

CENTRALISE ALL FORCES FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

The continued attack by the Thatcher government on employment, on the standard of life of the masses, on all the social services and on trade union organisation is not just a national policy concerned with maintaining the level of profits of capitalism but, essentially, of the preparation for war. This is shown clearly by the fact that the only area of real growth in government expenditure is on arms, by the constant bellicose attacks made on the Soviet Union and the Workers States and by the rapid agreement to site new Yankee nuclear missiles in this country. In fact, the British Tory government has taken a lead in respect of capitalist Europe. It has been the most determined of all the European bourgeoisies. Of course, as part of this, inter-capitalist competition continues to intensify. The crisis in the Common Market over financial contributions and over the agricultural policy shows it. But the weakness in this respect of the Thatcher government, compared with its firmness in supporting NATO and the introduction of the new Yankee missiles into Europe, shows the order of priorities which they have.

Clearly, all this policy comes from the weakness of capitalism and not from its strength. Thatcher, for example, has just been to Washington and expressed support for Yankee imperialism. But, she had nothing to propose in front of the impotence of Yankee imperialism to intervene in Nicaragua, or to do anything about a small country like Iran. The Thatcher government is, in its statements at least, more militantly anti-Soviet than Carter, but it has all the weakness of the capitalist system which has no future in history. The fact that the masses of Iran, without much working class, with few trade unions and all just emerging from a brutal dictatorship, can defy the armed might of Yankee imperialism, expresses, in a vivid way, the reality of a world balance of social forces which is against imperialism and the whole system of private property. And the massive anti-nuclear movement in capitalist Europe and the United States expresses the same thing in another form. The

statement of Kennedy condemning the regime of the Shah in Iran expresses the internal crisis within Yankee imperialism, and the fact that there is a large sector of the population of the United States which opposes the policy of Yankee imperialism. The Thatcher government shows the same weakness and internal divisions. The fact that two secret cabinet papers - on the policy for nuclear energy and proposal for measures against the families of strikers - have been made public in the last weeks, shows this internal crisis. These papers were made public by people who are quite high up in the administration and who are opposed to these policies. They are people who feel no confidence at all in the future of capitalism.

The sacking of Derek Robinson at Leylands has to be seen in this light. It is not just a local thing, concerned with Leylands, but part of an attempt to prevent the development of an anti-capitalist, political leadership. In part, it is concerned with trying to weaken the trade union organisation of the working class, but the prime intention of the Tory government is political. What this team of Thatcher sees very clearly - as representatives of British imperialism - is the natural relationship between the working class, the masses and the Soviet Union and the Workers States. They see that the anti-nuclear movement - which incorporates a wide strata of the population - is against Yankee missiles and not against the Soviet Union. This means that this attack on Robinson, who is a Communist, incorporates an attack on the workers movement and an attack on sectors who are firm on basic class positions and fully in support of the Soviet Union in the process of confrontation between the two social systems: capitalism and the Workers States. Above all, they seek to prevent the Labour left being influenced and the fact that the NEC of the Labour Party had to discuss the sacking of Robinson and take a position of support for him - even if it was in a limited form - shows that the Labour left is influenced

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE WORLD MASSES.

The latest by-election shows how rapidly the electoral support for the Tories has diminished. It means that a large sector of the population can be won to the struggle for social transformations. The proposal of NUPE, for example, for a process of meetings and discussions with the population on a campaign of opposition to the government's cuts in social services, answers in part a necessity. It answers to the necessity for a centralisation of all the forces for social change which are in movement now. The national conference called by the Leyland shop stewards has the same sense. They both seek the organisation of the means for discussion, for the exchange of ideas, for the organisation of the

social and political intelligence of the masses, to supercede the inadequacy of the existing leadership of the workers movement. This can be seen in two instances: One is in the fact that the Leyland workers at Bathgate worked without wages to produce trucks for Cambodia, and the other is the decision of the National Union of Students on a national policy of the occupation of empty property to ease the acute housing shortage. In both cases a simple conclusion has been drawn: it is necessary to match the productive forces and property to the needs of the people. At this moment there is not a political leadership which represents this consciousness, but it exists and is part of the consciousness and con-

Turn to page 4

Workers of the world, unite!

RED FLAG



Monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

297 FRIDAY 4th JANUARY 1980

PRICE 15p

Subscribe to RED FLAG
1 year £2.00
European Marxist Review
Publications
1 year £2.00
Order from
IV International Publications,
24, Cranbourn Street
London W.C.2.
Cheques payable to: -
'IV International Publications'

RESOLUTION OF THE XII WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE POSADIST IV INTERNATIONAL ON THE BOLIVIAN SECTION

2-10-79

J. POSADAS

From 1946 onwards in Bolivia there has been a process of blow and counter blow. But the coups given by the bourgeoisie in its own name and linked with imperialism have not detained the world course of the anti capitalist progress or in Bolivia. The big parties of the bourgeoisie, even those who have to bathe in social democratic water and dry off with the bourgeois towel, even these parties cannot now represent as before the same process, the same perspective. They cannot remain in the bourgeois camp but enter into the camp of the progress of Bolivia. They cannot speak any more, only in the name of the ruling layer, of the bourgeoisie. They have to speak in the name of a wider audience than that of the bourgeoisie.

This is in a process in which our section has intervened and it is not the first time in which it has intervened in this way. In 1946 the party intervened and won two deputies and a senator. They were not very prepared and not very good, but they tried to advance the activity in a reasonable way. Now our party must be preoccupied with drawing the conclusions of this stage which it has lived as a party. The party was not prepared and neither acted as if prepared; it should have made a meeting of the central committee and produced a resolution of the party which is the form of working as a party. The comrades worked with much will and decision, but not as a political leadership; a leadership which based itself on the experience and drew the conclusion with the programme and organised the activity in order to apply conclusions. This has to be done. The comrades have shown that although a small party, they have succeeded in intervening as a great party. When they intervene as a big party and the bourgeoisie allow it - even with manoeuvres - it is because the section represents a necessity. Our comrades are not simply the colour of the wheel, they form part of the spokes of the wheel.

It is necessary to draw the conclusion that this is a very elevated experience of the Bolivian section and the experience is, that being small and not having intervened with all the maturity that is necessary, they have had much echo and acceptance and have shown that they can participate as a party in any electoral activity or in another important activity of the country. But for this, the section has to elevate its experience and function as a leadership.

There is an alteration in the relations between the organisms of the working class and the bourgeoisie in Bolivia; for this reason the bourgeoisie has had to allow elections. In order to maintain its power and not alter that relation the bourgeoisie has constantly launched coups.

The right tried to support a government which was useful to it and showed that it feared to do so. Even Paz Es tensoro is not a guarantee for the right and imperialism. They do not have the security that he would be a direct agent of theirs. Hence Banzar did not support him. Banzar withdrew the original intention of supporting him and remained apart. The right saw that if it supported Paz Es tensoro, his triumph could stimulate a movement in which an agreement of the left could develop afterwards.

At the same time the workers parties did not have much echo and success in the elections. But Quiroga Santa Cruz was successful because 80,000 votes are a great number and furthermore they were to be found in almost all parts of the country. This meant that capitalism could not dominate, organise or lead the country politically. Before it dealt with the situation and made a coup. Why did they not do it now? They could have made a coup and Banzar was there to do it. What has happened is that the balance of world and Latin American forces, is reflected in Bolivia.

The process in Bolivia has not ended with the elections. This indecisive and non representative parliament cannot last very long. The class struggle has still not intensified and there is not a centralised trade union or political leadership. All this has

to be discussed in the section, together with the organisation of the life of the party, the organisation of the life of the leadership. There must be a discussion to draw the conclusions of this process and a programme of activity for now, foreseeing the perspective of new attempts at coups but the failure already of this government. This government has already failed and shows that it cannot intervene to resolve basically any problem and if it does not intervene it's quite lost. It does not have the social force to resolve any important problem. But one cannot expect that it will go on itself, simply from the fact that it has no strength.

Our section must make a programme on how to develop in the workers, miners, peasant, intellectual, student and military movements. But above all how to develop our comrades as leaders, which means to analyse, foreseeing the course of the process, to prepare the policy, the tactic, the appeals, the leaflets, the pamphlets, the political positions to stimulate the workers, the peasant and the university movement and to create a posadist current in this movement of Bolivia. The old Trotskyism has no strength. It can get up and move about but it has no strength. There is still a place for the old Trotskyism, as there is no leadership nor a mass movement led by workers parties.

The fact that Quiroga Santa Cruz isolated in Cochabamba has so much strength, shows a very important tendency which the section must take account of. It is a petit bourgeois tendency but not petit bourgeois in defence of the petit bourgeoisie. It is a petit bourgeois tendency which analyses problems but does not draw the conclusions of problems, does not have a precise orientation.

