet launched the war, is because it looks over its shoulder at the reaction of the North American proletariat: 'Will it clap, eh?' - But no. Yankee imperialism sees that the proletariat is much more ready to smash it than to clap and support. By nature and inclination, the proletariat cannot be disposed to be the constant and conscious instrument of imperialism. This is why the meetings of the AFL/CIO are exercises for hierarchies with not a worker in sight. This so-called trade union centre doesn't at all represent the workers movement.

About the topic of 'workers participation' emanating from the USA, we hear of a slogan calling for the "participation of the workers in employers' and state panels". The working class must counter this by upholding a workers' programme in every workplace. For, even when a firm is state owned, it does not mean that it operates in the interests of the population! In those companies, planning and administration are not applied with objectivity. As for what happens in smaller enterprises, one must demand salary rises, improvements in work conditions and pose that production must be at the service of the population; such an enterprise must hear clearly what the workers want and it must explain why it refuses. In North America, the leaders of the workers organisations are used by the bosses like puppets; the workers must not accept this. This is also what 'class struggle' means. Yankee enterprises often talk of associating the workforce, but this is to corrupt a top trade union layer and keep the workers movement out.

Today, revolution is worldwide and it can be made to flow in many channels. This is one such channel and we must remember it. The workers movement must be independent and denounce the collusion between the trade union leaderships and the bosses. The programme in this situation must stress the need for economic development to be at the service of the whole population. One must show how things would be so much improved for the North American population, if only the economy was in the hands of the workers movement, properly state owned and under workers control.

We keep returning to the Stalin question because it will soon be relevant. It is necessary to study the texts about this matter; not to show that we have been right all along, but to show that Trotsky's struggle was justified; as ours' is justified; to reason with the workers' vanguard and give it the arguments needed. There is a crying need for arguments, analyses, to educate the workers vanguard in the method of analysis, to educate intermediate communist sectors, the socialists, the nationalists, the Catholics and the military. We gave once a course to a nationalist military sector, a course that is still applicable to soldiers who start thinking. We examined the reasons for their fear of Marxism. We inspected the following antagonistic contradiction: pragmatic rigidity of military nature, versus the dialectical method of Marxism. In the two parts of the contradiction, objectives and methods differ - granted! But in this stage of history, the military feels that their uniform must be the signifier of something charged with human meaning, concerned with improvements, disposed to make a difference in history. Because this is not rare today, it shows that the conditions exist for the military to hear courses on Marxism, and to hear about the economy. The courses may not be always exhaustive, but explanations can be given about struggles, about the economy, society, human relations and social relations. Much can be said on music and song – with arguments and reasoning. We do not mean the sort of arguments the mystics give, but those worthy of the revolutionary organiser who seeks to be explicit and to organise: showing the why and the how. This endeavour, helped by the present favourable world process, can only find a welcome in the military.

The other fundamental aspect for which the comrades must get ready is this: our task towards the communist party. Let us not forget that we are in a rising curve of the revolution. From Italy to Argentina, there is no great difference. The workers vanguard establishes communication between the two. In Argentina, there is hardly any communist party at all. The socialist party is insignificant. However, even then, the proletariat of that country adopts points of programme and policies that have nothing to do with Argentine nationalism; nothing to do with god, religion or warmongering. What it adopts springs from the proletarian programme and from the general class struggle tending to incline towards the workers state. It is neither Miguel nor Herreras who invented this, be sure of that. These points of programme come from the experience far and wide made by the masses – in Italy, France, even Britain. Had there been a retreat in the world process of the revolution, you would not have witnessed such an animation in Argentina! In turn, the Argentine masses send a feedback to the masses of Italy, France, etc. It is the unequal and combined process of history, where what is unequal is slight whilst what is combined characterises the process almost entirely. What is most advanced in the world often finds its representation through lesser means, as in Argentina, where the means are less. This must be a rock of confidence for our comrades to trust in the necessity for them to plan their activity in each section, aiming at programmatic advances. This applies anywhere, Algeria, Spain, anywhere. The internal life of the party and its activity must be planned: political life, theoretical

study, the development of cadres, the ability to intervene, the number of members, etc. All this must be done in order to weigh every time more.

It seems that in the official State Summits to be held soon, like the one that took place at the initiative of Boumedienne or of Echevarria, Argentina is going to play a very important part. Our sections must plan their campaigns. This is the conclusion of this meeting. The development of the revolution expresses itself in the form of the Partial Regeneration. It also expresses itself through the advance of the socialist parties and the struggle of the masses in the world: from Africa and Asia, to Latin America. The triumph of the revolution in Vietnam is emphatic; the same goes for Cambodia and Laos. The current that seeks unification between those three countries is a beginning, and a necessity at all levels: the economy, culture and science. If not this, 'self determination' does not mean anything.

There is such a thing as 'self determination' but there is also another like: 'self revolution'. Problems are not solved today as in Lenin's time. Ethiopia shows how to do it now, and it is as we have proposed. Nationalities and 'self determination' are no longer sought after solely to stimulate the individual interest of a country, a region or a particular sector. Such questions are now solved by means of unification, with the question of the economy placed squarely in the centre of it. And what is there at the centre of the economy? There is the organised intervention of the masses, through their organisms whose aim is to discuss and lead. This is the way the masses are going about learning how to direct the economy, how to organise it and how to distribute its gains. This is a generous fountain of historic and social confidence, a confidence that will eventually be transcended and communicated to all other fields, like those of culture, of science and of revolution.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAMME FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORKERS STATE

Another matter arises clearly as a consequence of the exhaustion of capitalism: it is the general world crisis of the socialists, the communists and the Catholics; crisis too of the military, and in the nationalists like the Peronists in Argentina. This is because today's problems by-pass the programmes and policies of them all, making demands that overwhelm their leaderships. It was not like this before. In the past, regular rapports of alliances and agreements between capitalism and these leaders enabled them both to resolve the problems arising in each country through concessions, often very small.

In relation to the masses, the vanguard and other layers, these leaders had become used to contain the process of demands in this way: concede a little, a very little if possible; partial concession is the thing: a privilege here, a little economic or social improvement there. These leaderships were masters at gaining time. But today, the game is up. Capitalism has no longer the means to allow this to go on. It is exhausted and its possibilities to go on with this are at zero. The trade union bureaucracies, the union leaders and the political parties no longer find the margin of manoeuvre they need for their policy of conciliation with capitalism. For their part, the masses are not disposed to stop demanding their rights. Sure of themselves, they keep

marching on; and in this, there lies the real cause for the crisis of capitalism. It is the main reason for the crisis of capitalist policy. We are not talking about a simple economic crisis.

There are other factors of crisis, like the economy, inter-capitalist competition and the workers states; but the crisis of capitalism is historically determined by the development of the revolution. It is due to the fact that the masses keep marching on. Far from giving up, they give support to the rise and development of class and revolutionary tendencies. As neither capitalism nor bureaucracy can yield concessions, anyone attempting to find new intermediate terrains of class conciliation is frustrated. Moreover, the reason for the crisis of capitalism is also the reason for the crisis in the communists. The communists are forced to give up on the idea of bourgeois democracy as the way forward.

Communist leaders like Carrillo in Spain want to keep the bourgeois democratic pillow. Portugal has shown clearly what to make of it, but Carrillo has chosen to close his eyes and pronounce: "No. In Spain, it is different; we shall be prudent". The Spanish masses laugh because they do not give a fig for this prudence. They keep intact their decision to combat now that there is no longer room for class conciliation. This is the reason for the crisis they all experience. That same reason has other effects: it is the same reason why Herreras in Argentina stands up and says: "The bourgeoisie will not go away before having used every means at its disposal to stay in power". We do read in this declaration more than needful because it may have been made to attract attention. Nonetheless, it shows that one can go further: in proposing the immediate application of the points of the CGT programme like the participation of the workers, the right of the masses to intervene and greater trade union democracy; and in adding, for instance, the sliding scale of salaries with weekly adjustments.

It is in 1938 that Trotsky detailed these points of programme; many sniggered behind their hand, telling him: "These things are old hat. The Trotsky (of 1917) died long ago". Not so. Trotsky's theoretical thought and his capacity of foresight have not died. The sliding scale of wages and the sliding scale of working hours are still very much on the order of the day. More still: any enterprise to be closed pretending that it cannot pay its way, must pass into the hands of the state. No more talking, the state must expropriate it and put it under workers control. Factory committees must be set up to raise this discussion. They must be allowed to take immediately the kind of measures needed to solve the crisis.

Our party must discuss all these things; and whilst it does it, it must focus on the crisis of the nationalists, the military, the communists and the socialists. It must have a plan of intervention uniting activities in the following way: whilst our party must take a close interest in trade union matters, it must concentrate on the programmatic demands and political solutions we propose against the crisis of capitalism. This is what we must do the world over, in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. The party must take the initiative in this way and fix itself clear objectives.

The communists and partly the socialists make proposals but these remain limited. In France, the Common Programme is good but it lacks in dynamism and immediate goals. Should we dare to say that it is more 'common' in irresponsiveness than in programme? There are hundreds of failed factories occupied by the workers and what does the Common Programme say? It does not occur to them to pose state ownership, planning and workers control. So, our

comrades of the French, Italian and British sections must do it; they must take the initiative of raising these ideas. They must do this less by denouncing than by arguing. In the face of unemployment, the lack of jobs for the young, it is not enough to say: "we want work". Work must come accompanied by other kind of relations, human relations. As capitalism is incapable of this, one must show the way and add: state planning, workers committees for control, workers councils – in Italy, Spain, everywhere. Even though the communists turn away and try to avoid it, we propose to discuss this with them.

