

The world revolutionary process and the course of the partial regeneration in the workers states

J. POSADAS

This document is a tape transcript extracted from comrade J. Posadas' speech when he gave this Political Report to the Tenth World Congress of the Posadist IV International on 19 - 20 July 1975

This tenth World Congress takes place in a stage tending towards the clarification and establishment of historic truth. This truth does not only dwell in Trotsky's works but in the instrument for the application of the Marxist method. This Congress is being held with a team, small as it is, that has had the historic audacity to organise itself, draw lessons and accumulate experiences in order to contribute to the historic progress of humanity.

This team does not strive to prove its reasoning is correct, but to show that the correct reasoning is necessary for the progress of humanity. We hold this Congress with the idea of eliciting historic truth. We are preoccupied to learn from experience and to draw our examples from within the process, within the unfolding world course of human progress. The latter forges ahead through revolutions and Workers States, but it does not have a conscious leadership. History invents this leadership, partly through the Chinese, the Soviets, the Cubans. In its want of instruments for progress, it invents provisional ones. But science, the economy, the scientific capacity of humanity itself, all these keep on searching for the leadership that will concentrate the force of humanity, and give it a centre.

As we hold this Congress of the IV International, we sing no triumphant praise in tribute to our dead comrades, or to the heroism of our living ones everywhere. We are here to weigh events up in the light of historic comparisons. We analyse the pathway that can, and must, eventually convene and centralise the force to eliminate the capitalist system, and along with it, a most obnoxious power in history: the Soviet and Communist Party bureaucracy.

We do this at a time of uninterrupted processes of revolution and Permanent Revolution. As these lack a conscious leadership, they create types of revolutionary movements largely unaware of the force they could, and should, muster. They hardly support themselves on the objective process of history, and yet, they go forward like Portugal, Peru, Argentina, Mexico, Algeria, the Workers States. But these revolutions do not yield all what they could. Their limitations are manifest in the fact that the conscious,

scientific reasoning of Marxism has little or no participation in them, and when it does, it is from quite a distance.

Dear comrades, note how we are not an old Bolshevik team here, but very young comrades, young in age, young in politics. Age has no importance, but span in political life has. Take the children of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, or those of Portugal, Indochina, Vietnam, Cambodia. They are all very young in age, in physical age. But their political age as regards reasoning and maturity is so very great! The essential thing, therefore, is the social strength of people, the force of their thought and of their intelligence.

We are part of the process too. We devote ourselves to the elaboration of the scientific thought best suited for intervention. It is inevitable that, soon, this process is going to produce deliberately an open discussion about Marxism, even with all the obstacles put in the way by the lack in conscious leadership. This is going to happen before, during, and after the nuclear war. Humanity is getting ready to conquer a number of obstacles to its progress: imperialism and its atomic war, bureaucracy in both Workers States and Communist parties, and the lack of Marxist utilisation in historic interpretation. We are the only ones paying regards to this.

The immense majority of our comrades are youths. Some, even, are children, and others are not yet born; these latter are present though they cannot see the Congress. They have not been told, but we have incorporated them, so that they may live and feel this Congress. Today, pregnancy and birth are still separate, private and matrimonial activities. In the past, such things were strictly women's matters. Today, men come nearer, a little. But us, we have made the unification. To have a child is a social need. It cannot be a fault, a misdemeanour, a backsliding, a retreat or a particular woman's love. It is a social love. The child is a necessity of history and it is as such that it must be carried. Love must be present in pregnancy and child-birth. Whilst the foetus is still forming, it accumulates and organises the love that its mother communicates. Even if this does not directly connect with its brain or nervous system, the love of the mother has great repercussions on the structure and organisation of the brain and nervous system. It makes the child much more receptive to the influence of humanity.

In human relations, it is necessary to reason and persuade. Reasoning and persuasion do not exclude the use of force. We propose the preventative war, atomic even, against imperialism. But we do not advocate it with the mind of the assailant. It is the same as when some rock obstructs the way. What is the good begging it: 'Rock, move and let me through'? The rock must be cast aside. What we advocate about the war, we do it in the same spirit, with no sentiment of violence or of arrogance. We pose it with the sentiment of doing something necessary in history: and not for the sake of one group or the other, but for humanity's.

This is the kind of thinking to rate highly in politics, in revolution, in the construction of socialism. How far removed the actual Socialist, Communist and Workers States' apparatuses are from this manner of thought. They may be a power superior to what there was before, but if they mean to better distribute the proceeds of the economy, it is only because they are compelled by the Workers State and its statified economy (centralised and planned by the State -Edit.). They have not the conscious aim of

deliberately building superior human relations. In their view, the elimination of capitalism will do away with all the wrongs of the system. There may be some truth in this, but humanity is no longer just aiming at this. In its view, this gain is the lowest rung of a ladder that goes much higher: humanity thinks it is necessary to eliminate every form of oppression, arrogance, commandment and abuse; and to communicate with itself via comprehension and intelligence. No doubt the bureaucrats look upon all this as a monstrosity. Possessed of the apparatus, they reason according to it.

We have come here to discuss on the basis of intelligence, and not according to any apparatus. With this large quantity of young people attending, this Congress highlights that we are not intent on taking forces from, or competing with, the Communist Party, the Socialists or the Left groups. We focus on achieving a better integration and participation in a process that requires intelligence, first and foremost intelligence. Before everything, and above everything, what is wanted is intelligence. The most elevated and complete intelligence is Marxism. The Marxist method is the most elevated form of intelligence. Nothing else compares! Marxism grasps the essential reasoning of life, of history. We do not know where we come from, we do not yet know quite where we are going to, but what we know well is what is to be done. Knowing this, we can already fit ourselves out for more historic and social consciousness in order to better grasp where we are going.

It is not the aim of this tenth World Congress to make audits or to investigate what may have been done or not done. We have come here to discuss how things stand with the revolution and the final settlement of accounts. In our slogans, we subsume the present stage, its course, and prognoses about the evolution of humanity. Our slogans are conclusions. They centralise and synthesise the process. This is done without in the least neutralising, discarding, superseding or hiding away any of the already established conclusions.

THE NORTH AMERICAN PEOPLE IS SENSITIVE TO THE STRUGGLE OF HUMANITY FOR ITS DIGNITY

We must understand and feel in our bones that imperialism has not the slightest power to solve the problems of history or determine who commands it, or why. Imperialism prepares its atomic war but it cannot launch it when it likes, how it likes, where it likes. It certainly prepares it - just to save its own existence! In the face of this, humanity has already learnt: it wants to end capitalism and every form of oppression, not to save its own existence, but to give back to life its due dignity. The struggle for dignity has already gripped the consciousness of humanity and this is one of the most considerable historic achievements ever made. Thanks to this, humanity develops no end of capacity. It feels certain it can solve all the problems history has in store, of the economy and of nature.

Humankind is not a vaguely defined category. Humanity - it is this child, here in the Congress; it is the children of Dhofar, of Vietnam, of the USSR. It is the North American people too, for they are not a separate rung in the ladder of history. Their resistance to Yankee imperialism stops the latter doing what it likes, where, and how it likes. These liars in the Yankee imperialist army imposed a news black-out on US police strikes. They tried to draw the North American people behind their excuses to invade Vietnam and

drop atomic bombs on it. Here disappointed, they halted, held back by their fear of the Soviets and of the North American people. As the latter learn to intervene on political, economic and social problems, imperialism sees in them the growth of critical evaluation and resolve. There are no mass movements in North America, but people still make their point. They withhold political support from their governments, they abstain in elections and they keep clear of pro-government demonstrations or meetings. They refuse to be the so-called 'silent majority' the Yankees keep on about. The North American people feel the influence of the world struggles. They are not impressed by high living standards - unemployment notwithstanding - or by a powerful capitalism so eager on matters military/atomic. The North American people do not allow themselves to be intimidated.

Those who believed the North American petty bourgeoisie was stupid and a launch pad for Yankee imperialism, must now explain why Yankee imperialism has not been able to whip up any demonstration against the USSR, against Vietnam or against the anti-imperialist countries. Imperialism has not been able to bring its people onto the streets by telling them: "Let's defend our North American way of life" - higher even than in Europe. It is not as if the USA lacked in means of propaganda, home as it is to the most complete publicity machine, market studies in every popular taste and research into every trend and tendency. But still, not only it failed in getting support for its bomber flights, but it had to take flight instead.

What a measure this is of the maturity and intelligence of humanity! The North American people cannot express this politically, socially or with revolutionary positions. But their refusal to support Yankee imperialism means also a partiality to Vietnam and Cambodia. The North American people think and judge. They raise high the criterion through which they view human relations. This behaviour is one of the factors that held back, still does, an imperialist tendency bent on war this minute, giving way to the wonder: War, then what? Are the American people going to applaud and cry: "Well done lads!"? Imperialism knows that in war its foremost opponent, Enemy Number One, is within.

The notion of fatherland is fading away. It still exists but with no real force, tradition or power of conviction. It no longer draws people behind region and country. The notion of social relations and of social regimes acquires a real force instead. The abolition of private property in the Workers States, whatever their leaderships, has instituted a superior form of relation in the world. It has shown to the peoples that boundaries, flags and traditions are not paramount; that what counts is the nature of the economic and social regime, its ability to bring economic development, with what kind of a leadership, what plan. These superior relations mark the point of rupture with private property and national sentiment. Not even the Soviets are aware of the full depth of this process: But it marches on. The masses of the world reach levels of comprehension, reasoning and intelligence well over the heads of their political parties and leaders. Boundaries have not yet been eliminated and will probably be with us awhile, but humanity has already modified its behaviour. It judges and reasons in the general knowledge that boundaries will/must be eliminated and that progress needs the end of confrontations between countries. Science, technology, art, the means communication and of union in one country, are tomorrow's means of unification between all the countries.

Solidarity with Vietnam was not due solely to the conditions facing Vietnam: humanity is concentrating the sentiment of its unification on a world scale. This sentiment is still expressed limitedly because it can only culminate in Socialism. But it is already partly developing in local experiences.

In Ethiopia for example, conditions for people were worse than for animals. However, the Ethiopian people have decided to collectivise the land. They decided upon expropriations and the beheading of a few Chiefs - not enough by all accounts. The Ethiopian people come out of nothing. They were told that the Earth was square (the Negus thought it had the shape of his brain). See how such a backward people are forward today, raising the idea of Workers Councils and other Council-type organisms. The Portuguese people the same. You will soon see this idea arise in Latin America. In Italy, they talk about Factory Councils which, in a certain way, exercise some functions of the Workers Councils.

But which political party discusses this? The Socialists, the Communists and the Left groups see Councils as an immediate solution to a problem or an intervention. They do not consider them as instruments of history, bearers of an immense progress that must be treasured. However, popular councils demonstrate the will of the masses to advance their right to intervene in society and become its leadership. If you are looking for the intelligence of humanity, here it is. It is expressed in this quest, and its level is very high indeed. The capitalist system and the bureaucrats measure intelligence in relation to commercial interests like production capacity/time, savings, expenditures, production costs, etc. A guy who contributes to them some 'rationalisation plan' or 'creative accounting' is deemed 'intelligent'. But the intelligence of humanity must be measured against its behaviour in social struggles, its response and dynamism in social struggles.

Ethiopia, when it was a most backward country, was given no place in history. Dhofar, a heap of stones, mountains and deserts, could have been especially devised to wilt any bloom in human relations, let alone human love. But Dhofar is among the most loving of places. There are no trees, but people are struggling for Communism. Nature does not supply any water but there is a flood of love and fraternal sentiments in the ties between people; it is what gives them life, a sense of certainty, a firm knowledge of what they must do. In Portugal, very backward peasants have risen up after 50 years of fascism, not just to overthrow it, but to clear the way for Socialist progress. In backward Latin American countries the social struggles are not motivated by the desire to expropriate or to change proprietors but to eliminate property. They apply measures that seek the economic and social bases for Socialism. Mexico, Peru and Panama are examples. The backward peoples with no libraries, universities or texts, reclaim their place in history through intelligence and the impulsion they receive from the world revolution. They take their cue from the Workers States.

It was not the individual decision of man that woman should be man's or society's instrument. This came with the social relations determined by private property. Man's superiority over woman has nothing natural about it. It was created by the relations of private property. But well before the elimination of private property, equality between men, women, children and the old is already acquired in the revolution. Humanity unifies and centralises the human relation (i.e. 'human relations' - Edit). You look anywhere in any revolutionary movement, and you find that it moves towards this

human identification, seeking the equality of rights, of attributions and of behaviours. It yearns for people to have their rights; it wants them to have an equal participation in the construction of society. Socialism is not yet reached, but humanity has already won, and organised, the forces that capitalism used to wield to obtain submission. Submission meant no right to intervention, no participation, no progress with the passing of time. You can verify this in Uganda, in Algeria and in the whole of Africa. You can see it in Latin America and in Vietnam where women, children and the old had always been used to shore up conservatism, that keeper of capitalist and bureaucratic power. Today these people rise up and bring to the revolution their participation since neither the Communist parties nor the Workers States have offered them any. This happens in the most backward countries - backward, economically, socially and politically, but decidedly the most advanced from the point of view of their revolutionary struggles. These countries make a place for themselves in history, directly.

This process combines three aspects: the Permanent Revolution, the Political Revolution and the Partial Regeneration. It is a combined process, meaning that it is not linear. As time passes, all these aspects are interwoven: Permanent Revolution, Political Revolution and Partial Regeneration/Historic Re-encounter (the latter two having the same core).

The contribution of the children of Dhofar is not considered of great importance by the big Communist parties who ignore and hide it. They do the same with the children of Vietnam. In the literature of the Communist and Socialist parties, of the Workers States even, those children are a minute item, hardly anything. In the news, we are told about them once a year. Sometimes we are shown the Vietnamese children as graceful creatures to be praised for their good help in cleaning. But it is not in cleaning that the children participate, but in taking part in social organisation. Just look at the pictures of the children of Vietnam and of Dhofar. They are twelve and hold a gun bigger than themselves - bigger in the form that is, but smaller in reality, because it is the children who command the gun, keeping it trained on the goal of social improvement. They do not do this to serve themselves, but to serve history, i.e. the progress of humanity. The Communist leaders see nothing of this.

MADAGASCAR, PORTUGAL AND THE CREATION OF THE ORGANISMS NECESSARY TO THE PROGRESS OF THE REVOLUTION

Madagascar comes from nothing. That country, as most countries of the world, has many unorganised resources. But in only a few years, it has thrown out French imperialism and now it arrives at the programmatic revolutionary conclusion of: 'We must make Socialism'. The Fokonolona (popular assemblies), creations of the Madagascar Revolution, are organisms; they are hybrid in the way most organisms created by this type of revolution are. The leadership of the revolution is a hybrid also because it combines aspects of social progress, Communist even, with bourgeois limitations. The organisms created in these conditions reflect this situation. The most important thing is that they allow the intervention of the masses. Indeed, the economy and society must not remain in the hands of one group, and the masses must need to take part. Such organisms have Soviet forms even though they are not Soviet organs. They are still

limited, but they allow the masses to participate. This will soon happen in Algeria. Each revolution leads to organisms of this type.

In Portugal, the organisms of 'Direct Democracy' allow the participation of people. What else they are is still unclear, but they indicate an attempt at the development of mass organisms. The 'Movement of the Armed Forces' in power (MFA in Portuguese), is aware that it does not have the social capacity to lead the country. It decided to seek the support of the masses against the political leaderships that are either wedded to capitalism or do not know what to do. The MFA turned to the masses to stop further turmoil and confusion. This did not happen in the past when this sort of situation was quickly smothered, the masses crushed and accounts settled between leaders afterwards. Now, the masses intervene and leave no room for tranquillity or a new equilibrium. Dependent on them, the top leaderships cannot ignore them. This is what goes on in Madagascar and Portugal, and this is new in history.

Lenin watched out for such new things in the Russian Revolution; but he had the Party: His Party prepared, organised and planned the decision to take power. This is the way he founded the Soviet Union. Today, the revolutions in Madagascar, Dahomey, Latin America or Africa have no Bolshevik or Communist Party. This is their greatest deficit. They are movements with bourgeois origins, petty bourgeois or former servants of capitalism. They put themselves at the disposal of the revolution and create organisms. As this brings down some potentate, all the plans and projects of private property and many other private forms come down too. This action breathes life into, and brings to history, the new tools and organisms necessary to pass from Revolution to Socialist construction. These popular organisms allow the masses to intervene, discuss, decide, apply and control: and here, you have Soviet forms.

Why isn't the Soviet Union doing as much? It gives these aspects no consideration - no theoretical or political attention; these aspects are not even seen as experiences by any Communist or Socialist Party, or by any group. Each of them is busy with immediate concrete events about which it squabbles profusely with others, never drawing scientific conclusions or generalisations. But the revolutionary leaders, layers and groups representative of the masses, or tied to them, draw conclusions; they create popular organs for the progress of their revolutions. They are neither Communist, Socialist nor initially anti-capitalist, but they create such organisms. The latter carry on existing even when the revolution halts, reverses or gets intimidated. Such organisms are not ornaments: They encapsulate the will of the masses. What better subject of discussion is there for the world Communist movement? For those in love with science, this is a more scientific question than all the spacecrafts imaginable! You solve this problem and you resolve all the problems of the future - artificial satellites included. If this problem remains unsolved, there will be no satellites in the future. That such a debate should take place in the world communist movement is more decisive than all the universities put together, as far as the experience of history, of humanity, is concerned. You put all the universities together, and they are worth less than the experience which is being realised by the masses of Portugal or of Madagascar. We have every respect for science, but it does not simply consist in the study of mathematics, the universe or the atom.

The discovery of the proton alters the theories and the utilisation of the atomic fusion process. It should allow a huge development because it means a great deepening and

increase in scientific atomic knowledge. This small proton particle produces a force beyond compare. It is so small that, to study it, instruments must be ten times greater than now. This goes to show that humanity is still in nappies - not babies' but historical nappies - and this is due to the fear private property has kept humanity subjugated to. In the past, everything rested on private property. But today, organisms are developing against the arrogance, the petulance and the impunity of private property, its upper castes and mighty pinnacles. Class struggle nowadays presents itself in its most clear, characteristic and unmistakable aspects. Everyone in the world is being drawn into it, women, the old and the children too.

Don't you see more and more children file past in demonstrations, one-year olds in push-chairs? Their joy is demonstrable, not when you caress them but when you answer their Vivas by another Viva! There is no happiness for them in hearing: 'how nice you are...' with a protective pat on the head. They are happy when they can shout 'Viva!', because this exclamation identifies them with the others, whilst protection does not. They feel that they take part like everyone else in this call for struggle. You can see this in any demonstration. In Dhofar, the children are at one with their guns; they participate in every debate and deliberation. They are not surplus to requirement, a burden or a weight, as was the case in the past. They belong! Far from being a hindrance, they are one more factor of progress.

Humanity is breaking free from one of the essential factors that used to perturb and keep it back when politically engaged: the creation of its children. Nowadays, a child incorporates itself into the struggle. Even before its birth, it takes part in the need to change society. This is what humanity experiences today. The most backward countries acquire the most elevated culture. They do not have very great scientists but they produce very great revolutionaries who give the example. Some years ago, this would have seemed incongruous or improbable. History was considered the preserve of scholars, sages and masterminds. But today, the most backward people with little social force, rise up and achieve their incorporation into the most advanced social conquests without waiting to have economic or material means.

HUMANITY IS READY FOR COMMUNISM

All humanity is becoming entwined in a single whole. It springs forward in need of progress. Progress is not just the elimination of the exploitation of one by another. It lies in the participation of everyone. Every form of exploitation of the human being - of the woman, the child, the elderly, even the dog - is coming to an end. Everyone has become capable of participation. In the past, people would not dream of it: cast out of participation by towering social relations, they were made to feel a nuisance. Today, no longer. Everyone feels they want a part in the leadership of life. "We want socialism, a wage rise and a better standard of living" is no longer enough. The child, the woman, the old - man or woman - feel they belong, collaborate and intervene, because in their existence they are the leaders of whatever they are doing. They no longer accept to go and earn their bread without a notion of what tomorrow will bring. They no longer feel submitted to the mystery of life, to uncertainty, to insecurity. When they struggle, it is no longer just for a safe job, the right to reproduction and to prosperity. No! They seek human dignity. The children, the women and the old - mostly the youth - join in this quest ever more keenly. The youth are engaged in this by the tens of thousands. All this

shows that humanity is ready for Communism.

Humanity has already overcome the main obstacle to its development. It feels capable of resolving the problems of history. As a legacy of history, private property caused it to look for an answer - and Marxism obliged. There is no world leadership yet, but Marxism is the answer. Thanks to it, thanks to dialectical materialism, history can be apprehended in the light of the class struggle, making it possible to foresee. Marxism enables anyone to preview the general line and behaviour of society - and nature. Since its object was the class struggle, it was not Marxism's brief to make a deep investigation of nature; but it is just as fine an instrument to apply to nature and the Universe. Marxism can interpret these through dialectical materialism. Humanity is now casting off its fear. One of the best proofs of this lies in that the most backward people, like the Ethiopians or the Algerians, adopt the most advanced modern norms. After hundreds of years under the yoke of submission, Algeria has been standing up for fifteen years going from National Liberation to Socialism. Algeria is now engaged in fulfilling one of the most fundamental conditions for Socialist construction: it is building the Party. You do not get to Socialism without the Party.

In Mexico, it is the same thing. Those who seek to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution, and without even proposing to go beyond it, find that they are driven from bourgeois democracy and its measures to Socialist measures. In the ensuing intermingling of bourgeois democracy and socialist measures, the bourgeois democratic revolution turns into a hindrance and a brake. It resists every input of energy and ability, particularly in the economy where planning is imperative. Meanwhile, the already centralised structure of the world leaves no space for a private property style of development in any country. We are in the stage of the big monopolies and multinationals. They hold all the power of decision in production, distribution, investments. Within private property, they are those who control production. Whoever seeks a modicum of development or economic progress must start off with expropriations and planning, and be quick about enlisting the support of the masses at home and abroad. Countries succeed when they do this. The others drift along in an anguished fog of endless nattering, bickering and crises. They make not progress.

The economy of the capitalist system is hitting yet another rock, apart from revolutions, Workers States and endless upheavals by the workers and world masses: Prime material producing countries are also entering the fray. Capitalism had always assumed that it could always get its raw materials dirt cheap. Corrupting here, inventing a Lawrence of Arabia there, cheap raw materials would always be at hand. But now, the Lawrences have been shown the door by the Arabs. Types like him were brokers for local agents who appointed comptrollers, overseers, kings, and courtiers, all in the pay of imperialism. This is over: Even small countries like Kuwait want to develop their economies. They confront imperialism if only by increasing the price of their oil. To sustain itself, a regime like Kuwait grants to a petty bourgeois layer the status of potential ruling class, but even then, the latter still has more interest in state ownership than in private property. This is not to say that it has common interests with the proletariat, but it certainly has differences with imperialism. In its finely tuned games, it has an incentive in expropriation, stratifications and its own economic development. It is objectively compelled to develop the country socially, otherwise stagnation and rebellion fester. This is partly what happened in Saudi Arabia with the King's

assassination. These things lose imperialism the trust and confidence that are at the heart of its stability. Meanwhile, Workers States develop; Revolutionary States grow; they extend and advance; revolutions keep on happening. All this represents a force that limits imperialism and pushes it back. It narrows its room and freedom of movement, working against capitalism in general. In turn, this arouses the masses of the world. It inspires backward people to participate in the teams that settle the problems of their societies.

These conditions of history are the most handsome ever. The liquidation of swathes of private property has become much easier. But the Communists, Socialists and Workers States leaderships, held back by their bureaucratic interests, stand stock still before the need to coordinate a movement to finish with what is left of the capitalist system. Even though the crisis of capitalism deepens, a world leadership for these revolutionary forces is not being formed in the necessary homogenous manner. Revolutionary processes pop up just about anywhere but the Communist and Socialist parties fail to acknowledge them, hampered as they are by a series of concepts, of local interests, which prevent them understanding the dynamic and dialectical process of history. This is why they are constantly taken by surprise, and any revolution astonishes them. Take Portugal for instance: there, you have a topic worth setting up debates in all the world communist movement, and about which the Universities of all the Workers States should give courses.

Instead of dwelling on satellites and the Soyuz/Apollo joint venture - the best is the Soyuz anyway since the Apollo plays no role in history - why not develop seminars in the Universities of the USSR, China, Cuba and Czechoslovakia on the topic of Portugal? What happened there? How to interpret it? These questions are more important than interplanetary trips - infinitely so! It is necessary to hold debates on Portugal and Ethiopia, produce interpretations, give lectures and open discussions; how is one to understand that a backward country like Portugal could make such a leap? How has it passed from the barbarian imposition of fascism over to its elimination at the hand of its own soldiers? Who, on top of it, propose Socialist measures? How to interpret this? Are the people better in that country? Are the Portuguese soldiers better than elsewhere? Have they a better heart, a clearer head? If not, what is the social and dialectical explanation? Why do we have complete silence over this?

There is also Uganda - how to explain Uganda? It may be that Amin has aspects of a clown or dresses like one. But he does not act like one. Every time he moves, he kicks imperialism. There is Madagascar: How to explain that? Or Mexico? What is to be said about them? Here you have a mine of subjects for study in the Universities of Moscow, China and Cuba; and not just there, but in the whole workers movement, in the trade unions and the factories. Why not discuss the Portugal phenomenon in the factories of Italy, France, Brazil? Is Portugal just a particular case or could this spread in the world? How come soldiers carefully briefed, organised, prepared and interested in the defence of private property suddenly turn against it? We are not talking of one or ten soldiers, but whole Armies! What better motif for discussion is there? Since matters of astronomy, satellites, scientific discoveries and open-heart surgery can be discussed, why not these problems of humanity? They are far from being secondary in importance: Find the solution to the problems of society, and you will answer all the other problems, of the heart, of the brain and of Space. But no one discusses it!

ARMIES PASS OVER TO THE SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION

Just consider that the problems we are dealing with here are not strictly of the workers movement - they are vital for humanity. They beg the question: how is humanity going to progress? What scientific and medical progress does the United States represent for humanity? None, when all the progress they have is in gangsters, thieves, murderers and assassins; clearly, this cannot serve as a foundation for the interpretation and knowledge of progress. On the other hand, just look at Portugal, Ethiopia, Peru and the first years of Peronism in Argentina: military movements – the four of them! Is this to be ignored then? We are the only ones on the ground. We have invited, and hereby re-invite the Communist movement to discuss these phenomena.

We are no longer in the epoch when, in a Congress such as this, we used to analyse all the events that had taken place, draw conclusions and end with a balance sheet of prognosis. Now, we are analysing the forces of humanity in its mobilisation, their various manifestations, how they communicate between themselves and what they represent. We analyse what the workers movement must be invited to study, to understand and to prepare for. One point of great importance is to understand how the military, how armies - and not isolated soldiers - become mobilised on behalf of the revolution. Just how to interpret this?

When they reverse their roles, the Armies express the level of influence which the revolution has over them. This conclusion is not peculiar to one country or the other. It results from the concentrated influence of the revolution on the military. It so shapes their comprehension, their aspirations and their will, that they start playing a function opposed to their original one, as capitalist armies. They had belonged to organisms created by private property with mission to defend it. Drilled into them was the pride of the exceptional individual, the one special being whom society has selected to defend those in command. But now, they turn to defend the progress of humanity, the reverse of before. This is where you measure what little force national sentiments and boundaries have; this is a major defeat for capitalism.

When Vasco Goncalves, Chief of an Army such as the Portuguese, publicly embraces and congratulates Zamora Machel on the freedom of Mozambique, it is because Goncalves feels that he, himself, has become free. His embrace with Zamora means: "I congratulate you because we are both free, you and me". Indeed, he feels they have graduated to the freedom of the Human Being. There you have human dignity! Armies that had been set up with the express purpose of repressing people, march out instead to pick people up and help them walk. Such events are not exceptional, they happen in Peru, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Uganda even: the main line of Amin's conduct is anti-imperialist. Such events do not stem from the peculiar qualities or conditions in countries. They come from the influence history exercises over the military, inducing a change in modes of thinking and of reasoning, so that the soldiers yearn to serve society. In a word, revolution influences and wins over the organs created by the counter revolution. This can only happen when the world relation of forces, the course of history, clamour quite conclusively for the elimination of capitalism.

For the soldiers who pass over to the revolutionary camp, there are no economic rewards. They seek an answer to the meaning of life, to their consciousness, to human dignity. They do not covet improvements for their own advancement - they know there will be none. Under capitalism they had privileges, a fair remuneration, the prerogative to give orders. There were other advantages and benefits too. Now, it is all gone. But as they join the revolution, they experience a feeling and an uplifting of human dignity that is fresh every day. When human dignity is what motivates the course taken by an entire body of soldiers, it means that the revolution has won great authority indeed, and humanity is already aware that Communism is superior to all the other forms of movements and social processes.

The military of Portugal and of Ethiopia do not form movements with the view to improving their own standard of living, but for Socialism. They have not yet got to the construction of Socialism, but they apply socialist measures. Under private property, Ethiopia will not come out of backwardness; it won't even progress in a capitalist form. There is nothing for it but Socialist measures. This indicates the authority of Socialism in comparison to every other form of social, economic and political relation. When entire armies join the revolution, they are not reacting to the peculiar conclusions or qualities of their own countries. Only a world authority which already sways the course of history can do this. And indeed, nothing can put an end to human dispute, but Socialism. Humanity finds in these army changes the decisive proof of its own capacity and superiority, because humankind naturally prevails over the individual interest of one person or the other. What the various militaries of Portugal, Ethiopia, Cambodia or Laos demonstrate, is that Humanity is unafraid.