The Bolivian communist party is small and develops in a game of manoeuvre trying to impede the development of our section and that of Quiroga Santa Cruz. The communists do not seek their own development and expansion as a party, but that our section

Turn to page 2

RESOLUTION . . . ON THE BOLIVIAN SECTION

continued from page 1

does not develop. The Bolivian communist party has a policy of adaptation to every class of agreement.

THE PARTY MUST HAVE A FLEXIBLE CAPACITY OF PERSUASION

The movement of Quiroga Santa Cruz is very weak and reflects all the regional divisions of Bolivia, the lack of a centralised leadership of the bourgeoisie and workers movement. This situation gives rise to a movement like that of Quiroga Santa Cruz which triumphs in one part of the country.

Our section has to make a consistent organisation of the activity in the workers movement, the peasant and student movement. It is necessary to prepare the intervention with a logical, intelligent but very profound programme, not that it is necessary to go to socialism, to nationalise, but intervening with didactic explanations; that it is not only necessary to expropriate, to nationalise, to give houses to the workers, and the peasants, but that it is necessary to explain that Bolivia cannot come out of immense backwardness in which it is buried, without the measures which the party proposes. Without waiting for such measures, the party has to give an intermediate conclusion, an economic conclusion above all, to answer to the needs of people. It does not mean adapting itself to the bourgeois government. The party must make proposals as the trade union movement does, but much more profound and extended, making people participate.

Our section must propose that the universities discuss in the university: how to bring Bolivia out of backwardness, to see that they discuss and our comrades must make proposals. Our programme cannot be applied immediately, but it is necessary to make a didactic, cultural development at the same time as using the political energy, so that the programme is applied to the maximum possible, to make a cultural programme which shows that Bolivia cannot come out from the backwardness with any government which maintains itself at the present level. What are the problems of Bolivia? Foreign trade? That's not true. The essential problem of Bolivia is that people do not have houses, water, drainage, hospitals or transport. These are the problems of Bolivia. If the bourgeoisie says that it is going to resolve problems with the mines with their measures, that's a lie. They have had the mines for many years and no problem has been resolved, because the political and social leadership has seen that the mines serve a small minority of the country, who programme in accordance with their interests. Where does this minority lead the development of the country?

It is necessary to take these discussions as a centre of experience and of the development of the party and to take examples from other countries. For example in Nicaragua, it is necessary to understand the relation of dependence on external forces. The lack of means that make it depend on external support, means that they depend also on external political influence, orientation and pressure. Our section is going to suffer from the same political pressure.

The comrades must consider that it is necessary to elevate the discussion of the workers,

adaptation to every class of agreement.

peasant and miners movement on the need to take Bolivia out of backwardness. This is not simply to nationalise everything and plan. This is the conclusion, but it is necessary to advance now, and there is no water, no drainage, no transport, no light and no hospitals. It is necessary to unite the programme of social transformations with these immediate necessities. Wages are very low, the standard of living is among the poorest in the world: there is a very high mortality rate. At thirty three, the miner looks like someone about a hundred. The conditions of life and the atmosphere are among the worst in the world. It is not possible to write a literature or a novel on these problems. The "Mundo anche y ajeno" about which the Peruvian Ciro Alegria wrote, is not for now; now the world is wide but for us. The comrades must write showing that Bolivia has all the conditions to develop, but that even having them it cannot be made in isolation. Bolivia has to depend on the alliance with Peru, with Chile and other countries. Alone, it cannot come out of backwardness. One cannot propose this now as a conclusion. It is necessary to develop and explain it. But it is not the conclusion for now. It is necessary to make these analyses to develop the understanding and the influence in the intellectual sectors. The outlet to the sea can be won by means of the land. It is not possible to find the outlet to the sea without affirming the land. It is necessary to explain and develop this theme because new tendencies are going to come to try to create diversion with propaganda, saying "we do not have an outlet to the sea. It is for this reason that we are collapsing".

When there is such an activity of the party as important as the elections, it is necessary to draw conclusions to educate the party and learn to lead; what position to take, what experience to make, how to develop a programme of bourgeois democratic alliance with allies which are completely circumstantial but realising that alone it is not possible to advance. The forces do not exist, just to go alone. If the party remains isolated, it has no contact with reality, with the trade union, political and university life. Hence it is necessary to intervene in these movements. There is no possibility that the party can develop an extensive movement alone. It is impossible to do it. Hence it is necessary to intervene in alliance with bourgeois sectors but not with anyone. At the same time the party must not identify itself with these sectors.

It is necessary to acquire the flexibility of the position, of explanation, of the development of the tactic to educate the vanguard, winning people in the education of this policy, in a democratic bourgeois front where we intervene, as a

transitory stage. Meanwhile it is necessary to advance, developing cadres in the workers, peasant and intellectual movement, to understand that this is a transitory stage because the workers movement does not possess its own policy nor its own leadership. On the contrary the comrades must persist in reiterating the condition of the need for a COB united front (Bolivian workers centre) of trade unions, peasants and students, and although it may not be immediately taken up this is an objective more important than the UDP. It was correct to intervene in the UDP because this front was not made. It is necessary to discuss this experience to learn the flexibility of the policy and the tactic to intervene.

In Bolivia matters continue as before. The present government is a government of transition. It does not have its own representation. It lives from the oscillations of the bourgeois parties and has no security. It is not a government which can develop a political programme, of economic nor even commercial development. This government is completely transitory. But one cannot wait for it to fall or that its transitoriness is accentuated,

FUNCTIONING OF THE WORKERS ORGANISATIONS IS SUPERFICIAL

For example what is the conclusion of the mines, the wages and conditions of life? There are points which the section must constantly insist upon to take Bolivia out of backwardness. First it is necessary to take people out of backwardness, as for example the inhuman conditions in which the miners live. This is not going to be resolved now, but the explanations must be of such a nature that the miners can see that they can elevate their life and that they have to change the regime. They are not going to succeed in changing the conditions of life of the miners within the capitalist system, but on the other hand it is possible to raise a discussion to show that the miners can and must change the inhuman condition of work and life, but that for this, it is necessary to change Bolivia. This is the way to take Bolivia out of backwardness. The comrades must discuss all this.

The functioning of the communist and socialist parties and the trade unions are empirical and superficial, because there is no political life. Thus there is still not the level to understand and the movements develop on the basis of leaderships which trail along and give material means to act and show that they have been able to triumph like the Cuban leadership for example. It was soviet support and the world relation of forces which permitted Castro such a triumph plus a leadership which in this moment fulfilled its task with revolutionary capacity and duty. That is to say, there are not the conditions so that — by means of the truth, of the consistent relation and analysis — one can influence but now there are structures of parties which are not moved by the truth but by their truth.

These communist leaders and workers states have to defend themselves from capitalism but also from every consistent revolutionary idea. The same happened with the soviet leadership, but in this case, it is less because the soviet bureaucracy has an apparatus of immense strength and a left within it. The Cubans on the other hand depend on the soviets and in that on a sector which is closer to the right, than the sectors linked to the world process of the revolution.

The comrades of the Bolivian section must feel that the

as if nothing can be done. It is necessary to intervene! The party must begin by an internal discussion, with the conclusions of the electoral activity, to be able to educate the section and our cadres. The present government of Bolivia is totally unstable from every point of view. It is a compromise which cannot last but which can fall tomorrow.

An unquestionable fact is that while in another stage, this situation would have already determined a coup d'etat, this time conditions are such that they cannot make a coup. This is a defeat of the right. It is not the left which has been defeated. The left cannot triumph because it does not have its own position nor forces. There was the UDP or Paz Es tensoro.

It is necessary to discuss in the party and to maintain a more dynamic activity of publications. All the sections of the International have as a base for their development the publications but also to intervene — when there are the conditions as in Bolivia — with all the necessary force not at the cost of the publications but on the basis of them. This is to attract and concentrate the forces in those sectors that the party influences and it is necessary to influence not only towards historic solutions but also the specific, concrete solutions of the process.

experience which they have made of intervening in the elections in the UDP confirms that it cannot remain isolated from a movement which includes the whole country. It is necessary to seek how to intervene so as not to remain isolated and utilised. The form of intervening is such that the masses can see that the party intervenes, that it seeks the means of being in contact with them and to influence the masses and in part, the bourgeois democratic movement which makes a turn to the left. It is not a game, it's a turn to the left because these movements are formed in this way. There is something of a manoeuvre here but they see that capitalism has no future.