Boumedienne thinks he cannot find a solid point of support for his socialist programme. But this is because he needs straighten up the Algerian workers movement first; at present he does not allow the workers to intervene in the factories; they have not the full democratic right to do so. It is not exact to say that the workers, if allowed, would come up with unacceptable demands. Far from it, the example of every revolution shows that the workers have never put difficulties in the way of it, be it about salaries, work or life conditions. The Vietnamese workers are the example that illustrates very well how they starved whilst carrying supplies, not touching a single grain of unguarded corn. It is documented that in Vietnam, people helped reload overturned containers without taking anything at all. This sort of thing happened in Vietnam but also in Laos and Cambodia. It happened in Italy and France too.

If the workers do not act like this today in capitalism, it is because the present relations are capitalist. The rising tide that leads people into the taking of anti-capitalist measures is full of education and a source of inexhaustible inspiration. This is why we must propose to Boumedienne that he should call on the Algerian workers to intervene through workers control and workers councils - the latter acting through the means of trade union democracy. This way, all the problems get discussed. It would be false to believe that this being the case, the workers are going to start making exaggerated or disproportionate salary demands. There are those who are capable of this, and they are the managers, the administrators and the bureaucrats. For they busy themselves with 'capital gain assessments' and other such things, certain that the worth of their important selves has a figure on their salary slips. For their part, the workers will want a salary to live on, in correspondence with their feeling of responsibility in history. In this matter, no one is Algerian, French or Brazilian. The working class acts in this way because of its historic condition. Certainly, you can find one worker or two who want to be one of the boys. But as a class, the working class does not do this. This is because the progress of history is calling for the workers in power and not for one or two powerful workers. Vietnam is an example.

The experts in psychology were aghast when they observed the following event in Vietnam: potatoes had fallen off a military supply lorry and a group of famished Vietnamese children went to pick them up, not thinking of keeping them to eat. Enough for the experts to throw all their books in the sea, don't you think? Psychologists are in the habit of measuring and cataloguing human actions, but they do it according to the pattern of human relations already established in the capitalist world; this makes them blind to class conduct. For our part, we declare with complete confidence and with a sense of historic joy that the working class will never put difficulties in the way of revolution. Some people have declared that, in Chile, the masses brought the revolution down themselves! How stupid one can get! The masses did not make the Chilean revolution fail! Far from it, they were desperate for the proper means by which to forward it, namely factory expropriations, out with the bureaucrats and the administrators, etc. It

was precisely the working class who rose against all those types.

To operate as a class, the working class needs to unify its behaviour. For this to happen, the vanguard at the head of it must have access to the rest. This is best achieved in trade union democracy because the vanguard can address the political life of the whole class. It can speak to it and communicate with it. Take Algeria or France: what is the political life of the class? It is just about zero. Do they allow this in France, and if so, where? We are not talking about whether Marx, Engels and Trotsky are available for reading or not; we refer to an open political life and a working life where debate is normal. But deep inside itself, the working class does discuss: if unimpeded, it naturally inclines towards Trotsky - the latter pointing back to Marx. Intelligent and engaged, the working class goes to Marx. We need to intervene and enter polemics around those aspects in the working class movement.

Communist Party, communist base and communist leadership are not to be confused; neither confused, nor opposed to each other. For the degrees of maturation are different between party and leadership. In previous stages of history and up until when classes disappear, the working class will remain more sensitive to the progress of history than its leadership. Certainly, we do not expect the working class to become expert in Soyouz' mechanics. The working class is impressed by its ability to go so high up in the sky; but it wonders how it is that floods and droughts are not prevented yet; why is it that scientific knowledge is not used so that people stop dying of hunger? How come that knowledge is not directed towards the eradication of the cause of all calamities, namely capitalism itself? If asked, this will be the practical conclusion of the workers. It is already the conclusion of the communist and of the socialist vanguard.

It is a fact that theoretical and political comprehension is lesser amongst the socialists. This is to be seen in what their leaders write in France, Italy and Germany, a marker of the fact that they are closer to the capitalist camp. For all they are strong on intellectual pride, their discourse remains no less outside class objectives. They are mostly managers of political parties – parties with a recent past and doubtful future. This is because the future belongs to the socialist masses and to those of the socialist leaders who seek the progress of history. It is important to value at its worth the reasoning there is in the workers vanguard, its capacity for comprehension; and also its capacity for action, because its conclusions are of the practical kind, materialist and dialectical. Certainly, it lacks in actual knowledge. It has a deficit in scientific briefing, scientific practice and corresponding scientific certainty. But it makes up for this in the practice of its life. Its experience as a class makes of it a dialectical materialist. Not necessarily well versed in matters of physics or of chemistry, it is an authority in the field of social relations. As it intervenes in social relations, it prepares the conditions by which to become an expert tomorrow in physics and chemistry.

The Soyouz/Apollo space flight paints a view of the world that does not exist, akin to two smiling figures cavorting before the useless backdrop of conciliation. The working class is not fooled and this is very obvious because some bourgeois papers report: “many people say the meeting in space of Soyouz and Apollo is a comedy.” In fact, the bourgeois are warning each other: “don't be taken in, don't fall asleep under the Soyouz' kisses”. Of course, there have not been any debates about Apollo or Soyouz in the factories. This does not stop the fact that it is precisely there that occupations are taking place at the moment, occupations with

un-interrupted, continuous production. The workers go on producing and better than before, with lower production costs and greater sales, enough for the workers to live better. The workers see quite well that the bosses are redundant and play no role. In their practical experience, the workers verify every day that they can manage without the boss. In corners, you can hear the groans of a foreman or that of a communist, a socialist or trade union leader, at a loss about the serious matters of capital flow, investments, returns and balances. Full of gravitas about the various aspects of these quite simple matters, they hope to intimidate the workers. But these are only functions! Besides, they are quite easy to sort out: expropriation - of everything. In this, the workers are 'for'; those 'against' are the bureaucrats, fearing consequences, conflicts, civil war or whatever; in one word, they let themselves be intimidated.

Nothing like this would weigh much if only the communist parties and the socialists had a political life. Civil war, really? And if so, would it be such a catastrophe? And if so, for whom? They always avoid discussing this, but it must be discussed; and this, everywhere. Even if in Algeria, for instance, this debate is not on the order of the day right away, one must discuss it all the same, to raise the level of comprehension in people and for them to get used to the idea of dominating all the events of history; and mostly, to allow the worker, peasant and petty bourgeois vanguard to trust in its own self, and to increase its self-confidence. None of this may be of immediate concern in Algeria today, but it forms part of the learning of how to combine confidence and logical reasoning with the capacity for intervention. Generally speaking, Boumedienne needs all this; but in particular, he needs this kind of organised force behind him to enable him to go forward. That he is looking for support shows in the way he goes to seek that of Echevarria in Mexico. Even though this is not unreasonable, it is likely to yield secondary results compared with the support he could find in Algeria.

When we get involved it must be to apply these experiences, to develop our persuasive critical capacity and to increase our own means of intervention. The vanguard is way over the level of the leaderships and it has authority itself over the rest of the masses. The problems of this stage of history need resolving: there is the economic crisis, the rise in the cost of living, unemployment. In previous times, the struggles around these things were met with unmitigated repression: In the US, Germany, France, Italy or Britain. Today, however, capitalism fears resorting to this, regardless of whether it would like to do it. Certainly it would like to resort to fascism in France and Italy, if only it could. But instead, the historic conditions are favourable to the progress and action of the masses. Capitalism is isolated, without means or real strength. Indeed, it has atomic weapons and quite a military arsenal for intervention, but that does not change the fact that it is at a loss about what to do apart from using those. Deep down, it does not even believe it can co-ordinate all its forces for an outcome favourable to itself in general war. On the other hand, the one who has all the right conditions to intervene is the proletariat. To the crises, it has the solutions.

The proletariat has the conditions to intervene. The Soyouz/Apollo mission gives the false impression that an alliance is needed with the capitalist system, that it can be done, and that one should forge ahead in like fashion. This is deceiving for the petty bourgeoisie, the technicians, the administrators and others who are increasingly attracted by the proletariat. This suggests to them that there is a possibility for historic conciliation between the workers state and capitalism. They are invited to believe falsely that it is all fair play: as if one could count on

imperialism to surrender to the side that will eventually be shown to be the most able and resourceful. This is what this space embrace is saying. We stop short of calling it a historic farce, because the Soviet side really means to try and win the capitalist system over. But this is no good, of course. And it lends capitalism an image that is an illusion, as if one should believe that capitalism can be made to reason; as if capitalism could think and adjust its movements, economic and social measures, its politics and its military, along the lines dictated by reason! Not so. Capitalism decides according to its own interests and it avails itself of every historic opportunity.

It is fundamental to show how capitalism is the one that acts in a centralised manner as far as its historic interests and class possibilities are concerned. If capitalism makes this space 'rendez vous', it is because its interests are obliging it to do so. It realises that an enormous layer of the US population looks up to the Soviet Union. This is logical because one only has to look at the USSR, and then at the US, and compare.

There is a stir of discussion about these events in the communist, socialist, proletarian, Peronist, catholic and military movements. But as a whole, these movements lack greatly in self-confidence, policies, programmes and objectives. Pressed forward by the masses, they grope about without seeing, hoping that they may find a way of commanding some attention in the top notches and perhaps be allowed to consort with them a little longer.

In spite of the limited aspects of what Herreras and Miguel pose, we must support what is valid and try to spread it to the rest. For example, they propose workers' participation in the factories. In this case, we must raise very simple arguments, such as: In the name of whom are the workers going to participate in running the factory? Indeed, the workers must participate, but surely, they must do so in the name of the workers; if not, what are the workers called upon to do? Who are they going to represent? This debate is an opportunity to make proposals that show how to uphold the interests of the workers movement and population; one can show that any production or planning must be made to serve interests wider than those of the capitalists; otherwise capitalism adapts workers participation and serves itself. In a process of workers participation, there will be debates about the hours of work, conditions of work, salaries and investments. This will be the time to raise the necessity for workers control; for example, if the workers' delegates are left to face the employers alone, they are drawn into becoming the tool of the bosses. If the delegates are subject to recall by the workers, they will have to be the representatives of the workers' side among the bosses - and it will soon transpire that management need not be there and that it must not be capitalist! If this control is not imposed on the workers' delegate, an adaptation takes place that enables the bosses' interests to grow their tentacles inside the workers movement and the trade unions.