This must be discussed in Moscow's Universities; why not? True, if we go and ask them, they will tell us that we are naïve people, full of illusions and Ultra Leftists to boot. They will not fail to mention that we want the nuclear war and that, in consequence, we want the end of humanity; that we go around kindling the barbarism of war. Meanwhile the Yankees are raining bombs on Vietnam as if it were a simulation game. Laos, Cambodia, the Middle East - well, these are not real wars, you know. The assassinations which the imperialist army of Israel commits regularly in Lebanon are not wars - or assassinations; they are accidents. But for the people, war rages on every day of the week! Mind you, this is also why entire capitalist armies pass over to the side of human dignity. And this gives such a firm and unbeatable base of support to humanity in its quest for progress! Why should not this be discussed in the Workers States? We propose this to the Communist comrades.

IMPERIALIST OPPRESSION AND THE GONCALVES/ZAMORA EMBRACE

What gives a measure of human relations nowadays? Is it still commerce? No, it is not! Its measure is given by the conduct of the military and masses of Ethiopia and Portugal. In the name of the Posadist IV International and of this Congress, I call on the musicians and the poets to create a piece on the following theme: 'From Imperialist Oppression to the Goncalves/Zamora's Embrace'. Swept by the delight of freeing each other, the military and the masses of Portugal, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, stand up and

warmly applaud this embrace. Socialism is a necessity of the human relation - not of the economy! Though the course of humanity is still through the economy, the determinant role is no longer played by the economy. For instance: if the Soviets and the Yankees both go to the Moon, it is for different motives. Even with a military rationale, the Soviets ultimately aim at a greater knowledge of, and relation with, the universe. Their military inquisitiveness, though real, is not their historic objective. For its own need of progress and development, the Workers State creates fields and options for scientific investigation. After the Earth, it turns to planets, the universe, the solar system; and soon, other planetary systems. For what regards imperialism, on the other hand, its rockets aim at nothing but financial and military returns. This is not the case at all with the Workers State. It sends rockets up for aims that are just the opposite.

But since they can go to the Moon, fix the joint Soyuz/Apollo space manoeuvre and other scientific exploits, how is it that they cannot prevent floods here on Earth? There are deadly droughts and famines, too much water or not enough. The Workers States and the Communist parties would gain an immense authority in the world if they bothered about this. They could declare that all the benefits from atomic energy must be put at the service of resolving this matter! We are not saying they should stop preparing militarily against the imperialist war. But since the Workers States, the USSR, China, Poland, already acknowledge their need to be prepared atomically, what is to stop them making such a proposition?

Imperialism prepares the war. It does it bit by bit, not all at once, because it is not given the latitude; but it has already lost the power of decision over the initiative and the manner of it. It makes war little by little because it cannot do otherwise: the capacity for action of the capitalist system is disarticulated, disintegrated. We will not be able to stop it acting, but this disarticulation robs it of confidence and capacity. It cannot even unite in the face of its own agony. As it fragments, it weakens even more, whilst its historic capacity for initiative lessens. Why not discuss this in the Moscow's universities? What difference is there between discussing this and discussing the human heart, the Soyuz mission or space vehicles? Just now, pride of place must be given to vehicles capable of eliminating capitalism! We propose to the comrades of the Workers States, of the Communist parties, to the Portuguese comrades, to discuss all these problems because they are the crucial experience of humanity.

Guinea Bissau, Angola, Mozambique have broken free. Where does this liberation come from? Certainly, not from a fixed date! Every inch of it was gained by force. The time had kept coming and coming, but the world workers leaders had seen nothing. These countries had lain oppressed for decades and in twenty four hours, they broke free - though the cleansing may still take a year. If these Portuguese colonies became free, it is not because all the people suddenly stood up, but because the oppressor had become too weak to resist their struggles and keep the power. How has the oppressor come to this? It is because the world structure of capitalism is collapsing! Why not discuss it? The leaders elude this and would have us believe that it all happens by chance. They see no unity between Angola, Portugal, Argentina, the USSR and the struggle of the masses of Italy, France, Germany or Britain. They see everything separately. They see no unity in the process. It may be that the unity of the world is not orchestrated programmatically by a leadership, but the unity there is, albeit empirically, communicates all the experiences.

The Portuguese masses abolished fascism thanks to the Army, but mainly thanks to the experience of the struggles in other countries. The leaderships that arise in this way have no programme, but they are leaderships. They are empirical, unstable, they have no road maps. But when the masses lack leadership, the Armies step in to transmit the influence of the world revolution. This links the various experiences between them, making them universal. This process is more important than all the space vehicles, Soyuzes or Apollos.

Mozambique's liberation and Goncalves' embrace are as hugely important to history as the Russian Revolution. This happened, of course, after the Russian Revolution. But in this case, you have the liberation of the oppressed and of the oppressor, both freed by freeing each other and demonstrating that the world is ripe for Communism.

This accolade does not signify a fraternal gesture but a necessity of history; and the conditions are present for more progress. The Portuguese MFA feel the need to free all the oppressed! But do you think the armies of France, Germany, Italy or the US are so very different from Goncalves'? Are they so distinct, opposed? When it occurs to an Army during its calling to stand up and play a function of political revolutionary leadership, we are not dealing with individual cases. Peron in Argentina was the start of this process; then came Guatemala, Bolivia, Venezuela and Colombia; then, the whole of Latin America; after that, it happened in Africa and Asia, and now in the whole world.

In Peron's epoch, the USSR was the sole Workers State. Today, there are 14 Workers States and 18 Revolutionary States. Why not discuss the conditions that must prevail in such world and historic relations of forces? How do they impact on the strength of capitalism, of revolution, of Socialism? How does this affect intermediate layers, how to win them? With what plan, what programme? Can the capitalist system overcome this crisis and recover? Why let it recover? The most elementary experience of history shows how it recovers: ruined smaller capitalists, financial crashes, war.

Whilst capitalism sends its space vehicle to play burlesque with the Soviets, it prepares for the war. By lending themselves to the game, the Soviets posit that coexistence with imperialism is possible. But it isn't true that it is possible. Humanity is being lied to, and capitalism believes none of it! It is false to think that this space encounter holds out hopes of living together. Imperialism is making no scientific experiment for the sake of humanity, it only shores up its regime. The Soviets' experiments, for their part, intend to improve the Workers State. These two aims are antagonistic. There is neither rivalry nor competition here: it is an antagonism. 'Antagonism' means neither side can let the other live on. It is one side, or the other. There is no room for closeness or relations. If, seemingly, you have some economic and political relationship between Workers States and capitalism, it is not because these are possible. It is because the Workers States are not moving to liquidate capitalism whilst the latter lacks in forces sufficient to destroy the Workers States. The present situation is stretching out, with the old 'status quo' gone and very little accord or mutual respect showing. It is as if capitalism were simply letting the long length drag along. But the disputes and skirmishes that flare up in the Middle East, Vietnam, Latin America, Asia, expose unremitting antagonism. The class struggle keeps sharpening in every capitalist country too; and all this for one reason only: The capitalist system cannot put up with any agreement or competition with the system of

the Workers States, through which history could be left to elect the better or the worthier of the two. Are these conclusions not important enough for University debates?

LET'S DISCUSS MARXISM IN THE WORKERS STATES AND THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

In the Universities of the Workers States, Marxism is not discussed. When Marxism shows the top of its nose, it is as a theme amongst others and for a very superficial purpose. We propose and reiterate in this tenth World Congress the proposition we have already made to the Workers States, that they should place Marxism at the centre of curricula. Marxism must be the principal subject in primary, secondary and higher education. The Soviets had done this originally with Bukharin's ABC of Communism. This had been very empirical, scholastic and superficial, but it had set out the norms of the class struggle. Why shouldn't Marxism be the backbone of education in the Workers States? We proposed this before and reiterate this proposal. Children must learn that History is the history of the class struggle; and that the classes behave as classes and not as individual persons; indeed, it is the classes that speak through individual persons. Whilst it is instrumental to the course of history, the class struggle determines also the behaviour of classes, which behaviour can therefore be foreseen - the very thing our Marxist masters did.

We propose to the Communist parties, to the Workers States and the movements of the so-called 'Third World' that they discuss Marxism. In countries like Algeria, countries objecting to Marxism even though they have a good peep at it under the coat, we propose that they make an objective study of history: What does the behaviour of humanity consist of? Is it defined by the conduct of one or other individual, or by the economy and property forms? Are the economic plans and life decisions taken to suit some individuals, or a class?

Communists must refurbish the notion of 'class struggle' and re-introduce it in the world communist movement. This will give them a realistic view of the Stalin phenomenon. Was Stalin a rotten apple? Why did so much power come his way? Why was he allowed it? Was he supernaturally cunning? Why was he able to enforce a vile dictatorship? How could it have lasted 30 years? Why did he cancel democracy in the Bolshevik Party? Didn't the Party have the power to stop him? Why was Stalin able to impose his views on the Soviet Union? Why was there no reaction - was there a plot? Were the State and the Party in this plot whilst the people were against Stalin and did not support him?

A Review of the French Communist Party recently published an article by Jean Ellenstein (Head of the French Communist Party Centre for Historic Studies - Edit.). This comrade declares that Trotsky was right when he was in the Soviet Union; he presents Stalin as a capricious and rotten character who clamped down on democracy and made a Stalinist bureaucracy: This is a bit like saying water is wet: But why Stalin? Why his power? We propose to the comrades of the French Communist Party that they open a discussion on 'Why Stalin' and that they interpret like Trotsky in his book 'Stalin'. It is absurd to start criticising Stalin, to start speaking well of Trotsky - and then to avoid mentioning that Trotsky wrote the 'Stalin'. Why not start the debate on the basis of that book? Trotsky makes a very good job of it too. He shows that Stalin is the result of a historic stage and

of specific economic and social interests in a leading layer of the Bolshevik Party. In the then historic conditions, that layer was able to drain the Party of its power. The Party had already been enfeebled by the capitalist blockade and other factors. The revolution had absorbed all the leading cadres. The weakened Party opened its doors and allowed lots of people to participate in its life, seeing that it needed them in administration and the economy. Meanwhile, a sector of the leadership had become daunted. It did not doubt, but it had become awed by the world breadth of the revolution. Initially, Stalin and this sector had not been particularly motivated by local interests but they feared the world role of the revolution. This was made worse by a lack in Party continuity, the growing absence of Marxism, the lack of discussion, of historic practice; there was no previous historic precedent as to how to proceed. Then came the usurpation of Marxism, followed by the elimination of its scientific study.

The tradition of prizing scientific experience continues to be one of the essential tools to understand history. It teaches that history is that of the class struggle. In the USSR, Stalin came from the Bolshevik Party and was not an agent of the class enemy. The triumph of Stalinism is what Trotsky called the 'Thermidor' and 'Bonapartism' – meaning that the power that made the Russian Revolution started stagnating and halted. It then reversed, supported by parasitic forces that had accompanied the revolution. This is not mysterious, it comes from a given balance of social forces in the class struggle, balance that disappeared when the stage ended, leaving behind a formed, Stalinian, structure.

We invite the leaders of the Communist Party, and Ellenstein, to discuss in this light. Let us finally dissipate the mystery of Stalin's triumph. Why don't they explain why Stalin could triumph? They present him as Superman in the Land of no class struggle. Should they start correcting themselves upon this point, they would have to ask the next question: How could the Bolshevik Party, that took power, allow Stalin to prevail? Where was his force? Where did it come from since he started with none? The answers are to be found in the global conditions of the process: The Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Union were much weakened; many leading cadres had died in the civil war and the capitalist siege. Others had gone to fulfil administrative and economic tasks, further weakening the Party. Already before the revolution, the Party apparatus had contained sectors who had been unnerved by the world breadth and global role of the Russian Revolution. These laid hold of the apparatus; and to triumph, they had to wipe out all knowledge and discussion on the historic experience of Marxism. No mystery here either. They dumped Marxism and the class struggle with it.

Of this Ellenstein says nothing. He will only be consistent when he does. He will then realise that Stalin comes not from a trick of history, but from relations of forces, from the abandonment of Marxism and the abandonment of Marxist life in the Bolshevik Party. We invite Ellenstein and the Communist Party to discuss in this way.

Even today, the Communist parties do not discuss in the light of scientific experience. They pass judgements at the level of their concerns, their needs, a heap of accumulated interests, handshakes, bureaucratic excuses. They do not hold any scientific discussion about class struggle or class behaviour. But humanity is not detained. It goes forward in Portugal, in Ethiopia, in Latin America, Africa and Asia - Vietnam. Humanity progresses regardless and even influences leaders of capitalism whom it wins over. It enlarges the mind of children so they can play the function of leaders, which they do, both in political

parties and in society; it incorporates the old - men and women - into the leadership of society.

Humanity shows confidence in itself, sure that every problem can be solved. But the Communist and Socialist parties, the Workers States leaderships, still regard as enigmas the advent of a Stalin, and even the continuation of capitalism. They do not make any scientific appraisal of the process of capitalist war preparations. They do not discuss objectively, but partially and subjectively, according to bureaucratic interests. They still do not analyse the behaviour of classes, however blatantly capitalism behaves as a class, for its class interests, with its class reasoning, the world over. If it has not made the war yet, it is just that it has not found the confidence yet; and it is scared, it already knows it is going to lose. In countries like the United States, France or Italy, it gets full measure of its social weakness, whilst armies already feel a very advanced degree of insecurity as to their historic role. The sentiment of the defence of the fatherland, of each country's bourgeoisie, has wilted and dwindled. This is yet another way to gauge the actual weakness of the capitalist system.

In Sweden, they are considering for eventual legislation whether the traditional capitalist army should be disbanded, arming the people in case of invasion instead. This shows a loss of confidence in the capitalist system, and in its future. Prisons too, they say should be closed down, as senseless, costly things that exacerbate antagonistic social relations. They are also considering cuts in policing, what with no prisons or incarcerations to call on their services. See what kind of ideas come up within the framework of capitalism, seriously submitted to decision makers. It all goes against the structure, the support and the functioning of the capitalist system. Let's spread this to the Judiciary! In France, Sweden and Italy, they discuss that indictment and imprisonment are backward and anachronistic; that social relations must be changed to do away with thieves, criminals, assassins. Surely the judges observe this daily. In the world Communist movement, why not discuss the premises that justify imposing the suppression of armies, police-forces and judges?

Sweden is a small country, certainly, like Portugal or Ethiopia. But what is crucial is to wonder how, having started from opposed points and differing angles, ideas in these three countries have drawn towards each other and finally fastened upon one goal: The capitalist regime is not wanted. Why not discuss this? How can anyone be surprised, after that, at the sight of children with guns, children like those of Portugal, Mozambique and Ethiopia who arm themselves, fight and intervene like adults in the social struggles?

The events in Sweden are not poles apart from those in Portugal. They vary in significance but they have a common root: capitalism no longer serves. In both instances, the aim is to suppress all forms of power. This is the way to discuss. It is no longer necessary to see how best to combine with one or other sector of capitalism. Now, one has to measure the state of reasoning in people, their intelligence, the relations and interests between them: One must measure the social force humanity disposes of, in order to finish with what still remains of oppression, capitalist war preparations, its wars of invasion - mind boggling mires of human suffering. There is also unemployment, scourge on humanity, consequence of the capitalist system and yet, not even its greatest evil.

CLASSES BEHAVE IN HISTORY ACCORDING TO THE INTERESTS THEY DEFEND

The essential characteristic of the capitalist system is that it produces only unemployment, hunger, misery and war, nothing else. But if you wish capitalism to end, it is no good waiting for it to depart. What to do then? Can it be overcome or changed, or is it necessary to expel it by force and violence? Not a word about this in the world communist movement. But among the Communists, there are changes whereby policy and objectives tend to seek the displacement, or replacement, of the capitalist system. Does 'replacement' mean to wait until capitalism gives in to progress? Do not think this, it is incorrect, it is not what the class struggle teaches, it is a bureaucrat's dream! There is nothing happening in Germany, in Britain or in the US that is outside the class struggle. Capitalism is not quitting history, not without having first resorted to all the forces at its disposal to maintain itself.

We call on the Communists and the Workers States to discuss all these problems. The experiences made by revolutions the world over, before Marx and still today, teach that a class does not leave the scene of history without resorting to all the means at its disposal to survive. Thus, to try and survive, capitalism will resort to the atomic war. It is absurd to believe that capitalism can be turned, suborned, frightened or blackmailed away from it. In history, classes do not behave in deference to fear, but according to the interests which they defend: this is the history of the class struggle in a nutshell. What has changed in this struggle since Marx? Has capitalism stopped being capitalist, stopped thinking as such? Capitalism cannot be anything else! Capitalist interests rule over its decisions, its projects and its opinions. The life of capitalism is overarched by the system of competition. Its daily wars are only one aspect of its functioning. Capitalist mentality finds self-identification in private property, in the power to compete, to corrupt: "To each according to capacity" and "power wins". This is how it thinks. Has any of this changed in capitalism? When? Could the historic experience of 14 Workers States and 18 Revolutionary States have altered relations in what remains of capitalism to the point of changing its philosophy, its economic and social nature? No. Is there a single example showing that the capitalists are changed, disposed to give up and accept progress? None. Then, why not discuss in the world communist movement, on the basis of this historic experience? Let's discuss, for instance, the experiences made in Portugal, Chile, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, Vietnam, Laos et Cambodia.

We invite the communist comrades to hold this discussion. They cannot wipe history out with a sponge. Chile has demonstrated that capitalism is not going to give up voluntarily. Marx saw this, and Lenin, and what has changed? The Party is necessary. But to do what? To be an accountant, or an organiser? Organiser! But on what basis? Are classes behaving under the spur of their fears - or under that of their historic interests? No example indicates that they cave in to fear: Neither the bourgeoisie, nor the proletariat. They obey historic interests. Take the bourgeoisie: It does not plan out its defence; it does not say: 'Now what do I do?' Its position in life, its form of thinking, of feeling, of reasoning, is entirely determined, organised and structured by property. It is private property that has organised the form, the functioning and the development of its sentiments and their rapport with its consciousness. You can win one bourgeois or more; a number of bourgeois can be made harmless and this is happening. But it is not for some guys that the bourgeois class operates, but as a class, and according to a

structure - namely, that of high finance which decides all things in the economy.

Fear may strike and paralyse, certainly, and some bourgeois may seek contact with the Workers States, perhaps to shake bigger capitalists off their backs. But they will not renounce their class interests. It is big capital that represents the structure of capitalism; big and medium finance-capital determines the functioning of the system. They decide capitalism's every major step, war, invasion, the atomic war.

From the social point of view, capitalism is constantly losing forces, but it does not lose its domination over power: it holds on to the command posts all the tighter. One cannot be guided by one or other capitalist, but by the system as such, as a whole, because it has the resources, the means and the force to oppose any single capitalist. One must return to discuss all these problems which are, in the last instance, quite elementary.

Carrillo and Berlinguer have just made declarations which are as many bundles of class conciliation thrown at this historic stage. With each bundle, they mean to recruit and train a layer in the Communist and Socialist parties steeped in bureaucratic interests, to obstruct any functioning of the class as class - and for them to continue to conciliate nicely. But this policy offers no chance of progress. It tries to manacle the working class, but it will fail because the latter has an immense audacity and confidence; it will leap over its leaderships. However, this is how the policies of the Communists and of the Socialists constantly undermine the capacity of the working class, its dynamism and its initiative as a class.

Working class initiative is a decisive factor for the progress of history. It is the class that determines and feels; it thinks and figures out when the time has come for action, decision, organisation and leadership. Only the working class is capable of this. It does it as a result of its function in history. When soldiers in Portugal or in Ethiopia adopt the resolution to organise and lead the struggle against capitalism, they base themselves on the working class.

THE REVOLUTIONARY COURSE AND TASKS IN PORTUGAL

The working class has little numerical strength in Ethiopia or in Portugal, but it is numerous in the world. This makes it so that, what matters in a movement is its programme, policy and objectives. In Portugal/Ethiopia, the programme, policy and objectives of the Military are expropriations, statifications, workers control. This programme is not a peasants or a petty bourgeois one. The organs and conclusions of the Military hark back to the Russian Revolution. Their functioning and their objectives are those which revolutions developed in all the Workers States. Portugal is adopting a proletarian programme as a result of the historic function of the proletariat.

The actions the proletariat takes are not really the result of a choice made by its intelligence. Rather, it takes the actions it does because it has no other option. What the proletariat does is forced upon it by its position in history, and these give it little alternative. But history also gives it the conditions: the proletariat can statify and plan the economy. It can do this because of its position in the economy, in production and in

society, and no other class can do it. Failure to grasp this clearly and neatly leads to the error of idealising the proletariat.

The proletariat cannot think or decide just for its own interests. Its function in society determines that it cannot be egotistic; it cannot think only of itself because it must develop society, the economy, science and human relations. No other class can do this. This is not because the proletariat has a 'worker' mission to think of others, but because of its function in history. Socialism is not an individual option; it is a necessity of history. Marx, the Marxists, do no more than interpret the course of history, proposing the programme that makes it orderly: Marxism is the consciousness of the unconscious process of history. Such a feat is not the simple deed of the proletariat. To think so again idealises the proletariat, and history. The proletariat is simply history's conscious agent; from its class position, it has not been able to give much time to scientific and theoretical studies, but Marx did. Marx did not do it in the name and place of the proletariat but as the interpreter of history. It is in this sense that Marx represents the proletariat.

In Portugal, the objectives and social organs appearing are those of the proletariat and not of the petty bourgeoisie or of the peasantry. The proletariat can be small, and the Army in charge, as is the case in Portugal; and still, the programme and the objectives reveal that the proletariat is the class that influences the Army.

The discussion taking place in Portugal shows that neither the Socialists nor the Communists contribute any idea. It is really such a crime! Not surprisingly, the military find it hard to settle on a firm course of action, and even harder to set up a Party: And you cannot invent a Party. Consequently, this leaves a yawning gap in the country which the Right wing is most eager to fill. It is fomenting another Chile, busily collecting a junta of assassins, as in Chile. But this time, the counter-revolution will be crushed and the revolutionary process will spill over into Spain.

Assaults and outrages have been launched against the Communist Party headquarters in Lisbon. If the perpetrators did not do worse, it is because they could not. Those pointing an accusing finger at the Socialists are wrong. In no country have the polemics between Socialists and Communists reached armed confrontation: It is always a battle of words. These attacks come from the Right wing. The bourgeois Right wing and Centre responsible for this may have simply used the Socialists as a scapegoat. By the manner of it, it must have been a small group of provocateurs with no foot soldiers, a small band of assassins hired in preparation for a Coup. But the 'Coup' will be against them and they will lose the opportunity for further plotting. Such things come from the right, well baited by imperialism, and with Soares (Leader of the Portuguese Socialist Party) as a cover. You must expect greater events. The the Military, the MFA, have reiterated their adherence to Goncalves and his programme.

The MFA have the support of the proletarian vanguard which knows what to do, and how to make up for the military's political deficiencies. The Communists discuss nothing. They show no initiative. The organisms of 'direct democracy' that have been created in Portugal can only have a role if they decide in the economy. Life is still determined by the economy! If people are barred from leading the economy, 'direct democracy' has very little use; it must serve people to decide in the economy.

Soldiers of the MFA! We call on you to declare that all the means of production are to be nationalised. You may lose the loan promised by the Common Market. This is indeed possible. But it is not certain either, because the lenders are scared of the effect a blockade against Portugal may have on the petty bourgeoisie and proletariat of the Common Market countries. But even if they cut off credit and aid - no great sums - the Workers States will quickly have to help out. Quickly, because once Portugal stabilises the revolution and erases counter-revolution, the Workers States will become interested; indeed, they will be obliged to get involved. We are not speculating; we are drawing a theoretical and political conclusion. This way of making deductions enabled us to foresee that the Soviet Union would approve of Portugal, even against the other Communist parties, as it does. We knew the Soviet Union would be favourable and identify with Portugal: A Portugal on the way to the Workers State, or leaning towards it, has the dual effect of weakening capitalism and of reinforcing the Workers States. This is how we know that the Workers States will have to help Portugal.

The world communist movement says naught on this. But it will have to! It goes without saying that revolutions as in Portugal or Ethiopia are in sore need of economic means. But in Portugal for instance, revolution will soon find essential means if it starts planning the economy right away; if the mass organisms start leading the economy. These organisms must not come from the top, but from below, from the factories, the countryside, and decree the programming of the Portuguese economy through centralisation and planning. They must send calls to the Workers States for support and ensure the participation of the peasantry. As in Ethiopia: Nationalisations, expropriations, land distribution! The counter revolution now in Ethiopia is no more than the old proprietors, landowners and assorted feudals - the former owners - wading into the population: So, let's have organisms where the population can intervene directly. Let the world Communists and Socialists discuss these conclusions.

It is not enough to say as Cunhal (Leader of the Spanish Communist Party) does: "We are for democracy, the multinationals are against democracy". Agreed. Then Cunhal adds that the Socialists are soft on the multinationals. Agreed. But matters in hand do not just concern Cunhal, Soares and the Socialist party. There is a political leadership, the MFA leadership. It lacks in experience, confidence, centralisation, but it wants to understand. It cannot act with sufficient political sophistication because it still has to learn. It tends towards the conclusion that the statification and centralisation of the economy are needed, as well as organs where the population can take the leadership of the economy. Indeed, the population must lead the economy, directly! But the Communist and Socialist leaders fear this! They object: "You cannot do this, you need technicians". What for? They also want consultant economists and managers. These are necessary to the capitalist economy and enterprise but useless to the Workers State. In the Soviet Union, the bureaucracy retains administrators and planners as a prop for the bureaucratic apparatus; but they aren't necessary. We call on the MFA to propose a Programme of Economic Development. The Popular Committees must not be limited to matters local to where they live: they must discuss the economy. Let them all intervene. Let's break with all the experts, planners and administrators! Let all the population answer the question: What is wanted by the Portuguese people?

Planning must be done openly, with public discussions. Discussions are not grit in the oil, a nuisance or a waste of time. It is a waste of time to those who look upon it from the

viewpoint of capitalist interests. But there is more to consider than competition with the other capitalist countries. We reiterate what we have already posed in all our previous articles: the Portuguese economy must give the lion share of national production over to the satisfaction of national needs – namely, the Portuguese population. Consumption versus the export of industrial and agricultural products must be planned. Workers Control is necessary to free the revolution from obstruction and to prevent the formation of bureaucratic interests and layers. To get Workers Control in place, popular organisms must help impose it. What is ‘direct democracy’ to mean, if not this? What is this democracy supposed to discuss? What attributes should it have? We say that these organisms must be linked to the population. We call on the Portuguese Trade Unions to propose this also. The leaders of the Italian Communist and Socialist parties oppose this kind of thing, those of the Portuguese Socialist Party too. As for the masses – why, they agree! A revolution progresses not because the leaders make it, but because the masses steam ahead in spite of the leaders. The masses show a good deal more confidence in themselves, and in the class, than in their own leaders.

BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

The Portuguese revolution is reaching a critical stage where the threat of a Chilean type Coup is evident; the conditions are being prepared for a Coup. It is not by chance that the Common Market has turned around, now offering, economic support to Portugal - strings and all. It is not to encourage the government that it does this, but the counter revolution. It holds out a hand to internal counter revolution, hoping to muddle the political situation. It seeks out tendencies tied to capitalism and best placed to malign the socialist conclusions the Military might still arrive at in the course of the struggle. Let the masses participate!

In the world, the Communists discuss nothing of this! They want to know whether Cunhal is right – yes or no; if democracy is necessary, yes or no, if democracy is sufficient now in Portugal. The Socialists say that all democracy has not gone overboard since Soares gets shouted down. All a false discussion! We invite Communists and Socialists to say: ‘let’s satisfy the main means of production, factories, banks, and Foreign Trade and then, let’s have full democracy: Discussion on all that comes up.’ Indeed, democracy must serve progress, not regression or stagnation. Who is to say what is progress or stagnation? The population! Let the population determine what economy it needs: state property and planning, or private interests? When that is over, not before, there can be talk about the best form of democracy. There are not that many forms. Democracy means the right to speak and to discuss, granted. But, essentially, it means the right to a life for the Portuguese masses. The economy must allow them to develop their lives, their intelligence and their capacity to think. This comes with statified property, workers control, workers councils; the full intervention of the peasantry, workers and petty bourgeois in Popular Organisms must lead the economy and all aspects of society. The population must have the power to decide on every problem.

This is the way to discuss democracy: first, you pose a programme. Then you ask who supports this programme? Explain that it is not utopian and that the Portuguese Army is disposed to support it, arms in hand. The bourgeoisie will be against. The Socialists also.

Nevertheless, this is democracy! Anything else amounts to making a defence of capitalist interests, war, oppression and indignity. It amounts to opposing whatever is of service to the population. The right for every person to think is not the hallmark of democracy by any means: to think, yes, but for what aim? In the name of what? If this is unspecified, democracy is an abstraction which serves the strongest. If the murderer has the right to shoot and the victim the right to be shot, the murderer has too many democratic rights.

The Military had foreseen what is happening now with the Constituent Assembly in Portugal. They had wisely avoided granting it too much power. Holding fast to their programme, they had stipulated that the Constituent, or any other Assembly not respectful of their programme, would be dissolved. Soares himself had gone along. A bit down the road, he changed his mind after a nudge from imperialism. The latter tries to spread an adverse reaction in the whole of Europe starting from Portugal. It is leaning hard on Mitterrand for him to do in France what Soares does in Portugal, using the hackneyed 'Democracy and Liberty' pretext.