The comrades of the Bolivian section must consider that they have made an experience which must be the basis of a later activity. In all the sections of Latin America within a short time, favourable situations are going to appear. In Argentina and Uruguay situations are going to occur — in which we can intervene. In Argentina it is more difficult, because there is a bourgeoisie which is the most conscious in Latin America and it is more structured than the old oligarchy which before through coffee was linked to the world market because it depended on the British world market. Brasil was slower to create a stable economic base. But the Argentinians with cattle raising were strongly based because that was the essential foundation of the economy. Hence it is one of

the most solid Latin American bourgeoisie and a part of them became industrial. There are confrontations and agreements between the oligarchy and the industrial sector because it's the same as with the coffee bosses. Part of them are investors in the banks and afterwards they invest in industry.

One must feel that it is necessary to intervene in these movements of Latin America. But the party has to prepare beforehand to discuss, to see what policy to put forward, what slogans, what tactic in a manner not to be absorbed, not to stop, or wait or be outside nor on one side of the process but to intervene to link up with the masses, with the intellectual vanguard, with the petit bourgeois vanguard which could be attracted through the bourgeois democratic movement, not bourgeois but democratic. These movements do not attract indiscriminately but through the democratic aspect of the movement. Thus it is necessary to intervene, maintaining our physiognomy, so that there is no confusion about our going behind this programme. It is an agreement that people, that the masses know is an agreement, a united front for these points which are in the programme: democratic liberties, development of the economy, trade union liberty etc. Every economic programme must include democratic liberties for the trade union movement, peasant movement, peasant or petit bourgeois organisation. That is, it is not possible to make a movement in which democratic liberties are denied to anyone (less for the bourgeoisie and the oligarchy). Liberty for everyone we agree. Rights for the oligarchy we cannot oppose but if they try anything we will smash them. But in the peasant and trade union movement we discuss and exchange ideas.

It is necessary to learn so as to move in this activity. It is not new. Our party in Argentina acted like this with Peronism. The first clashes with the leadership of the international of that time were over this, when we posed: we critically support Peronism. They said that "Posadas is an agent paid by peronism". After many of them saw our force and supported our position of support to the Peronist movement. Peron took the most advanced measures in Latin America towards the trade union movement. It they were inferior in a general sense to those of Bolivia in programme, politically they were infinitely superior because they were conquests which made Argentina the most important country in Latin America, because it was the centre of the most concentrated industry and proletariat. There was a proletariat of one million eight hundred thousand workers in a country of twenty million which is a great deal. One has to see that when Peron made this policy, it was not anything. It was motivated by the war and thus a national industry was developed. Also the proletariat had to be developed. Thus there was not the opportunity for an independent movement or to educate the vanguard, particularly because the communists supported the Yanks. The communists supported and made a united front with Santamarina and Branden, the Yankee ambassador in Argentina.

The party has to prepare not to make the error of adapting to the bourgeois sector. But it certainly has to make a united front with whoever there is, provided the party afterwards has freedom of

action to continue as a party agitating around the programme, slogans and objectives. In the alliance, the slogans must relate to democratic and trade union rights, rights of the petit bourgeoisie and of the peasantry, within the plane of bourgeois democracy and on occasion as at present, these bourgeois sectors have to consent to such support. This is because there are disputes against the military apparatus: the military apparatus which supports the bourgeois apparatus and manufacturers the votes. For example the defeat of Siles Suazo is a lie.

Siles Suazo in the elections got at least 60—65% of the votes. The rest are votes that were stolen. This is going to be expressed soon enough. They cannot allow a new election because Siles Suazo could win or a new tendency might arise from all this process within the camp of Paz Es tensoro which could seek a new alliance. As there are not structured movements but indecisive ones, tendencies are formed on the way. Before, the equation was Paz Es tensoro — Siles Suazo. Now they are separated. Before the progressive one was Paz Es tensoro and Siles Suazo was on the right of the movement of Paz Estensoro.

All these sectors see nationalism as a movement which they dominated and contained. Then the slogans which they themselves gave, they hoped to use to contain, like Peron although he wanted to advance. Peron himself posed "I understood that one could not stay here and that communism was inevitable but this is the stage of bourgeois democracy". This was not merely a manoeuvre. The bourgeoisie did not understand Peron, hence it threw him out

and from the time that Peron fell there was a terrible economic stagnation. Peron developed the bourgeoisie but at an enormous cost because he spent an immense wealth in stupidities; he bought the Yanks and the British out of a series of enterprises for which there was no need and which were only worth one percent of what he paid. This shows the fear of the bourgeoisie because if Peron moved the masses, expropriation would follow. But this was then to fall in to the hands of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie did not allow it, because it had what it has now: the agricultural oligarchy, the cattle owners who controlled the industrial development of the country. Peron had to resort to the workers for industrial development and at the same time he had to make all the concessions which he did and which were many. Argentina was the first country of Latin America and almost all the world where they established that the section delegates of the factory could see the company books. It was a very important conquest. Besides the workers could meet during working hours in the factory. The boss could not sack the worker but had to call the council of delegates and communicate this to them. These then discussed if this was acceptable or not. All these were concessions which Peron had to make and showed also the maturity of the workers movement because they were directly linked with that.

All this is going to be returned to. It can happen in a similar form or deeper for the stage in which we are living, in Brasil or Ecuador, in Argentina and Bolivia. It can happen in all these countries, it can, but it does not mean that it will.

IT IS NECESSARY TO DEVELOP A BROAD UNITED FRONT

The party must feel that it is necessary to be prepared to intervene in the democratic bourgeois process and to see that it is linked to the maximum to the base: to the students, the intellectuals, the teachers, and trade union leaders. But not to remain submitted to the trade union leaders. It is very important to be linked to the petit bourgeoisie, to the teachers, students, leaders, intellectuals, the ones who afterwards determine the programmatic course of the workers movement.

In the next year the government says that they will call new elections. A coup can come and they may call elections before. But it is necessary to take into account the defeat which this is for the oligarchy which had to accept an election without a coup and not to go back on it. It is a defeat for the oligarchy and thus it is necessary to prepare to intervene in this process, not waiting for the communist party. It is not a question of breaking with them but the party has to make a programme and launch it without waiting for the communists. They want to impede our development and the reasons they want to impede it, is that our party is more resolved, more advanced and more decided than the communist party. This is very limited. Its own base does not respond to them; if they want to advance much, half of them would stay behind. It is not that they do not have confidence, but they do not have the basis for a better policy. On the other hand, the party is influencing the communist base. Thus they want us to give them ideas. Then they want to apply them and leave us on one side. Hence the party must make its own independent activity. If there is an agreement, the latter should be public: it is necessary to make public and programmatic agreements, proposing "we will make an agreement on this basis, on these points". Let the communist and non communist base feel these points of agreement, points that are not made in private. It may be possible to make a discussion of leadership with leadership, but it should be made public.

It is necessary to intervene using all our authority to develop discussions on the need for a more profound programme. It is necessary to have a united front in which workers, students and peasants participate with a programme of changes. If transformations frighten people

then call it changes. One must show that changes are necessary, for example to take Bolivia out of backwardness. It is necessary to say that this is a slogan which responds to an urgent necessity of the situation of the country, of a very backward country which has no reason for such backwardness. This backwardness is not the result of lack of means but comes from the negligence and the incapacity of the ruling class. This incapacity stems from their interest which does not allow them to be concerned with the progress of the country and they have no measures for progress. What they want is to extend their business affairs for competition with the rest of the capitalist system.

There is no doubt that the election was a swindle. Siles Suazo had between 60—65% of the votes. There are plenty of stories about this; in places where there are only 1500 electors there were suddenly two thousand votes in favour of Paz Estensoro; regions which were favourable to the UDP afterwards appeared with a majority for Paz Estensoro and nobody said anything. One does not measure the result by the fact that the election was different in the countryside compared with the town. When the town is characterised by this attitude, it is because it includes the thought of the whole country. The countryside can vary a little, but it is not against the process. In

IT IS NECESSARY TO SATISFY THE NEEDS OF THE POPULATION

Thus for example if they say when the increase in wages is proposed that it cannot be done, it has to be said that it can be done. If the party goes to power or to a popular government in power lowering the income of all the cliques who control the mine, they have to triple the wages of the miners by eliminating the robberies of these people, it is possible to triple the wages of the miners. One must recall the book of the Trotskyist Tristan Maroff written in 1936 which recounts that the miners shifted from the mines, masses of earth which were really minerals. Now perhaps this is not the case, but the robbery goes on,

turn to page 4

The London Conference on Zimbabwe-Rhodesia and the need for the socialist solution

The African revolution may be delayed but it cannot be stopped by the declining forces of imperialism. As with the case of Nicaragua or Iran, the world balance of forces favours the revolution and contains imperialism.