The party must discuss and prepare. In 1948, we already wrote in an article what we are saying here. In those days, Peron was calling for workers' delegates on the management board of the railways. It was a state enterprise, and he may have hoped to improve it to his credit; he may have calculated that a workers' delegate can easily be made to speak for management against the workers. This is why our party must discuss and be ready.

Today, you have the same situation in Mexico. The trade union of the electricians STERM

threatens to stop supporting the government, and indeed to oppose it. We advise not to separate the union from the government but to raise political ideas instead, to help the Mexican revolution. True, one must not remain submitted to the state apparatus, but the aim must be to remain in a position to influence the government. Our party needs to be prepared to accomplish such tasks. This is done on one hand, by discussing, and on the other by dynamic intervention.

There have been agreements recently between Argentina and the Soviet Union. There is a very great advance in this way, but not enough; there is the need for a countrywide planning in Argentina. This is going to demand the workers movement becomes a factory of ideas, proposals, suggestions, measures and its own planning programmes. The workers movement will have to resort to educating its own ranks, as a class, and insist on vigorous discussions in the trade unions and factories. Why shouldn't the workers discuss the planning of the country? To say the workers are not interested can only be false! What the workers demonstrate is not their lack of interest; it is their lack of interest in the meetings of the bureaucrats who are all talk and no action. This is why the workers leave the meetings. When they prepare for action, far from doing this, they concentrate.

These are very important experiences that solicit our intervention. Our Greek comrades have given us illustrations. The recent confrontations in Greece between the masses and police were not the work of leftists or rebels, but that of the working class. This is soon going to have important repercussions.

RETURN TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MARXIST ANALYSIS

We must prepare for intervention in the new situations, in Argentina, Brazil, Greece or Algeria. We must support all the advances in those countries, in the movements and the governments. We must encourage and nurture the formation of organisms that will ease the task of the working class. We are no longer in a stage when there was sufficient historic time to start building from scratch revolutionary parties. Now we must use the tools that exist - legacies of history. By this we mean that the moment of definition is close by. We base our tactics and prospects for intervention upon the rhythms and delays we perceive in history. And all the while, we watch closely the debates in the world communist movement.

Each of our sections must really understand, dominate and argue. It must be able to explain such matters as what Stalin did and the historic reasons for his death. It must know the experiences in history that explain the degeneration of the workers state. Each section must know the reasons why the workers state maintains itself in spite of degeneration. This is not any 'antinomy' as some say; it is a contradiction that will resolve itself in the way of every contradiction: either the degenerated workers state will return to capitalism, or it will overcome its degeneration. The paramount topic for study in our sections is, 'what is the workers state?'

About the dictatorship of the proletariat, there are hardly any references made in the world communist movement or in the workers states. We keep returning to this. We raised this matter quite a long time ago in an article on Trotsky and Lenin, who both wrote a lot about the dictatorship of the proletariat. Many things have happened since Trotsky's death that he could not have foreseen. Foremost about these is the advent of 14 workers states as we have today,

workers states divided among themselves! Trotsky could not have foreseen that the Soviet Union would remain alone in the World War; and that it would not be crushed even then; and would be followed by other revolutions. He could not foretell all this in concrete terms. But he saw the general trend of history and he said in 1938: "In ten years, millions of revolutionaries will follow the programme and objectives of the IV International".

The course of history has illustrated this well. Ten years later, in 1948, there were twelve new workers states. Trotsky was not making pronouncements to become famous! He summed up the prospects. He managed to keep his ability for clear foresight in the most difficult circumstances of history: the whole Bolshevik vanguard had been assassinated around him. The workers movement was in retreat and Stalin had just made a pact with Hitler! In spite of this – we were the only ones to point this out at the time – there was still Mexico, Cardenas, and Cardenas' policy, showing that the workers movement never did let itself be entirely crushed. Retreating, and greatly hit, certainly. But it never gave up, and even less disappeared. Cardenas was the expression that such were the relation of world forces, even then.

From 1936 to 1938, Spain received 180,000 revolutionaries from all corners of the world, half of whom were workers' cadres. Therefore one cannot say simply that the workers movement was in retreat. This would be wrong. There was indeed a retreat but the vanguard was on the watch for fresh points of support. From there, it was making itself ready to launch new offensives and draw the proletariat behind itself. Had this not been the case, there would not have been such a mobilisation for Spain. Shortly after this, the same thing happened in Yugoslavia where 250,000 young people from the world came and started building railways. They laid hundreds of kilometres of track by hand in the same way as happened in the Mexican revolution under Pancho Villa.

Youth was not invented yesterday! Youth comes from long ago, before Vietnam and the present world revolutionary situation! However, it is a fact that young people have been much in the picture during and after the Second World War. In 1948, the youth rose in a general swell. It could not keep an even tempo and a durable programmatic form because the leaderships did not permit it. Had the communists taken power in 1948 in France and Italy, the Youth with the adults would have taken power in the rest of the world.

And now, it is a fact that the communist movement has no notion of what the workers states are. They are at an even greater loss about the differences between them. We characterised Cuba as a 'sui generis' workers state, and that its political revolution was also 'sui generis'. We said that this qualification applied to no other workers state. Why 'sui generis'? Because the Cuban revolution was not started by a leadership that had a workers state in mind; indeed, that leadership was bourgeois. It was a bourgeois leadership, and it had only intended to humanise Cuban capitalism. Half way through the revolution, however, and in conditions of the existence of the USSR, a workers state rose up in Cuba practically in the teeth of that leadership. This is why the Cuban leaders of that epoch kept speaking for a whole period of a 'moralised' capitalist regime. This can be checked in Castro's speeches. It is the masses that imposed the Cuban workers state.

This is the way this characterisation of 'sui generis' came up; meaning that this revolution

conformed to no model and resembled no other. Cuba had acquired characteristics of its own, exclusive to itself and due to the fact that the historic roots of the revolution were bourgeois; its objectives long remained bourgeois too. It is only along the way that the leadership got transformed and became revolutionary. How do you qualify such an unprecedented thing? We could not say this revolution was deformed or degenerated! It was a revolution that triumphed over a leadership that was initially contrary. More than contrary: opposed, because it had only wanted capitalism with a moral face. It is on the way that it became clear the revolution was not just the result of a guerrilla struggle. The peasants and the workers had entered the ranks. It is true to say also there was no real conflict between the leadership and the masses. When the leaders tried to moralise capitalism they soon realised – and they did this on the way – that this could only be done by a workers state. Such are the superb conditions of history that are so rich in examples. Fidel Castro is a leader who said, at first, that his plan was to moralise capitalism, but who understood that the liquidation of the capitalist regime was necessary to actually do it. This is a splendid source of revolutionary teachings.

We have also said that the political revolution in Cuba was 'sui generis'. This is because the Cuban leadership had such origins that, when it came to power, it had no arrogance and no sentiment of prepotency. The latter are the characteristics of those who take power in private property. Far from this, the Cuban leaders wanted to develop the revolution. That revolution was so poor that it had to resort to means never seen in other workers states. We intervened in it. We proposed a law for the vote at 16, popular committees for each block of houses, and other things. We retook these points later for Algeria, enlarging upon them. The idea of popular committees is to enable the population to intervene, to be involved in everything that comes to pass. The inhabitants of a block lead a public life; they do not just exercise control and surveillance for the revolution because they play a political role. We proposed to these committees they should meet weekly and discuss all the events taking place in society. This is the way to nurture the cultural capacity of a people, create leaderships and set up an administration for society. There will be many other workers states of the Cuban kind in the future.

Our International must know about every one of those problems and discuss them. In our interventions, we must be able to explain the different categories of workers states: degenerated, deformed, non-deformed and 'sui generis'. We deemed this characterisation of 'sui generis' necessary because it underlines a given state in the world relations of forces. Indeed, it is the world balance of forces that lent Cuba the strength and courage. The latter was not programmatically conscious of this in the beginning, but it became aware of it afterwards. With the qualifier of 'sui generis', we make an appraisal of a historic period. It is not a catch phrase or a game in terminology, because it allows us to show that it is possible to navigate in history. With it, we have shown how to draw courage from favourable conditions when they exist, in a world rich in possibilities but short of 'road maps' with locations clearly marked.

All this must be known in the way we make known the programme of the Left Opposition proposed by Trotsky, whilst he was still in the Soviet Union. Trotsky is our example. He spelled out the measures, industrial and agricultural, to be taken according to the state of the Soviet Union and that of the world revolution at the time. Later, Stalin himself retook numerous points of the programme of the Left Opposition - unfortunately applying them in the 'stalinian' manner.

For it was not enough that he should retake the programme, there remained the question of knowing how to apply it. It is around that time that Trotsky spoke of the famous 'scissors' question at the points of which he placed the towns on one side and the countryside on the other. In a mostly backward country, focus is very much on economic development. This is not the case in relatively advanced countries, but in a backward country agriculture has the largest place in the economy. An ill-handled scissors will easily set town and country against each other. This is still entirely valid today, in China for example, and it must be discussed and well understood. Stalin rejected Trotsky, but he had to apply Trotsky's policies. What happened next was that he did not apply them through the proletariat - but through the bureaucracy. Result: six million peasants killed. This was the result of Stalin's enforced collectivisation, with almost 40% of the cattle slaughtered. The comparisons Trotsky drew with the scissors, and on how exactly to handle them, are still valid today.