The MFA have proposed a programme and objectives. Political parties who are agreed can join and those who are opposed can stay away. The setting up of a Constituent Assembly was not the MFA's objective: It was only part of the programme. But fat Soares now howls and rants: 'We are the majority' he cries, 'The Constituent Assembly proves it'. Not true! In the elections for the Constituent Assembly, people voted for Socialism, not for the Socialists.

It is not a matter of distributing arms so much as forming Workers and Peasants Organisms to lead the Socialist organisation of Portugal; arms as well in case of a Coup. But now, the Army cannot keep on reiterating its objectives, it must develop a political life, day in, day out. It must discuss in the barracks, meet the trade unions, go to the factories, to the countryside. Let the peasants, the workers and the trade unions enter the barracks. That is what must be done.

Portugal displays the characteristics of the permanent revolution, leaping from a very backward initial situation to a most advanced one. But still, there aren't the necessary organisms. They must be set up. The Communists have no idea and consequently form none of their own. They still have a very backward conception of history. Their objective is not evil, they want Socialism. But they do nothing about it. Let's be concrete: Let's conduct a discussion with all the Portuguese people as to what is the way to advance the Portuguese economy, the living standards of the masses, the dignity and prosperity for every person. How? Let them discuss this: in the streets, the cinemas, everywhere, in public!

Note how imperialism had no stomach for a frontal attack. In the past, and never short of a pretext, it would have invaded Portugal. As it no longer has the force, it looks for others to do it on its behalf. If it does not invade, it is because it fears the consequences, the reaction of the masses. But that is not all. Above all, it fears adverse repercussions in its own country, a rising of the American people. It also fears the European proletariat. It realises that any direct venture there can have nasty consequences. Action by proxy is better. In the past, it did its own work directly, but the era of invasions has gone. Now, it organises counter-revolutions. The imperialists don't want Portugal out of NATO because this allows them to influence a layer in the Portuguese government, population

and Army; and they prefer not to appear as the direct enemies of progress in the eyes of the population of Europe.

One must always start by proposing a programme for all the population to debate: soldiers, workers, peasants and petty bourgeois. This done, one must propose to let the Popular Organisms decide whether they adopt it or not. This immediately invalidates any Constituent Assembly: Out with it! No need even to call for its dissolution. There are calls for this in Portugal, but what for? What replaces it? What is wanted from it? More important is to make Neighbourhood, Factory and Trade union Organisms. These, if they are the real power, will soon want to know what the 'Assembly' has to do with anything. The various roles of soldier, worker, peasant and intellectual, must be united into a single function. The Socialists of the Soares tendency must be included, to the edification of the Socialist rank-and-file now able to view their leaders opposing the process, clamouring for democracy whilst fighting its every inch and persistently evading the heart of the question: 'Socialism, but how and for whom?' When you propose a programme of economic planning and expropriations, let the masses intervene: They will carry it through if their organisms truly lead the economy and if there are full discussions on all the problems. The central question to ask is: 'To take Portugal out of backwardness, do you want the private property sort of economy, or the State planned one?'

Examples must be shown as to how Hungary and Yugoslavia came out of backwardness in 25 years. How China left the orphanage of history to lead the progress of humanity. They did it with the planned economy, the statification of the main means of production/exchange and the centralisation of planned production. It is going to panic the bourgeois? Certainly! The murderer is going to protest that his gun has been confiscated. But what is to count, then: the assassin's protests, or the lives of those saved? This is the matter to discuss.

In Portugal, there is a notable absence of political leadership. The Communist Party is not acting as a leadership. Recently, it declared that "many years are going to be necessary before Portugal can think of nationalisations". They had hardly shut their mouths that the workers came rushing in and said: "We are putting everything into State hands". The working class base goes well beyond the leadership of the Communist Party.

In Portugal, many parties support the revolutionary process; they favour the statification programme of the means of production, production planning and the centralisation of the planned production. These parties must be able to function. The discussion among the Socialists and the Communists is not logical. The Socialist membership does not support Soares' positions, but it is doubtful about the Army too. It also mistrusts the Communists who have no programme or policy: It sees a void. The Socialist leaders and their right wing backers profit by it. The Socialist base agrees to take the road of Socialism; the way to make contact with it is through the objectives of statification, economic planning, organisms of Workers control, Peasant's Organisms, Organs for everyone to take a part in, petty bourgeois, soldiers and all. Is this not what 'direct democracy' must mean? It is not enough just to have the right to speak from below; there must also be the right to lead from below: From below, and also from above.

The Communists do not discuss these problems. We call on the leaders of the Communist Parties to note how the world workers movement of Africa, Asia and Latin America is experiencing Portugal as if it were its own experience. The Communists must discuss what they can do, how they can develop forces, leaderships, and their capacity for organisation. They must declare what conclusions they reach. Now they refuse to draw any. But this amounts to washing their hands of any responsibility regarding the validity of the revolutionary road; or regarding the experiences/conclusions Portugal offers to the world Armies, peasants and petty bourgeois movements as in Algeria. Besides, Portugal cannot remain in its present uncertainty! The counter revolution prepares. It may not strictly repeat 'a Chile' but stage a Chile-type coup if it finds the force. It is already busy arousing the discontented petty bourgeoisie, seeking advantage in every doubt and dissatisfaction. It uses the agitation felt by those who may not be particularly opposed but who see no clarity in the objectives of the revolution, who wonder where it is all going and what will happen. Public discussion is again the answer! We propose this to the Communist movement.

Such problems have substance enough for any World Congress: USSR/USA relations, economy and Workers States, rockets that mate in Space, on Earth that separate - later to fight. Far from this being a play, it engrosses all of humanity. In the Workers States they must discuss their return to Marxism, and the nature of the capitalist economic crisis. Capitalism is not failing temporarily; it is in a total crisis. This is expressed in rising unemployment, growing disaffection in armies, police-forces, churches and in layers of capitalist planners and administrators who are being won to Socialism.

SELF MANAGEMENT DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO THE NECESSITY OF HISTORY

The self-management slogan is an invention. It has no scientific value and corresponds to no historic necessity. It sprang up during an intermediate period in the life of the Workers States. It was a period in the Soviet bureaucracy and the world communist movement characterised by a lack of leadership. This slogan does not correspond to any call of experience or of history. But self management is around, and Socialist movements in France, partly in Italy and in Portugal - and in Yugoslavia - defend it. What proof is there of its being necessary? Is Socialism a kind of self-management? If so, Socialism is no longer a necessity of history, but a *modus vivendi* between different social layers; and self management is not a scientific conclusion but an expedient for them.

The elimination of every form of property, the centralisation and planning of the economy, are measures that allow production to yield fully. If production is not centralised and planned, it obeys competitive concepts and interests: it is forced by competition to make room for every form of capitalist empiricism, and you have anarchy in production. Instead of eliminating competition and dispute, self-management keeps them going. To be useful in its totality, the economy must eliminate all the clashes, collisions and discords inherent to private property. Self management maintains property, a property no longer belonging to one person but to several. It is still at loggerheads, at variance, with those around. The centralised and planned economy eliminates competition. A consequence of self-management in Yugoslavia has been, still is, that you can have five shoe factories competing against each other. The self-managers

argue that competition is necessary to lower the prices. And why should it be so? When all competitors have been eliminated, the prices automatically come down.

Self-management is a policy aimed at the defence of private interests. It is a muffled form of private property, of competition, that can only stimulate bigger interests. If, as in Yugoslavia, the French Socialists could set up a self managed factory, it would end up broadening its interests, accumulation and competition against the other factories. Where would that lead to? When the other factories do the same, what is that called? Isn't self management leading to competition as in capitalism and private property? Instead of one boss, you have a cluster of them who keep going the same enmities, dissensions and class interests as in capitalism. Production is not one bit improved, neither is its cost. Human mentality is not improved either since the survival of private property keeps its private interest going, complete with its norms of 'liberty' and the human/social relations of private property. The criterion of 'to each according to possibilities and strength' remains. Production capacity and what should have been a progress in human relations all stay shackled. Instead of socialist relationships, it is arrogance and the rule of the strong that persist and reproduce. Is this not worth discussing?

The concept of self-management has lived on because, since Stalin, the Workers States and the Communists parties have not prized centralisation and planning. Using this limitation as a justification, petty bourgeois layers adopted the idea of self-management without noting how scarce the examples. True in Yugoslavia, self-management continues. But in spite of restrictions, it spurts out private property and class struggle. Why not discuss this in the Workers States? Bureaucratic sectors hint at self-management not being appropriate, but they make no scientific discussion, no characterisation of the interests or results involved: they are not likely to do this either, for they might as well cut their own throats!

Any form of property - the statified and planned included - develops its own forms of thought and human relations. When economic relations are centralised, humanity develops on the basis of this comprehension. When 'to each according to capacity' reigns, people's interests diverge and every aspect of the human interaction is bedevilled.

The elimination of private property creates the collective sentiment. Even when not evenly applied, this sentiment becomes the basis for reasoning. In the Soviet Union, the proletariat will soon prove that it is the most accomplished representative of the world working class. It has already experienced 56 years of the State owned and planned economy; it got the better of the nazis, of Stalin and of Khrushchev. Now, it keeps Brezhnev in line. It does not appear to intervene directly, but it has already given the proof of its historic competence. It determined the existence and development of the Workers State and vanquished the nazis. When it comes to class political consciousness, it is the most assured and staunchest in history. As a class, the proletariat of the world is secure and firm, but it does not have everywhere the same degree of comprehension and political consciousness. The historic confidence of the Soviet proletariat stems from having endured Stalin and the nazis, and overcome both.

Statified property and centralised planning generate and raise political consciousness to

incomparable levels – apart from our own in our most centralised revolutionary party functioning. Indeed, though we have not yet a role in the economy, we have the most complete objectivity. We have the deepest objective capacity to think, to formulate aims and ideas. Apart from this, there is the Soviet proletariat. It is decisively the most powerful of all humanity: Had it wavered in the least, the bureaucracy would have forged ahead with degeneration and allowed the likes of Solzhenitsyn to restore capitalism.

Remain confident in the expectation that the Soviet proletariat will soon show its mettle. Since it cannot operate in its class organisms, it displays its strength in having resisted any step back into Stalinism. Indeed, the steps the Soviet Union takes are all forward. Admittedly it is rather obliged to, but there are layers in the USSR that insist on a forward course because they have reached a certain comprehension. The particular combination of historic factors nowadays enables the Soviet proletariat to maintain its irrepressible resolve to sustain and impel the Workers State, whilst it waits for later historic stages.

The Soviet proletariat seems to be intervening in nothing much. It remains passive and seems impervious to the influence of history. But this is the surface, not the depth. Before the nazi invasion, this proletariat had received the most terrible blows imaginable: Stalin had had the whole Bolshevik leadership assassinated, enough to wreck anybody, thoroughly. But the nazi invasion unveiled the fact that the Workers State was rooted in the proletariat. At no time had the proletariat been fooled or crushed by Stalin. It never trusted him or forgot his crimes, and once it had defeated nazism, it liquidated him too. Should the proletariat have done nothing about Stalin, he would have clung to power. True, the post-war economic development of the USSR helped to get rid of Stalin, but the Soviet proletariat was instrumental in Stalin's demise. It is not the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party, but the Soviet proletariat that encapsulates the basic strength of the USSR. Soon, this will show again.

HISTORY GIVES NO INSTANCE OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY

We reiterate our call to comrade Ellenstein to discuss by using historic truth as guide. This is what Trotsky did regarding Stalin's policies. He asked: Why Socialism in one country? In France, Ellenstein refers to this phrase only once and only to say that he is against. In a review of the Communist Party in Italy, Ingrao says that at no time did Lenin support the idea of Socialism in one country. These are indications of what discussions are coming. History provides not a single instance of Socialism in one country. Who says that, right now, there is Socialism in the Soviet Union? Absurd! Socialism is a level of social relations from where all forms of power have been eliminated. But in the Soviet Union there is power and inequality in distribution: Distribution is done on the basis of a wage and not according to the needs of each individual. We are told that this cannot be helped because there is not enough to go round. This is nonsense because you can still be mindful of needs in conditions of economic shortage. Besides, how can anyone present as a great triumph a social relation so unable to surmount the disparities and impositions of the economy? And posit it as a worthy example to educate and edify people's mentalities with? If Socialism were to be distinguished by distribution according to capacity, it would mean that it favours those

who achieve more because, in social life and from every other point of view, they manage to get the best for themselves. This creates private interests and not collective social relations. Forms of private property would therefore be maintained in Socialism! This is absurd, but Ellenstein and the other Communists do not see it this way.

Lenin and Trotsky taught us that Socialism, having ended every form of oppression and of imposition, allows the newly acquired consciousness to organise distribution. The masses know this, and so do we. But the Communist, Socialist and Workers States' leaders do not believe this. They think that there will always be an authority and a power. In the recent Congress of the Italian Communist Party, comrade Berlinguer said: "We look forward to the one world government when national governments will have disappeared". But the day humanity can do away with national governments it will not need any sort of government. Berlinguer speaks of the "one world government" because he believes a ruling power is indispensable. He has not the perverse intention of a bureaucrat in saying this, but an erroneous social and historic philosophy according to which the world cannot exist without a ruling class. In this scheme, there will always be those who do the thinking whilst the others do the working, the fetching and the carrying. Berlinguer thus gives a glimpse into his lack of ideas, of thought method, his lack of dialectical materialism.

In the Workers State, the base of the State is in contradiction with its character. The base is not private but statified property: Centralised production is planned by the State. As the State also controls foreign trade, it centralises relations with the capitalist world, stopping the latter's influence through commerce. This is a sound foundation for Socialism. But in character, the Workers State still allows remuneration through wages, i.e., through the arbitrary standard of what each person can earn. As the bearer of dignity and justice, Socialism represents relations based on the needs of each person. Since wages represent relations based on what each person is capable of earning, the two principles are opposed. What connection is there between Socialism and remuneration according to what each person manages to get hold of? None, and this is not Socialism. The Workers State centralises everything - and this much is Socialism. The contradiction comes from salaries continuing: The State centralises property, concentrates planning and controls foreign trade, but salaries distribute to each according to capacity. This constantly hatches and feeds inequality, injustice and arbitrariness. It leads to unjust, arbitrary and arrogant State organisms where thieves and bureaucrats multiply. With the end of inequality in distribution, bureaucrats cannot exist. The scramble in the economy to grab everything one can lay hands on disappears, and one simply takes what one needs.

From the depth of our objective Communist love, we propose that comrade Ellenstein starts a public debate showing how Stalin came from specific conditions. Stalin was not so very clever, and he did not fool history. He did not hide in the dark either, to waylay the Workers State by infiltration: He climbed to power publicly and deliberately. The historic conditions allowed, and one of these lies in the contradictory character of the Workers State, an enduring factor that, even now, does not entirely preclude the possibility of a repeat performance.

THE WORLD PROGRESS OF

THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION IS THE ESSENTIAL REASON FOR THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The Chinese Revolution has been the deepest, the most homogenous in the history of Asia. But isn't there still class struggle and bureaucracy in China? Is it Socialism? Is it Socialism that inspires the Chinese leadership to accuse the Soviet leaders of being 'the worst imperialist agents, the right-wing of the reactionary ultra-right, even more rotten than the Tsarist regime'? This is what the Chinese leaders say. If Socialism had been reached, China and the USSR would have identified with each other and would not be in dispute.

The dispute between countries that starts in the economy soon makes social mischief because each one defends particular interests. If the economy hatches and develops particular interests, you have not got Socialism but private interests. Socialism allows human identification and does not engender private interest or disputes. "Socialism is peace, capitalism is war" said Lenin. True before the Soviet Union, it is still true now. Socialism fosters identification, it equalises people and fires human behaviour with human dignity. In individuals, it does not create the sentiment of appropriation or of accumulation generated by distribution according to ability. Why not discuss this, instead of accusing Stalin of being a bastard, a trickster, a liar whose prognostics were all wrong? But why could he do all this? Were they all blind around him? Absurd! We propose to discuss all this.

It is not essential to always dwell on the capitalist crisis. The capitalist economy is bankrupt, certainly; but it has been so for a long time, ever since the triumph of the Soviet Union. The problems of history are no longer due to that crisis but to the rise in the world Socialist revolution. You hear from all corners that 'capitalism is in crisis, the class struggle advances'. We say the opposite: The advance of the world Socialist revolution is why capitalism is in crisis. Capitalist economic crisis there is also, but still essentially because of the world revolution. Take the clear and obvious example of the armies of Madagascar, Portugal and Ethiopia turning against their former masters. Instead of defending capitalist private interest - their reason for being - they oppose it, and uphold Socialism. Is this a crisis, yes or no? Obviously it is, and a good deal greater than all the economic crises put together, for it pulls the rug from under capitalism. The latter can still partially cope with the economy and re-raise its functioning on a higher plane by eliminating swathes of competitors. But what remedy has it got against the world advance of the Socialist revolution? Revolutions keep coming, not only in Ethiopia and Portugal, but in the whole of Latin America, Africa, Asia, Indochina and in the Workers States! Everywhere!

In the past, capitalism conciliated with Khrushchev and the early Brezhnev. But now, confrontation is constant. The Workers States are obliged to support the rising process of anti-imperialist struggle. They do not support the class and revolutionary struggle - though they cannot keep entirely out of it - but they must support the progress of the so-called 'Third World' which comes up to them in search of unity against imperialism.

The 'world oil crisis' is not due to rising prices, but to capitalism no longer having the freedom of the world raw materials that sustain its entire system of domination. The so-called 'Third World' seeks out the Workers States, and vice versa. This connects up a

circuit of constant crises for the capitalist system.

These factors destabilise capitalist domination, deepening and sharpening the crisis. Anxious to recover its previous balance, the system tears itself up internally. This happens in the United States, France, Germany, Britain, whilst their inter-capitalist relations deteriorate and find no haven. In the European Common Market, they are not at all trying to achieve a joint economic planning. The high finance sector tries to impose itself over the others. To preserve its functioning and keep confronting Workers States and masses, capitalism concentrates at the expense of its own support in the middling and small capitalists.

As a system, capitalism engenders unemployment. It then uses it to blackmail the working class and make it accept lesser living standards by constantly fomenting competition inside the proletariat over jobs. But a consequence of today's very rich process is that capitalism has had to concede unemployment pay. This is quite against its interest, structure and functioning. This stops it using the army of the unemployed to reduce the wages of those in work. Instead, the unemployed have become a force that it must subsidise, proof of its disintegration. Before, capitalism used the unemployed to bring down the wages, now it fears being brought down by the unemployed.

All these problems must be discussed in the world communist movement. The Communists do not do it because the conclusion is revolutionary. They haven't the theoretical and political preparation. They have an apparatus structure according to which they feel and act. What is the difference between Party and apparatus? The apparatus represents the interests of those in charge, whose vision, perception and comprehension are eminently short term - having been established for, measured against and determined by, those interests. The apparatus loses the capacity to see the process objectively, and the greater the interest, the lesser the objectivity. Bureaucracy is much the same: it never grasps the depth of anything or the craving of the masses to bring capitalism down. Far from it, it senses all the danger to itself and cries: "Stop! No revolution, no civil war, we do not want brother to kill brother!" Meanwhile, it lets the enemy kill the brothers.

THE WORKING CLASS AND ITS FUNCTION IN HISTORY

The bureaucracy utters strings of lies when it opposes revolutionary measures on the strength that repression is round the corner. Those lies, not always intentional, are motivated by bureaucratic interests and apparatus conceptions. Bureaucracy in the workers movement is fond of saying: "conditions are not ready; capitalism is going to fall on us". It insists that conditions in Italy are distinct from those in France or in Portugal. Indeed, there is a difference and a distance - but the class struggle is everywhere. The bureaucracy fears that the revolutionary war and the struggle for power will displace it in favour of principles like statification, economic planning. Soviet bureaucrats and Communist leaders alike, have no confidence in the masses who they believe are simply cut out for the yoke. They just take the working class for a prop of history.

From its function in the economy, from its standpoint in history, the working class can only be objective. In line with the progress of history, its vision goes beyond the concerns of the moment, those of the factory, of the workshop. It can therefore give ideas, programmes, policies and responses tending to eliminate every power, every property form. The Trade Union campaigns that run alongside its objective historic struggle, do not alter this in any way. As a class, the working class acts collectively. It cannot accept, and even less elaborate a social thought whereby, say 100 workers here and 1000 elsewhere, want to lay hold of their companies to carve them up between themselves. The conditions do not exist to attract the working class to this sort of ethical, theoretical or social stance; and they are not conducive to the mentality of personal ambition and individual lust for power. Through its collective role in production, the working class is made to feel that the solution is collective.

The social collective thought of the working class stems from its function in society, in the economy. It defends a programme devoid of any egotistical interest. When it speaks in the name of its class interests, what it defends is not only for itself: It proposes measures tending towards the elimination all forms of oppression, power and private property. The Communists ignore this interpretation. For them, the working class is good, courageous, full of resolve, ready to go without. But the class has also shown that it does not always put up with bureaucracy. Two years ago, we already posed that if the Italian CP (Communist Party) were not going to respond to the working class' drive for power, there would be a rebellion. In principle, there are all the elements for this. The class increases its support for, and concentration in the CP and SP (Socialist Party), but also its divergences with them.

The Italian Communists have passed from 9,100 millions votes to 11,100 millions, a 20% increase. This announces historic struggles beyond the demand for rights and liberties. Such a concentration of votes means that, on top of wanting better conditions of life, work, and security, people want to be rid of what blocks their way. This concentration together with greater divergences between the Unions and the workers parties, means to press the CP and the leaders forward. For the working class, an electoral triumph will not be enough: it wants progress, the same as in Britain, Germany, France.

In Germany, working class opposition and resistance to the trade union bureaucracy increases. In the unions, left leaderships are progressing and often win elections. The bureaucratic apparatus of the DGB (TUC equivalent) is dense, but the workers fight so that they manage to weigh and make progress. For the time being, their demands are mostly economic. But in the Unions, their objective of changing leaders and forms of organisation is political. This progress is very great considering that Germany, due to previous conditions, is one of the places where the rigid power of the Trade Union bureaucracy is quite feudal. Indeed, there are still feudal relations in the Unions, and the same goes on in Belgium.

There are also forms of feudal relations in some factories in Germany, in France, Italy and Britain – often in the lesser industrial sectors; but the Union leaderships that have strength and power enough to eradicate it, do not do it. This will only end when the working class can finally stand up with the full liberty to discuss all the problems. Only one small year of unimpeded discussion in the workers movement would remove every

type of bureaucrat! The freedom of tendency enables the class to reason, to think dialectically, to increase its capacity to judge and its ability to convince. But as it meets with a constant barrage of difficulty, interdicts and rejections, it turns to other means like 'Leftism' or whatever.

We appeal for the full liberty of tendency in the workers movement; liberty for all those opposed to capitalism! Be sure that Soares, for example, won't have any of this. Tell him you won a right of tendency so total that you can discuss all the ways of bringing down capitalism, and he will squeal: "Democracy, democracy!" When he was asked what he thought about Portugal, he cried out: "Socialism and democracy, Socialism and democracy, I want Liberty, Liberty!" That charlatan represents a layer of the petty bourgeoisie scared of Socialism, feeling itself above the working class - and history. The Communists and the MFA do not deny him anything apart from what harks back to the bourgeoisie. But Soares has no confidence in the Socialist programme, and even less in the construction of Socialism.

There is no reason why one should not trust Socialism. Soviet bureaucracy and the assassinations committed by Stalin have not stopped the progress of humanity. As to whether Socialism is possible or not, one must show how North Korea was a heap of stones, and now, after 30 years of the Workers State, it exports technicians and machines. Just what idea does Soares give that allows an understanding or an interpretation of this? None! Before 1917, Russia was the most backward capitalist country in Europe; Hungary and Rumania were much the same. In 58 years, the Soviet Union became the most developed country in history, more than the US in many ways. Hungary and Bulgaria were stables exporting horses and other animals, princes included. Now, they export machines, technicians, engineers and physicists. There is not yet the type of democracy we seek, but Soares wants democracy for another purpose. The Workers State is the road to progress. We do not give political support to its leadership but we give the Workers State every social support possible against capitalism. This is what we did when the Soviet Union intervened in Czechoslovakia.

This is the way to tackle this. For Soares, the historic function of the Workers State, planning and statified property, all these are abstractions to be ignored. To TV journalists wanting to know what Socialism was to him, he replied: "Socialism, liberty, democracy". He can say nothing else. Nationalisation, workers control, planning and economic centralisation are not for him. No. For him, these are petty matters without importance. And yet, here you have all the fundamental problems of Portugal.

ABSTRACT PAINTING IN THE USSR, SOLZHENITSYN, AND THE NEED FOR THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

The true and most elevated form of democracy is the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communists have concealed this term. In Lenin's view, it was the most complete form of democracy, the most comprehensive in enabling everyone to discuss the problems of society's development. This democracy does not let the capitalists discuss because a distinction is made between those who kill and those who are made to die - between the capitalists and the workers. Let the capitalist who opposes the progress of history be

liquidated. Is this murder? No! It is the removal of an obstacle. Capitalism, and Soares who defends the bourgeoisie without admitting it, wants democracy in the abstract, namely, the so-called right for all to say what they think. But such a right does not exist in reality.

Only a year ago, there was a kind of Rasputin still living in the Soviet Union. His name was Solzhenitsyn: a free man by all accounts, and decidedly not in prison. He had been incarcerated under Stalin but freed after that. He had plenty of support in the Soviet bureaucracy but the books he wrote were for outside. The outside world obliged by publishing three of them. This character is now in the US where his Conferences advocate the destruction of the USSR accused of being the greatest and most pernicious evil in humanity. Look at what has oozed out the bureaucracy!

It is now clear that Solzhenitsyn is not a product of Stalin's bureaucracy but very much of today's, the very same that clamours for the democracy to do what it likes. Solzhenitsyn had a fair share of it in the USSR – a great deal more than the Left wing Soviet tendencies which have got none: He could write his books in the same way as the so-called 'abstract' or 'surrealist' painters can paint their pictures. But when the Soviet Union, home to the most complete materialist and dialectical blossoming, ends up producing surrealist, abstract or cubist painters and writers, one can tell that the society it has become no longer inspires the sentiment of human fraternity.

Cubism and surrealism had originally a different meaning, but even then, they were already indicative of degeneration in the way of seeing life. These forms of painting, aberrant even then, resulted from given stages in history when painters registered protest, desertion and powerlessness at the absence of a revolutionary socio-political solution. They did not want to belong to the world, and painted it. But today, and in a Workers State, abstract or surrealist art reveals an individual and degenerate idea of reality. The reality of the Workers State has nothing abstract or surrealist about it. It is clear and limpid: Hungary and the Soviet Union were stables; today and albeit bureaucratically, the Workers State has routed the nazis, supports revolutionary movements and Vietnam, sends rockets into Space. How can this suggest abstraction? How can one keep on working on cubism today, such a signifier of intelligence chequered? Those with this vision make a separation between them and reality. They see the world in categories, and life through five, ten or a hundred individuals. They produce inane works because they see the world in an altered form, falsified and warped.

Why not open a discussion about how such painters come to exist in the Workers States? How come Solzhenitsyn? He did not come in a wooden horse! He enjoys the support of very important sectors of the bureaucracy who, for their part, have not left the USSR. First they freed him, and then they let him go to the US. A year on, and this individual is demanding from the Yankees the destruction of the Soviet Union, and with atomic weapons! In each of those abstract painters you have a budding Solzhenitsyn, different, but with the same individual, egotistical, conservative and backward view of history. Why not discuss this in the world Communist movement?

We invite the Communist comrades to discuss with us, to contend in public. Regarding the painters and writers, the question is not so much the individual statement they make

as the state of relations within Soviet society which they reflect. Painters are not strangers to history. They are a moment on the vast historic scene. When interpreting art, one interprets prevailing relations. Fully functioning democracy and discussion in the USSR would leave no space for such art. Instead of twirling within cubism, painters would be developing as part of the Marxist policy of Socialism. We are not talking about so-called 'Socialist realism', this other and pure fraud - but about Marxism. When Socialism is able to show that it means superior human relations, people's sentiments and consciousness will develop. They will see the world in the light of fraternal human relations, a real-size world containing objects and relations such as they are. Reality has shown the USSR capable of defeating nazism and Stalin. It is the most evolved country in the world, the one that broke the spine of the class struggle.

The Soviet people are happy and proud to live in the USSR, even though they are still living in economic conditions relatively inferior to those in the United States. But let us not forget that in the US there are 40 million people in need, out of whom 20 million are on the bread line or famished, in the country of 'abundance'! It is abundant, for the capitalists obviously, but not for the others. We invite the comrades of the Soviet Union to discuss this.

Socialism does not emanate from a national decision, or from the capability or even the possibility of one country. It is a historic necessity. When the economy progresses, there arises a demonstrable need for coordination and planning to ensure that all its different sectors are integrated; they need to operate fully, with no mishap, no difficulty or stagnation. As the economy develops, it becomes obvious and indisputable that property is the in way. Property boils down to an individual interest whereby each owner has an individual plan. Each plan then needs to accord with the others and try to live with them. As capitalism, i.e. private property, manifests itself through competition, this curtails even the scant ability created by its own system. Take science, for example. Capitalism did not create science: It took whatever science there was and improved it, but it also stops its development.