Imperialism has only survived so long in Africa because the Soviet Union and the Communist parties conspicuously failed to develop movements which could consistently develop an anti-capitalist programme — hence the progress of Ethiopia has been achieved empirically through the transformation of the army into a weapon of social progress, or there has been the bloody and quite unnecessary process in Uganda. But such is the progress of the world revolution and the immense growth of the Workers States, that social progress takes hold of movements like that of Nkomo or Mugabe and turns them into instruments of social change, bound to continue an anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggle to advance from nationalist to Socialist objectives. This is why the London conference has given the appearance

*from the start of *deja vu*. Imperialism is faced with a situation which it cannot determine.*

It would have liked to develop a nationalist bourgeois force with which it could deal, but the Muzorewa outfit hardly represents any force at all. In practice there is little African bourgeoisie anywhere with any weight — nothing that can compare with, for example, the Argentinian bourgeoisie in Latin America. Imperialism has kept Africa so poor and so backward that, as a continent, it has to import more and more foodstuffs because the economy is developed in a totally distorted way for the interests only of raw material exploitation. Imperialism now reaps the harvest of its incompetence — lack of social support to interrupt the revolutionary process. Thus, in conditions of extreme backwardness it is possible in present historic circumstances, to advance from tribalism to Socialism. Essentially this is what, in Marxist terms, is referred to as the 'permanent revolution', which is not a hail

of bullets, but leaping historic stages — because the bourgeoisie is too weak to fulfil even the most elementary of its historic tasks. The craven Muzorewa is the image of the African 'bourgeoisie'.

Theoretically, imperialism would like to enveigle the Patriotic Front into all manner of negotiations to emasculate its power, but it has nothing to offer the exploited masses who look to the Patriotic Front. It can only offer submission to itself as a perspective. The original Kissinger initiative was to make Smith give more concessions to admit to the principle of one man, one vote. This, in itself, was a defeat. The fact that imperialism had to enter upon negotiations with the Patriotic Front and admit that previous elections were fraudulent has been another blow to its authority in front of the world.

But the whites are not going to go quietly. Imperialism is not going to give up without a fight. Imperialism tries to de-

velop a series of apparent concessions. Thus it superficially tries to modify 'apartheid' in South Africa and even recognise 'black unions', but it has no means and no interest in transforming the life of the masses in South Africa or Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. The economy of the latter is totally underdeveloped. It amounts to mining and certain agricultural products, but the mass of the population is kept at a low level of life because capitalism has no interest in developing a harmonious economy as a whole.

Despite the reluctance of the Soviet leadership to take creative initiatives to accelerate the process to its maximum, it has been obliged to support all the progress of states, such as Angola and Mozambique, in freeing themselves from capitalism. It is obliged to support the Patriotic Front and will have to do so even more in the future. Imperialism hoped that what they call 'the front line states' would exert a 'restraining influence' on the Patriotic Front, but there is no basis for such a restraint. If the Soviet

the next election the party must intervene by preparing to publish a great deal, to draw conclusions with periodic meetings and a plan of progress. Each militant in his place of work, place of study in the university, in the mines in the factory, in the school in the centre of work must develop the activity and win and develop cadres.

In the mines there is no leadership. There is a rupture. Hence the leadership changes constantly. From the old programme of the COB nothing remains. The old programme which they had in 1947 even with Paz Estensoro has gone. These present leaders are not capable of making a new programme. Our comrades can intervene on the other hand proposing resolutions, accentuating immediately the necessity to improve the conditions of life of the miner and to propose finally the nationalisation of the mines and planning.

The old leaders put this in the first place and there they remained for years and years. It is necessary to propose and immediately, to improve the conditions of life which means better wages, better conditions of work, of health, better drainage, transport, welfare, baths, better food, better houses for the miner with windows, floors, baths, with running water and light. That's a programme, so that the streets of the miners' areas have proper drainage, so they are not where the children are born with malaria. This is a programme united to certain transformations of the mines, of the planning of production or statification of other properties which are still not satisfied. But this is the programme which has to be proposed.

leadership had been adequately prepared, none of the Carrington negotiations would have been necessary but, even so, imperialism — though it may gain a little time — is seen to have come away empty handed with nothing to show but a new confrontation in which it is at the receiving and not the triumphant end. Whatever the particular forms of the process in Zimbabwe, the solution can only be social transformations based on the expropriation of private property. The Conservative government in Britain has tried to build its prestige on the basis of its handling of the negotiations, but the result has shown yet again the social weakness of imperialism and its inability to win any of its objectives — that is, to contain the process of permanent revolution. The left in the Labour Party must base itself on the very favourable world situation and the resultant weakness of the capitalist government here, so as to develop a consistent programme of social transformations. That is the conclusion flowing from the negotiations over Zimbabwe Rhodesia.

RESOLUTION ON THE BOLIVIAN SECTION

continued from page 3

like the sale of oil and gas which is a scandal. This is a business which they have with Argentina. They sell at half the price and all the managing clique benefits from this. Instead of being private property, it's the property of the military clique in control because they determine the price and everything. Thus instead of being profitable, nationalisation result in losses and the profit is taken by these people.

It is necessary to improve the standard of living of the people, to provide statistics making a demonstration of the low level of life of the miners. All know that it is like this, well and how to fight it now? Running water is necessary, drains, baths, streets, not mud tracks but roads with pavements, pathways, houses with windows, floors, roofs and doors. This is the progress of Bolivia to elevate the quality and quantity of the food of the miners.

The party must pose all this, united to nationalisations and statifications. Where the nationalisation is carried out, planning has to be done with the trade union. Trade union democracy has to be extended to the miners zones. At the beginning one must not believe that the miners are going to intervene; with the experience which they have of those who were there, they are not going to intervene, and besides that they are too tired after work, to intervene. To go home and return to a meeting is not going to happen. Thus first of all, it is necessary to agitate so that all intervene as a commission of control of the programme with a commission of application in every mine, in every pit and every trade union. It is necessary to have publications in which the miners write what they want. Together with this it is necessary to intervene in the discussion of all the problems of the mines, of the country so that the miners intervene. It is necessary to pose a plan to overcome illiteracy; if they want quicha, alright, quicha together with Spanish. One must not insist too much on Spanish, that will come by itself. When the miners feel that quicha does not place them in communication with the rest of the country or does it in a slow form, they are going to change to Spanish. They do not learn Spanish because of resistance to the capitalist state, but all understand Spanish; they do not want to speak it nor learn it because of resistance to the state.

This does not mean taking Bolivia out of backwardness, as the bourgeoisie want or the well off petit bourgeoisie, to develop business, new concerns so as then to say "we got out of that" or "I got out of the backwardness". At the same time as posing the need to leave backwardness behind it should be combined with an increase in the efficiency of the mines and better commercial initiatives. Even with the repression of these governments even of Banzer, they had to do business with the soviets. One has to feel this because imperialism does not have any interest or in the blast furnaces. It has an interest in producing raw material as it comes and nothing more. Now they have abandoned the junk that turned out to be valuable silver, copper, lead and rare minerals. They have no interest except in buying what is strictly necessary to them. What they need most is what the Chileans are exporting, which is

copper and it is in Chile that they have most interest. But the mining producing of Bolivia is also indispensable to the country. On the other hand the workers states have an interest and the blast furnaces which were made with the workers states, show that after the blast furnaces, it is necessary to establish factories to produce useful articles not building car factories in which the bourgeoisie and the well heeled petit bourgeoisie are only interested. Instead of a mountain of cars, it is necessary to make factories for houses, for roads, and so that people can have running water everyday. The mountains have enough resources to provide water all the year round.

The party must discuss all this. At the same time as the immediate demands of the workers, peasants, miners, secondary and university students, they should discuss all this. Medicine is very important. We agree. But if the doctors do not concern themselves with the Bolivian people so that they have medicines, it is a very restricted activity and conclusion of medicine. Doctors are used to cure a small layer of the population who can pay but the rest cannot pay. Then the sale of knowledge to kill people develops and the immense majority of the students now do not have this idea of being a doctor. They want to study. They want to be useful. They want to intervene in the construction of life. They feel that life is constructed in this way.

The party must make the programme to take Bolivia out of backwardness, with a programme essentially aimed at the miners, at poor people, at the peasant. It is necessary to propose above all the problem of agriculture, an agrarian programme. It is not true that the altiplano is the image and mirror of Bolivia. It's a lie. Bolivia has hot valleys, all of Cochabamba and Santa Cruz which is a marvellous country and also Pando. These are lands for livestock and for everything; not to no purpose which is the history of the bourgeoisie. The Argentinian bourgeoisie wants to grab this. These are very rich zones for agricultural production and cattle raising.