This kind of problem will come again in the next stages, in the Spanish revolution perhaps. Fortunately, things are easier nowadays compared with the epoch of the Russian Revolution. In the future, those handling the 'scissors' will probably do it – with buttons! Besides, there is today a greater experience in people; the peasants have matured much politically, for example. This facilitates the application of the 'scissors'. The 'scissors' question will carry on existing to the extent that it lies in the path of historic finality; but it has changed a lot in the forms under which to apply it, making the task immeasurably simpler.

It is necessary to discuss the reasons for the formation of the bureaucracy. This aspect of history is neither overcome nor surmounted. The discussion about ambition and the professional dangers of power remains on the order of the day. Mentalities, customs and all human experiences as we know them, have developed in the specific relations of private property, in the present relations of power. All this is still relevant to the extent to which the Bolsheviks were not able to develop worldwide. Their experiences of 1917 span only a few years. The subsequent historic conditions prevented them from having a longer range. The problems of power are still with us. If the Bolsheviks are no longer with us, their experience remains indispensable to us and quite irreplaceable in the fight against the professional dangers of power.

Even though there is no immediate prospect of a new Stalin or for a new historic 'stalinian' cycle, the danger remains that the progress of history may receive a serious set back. For example, there is the danger that, in its very moment of readiness for nuclear war, capitalism may still be granted a degree of space. There are signs of this: the more capitalism is given time and allowed to get ready for war, the greater damage it will inflict on humanity. True, it is not in a position to determine when, how and where to launch the war, because the war will be imposed on it by the course of the revolution; the latter will force it to launch it. Nonetheless, by postponing the historic solution of socialism, one gives capitalism time to equip itself with ever more devastating means of destruction. Imperialism has now acquired this fragmentation bomb, the like of which it will use in strikes, local struggles, revolutions and civil wars. Had humanity destroyed capitalism in 1945, there would have been no so such 'fragments' - atomic or otherwise.

The communist leaders do not inquire into those questions inasmuch as their way of thinking is

a function of that prevailing in the Soviet Union: the absence of Marxist analysis. They perceive human life and events from the premise that there will be no general war. But general war there is already! For, if you add all the local wars plus their sequels, plus all those due to the existence of capitalism, doesn't this add up to general war? War is the consequence of capitalism. Put together, the casualties occasioned by the famines, draughts and the work accidents – isn't that war? Three years ago, a communist made a beautiful analysis showing that, in Italy, there had been more killed at work in five years than during the whole of the Russian Revolution! Why so much outrage about the deaths caused by civil wars and revolutions? Statistics talk louder and say: capitalism in Italy killed more workers in five years than the entire Russian Revolution!

Let us not forget either all those who died in the Middle East wars, the assassinations in Spain, in Portugal, Ethiopia, in the Far East. Just these, have left more than seven millions dead. Who can come now, and say: 'you see, there hasn't been war and general confrontation has been avoided'. This is perfect bureaucratic rubbish. If you add on top of this all the deaths capitalism has occasioned, you have the equivalent of several nuclear wars. And now, yet again on top of this, capitalism possesses weapons that can kill in one day what it could in one year before. Any prolongation in the existence of capitalism allows it to increase its concrete capacity to inflict ever more historic devastation. How can anyone say; 'we are going to stop general war'? All you get is greater delays, and all-out war is not prevented in the least.

This is to be raised with the communists, telling them how inexact it is to pretend there has not been general war - and, related to this, we must explain what the workers state really means. We must show that, yes, it has a contradictory character, and why. The roots of the contradiction must be elucidated, together with what to do about it. We must discuss the relationship there is between the workers state and the world course of the revolution: how bureaucracy is formed, the question of the professional dangers of power, how to avoid these. One simple thing: if bureaucracy rules now, it is because a category of people, a social layer, stood up as a power: in a private capacity and entirely on its own behalf as a layer, it arrogated to itself the usufruct of the state-owned property. That is all there is to it.

Bureaucracy is empirical and so, it cannot reason about production or general policy. This is so even if, since Stalin, it has somewhat increased its means for reasoning in the USSR. This is not because it has become suddenly endowed with theoretical and political qualities; it is due to the role of the worker state, the rise in the world revolution and the struggle of the masses. These are the factors that have kept capitalism at bay, and forced bureaucracy to take notice. The world balance of forces has tipped favourably towards the workers states. The spread of science and of industry in the other workers state is now a reality. It imposes itself by demanding a superior planning. In turn, the latter demands the elimination of the impediments, the hindrances and the obstacles represented by the bureaucratic way of planning. The latter, in fact, is little more than the management of interests for the local and individual bureaucrats, for groups, casts and camarillas. Today's reality produces internal alterations in the bureaucracy, forcing it to act differently. This change does not come from the force of fresh intelligence or analysis, but from reality that drags the bureaucrat along into some non-bureaucratic plan.

If bureaucracy were a logical consequence of revolution, it would demonstrate some ability. Like

Marxism does, it would foresee. But no: it is entirely incapable of this. And it is incapable, precisely because it is not the logical result of any necessity. If you observe it, you realise that it is forever taken by surprise instead. In the workers states, the confidence of the masses grows in relation to the economic advance, the progress made in science, technology and in the class struggle. The most backward layers of bureaucracy, its local layers particularly, are being eliminated. It is not excluded that ability and intelligence do enter the bureaucracy at some points. But, regardless of this, the historic uselessness of bureaucracy remains. The same goes for the useless historic role of bureaucracy - bureaucracy being the usurper. No amount of improvement in production can change what it is. The balance of forces may become as favourable to human progress as could be, but the historic role of bureaucracy remains noxious and useless.

Each of our sections must study these questions as this is going to be quite indispensable in the coming stages. Take the examples of Yugoslavia, Rumania, the USSR or China. In these workers states, the persistency of the demand for change aggravates the internal squabbles in the bureaucracy. Increases in production and improvements in its concentration provoke clarifications as well as more concentrated and centralised efforts. These come into collision with the local interests of each bureaucracy. In the past, the various bureaucratic layers managed to agree amongst themselves, albeit under the domination of the more powerful bureaucrats. As this kept them going, they respected each other's agreements even when this hurt their local interests.

Today, the increase, concentration and centralisation of production in the workers state are hurting these local interests; but this time, in a way that tends to eliminate them. The bureaucracy as a whole finds that this process boosts its overall power - military, economic and social: But political, not so. Far from it: its contradictions increase. As it loses local points of support, its historic perspectives and role go on weakening.

So, for our part, we can no longer reason as we used to. We must start from today's conditions where tendencies appear and tend towards reasoning. For reason circulates quite freely and without difficulty in the streets of any workers state, contrarily to what happens in the capitalist regime. In the workers state, the rapport and need between people are straight. They are diaphanous compared to those in the capitalist state where the interest of each is individual, and the economy depends on each individual wanting a profit. The workers state, on the other hand, is planned and centralised: the relations between people are not entirely simplified, but they are already diaphanous in comparison; human relations in the workers state do not have the tortured character they have in the capitalist system where each boss is obsessed with competition and with putting the others down. This explains the devious relations between people in capitalism, full of deceit and trickery. In the workers states, the need to centralise, of itself, is a simple and diaphanous thing. This is so, even with the bureaucracy that is not without its share of twisted interests! What there is, in the workers state, is the straightforward possibility for improvement. This is why it is necessary to intervene to help the communist movement to reason this out. As for us, we must increase our own conscious weight and gain bases of support to carry out this task.

In the nationalist movements like that of Mexico, for example, our task is slightly different. We

must make proposals and be full of ideas. Why not propose a 'production plan' for instance, a plan that raises fundamental points of principle, leaving aside the greatest or the most ambitious plan: the most important thing in such countries is to pose the need for trade union democracy, and the intervention of the masses: democracy for the masses, mind - not bourgeois democracy. This has to mean that the masses intervene in the control of production; that they have the right to judge what they produce, to reason and decide. No plan of production that fails to mention democracy for the masses is acceptable. In the case of Mexico, the production plan is irretrievably tied to the struggle of the masses to liquidate the 'charros'. If the Mexican government wishes to help in doing this: even better. But as regards the liquidation of the bureaucracy in Mexico, do not expect this to come from decrees or laws! This is not to say either that we should oppose a helpful government. It simply means that if the masses do not have the right to exercise democracy, the bureaucrats will regroup at every turn. The masses must be in a position to intervene, and with the full right to make tendencies.

We must prepare our sections for this sort of intervention. Our Mexican comrades must arrange to have time for growth, numerical and qualitative. The preparation of their capacity must result both from study and practical application, in order to debate and draw lessons from the experiences made. In Mexico it is possible to encourage the nationalist movement. We must intervene in this sense, particularly towards the conscious wing inside the nationalists seeking the progress of Mexico. The same goes for the proletarian wing. Towards these, we must suggest ideas, taking account that Echevarria is an advanced nationalist. He has just made a declaration where he said that the unification of the USSR and China is necessary because this would give a powerful stimulus to his own ability to advance in Mexico. True, he may have said this to justify himself; but it is a thing that he would not have done if we were in the situation of only ten years ago. People like Echevarria did not exist ten years ago. Take account of what it means when a leader like him, the head of a bourgeois country and bourgeois government, says this in the face of the world and of his country! This is not the idea of someone who thinks in capitalist terms; he is rather like someone who, whilst still in the capitalist house, looks out of the window towards the house in front. This thinking is not for those in the capitalist house. Echevarria went to China, then to the USSR, and he told them: 'Unify'! Here, you can see the other effect the disintegration of the capitalist system has, leading nationalism to take new, more vivid and direct forms. Nationalism starts looking in the direction of the workers state and at the workers state's manner of economic development.