Socialism is necessary for economic expansion for everyone. This is neither an idea dreamed up by Marx nor the result of what the workers may be aspiring to. Certainly, the Socialist Programme is a creation of Marx; but whilst it answers the workers' expectations, it is less to solve their economic problems than to respond to the scientific necessities demanded by history. Capitalism means anything but continuity: This oppresses the economy as much as science and technique: today's science has infinitely more potential than the entire capitalist economy. The intelligence of the working class encapsulates more ability than all the capitalist academicians; this comes from the particular position the working class occupies in the economy. It comes from its particular function in history.

SCIENCE AND TECHNIQUE SUFFOCATE UNDER THE REGIME OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Science and technology allowed the development of the economy, but now they need the freedom to move in all directions. When they have it, they will reach infinitely superior levels. They will spread into new areas and unify all knowledge. But under the regime of

private property, science is made to depend upon what is wanted by one individual or another. Give to science its freedom, and see how it engenders ideas; how it suggests and realises coordination schemes, how it harmonises production through planning. To achieve this, statified property is a prerequisite, seeing that private property is incapable of it.

The capitalist world was formed and developed through private property and competition, and therefore, through the voracious conquest of markets. The capitalists not only are greedier than the all-devouring locusts, they attack each other in competition. When capitalism was growing, circles were formed with the ability and money to develop the economy. With the spirit of enterprise, they sailed from one country to another in ships, investing and trading, buying and selling, opening communications. They were captains of enterprise. By means of communication and world trade, they enlarged what existed before. They traded raw materials against finished products and a world structure was born. No single country has everything it needs to develop its economy: neither can it have all the preparation, development and geo-economic conditions, nor all the natural riches and raw materials. Each country has to exchange with the others, and this passes through competition.

Socialism triumphs for historical reasons. To realise its expansion, the economy needs to break free from capitalist strangulation. But Socialist construction meets the point when it requires, as a basic and essential minimum, to replace 'to each according to capacity' by 'to each according to needs'. When the Communists tell us that in Socialism distribution goes on being according to ability, it is false. Socialism and competition are incompatible. Competition is a squandering of resources. Marx in 'Capital', and then Engels, Lenin and Trotsky in all their texts, have explained that capitalism is anarchy. Competition takes place on the market place: The one with the lowest price wins - but what of all the others?

World prices are not determined or planned directly, they are fixed indirectly. In the last instance, overall prices represent the labour power that has been lodged in the product. A product priced over that level will not sell and will be thrown away. On top of this waste, great number of capitalists are liquidated or made bankrupt. Who remains, wins. Nowadays, the capitalists make a lesser return per worker, but the use of machinery enables them to earn infinitely more. Before, they exploited manual work and could derive from the labour of each worker some 30% profit. Now, the capitalists profit less from each worker, but immeasurably more thanks to the machines, ten times more.

What kind of Socialism are we building with 'to each according to capacity'? What kind of an idea is this, what moral precept? What human inter-relation is engendered by a 'Socialism' that strives in the midst of greed, competition and dispute, these cesspits of conservatism, individualism and superficiality that thrive at the expense of human fraternity and solidarity? In the class struggle, the working class develops sentiments of fraternity always. But as it takes power, it cannot immediately create the conditions for human fulfilment, or the human relations needed to end confrontation and dispute: This is not yet 'Socialism'.

As soon as it triumphs, the Workers State develops the economy. To live, it must start trading with the rest of the world where history has determined that it must pass

through commercial interchange; even science is a means of commercial interchange. When the working class takes power, it develops an economy in need of raw materials, of goods and of links with the rest of the world. As its economy depends on the world, not only it cannot immediately reach its full potential but the poorer it is, the greater its dependency. Strictly on its own, the new State cannot reach the production levels required to satisfy all the inhabitants according to all their needs.

Commerce has divided the world. It allows the exchange of goods produced in private property. It has established world relations through competition, raw materials included. Britain was a great industrial country with its huge merchant and war fleet. This enabled it to plunder countries, lay hold of raw materials and produce. Without its colonies and warships Britain was nothing. Drake was the greatest pirate and navigator. In those days, the course of the world was determined by capitalist expansion. It led to a huge mechanised economy, to important and great inventions. The capitalists looked for their raw materials in the colonies. They built commercial ties with countries with no productive development, and this was the world division of labour - between the capitalist bandits that is - which carved up the world according to power and involvement. Large competing interests were formed. In Britain, big workers' struggles came in the way of an even greater economic development. The financial circles, masters of the world, were affected. And then, countries already in capitalist growth enlisted the support of their respective States to break or hinder English domination, to profit in their turn and see to their own development.

Thus were established both the world division of labour, and production according to the world law of supply and demand. No country, in its need to communicate with the world, can abstract its own productive forces and production capacity from this world division of labour, or from its relations of competition.

After the taking of power, a Workers State comes face to face with these conditions. If 'Socialism in one country' were possible, it would mean that one single country can develop the economy to the point of fulfilling all needs. But the Workers State cannot do this. It has neither the mechanised capacity nor all the necessary raw materials. It does not have the social structure either, the skilled labour for instance. It must depend on world competition. 'Socialism in one country' cannot exist. But one can advance deeply towards it, thanks to changes in production like the setting up of economic and above all social relations that nip in the bud every hint of bureaucracy, imposition or arrogance. These measures can be applied immediately, even before the Programme has had time to take effect. For instance, had the German revolution taken power in 1918, it could have started off with socialist measures more complete than those of the Soviet Union. Had these measures directly accompanied the initial planning after the take-over of all major land and production centres, the resulting economic development could have been three times what it had been in the USSR. Germany lacked in raw materials and in bases for agricultural production, but it had a more developed industry and an enormous labour force.

Socialism in one country is therefore not possible. But this is not the same thing as saying that in the conditions of the Soviet Union Democratic Socialist Soviet rights could not have been made to reach the sky. These rights are not determined by the course of the economy. They depend on the leadership, on the structure, on the quality of the

Party. Stalinists and Communists still continue to lie about this today. They offend scientific thought and trample it underfoot when they say democracy could not be attended to in the USSR because there were not the economic conditions. In South Yemen today, in Algeria, there is more democracy than ever was conceded by Stalin, even though the economic backwardness in those countries is even greater than in the early USSR.

The lack of Soviet Democratic rights cannot be laid at the door of economic underdevelopment. This is a problem of leadership, a Party matter. As long as Lenin lived, Soviet organisms were a power in bloom. His death ended all this. Socialism in one country is impossible, but in the Soviet Union the full exercise of democratic liberties was possible – still is. It is not even a matter of being sensitive to the right of the masses or to economic development. It is in fact the only way to develop. It collects in a centralised manner all the capability and intelligence of the country and of the masses. Soviet Democracy not only is what allows the development of the economy, but it establishes social, Trade Union and other relations devoid of conflict, antagonism or dispute.

THE HISTORIC FUNCTION OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

There is a tension between the still limited economic development of a Workers State and the fullest development of its Soviet Democratic rights. The solution depends entirely on the leadership of the Party and on its functioning. Complete Trade Union democracy is independent of whether there is enough to distribute to everyone; it depends on how the Party and its leadership do their work. Assume some people in the USSR were to propose today the need to return to the original Soviet Democratic rights: they would soon come up against a wall of bureaucrats whose interests were formed when the ebbing revolution was in difficulty. In the name of country and economy, they would oppose!

After 1917, the Soviet Union was besieged by the imperialist armies. On behalf of the Bolsheviks, Trotsky invented a whole army. Had the masses not been determined to win, this would not have been possible and there would have been no Red Army. It is not Trotsky's genius that made the Army possible, as is so often said, but the Soviet masses. The same Trotsky elsewhere could not have done it. This shows that, had the Soviet people been able to enjoy subsequently full Trade Union and Soviet democracy - the full right to discuss all the problems - they would have become scientifically brilliant, mature in their own ideas and secure in ability and intelligence. Instead of this, they withdrew within themselves. In the pressurised situation of persecution and repression that came next, their social functioning was smashed and the bureaucrats filled the vacant field.

The loss of democracy and of Soviet democratic rights was not inevitable in the USSR. The bureaucracy used it to maintain its power. It won the day inasmuch as the Russian Revolution took place in one of the most deprived countries of the world. But the revolution did prevail, and this, in spite of the scantiest of material means. One of the essential reasons for its victory lies in the audacity of the Party of Lenin. For this was no ordinary Party: It doggedly kept itself organised, structured and consistent with its determination to take power and to make Socialism. The Bolshevik Party was based on

no other conception but the Marxist one, no other influence but the class struggle and no other teacher but the reality of classes; far from it the belief that social classes may abandon their class function! The Bolshevik Party of Lenin was neither 'soft' nor 'hard' but simply intelligent. Here you have the crucial instrument that allowed the triumph of the Russian Revolution, and what a world of difference there is between it, and the present Communist parties.

The Bolshevik Party of Lenin saw reality as it was, thanks to being the instrument for class struggle and historic experience. Today, the Communist Parties listen to this guy or that other. But Lenin, from whom we learn and apply today, anticipated the movement of the classes and gave orientations. What the class enemy was up to in the economy, in politics or in war, was never a question mark or a puzzle under Lenin. He analysed and passed judgements in the light of the class struggle. The Communists no longer do this today. When they happen to speak of class struggle, they mean a factory occupation or a strike. But when it comes to a political analysis of the historic function of classes, they only see individuals. This is why they blunder. At the drop of a hat, they say: "Who would have thought such a thing could happen!" Is this not why the Chilean events took them by surprise?

Marchais (General Secretary French CP) was fond of saying that one couldn't know what was going to happen in Chile, that France was not Chile; that the French army is different from the Chilean - meaning that the Chilean army is backward whilst the educated and cultured French one would never stage a Coup. But suddenly Marchais has changed. Now, the situation has evolved: In France as in Chile, the army may launch a Coup and it must be won over.

When we say that Socialism in one country is impossible, this does not mean that Socialism has to win at once all over the world. In "The Permanent Revolution", Trotsky posed the possibility of progressing towards Socialism, and without delay, to start eliminating certain forms of distribution inherited from capitalism. In his opinion, the unification of the USSR, Germany, France and Britain, had it happened, would have accelerated the process of history by hundreds of years, their economic development combining with their able proletariat to achieve an enormous progress.

But in the Soviet Union, there was not much proletariat. The war and the revolution had killed 60% of the Bolshevik cadres. Many of the remaining ones were posted as functionaries, leaders or administrators. The Party was further weakened and the gaps were filled by technicians, administrators, workers, petty bourgeois, leaders, peasants - revolutionaries but with a local or national conception of the revolution. They had no internationalist notion of the revolutionary process, and they became a base for Stalin.

Stalin became enclosed in 'the Soviet Union'; he retreated within it through fear, lack of comprehension, lack of development in Marxist thought. He withdrew on the national terrain. He had the suitable traits for this and the emerging bureaucracy gathered around him. Fortified by prevailing backwardness and the shortage in revolutionary cadres, Stalin was able to put forward the concept of 'Socialism in one country'. It became the responsibility of all the Communist movement to draw around the USSR, drop the class struggle and fall back on the 'defence of the USSR' - i.e. the defence of the national interests of the Soviet bureaucracy. The triumph of Stalin is no mystery. It is

due to historic conditions that no longer exist today.

The dictatorship of the proletariat does not constitute a power against the masses by any means. It is not an assault on the exercise of the right to think, to reason, speak, write. The Workers State, the proletariat, gives to each the possibility to write, to speak and to say anything necessary: anything, but what is in contradiction, in opposition with the interests of the Workers State. This is democracy! What does capitalism do? Capitalism is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. If it puts up with Communist and Socialist parties, it is only because the working class, the world balance of forces, inter-capitalist competition and its own weakness obliges it to do so.

Capitalism protects itself as a class. Its laws and directives, like its 'democracy', automatically defend those in charge and in power. About the clear and simple right to life, the bastards legislate against abortion. Whilst they say: 'no, you cannot mutilate life, life must be defended' they kill thousands upon thousands of people every day. But the 23 million Soviet people who died in the last war, wasn't that more than an abortion? They do the same with the divorce laws.

The capitalists make laws for their own rights and uses. As Lenin posed, this is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The Communist comrades like Marchais, or Berlinguer (Gen Sec Italian CP), do a lot of harm by not saying that Lenin posed all this. What is different now from when Lenin lived? They must say! What difference is there between Fanfani (Head of Italian government) and the most terrible of dictatorships? If Fanfani has been up to every lousy trick, it is not because he is a horror - though he is - but because he represents the thinking of the bourgeoisie. The Communists do not discuss in this way. They say "Fanfani bad" as in the films where the villain must be caught. But what is Fanfani, if not a policy? In the present process in Italy, he operates as any bourgeois politician would. When he makes waves in his own party (Christian Democracy), it is never serious. The Communists go on saying: 'Fanfani out'. But if the Christian Democracy decides to change policy, it will not be because Fanfani is out, but because conditions forced the change. In other words, had the workers been allowed to intervene directly, they would have achieved ten times more: They would have liquidated not just Fanfani, but Company. But the Communists are not for talking about it.

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT IS THE MOST COMPLETE FORM OF DEMOCRACY

In Lenin's epoch, the Workers State was in full revolution, in the thick of an imperialist war and under a capitalist siege; and yet, all the problems were discussed, fully. It is only in 1918 that factions were forbidden, only when the Soviets were surrounded by the imperialist armies and Makno (Russian Anarchist guerrilla leader) joined forces with the White Russians attacking from within. Trotsky had proposed to Lenin to let the Anarchists make their experiment; this way, he thought, they would realise its impracticality and would verify that centralisation is necessary to economic development. Lenin replied that he had thought the same, but that the conditions were not allowing this, since the White Russians were at the gates. Had Lenin and Trotsky not been forced to resort to dictatorship, they would have let Makno make his experiment of

the Anarchist republic. See what a 'dictatorship' that was! And this 'dictatorship' kept discussing. In the Party, they discussed about a Proletarian Army, Proletarian Art and a whole series of questions deriving from the central tenet of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. They concluded that a real, regular army would have to be set up instead of a proletarian one. This was the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat permitted - permits and will permit - to discuss all the problems: from the construction of Socialism to the creation of human relations superior to those in capitalism. What it does not permit is the abstract chattering of the counter revolutionaries who hate the centralised and planned economy. Those types do not agree in the least that the masses should head the country; that power should belong to the Workers and Peasants, and even less that these two should meet to discuss how best to lead the economy. The bourgeoisie keeps nattering on about 'democracy' and 'free speech' whilst it regroups army, police, judges, churches and clerics into a tight ball of counter-revolution. It wants the 'democracy' that gives it the freedom to organise the counter-revolution.

Take Portugal. Soares has not once raised a debate about which is the best economy in his view: The planned one, or the capitalist one? He does not agree with revolution, but he never says why: maybe he thinks the timing is wrong, or it is not correct. Let him say! All he needs to do is explain. We invite the Communist comrades to propose to Soares a debate on the planned and centralised economy, workers control and the planning of statified production. Let's have a full discussion about these basic things!

We must raise high the banner of our opposition to imperialist war. We declare that we oppose the war preparations of imperialism. We call for the total liberty of the colonies! Full support for the Socialist development of Vietnam! Aren't these the matters that count in debates? You let Soares speak and he wants democracy for Solzhenitsyn: tell him to go and give it himself. Solzhenitsyn wants the freedom to get the Soviet Union destroyed. Since the Yankees have made ample room for this opinion in the US, why should he want more of it in the USSR or in Portugal? We deny it to him. There, we have stated our case! Imperialist war is an instrument of regression and a brutal set back for humanity. Let Solzhenitsyn argue and demonstrate how imperialist war is necessary to human progress! One cannot discuss 'democracy' or even the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' abstractly. One must also state what these are wanted for.

The dictatorship of the proletariat has nothing to do with armed workers watching houses to make everybody repeat what the Leader says. It is the functioning of the Workers State with complete liberty for everyone in it. The dictatorship of the proletariat made the whole of Russia literate in only seven years. Capitalist dictatorship never, ever, made any country literate - Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, you name it. Soares keeps mum on this point too.

The conception of 'Socialism in one country' of Stalin and camarilla, intended first of all to keep the world course of the revolution at bay; now, it provides the bureaucracy with a nice defensive shield that keeps it in command instead of capitalism. It did not return to capitalism because it was stopped. Had the world proletariat given up, had the Soviet proletariat stopped caring, the bureaucrats would have let capitalism return. They tried it in Yugoslavia.

Democracy to return to capitalism: is that just? No. We are against it, the same as we oppose Stalin's suppression of liberties. But when Solzhenitsyn rose furiously against Stalin's dictatorship, he neither supported the right to speak for the Bolsheviks nor for the Left Opposition. Not a peep of indignation came from him when the Trotskyists and the Leninists were silenced and sent to concentration camps. He only opposed the dictatorship exercised against him, because he could not say those things which he says now.

For such people, democracy is a subterfuge. Democracy - yes, but for whom? In the pursuit of what? To build what? Far from being an abstraction, the answer to these questions never fails to be extremely concrete. To obtain real democracy in Portugal, we propose statification, workers control and a centralised economic plan to produce mainly for the consumption of the masses. The latter will see what an enormous progress their country makes as it marches on to the Workers State. Is this not democracy? The democracy Soares speaks about is for the bourgeois, the boss, the capitalist, the cleric. If he agreed with these measures, he would not kick up such a scandalous fuss that makes him the willing hero of the Right wing. It isn't a mistake: he has turned himself into a conscious rallying point for the Right. People like him are shit scared of the revolution.

'Socialism in one country' is not simply a subject or a theme about which Stalin and Trotsky were at loggerheads. In depth, it is the historic discussion as to what are, for the Workers State, its chances of getting to Socialism; no Workers State can reach Socialism alone. Several Workers States drawing close may come nearer to it, eliminating their dependency on external trade by planning their economies. They can reach a fair degree of progress towards Socialism, but complete Socialism is only achievable on a world scale.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IN CUBA

In the coming stages, it will be vital to discuss these things. Here, we have not sought to give an answer to immediate policy needs; but we have been comprehensive about the key problems that will arise from actions taken against capitalism and on behalf of the Workers State and Socialism. In the Communist parties, they have finally arrived at a very tentative discussion of Stalin. The Communists have also corrected some of their previous positions. At a recent meeting held in Cuba, they corrected their previous position on Chile and other countries. They now concede that, on reaching power through elections, one must defend this conquest by force. Without openly proclaiming it, they accept the conclusion that the civil war is necessary since the Chilean bourgeoisie resisted progress. The Communists also recognise that Nationalist movements - Military included - can have some historic importance even though they lay outside the creation, the control, the leadership or the directives of the Communist parties. In the past, they never referred to these themes.

The Posadist IV International has long been upholding, and alone, those positions the Communists now say they agree with. But Posadas raised another question they still

avoid. And that is, the China-USSR unification. The unification of the USSR and China is the most important instrument for the progress of history. Imperialism is going to launch the war in any case. But the USSR-China unification is so strong a base, such a source of power and authority that it will sweep the masses of the United States off their feet. It will inspire the masses of the world, and fire the world proletariat with the realisation that the problems of each country are simple. A world United front of Communists/Socialists/Trade Unions will arise, winning over swathes of petty bourgeois, in the United States included. The USSR- China unification is one of the most pressing needs for history's progress. We propose this to the Communists. It is not enough to condemn the Chinese; more is to be gained by demanding the unification of the USSR and China. China is not a capitalist state - it is a Workers State! Chou en Lai called the Soviet Union 'capitalist', but he does not speak for the Chinese Workers State. The present leadership in China does not represent the Chinese masses.

Returning to the Cuban meeting: it has kept something else silent: Since the Communists changed their position about Chile, since they now value some Armed Forces and Nationalist or Catholic movements - they must also acknowledge their past errors. But they keep silent about our intervention, our capacity to interpret, our functioning as a public good of history: It is us who gave the ideas they have learnt from, and presently cling to. This silence is the fudge of bureaucratic functioning and conditioning. We never stopped insisting that, since the class struggle determines the course of history, the Chilean bourgeoisie would make a Coup. It is us also who proposed to the Allende government to try and win over the Chilean army, incorporating it into economic activities, in government even, so long as it was not given the political leadership. We posed that a political campaign should be aimed at the army, if only to prevent it from dissembling whilst making counter revolution. When the time came for the Coup, it is us who showed what to do about the bourgeoisie blocking the Socialist road. This was the time of the 'Saucepans' demonstrations; we posed that now was the time for audacity: statification, workers control, expropriations under the control of the masses! Counter-demonstrations were not enough; they removed no power from the bourgeois 'Saucepans'. The force of these idiotic women was in not their shouts and screams but in their properties: expropriate them! But the Allende government did not do it.

We supported the Peronist movement when the Communists declared it fascist. It is the Posadists who characterised Peronism as a progressive Nationalist movement. We supported its anti-imperialist proclivity and the creation of the CGT (Trade Union Centre) by Peron. The CGT was not a backward or repressive instrument. It was set up to channel the working class and keep its leadership tied to the national bourgeoisie. The Communists said all this was fascism. But the CGT of Argentina had nothing whatever to do with fascism. Two analyses, two conclusions: you either fought the CGT, or you tried to improve it and make it sprout a class tendency. It took a fair amount of time, but that tendency was formed.

The Communists were also saying that Villaroel in Brazil, Arbenz in Guatemala and others in Colombia were fascists. We stood in opposition and analysed that these movements resulted from post-war conditions; that they were nationalists, Left-wing nationalists and quite empirical; but in 1968 the Communists were still denouncing the Peruvian 'Gorilla' movement as reactionary. And therefore if they now think this was wrong, they owe it to historic truth to bring out a declaration saying that the Posadists

had been the first to understand this process, in Latin America, and indeed outside Latin America.

Socialism cannot be constructed without Marxism. Marx saw his method as an instrument for the interpretation of history. Without the Party, Marxism is a museum piece that creates nothing. As for the Party it cannot function without internal democracy. The latter opens up the militants' mind and calls on all their intellectual faculties. It concentrates and focuses their preoccupation on what is necessary to advance the class struggle and the revolution. They take an interest in the experiences made far away; they discuss them and transmit their conclusions to the Party. The Party gathers these up and develops them.

Had the Cuban meeting ended up with conclusions and projects, each Communist Party would have been given the task to apply them in their own country. There would have been Communist meetings, Conferences, Congresses and Cadre Schools to disseminate the new knowledge in the rest of the Communist movement. This would have influenced the Latin American and world Socialist movement. But no one speaks about this Cuban meeting any more! We hear not a word! To the comrades of the Latin American Communist parties, we propose a public discussion about these conclusions.

LET'S DISCUSS WHERE STALINISM COMES FROM

We propose to the Communist parties to appreciate the necessity for a public discussion on Stalin. Stalin could establish a dictatorship and stay put, because of the way certain historic conditions combined. These went from a 'Thermidor' process to a world retreat of the revolution. It is not as if Stalin had imposed these conditions himself, or even sought them: they resulted from the relations determined by the world class struggle. Of himself, Stalin had no colossal powers and even less mystical ones. He represented a layer of the bureaucracy that was allowed to develop in the Soviet Union. It is not true that every revolution leads to a bureaucracy. The bureaucratic apparatus involved in administrative functions is one thing; the actual role of political leadership is another. There is no reason why those in administrative functions should be allowed to exercise political ones. The conditions of history, and nothing else, have permitted a Stalin. The conditions of history also gave Hitler victory in Germany. But didn't they also enable the Soviet masses to smash Hitler and his 'genius'? Hitler showed his genius in one thing only: in choosing to die, and where - his wholly imbecilic dream of smashing the Soviet Union going down with him.

We must prepare for these discussions. The Stalin debate must not simply revisit a historic process; it must draw scientific conclusions from the experiences made in the class struggle. We pose, for instance, that there is a class struggle in the Soviet Union and we have published a text on the subject. Some Communists have been scandalised. "What class struggle?" they demanded "In the USSR, there is Socialism!" But without mentioning Posadas, the Chinese have admitted that there is a class struggle in the USSR; adding that the leadership of the USSR is the most right wing of all the treacherous and contemptible leaderships of the right wing Tsarist scum. But this could not be right. The just way to put it is that there is a class struggle in the Workers State due to its contradictory character: The State has statified everything, but distribution is

on private property lines. Complete stratification is a feat, but the distribution 'to each according to ability' via wages, is in contradiction with the objective character of Centralised Planning and the State Monopoly of Foreign Trade.

The contradiction between the Socialist base of the Soviet Workers State and its capitalist form of distribution, created – and still does – relations favourable to bureaucratic cliques. These latter are the product of this contradiction. Lenin and Trotsky knew this. To lessen and counter the possibility of bureaucratic development, they proposed to maximise the functioning of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Workers Councils, Workers' Commissions, Workers' Plans, plus the Independence of the Party and of the Trade Unions from the State. 'Independence' meant neither neutrality nor indifference, but a simple independence from the State. Per force the State develops bureaucratic functions, but it has no reason to take over the political ones. There is no need of this at all. Why should the leaders of the government, and the ministers, be automatically Party Leaders? They may very well be in the government and Party members, but not representatives of the Party. In the USSR, the Party should have kept its functioning independent from the State, whilst still supplying the State with its Party conclusions. Lenin and Trotsky were stipulating this, precisely so that the bureaucracy should keep to administrative functions.

When bureaucracy exercises State political functions, it comes into contact with the capitalist world. In the USSR, this came on top of the trials of the revolution and the perspective of its slow but sure retreat. For the Soviet bureaucracy, the contact with capitalism was an invitation to capitulation. It soon acclimatised and sought a conciliation best suited to the interests of those layers formed during the revolution and before. The struggle of Lenin and Trotsky against bureaucracy had been very deep, going back to before the taking of power.

Indeed, half the Bolshevik leadership had been against the taking of power. In this event, there already lurked the potential for the notion of 'Socialism in one country'. Those Bolsheviks were strong and proven revolutionaries, but they had felt overwhelmed by the turn of history in not knowing where it was all leading to. Their insecurity was ultimately a measure of their lack of confidence in the proletariat. For these layers, the proletariat was strong, it won strikes, it was against Czarism and brave in war. But they did not think the proletariat would ever create ideas, technical means or scientific evaluations. They still saw these functions as the preserve of small categories of individuals. Later, when the proletariat gave the proof that it could do all this, these layers joined in the 'Socialism in one country' chorus and lent their support to Stalin.

The so-called 'mystery' of the Soviet Union boils down to this. There was no mystery, only the objective conditions of history. We warn against letting any Workers State bureaucratic apparatus exercise a leading function in the Party. The members of the government can belong to the Party, but they must never be its approved Leaders or Representatives. The Party must be completely independent from the State. We are not saying that the Party must be indifferent to the State! This is what has to be discussed with the Communist comrades when they evoke Stalin, and we are going to raise all these problems - past and present.

The Communists have neglected and abandoned the essential quality of always

discussing in the light of the scientific experience of history. Take the 'Thermidor' in 1927 and its significance in the USSR. Thermidor means that the power won by the revolution turns around and loses confidence; it lets strangers influence it or get hold of its leadership, pushing the revolution against its own aims and conscious goal. Something similar created a reaction against Robespierre in the French Revolution. Trotsky draws from there his 'Thermidor' qualification. But he later wrote that the Left Opposition had made an error in its Programme: It had not seen that the Thermidor had not happened in 1927, but before. This error in the date had prevented the adequate policy from being pursued.

All these problems are going to re-surface. We are on the ready. We propose to the comrades of the Communist parties to discuss them with our public participation, without casting aside the anti-imperialist struggle, the struggle to overthrow the capitalist governments and bring to power the Communists, in United Fronts with the Socialists and the Military/Catholic/Left wing Nationalists. These actions must be combined with the discussion about Stalin. Stalin is neither an 'illness' of history nor an impotence of the proletariat. He rose from historic conditions that have all gone today.

CAPITALISM PREPARES THE WAR, BUT IT CANNOT LAUNCH IT WHEN, HOW AND WHERE IT LIKES

Capitalism prepares the war. But it cannot do it as it likes, nor when it likes. It supports itself on the existing divergences and disputes between the Workers States. It counts on being able to widen these before launching the war when it thinks the time is right. It aims at regaining some Workers States to capitalism, if it can. This explains its attitude towards some Communist parties that it hopes to seduce. The "New York Herald Tribune" for example, has printed a eulogy to Berlinguer who felt the need to reply thus: "I do not know the United States, I would like to know them, I have a whole world to discover". What world, eh? Haven't the United States been discovered long ago? Just ask the Vietnamese masses what the United States are! Just look how Nixon was elected with 60% abstentions! Is it as if we did not know the United States? Berlinguer's silver tongue means conciliation with capitalism.

The Communist leaders dread having to face the necessity of the class struggle. They try to calm it and hide away. The recent agreement between Carrillo (Gen Sec Spanish CP) and Berlinguer shows how much these leaders are moved by expediency and local interests. The conclusion they draw regarding relations between Communist parties is based on no scientific experience whatever. We must discuss this. We must hold fast to the principle of the class struggle.

We reiterate a conclusion which we have stood for, analysed many times and written much about: The Italian Christian Democracy (CD) is a heterogeneous party, where you find bourgeois, workers, peasants and petty bourgeois. But as a Party in Italy, it is led by the bourgeoisie which represents the interests of the capitalists. What determines the conduct of that Party? Is it its programme, its aims and policies - or its social composition? The CD's social base contains some workers and petty bourgeois, but they are not made to count, they have no weight or say in the CD. The bourgeois sectors are those who decide.