The party must discuss all this. The bourgeoisie is not interested. It is necessary to give a programme of the elevation of life of the peasant. The first condition is to elevate production and to elevate the life of the peasant and to produce mechanisation in the fields. If the peasants want to continue speaking the original language, let them do it. Spanish is only going to come through logical necessity. One must not impose Spanish on them but let them maintain their language and their tongue. Cultural development brings the logical necessity of a language which communicates with the world. It is not an imposition.

J. POSADAS, 2 October, 1979.

BLUNT: TRAITOR TO WHOM?

The so-called spying of Anthony Blunt was kept quiet by all manner of bourgeois sectors (which appears to include the Queen) because of the social and political blow it would have meant for them all. It would have brought to light the reality that the capitalist system is in total and final social, political and cultural crisis - to say nothing of the economic crisis. Large sectors of the British intelligentsia have been, and still are, won over to the Soviet Union, the Workers State, and abhor capitalism. They saw as plain as daylight that capitalism did not resist fascism in Europe, hoping that it would destroy the Soviet Union. Those who helped the Soviet Union, therefore, have shown their concern for humanity and not loyalty to the murderous establishment. Many Labour MPs have called Anthony Blunt a 'traitor', and the Labour Party has not disagreed with this. However, it is necessary to wonder a 'traitor' to whom?

Many sectors of the bourgeois state, the secret services, high ranking police officers, the Home Office, the judiciary, the monarchy and others, have covered up the 'spying' (so-called) because they felt that it would show to everyone the mortal social agony of their system of private property, and the superiority of the USSR which is even felt by very qualified members of the intelligentsia, interested in art, history and human culture. This is why they kept this 'Blunt affair' quiet. Correspondingly, it is quite a commentary on the actual disintegration of the bourgeois state, their internal feuds, when they can no longer agree amongst themselves to keep this quiet. The Labour Party has to say that the uncovering of this 'spying' - like the struggle between the BBC and Heseltine, for instance - is the result of the disintegration of the bourgeois state, which is the result, not of the struggle in Britain but of the world balance of forces, in which it is the Workers States which decide and not imperialism; and it is the Workers States which influence the masses of the world. This is not simply an economic crisis, it is a social, political, cultural, and an economic crisis of British imperialism. We call on the Labour left to analyse this and conclude that conditions exist for a consistent anti-capitalist struggle by the Labour left and the trade unions.

Many Labour MPs have called Blunt a 'traitor', and the Labour Party has said no different. It is quite relevant to recall, however, that in the period which we are talking about, capitalism in Europe - far from struggling against fascism - sat back and let it take over, in the hope that it would smash the Soviet Union. If, however, Hitler was smashed and fascism with it, who is to take the credit? The Soviet Union, its masses and the historic battle of Stalingrad! The masses of the Soviet Union, in spite of Stalin, took the lead in the struggle at the cost of 20,000,000 dead and more. This is a fact which capitalism has completely forgotten today. If the USSR was an ally of Britain against fascism, why should the passing of information to an ally be considered 'spying'? The fact that

this passing of information was, and still is, considered 'spying' shows beyond any doubt that the rulers of this country were not identified with the struggle against fascism. Everyone knows that European and US capitalism just waited - hoping that the USSR would be smashed. And, supporting themselves on the USSR, the masses of each country, of France and Italy - with no help from their governments (indeed, their governments were either collaborating or fascist) - dealt with the fascists. Millions died out of this monumental treason of capitalism to humanity, which shows the real nature of capitalism, not just capable of some treasonable act. Then, who is the traitor? It is against the interest of the Labour masses that the Labour Party should join the bourgeois rumpus and consider, therefore, perfectly gentlemanly the activity of the British ruling class of condoning fascism. The acceptance of the qualification of 'traitor' against Blunt by Labour leaders can mean nothing more than a loyalty to the social system of capitalism and its neutron bomb. This loyalty could quite correctly be qualified on its own merit as treason to the working class of Britain, Ireland and of the whole world.

SEEK THE MEANS FOR DEMOCRACY OUTSIDE PARLIAMENT

It is necessary to discuss in the Labour Party and the trade unions that there has not been a 'cover-up' as their leaders say. This expression comes from the illusion that the bourgeois state is democratic - except sometimes. This, however, is refuted by all and permanent evidence. To this day, no one has found the killers of Blair Peach, a shop steward's convenor in 'state-owned' industry is sacked without any regard for parliamentary procedure, the most important political and military decisions are taken outside parliament, such as the presence of the SAS in the British army, the commitment to NATO or the nuclear war rehearsals. Where is the democracy in any of this? However, it is necessary to add, too, that the 'solidarity' which there appears to have been between all sectors of the bourgeois state over the so-called 'spying cover-up' is not an accident or a failure of individuals or of democracy. These various sectors of the state apparatus have all in common their respect of, and dependance on, private property; and it is in defence of their own class interest that they kept silent. They show that for all the matters of life and death of the capitalist system, the state functions as a STRUCTURE in defence of private property, which is the normal functioning of a bourgeois state. And it is precisely when such revelations - particularly in the heart of imperialism - take place that you measure the degree of decomposition of the bourgeois state, its mortal agony, and the fact that big social upheavals and revolutions are to come. So, it is necessary to conclude that, however much one may struggle in parliament for the amelioration of the conditions of the working class, which is necessary, the bulk of the struggle for the working class is outside parliament.

This does not mean that the struggle in parliament to make the government abandon projects of repressive laws such as the 'Freedom of Information Act' which Thatcher has had to drop, is not necessary. On the contrary, it is correct to have made her drop it. But one has to do this without illusion that the

system as a whole only needs amelioration from within parliament. An instance is highlighted by the continuing existence of the Official Secrets Acts, under which the two journalists (Agee) were recently fined and victimised for the crime of reporting things as they were. There is no doubt also that, even if this Act were not in force, the state would have found some other way to impede information on what is happening in Northern Ireland, what NATO is preparing, and on the 'nuclear computer incident', which really was a rehearsal for war. It shows, therefore, that not all the efforts of the Labour Party and trade unions have to be spent on the parliamentary struggle and dispute, but that it is necessary to mobilise the working class and masses against the nuclear preparations, against the immense destruction of life which capitalism represents. If the capitalist class has its power in the fact that it owns the means of production, it is the workers, the trade unions and their workers' party that can abolish this power through the expropriation of capitalism, nationalisations, workers control and the functioning of committees of the working class and masses. The parliamentary struggle is good, but only secondary to this. The loyalty shown by Labour leaders to the capitalist system has to be denounced by the left in the Labour Party and the trade unions, and the left has to organise a life of discussions and publications, supporting themselves on all this analysis.

Editorial

continued from page 1

fidence of the masses of the world which is expressed in Iran when they confront Yankee imperialism and make appeals to the masses of Britain and the United States.

These initiatives, together with the steel strike and the other actions which the working class is going to take in the next period, form a basis for the elevation of the trade unions and the Labour left in the formulation of an anti-capitalist programme and policy. In a limited sense, there has been the development of a united front of the Labour Party and trade unions in opposition to the government policy in cutting social services. Now it is essential to extend the process of discussion and the organisation of the means to centralise the various sectors in struggle, like the anti-nuclear movement, on the basis of an understanding that all the problems stem from the inability of the capitalist system, as a system, to develop the economy and society.

30.12.79

Editorial

FOR THE UNITED FRONT OF THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE TRADE UNIONS ON A POLICY OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS AGAINST THE WAR POLICIES OF CAPITALISM!

The confrontation between imperialism and the workers states led by the Soviet Union over the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan has demonstrated how clearly the world structure of history dominates any "national" conflicts. Every event is submitted to the struggle of the two social systems, that of private property and that founded on collectivised property. The soviets had the confidence to intervene in Afghanistan risking world war and then to proceed to liquidate even further their own internal seekers of collaboration with capitalism i.e. Sakharov, because now the world balance of forces has given them the confidence to confront anything imperialism hands out and to be prepared to erase imperialism and capitalism from the map of the world. That is the time of day it is, and the squawks of imperialism are efforts to justify their preparations for war, against the workers states and the masses. The soviets have pre-empted imperialist attacks on Afghanistan and have acted to impel progress there, to eliminate landlordism, illiteracy and to develop a stage towards socialism. Imperialism has only ever intervened to keep Afghanistan poor and backward. It served no useful profit to develop it. This is the image of the world. The Soviet Union represents progress and all the forces of imperialism and capitalism, complete and total backwardness. Capitalism is of no use to humanity and has to be liquidated. As imperialism from its nature means war, the Soviet Union and the masses have to prepare to meet it with all possible means.