The difficulty when one intervenes in these movements is twofold: not to turn away is one, and not to drown in their limitations, is the other. This is where theoretical and political preparation is paramount, requiring an intense political life between the International and its leadership. The fundamental matters to preoccupy each of our sections are: to learn and dominate how the workers state is constructed, and how the world communist movement, the USSR and China, must unify. Imagine the USSR and China unified! What a great conquest for the progress of humanity, ten thousand times greater than the Soyouz-Apollo space encounter! The unification of USSR and China is beyond question the single most important thing that will fill humanity with the confidence it needs: lifting from its shoulders the weight of a very great anguish; making it capable of winning immense layers of petty bourgeois, peasant and army people. This unification will vastly reduce the field of action of capitalism, restricting its sphere of influence and of organisation. It will point in the direction of a world on a par with China and the USSR.

And most importantly, it will show the masses of North America how to gain the upper hand in building their own class party.

We must dominate these questions and raise them with the communists. We must use persuasion, avoiding polemics and confrontations. In the world communist movement, we are already known. One of our aims when we held our IX world congress was to become the Trotskyist-Posadist wing of the world communist movement and we have achieved this. Now, we plan to be recognised as a thinking part of the world communist movement. This is not for now or may be next year. We may even remain some time on the ground floor. But our aim is to get to the higher storeys; for this, the capacity for reasoning is requisite.

The existence of a gigantic process of dual power and of permanent revolution in the world determines the course of the political revolution. Trotsky was looking out for it in the USSR. Today, we too work in the same perspective, but on the scale of the world process of the permanent revolution. This is because the latter enormously facilitates the political revolution today.

We have other tasks in the meantime: our sections, our parties, must prepare consciously, theoretically and politically to intervene in the nationalist movements, as in Argentina, to support their progress and to encourage them to adopt a Marxist understanding.

Marxism is no longer at the stage of twenty, or twenty-five years ago. Then, it still had to knock and ask permission to enter. Thanks to human intelligence, it is now in demand among the military, and in the various Churches. Everyone needs Marxism, even those who still try to reconcile it with God. Marxism need not reconcile itself with anything. As tool of progress and understanding, it cannot be given rules to follow. Either it is a method for the dialectical interpretation of history, or it is a broken tool.

One must increase the Marxist capacity of our sections, plan our activities and improve our cadres. We have to tackle the process as required by its unfolding. We must give impulses and gain authority, taking positions in the public and immense world polemic that leads to socialism. We must improve on previous experiences and on the actual ones; above all, we must answer to the needs of the world communist movement.

Soviet bureaucracy is not a class; it is the representation of social interests that exist in a layer of soviet society. Even if it has some attributes of a class, it is not one. What it has, and in no small measure, is the pretension and the thirst for being a class. We must insist that it is not a class. It has no class function because it represents neither the functioning of the economy nor that of the future of the economy. Bureaucracy is not a proprietor of the economy: it derives a usufruct from it. It does not represent the economic or social structure of the workers state. It is not a class because there is no private property. Bureaucracy is in contradiction with the workers state. As it goes on defending itself in order to exist, bureaucracy is led to defend the state-owned character of the state and of property. At the same time, and equally in order to preserve itself, it must stop the workers state from going forward.

This is the manner in which bureaucracy is drawn behind the development of the workers state,

having to produce the means and conditions for its own liquidation. Let us be clear in this: it does not mean that bureaucracy will go away. It means that the advances of history generate organisms that are pushing it aside. These advances are: various proletarian organisms, proletarian struggles, higher levels of class struggle – and our own intervention as the public good of history.

We have to prepare and discuss. There is a particular preparation to be made, a preparation called for by the very reasons and conditions in which the capitalist system must be destroyed. For example, the fact that one may reach office via elections is far from being the same as having eliminated the capitalist system! At the moment of coming to office, and more than ever, previous preparation must have been made in order to know how to liquidate and replace capitalism. To get to office via the parliamentary road is conceivable today, but it will not be possible to keep using parliament and govern onwards to socialism. The fact that one can be elected to some government, results from a given world balance of forces which did not exist in Marx's or in Trotsky's time.

No revolution has ever turned its back on the advances made by history, whatever the forms these advances may have taken. Far from it, revolution picks up the various forms of those advances, gives them the right shape and incorporates them into its natural flow. So, to return to our example concerning elections, it has indeed become possible to get to government through elections. But then, after having been elected, it is not possible to stay there, because the situation changes at this point. It immediately demands that one musters all the means available in readiness for the revolutionary situation that appears straight away. One has to be ready for the suppression of the capitalist state and face the army.

The army can be won fractionally as we can see in Portugal. We can see this also to a certain extent in Peru or in Argentina. One must not pause to wait and see which side the army is going to take. One must have created beforehand a dynamic movement sufficiently attractive and convincing to be able to have influence in the army. One must be capable of making it more aware that its role can be modified. One can make a difference inside the army. It can be raised culturally and intellectually above what it is now. It can be influenced to feel more useful than before. Its uniform can be made to evoke something the soldier can identify with progress. Then, the army stops being in awe of its uniform (2). It stops looking for medals and rewards; it starts wanting to give ideas. The day the military enters the field of ideas and thought, the gun ceases to be the deadly antagonist of society it is now. To be any good, the gun must be held by intelligence in consideration of the need for human progress. A French song says: "Drop the guitar and take the gun". Indeed. But remember too that the gun is a transitory instrument, whilst the guitar is not.

THE ROLE OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL AND THE PARTICIPATION OF ITS PARTIES

We must have a domination of the experiences that we make. We must plan the progress of our sections, generalise editions and world meetings. We have to do this particularly regarding what

transpires after our interventions towards the communist parties, the nationalist movements and the nationalist governments, without forgetting that the revolutionary movements amongst the poorest people have a tremendous longing for progress - as in Ethiopia. We can develop ourselves. We can progress in these movements and in many parts of the revolutionary movement. We can do this not only as a public good of history that relays ideas to them, but as a leadership ourselves.

This requires an increasing political life in the sections. Plans of growth and programmes are needed. Each section must discuss how best to edit its weekly paper, how to publish the texts of the International, how to develop teams of good translators, whilst bringing out brochure after brochure.

We return to the question of the judgement we make of our role as organiser in history by the publication of texts, papers and reviews. No organism can replace this because the papers show our centralised capacity to reason, to think and give ideas. The paper is what transmits the authority of an organism, a thing very superior to the action of one or other of our comrades even when speaking in the name of the party. For the latter remains an individual. On the other hand, what exerts an immense authority is the action of the organ, the voice of the organ, the voice of the fraction or of the cell, when supported by publications. This makes a unity between the thinking organ and the individual militant.

All the sections, the French, the Greek or the Mexican, for instance, must aim at regularising their publications. They must write good texts, increase their political ability, organise and educate new leaders. To be a leader means to have the capacity to think in order to generalise the application of the policy. This applies not only to immediate tasks but essentially to the capacity to think; to think objectively for what is best, to increase the capacity for reasoning, to increase yet more the capacity to think, decide, publish and apply. This is the task that we can take forward, and must take forward.

The presence of the Greek section here is an immense joy. This will have very important effects; already it puts us in contact with the conscious origins of human civilisation. The historic principles have not changed. The Ancient Greeks laid the foundation for Marxism, and with Marx, we are taken back to Ancient Greece - albeit enabled to go beyond Socrates and Plato.

We draw conclusions from all experiences. We do this in the most centralised way possible. It is evident that the process requires the generalisation of ideas. It is imperative that one should analyse objectively, for scientific advances keep coming and must be incorporated. Science is already becoming universalised in all fields of human activity both on land and in space.

It is false to say that Soyouz or Apollo exemplify human progress. Sure, they are great, particularly on the Soviet side. But the progress evoked in them is better expressed in the Portuguese grandmother who raises her combative fist even though her son has been tortured to death in prison and she is 80 years old (3). She carries more meaning than all the Apollos and Soyouzes, because she represents the unity of the progress of humanity, progress ultimately determined by the existence of the workers states. The communist parties must be seen as a branch of this unity. This is so even when they do not contribute much to its advance.

Even these parties will be pushed forward by history. At present, in their immense majority, the communist parties, like the socialist ones, appear disconcerted.

We must intervene with publications, showing the activity of our organisms whilst trying to gain more authority among the communists. Our parties must prepare themselves for this. This is not the simplest of tasks, admittedly, but it not so difficult either. There are imperatives and norms, because we have to acquit ourselves of our task scientifically and with great regularity. This endeavour develops the capacity to observe, analyse, draw conclusions; one learns how to generalise from every experience and how to retain from each what can be applied elsewhere. The small kernel of people we are has immense possibilities.

Had we strictly gone on repeating one or other of Trotsky's teachings, we may have grown in numbers and gained a certain mass following. And then, we would have been one more 'left wing group'. We did not choose to do this. But even then, it is worth considering that apart from the communists and the socialists, there are hardly any new large movements forming now. There are the nationalists, but they tend to be either socialist or communist. And the reason why they have appeared as nationalists is because of the deficits of history. On the whole, none of these three formations represents the progress of humanity with its thirst for programme. Had there been no nationalists, all the movements would have been communist or socialist. The rise of nationalism, to be seen even in the military, highlights the trajectory of the process of history, seeking the logical progress of the economy, of science and of the human relation. Nationalism arises because progress has not found a logical and centralised leadership elsewhere. This explains the great empiricism of the actual process.

But however empirical it may be, this process fluctuates around a norm: the norm of intelligent progress. This explains countries like Ethiopia, or Portugal. It explains what happens in Argentina, or the fact that the masses of Italy have managed to make great revolutionary gains without shattering their own leadership. Mind you, if the latter does not take power, the masses may not put up with it much longer.