We invite the Communist parties to discuss in this way. Italy is not a case apart. It experiences particular aspects of the class struggle, but it does not stand outside the world relations of the class struggle. It is necessary to win over the Socialists of Italy. But to manage this, one has to reach the Socialist base. The actual policy of United Fronts with the Socialists in the various regions prepares for the rise to power of the Italian Communist Party. The Communists do not reject power, but they lack confidence and fear a rupture with the Socialist Party and Left wing Christians. Their trepidation is justified and sensible but their policy is not. They need to interest the CD base. But how can they do it, if they do not say that the CD is heterogeneous, (workers and petty bourgeois, peasants and bourgeois) but that the leadership is firmly bourgeois? As it is, they keep expecting from the policy of the CD Party conclusions and changes that will never happen.

Whether they analyse the Christian Democracy or the Workers States, the Communists show the same contempt for the Marxist method. Capitalism prepares the war. It does not prepare it for tomorrow or for the day after - but every day. If it does not launch it, it is because it cannot, but we are aware of its preparedness. The day it feels it has the conditions, or its back against the wall, it will launch the war. If the Communists go to power, with or without elections, it will launch it. If the Communists, together with the Socialists, reach power via elections but fail to conduct an anti-capitalist struggle, this is what capitalism will do: It will use the Communists to breathe life into its system and to attack the Communist movement; it will wrench it away from the Socialists and cut it off from the masses. Result? The Communists will have given their all to capitalism and nothing to progress. If, on the other hand, the Communists continue to generalise the policy of United Fronts they have in the regions, then, capitalism will accelerate its war preparations.

The French Communist Party has reiterated emphatically its accusations that the French government has supplied atomic missiles to the German army. These are short range but enough to reach the Soviet Union: Such weapons upgrade capitalist engagement against revolutions. The French Communists are perfectly right to denounce this, particularly since the Italian Communists keep silent. But all the inferences are yet to be drawn in anticipation of capitalism's riposte at a given moment, either with war, or civil war. It is necessary to be on the look out, disposed and ready. One must learn how to read the possible paths in the movements of the class enemy.

We propose to discuss the continuation of the Communist, Socialist and Left Radicals United Front in France; and in Italy, to continue to try and influence the base of the left Christian Democrats (CD). The CD base, not the leadership, is worth the attention because it struggles in the factories, the countryside and the offices. Apart from this, it must be said that capitalism is doing its utmost to stop the Italian Communists going to government or participating in it - viewing these things as class defeats. This means that capitalism would 'do a Chile' against a Communist electoral victory. The masses, the Communists, Socialists and Left CD must be warned of this eventuality, or rather, this certainty - because even with a few people following it, capitalism will stage a military Coup. This is not the kind of matter to leave to chance as in: 'heads or tails, will it or will it not?' or: 'let's hold capitalism back, turn it round or steal its weapons before the Coup'.

Capitalism will do it, full stop. Without being obsessed about it, one must prepare for it, in Italy and in other countries.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE TRADE UNIONS/ARMY UNITED FRONT

There is a very deep process of revolution in Latin America, and crisis in the Communist parties. This is because no country in Latin America can develop within the capitalist system. World capitalist competition continues to intensify. The centralisation of capitalist investment is ever greater, increasing the power of the big monopolies - the multinationals so-called. Faced with this, the countries of Latin America, or of anywhere, cannot grow anything more than a few twigs of competition at an inferior economic level. None of them will ever obtain the huge accumulation and development to match that of a large country.

The workers' vanguard, the Military and intellectuals circles, already know Latin America is not going to develop under the system of private property. They realise that they will inevitably have to plan production. In Latin America, we foresaw one of the richest events in history that was not foreseen by the Communists: Army/Trade Union United Fronts. We have placed ourselves in a position to be part of this process. None of these United Fronts have a firm structure because they are still at the stage of agreements and dialogues. But when the Argentine Unions - tools of Peronism in the past - start disputing the country's leadership from the national bourgeoisie, when they wrest economic/political concessions from it, the stage is set to go further. The very same Union leaders who had previously been the government's pals now turn against it, and try to make it fall.

The Trade Unions/Army United Front in Argentina announces a more advanced level of class struggle to come. It is not just a circumstantial, electoral or political agreement. No longer finding the force within itself, capitalism must look for solutions in the mass organisations. When he was in charge, Peron resolved all things; but he has hardly been dead a year that this crisis overthrows Lopez Rega, placing also a question mark over Isabel Peron. This is a gauge of people's understanding and of their thirst to intervene. This sort of thing is not specific to Argentina, it happens in Latin America, Africa, Asia and also in Europe. Whilst it takes place in Argentina, it is not an Argentine process: in varying degrees, it happens all over the world. Our Argentine section must discuss and propose the formation of a Workers Party Based on the Trade Unions (POBS) and a Socialist/Communist/Peronist United Front, not forgetting the Montoneros and the Authentic Party.

Consideration must be given to such events in history. They take specific forms in Latin America but they contain aspects to be found in other parts of the world. Take Portugal, and measure the crucial importance the Portuguese Army's behaviour has for the world class and revolutionary struggle. The Communist Parties rarely write about this and when they do, it is only in reference to concrete facts or immediate measures. They do not give the historic interpretation called for by the full scale of this process.

It is not the Communist parties who lead this task - they have left the lead to others. We call on the Communists, the Socialists and the Left to appreciate what it means when the

struggle for socialist-leaning measures is not with them, but with the Armed Forces! What it means when this happens not once in the world, but repeatedly, insistently and conclusively. The Communist and the Socialist parties have not earned the authority to be those who decide or weigh. Their deficit does not reside in a shortage of possibilities but in their policies so lacking in audacity. It was left to the Portuguese Army to stand for what the masses would welcome and support! If this Army were out to smash the masses, it would not do such a thing. And so, the least the workers parties could have done, was to respond with appeals and a work to influence the Army even more. The Communist and Socialist comrades must, like us, draw these conclusions.

Our intervention in countries like Venezuela and Mexico requires a comprehension, a specialisation and a preoccupation always superior to before. The problems we have raised cannot be considered superficially, for they are of the highest importance. Through these movements, we must be able to develop ourselves with the view to advance within a mass movement. The Communists are unable to control or lead in that field. In Uruguay, Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador and Peru, in the whole of Latin America, in parts of Africa and Europe, people grapple with the ideas, experiences and scientific comparisons which we make. Here are movements in search of historic progress, even if they are guided more by the objective situation than by their own theoretical, or class political preparation. We have to take them as they are, seeking in them bases for mass support. In Venezuela for instance, the 'Democratic Action' youth has a programme to the left of the Communists and fairly good considering that it was passive before. The same goes for Colombia, Mexico and Ecuador.

The process is blooming: It is open to ideas, experiences, scientific comparisons. The advent of someone like Ellenstein shows unease in the French Communist Party concerning Trotsky. But the ideas which Trotsky developed up to 1940 are no longer directly applicable. The process is different today. Trotsky had not foreseen 14 Workers States or the form which the political revolution would take. But he foresaw the course of revolution ten years ahead when he said: 'Within 10 years, millions of revolutionaries will follow the objectives, the programme and the policy of the IV International'. He was correct and it happened. But he could do no more, it was not possible! Marxism is not divination but a means of foreseeing the course of history. With the elements at his disposal, Trotsky did what he could. But today, concretely, there are 14 Workers States and 18 Revolutionary States. There are political parties and movements which, without renouncing their bourgeois origins, are driven to adopt positions, policies and programmes outside the camp of the bourgeoisie. This process breeds revolutionary tendencies and currents. They are not attracted to the Communists who do not influence or win them over. We must be those who do, in Greece, Portugal, Ethiopia and Latin America. We can and must conduct activities to win over these movements because we have the necessary ideas, the positions, the programme and the historic comparisons.

The Communists do not draw lessons from the process. They do not compare the course taken by different revolutions in the world, in Latin America, in Portugal. For them Portugal was a riddle and all they could say was: The military of Portugal is good, it has broken away from fascism. But why such changes in the historic behaviour of a movement whose destiny was welded to hard discipline and the soldier's pay? When the military breaks from these things - without even being sure of success in its new aims - it is because it is compelled by historic forces superior to those of the Army, forces that

have come to it on the wings of the world revolution. We can and we must develop in all these countries.

The objective conditions in the capitalist world, the development of the Workers States and the struggle of the masses preclude conciliation. The driving force underneath this principle is simple: the bureaucracy of the Workers States on a one hand, and the capitalist economy on the other, can no longer draw close and act together. Their class competition is too deep and constantly sharpens. The possibilities are exhausted for durable conciliation between the Soviet and Communist bureaucracy on one side, and the capitalist regime on the other.

The condition which gives us access to the Communist Parties lies in our ability to unravel the problems which they do not understand. Why this process in the Portuguese Military? The Portuguese Socialists feel in competition with it, but the Portuguese Communists have welcomed it. This means that the crisis in the Communists does not come simply from limitations in each Party. It is not by chance that a book by Ellenstein comes out in the middle of the present conflict between the Italian and the French Communist parties. All these aspects are one, but the Communists discuss so limitedly and parsimoniously that it leaves them with no idea where to start, and they soon return to their bureaucratic view of history. When they take a small step forward, it is only because objective necessity and the progress of the revolution have come crashing down on them. They open their eyes awhile, and wonder; they adopt one or two correct positions - and go back to paralyse any discussion.

Certain Communist parties, as in Greece, thrash about in uncertainty. They used to mock the Trotskyists and their "20 fractions". Today however, there are at least 40 Communist fractions in the world. It is crucial to understand why, in the full flux of world revolution and extension of the Workers States, the crisis in the Communist parties keeps growing. The Communist parties give no answer to the calls of history. If they did, you would see them leading the process in Portugal, Greece, Ethiopia and Latin America. They are not leading any revolution anywhere, because they have neither the force nor the preparation.

PARTIAL REGENERATION AND THE FUNCTION OF TROTSKYISM-POSADISM IN HISTORY

Not one Communist Party dominates the present living experience. As the Communists are obliged to advance and discuss, they do it empirically, as in this crisis over Stalin's role; all because a letter was sent to the Editor of the Communist Review 'France Nouvelle'. Perhaps the letter was sent to limit the budding polemic to the Readers' Column. Anyway, there came a reply signed by Ellenstein, who managed to eulogise the Trotsky of 1917 and carefully separate him from the Trotskyist movement of today. We know that Ellenstein has read our texts. He knows in what way the Trotskyist-Posadist ideas diverge from those of the other groups. But when he puts all the Trotskyists in the same crate, all under same vintage, it is not an oversight on his part.

Even though he thinks Trotsky's worth stops in 1932, Ellenstein is nevertheless obliged to speak well of him; what counts now is to apply Trotsky today. But Ellenstein says:

“What Trotsky did up to a certain period was just, but the Trotskyists who followed after him had no value”: thus, he re-directs towards himself the authority of Trotskyism in the Communist Party, to stop it turning into a base for class policy re-growth. In intention, this comrade is not necessarily setting out to do wrong with a conscious attitude of dishonesty: He simply shores up the borders of the apparatus. If he had chosen to act responsibly and as true Communist leader, he would have said: ‘The Posadists have already defended this and that position which we now also support. The Posadists have written such and such text, in such and such a publication’.

Trotskyism is still necessary. The conditions of today are begging for its corpus of unassailable and mandatory principles. The role of the Trotskyists in history is unchanged because the Regeneration of the Soviet Union is only partial. Partial Regeneration leading to Complete Regeneration will not happen without huge historic events. Degeneration in the USSR led to degeneration in the use of Marxism - the Workers State’s very power source! As the Communist parties cannot return to Marxism alone, our intervention is indispensable. This is why we call ourselves Trotskyist-Posadists and not just Trotskyists: We help layers to regenerate and acquire the experience and intellectual bases for the Conscious Regeneration. Ellenstein’s article indicates that in the French Communist Party, and beyond, there are aspects of Conscious Regeneration. If he speaks well of Trotsky but denigrates the present-day Trotskyists, it is to curtail Trotsky’s authority over important sectors of French Communists. This happens in Portugal too and elsewhere, the world over.

Our growth is complicated by our function in history, but complication is not the same as impossibility. Complications arise because we are not intent on a large self development, or on the satisfaction to be had in simple agitation. In order to offer ideas, our militants need to be preoccupied more with their theoretical and political preparation than with their intervention in concrete or immediate problems. In concrete interventions, say in a trade union, we produce less in the way of agitation to win cadres than in the way of giving orientations. This task does not win many people but exercises a greater influence because it is needed by the world communist movement. Had we dedicated more time to trade union work, we would have now a good supporting base - better than the Left groups. But this would have had no impact on the Communist parties. The Communists and the Socialists, not the groups, are those who are going to decide matters. This is why we apply ourselves consciously to this task. It requires high levels of preparation, much flexibility and a capacity of persuasion which we have to constantly refurbish, develop and firm up.

We must increase our capacity to argue and analyse. We still harbour attitudes of impatience at not being able to grow more numerically. But it is our authority that experiences a very important growth. We are already in a position to win a current in the world. ‘Gauchist’ comrades of the groups tend to feel satisfied when howling, insulting or attacking the Communists. They may take part in a strike or two, then go to bed - and that is it. We do not act like this. We write good trade union articles that educate a part of the world communist movement. This task does not overflow with the kind of satisfaction to be had in a strike or in the denunciation of the Communists. But we feel the joy of having contributed to the formation of Communist thought; or the joy of having helped organise Marxist wings in Nationalist movements of a bourgeois origin in Algeria, Mexico, Peru.

We are not engaged in an idealistic task without future or necessity in history. Had we not been around, the world Communist movement would not be what it is now. Ellenstein would not have bothered with his book, and there would have been no such Cuban meeting. It is Posadas and the Posadist IV International that warned of the junta of assassins in Chile and foresaw the Coup. We were the only ones in Chile to support, critically, the Left wing groups. We supported their land occupations, expropriations and nationalisations, and we criticised their way of ignoring the Allende government. Of course, we did not say to them: 'Stop and wait for the government's blessing'! We told them that they should coordinate what they were doing with efforts to influence the government. There was a crying need to coordinate all actions so that the leaderships of the masses - so short in confidence, in experience and in political resolve - would dare go forward. Without our intervention and texts on Chile, the Communist Conference in Cuba would not have drawn the sort of conclusions it did.

Our task is to influence the Communist movement and to generalise experience. We are going to persist in encouraging the Communist left that exists potentially, a left that seeks to develop. The polemic between the French and the Italian Communist parties is profound. It is expressed bureaucratically but it points in that direction. Ultimately, it transcends all bureaucratic interests because it raises matters of programme, policy and historic objectives. The polemic between Marchais and Berlinguer is not a comedy or a simple dispute. Even in the manner of an apparatus - of which they reflect all the limitations - these two leaders deal with fundamental matters. Their discussions are terribly narrow and insufficient: it is not as if they could consult a book, read a few lines and put it back on the shelf sighing: 'Enough for now'. On realising that others have already read it, some Communists want a second look. But they all trudge heavily, without innovation. Without specifically meaning to cheat, they never desist from trying to slow the process down. We do not think that Marchais or Ellenstein intend to cheat. They are so extremely limited because they have no confidence in the Marxist method or in the power of persuasion of Marxism.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE IS ILLUSORY IN SPITE OF THE JOINT APOLLO-SOYUZ VENTURE

Capitalism prepares for war, but it will not be able to launch it when and how it pleases. Whilst it continues preparing, its internal crisis blazes and the Communists take no advantage of it. Soyuz going up in Space changes nothing to capitalist war preparations down here. The Soviets hope that, by dint of reiteration of peaceful purpose and the joint Apollo-Soyuz Space flight, they are going to mollify part of the Yankee and European bourgeoisie. This is illusory and it amounts to class conciliation. True, this gives a blow to the Yankees by demonstrating the Soviets are able to accomplish this task and still arm countries against imperialism. But imperialism does the same: it arms Israel to stop the liberation of the masses of the Middle East. This is the way the world people see this, and judge it.

The Soviets should make their Space experiments alone. They should denounce imperialism and call for the taking of power in the world. They should show that imperialism is preparing for war and will launch it. Even now, they could explain that

this joint Space venture has no value. They must call on the North American people to rebel against imperialism, to stave off the US economy, reduce unemployment and plan production under workers control. The Soviets must make appeals to the peoples still living under capitalism. They must encourage a World United Front for the taking of power, production planning and Workers Councils. To the North American people, this is more important than all the Space Stations, because capitalism will never believe in the peaceful intention of the Soviets.

Capitalism is not in any way impressed by Soviet achievement. As far as it is concerned, 'Workers State' means statified property - and capitalism private property. Confrontation is therefore inevitable. By hiding this fact, the Soviets lose a great opportunity to spread their influence, whilst they do not even get 'détente' either. We would agree with 'détente' if war could be prevented by coordination and consultation with imperialism. But imperialism, never short of an excuse or two, will launch the war. It has not done it yet because it fears the USSR: it fears its own destruction. But it is only a matter of time - it could do it tomorrow.

One must foresee that imperialism is preparing to launch the war. Without a sense of obsession, it is necessary to prepare the workers movement, and the North American masses, in the realisation that, indeed, imperialism is going to launch the war; that it is going to lose it, and that it will be destroyed. The greatest possible amount of social conquests must be achieved now, whilst still in capitalism, with urgent petitions for the USSR/China unification. We clamour for this unification. Appeals must be sent to the world communist movement for it to adopt an anti-capitalist programme, inexhaustible source of education that will show to the North American masses how to drop their abstention posture. A factor retards imperialism and its war: at its very core, it does not feel safe in the United States. It fears that if it launches the war, a human tidal wave will rush at it and crush it.

One must discuss all these things with the Communist parties, using the new experiences of Portugal, Ethiopia, Mexico or Argentina which they have neglected and failed to understand. The world is ready for Communism. Thousands of things prove it, such as the homogeneity of humanity in its search for progress. Capitalism is in constant retreat and crisis. Wilson won his 'Yes' in the British referendum - but with the support of the right wing. This does not increase his authority over the Labour Party and there will be ruptures. There is nothing to stop the European Communists appealing for a United Front for the overthrow of capitalism, without necessarily appealing to bring it down by force; nothing stops them setting up Socialist/Communist governments with left-wing programmes. If they conducted such a campaign over six months, it would have an immense effect, say, in Britain. The Labour masses have stood up to Labour governments before. They have laid serious bases to organise a Left in the Labour Party with a real programme of the left.

Just consider the world character of this process. What decides is not the triumph of a strike, an anti-capitalist or an anti-governmental movement in one place or another. Rather, each movement influences the rest of the world because an uninterrupted world process feeds every one of its parts. We must always count on this world process because this is what prevents capitalism from finding economic stability or confidence. The resulting crisis helps the Socialists and the Communists in France and in Italy a

great deal, with rippling repercussions in Britain. The Communists do not progress much in Britain or anywhere, apart from France and Italy. In Spain, their crisis can only deepen, if Carrillo's policy is any guide. If the leadership of the Spanish Communist Party does not break with his policy; if it keeps agreeing with the Right in the hope that the class struggle can always wait until tomorrow, it will be by-passed. These things should be discussed amongst the Communists of the world.

We do not discuss the precise moment when imperialism may launch the war because it can still procrastinate. But when we pose that this conclusion and foresight must be kept in mind, it is because imperialism can also launch it at any moment, as it did in Chile. In Chile, the Coup was coming and coming, publicly. Everyone knew it was coming but no one took any action. The war, the coup of imperialism, is not imminent; but its plans are always afoot. With the war preparations of imperialism just under our noses, it is insane not to prepare the workers movement.

Basmanov (USSR Communist leader) erroneously accuses us of seeking the atomic war. He has no ground for making such an accusation. We reiterate that it is necessary to make the preventative war. But we do not say either that this must be done at any old moment. In a stage such as the present one, of big struggles, large movements, elections, United Fronts, general strikes and victories of joint Socialists/Communists, it is natural to put the stress on these mobilisations, to help them mount the next step and improve the slogans. In a stage like today, it would be absurd to come up and say: 'Stop what you are doing; what you need is the preventative war'! Absurd! But at no time are we saying the atomic war is not going to happen and that the preventative war is not needed. We simply do not give prominence to the preventative war because it is not the necessary slogan at this moment.

But when Basmanov needs to say: "Posadas has been wrong and has now corrected himself; he no longer speaks about the preventative war", it is because inside the USSR there are many people wanting to discuss this. For our part, we neither want the preventative war, nor any war - nor even any strike. But we would dearly like to live without capitalism too. As we live in capitalism, it is incumbent on us to show that it means war, and strikes. The discussion of these problems in the communist movement is improving. There seems to be a deepening of their need for clarification even though the leaders nip every discussion in the bud.

The Communists do not discuss Lenin's 'State and Revolution'. But they soon will have to. To the extent that they think it possible to take power by 'assimilating' the bourgeois State without destroying it - as they do in Spain and Italy amongst other places - they foster what we call 'Czech wings', people like Dubcek and Ota Sik. It is both erroneous and criminal to pose that the bourgeois State machine needs no longer be destroyed: for indeed it is the first thing to be done after the taking of power. The example of Chile is eloquent. One cannot take power and implement progressive measures without destroying the apparatus and functioning of the capitalist State machine. The Communists elude this question, and Carrillo goes as far as to say that: "the Russian Revolution took place in other conditions, now is no longer the epoch of Lenin". We answer that it is certainly correct to always take account of conditions better than when Lenin lived, like the existence of 14 Workers States and 18 Revolutionary States; or like the disintegration of the capitalist apparatus - army, church, police and administration.

These conditions are truly better, but they have not stopped imperialism from making war on Vietnam or on the Middle East. If in its disintegration capitalism were utterly gutted, it would not make these wars and it would have no atomic weapons. Absurd!

The first measure to be taken when going to government and power - even via 'the parliamentary road' as they call it - is to destroy the capitalist State machine, smash it! To take power means, amongst other things, to make the police function for the progress of the country; it means to transform and incorporate the Army and make it part of the progress of the economy. Relations inside the Army must be transformed, as some Communists are now saying. The barracks must not remain apart, but be treated like the factories and with the same rights. The soldiers must know against whom they defend the country. The soldiers must be told that the capitalists no longer speak of war against each other but against the USSR, and that their atomic weapons are poised against the new revolutions.

THE CRISIS IN THE WORKERS STATES

It is necessary to discuss, argue, give examples and help the development of a Communist and Socialist vanguard capable of reasoning about both the experiences in Lenin's time and in our own. It must be made conversant with such topics as the Workers States, the Ota Sik types, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Germany and Poland. All the events that took place in those countries demonstrated that the old bourgeois apparatuses had needed to be changed. Though COMECON and CAME are organisms of bureaucratic planning, they show that the Workers States need to plan between themselves. We must intervene to insist on the need for Soviet planning. No amount of COMECONs or CAMEs will replace Soviet democracy, which is the means by which to develop and advance each Workers State, over and above commercial exchanges. Most of all, there is a need to elevate the function of the working class in each of those countries so that it truly gets hold of the leadership.

If nothing gets in the way, the North American masses will achieve in one leap what used to take decades. It is not enough, of course, to launch appeals to them. They must see examples. In Poland, there are very important structural changes, with the elimination of local powers for a greater centralisation and unity. Progress in the economy and science imposes a superior planning, a more centralised one. This collides with local, regional and provincial bureaucratic interests. This is the reason why, in Poland, as in Rumania, Hungary and Yugoslavia, local interests are liquidated to the benefit of the centralised plan. True, the bureaucratic upper layers involved in this, broaden their relationship with capitalism where they appeal for investments. In not being motivated by Soviet intent, their combined activity benefits some of them, eliminating the competition of others. But overall, the bureaucracy no longer permits the local planners of yore that only came together to carve things up between them. Their interests have now been made to heed more global interests, having now to produce in each region and in each province according to the central plan.

This represents a progress in the Workers States. At present, it benefits the higher rungs of bureaucracy, but it also weakens them historically since they lose local points of support. This progress encourages and stimulates an interest in a centralised sort of leadership and functioning. In four countries already, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia and

Germany, local interests are being eliminated to the benefit of the centralised structure. In the next stage, the necessity for the democratic rights of the masses is inevitably going to be posed. It will be evident that it is not just through economic proficiency that the Soviet Union has authority and influence. But the present measures already prove that the economy must be centralised in order to develop. They are an example for the countries on the way to Communism.

Capitalism feels that it has reached the end of its viability. It is not going to pack up and go without a struggle, but it cannot launch the war when and how it likes. An example of its disintegration and crisis lies in that it must finance unemployment. Not only must it give the means of life to the unemployed, it has to give them some spending power too. The very functioning of the system demands this. In the past, it financed soup kitchens before which thousands queued up for a bowl. Now capitalism has to give them a wage, however insufficient. All in all, this is a spur to resistance. One does not see the unemployed going as a body to break workers' strikes. You never saw this and you will never see such abasement. Today, there is one million two hundred thousands unemployed in France, one million five hundred thousands in Italy – but those in jobs occupy the factories. In France, there are 250 occupied factories, big and small, and often by women workers. They run them too and undaunted, refuse to surrender; people even go and buy their produce. In Belgium, the same. In Britain, the workers occupied the Clydeside naval shipyards over a very long period. To a lesser extent the same happens in Germany, regardless of better living standards.

These examples show that the crisis of capitalism, unemployment and price rises do not discourage the working class. It keeps intact its resolution to fight and it does not despair. It keeps all its sense of resolve and combative vigour, all its historic and concrete confidence. The Communist and Socialist parties are usually attentive to these aspects, but they do not plumb the depth of this process. It is not only due to their incomprehension, but to their bureaucratic conception of history. However, the French Communist Party has progressed lately. It has nodded approvingly in the direction of a series of movements; it has opened the door to positions and activities that speed up a Communist/Socialist march towards government. This pushes it in the direction of more critical policies and objectives in relation to the capitalist system. Without quite yet proposing to destroy it, it raises the need for certain economic and production measures, and the nationalisation of some properties

THE POLEMIC BETWEEN COMMUNIST AND SOCIALIST PARTIES

The Communist-Socialist polemic opens new and very important stages in the course of history. The crisis between them has the same sense as that between the Communist parties, the French versus the Italian, or between the Portuguese, Spanish and Italian ones. Conciliatory methods of adaptation to the capitalist system are being defeated by the process. History requires changes that will not be obtained by electoral means, only programmatically. Thus the crisis into which the Socialists are immersed, can only increase.

The Socialists are in crisis because they are not prepared for this historic stage. They always have had a programme and a policy of reform and of adaptation to the capitalist

system. Even today, they only propose changes that do not transform the system. True, the Communists do the same, but the Workers States push and shove them so that they keep pointing in the direction of historic change. This explains many of the divergences that have arisen between the various Communist leaders, Cunhal, Marchais, Berlinguer, Carillo.

The concrete case of Portugal has opened the floodgates to a process of differentiation that was waiting to come out between them. The USSR, some Soviet leaders and the Soviet bureaucracy do not mind using the Communist parties as a means to increase the authority of the USSR, since this also reduces the authority and domination of capitalism. Thus they are not averse to the idea of pushing - without revolution - some Communist parties towards government. Though they never dreamt of a revolution led by the MFA, this is the reason why they approved of Portugal.

The Socialists are faced with the historic alternative posed by the problems of government and capitalist crises; but apart from self-management, they have no programme for social transformation. They eventually realised that self-management was not viable, and since then, they had to return to the question of knowing what is their own perspective or objective in history. Indeed, it is no longer a matter of Parliaments, Ministerial posts or how to become an MP. The problems of the economy, of relations with imperialism, of relations with the other capitalist countries and with the Workers States – all these need solutions. What lies at the bottom of the profound crisis in the Socialist parties is that they have no solution for this stage of history. The utmost they can propose is a programme of nationalisations.

There is 'nationalisation' and 'nationalisation', so to say. Often, the nationalisation of an enterprise amounts to a private company being expropriated and handed over by the State to the management of a private group. When this happens, the State cannot use this enterprise to plan the country's economy with others: It has simply transferred the private property of one, to the private property of several people, making no difference as far as planning is concerned. On the other hand, the programme of the Popular Union in France makes a difference when it includes the 'nationalisation' of the most important Banks. This differentiation sharpens the crisis between Right and Left in the Socialist Parties. They wonder what to do, what programme to adopt, what perspective to have. They were not created for this and they are not prepared to replace the capitalist system. When they made reforms before, it was always by adapting to capitalism and by managing it. They sought to ameliorate the function of capitalism - partly to improve its relationship with the population. But every Socialist government has demonstrated that this road is being closed.

If capitalism cannot function as a system, it ceases to function. Its political leadership is not crucial to its function - its property relations are. The Socialists cannot cope with this. We must intervene towards them, so that some of them take the first step towards revolution, accepting the revolutionary Communist viewpoint. It is necessary to win the Socialists - and the Communists - to persuade them, and draw them towards the Communist conception of history. We must argue and help them with the experiences their cadres make. We must assist tendencies, sectors and groups in those parties. We must show them that nationalisation in the sense of 'statification' is an objective necessity of history, a necessity to develop the economy. It is the only possible

locomotive that will move the train. You put a better engine in the administration of capitalism, and nothing changes. As long as one remains within the system, there are only temporary improvements. The capitalists operate on the basis of competition. They relate to each other only through the market, where they each do their own thing and only when convenient to them. You impose on them other norms and they resist, cease production, close the factory, move away. Thousands of examples show this. You try to make a 'cleaner' management but all you get is a little office cleaned up. Finance, salaries, production always stay firmly in their hands. As the class struggle advances, which side are the Socialists to take: the workers', or the capitalists'? These are not simple problems because they are historic. The Socialists give no answer to them because they never had a Marxist education. They never mention Marx or Marxism. They have an abstract method of interpretation of Socialism.