ALL THE MAJOR STRIKES FURTHER DISINTEGRATE CAPITALIST SOCIETY

All the usual struggles of the masses against the exploitation of the capitalist system take on a different quality in such a situation. They are closer to the problems of taking power and the needs of a comprehensive programme with which to confront capitalism. The conservative government would like a totally subdued proletariat, so that capitalism could take advantage of the limitations of the workers parties and leaderships in order to repress and to submit the economy purely to war preparations. The new arms drive of the government ideally should be linked to a massive internal repression and the willing subordination of the social democracy to its wishes, as happened in the events leading to world war two. Then capitalism developed an immense campaign over the soviet attack on Finland (poor little Finland of that epoch and ally of nazism) involving the trade unions. Now the British trade unions refuse to break relations with the Soviet Union. Thus capitalism does not have the strength to develop a fascist or patriotic or anti communist sentiment which finds any echo in the masses. The Thatcher government may control the government apparatus and the parliamentary club, but it is working in a national and international context which could not be worse. The steel strike as all other mobilisations of the class are now severe blows at the capacity of a conservative government to achieve its objectives. A population in turbulence is not a favourable context for war preparation or the maintenance of capitalist authority. The defiance of the steel workers in relation to the famous "secondary" picketing is the example of the class going towards its own forms of social organisations which stand in direct contradiction to the norms of capitalist society.

Capitalism cannot now acquire a favourable external environment for its policies. Thus Carrington having been obliged to participate in the downfall of the Smith regime in Rhodesia, has toured the Middle East, India and Pakistan desperately seeking to achieve some anti soviet unity there and all has been a flop because none of these regimes have the means or capacity or confidence to link with the plans of imperialism to confront the Soviet Union and neither can imperialism itself have much confidence in them. Nothing will stop imperialism going ahead with its plans for war, but it is in the worst possible conditions. When Carrington has to say that the trouble with the Soviet Union is that it is subversive, this is their way of saying that of themselves the workers states through their very system and social influence, undermine all the authority of capitalism even though neither the soviet leadership nor the communist and workers parties have taken anything like the full advantage of this.

All the existing leaderships in the workers organisation in Britain feel bypassed in this situation. The process goes beyond all reformist, gradualist perspectives, all the perspectives of using the electoral means to achieve everything to be desired. The government itself does not base itself on any electoralist perspective, whatever its phoney "majority" in parliament. On the other hand neither the unions or the LP breaks its links with the workers states and the process insistently demands a new type of leadership in the workers organisations, not tied to parliamentary perspectives and more geared to a programme which relates to the solution of the needs of the population and not the modification of the capitalist system. The process is slowed down here because of a lack of previous initiative by the Soviet Union and the world communist movement but the fog induced by previous illusions and empiricism will lift as the process takes its inexorable course.

The forces of capitalism in Britain are greatly disintegrated. This is not always visible but it is important to see that the bourgeoisie are profoundly divided. The Thatcher government is not homogeneous. Sectors of the conservative local government structure resist the plans

turn to page 3

Workers of the world, unite!

RED FLAG



Monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

298 Friday February 1, 1980

PRICE 15p

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Order from
IV International Publications,
24, Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

Cheques payable to:—
'IV International Publications'

THE ARTICLES IN "UNITA" ON THE ROLE OF TROTSKY

(title and subtitles by the editorial board)

10-11-79

J. POSADAS

The acknowledgement of Trotsky made by the Italian Communist Party implies that there is a very great internal discussion. This resolution, recognising the historic function of Trotsky means that within the ICP they are discussing very profoundly on what they are going to do. They are opening the way to a theoretical political discussion, to the experiences of history. It does not mean that they are opening a programme to discuss this. But when UNITA (daily newspaper of the Italian Communist Party) publishes a leading article, written by its editor, on this subject it shows that, within the Party, there is a discussion and a profound pressure so that this question is discussed.

This taking of position by the Italian Communist Party shows that it is possible to influence the Communist parties, not expecting that they will be convinced but that the process of history will lead them to conviction. It is not the same in all the Communist parties, nor are they all in the same conditions, but the old mass Communist parties cannot be indifferent, cannot close the gates to the influence of the world process, because they are instruments of history which are based on these necessary principles for the progress of humanity. In order to progress, it is necessary to construct Socialism and to construct Socialism it is necessary to eliminate capitalism. Although one can make changes through the democratic parliamentary road, an experience like that of Iran shows that platonic changes do not exist. There are laconic changes, but the laconic changes of bullets.

This position on Trotsky is not a resolution, the 'taking of a position, or a principle established by a Congress, but it is an influence which is creating bases to establish new principles for the Communist movement. In these conditions, it

is possible to carry out a very great and profound task to influence the Communist parties and to elevate the discussion in the Communist parties.

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of the Communist parties is the lack of an internal life, of programmatic discussion and discussion of experiences. It is not true that in the Communist parties they discuss the experiences which they live. No, there is a resolution which they then have to discuss. Thus, they do not discuss the experience but the resolution which comes from the leadership, and with the support of the leadership. Many times the leadership resolves then upon a correction, because it was mistaken and impedes a discussion of the base. All this procedure impedes the Communist base, the cadres, from discussing openly and without limit — because, in the Party, discussion (although there may be various lines around), the line which is in agreement with the orientation of the leadership and the changes continue in accordance with the orientation of the leadership. They do not have the boldness to take the experiences of history, but they limit the experiences, the capacity of analysis, of conclusions, and the Party remains submitted to the experience or pre-occupation or understanding of the leadership, although the process shows that it is mistaken.

For example, it is not true — as the comrades of the ICP say — that the tactic of the Permanent Revolution is a thing of the past. The Permanent Revolution is not a principle determined by a stage of history, but a permanent principle of the process of social transformations and means that, in particular relations of forces, backward countries can and must pass from their feudal stage directly to Socialist transformations and must develop the process — which corresponds

to the democratic bourgeois stage — under the dictatorship of the proletariat. What has happened in Ethiopia, Cuba, Vietnam, Angola and Mozambique? All these countries, which have adopted this conclusion, have they retreated and created internal conflicts reviving the class struggle; or have they overcome the essential aspects of the class struggle — which is the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie? Part of the class struggle exists through the unequal distribution of each according to his capacity, which creates inevitable divergences and differences in distribution. But history confirms that the theory of the Permanent Revolution is not measured through one or another country, but is a programme determined by the unequal and combined empirical course of the social, economic and revolutionary process of history. This continues to be valid. Vietnam passed from the feudal stage of submission to French imperialism to the construction of Socialism, and posed the resolution of problems which corresponded, in that stage, to bourgeois democracy: to develop the economy, to develop education and culture. All this then develops under the Workers State. It is not obligatory to give the bourgeoisie freedom to intervene. At a certain stage it was not obligatory or necessary. Before, the process was a necessary consequence of history which corresponded to the bourgeoisie which was organised in the economy to make this function. Today the proletariat is organised in society, in politics, and as a consequence, can dominate the economy and society. The Communists do not discuss this.

The Permanent Revolution is not a heroic conclusion of Trotsky. The latter himself said that it was Marx who posed this for the first time in 1851 with the coup of Louis Napoleon. At that time, it was not

turn to page 2

FULL SUPPORT TO THE SOVIET INTERVENTION IN AFGHANISTAN!

THE ARTICLES IN "UNITA" ON THE ROLE OF TROTSKY

continued from page 1

possible to define it as later Trotsky could. When Marx wrote, he was dealing with the first experience, and he posed in the 18 Brumaire the permanent process of the revolution. Then it was a process in which the basis was the development of the Permanent Revolution in the capitalist countries. Capitalism still had to develop. Marx foresaw the process without being able to define it precisely.

The other principle of the Permanent Revolution is that 'Socialism in a single country is not possible', and less so in a backward country as was Czarist Russia. What does the experience of the Soviet Union show? That it is not possible to have Socialism in a single country. The Communists criticise the USSR saying that there is oppression and that people are not allowed to speak or discuss. But, if it is like this, there is no Socialism and thus the USSR is not the demonstration of the possibility of Socialism in a single country. But, many times - when it is politically convenient to them - these same Communist leaders speak of 'Socialism in the USSR'. This is an incongruity that deceives the Communist base. It then appears as if these countries are Socialist. But they show Socialism as a continuation of the system of capitalist oppression, because it oppresses people and does not let them speak (it does not oppress only in the economy, but it can also in thought). Thus Socialism does not exist in a single country. What is missing in the Communist parties is the characterisation of the stage between capitalism and Socialism which is the Workers State. This is the characterisation of Lenin and Trotsky, and it was the term that they gave to the USSR. They did not call it a 'Socialist state', but a 'Workers State'. This remains valid and alive. That is, the conception of Trotsky has not been superceded. It is not a question of the conception of Trotsky, but of the application of Marxism in this stage of history.