To accomplish our task we must focus on theoretical and political dominion. We have to bring fresh material to the continuity of the historic experience we have inherited from history. This can only be done through the instrument that permits it. The dialectical materialism from which Marxism emanates, is the sole means of dependable interpretation.

We contribute to the historic task of building a concrete organisation capable of lending to the communist parties, the workers states and the revolutionary movements a greater level of determination. Without a tangible effect from our organisation, the deficit for history would be enormous and the world communist movement very much set back.

We are not a mass movement. When we say this, is not for pride or to make up for the forces we lack. Instead, we feel full of force considering the role we play, and considering the tasks we know to be as necessary today as yesterday. Trotsky did not make a mass movement either. He could easily have done so, but such a movement would have degenerated in the way movements do when their motive is a career, or the satisfaction of the ambition for might and power. Such movements usually concentrate on a single issue and they use it as a ladder up

which for them to climb. Not for them to lead history.

In our work we verify that, beyond the problem of each and every individual, the objective and collective plea of all humanity is at stake. Our task makes us the public servant of history. We are profoundly sorry for the errors committed by the communist movement and the reverses it has suffered. From both errors and reverses, we aim at putting the finger on what should restore to them their capacity to think and to act. Inside ourselves we concentrate our will to see to it that history progresses, and we do so with equal vigour whether it happens through the communists, the socialists, the nationalists – or through ourselves.

So, if we are small, it is not due to some impotence; it is not from a failing or a lack. Our role is like this and it hardly allows for our growth. It is nonetheless possible to combine what we do with some growth in places, in Africa, Asia and Latin America; or in some communist parties. This is all we have to say about our growth.

We salute with our communist love the decision that the Latin American sections have taken via the Latin American Bureau, to publish the Marxist Review. We propose that the same resolution be extended to the sections of the other countries. If three Marxist Review issues were appearing in France, Italy and Britain, it should bring back enough means to fulfil our present plans for Europe. The dialectical appraisal of the process makes us think that the solution to our actual deficiencies lies in more regular duplicated or printed texts. I propose this as a resolution to be voted on. This is the plan, and we call on the sections to do the same. We understand the difficulties created by the lack of finances and cadres. But we have been so much poorer in the past and still we got where we are now. Real wealth does not strictly lie in a lot of money or means, but in the capacity to think and to reason. For, in the wake of the capacity to think and reason, the other means are bound to come.

Conclusions like this must be drawn. We must grow by increasing the political life of the sections. Cell life, like that of the other organs, must focus on programming the tasks, on growth targets, interventions and activities to gain authority. We must at the same time concentrate on publishing and distributing, whilst increasing the theoretical and political ability of the party organs. We must create leaders who learn how to be audacious, but not blindly so. We have the capacity to organise, to educate cadres, and this is why we can adopt these objectives. These are not pious wishes because we are already doing it. The key is to read, discuss and publish.

We are not many but the potential for our intervention is immense. We have no comrade with a smallness complex, or a chip on the shoulder for having been outdone by a 'left group'; what we have is the consciousness necessary to play our role in history. This gives us the ability to find the solution to the problems as they come. Scarcity in material means gives us most of our problems. However, our scientific capacity for the organisation of ideas is inexhaustible. It is the latter that we use, and it guides our sentiments. If it were not so, the problems would be too much.

We are glad to see here all our Latin American delegations; so happy to see the comrades surgeons who come to contribute to history. They come to operate – so to say – not with the tools of medicine but with those of revolution and Marxism. What better? After the operation by

these most complete instruments, the surgeons of the future will have complete success in surgery - unlike now. To the extent to which humanity progresses, the need for surgeons and doctors lessens because the rise in human love acts as a medicine in itself. It can often be a veritable substitute to medicine. The structure of the nervous system, central guide to our movements, is craving after human love. Under the reign of a greater amount of human love, there corresponds a greater fitness of the heart, of the head and of the body. Then, there is little need for the doctor. See how after revolution in Portugal and Ethiopia, a kind of historic healing descended and what a superior sense of wellbeing it gave! At present, we use medicine and operations ordinarily, but intervention is necessary at a much deeper level. This is why the great doctors and the great artists join the revolution. It is only when they are included in this way in history that they really feel completely useful.

In the name of the International Secretariat, I end this report, having summed up the essential things. We believe that it has been good, and has laid the foundation for reasoning, thought and experience to help to develop further. I conclude with the greatest and clearest confidence that what we have said forms part of the most elevated scientific experience since Trotsky. And yet, this was done in the simplest and most homogeneous manner - that of communism. We have gone into quite sensitive matters, and it was all very simple. Leaderships often confuse means and ends: either they make their party an end in itself, or they make politics an end in itself: nothing better designed to make simple problems very complicated!

We are identified with history through our goal. It is not an abstract kind of identification, but the sort that reaches down where progress is most concentrated and decisive: in the progress of the human mentality. In a given state of human mentality, all the other aspects of human achievement in the economy, in society and in science, are pressed together. They combine to eventually flourish into a greater level of human love. In private property or in the bureaucracy, human love is stunted. And yet, it is human love that drives the locomotive of human relations, unflinching - even when there are many stops. Humanity has the ability to assimilate the experiences of history made under the leadership of the proletariat, and the proletariat derives this capacity from its historic role and social function in the economy.

We have been able to assemble here people from very different social backgrounds, and yet they all adhere to this task of giving ideas in this empirical process. After the Russian Revolution, the progress of history continued to be empirical. Now, economic, social and military power, have become concentrated in either capitalist states or in workers states. In none of those states, however, can you find the ideas, the programme and the capacity for generalisation at the level required to bring down the capitalist system. Each side has developed an immense economic, social and military power, but neither has managed to concentrate the capacity for thought. We have this capacity.

We have this capacity evidently limited, but in sufficient measure to enable us to accomplish our task and play our role in history. When Trotsky died, he said: "Viva the IV International. I believe in the objective role of the IV International in the defence of the workers state". It is the same with us; our role is justified and even recognised. The proof of this can be seen in our rising organic influence in mass movements where we find approval. History marches on, taking us where important decisions are being made, converging and concentrating around the economic,

social, political and military centres of the workers states. What is needed is ideas - ideas to feed the currents, the tendencies and the groups that are going to need them, and who do not appear ready to produce them. Between them and us there is an identity. This is why, as we come closer to them, we find no rejection. Far from it, an attraction draws us into an increasingly concentrated historical vortex that concentrates the progressive strands of history, of which we are one.

Next month is the anniversary of Trotsky's assassination. At the root of our confidence and development there is the political confidence Trotsky gave us: confidence in the programme, in the need for experience and for scientific application. We continue Trotsky's task. We feel ourselves capable of doing it, knowing it to be irreplaceable. We must study all of Trotsky's works without ceasing to be active, finding time for both political preparation and organisation.

This Congress of the Trotskyist-Posadist IV International has done what it set out to do. It is a necessary instrument of history for the conscious progress towards socialism. We feel ourselves to be part of that progress. The various experiences we have made or spoken about must be assimilated. We must puzzle out of them what can be concretely applied in the best possible way, and generalise it to the whole International. In turn, this will make the International better able to influence the workers and revolutionary movement.

There are difficulties to the extent that we lack the means corresponding to our scientific ability. We need means in the measure of our consciousness and high level of intelligence. We have the audacity to intervene as much towards the Soviet Union as China – calling on them to unify. We do the same regarding the revolutionary nationalists, as in Mexico, Argentina or Algeria; and we do this regardless of the fact that they are each at a different level and in need of different historic solutions. We have enough capacity and determination to cope with these differences. We already assume the responsibility of studying them, and we contribute to the process in which history finds its different solutions.

We salute the masses of the workers states. We salute the workers states themselves. There is the urgent historic need for the unification of the USSR and China. We are not of those who sail through history, or give it a coin as we pass by. Our project is to intervene in this process, directly - and at the head. It is with this in mind that we shape our capacity for intervention. The Brazilian section gives an example in how this is done: though under government persecution and repression, it publishes the Marxist Review and develops its influence in the nationalist movement.

I reiterate my joy in having met the new comrades. I end this Report with a fraternal embrace to all the comrades in all the sections.

- Viva the X Congress of the Trotskyist-Posadist IV International!
- Viva the immense increase in our contribution to the fusion of the USSR and China and II the workers states, for the greater advance of history and of all of humanity!
- Viva to our dear comrades in all countries who have not been able to come but who are by our side in pressing forward for the world development of the revolution, and of the

Trotskyist-Posadist IV International!

· Viva the application of all the resolutions and all the conclusions – with the least delay!
J Posadas – 26th July 1975

Notes:

1. The Bologna Whistles and the Need for a Government of the Left in Italy – J Posadas, 12th August 1974. See Red Flag No. 230.
2. The Avalanche of Votes for the Communist Party and the Left Government in Italy – J Posadas, 15th June 1975. See Red Flag No. 246.
3. The Military, the Progress of History and Marxism – J Posadas, 11th June 1973.
4. The Revolution in Portugal Elevates the Role of the Old People – J Posadas, 20th September 1974. See Red Flag 232.

In the Red Flag Button of this site, you should find the following text: (Red Flag No. 241 - 2nd May 1975): “The Bureaucracy of the Workers States and the World Process of the Permanent Revolution” - J Posadas, 15th February 1975.