It is necessary to intervene in the Nationalist movements, movements like Peronism which advances towards a Socialist comprehension. They make progress, albeit limitedly, and they represent a mass alternative. The Peronist leadership of the CGT went ahead of a process that it feared was by-passing it, with the intention of trying to contain it. But once it got hold of the leadership, it started using it less to stop the process as to raise it onto a higher plane: That is how it brought down Lopez Rega. Movements like this are no longer strictly the representatives of national bourgeois interests. Meanwhile, the Peronist base is exerting a series of pressures that go well beyond these interests. It demands nationalisations, workers control and the right for people to intervene in economic policies. These crises cannot be halted or contained, let alone managed, by capitalism. We have to realise that since the Communists will not lead it, we can and must intervene in this process.

The final settlement of accounts cannot be many years away. History no longer puts up with fiddling and tinkering as a means to avoid the necessity of statification. This necessity cannot be avoided! Every step taken in that direction increases the level of people's intelligence allowing them to verify that progress depends on planned, and not on private, property. Nothing points to the least possibility of development for the private sector - for it even limits itself. Capital is more and more concentrated in multinational societies and monopolies. Ever smaller spheres and layers involved in production go on raising their output. They hold such a power of capital accumulation that, against them, it is not possible to compete.

In the world communist movement they will have to return to the Stalin question. For now, they just chip at it, indirectly and without continuity. They present Stalin as an accident of history. But if Stalin triumphed it is essentially due to the objective conditions produced by the ebbing of the revolution, the absence of Parties and the lack of Marxist party political life. This last point must be emphatically highlighted: Stalin would not have existed had the Bolshevik Party gone on with the Party life it had under Lenin and Trotsky. Lenin said: "The USSR is the beacon that illuminates the world; it is an experience that summons all of humanity. We must spread the Soviet Union to the entire world. If we are beaten, the world proletarian vanguard will know how to do better than us. If the USSR closes in upon itself, it will choke". The Soviet Union did not perish because capitalism did not have the strength to liquidate it, but the Soviet bureaucracy took it all the way to the brink. One must discuss urgently the present reanimation of the Workers State. We have no interest in raking up the past to maintain

that Trotsky was right over Stalin. What interests us is the method of analysis, the conclusions and the experiences remaining to be drawn. We avoid and refuse to be drawn into debating whether Stalin was right or Trotsky. What is of interest is what policies were conducted in the past, and what is to be done today.

Otherwise, the discussion takes a theatrical turn: "Trotsky was right, but he is dead, let him lie in peace. But his texts are no good. I already told you that Trotsky was right, etc". It may be the left wing groups gain some authority in this sort of duel amongst intellectual layers, or people who fear such things may happen again. But this does not elucidate or clarify what is to be done today. The thing to query is this: did the bureaucracy triumph as an inevitable consequence of the taking of power? Or because of historic conditions partly determined by the elimination of the Party and the Party's scientific analysis?

To build Socialism, the Party is an irreplaceable instrument. No power of any kind, no other instrument, can take its place. The Party evaluates, elucidates and learns from experience; it makes comparisons. Yesterday, the French Communist Party was saying about France: "Here, it is different from Chile". Today it says: "Here, it is as in Chile". On what experiences has it based itself? What lessons has it drawn? Should the State apparatus be destroyed? Should the workers be armed? Is civil war inevitable? All these discussions are going on in the French Communist Party. In 'France Nouvelle', a Communist leader wrote: "In the last instance, we are ready to defend our conquests arms in hand. We shall not submit to the formalism of bourgeois democracy". This speech means that it is necessary to take up arms!

We make it our business to know what laws determine the construction of the Workers State, its functioning, and what Soviet democracy is. We are not beholden to the Stalin-Trotsky conflict but to the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat today. 'Dictatorship' is not the same thing as persecution, repression, the cancellation of workers' tendencies and rights. It means a ban on all activities opposed to the Workers State. On this last point, we are adamant. If Soares demands the right to speak against the Workers State, we vote against. We ask him: "you want liberty – but to do what?". We are against what they call 'intellectual and artistic liberty' and very much against Solzhenitsyn's. We ask what does he want to do with this liberty? We fully support the workers of Republica in Portugal who refused to print his book. We will support all others actions of that sort. But we disagree with those who refuse to publish a text from the 'gauchist' Left groups because they have political differences. In Portugal, let's publish their writings and get the workers to reply. One must learn how to handle polemics and debates, and the Portuguese Communist Party must be in thick of it. At present, it keeps well away from any notion of 'Workers State'; it hardly even tackles concrete facts, always preferring generalities.

The Workers State has created a mode of planning that is opposed to private property. In the struggle for government and to take power, it is necessary to show how the structure of private property in capitalism narrows economic development. Take Renault in France. It is a nationalised company but it is directed in a private manner by executives. What benefit does it afford the French people? None! The leading bureaucrats at Renault are those who profit. This nationalisation removed the ownership from a private owner, in deficit mind, only to hand it over to a set of other

private owners - whilst the State goes on airily financing the losses. There must be statification. It will plan production according to the interests of the population, namely, according to what the French people need to consume. Instead of cars, it is necessary to produce cookers, baths, heaters, hammers, you name it – all planned. We propose the world communist movement discusses this very minute that car production must be stopped; that most of the present car companies should be statified without compensation and made to produce consumer goods. If compensation there must be, let it be spread over one hundred years. The resulting planned production must be under the control of Workers Councils in the factories. The workers must meet the population and decide what to produce. Why let the capitalists produce what they please? The workers must expropriate them and produce what they need. You will hear howls that the company will collapse, that it will not be profitable. Tut-tut! It is the capitalists who will collapse.

The class struggle today interweaves with the crisis of the Workers States and of the capitalist system. The public Communist/Socialist polemics and those between the various Communist Parties form part of this. There is a crying need to discuss theoretically and politically. The leaderships try to reduce the discussion to pique and irony. But deep in the Communist and workers vanguard, in the base of the world communist movement, they wonder about the Workers State, the road to power, the crisis of capitalism and its war preparations. They discuss the nature of the world Nationalist, Catholic and Military movements. They do not want to know what Stalin was so much as what to do now. The Communists are increasingly led into accepting our intervention.

We hold this Congress in order to increase our intervention in the world communist movement. We have not come here to make triumphant declarations but to intensify our intervention in the world communist movement, to weigh directly in the Communist parties, the Nationalist, Catholic and Military movements. The revolution evinces an irresistible power: Progressive Military movements are today arising from it. They are not directed by one individual or the other, but by the world pull which the revolution exerts on them. The capitalist system disintegrates and retreats before the advance of the Workers States and of the revolution, where young and old participate. Military forces are won by this process.

CONSCIOUSNESS' AND 'EXISTENCE' IN THIS STAGE OF HISTORY

Existence determines consciousness. But in the case of the progressive Military, it is their consciousness that now determines their existence. When it comes to Yankee imperialism, to the representatives and the masters of capital, they go on forming their consciousness according to their existence. But whole teams without which capitalism could not possibly survive, now turn around to take a swipe at it. How do you qualify this? Amongst the people in these layers, consciousness already determines existence, and will do so ever more obviously. The balance of forces grows in favour of the revolution. The same thing is observable in the church; you get a fair amount of Marxist priests nowadays. Their existence is determined by the consciousness they acquire in today's world. Their form of life is more influenced by their consciousness than by any careerism. The disintegration of the capitalist system produces all these side effects. There will come a time when there will be any number of children, old people, police,

philosophers or priests who become Marxists. One of the most important aspects of the progress of the revolution lies in its ability to dissuade and disintegrate the enemy.

My concern in this intervention has been to highlight the essential points that serve as pivot and communicating axis between the present and the future. They are: what are the main problems of the revolution in this stage; how does revolution develop; what experiences come out of it; how to develop themes that educate, strengthen, support and impel present day revolutionary movements who crave for ideas. The ability to do this is the essential quality needed today. We are dealing with the construction of a new society. Its construction has started even though the Communists and the Socialists have no notion of it. They think Socialism is meat and 'vinoverde' every day, like Soares. For Soares, Socialism is democracy of the sort that puts him in command, in the place of the fascists or the big landowners. But Socialism is a necessity of history and not a need of the stomach. What they are all doing is abominable: Socialism signifies, amongst other things, the blossoming of human relations - relations presently crushed to pulp in consequence of private property. Where do you find dignified human relations today? In the unfolding historic events! In the intervention of the backward peoples of Ethiopia or of Portugal who, with nothing at all, rise up to what is demanded of them in collective works, land distributions, statifications and planning. Portugal has leapt from 50 years of fascism, over to the start of a programme that the French, Spanish or German proletariat, for example, has yet to acquire.

Any conscious leadership using the scientific method and interpreting Socialism as a necessity of history, finds its inspiration in such events. It finds it in the expression of true human relations. The Ethiopians threw the Negus out, and instead of seeking revenge, they embarked upon programmes of construction. After 100 years of imperialist domination, Algeria sought no reprisals but a rapid opening towards Socialist measures. It is busy building Socialism. These countries give a measure of today's human relations. With a proletariat small numerically, Portugal comes out of nothing, brings fascism down and its Armed Forces come up with a Socialist programme! With much ingenuousness and a deal of uncertainty, the Military propose organisms that roughly follow the norms of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. This is human relations! There is no other sort of human relations. When you go to the shops and are told: "if you please, thank you" this is not 'human' but diplomatic and commercial relations. The countries referred to above are building human relations.

None of this is important in the eyes of the Communists and Socialists. They are not ignorant of this and they do not turn their backs. Only, they have a contrary, a matrimonial conception of Socialism. We need clarify further a series of aspects that concern the construction of Socialism: one of them is around the question of how, exactly, to destroy the State apparatus. Is it possible to adjust or to adapt the State? Can it be changed in the 'moonlighting' way of moving house during the night? The Communists do not consider that it is necessary to destroy the State apparatus. They think it can be transformed - the way you remove a part and sneak-in a spare when no one is watching! The Communists have this conception which quite mocks science. We do not follow Lenin and our masters by preference, but because they represent scientific thought. Science gives a grasp of history's progress.

The capitalist State was created, formed, structured and developed on the basis of a

State civil service steeped in private property. Private property determines everything: conceptions, functions, structures. All this has to be changed! True, one can win a fair amount through elections and we agree to advance as far as possible through them. But to oppose change, the class enemy is inevitably going to use the structure of the State and all its connections, from top to bottom. First and foremost, it is imperative to discuss scientifically this necessity of destroying the State apparatus.

There is a second point to discuss: does Socialism respond to a necessity of the stomach or of the family - or to a historic necessity? To a historic necessity! A necessity of history, mind, not an aspiration of the proletariat, although the proletariat is the representative of that necessity. True human relations are the conquest of today, and represent the most complete form of progress. It is the sole and unique form capable of eliminating the essential factors that retard humanity and block its progress. On the ship of the economy, enters the captain of human relations. He grabs the atomic weapon and flings it overboard. He then takes the helm and commands the ship. Take any text of the Communists and you find that Marx, Engels and Lenin are ignored. Not only they do not quote them, but they do not heed their experiences. One must discuss scientifically, as our masters did. The Communists are moved by an interest that causes them to trade-in the private property of their Parties. They defend local and set interests, calling these: 'the interests of the Party'. This is absurd.

In Lenin's epoch, 'Party interest' was still spoken of, because of the Socialist parties. There existed a sentiment of Party but it was not a sentiment of property. Lenin never gave to his Party any consciousness of being a property. What he did with Trotsky proves it. Lenin said to him: 'come!' and he won Trotsky. He criticised him much, because he wanted the most brilliant intelligences in the Bolshevik Party. He tried to win Martov and others who went over to the other side, but who could have developed great qualities with Lenin.

These problems are of prime importance, and it is with great optimism and simplicity that we deal with them. We do not strain our brains over them and we do not see them as steeplechase hurdles. They are just the problems to discuss now and tomorrow. For how is anybody to explain that such a movement as the MFA originally in the service of capitalism, can turn around as a body, and start fulfilling a function opposed to the capitalist system?

Marx posed that existence determines consciousness and this goes on being true today. Capitalist consciousness is formed in relation to its interests. 'Class' determines itself in relation to its position in the economy. One's 'existence' in the economy determines one's consciousness. Capitalism, let us say private owners, goes on determining its consciousness according to its existence. But this no longer applies to its servants. Some of them are already won to the revolution, to the sentiment of dignity. Such an event in history resounds like an alarm bell for capitalism: "What! Is the whole world Socialist now?"

But the police, or present-day Nationalists, are not the proprietors: they are servants. They form part of the superstructure of the State apparatus without which capitalism could not exist. They used to model their consciousness on the necessity to defend capitalism. That was the way they had been educated, that is how they had functioned.

But this had also imprisoned them in 'the solitude of the uniform' while the rising revolutions had started winning new layers of population. When they maintained their assassin roles, these servants isolated themselves from life. Full of reproaches, their own families, their children, decided to march out and rejoin life. Everywhere people came out to reject the filthy role played by the servants; eventually, and in several countries, half the servants decided to join the revolution. You can no longer say that their existence determines their consciousness, but that the consciousness the world revolution has given them, determines their existence. In no way does this conclusion turn Marx on his head. There is no replacement, superseding or discarding of Marx, but a continuation of his analyses in the concrete and ongoing process.

In the past, Socrates, Aristotle or Homer took on board what had to be studied. Today, it is Marxism that does it. But what are the Communist parties doing? It is indispensable to write on all these problems: this is our function. These analyses cannot be avoided. It is possible to hide the truth for 30 years, as Stalin did when he locked up all the archives. But he ended up being an archive and was buried.

History goes forth because its progress is a necessity of life. The economy is still paramount to the progress of history, but no longer exclusively. Consciousness already determines the process at a very high level, and in a large part of the world. There are 14 Workers States and 18 Revolutionary States. Processes in Mexico, Peru, Algeria, Ethiopia, Portugal, are possible because the global process of history determines the individual behaviour of each country. It is not the other way around, as the Communists believe, for whom various individual behaviours add up to make the whole. Concerning Peronism in Argentina, regarding Peru or any other country, they will say to you: "Who knows what is happening over there?"

Marxism is an instrument, so it gets built. This instrument observes and foresees the process of history. The Communists do nothing of the sort. For instance, they have never understood Stalin's reason for being. What Ellenstein does at the moment has nothing to do with a serious quest after the truth. Were he motivated by love for the truth, he would not close his calendar at year 1927. When he says that: "Trotsky was right up until 1925-1927 but after that he was wrong", he means to tell the Communists that they should look no further. This is because he was himself involved subsequently and never explained, even to himself, where Stalin's got his power from.

In the last stage of Lenin's life, Trotsky and Lenin discussed like Marx and Engels and they were aware of the professional dangers of power. In a book written in prison about "the professional dangers of power", Rakovsky had analysed that any revolutionary leadership intent on building a better regime than capitalism would face internal forces thirsting after power. The conclusion for us is that Socialism has become possible and necessary today, but that humanity has not yet gathered every means, organisation and condition to live up to the possibilities; it still lacks in experiences and in social bases. 'The professional dangers of power' were always already latent, and Stalin gave them their starkest expression.

Stalin triumphed because he found support in a layer of people, revolutionaries like him, who had become daunted by history. They took fright because they were only partially Marxists. What all the Communist party bureaucrats have in common is that they run

away from science and accept Marxism only under the bedclothes. And even then, they only tolerate the label 'Marxism' and make no use of it. It neither underpins their thought nor the consciousness that informs intelligence, which in turn, builds the instrument capable of exercising that intelligence. Science is necessary to build Socialism but one cannot use science without the dialectical materialist method. With this method, one finds that Stalin represented a layer of bureaucrats who based themselves on certain conditions in order to usurp power. In this, there is not the slightest hint of impotence on the part of the proletariat; Stalin had no supernatural gifts and bureaucracy no more talent for fraud than others one could name. It is not good enough to say as Ellenstein does, that 'Trotsky is an important person who was right about this and that point'. History is not determined by one point or another: it is a process that requires ideas, positions, experiences and a Party.

The Party is a conscious creative instrument. Capitalism had no use whatever for a revolutionary dialectical Marxist Party. It only brought together a series of interests in the defence of the bourgeoisie against feudalism, and developed the capacity of production. 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' summed up its interests. But Communism signifies neither liberty, nor equality, nor fraternity: it signifies the complete abolition of every form of oppression. Stalin did not triumph because he was clever, capable or devious. He based himself on a layer of society, on the world retreat of the revolution, on the devastation of the Soviet Union, on an weakened Party, on the disappearance of the best of the Party cadres. But even then, and before he could gain power, he had to spend two to three years suppressing every aspect of political life in the Soviet Communist Party. Ellenstein says nothing of this. Stalin outlawed all political life to guard against any fresh consciousness, experience or progress in Party cadres. Ellenstein shrinks from us and breathes not a word about us. For him, it is as if we did not exist. But Basmanov has already written five books on Trotskyism. In his role as bureaucrat informer, he is increasingly busy with Posadas. He has turned himself into an 'expert' on Trotskyism and 'specialist' on Posadism. He reports to bureaucracy on 'Posadism in this stage'. He makes passing references to the Left Groups about one or other concrete event, and without historicity; and little wonder, because they mushroom out of activities which only serve from day to day. But as for us, we attract the attention of the bureaucrats because we have programme, policy and objectives. They see that we have given a continuation to revolutionary thought; and that we have known how to muster the resolve, the determination and the organisation to do it - and it scares them!

One must take account of the fact that capitalism is preparing for war like a corpse trying to breathe. It realises that the USSR prepares too, and for triumph! Victory for the USSR is palpable. The great confidence it exudes does not come from a bureaucracy hoping it will go on for ever. The bureaucracy mirrors the contradictions of the Workers State, in conditions where the aspects adverse to progress lessen, whilst those favouring progress and development improve. The bureaucracy has not engineered this. It is the result of the ineluctable progress of Marxism. The USSR prepares for triumph. This is why we pose that humanity will have to cross the atomic massacre and quagmire - since it is inevitable - but that humanity will survive. Meanwhile, we prepare the very thing that will correct the world communist movement: Thoughts, ideas, experiences and cadres dedicated to this activity - the best activity possible in history.

As from my origins and education, I am an agitator. For years, I climbed onto podiums

and spoke. When I grasped what our function was, I stopped doing it. I only spoke from small platforms as in this Congress. The Left groups derive much individual satisfaction from loud-speaking and attacks on the Communists and Socialists. For our part, we experience the joy of making the Communists advance because history has not created another instrument. Had it been possible, we would have made another instrument. But it was not possible. The masses of the world have seen that the Workers State is superior to the capitalist regime; that Stalin was defeated and that the Workers State wasn't. They know the Workers State can be pushed. But unlike us, the Communists do not trust the masses. They have the task of building a new society without any notion of history! They know dates, facts, quantities, but they have no trust in the masses and even less in the course followed by the movement of humanity.

Take India. On the face of it, Indira Gandhi has led a Coup in the name of one bourgeois sector against another. But there is nothing to prove this because this Coup has set off non-bourgeois and non-capitalist mechanisms. This demonstrates that 'democracy' has to be assessed against whether a society progresses. Soares and company say not a word about India. They do not explain why all the guys Indira Gandhi has thrown out or imprisoned were told first: "We voted for you, you bastards and thieves! Jail for you!" - This is democracy!

Indira Gandhi stood for nationalisations and agreements with Moscow. Those types used their electoral majority to oppose her policies: jail for them! We agree with this piece of dictatorship, it is the most elevated form of democracy. Why? Because it defends an interest rooted in the objective development of the masses and not for a few idiots who have the power to decide and distribute democracy. This squabble about 'democracy' is a complete fraud because the real point is how to plan the nationalised economy and how to make the masses intervene. We will be told: "Eh you! Hasn't Mister Bourgeois any right to speak?". "Too right" we answer: "He hasn't. He has only the right to get lost!"

We know that in order to intervene and pursue our intervention, it is paramount to elevate our Marxist culture, the Marxist experience of the International. Our magnificent team has the historic audacity - like Lenin's - to respond with its intelligence to the necessary task.

We are eulogising the children of Dhofar and the young of India, because they have the audacity to intervene. But the Youth of our International also forms part of the teams of young people now 'shaking the world'. We have lived through the 'Ten Days', and many more, that are shaking History and not just 'the World'*. This small core of people dedicates itself to this task. Had we devoted ourselves to the role of agitators, we would be little more than an important movement with no perspective. Here, we have dedicated ourselves to the construction of the scientific comprehension tailored to this historic goal. We are necessary in history. We must always be concerned with our better preparation. It is one of the essential objectives of this Congress - a Congress that has been prepared by the most complete texts since Trotsky. Our texts have tackled all the essential themes. They are the most complete since Trotsky.

J POSADAS
19 July 1975

· Reference to: 'The Ten Days that Shook the World', by the American author John Reed.

INTERVENTION
IN REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION

J POSADAS
20 July 1975

With great joy, we have listened to the intervention of all the comrades, the grown ups and the children. In holding this Congress, we experience the immense satisfaction of fulfilling our function in history. We also salute the record participation of women comrades. They are more or less half of this Congress; they intervene with passion and with intelligence, taking part fully in the activity. Far from being here as ornaments, they participate actively in the thought, the action and the progress of the International. You will find this quality in no other organisation. We are not saying this to show off, but to show that we operate according to a necessity of history; it is not by chance, we have organised for it.

The Communist and Socialist Parties discuss nowadays the incorporation of women. They hold a 'woman's day', speak of 'the emancipation of women' and wonder 'how far have women come'. They are beginning to be preoccupied with women, children and the old. If truth be told, this is a very retarded and superficial response to a call of history that had long been crying out for the incorporation of women with the same rights, activities and functions as men. Aren't men and women united through their aims and intelligence? Where women have not quantitatively the same intelligence as men, it is because society has fragmented it. If the child does not take part in society as an organiser, it is because society does not allow it. This is the result of the human relations of private property and it applies as much to the family, as to sex, or to relations between adults and children.

This Congress is an example of Communist life and how it operates. We have incorporated the women into our movement as a beacon in the world revolutionary movement. We want to have it known that the Posadist women act with the same ability and preparation as the Posadist men. We do it to stimulate others and in order to weigh objectively. Women may be more or less gifted in the same way as men. Nothing more.

Let us feel the joy of seeing here such an increase in young people and women, together with the very good interventions of all the comrades and the emotion expressed by many women comrades. Their emotion is natural: how is it possible not to be moved when taking part in such a Congress? The bourgeoisie represses the emotions of the masses and of the populations – represses and despises. There are also demagogues and Chair Professors (often claiming to be Marxists) for whom a display of militant emotion points to a disability or lack of fibre. Pure lies! As an essential part of the human condition, emotion is a springboard from which to let oneself be touched by love for the human being, love for the human plight and love for objectivity in history. Emotion is totally legitimate.

The tears that accompany it can equally be legitimate. With more maturity and development, the quality of emotional tears can be made to reach a higher level where it elicits more accurate forms of words, thoughts and resolutions. At that point, it becomes an edifying material force well beyond even that which is ideological and intellectual. In the evolution of our Congress, tears of every sort have found acceptance. We have guided them so that, far from limiting or detaining the capacity to think, they helped create higher forms of constructive impulses. You have two essential props: preserve your ability for critical judgement and that for self-criticism. This done, tears and emotions cease to be the choking suffocation that halts the thought process. Instead, they become helpmates that keep thought answerable to the plea of human love. This leads to great surges in the determination to fight on, and on, all the way to the objective triumph of what history needs.

We salute the emotion of all the comrades, women and men. This normally happens to me too. I am used to upsurges of resolution: For instance, when the comrades reported that the Bolivian miners were giving their meal vouchers in exchange for newspapers and political material. This is equivalent to the French May (1968), because the aim is identical. The French May had more means at its disposal - that is the only difference. The Bolivian miners living in very poor conditions, and the immense progress of the French May, are indissolubly united in the commitment to see to progress. This is not conceivable or possible outside the construction of Socialism. The miner who gives his voucher to pay for the paper is moved by a deep longing. In this gesture there is constructive thrust, a passionate care for all humanity, for the future: Not the future of tomorrow - the future of today. For Marxism, there is no longer any uncertainty regarding the future. The future is foreseeable, it has become the present. We are engaged in building the future. Today we are building the component parts of a process which the world will see tomorrow completed and whole. The Bolivian miners teach all of us: For, if the comrades look closely, if they take enough trouble, they will find the same thing happening in Italy and in France.

The Bolivian or Italian workers feel a sense of identification with the French workers who occupy their factories. There are more than 200 occupied factories in France. The same vehemence, the same resolution, the same determination to overcome, can be expressed in so many different forms of emotion and sentiment. Isn't this a theme for the philosophers of today, the poets, the writers, the singers? This is what they must do, instead of writing about any old thing. Humanity wants Communism not tomorrow, but today, and it proves it in all its actions. It cannot express it everywhere homogeneously because it hasn't the leadership. But it demonstrates it constantly at a very high level, in a clamour that should prompt the leaders to build mass organisms, offer perspectives, set up action plans. The leaders must be made count on the triumphant yearning of the masses.

At this particular time, imperialism has just received an immense blow in Argentina: Lopez Rega is out. This is going to be very, very important because it informs the world that the mettle of the Trade Unions has finally shone through, even from behind the economic and social apparatus, even when the leaders were hesitant, doubtful and unprepared. We are not saying that the present Trade Unions and this Trade Union Centre are the best; we are saying that workers organisms and unions are decisive. It is

possible that the present ones will eventually be replaced by others. But right now, let the Workers Party Based on the Trade Unions become the Workers Party based on Presidency! The trade unions are raising their function. It is them who brought down the Lopez Rega government, not the petty bourgeoisie, nor any bourgeois organ, nor yet even the Army. Ultimately, it is the people's mobilisations that did it, thanks to unflinching persistence and commitment to struggle. This is what obliged the Trade Union leaders to bring Rega down. The workers mobilisations have imposed this on their leaders, by force.

We had foreseen this whilst these leaders had not. Now, they are busy trying to contain and avoid any further loss of control. They want to prevent the organisation of a Left union leadership with an anti-capitalist programme and policy. For this purpose, they ran at the head of the movement to shorten the leash they hold around its neck. But they cannot tether it, for if they do, another form of workers' organisation will spring up; and much as they try to hold the leash real tight, they cannot do it and they fail.

Our comrades have made an enormous contribution to the process in Argentina. They are a small core, fairly numerous but small for a country like Argentina. Inside the bourgeois camp, they audaciously and resolutely waged the political struggle that spills over the bourgeois barriers. They intervened in a movement containing bourgeois leaders - military, government and Peronist party people - and the trade union leadership which isn't bourgeois. In the United Front of the Army, Trade Unions and Peronist leaders, programme and policies will not stay long under the control of the Army and of bourgeois Peronism.

We must understand this process as it moves: its origins, ramifications, evolution and the hybrid forms it adopts. To the extent that it has no logical and representative leadership, actual acting leaderships display façades only: With its reality hidden and only appearances visible, the content seems motionless. We must prepare for struggles which will lift the veil on this reality. It is a learning curve. Our International, our cadres in Argentina, Bolivia, Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, all the sections, must increase their theoretical and political ability.

A process similar to that of Argentina works in the world communist movement, the Workers States and the Communist parties. But there, of course, it takes place at the level of ideas, positions and objectives: This is 'Partial Regeneration' and one must learn to understand this process. Hence, there is such a need to increase our theoretical and political calibre. This implies a deep Party life, always more harmonious and more consistent: To read, discuss, draw conclusions, make plans and projects and continually learn how to intervene. In Argentina as much as in the world communist movement, there are signs of new revolutionary upheavals to come soon.

The process inside the world communist movement, focusing as it must, around anti-capitalist positions and ideas, cannot be the same as that in Argentina, naturally. We must appreciate and feel with all our passionate communist affection that the discussion in the world communist movement bears upon necessary changes - like corrections in the political line. Meetings such as the one in Cuba are not the fruit of Congresses, debates, activities, Seminars or Cadres Schools concerning the essential problems of this historic stage. But the Communists used to say 'no civil war', 'no brother to kill brother'

and now, albeit with the same lightness, they suddenly declare: 'yes to civil war. ! ...' Have they made a study? A debate? No! Reality has dawned. But 'reality' is not just the vile foe whose junta of assassins is presently roaming around Chile. It is also the workers vanguard which, refusing to be cowed, mobilises itself on its own account and draws conclusions from events as in Chile. The changes among the Communists do not stem from their leaders, be they Fidel Castro, Brezhnev or Ellenstein, because the initiative does not belong to them. These detect the scent of initiative on the wind and let it escape. The scent rises, like a kite well launched and blown hither by the revolution. The cord is near-by, but the Communists cannot direct the kite. This is asking more than they can do.

They discussed in Cuba: The closing speeches were hardly finished before each Communist Party was back again doing its own thing. This shows what kind of a discussion they must have had - an invented discussion tossed this way and that by the winds. The debate too was invented because the kite is still up there, unattended. The Communists could catch it; it would not be very difficult. And, since it stays up there and keeps on rising, there must be a wind! It is the wind of the revolution, plus the wind created by the actions people take every day. If the kite soars on, it is due to the concentration of the will of the masses themselves, determined to keep going, with a maturity for ever greater than that of their leaders.

THE REVOLT OF PRISON WARDERS AND OF PROSTITUTES

There have been moving scenes in the Chilean prisons: The gaolers, not the inmates, feel terror. Petrified warders wonder: 'What if the birds fly off?', or 'What will become of me tomorrow?' They feel a constant compulsion to protect their own lives. They are full of foreboding and badgered by insecurity. They fear the future.