COMPLETE SUPPORT FOR THE WORKERS STATE

The other fundamental aspect is the function of the Party. The Party is a fundamental instrument to construct the new society: Socialism. This is because it organises the class, and this organises the country to discuss, to resolve, to debate and to be based on this process in which the capitalist system divides, separates and confronts the population; while the Workers State, through the proletariat, performs the function of educating society in the conception of the new society and to win sectors in this way, including from the bourgeoisie. The aim of Socialism is not to kill all the bourgeoisie. In the revolutionary struggle, if it is necessary to kill, one kills, but what one seeks to do is to try to win all capitalist society, to win it for the progress of humanity. But the class struggle exists, in which it is not possible to pose a programme with the condition that it is possible to win everyone. That would be ab-

surd. The only condition is social, scientific, cultural progress, accompanied by economic progress. When the latter cannot be achieved because the resources do not exist, it is possible to make cultural, scientific and artistic progress as in the Russian Revolution. The Russian Revolution created the most elevated principles of art and culture. Culture is not knowledge, but the application of knowledge to organise intelligence for the benefit of humanity.

The problems which Trotsky posed are still valid, but rest on the basis of the recognition of the unquestionable, unavoidable existence, support and maintenance of the Workers States. These are the instruments of history. Criticisms of the leadership of the Workers States are necessary, but criticism must be submitted to the needs of the defence of the Workers States, not a criticism outside the defence, the world relation of the class struggle, in which the final settlement of accounts is being prepared. In front of the problem of the final settlement of accounts, the Trotskyists divide, and now Trotskyism is not unanimous. From Trotskyism appears a Trotskyist wing, a Pabloist wing and a Mandelist wing. There are many wings, but the bird has only two. Within the bird of the Workers State there are a series of divergences, dissidents, discussions, which have arisen in the first place and essentially over Trotsky. Trotsky made a criticism in defence of the programme of the Socialist revolution, of the development of cadres in the workers movement, and the proletariat as the ruling class, to lead the construction of Socialism not for itself - because, even if it wanted to, it cannot do it for itself. But Stalinism developed a layer of the population which made of the Party an instrument in defence of privileged interests, of the defence of distribution 'to each one according to his capacity'. This is the living experience of the Russian Revolution. The elaboration of Trotsky on all this exists, and is very much alive.

The old Trotskyism annuls all this and puts forward the defence of the dissidents. The dissidents are an expression of the previous process of the degeneration of the Workers State. A series of sectors like Solzenitsyn and Bierman develop interests antagonistic to the Workers States. They do not all have the interest of returning to the capitalist system, but they develop their relation with the Workers State in accordance with individual interests, not with the interests of the historic structure of the Workers State, to eliminate every form of oppression and, as a consequence, every form of necessity. A new layer has been created which has its own interests within the Workers State, but has to defend the Workers State because it makes a usufruct of it, and with capitalism it is not certain that it can or it feels that it cannot do so. A layer of the population has been created which has this interest.

To the extent that the process of

the revolution develops and the elimination of capitalism is delayed, different forms of degeneration are created, such as that of the Chinese which is one of the profoundest degenerations. It is similar to Stalin but with a function which is greater than Stalin in his epoch. This stage is the final settlement of accounts, and it is a question of defending the Workers State against the capitalist system. It is necessary to defend all the Workers States including China, Poland, Yugoslavia and all the others, against the capitalist system. But the Chinese leadership make a policy which tends to encourage and allow capitalism historic time. They do not stimulate the capitalists, because they say that capitalism is doing well, but they let capitalism win historic time, because they do not support any revolutionary or any anti-capitalist movement which may be supported by the Soviets and ally themselves to reactionary and fascist movements like the Shah of Iran or Pinochet in Chile. They give direct support to the oppression of humanity which these fascist movements represent.

This is the result of the bureaucratic perversion through lack of development in time of the leadership, of the political, theoretical and programmatic life. This creates every type of condition and bureaucrat of every level and kind.

The attitude of the Chinese, the last trip of Hua Kuo Feng, stimulates attacks against the Workers States and gives guarantees to the capitalist system that China will not cause difficulties, if capitalism arms to defend itself or attack the Soviet Union. This is not a policy aimed simply to blackmail, but a policy of a nationalist sector with an interest similar to bourgeois nationalism, which has local not world interests. Then, through its local interest, this nationalist sector abandons the principle of Socialism and replaces it by nationalism, although they call it Communism. It is nationalism, in defence of the interests of this layer of the population which cannot return to the capitalist system and has to stay with the structure of the Workers State. But, as it defends interests and has developed caste interests, the interests of a sector - through the weakness of the Workers State, the weakness of the Communist Party and through the previous policy of Stalin, which promoted all these consequences - it is an ally of the capitalist system.

THE PARTY IS AN INSTRUMENT OF HISTORY

Trotsky, in no instance and at no time, promoted the alliance with capitalism against the USSR, but always promoted the unconditional defence of the USSR, right up to his death. In his final declarations and texts he maintained the unconditional defence of the USSR and the confidence and security that the Soviet Union, through its very existence, was going to promote new revolutions - as the programme of the IV International declared in

ARTICLE OF REICHLIN PUBLISHED IN 'UNITA', ORGAN OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

(Reichlin is editor of 'Unita' and member of the CC of the ICP.)

This article was published as an introduction to two articles also published in the same issue of 'Unita', written by Boffa and Spriano (both members of the Central Committee) on Trotsky.

THE CENTENARY OF TROTSKY'S BIRTH ('Unita', 3 November 1979).

'Unita' today dedicates a large part of the third page to the centenary of Trotsky. But, apart from the obvious reason of dealing with a great figure of the workers' movement who belongs to history and cannot be erased - there is something more in our decision. We ask, now that so much time has passed and so many circumstances have changed, if it is enough to entrust to the expert and the historian the task of arranging in a different way the portraits in the 'family album'. This would be to reduce it to a passive operation which runs the risk of avoiding the substance of a great problem which is not only historiographic but political-cultural: political because from there, from that tragic and ferocious struggle, a tendency originated, a grave deformation which has weighed enormously on all the vicissitudes of the workers and Communist movement. From there a conception of history was affirmed and consolidated, with an ideology, an education, an instrument devoted to showing the continuity, the reasons, the myths, the representation which the ruling groups wanted to give of themselves. It is no consolation that the bourgeoisie has made a worse use of history, still more ideological and apologetic.

The damage has been enormous, and it is not so much or only a question of a damage of a moral type. What has darkened the image of Socialism has not only been the silence over this or that crime. This also is true, but that is also above all the polemic of the other side, the alpha and omega of their continuous hammering attacks on 'murderous Communism'. Now, we could conceal this damage, counterpose propaganda with propaganda, and it is very easy to respond to the pharisee by throwing in his face the dead, the hecatombs of capitalism, the destruction of man reduced to a commodity. The facts in this world of communications which we are bombarded with every day the images of hunger and genocide, say enough. But now, on the contrary, it is time to say with total clarity that the error, our 'crime' has been of another order. It seems to me that the most serious and most productive reflection (productive of strength and authority) which we can make today around the forms which the struggle took between Trotskyism and Stalinism is this: that from all this a perverse and manichal logic was hatched by which history was reduced to an ideology, was denied as a sum of real lived experiences, as collective memory; as a consequence, the substance of 'real movement' has been hidden and, with this, the possibilities to know and dominate it have been reduced. So it is a crime against ourselves because, after all, the proletariat has one advantage over the bourgeoisie, which is not accumulated knowledge nor power nor money. It is only that it does not need, differently from the bourgeoisie, to hide the reality of the class struggle and the mechanisms of power. It does not have the need to create a false consciousness. Is not this the great theme of the struggle today in Italy and elsewhere? We must reflect much more on the fact that, in this phase, the

enormous effort of the adversary at times directed towards new generations, is not so much aimed to destroy the organisations of the left, as its collective brain, erasing the historic consciousness, the rational vision of things, memory, and all this is to impede the working class understanding as Mehring observed, that it 'struggles in conditions which have been imposed by historic development, and thus in conditions which cannot be demolished by a leap, but which can be overcome only through understanding in the Hegelian sense of the term, in which to understand means to overcome'.