Finally, still among the papers we intend to place on the Red Flag button, you will eventually find relevant texts, as follows:

- Red Flag No. 230 – 29th October 1974 – The Whistling in Bologna and the Need for the Left Government in Italy, J Posadas, 12th August 1974.
- Red Flag No. 246 – 11th July 1975 – The Avalanche of Votes for the Communist Party and the Left government in Italy, J Posadas, 15th June 1975.
- Red Flag No. 232 – 26th November 1974 – The Revolution in Portugal Elevates the Function of the Old People, J Posadas, 20th July 1974.
- Red Flag No. 254 – 28th November 1975 – The Rebellion in the Barracks and the Revolution in Portugal, J Posadas, 16th October 1975.
- Red Flag No. 234 – 14th January 1975 – The Soldiers and the Permanent Revolution in Ethiopia, J Posadas, 26th November 1974.
- Red Flag No. 240 – 15th April 1975 – The Closing Speech of the V Cadre School of the Posadist IV International, J Posadas, 31st December 1974.
- Red Flag No. 252 – Press Communique on the X World Congress of the Trotskyist Posadist IV International, International Secretariat, August 1975.
- Red Flag No. 255 – 12th December 1975 – The X World Congress of the Trotskyist Posadist IV International, Opening Speech, J Posadas, 19th July 1975

REPLY TO THE INTERVENTIONS
ON THE ORGANISATIONAL REPORT

J POSADAS

28 July 1975

With immense joy, we make this reply to close the debates and affirm the Congress resolutions. Our joy comes from duty accomplished. It is made possible by the fact that we prepared consciously beforehand to respond to this need of history. Our joy is in seeing human thought treasured, made victorious and chosen as the standard bearer at every stage of the progress of humanity. The problems we have talked about are not difficult in themselves, since Marxism gives us the simple tool by which means to interpret. The difficulty lies in the need to acquire, at the same time, more material means and more preparation. We need ever more theoretical and political preparation to generate policy, experience, organisation and discipline. In having to do this in a world fairly torn apart by economic competition and amid the appalling disorder of the human relation, the difficulty is increased. Against this, we make use of Marxism, the most elevated, the most complete and the most centralised form of discipline – monolithic even.

There are those who bristle at the evocation of centralisation and of monolithism; but they are not without being themselves most centralised - in their fear of history. What we do, is to centralise ourselves on the plane of ideas and in the field where these ideas are used. Marx was the most complete human being, the most centralised, and indeed monolithic, person! He had an aim, and to that aim, he gave everything. To the bristling ones, he said after Dante: "Walk your way, let others bray". Today, in the name of the same thing we say: "Walk your way but listen carefully".

See what happens in Portugal where a popular tribunal recently set up has acquitted a farm hand. The accused was an agricultural worker who killed, justifiably, his feudal boss. This instance illustrates well the principle of what is a popular tribunal. In popular justice, we do not stop at the superficial aspects of a case; we start from these aspects but we inspect what other matters stand behind them. In this case, we look for the form and the content of the production the worker was involved in; we appraise the official justice system that prevailed at the time. Indeed, aren't we still in a stage of the existence of 'justice'? In socialism we shall do away with 'justice' because everything will be just. What we call justice and liberty, arise from specific conditions. It is interesting to note that when the peasants of Portugal decided to direct popular tribunals, the socialist leader Soarès had almost a heart attack.

We take part in this Congress closure work with the great joy of feeling united both amongst ourselves and to history's progress; we have achieved this through ideas, programme and policy. Of course, it is not us who decide the course of the process. We know very well that it exists independently from ourselves. But by 'grasping' it, we can give it order and we can set out, to an extent, to lead it. As the process goes on centralising and concentrating in on itself, it tends to become a single entity. Then, it rejects fragmentation, division and exclusion. It is clear that there is still much more room for us to intervene in it.

When we intervene in the nationalist and catholic movements, we cannot be everywhere. Our calculations, like our organisational intervention and our programmes, must take careful account of both our forces and our scope. The movements we intervene in are short in ideas, programmes, tactics and experience. But they have the numbers; and within them, there is a

ripening and learning. The Montoneros in Argentina are a case in point, but this applies also to the nationalists, the left catholics etc. It is particularly so with the socialists and the communists.

History proceeds firmly and resolutely. It is in Marx's thinking that history finds its most elevated expression. Given the actual economic relations, this is going to remain the case for quite some time. Economic relations still determine the manner in which people think today but not all the people, and not all of humanity. Someone like Marx rose and stood up, steadfast against the restrictions such relations impose and the foul competitive human relations they carry. And today, it is these poisoned human relations that are being scattered to the four winds. The capitalist straightjacket is being flung off, and behind it goes the type of human relations it had imposed.

The release of the Portuguese peasant acquitted by a popular tribunal shows the high level reached by the revolution; all the more when this takes place in a country where neither communists nor socialists have known what to do, because 'they had not enough forces'! How could they say this? The popular tribunal shows them: 'This way!' There are communist cadres who know this and who agree entirely. There is always a great distance between the leaders at the top and what the masses at the base know to be true. This gap, however, is in the process of narrowing down. The people closing it are the socialist and communist cadres, the catholics, the nationalists and even the military. They are moved by the intervention, the determination and the great experience of the masses. This is the way the process goes.

We are using the expression 'the joy of intelligence' because it is a vivid and correct description of what we feel. This feeling is sorely in need of a painter, a poet or a musician to interpret it. There is a new relation of forces in the world. How can intelligence fail to experience joy when the masses of the world, often the most wretched, rise up - not for food - but to bring down the human relations of oppression? For those who wanted a picture of what 'the joy of intelligence' looks like: there they have it! Quite unlike, for sure, that of the researcher bent over his paperwork with one hand against his forehead!

The new relation of forces can be seen in the greater preoccupation and determination of the nationalists in the world. They are buoyed by a swelling tide that moves even the catholic and military circles. In Argentina, this is happening to the Peronist cadres who feel they have to speak up. The Montoneros who go about terrorising the rich districts of Buenos Aires, are also demanding the resignation of Isabel Peron and immediate elections. Since they have taken this political and centralised stand, it shows that they are capable of more than just guerrilla action. Should there be elections now a left government - very much to the left - would win. But the process remains confused by the lack of leadership and movements like the Montoneros are a mixture of correct and incorrect positions.

In consequence, it is important to plan what we do, to give ourselves plans beforehand and to define programmes. If not, empiricism sets in; then, one goes running behind one or other event, never catching up - even with good legs. To avoid this, one must define plans of goals and of growth, inside the relevant organism of party intervention. This must be done taking account of the fact that the state of the world is favourable and that it is entirely possible to have influence. Even in France, the PCF has positions that show it feels the need to better

understand the process. It has taken a good position on Portugal for example. This proves that, at the base of the PCF, there is an even greater understanding. We must find the means to get in touch with this, meaning that we need a better functioning ourselves with more dynamism, more militant activity. Personal life must gravitate around the revolutionary activity. This in no way signifies some kind of abnegation, because it makes for a much more joyous life.

All the problems of history are summed up in politics. The persons who remain outside revolutionary politics are somewhat 'absent' from existence. They pass by without knowing where they are going. They know neither where they come from nor where they are. For our part, this is not so. We do know where we come from, where we are going, and in the meantime what we are doing.

To have a revolutionary life, to have a party life, does not mean that we exclude the rest of existence! It is only that our existence is concentrated and focused. It enables us to have a quite complete and dynamic understanding of the way in which all activities are united; those of the mind, those of the sentiments and those of society. Our parties must manage to live in this way, more completely and more systematically. This will generate a better organisation of time, more means and more capacity. There is nothing to fear in this discussion because it helps us to see and understand better what the limitations are.

The process of revolution creates a unity between the experiences made by people and their level of intelligence. There are few things the old Vietnamese grandfather knows that his grandchild of twelve does not. The children express this by their reactions, which are the necessary reactions. We say 'necessary' because they are the reactions that allow the children to intervene, to decide monolithically and to keep their will entirely concentrated. Are there other features of the human being surpassing these? If humanity already acts like this, why shouldn't we? Indeed we do already, and we must do it better.

Organising and planning our intervention, we shall overcome the difficulties. The tasks are immense but they become simpler with the rise in our cultural capacity. Solutions to various problems become simpler; the anguish produced by too much to do decreases. True, our intervention demands more means and more publications, but what it demands most of, is determination and audacity.

The realisation of this Congress is an event of great importance in history. In spite of our numerical weakness, we are going to publish the Marxist Review in different languages, develop in various countries and encourage the socialist revolution and the communist movement. We are not in the habit of checking up on what everyone does, in dwelling on difficulties or in making a tragedy of past errors. We simply try to go beyond what is insufficient. This Congress witnessed not the slightest recrimination; it was homogeneous to the point that there was not the least hint of disputation. This could only happen because we focus on ideas, and we reason. Each comrade feels united to the other by means of trying to make up for what may be lacking. Conversely, there was no concession made either. The idea of making concessions to each other is alien to us because our functioning is centralised, and we draw fully on the monolithic concentration of our thought and capacity.

A movement that is not monolithic and centralised leaves the door open to the winds of insecurity. Then doubts and secondary preoccupations enter. The attention of such a movement gets distracted: its subconscious lays prohibitions above which the best impulses and ideas find it difficult to rise. In our case, the opposite takes place; our preoccupation remains constant, permanent and monolithic towards the centralised instrument. This is because we all have the same attitude towards our essential objective.

Sure, the problems of life in general are important, but they do not decide history. We have not the forces required to deal with all things, and so, we concentrate on the decisive ones. But far be it that we should always only talk politics! We are revolutionaries and not politicians! We talk about things, about the children – a great deal. Incidentally, the children participate in our meetings. We talk about intelligence and about ideas. Do not think programme, policy and objectives suffer in the least because we talk about other things!

We educate the children in order to raise their level of preoccupation. We show them how to be useful, and how to order the way in which they control their own preoccupation. Order reigns here, as you can see. This order reflects the state of order in our ideas, but above all, in the human relation between us. In turn, even though speaking different languages, the children here have been constantly improving. The relations between ourselves sharpen intelligence all round, and edify the children. The children become better able focus their thinking and organise their subconscious. Their intelligence finds good nourishment. The children are no longer in the grip of their own problems but in the hands of intelligence. Their behaviour is quite a statement on this Congress.