But how can it be that the human being still feels a prisoner when science reaches today's levels? There are space modules capable of staying many kilometres above the Earth with exchanges of crews (kissing in Space and kicking on Earth). Since space science and technology have freed us from Earth; since we have started the conquest of space - how can there still be people who feel they are prisoners? The contradiction is absurd! Today, there is no revolutionary political inmate who feels a prisoner: jail makes things less comfortable, that is all. The one with the feeling of being a prisoner is the gaoler. Capitalism realises that its jails have no effect and this fills it with panic - as happened in Turkey, Spain and Greece. Sweden already proposes to do away with prisons: This idea is not an Olof Palme brainwave to save money but a state of mind and a sentiment that have found him. Such things cannot be stopped from finding their way, and they do, by every means.

Recently there were rebellions in prisons, and now there are prostitutes' rebellions. No doubt, prostitutes have a limited view of life, but in revolutionary conditions they too proclaim their rights. It is a base for them to win back their human dignity. If they raise their sights, it is not just to keep exercising the same function but to improve their relations with society. Their revolt indicates, even if indirectly, the very accentuated and focused revolutionary influence upon this layer of 'human merchandise'. For what is the difference between this merchandise and the factory workers? Aren't they both

prostituted? Marx explains this well: They are exploited and turned into objects of commerce and prostitution is precisely that. This practice snuffs out human dignity but the revolution revives it. This is why an ex-prostitute could be heard explaining that she wanted to become a philosophy teacher or to start studying. This means the influence of revolution reaches down to her.

In the prisons of the world, a United Front has started between prison officers, and prisoners in revolt. What is it that unifies the two, when they have such different interests? Capitalism cannot prevent its warders from being incorporated in the whirl of revolution. Look at the conditions we are living in: The workers in every country, Iceland, Belgium, France, Italy, Argentina, etc, launch strikes that are not for money, like the strike of Villa Constitucion in Argentina; it was not for a rise, it was a trial of strength – albeit an empirical one. And Villa Constitucion won the essential thing: the Lopez Rega government was brought down.

Amin Dada of Uganda has delivered a considerable blow to Yankee imperialism. It is an indication; it is one way in which the rebellion of the world's peoples finds an expression against their enemy, imperialism. There are more elevated instances, like petrol statifications and United Fronts in the Arab world. These impel the oil producing countries against imperialism, as well as the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa. Amin Dada in Uganda, is no direct representative of this anti-imperialist resolve: the direct representative lies in programme, policy, objectives, and in the formation of the Party.

There are differences in delays, in qualifications and in objectives between say, Boumedienne (President of Algeria) and Amin. But they go back to the same root: the world is ready for Communism. If Boumedienne is more advanced than Amin, it isn't because conditions in Uganda are less favourable but because Boumedienne realises the need to organise scientifically and politically. This is why we address him as much as we do. We have had the audacity of addressing texts to him to tell him: "Make a Party, you need a Party!" The IV International intervened in the Algerian revolution from day one, and we have given it all our support. Even before that, the IV International always sought to become included in the world anti-imperialist movement, as one more means of fulfilling its historic function.

It is necessary to include in this world situation what happens in France, Italy, Britain, Japan and the main capitalist countries. There is an irresistible rise in the revolution. There are differing degrees from one country to the other but what characterises them all, objectively and historically, is that they are advancing. Workers' United Fronts and conquests by the proletariat are appearing everywhere. The progress of the struggle against imperialism and capitalism never abates in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The time when struggles were uncertain, or ignored, is over. Struggles, nowadays, have a clear and visible political programmatic level and they cannot be ignored.

In the oil producing countries, the leaders are really blackmailing imperialism. True, they wish to become oil masters and form local bourgeoisies, but if they have this power today, it is thanks to the existence of the world force of the revolution - the very influence they cannot entirely ignore in their own countries. The world forms a whole.

This whole is established by the existing relations between the economy, science, technology and art. The economy unites the world via inseparable ties and daily needs. Art, science and technology unify the economy through the human need for intellectual life. All the elements are becoming more and more closely associated and interwoven. As struggles mount, there are more reasons to bring down the capitalist system.

This situation is reflected in the Communist parties and in the Workers States. They feel it, and express it in their discussions. The recent meeting in Cuba is an instance, and some corrections of previous errors is another. But they did not explain the changes and now they do not admit to having been wrong previously. They draw no conclusion that might permit them to overcome the errors and move on. They only turn the page. They had no preparatory discussion before Cuba, and now, they do not try to understand what caused the errors. They take no account either of the Posadists who warned them; the Posadists who called on them to foresee the course of revolution and counter-revolution in Chile and what was going to happen. The Posadists called on them to draw the conclusions and be changed by this historic experience - one of these fundamental conclusions being: no class abandons power without resorting to all the means at its disposal. If this were not the case, why, there would be no class struggle at all. There would only be struggles between individuals.

One must feel and understand this process of elevation in the course of the revolution. It expresses itself in Latin America: Chile, Mexico, Peru, Argentina, soon Uruguay and Brazil and in the whole world. It is the determination of the masses that prevents capitalism from triumphing. In the Chilean prisons, the political prisoners sang the chorus of Beethoven's Ninth! Our comrades wrote to us what life was like in the prisons; the women and the men, fathers, mothers, children, all united by a complete homogeneity in the resolution not to let themselves be cowed: Imagine! There was no political leadership.

In Chile, the leadership capitulated and surrendered; and after that, it did nothing to organise anything. But the Chilean political prisoners stayed resolute in upholding the dignity of the struggle for Communism. They may have been mistaken about some things, but these shortcomings were nothing compared with their resolve and dogged certainty as to the need to bring down the assassin junta. They might have made political mistakes, but these can always be corrected. When the intention is honourable and just, when the means are absent and the path is unclear, it is not the aim that has to be rectified but the path. Anybody can learn how to do this. The Ode to Joy of the Ninth Symphony was a way to unify and cheer up. It was not sung instead of the Internationale, it complemented it. In those specific conditions, the chorus of the Ninth played as great a role as the Internationale, and, as happens when there are no other means to communicate and unite, people use every means at hand to express what they have to say. In Chile, the prisoners refused to be intimidated. Our team went on afterwards totally confident and convinced that triumph would come; not the triumph of our Party, but the triumph of the Chilean revolution. The most important thing that is needed now is to draw conclusions from the defeat in order to avoid repeating the same errors. The masses do not seek revenge against the Christian-Democracy or the bad Communist leaders; they seek to overcome.

THE COMMON MARKET AND THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

There is no strike of whatever importance which fails nowadays in the world. There has not been any retreat of the working class on the world scale. In Lapponia, a remote part of Sweden quite at the end of the world where the sun does not set, hotel cleaners have gone on strike for three months, and won. The Swedish comrades sent us the cutting which highlights that it was the first time in the history of the place that there had been a janitors' strike in hotels. It had never happened before! The bourgeoisie could not believe it: "you, going on strike? But you must be mad!" They were women who had never been on strike before either. They replied: "We are neither mad nor stupid, and we are going to win". They received the complete support of the population. The newspaper noted the unity there had been between all the women, young and less young, around their decision to win. They collected money and people came from all around with money and support: "hold on fast until victory!" they said. Even the rich turned up in support. The bourgeoisie did not admire this and told them they were mad too! In supporting this movement, these people felt that they, too, were rejoining the progress of history. This is how this movement triumphed. The struggle was victorious in Lapponia, and in the hotels.

In Britain, the workers have won all the big strikes; in the cases where they did not get what they wanted, their determination has grown. They keep creating the conditions and changes to eventually challenge the leadership of the Labour Party. The same goes for France; in Italy, the avalanche of votes for the Communist Party came after the avalanche of the masses on the side of the Left that had not been expected. Recent election results confirmed the trend previously characterised by factory occupations, factory committees, strikes and anti-fascist mobilisations. The masses give ample proof that they want to triumph. The avalanche of their votes to the Communists is a reiteration, as if to say: "See?" The result is: crisis for Italian capitalism and crisis in the Italian Communist Party.

This crisis blazes in the great divergences in internal debates. The same happens in the French Socialist and Communist parties. Revolution progresses - and all these parties go into crisis. In the French Socialist Party, the left can have up to 26% of the vote even in places where the apparatus decides: this represents at least 40% of the Party. As for the left of the French Communist Party, it is neither homogeneous nor sure of its direction. It stalks tentatively in an attempt to locate its social support, and Ellenstein is a good illustration.

All this happens at the time of an extremely acute and profound struggle in the bourgeoisie. You see the defection from it of bourgeois sectors closer to the petty bourgeoisie, which itself is closer to the proletariat. These sectors are the Radicals, the Centrists, the Gaullists, and the UDR. Crises are all around. In another stage and in other historical conditions, the bourgeoisie would have already imposed fascism and started the war. As things go, it must keep crawling along for another period without being able to do either. It tried once, and lost. Had it found encouragement in the Middle East or in Vietnam, it would have launched total war. But instead of this, it lost! Its war was not total, but its defeat was.

The same happened in the Middle East. What prevented imperialism from continuing

with Vietnam-type wars is not because of any Yankee doubt, hesitation or vacillation. It is essentially due to the conduct of the North American people: had they supported Nixon and voted for him - instead of their 60% abstentions - Nixon would have felt supported and would have launched the war - a blitzkrieg no doubt. Imperialism is fond of lightening wars, but history holds the lightening of the Workers States' atomic weapons up its sleeve. Imperialism keeps on preparing war but it has not launched it yet, because its own population is opposed whilst the Soviets have the weapons to crush it with. And then, the Yankees wonder: 'what will happen after the war?' War is no longer, like before, a field the victors enter to reap the benefits. After this war, it will be revolution - a thing imperialism/capitalism can verify wherever it goes in the world, and that explains its doubts. Its crisis drags on and on, through the swamp of its insecurity. If this were not so, the 'ten' or the 'twelve' in the Common Market would have long ago come to an accord.

The Common Market shows how capitalism is incapable of resolving the problems its own contradictions engender. The problems of capitalism do not fall from the sky but follow the normal evolutions of capitalist competition. Capitalism is heterogeneous because it is unable to translate into social advances those made in science and technology. Competition goes on dominating, manifesting itself unremittingly and putting every kind of spanner in the works of the system. France, Germany, the United States and the rest of them all have the common interest of crushing the USSR. But they do not manage to unite due to the social situation that arises from their economies, from their competition. Only one thing can unify them: the jackboot. The French bourgeoisie and French imperialism keep clashing with Germany for instance. One must count fully on these factors.

It is essential to understand all the contradictions of capitalism. It is not homogeneous, it is contradictory, the opposite of the Workers State. Stalin signified that certain contradictions existed in the Workers State, caused by bureaucratic functioning. But in that contradiction, the Workers State won and not Stalin. Between the Workers State and Stalin there was neither a dispute nor a kind of lottery: the Workers State won because the economy made its victory necessary, and because the objective conditions of history - the masses mostly - rose to the occasion. On the other hand, the competition and contradictions between the various capitalist countries prevent them from uniting to crush the Workers States. The Communists believe that Stalin and Stalinism had the ability to develop the Soviet Union. Not so! What a lie! Comrade Ellenstein demonstrates that he is ignorant about many things, that he is still an orphan of Marxism. He is still in the pram when it comes to explaining how the Soviet Union had to face up to Stalin and fascism, and triumphed over both. Had things been as Ellenstein says, it is Stalin and not Trotsky that would have been right. But Ellenstein cares little for the beauty of truth. He only deals with certain aspects, shreds of truth adrift upon a sea of uncertainty and contradiction.

We are in a historic stage where capitalism seeks the war without being able to launch it. It steadily accentuates the war conditions in a mass of contradictions and immense inter-capitalist competition. It no longer determines the course of history and no longer decides. The Workers States do! When we say that 'the impulses can come from anywhere, but the decisions are taken in Moscow', it is because the USSR has the economic, military and social means at hand. It has the most concentrated proletariat,

the most centralised and powerful proletariat in history. The Soviet proletariat defeated Hitler; and regarding Stalin, it showed the historic ability to put up with him, resist intimidation and deception and finally crush him. It triumphed over both Stalin and Hitler! Had the Soviet proletariat fallen to its knees, imperialism would have crushed the Soviet Union to dust. Hitler invaded the USSR in the hope of finding a passive resistance, a general disinterest in masses of people full of hatred for Stalin. But those masses could discern that Stalin meant, and in what way the Workers State meant something else.

The masses of Cuba had the same behaviour at the Bay of Pigs invasion. The Yankees invaded in the hope of using the internal struggle in Cuba. At the time, there had just been a demonstration by thousands of electricians protesting against Castro's position on salaries and trade union elections. It is perfectly true that there was great indignation amongst the workers. But the moment the Playa Giron was invaded, the Cuban masses rose as one and totally routed the Yankees. After that, they sorted things out with Fidel Castro.

Be it in Cuba, the USSR, China or Vietnam, the masses show their maturity and their sensible ability for analysis, resolution, deduction and application. They are on a superior plane to that of their leaders. They demonstrate their class, political and very mature common sense - way over the head of their leaders. You can verify this in all the processes in development, as much in France as in Italy.

The masses do not abandon their Trade Unions; neither do they abandon the Communist parties in spite of the leaders persisting with contradictory policies not infrequently opposed to the interests of the masses; leaders who do not echo the will of the masses to take power. But the masses stay concentrated in their Trade Union, or their Communist Parties, or in both. They seek where to apply their pressure. This is why there is no disintegration at all in the workers movement, neither on the side of the Trade Unions nor on that of the Socialists or the Communists. Quite the reverse, for layers of the bourgeoisie carrying a substantial social or technical weight pass over into the proletarian camp. It is these layers to whom the Socialist parties make the offering of 'self management' in the hope of attracting them. But capitalism has not been able to draw any advantage from it; nothing has come out in its favour from this revolutionary process which has much crisis of growth in it - what with all the crises in Trade Unions, workers centres, the Socialists and the Communists. The masses show an inimitable class common sense, and this is not new: it characterised people under Stalin, at Stalingrad and at Playa Giron. This is the actual condition of the world.

Any project or programme of ours must be anchored in these conditions. This process has such a power that it impels prostitutes to go on strike, prisoners to revolt, police and under-officers to rebel with demands for democratic and trade union rights. This same force pushes important, substantial portions of capitalist armies to pass over to the camp of the revolution. We are no longer in the times of the Tsar when one or the other individual could be won to the Bolsheviks. Now, entire armies are won, as the one in Ethiopia. The army does not change sides entirely, but many of those whose function was to kill, pass over to the other side with the resolve not only to replace one power by another, but to abolish power. They commit errors because this is not obvious, but don't the Communists make any? The Portuguese Military (MFA) makes mistakes but, what do you say about those of the Communists and Socialists in France, in Italy - before, and

now? In comparison and considering their previous function, the MFA's errors are small. It had been trained to give not a fig for anyone's ability to discuss and reason politically, to organise or develop any intellectual or political ability. It was all imposition and iron discipline. See how these soldiers have developed their ability to make deductions and analyses, to draw conclusions. They are won! This is very beautiful! Looking at this beauty - how can one ever be sad!

The world is bathed in joy, the exhilaration and the beauty of intelligence. It is because of this that human relations blossom today. Joy used to be defined against what was of a personal, individual, family or class interest. Today, joy is defined in terms of human intelligence, of which it is the most elevated form, evocative of the most edifying notions and images. Intelligence consists in seeing that all the problems can be solved, those of humanity as well as those of history. All in life that used to appear mysterious, insoluble or unbearable turns out to have been only an easy-to-solve class problem. Entire peoples are in the process of experiencing this, from Portugal to Ethiopia, passing through France and Italy. Their leaderships hold them back and prevent the taking of power but the workers at the base and the peasants, the petty bourgeois and the military, the priests and the nationalists, are all increasing their political and scientific ability; their capacity for organisation, leadership and action too. Those leaders who can prevent them taking power cannot make them desist, and regardless, each mass movement elevates its political, scientific and intellectual potential. From nothing at all, the people of Ethiopia advance in leaps and bounds that would have been impossible had they been isolated from the world. It is the world process that engenders such effects, lending them the sprightliness to leap ahead. This knowledge must be kept in the mind of all revolutionaries. In these conditions, how can the Communists avoid being influenced? How can one believe they will remain insensible?

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION IS A WORLD PROCESS

The Portuguese masses draw their own conclusions, even if Cunhal does not. If not everyone in Portugal is allowed to draw them, the masses of the world do. Albeit at differing levels, there is an uninterrupted process of elevation of the revolution, permanent, continuous, always anti-capitalist. For that reason, this is a world process of Permanent Revolution and not something peculiar to one country or another. The Political Revolution in the Soviet Union develops in a world process that gets concretised in the Soviet Union. A greater level of revolution in the world means greater qualities, abilities and revolutionary conditions that make the Soviet Union better disposed towards its Political Revolution. The Political Revolution is not being eliminated but simply made less stormy, less costly to history, more accessible and flexible. The growing confidence observable in the world revolution induces changes in the Soviets. If they become more pliant, it is not that they have changed their nature, but that the progress of the revolution demands it.

We must be based on this world process and view it as a whole when we make prognoses and draw conclusions. The course of history is determined essentially by the world progress of the Permanent and Political Revolution - one of the consequences of which is the Partial Regeneration. The course of history in Portugal, Uganda, Ireland or Argentina, is not the result of conditions prevailing in each of these countries but of the world balance of forces. At any given moment, one of these revolutions can have the

effect of creating more organisation, as well as improved principles and movements for yet further advances. Take the example of the Trade Unions/Army United Front in Argentina. It is not a unique case: There have been instances of this before. But this time, this United Front has attracted the world's attention, even in Italy and France. The trade union leaders in Europe look over their shoulders, wondering whether Army and Trade Unions are becoming the new Peronists. What is more, this is happening in Argentina, a country that has tightened its links with all the Workers States, North Korea amongst others. At one time, Peron had appeared on TV surrounded by 70 children from North Korea.

Such is the world level of relations nowadays. The crisis of capitalism is, without doubt, very deep and insoluble. But imagine if the proletariat did not give a class solution to this crisis; Imagine that! If the Communist and Socialist parties, the Workers States, the workers' parties in France, Italy, Japan, Britain and Germany do not react - what will happen? Capitalism will find a solution - at the expense of the revolution. However, this time round, it will be neither in a position to find its feet, nor to re-ignite in the world the light of authority and confidence. It may re-establish its functioning but it will stay in a permanent crisis of confidence. Thus lame, it will roll on down the hill, all the way to where the proletariat is waiting to crush it.

If the Workers States, the Communist and Socialist parties fail to make headway in this structural crisis of the capitalist system, the latter will seek solutions that make short work of precepts, principles and agreements. The big monopolies are on the alert. They concentrate the functioning of big capital for a further elimination of competitors. This has also the effect of increasing the weight of the masses and of the revolution in the world. The result for capitalism is continuing decadence. This time it will not be as in the past when capitalism had always a solution because it had no competitor. Now the Workers States exist, and the masses of the world too. The technicians, the scientists - irreplaceable as they are for capitalism - see that there are no such agonies in the Workers States.

The countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America who started with nothing, manage their own incorporation into life. They develop their economies whilst capitalism never managed an iota of it with all its investments, armies and assassins. These countries develop on the basis of the stratified form of property, with production centralised and planned. The technicians and engineers of capitalism, and all their administrators, feel galled and shaken by this. This is the actual stage the world has reached.

We must consider what policies for this stage, what major preoccupations and what our main function shall be in all this next period. The crisis of capitalism, that of the Workers States/Communist parties, plus the world development of the revolution, all find their realisation in a world vortex of Permanent Revolution, Political Revolution, Partial Regeneration and Historic Re-encounter. Of all these, the Historic Re-encounter is the least important aspect, having less possibilities to advance openly and consistently at present.

The prospect for the next stage is sharper class struggles and struggles for power. This World Congress must ratify the conclusions developed in our first exposé. The inexhaustible world course of the revolution takes thousand forms. In Uganda, Amin told

the British PM: 'Come here and beg my pardon'! Without representing their class decision, he reflects the opposition of people. This highlights the indirect use that can be made of the fighting will of the masses of the world, though the effects in this instance have a limited historic scope.

The world crisis of the capitalist system increases. There is a constant search on its part to respond in every country by more counter revolution and world wide by means of a front between Yankee, Japanese and European imperialism. They seek to combine forces and confront the rising tide. But they have not the means to stem it all, outflanked as they are by the masses politically and industrially. They are preparing small atomic wars. They keep on about 'tactical' weapons in Germany, France, Italy and Britain. It is not certain that they will succeed, however much 'tactical' for them might mean 'easy to use'.

Behind the fraudulent qualifier of 'tactical', they mean pocket size weapons for a 'lightening strike'. What is that but preparation for counter revolution? And by means of atomic repression? We call on the comrades of the Communist parties and of the Workers States to kick up a world fuss to challenge this now. The fundamental conclusion, surely, is that the capitalist system must be brought down! We are not against trying it through an electoral process. In France and in Italy, let the Communists be elected: we shall support them wholeheartedly, with all our consciousness and intellectual power.

We invite the Socialist and Communist comrades, all the movements of the Nationalist left, to make a United Front in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, on the basis of an anti-capitalist programme: expropriate capitalism and plan production to satisfy human need! From that point, one will be in a position to forge ahead towards the total elimination of capitalism. The appeal for such an action would, of itself, have an immediate revolutionary effect in North America. We agree with the struggles to conquer and maintain democracy. But the problems of Europe do not reside in a lack of democracy. Bourgeois democracy will give no more than it does now. Any progress in Europe, or anywhere else, will be made against the bourgeoisie and its interests. This must be proclaimed! The very demand for greater democratic rights signifies structural changes. In Italy, for instance, the regional Left United Fronts must spell this out, loud and clear. If this is avoided, the workers' movement cannot prepare itself and this limits the effect of all other achievements. Take the Venice or Turin United Front: It must state what exact programme and policy will gain more democracy for the masses. This is as important as having formed the Fronts themselves, since they are destined to become Local Governments of the Communists and Socialists.

The crisis of the capitalist system is insoluble. It is not an occasional or partial crisis. It is a crisis of structure, with effects in every corner and from A to Z, passing through every imaginable or unimaginable letter. As far as history is concerned, capitalism has exhausted its function. Since when? Since the day of the Russian Revolution! If capitalism went on living, it is only because it was not brought down. It was not brought down because of the incorrect and conciliatory policies of the Communists and the Socialists. Now capitalism has not force enough to continue living: Proof is that it could not combine to smash the Soviet Union. Perish the thought it was negligence or an oversight! After the Soviet Union, there came 14 other Workers States. Had the USSR

been crushed, these 14 would not have been born. World capitalism did not crush the USSR because it did not have the force to do it, and because the world proletariat was opposed. Had imperialism invaded, the world masses would have stimulated anti-capitalist movements everywhere. The inability of the capitalist system lies in this past example, but it is still the same today.

The capitalists can no longer make war between themselves. In their economic competition, France, Britain, Germany and the United States have ten times more reasons to make war against each other than they ever had before. In the Common Market, conditions are such they could make one every day, but they dare not. Thus, they make small, local, wars about onions, carrots, meat, wine. These may be less costly, but they are wars alright. When imperialism cannot launch a war against the oppressed countries, it blackmails them. It used to say: 'we will no longer invest here', but now these countries make their own investments. When it cannot blackmail, imperialism makes agreements, as with the oil producing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. It is all wars. Do not think that the Common Market signifies 'accord' within Europe! A pure lie! Faced with capitalist crisis and the stiff world competition of the Workers States, European capitalist discord is complete and terrible. This is the Common Market in a nutshell. Because of its huge concentration and the expansionary imperatives of big capital, the Common Market turns itself into the great monopoly of the monopolies.

The capitalists need to form these big monopolies to deal with their own crisis, and with the Workers States. They make this giant multinational to lessen competition; but this fails and discord erupts between them. The last ten years have seen their unceasing squabbling and bickering: For they are not just faced with their inter-capitalist competition but with that of the Workers States. The Common Market centralises big industry, high finance and large capital at the expense of the small and middle size European producers and industries. Their concentration needs to break up and eliminate, restrain or destroy an immense layer of what was previously their base of support; like small to medium industry and agriculture. No 'entente' is possible here. Capitalism has no perspective and the Common Market will never reach an accord. You may get an agreement at the top of the multinationals but that is also a fight. They will never manage the unification of the Common Market because competition is at the heart of their divergences. They try to regulate it, to plan it, but this is precisely what is unattainable in the system of competition where the strong wins, and nothing else. In Europe, capitalism works no differently than anywhere else.

The Common Market has not been able, and will not be able, to resolve any of the problems of the capitalist system. This is another highlight of its exhaustion and total crisis. The Communist and Socialist parties would like to believe the Common Market can produce a stable economy and some planning. Some Communist parties as in France and Italy - in Germany and Britain it is different - have reservations, but they propose no policy. What they must demand is the Socialist United States of Europe. We call on the Socialist comrades, the Communists, the Left Radicals and the Catholics, to pose the need for the Soviet Socialist United States of Europe in opposition to the Common Market which only guarantees instability in life. The unity of Europe demands the Soviet Socialist United States, where democracy will bloom. How do we know democracy will bloom? Because there will no longer be democracy for the bandits! In the Building of Life, bandits have no place allocated. We invite the Communists and the Socialists to take

this discussion on board.

The Workers States weigh limitedly in the world and they do not sufficiently identify with progress. They need to offer an alternative to the capitalist Common Market. The latter still attracts a substantial petty bourgeois layer – itself, a demonstration that it is possible to build the Socialist United States of Europe. The Workers States must unify: let them plan between themselves in their common interests and with priority given to the least developed. If they start this, the broad masses of Europe, its petty bourgeoisie and small proprietors will feel an immense attraction. The effects of the ‘tactical’ war capitalism prepares will be immensely less disastrous whilst the attraction felt by people towards the social progress of the Workers States will be enormous. In offering a united perspective, the Workers States will be quite compelling. We appeal for this discussion to be made with the view to organise in the whole of Europe a United Front of Trade Unions/Workers Centres, with the Communist and Socialist parties, plus the Radicals and Catholics of the Left. This Front must call for the Soviet Socialist United States of Europe, a Socialist Unity based on a common European programme and planning, requiring the statification of property. We call for the unification of the Workers States, in Europe, and in the world! This breakthrough will give an example whilst becoming a force to reckon with, a force of authority and experience.

THE NEED TO UNIFY THE USSR AND CHINA, AND TO CREATE A WORLD ANTI-IMPERIALIST UNITED FRONT

The division China/USSR is one of the greatest deficits of this process of history: it enables capitalism to arm itself and to constantly brandish its atomic answer in the face of the progress of the revolution, against Socialism and humanity.

A foremost basis for any meeting of the Communist parties must be a discussion of the reason for the divide between the USSR and China. The essential conclusion to be drawn must be a call for these two Workers States to unite and plan jointly. We call for this unification and common planning to be discussed in the world movement of the Communists, Socialists, Radicals and Trade Unions, as well as in the Workers Centres and in the factories. This does not simply suit the USSR and China; it is a necessary conclusion for the whole of humanity: Humanity needs this unification! And what is preventing it? The existence of bureaucratic interests! It is necessary to state clearly that the interests of the bureaucracy, and nothing else, prevent the unification of China and the USSR.

We appeal also, and fundamentally, to the Communist parties, to the Workers States - the 'socialist countries' as they say - to develop a complete Soviet Democratic activity in the factories and in the public places. They must engage in daily and unceasing activities of demonstrations, rallies and public meetings in all the Workers States from where appeals need to be made for the crushing of the capitalist system - this atomic warmonger and oppressor of the world's peoples. Let there be appeals to develop democracy in the Workers States and to unify China and the USSR via their common economic planning. Let the masses of China, of the USSR and of the whole world discuss!

It is necessary address the US masses with a programme. Just the start of such action

would have an irresistible effect on the masses of the United States. It would help their class organisation and prepare them for their own class, rapid, dynamic response to the war preparations of imperialism, and to the war itself. We are not saying that war is imminent, but every Communist and Socialist Party must denounce it in their programme. Without being obsessed by it, one must remember that the more imperialism is pushed against the wall, the greater the risk of war: Imperialism is ready and can start it any minute. The alliance of spacecraft overhead makes no difference. Capitalist science has no historic interest whatever - and not the slightest preoccupation or possibility - of uniting with that of the Workers States: It is their antagonist. The capitalist countries have not yet launched a concerted war against the Workers States because they cannot agree on anything. Instead, they have a thousand motives for war against each other. The Common Market is a case in point, where the capitalists are not fighting against each other with weapons, so afraid are they this would serve the development of the revolution and favour the Workers States in Europe.

We appeal to the Communist parties/ Trade Unions/Workers Centres, to draw the conclusions from the present crisis of capitalism for which it has no solution. It has exhausted all its possibilities. Whether it is today, tomorrow or the day after, it will react with war. It is therefore paramount to organise against it, without either feeling haunted by it - or waiting until it happens! It is necessary to gather together the understanding, the consciousness and the means - economic, social, industrial, political and military - with this perspective in mind. The indispensable condition to remedy the war is to be prepared for it, elevating the qualities of the masses of the world, increasing both their authority and their progress to Socialism. Let's the North American masses be told! Let us count on their homogeneous conduct, their upright behaviour. They have no political or trade union means of expression, but they speak through their abstention. Imperialism dreads the consequences of its own war because it senses the hostility of the North American people.