We must praise the level of intervention of all the comrades. Centralised monolithism has prevented dispersion. Monolithism does not mean 'yes yes' to everything. It means that one reasons solely as regards to the objective. When capacity and intelligence are tended towards the objective, this shapes the mind intelligently. The unconscious receives sustenance. It is made to see what is necessary, and forget the rest. We saw here neither dispute nor polemic because the unconscious was playing its part in helping to reason and decide; it helped in organising the conscious will, instead of inflating the tendency to empiricism.

The ability to act in this way is not obvious. It is possible only when there is identity between history and role. It can only happen when there is an identity between what one does and what one perceives the objectives of history to be. Marx was like this, and we are his disciples. We have the same will as him, the same determination. We have the same historic resourcefulness in resolving problems – albeit not so much as him. We do not have the same intelligence. Marx's intelligence allowed him to find better means. But we have the same capacity in resolving problems; and this is because we are centralised in a monolithic manner within Marxism and within the experience of history.

This Congress, centralised and monolithic, has increased intelligence in each of our cadres. This is not an understatement. This is the functioning that each section must reach. It can be done regardless of the deficits, the limitations and the differing levels. Each section must have this type of functioning to enable its intelligence to rise. Let us not forget either that human activity is requisite to human intelligence. The latter does not improve just with balanced food!

Even though class society hides the fact carefully, intelligence is not individual. Intelligence is social, and it is a beautiful thing to watch how the children demonstrate it.

The preparation for this Congress must represent an example. Our Congresses are of the best prepared in history, apart from the first four Congresses of the Communist International. We prepare them with the view to intervene, to increase our capacity, to raise intelligence, to organise our sections. We prepare them by means of texts beforehand, by means of Cadre Schools and world meetings, as well as with Enlarged International Executive Committees and World Conferences.

We do not turn up at a Congress to start debating some problem – or to close the debate on it! We consider that a specific problem, when it arises, is the sharp point of a dynamic process of change. What concerns us is to understand this process. Then, we avoid repeating ourselves and we can return to a task with all due modifications, incorporations and additions.

Take again the instance of the farm hand freed in Portugal. This event took place because one of the decisions of the MFA (Movement of the Armed Forces) was to set up popular commissions. The masses agreed, but what they made of it surpassed by far the understanding of the initiators. The decision of the MFA preceded the masses' demands, but it was soon left behind by the tribunal's verdict! The worker had killed his boss not for revenge or retribution. The killing was an organisational decision of history to remove an obstacle in the way of life. The intelligence of the peasants who sat on the tribunal was prepared. They were already disposed to expropriate and to impose their collective will. There is much dynamism in this event. Far from it being abstractly expressed, this dynamism takes the clear form of programme - expropriation and statification. In this, the masses show their capacity for leadership and organisation, as well as their ability for orientation.

We have realised this Congress by preparing ourselves beforehand. This must be an example to all our sections. This Congress was prepared directly by texts, but also by meetings in the whole world. And it was prepared mostly by our uninterrupted intervention in the moving process. We have intervened and continue to do so because we foresee the course of the process. We do not write to summarise events or to put off decisions. We organise and develop the activity of the International by the means of foresight. It is thanks to this that our International develops, in the intelligent and uninterrupted harmony that allows everyone to remain constant and fused to the process of history, ready to foresee its course.

About the left wing groups, the other movements and parties: communist, socialist, Trotskyists or partisans of the guerrilla struggle, this much must be said: They do not manage to coincide with the unfolding developments and perspectives of history. They do not have the capacity of foresight. They have neither the method, nor the instrument, that lies in Marxism. For our part, we do not pursue an individual aim. We seek to be the public good of history. This places us in the unique position of being able to really appreciate, to see and to learn. We organise all that is necessary, not for us, but for the global progress of humanity. One aspect of the progress of humanity – essential and irreplaceable – is the ideas, the analyses and their generalisation. We must increase the centralised monolithism of our parties in accord with our role as a public good of history. We are not talking of the stubborn kind of monolithism because that sort sends all

ideas to hell, as well as being a complete block to action.

This is why this Congress has not simply been prepared by texts. It was prepared by all the activity realised since the preceding Congress. We are the most democratic organisation since Lenin. We discuss all that is necessary to talk about. This is because intelligence requires it, and the human relation requires it also. We do it even when we do not have the corresponding forces. We take an interest in the questions of the children, love, sex, the role of woman in history, music, art, workers councils, military governments – you name it. And none of these are accessory matters!

Our intervention is a factor that becomes decisive when the process is in crisis. Without our intervention, it is evident that the process will go on. There was Lenin's death - then came Stalin - but revolution went on. See how humanity has undergone so many devastations and even regressions! Had revolution succeeded in Europe in 1945, and it was possible, there would be no capitalism now. This would have prevented umpteenth deaths, more than 50 million human beings, at least. The present leaders, cheerfully echoed by the bureaucrats, keep telling us: "They are dead, but history goes on". Sure, but at what price? How can they say that 50 million people mean so little? To them, it is not important but it is to us, because it hits humanity in its innermost principle of creativity and organisation.

If death can still defeat people on the individual level today, it does not on the collective level. Humanity is stronger than death. Death removes one person or another, but the idea goes on making waves in ever widening circles. The leaders and the bureaucrats discount this fact entirely because they know nothing beyond the individual utilisation of life that they make. They are tied to life only through the usufruct they take from it. They do not know how to make an intelligent use of life because this means - the idea. As they look upon the world in a manner that is individual, they live and experience life through their backward rapport with history.

We need more weight and numerical force, certainly. But we can also, and we must, encourage currents and tendencies to intervene on their own behalf in the setting up of the coming revolutionary leaderships in the communists and the socialists; and also in the catholics and amongst the military. The meticulousness that characterises our International does not result from the activation of any statute. It stems from having given way to the demands of intelligence and having trusted it in the choice of the best ideas. Statutes are required where there is instability, or to arbitrate in disputes, divergences and divisions. We have no need for statutes. Statutes unite people as they cast their separation in stone. Here, our common conviction, our common experience and the determination we all share, is what unites us. All this has come into play in the activities we have carried out since the IX World Congress, and before. This is the way in which we manage to keep improving and generalising our capacity to think and to reason.

We have reached a stage when a peasant who killed his landowner proprietor is acquitted. But the Portuguese revolution has still not conquered. It is still under the internal pressure exerted against it by the instrument it inherited from imperialism, even though this instrument is not strictly the representative of imperialism – namely: the socialist party. The reasoning of the socialist masses is advancing rapidly, but not that of the socialist leadership. At this moment,

the masses weigh proportionally more than their leaders, and it is their intelligence and behaviour that prevent the leaders from causing abandonment - or worse. The qualities of the people make up for the lacks in the leaders, their insufficiencies and their incapacity. It makes up for the leaders' fear. It is in spite of their leaders that the people carry on struggling.

Do not wait for the leaders, for what they are going to do or for what they are going to say. The Portuguese masses did not; the Soviet masses did not either, and neither do we. If what the leaders say is correct, we follow but we do so with our own initiative and in our own capacity. This is the way the masses do it. If the masses were passive, they would simply acquiesce. They would not goad their leaderships forward into any advance or change - or into better notions as in this acquittal. You can see how it goes in Portugal, but this happens in Italy too. In Italy, the recurring crises of government, the many bourgeois crises, are due to the masses. In their determination and vigour, they drive towards a government of the left, by making every rightwing and centrist government fail. In Italy, the masses are leaving their mark on everything, and in every crisis.

We cannot but feel joy, an immense joy, in seeing the audacity and determination of the Latin American comrades. They have even less means than the European comrades because the economy is more developed in Europe. In Latin America, the comrades form part of the leadership of the revolution even though many are in jail, they are constantly hounded and they can be arrested at the drop of a hat. They show no paralysis, far from it. The Latin American sections continue to develop. This is food for meditation! It is very important to appreciate the perseverance of the Latin American Bureau that has not given way to paralysis in the face of intimidation and harassment.

We must feel also an immense joy for the Spanish comrades whose section has emerged as firm as rock from a rich but decisive experience. The comrades have stood upright, even when the way was muddled. We appreciate this; we are proud that they have not only pulled through, but gained authority. Our activity finds inspiration in such experiences.

There are also the Sardinian comrades who live on an isolated island with hardly any material means at all. In spite of this, they have managed to bring the 'continent' into their island. Look at the disproportions in the process of history, and the way it is unequal and combined. We must organise with ideas that explain and persuade. Ideas must look back upon the past, only in order to be useful to the present. The past that is not linked to the present is of no use. The past must be useful in drawing conclusions for application now. This is what the Ancient Greeks told us and they are still speaking today.

In all this, we have shown what we mean by 'preparation'. The communist parties do not get so prepared. Their discourse like their meetings are solemn - suit and tie affairs. We do not say this in jest but to underline how inappropriate and out of step, compared with the dynamism of this epoch and the ability of the masses. As for them - whether they can read and write - the masses always come up with the most advanced ideas. Our analytical criticisms always seek to show what is to be done.

Experience shows that it is necessary and possible for us to grow and advance. We must learn

how to be available for a greater Marxist culture via our publications and our section's involvement in interventions. Most of all we must do this via the development of our influence in the communist parties. We must get ready for fresh interventions in the coming crises of the communist and socialist parties, in the Catholics and in the nationalists.

In the name of the International Secretariat, we salute the Latin American Bureau, the small Bureau in Sardinia, the small Bureau in Spain, and all the Bureaux of the International.

It is with a complete sense of joy that I end my Report. I do this in the absolute certainty that the International is going to progress immensely in its activity and apply all the conclusions we have drawn. This way, the International will be prepared for the next stage and pave the way to the next Congress.

J Posadas
28 July 1975