The US Trade Union Centres are useless, to say the least. They invited Solzhenitsyn! But it was at the behest of the CIA, not of the Unions, that this shitty pant went to the United States. He went to lobby, stimulate, foment and shore up the US's decision to "bomb the USSR". Isn't this a call to bomb Workers States? Revolutions? Solzhenitsyn's function is that of a shit that can hold a pen. This is what he was hired for, since he has no other talent or political skill. He is incapable of raising his political thought above his imbecility, but there is carte-blanche for the likes of him in the US: he can hold public Conferences and declare what no one else dare to. In the US, they knew what he was going to say because the top US security chiefs concocted it all beforehand. They made Solzhenitsyn say what they did not want to say themselves, due to so-called 'détente', etc. This prepares for atomic war! Besides, look at what extremely malicious tendencies there are in the Soviet Union and the other Workers States: they are not just 'democracy' loud-mouths but malevolent enemies like Ota Sik in Czechoslovakia and this feather brain in the Soviet Union. The US invitation to him is proof that imperialism prepares for nuclear war.

We call on the Workers States to hold public debates about this and to publish declarations in the workers movement. The latter must explain that the policy of 'détente' has no value; that it does not hinder, dampen down or lessen the dynamics of war preparations. We are against the nuclear war! It is not us who are pushing for it -

they do! It is imperialism that prepares the nuclear war! Solzhenitsyn is only one aspect of these preparations, along with Ota Sik and assorted bureaucrats in the Workers States. For the time being, these types try destabilisation tactics with the aggressions, disputes, tensions and confusions they spread in the Workers States. We propose that the USSR and Czechoslovakia respond with public debates on Dubcek's petitions in Czechoslovakia as part of a campaign for the Socialist planning of Europe, to include both the Workers States and the capitalist countries. This elevated democratic functioning will soon find solutions to the crises of the economy, society and work. We propose the Communist parties discuss all these problems.

The masses have demonstrated that they want to finish with the capitalist system. This is reiterated in Britain, for instance, in the strikes, the electoral advances and the crisis in Labour. There is no need for great consultations or much head scratching; you simply pick on anything that happens, and open a public discussion in the workers movement in support of a United Front of Socialists, Communists and all the Left tendencies. An end will soon be put to the crisis of capitalism by expropriations and statification.

It is necessary to have a discussion in the World Workers Movement and the Workers States aiming at a European United Front with an anti-capitalist programme. Production needs to be planned in the interest of populations, and this demands the statification of the main means of production - basic production centres first. Let's have this instead of individual cars! It is necessary to construct collective facilities for people, trains, transports, planes, cookers, fridges, roads, hospitals. Who benefits from investments presently sunk in the car industry? Are they a guarantee of wealth for any country? No, they guarantee wealth for car industry bosses and nothing more. With expropriation and planning, all that energy and labour would go into building hospitals, roads, houses and collective amenities, thereby also resolving a thousand other problems. No more capitalist accumulation? Let's have public well-being accumulation! The Communists and Socialists will say this pie in the sky. But why? It is not as if it couldn't be done!

We propose the Communist and Socialist comrades discuss in all the factories about the planning of Europe on the basis of production programmes and commercial exchanges to unite with the Workers States. The aim must be the Soviet Socialist United States of Europe. Why not discuss this? Who is against? The leadership of the workers parties says that the situation is not yet ripe. Whatever else do they need? The masses have already made their point in the 'Whistlings in Bologna' and the 'Avalanche of Votes for the Communist Party' in Italy (See Red Flag 246 - Edit). In Britain, they made a front of resistance in the Common Market referendum amounting to a 60% Labour abstention against the Labour leadership. The immense majority of the Spanish people are against Franco-ism. The masses have made a revolution in Portugal. There is a rising tide of revolution in Germany, one of the most stable capitalist countries. Why on Earth shouldn't this be discussed? It is false to say that forwarding the revolution precipitates the war which capitalism is preparing. If it launches it, it is because it has no other solution. One must not give it the liberty of making the war when it suits it best. Besides, why should it go berserk because you call for a Workers and Peasants government in Italy? But why? The Italian Christian Democrat (CD) leaders of the Fanfani, Moro and Rumor sort, will certainly sound the trumpet of their opposition; but what are they, and their noises, compared with the CD masses? We know that the CD masses agree with a programme of social progress, a programme that only the Communists and the Socialists

are in a position to accomplish.

It is necessary to give a class response to the crisis of capitalism in Europe and in the world - United States included - with a world offensive by the Workers States, Communist and Socialist parties, opening a struggle for a Workers and Peasant Government of the Left (electoral fronts wherever feasible) on the basis of a Left programme spearheading measures for Socialism via Workers Councils and local/regional Committees serving as social and political spearheads. Let's give this response to the crisis of the capitalist system.

CALL FOR INTERNAL SOVIET DEMOCRACY IN THE USSR AND IN THE WORKERS STATES!

We call for a World United Front on a common anti-imperialist programme: Expropriate imperialism and statify property! Plan production under the control of workers, neighbourhood and factory committees! In the leadership of society, must be placed those organisms that show ability, efficiency and intelligence in dealing with society's problems. Capitalism cannot resolve them, and besides, it has not one iota of interest in trying. Since it is preparing for war, it will launch it in any case.

We invite the Communist and Socialists parties to return to class analyses and conclusions. Capitalism is a class - and not a set of people united by their roles as heads of enterprises for instance. It is a class, whose character lies in the function of being boss or financier. It thinks, makes deductions and takes decisions as a class. In small Belgium or any large European country, every aspect of the capitalist class' behaviour, is steeped in its class interests in the class struggle. This is not to say one must not look for electoral advances. Far from it, United Fronts must be made for electoral gains. But the very condition that renders a United Front necessary lies in the incapacity of capitalism to resolve - today or tomorrow - any of the problems arising in Europe. In this case, capitalism is not beset by a passing or circumstantial crisis; it is in a total crisis. Imagine that the proletariat does not give a class response to this crisis, or that the Workers States do not help the proletariat: Capitalism will simply be at liberty to prepare and launch the war at the time of its choice, instead of being forced into it by the development of the revolution - i.e., the least favourable moment for it.

One must seek - with all endeavour - to get this policy understood and debated openly in the workers movement, where all tendencies must be included, the Posadists, the Leftists and the Communists. Discussions must pose the need for a United Front of all the Socialists, Communists, Left Nationalists and Catholics plus all the Left groups and the Trotskyist-Posadists, to make a Front against the capitalist system.

We call on the Workers States to maintain and develop COMECON, and to discuss publicly joint economic planning where their Trade Unions are seen clearly intervening, as well as neighbourhoods and schools. Let every location where people live, discuss and debate all the problems of society. Let the North-American people, the Japanese and the Chinese, observe these debates in full operation. Such an activity contains, and will always contain, power enough to send both the Chinese bureaucracy and the capitalist system crashing down. We say that there is no reason why each and every place cannot

have its debating hall - in the capitalist countries and in the Workers States! Let the 12 year olds participate in such meetings in their schools, in the capitalist countries and Workers States.

We propose a public discussion in all the trade unions, the schools, the local wards, the houses. Let's get out of the deadly grip of the 'specialists' and the 'experts'. Let everyone in society intervene in debates on every subject. Isn't this democracy? The people will soon want to know how to develop the economy; and how to reach an egalitarian distribution that takes account of what every person needs rather than what every person can grab hold of. We propose to discuss openly in the Workers States, in the factories, in the barracks, the houses and the streets, absolutely everywhere, how to resolve the present problems of humanity; and how to uproot the crisis of humanity regarding food, health and the environment. We propose to break the Soviets' Space alliance with the Yankees, and to make an alliance here on Earth with the masses of the world.

We would not be against 'détente' if it were possible or beneficial to the development of the struggle of the masses. But there is no such thing as 'détente'. It does not exist! At this very moment of 'détente' talks between Yankees, Soviets and Workers States, the Yankees are making war! If they do not go farther in warmongering, it is because they can't. Just look how they create the most terrifying weapons! In their heads, in their mentality and in their conceptions, they look no further than war to solve the problems of their historic antagonism with the Workers States and world masses. Surely, this has to be discussed openly.

We would not be opposed to 'détente' if it benefited the Workers States and the world masses. But what does détente bring? Nothing - apart from a greater opportunity for imperialism to keep the masses out of power in France and Italy above all, but also in Britain. This is the benefit! Had the proletariat, the Socialist and Communist parties taken power in France and Italy, they would have slashed the power of imperialism down to a minimum. What is the perspective of 'détente'? To hang about until imperialism and capitalist governments get tired and disarm? Never! The Left can go to government, as in Chile, but counter-revolution carries the day if class power is not exercised, arms in hand. See how now, once again, capitalism is offered the same opportunity in Portugal, where it uses Socialists like Soares for its purpose! With 'détente', what perspective, what delays? It is an aimless policy, devoid of perspective.

We propose that maximum use be made of the weakness of imperialism. Since it cannot make the war this minute, the opportunity must be seized, in every country, to sap at its structure, capabilities and possibilities. No accord is necessary or interesting if it is, in any way, at the expense of the class struggle. With such things, one must simultaneously develop, stimulate and impel the class struggle to overthrow the capitalist system.

This principle, when publicised, will tell the time of day to the Chinese camarilla that has so much to say about the Soviet Union being the most reactionary, most backward, most feudal tsarist right wing of the capitalist system. These types in China are no better than Stalin: they have the same concepts rooted in economic interests and deliberate agreements with capitalism. Many of them are of feudal origin. Their perversion shows in their hostility to any tie with the Soviet Union; even more so in their keenness to hold

back and oppose the development of Workers States. They can only do this, of course, by making pals with capitalism. What perversion lurks behind this conscious and organic - not only organised, but organic - support for the capitalist system! Such political positions are not indicative of errors, wrong forecasts, inconsistencies or political incapacity, but from retrograde social interests. This camarilla is ready to become a prop, a support, to the imperialist war!

The Soviets do not put up a more determined fight against this Chinese bureaucracy because they fear this would revive the class struggle. They fear the adverse repercussions this would have internally, against the Soviet bureaucracy. As for this Chinese camarilla, it is not a bureaucracy engaged in rivalry with the Soviets, it simply is retrograde. It has stooped as low as to ally itself with reactionary Chile and some Western countries against the USSR! Only very adverse economic interests can explain this. This policy, entirely against the grain of the world advance to Socialism, can only sharpen the class struggle in China. We call on the Soviet Union to improve Soviet life, to give an example and lance this boil. This also demands the heightening of Communist political life in the Communist parties, better internal Communist life and anti-capitalist discussions. What will transform China is the historic and concrete class discussion in the Workers States. No 'sound barrier' will ever stop the sweet music of the world revolution reaching Chinese ears.

The Chinese bureaucracy keeps on stirring and deliberately fomenting false divergences with the USSR. These two bureaucracies diverge, but the USSR is so anchored and positioned in historic conditions, that its bureaucracy is forced to make ties with, and even support, the world revolution. It does not advocate class struggle or civil war, but it has to encourage the struggle. It looks for those places where it feels it can both help the struggle and enclose it within a gradual process.

The viper of competition, on the other hand, pushes the Chinese to contain any revolutionary development that may favour the Soviets. It is false to think this Chinese policy is caused by some failing in the Soviets. No such thing. It emanates from a bureaucratic camarilla very similar in China to that which existed in Stalin's epoch. It has no interest in the development of the anti-capitalist struggle or the revolution. It did not hesitate to support a government as reactionary as that of Chile to further its own policies.

There is no need to wait until China changes. Two things can reach the Chinese masses outright: direct appeals and one's own good example in Soviet democratic organisation. The very example that will influence China - as much as Japan and the United States - is an organic public discussion in the USSR, in the streets, the Trade Unions, the housing blocks, capable of airing every social and economic matter and everything concerning the leadership of the economy, the Trade Unions and politics.

On this tenth World Congress of The Trotskyist Posadist IV International, we call on the Soviet Union and the Workers States to elevate their internal democracy, organising the purest sort of discussion on all the problems. This will have an immense effect on China, and the whole world. Let this be done! We call on the Communist parties in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America to consider the necessity of a United Front of all the Communist parties, Socialists, Left Radicals, Nationalists, Military and Left Catholics.

This Front must include all the countries in struggle against imperialism, on the basis of joint political and social actions - anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist - in the world, and between the Workers States. We invite the Communist parties to appeal for the replacement of the capitalist system, even via elections. We propose that capitalism be changed and that even when electoral means are used, one should foresee that capitalism will unleash the war regardless. Transformation plans must be adopted, of the sort that offer solutions to the capitalist crisis, to unemployment, the adulteration of foodstuffs, the low standard of living, pollution.

We call on all the Left wing groups, Trotskyist and others, to make an anti-capitalist United Front. They must serve that Front by opening a discussion conducive to a feeling of collaboration and support for the changes that must happen in the world Communist parties. These changes are indispensable and they necessitate discussions, analyses and theoretical political conclusions. These groups need to adopt the corresponding internal programmatic political life, based on the necessary texts and on the discussion of ideas, programmes, objectives. They must understand the structure of the world as it is, with 14 Workers States that determine the course of history today. The comrades must consider this in conjunction with capitalist atomic preparations, the crises of capitalism/imperialism and the internal crises in the Communist/Socialist parties. This intervention demands the sort of ideas and human experience that bring solutions to the historic problems of today. We call on the comrades to accomplish this task.

One of the most important events in history, certainly one of the most profound and beautiful, lies in the fact that the world revolution keeps advancing even without a conscious leadership. It does so by suppressing private property, and the capitalist regime and system. The steady rise in the measures that organise and coordinate this march to Socialism determines the course of history. By holding fast to these conclusions one can understand history, and even science. Though they have no Communist or Socialist leadership, new and triumphant revolutions in Ethiopia, Portugal and Algeria adopt the measures and programme that end capitalism and even plan production. Elsewhere, governments lean towards the Revolutionary State in Mexico, Peru, Argentina in part, Ecuador, Panama. There is another dozen or so such countries in Africa, plus Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia - soon Thailand and Burma.

Progress is constant, uninterrupted, eager and vibrant. Such is the norm of the process of history today. Capitalism can no longer dominate or even contain it, and it is on the back-foot even in countries at its core like Japan, France, Germany, Britain. Even in these countries it is impotent, incapable of holding its own, unable to increase its social or electoral support. It is in decadence, whilst the Socialists, Communists, Left wing Catholics and Nationalists gain electoral strength. Such is the norm of history.

There is logic in all this. In countries as backward as Uganda, as much as in countries such as Japan or France, the same directing line of anti-capitalist purpose works away. This can only happen when a norm has become established in history, and when it has found its representation in the consciousness of humanity. 'Norm' is not established because two people have spoken, written, telephoned or sent each other a telegram. 'Norm' exists because it is a criterion which proceeds without any need for words or wires: it works through the experience people make. Today's criterion is that you cannot progress without state control and planning (statification), and this is because

capitalism no longer determines history. It is only a cesspool of crises to such a degree that the only objective answer is revolutionary: Transformation, and Workers State.

When the Communist parties, the Socialists, the Trade Unions do not respond to this situation with statification, with workers control and power, crisis breaks out inside them. Where there is no progress, the masses continue to press on for power anyway. This creates internal divisions, struggles and differentiations between the older omnipotent leaderships and sectors that hammer away at the old omnipotence. This is what is happening now in all these organisations. They are not being toppled or led to destruction but they are caught in a storm provoked by the forces that demand a historic answer. The masses insist on this answer, unleashing the crises.

If the masses were passive, if they were not persistent, there would be no crisis and one would still be jogging along nicely in electoral solemnity. To the extent that the masses keep on fighting for solutions and outcomes, you get crises and fissures everywhere in those parties. It is here that you can see most glaringly, unavoidably - and for them most disconcertingly - that the cause of it all lies in the absence of Marxism. To extricate themselves, the Communists and the Socialists explain away the goings-on by declaring that 'the world is a strange place' and that 'change is needed'. Their response is always partial and never programmatic.

Boumedienne, on the other hand, hears the call of the Algerian masses. He says that the solution is Socialism; he answers them with a series of measures that should be the envy of France and Italy: Party, programme, statifications. He analyses that 'Islam is Islam' and 'Mahomet is interesting but he cannot resolve Algeria's problems'. Let us appreciate this: Boumedienne stands up against all the big bourgeois camarillas that hide - carefully behind Mahomet's back - their large landed interests and alliances with capitalism. He upholds Socialism against them all. Except for domination purposes, Mahomet or God do not bother the French imperialists much. But when Boumedienne accuses them of being in the way of Socialism, the revolutionary process is very deep.

There is an uninterrupted world communication from the most backward countries - as Algeria was - to the most advanced. Take Panama or Peru, where they take steps against imperialist domination: This weakens capitalist structures even if capitalist interests remain. In Africa, Asia and Latin America, progressive economic and social anti-capitalist measures are taken. This exacerbates a crisis in the leaderships of the Communists, Socialists, Radicals and Nationalists, to the extent that all this happens without them. In conditions of total and world-wide revolutionary upheaval, the Communist and the Socialist parties are absent from the vanguard. This provokes enormous crises in these parties: This applies to the USSR too, where 'expert' and 'think-tank' forecasts are all being trashed. Hadn't these experts been in the habit of studying revolutions with the view to defeating them? This is how Basmanov came to be prime eavesdropper and especial informer for the Anti-Trotskyist Department. That was his role. But these things are disastrous for the world Communists because they no longer have control or dominion; they cannot foresee what is going to happen this afternoon and they give no response to what is going to happen tomorrow. And what is going to happen tomorrow? The war, which is the counter revolution!

Therein lay the reasons why they precipitately decided to make this meeting in Cuba,

without any theoretical or political preparation. It was a rush job in the manner of those who open an umbrella full of holes against a sudden downpour. The meeting took place, the rain went on falling, no conclusions were drawn.

DISCUSS THE ROLE OF TROTSKYISM-POSADISM

We call on the comrades of the communist movement, on the Communist and Socialist parties, to consider the role of Trotskyism-Posadism. We feel not the slightest difficulty in asking them to help us economically, for we are not acting as their competitors. We think and believe that the solutions called for by history are a need of Humanity. We are a public good of history. We act, think, analyse and draw conclusions according to this. We thirst to give these movements and mass parties the concrete demonstration of our power to foresee, to give ideas, to make analyses, to pass on the necessary human experience that will help in building the New Leadership that cannot fail to come. Our ideas and our energy are inexhaustible, although we lack in the financial means to give them their full expression. We ask the comrades for their aid, and we have every legitimate right to do so. We are not asking them for protection but aid to serve the objective finality of the development of history. The revolutionary development of history is served when learning to reason, to judge, to analyse experiences, to draw conclusions. It is expressly for this purpose that we make this appeal to the world communist movement. We know that the latter will not do it, but we also know it will not oppose it. Though they ignore us, the echo of our appeal will go on and on.

The Communists are not so much short of capable comrades as of historic objectivity. It is not that they don't study or lack in knowledge or understanding. It is that they have no interest vested in the revolutionary development of history. Their anxiety, their fear of the war, comes less from incapacity to understand what we say, than from their economic and social concepts; the latter screen them off from the objective observation and analysis of reality. Because it goes against them, they choose not to resort to any scientific method of observation. To the extent that their interests drive them towards a conception opposed to history, they view social relations in a manner opposed to the objectives of history.

For example, Stalin did not see that imperialism was preparing for war. Today, the Soviets do and they denounce it. They respond in kind with their own atomic preparations, and this is correct. But in its confrontation with imperialism, the essential force of the Workers State lies in the mobilisation of the masses. The bureaucrats give this no consideration, and this opposes the objectives of history. Because they do not want people to discuss, analyse, understand, judge and reason, the bureaucrats are opposed. This is how, not only they obstruct the immense compass of mass mobilisations, but they lower preparations to the level of a purely military and atomic confrontation.

In spite of their sundry denunciations of imperialism, the bureaucrats curtail the aptitude of the Workers State. They take issue with those who judge and analyse as insufficient the Workers States' atomic preparations. We say that one must prepare the fall of the capitalist system, but they are against and take us for savages! All the more so because we are not humouring their bureaucratic interests bathed, as they are, in

passivity. This is the reason why the Communist parties do not submit reality to the test of the 'class struggle', for all their talk of 'ideology'. In ideological jousts, the Soviet bureaucracy and most Communist parties disparage class conciliation. In the USSR, there are 'experts' who deprecate the idea of 'ideological class conciliation'. They are against 'class concord'. But their articles are living contradictions.

They posit that bourgeois and proletarian ideological interests must be kept separate – 'ideology' being a concept referring to a body of political and ethical thought pertaining to the social historic stance of a class. The Soviet 'experts' oppose assembling or conciliating bourgeois and proletarian thought. They want to keep separate the ways of seeing, observing, and foreseeing. So far, so good, in principle, since there are indeed bourgeois perspectives and proletarian ones: But to mean anything, this must testify to the reality of the class struggle.

Let's look into ideological interests by viewing them logically in the context of the class struggle. Take capitalism: it cannot conciliate or agree on anything important with either the Workers States or the working class. If it did, it would scupper itself - a thing it simply cannot do. It cedes or conciliates somewhat as long as the working class yields to the interests of its system; otherwise, capitalism yields nothing but what the workers impose. Thus the 'ideological interests' are not 'separate' since they impose on each other, by force, what each is seeking; and this is the 'class struggle'. You talk of anything else, and it is not the class struggle: There is no 'détente' for instance, there is the class struggle. Détente is a historical black hole which deceives people about perspectives. It amounts to the disarmament of consciousness, the demobilization of the ability to comprehend and observe. The Communists have the civil war under their noses, as in Chile, but they do not see it.

We call on the comrades to discuss these principles, particularly this point about the separation between what they call bourgeois ideological interests and proletarian ones. They must discuss what happens to this separation in the class struggle. They must return to notion of 'class struggle' and base their reasoning on it. See how capitalism reasons as a class, and abides by its class interests!

In Cuba, the Communists dealt with the events in Chile; they concluded that reaching government can be done via elections, but that one must defend it by the force of arms. The Communists discussed also about various Military and Nationalist movements; they concluded that these can be anti-imperialist and even take correct Socialist positions. This Cuban meeting dealt with other things, and called on the Communist parties to adopt various positions. But these are the positions the Posadists have publicly held for 15 years. All these years ago, the Posadist IV International presented them, developed them theoretically and fought for them. Today, the Posadist IV International criticises the Cuban meeting for not having acknowledged this fact. Posadas analysed the revolutionary process in Chile continuously, in Conferences, Enlarged Meetings of the International Secretariat, Meetings, Cadres Schools, Congresses, as well as in numerous articles.

Additionally, the Posadist IV International foresaw that the success of the revolution in Chile depended on stratifications, on the setting up of Organisms of Popular Power, on attracting the army. It called for the army to be given a role in the economy where the

Trade Unions could influence it. The International posed openly that the battle against the Chilean bourgeoisie and imperialism was a necessity; and to get on with the agrarian reform, which the Left groups supported too. We foresaw and wrote many times, many months before the State Coup, that if the Allende government did not deepen the revolution, if he did not prepare and arm the population, counter-revolution would strike. For having dared to say such a thing, we were properly insulted and vilified in a thousand ways. And now? These are the very conclusions the Communist parties have drawn in Cuba.

Years back, we wrote on the limited role that guerrillas can play in Latin America. We do not entirely discount the role of the guerrilla, but it can only be transitional and as a support back up. You cannot make revolution with guerrillas: Revolution is made with ideas and weapons. It can take guerrilla forms transitionally, but very limitedly. Revolution is made by the population rising up, arms in hand – and that is not a guerrilla.

We wrote about the way Fidel Castro took power and how it was not possible to repeat this experience in Latin America even when the Fidel's movement went on believing it for years. This is why we proposed to the comrades of the Latin American Communist Parties that they should publicise all the texts of Posadist IV International on this matter, showing that this body of thought does not come from today but was formulated years ago.

Amongst the conclusions of this tenth World Congress of the Posadist IV International, we must review the prospects offered by the objective process. We think the process before us leads to confrontations soon, partial or general. If partial, they will soon become generalised. One must expect bourgeois/proletariat confrontations; and bourgeois/Workers States ones too. One must prepare for such events. In expectation, we must seek points of support in the mounting exacerbation of the usual class struggle, encouraged as it is by the existence of the Workers States. The latter have helped influence or organise the 18 actual Revolutionary States, as well as the class struggle in the major capitalist countries. The same goes for the countries going towards Revolutionary States in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Workers States develop in the whole world conditions very favourable to concrete and immediate revolutionary transformations: in Argentina, Peru, Mexico, Brazil, Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela – plus half of Africa, Asia and Europe.

We call for a discussion to organise a world United Front to bring down the capitalist system. A world debate is required, involving the world proletariat and Trade Unions, the Workers Centres, factories, workers parties, Catholics, Nationalists, soldiers, etc, to determine how to replace, or transform, the capitalist system. There is only one way: statifications, production planning and the State Monopoly of Foreign Trade. These measures, in turn, demand the formation of Mass Organisms whereby the population intervenes massively in production, distribution and planning. Mass Organisms straight away, and across countries! They will be particularly essential in spreading literacy where needed. The basis for illiteracy eradication lies in a programme for economic development where the people intervene. The whole population must be brought into play, from the 6 years old to 90 years old. All the means of broadcasting must be enlisted: TV, radio, papers, meetings, conferences, assemblies, and schools - all these

things to serve the purpose! In the Primary and Secondary schools, in Colleges and Higher Education, the students must be involved in syllabus planning, and be allowed to discuss all the problems of society along with maths, science and medicine. From the Primary onwards, teaching must integrate discussions where the young discuss how to develop the economy, society, the world revolution, Socialism.

The essential theme that forms the basis of a scientific method of study in algebra, maths, or medicine, etc, must be Marxism. One must discuss and transmit to all the experiences made on how to progress, showing that countries with stratified economies are those that do progress; indeed, they can pass from nothingness to the development of their economies, their societies, their consciousness and their intelligence.

Intelligence results from the development of social relations. In the near future, the most elevated form of love will be intelligence. Maternal love, like the fraternal, filial or conjugal, sexual life included, are all branches of the same tree of love: what they are now is a consequence of the relations imposed on humanity by the regime of private property. Tomorrow on the other hand - this already happens in part - the most sentient forms of love will bloom at the level intelligence. Love, like intelligence, is a thing that gets built. Intelligence vibrates with comprehension at the various claims of life, unifying them all. Human beings cease to feel - as already happens partly in the Workers States - that they are atomised. In the near future, they will feel entirely part of the immense sweep of humankind.

The development of intelligence will go on and on, always as the most elevated form of love. The feeling of veneration, consequence of capitalist relations, will disappear. But far from disappearing, love will be of an ever finer sort, if only because it will no longer be pared down back to the individual, the personal or the sexual. It will be on a level with human intelligence. This already exists in part today, but in Socialism, what could be called 'the joy of intelligence', 'the beauty of intelligence' will become common, as conclusive qualifiers of human aptitude. Harmony, beauty and intelligence will be intrinsic to the human relation. This is already partly happening in the Workers States where there is no longer the need to think strictly in an individual manner or to accumulate. This already opens people's mind to the quest for improvements in the relation between life and nature. This is limited by bureaucracy and an insufficient development of the Workers States, but it goes on.

Even though the leaders wish to close it, the debate opened in the world communist movement keeps rippling. The Soviets have no interest in a continuing discussion and they want the dams back up. They have no time for a whole series of aspects which they wish to ignore. But if the discussion has its own momentum, it is not necessarily because a Communist himself opened the flood-gates (Ellenstein), but because scientific discussion is necessary for further advance. They respect the development of space science and vehicles; they defer to science and technology even in its culminating form in the economy. But in the political field they contain and limit every political explanation.

Bureaucracy wishes to contain every scientific discussion. But scientific discussion is imposed by the world economy, by science and technology, and by the progress of the Workers States themselves. All these factors find it already intolerable that the Soviet

bureaucracy and the Workers States should hold back, should erect such barriers. As long as there is no leadership and the struggle remains within bureaucratic confrontations, the resulting discussion will stay very limited. This is how such characters as Ota Sik and Solzhenitsyn can appear. This why debate remains minimal even when all the conditions are present for the development of our influence.

The revolution has huge perspectives for irreversible development in thousands of ways. It is led neither by the Communists nor by the Socialists. There is a legitimate space for our own development; as well as a space for collaborating in the task of inspiring and forming a new revolutionary leadership, inside and outside the Workers States. The process of the Political Revolution is woven into that of the world Permanent Revolution. There is a whole process of inner Partial Regeneration and Historic Re-encounter. Even though, of all the aspects, it is not the most important just now, we must seek by every means to have access to it.

This tenth World Congress is a synthesis of the enormous progress accomplished by our International - on a par with that accomplished by the world Socialist revolution, which is also immense. The leaps taken by revolutionary movements towards Socialism are infinitely superior to what has been. This is the case in Africa, Asia and Latin America, where advances are made without either the Workers States or the Communist parties leading them. This makes room for our influence. It offers us points of support to enable us to weigh in the struggle for leadership reconstruction, in all the Workers States.

We ardently desire with all our Communist passion, the unification of China and the USSR. This unification is an inviolable necessity, urgently prescribed by history. The unification China-USSR, the unification of all the Workers States, is vital for the progress of humanity. One of Humanity's essential preoccupations rests here, as well as in its conscious preparation to confront the nuclear war which imperialism is preparing. It is necessary to refuse being in any way limited, stopped or hindered in the preparation for that war. The revolution must keep seeking the maximum political, trade union, legislative and electoral conquests. One must learn when to gain time too, and when to develop and sharpen the struggle; and always how to build points of support and bases in the world balance of forces. This is the way in which to prepare for the final settlement of accounts.

J. POSADAS
20 July 1975