Hence the petulant invitations aimed at us, to repudiate the past, that we deny the roots of our history are made. It all belongs to us, including those battles which developed in years of 'iron and fire' of the Comintern, and which changed - let no one forget - the face of the world. But we must not forget either that the complexity itself of Communist thought - of its culture - was at particular moments missing and impoverished. Was it inevitable? We have considered this over a time but always with reserve and up to a certain point. Fortunately for us, at the same time with Gramsci, with Togliatti and with the collective activity of the Party, our contribution to the defence and to the enrichment of that culture has not been absent. Indeed, a leadership which was also then quite different from that of Trotsky. It is sufficient to record the sharp polemics of Gramsci from prison, certainly not dictated from Moscow.

It is clear, moreover, that we do not consider completely that the political ideas of Trotsky have an especial current importance. These were fundamentally mistaken, and are, and remain very dated, although we do not underestimate that their analysis can help us to understand the past better. Nor, on the other hand, do we seek new genealogies. This would be stupid, as if to consider history as a warehouse, a great cake from which one cuts a piece, according to the circumstances and the conveniences of the moment. We leave to others operations of this type, similar to those we have been charmed with over the past months. They record the reference of Craxi to Proudhon.

Why then is our attitude different from what it was in the past? In what way has our culture changed, at least from 1956? There will be much to discuss. Here we want to say that it is not only a question of an intellectual conquest. We have sought a greater knowledge of our history (in which also Trotsky has an outstanding place), because we have felt it necessary for our present action: a greater critical knowledge of the past, to resolve the tasks which the future imposes on us. What is important for us is that the new ranks of militants should have a consciousness of all the historic patrimony which is behind them in all its complexity, including the tragedies. Why have I underlined all? Because the famous warning of Rosa Luxemburg remains very valid for us Italian Communists. 'No pre-established scheme is valid once and for ever. No infallible guide shows to the proletariat the road it must follow. Historic experience is its only master. The thorny road of its self emancipation is not only paved with infinite sufferings but also with innumerable errors. The objective of its journey, its emancipation depends on the problem of whether the proletariat is capable of learning from its own mistakes'.

A. REICHLIN

1938, 'Within ten years, millions of Revolutionaries will know how to move heaven and earth'. Trotsky saw that the war was coming, but saw also that the revolution was coming. He was preparing for the revolution, not saying, 'We will be revenged on Stalin', but 'We will prepare ourselves for the revolution'. He posed that the revolution was going to clear away all the difficulties which Stalin represented.

All these are principles established by Trotskyism of before and now. One cannot make the comparison of Trotsky before and now, if one does not make this analysis. Moreover, because the Trotsky of now is the same as the one of 1940 when he was assassinated, nothing has changed. The comrades of the Italian Communist Party now, thirty nine years after, record that Trotsky was right - after having passed through thirtyeight years rejecting and criticising him and posing difficulties. This is not a criticism of the Communist comrades or the Communist parties, but an analysis to show that it is necessary to be based on scientific analysis, not a partisan approach. The Party is an instrument of history, not a piece of property, and it is an instrument to construct Socialism. Then it has to be open to every type of reasoning, to all the experiences which lead to the elevation of the political and theoretical capacity, the experience, the organising capacity for the construction of Socialism. This passes through living experience of anti-capitalist struggle for the discussion over the principles, the tactic, over whether it is correct to have a tactic of electoral expectation or a revolutionary tactic which combines electoral and trade union struggle. All this discussion continues to be relevant.

The element of Trotsky that is not alive is the form of organisational tactic, because now the relation of forces is different. Before, there was only one Workers State and it was necessary to defend it and to prepare to intervene in the war in defence of the Workers States. Today, there are twenty Workers States and it is necessary to defend them and the leadership of the Workers State. It is necessary to defend unconditionally the Workers State. Then the criticism by Posadist Trotskyism is aimed to elevate the function of the Soviet Workers State and the Communist parties which are instruments of history. They are instruments of history because these parties have been formed with the principle of the transformation of society, not of changes of the electoral struggle or parliamentary symbols, but the transformation of society; and because the proletariat of the world has seen that the progress of humanity is achieved in the form of revolution, of transformations by force with the combination of military, trade union and political forces. The proletariat lives and sees this experience.

This article of UNITA proposes at the same time the need for an open struggle against old Trotskyism and of differentiating us from old Trotskyism, which is only old Trotskyism proposed in the criticism of the bureaucracy, in the unconditional defence of the USSR,

to participate, helping the construction of the instrument of history, which is the Party, with the base of the unconditional defence of the Workers State. If the Workers State had fallen, it would have been a historic defeat of humanity which would have led to a return to a feudal state.

Today these conditions do not exist. But the struggle today takes place on other planes: that between China and the USSR. The historic antecedents to the conflict do not lie in the relations between the USSR and China, but in the fact that the Soviet bureaucracy wanted to absorb China. This is the historic antecedent, but now it is no longer like this. Now there are other conditions. Now it is no longer an inter-bureaucratic dispute, but the fact that the bureaucratic development of Stalin and then of Khrushchev has created, together with the antagonistic difference of the Communist movement with the capitalist system, inter-bureaucratic competition within the Workers States.

In the epoch of Mao Tse Tung, the antagonism of Mao with capitalism was complete, but there was also competition with the USSR. The reasons come from the USSR, but they are based on the particular historic conditions of China. China never had a Communist Party that was a mass Party or with a proletarian structure. It was a Party of resolved and audacious comrades, but of landowner and student origin. They came from bourgeois layers and had not made their experience with the proletariat. Thus they developed a conception based on a weak structure and one of national defence against the nationalism of Stalin. All this created bases for the present bureaucracy in China. Hence the trade unions and the workers do not open their mouths. There is not one trade union, even a small one which has brought out a declaration. They fear the intervention of the people.

This phase of history shows that the political revolution was and is necessary, but not in the forms which Trotsky proposed. Now the violent form of the political revolution is not necessary. In China, it is possible that it may be necessary, but as it is combined with the war which imperialism is preparing, the political revolution in China is determined by the confrontation with the capitalist system, a thing which did not exist in the time of Trotsky.

PRINCIPLES HAVE TO BE DISCUSSED

Trotsky, even when he was about to be assassinated, in his last articles proposed the political revolution, but also the unconditional defence of the USSR in respect to imperialism. They are problems which the world Communist movement has not discussed, and does not discuss. It does not have education or principles, theory, nor experiences or tactics. It has no experiences. It lives simply the conclusions of 'we support the USSR', or 'we do not support the USSR'.

For example, it is necessary to discuss the intervention of the Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia. Is it an invasion? According to the usual language of capitalism, it is

an invasion. But invasion tends to oppress, tends to place the invaded country at the service of the invader. In the case of Czechoslovakia, the objective of the USSR would be to make use of the Czechoslovakian economy for its own benefit. Was it like this? No. After 1968 the Czechoslovakian economy has developed, Czechoslovakia has reached much more cultural, technical, scientific and economic development. How then does one measure what is called an invasion? How does one define an intervention as an invasion? If the doctors of the United States are going to cure Brezhnev, is this an invasion? This is different from a military invasion, but it shows that intervention in other countries - whether military or cultural - cannot be defined as an invasion or as oppression, but has to be defined through the objective it pursues.

Cuba intervened in Angola, in Mozambique, and afterwards it did the same in Zaire. In the Spanish civil war everyone intervened. Why was not all this defined as an invasion? Because they left afterwards? No, it was not defined like this, but because it did not clash with bourgeois public opinion. All the reaction of the Communist parties for the Soviet intervention of Czechoslovakia was determined by bourgeois public opinion.

Our objective is to help the Communist parties to elevate the method of interpretation, the dialectical continuity of analysis over the Workers States, over the functioning of the USSR, to improve the social revolutionary relations with the rest of the world, and to extend the capacity of the Workers States and the Communist parties. This is so that these learn to intervene, to know how to understand that the bureaucracy of the Workers States is not a phenomenon inherent in the Workers State, but it is transitory. The defence of the Workers States is not an abstract principle, but a principle which has complications because there is no pure development of the Workers State, but a development accompanied with a bureaucracy which comes from the previous stage which has bureaucratic interests (although inferior to those of the stage of Stalin), which has created a means of bureaucratic interpretation of history. But this, in turn, has to develop itself, taking into account principles of Marxism and, as part of that, the fact that imperialism is going to launch war. Before, for example, they posed that war could be avoided. But now they accept war. But they do not draw the conclusion of that change, that before they rejected this idea and now they accept it. Our International posed for some years that imperialism was preparing the war. Imperialism does not determine the course, nor the stage, but imperialism is preparing the war. This means a form of preparing the Party, understanding the development of the objective course of the process of the class struggle.

Trotsky foresaw all this, and this continues to be valid. The old Trotskyism understood nothing of this. They subjected the bureaucracy and the Communist parties to criticism because, in not understanding and in not preparing for

these events, they also accept passivity and hope that capitalism will not make war, and that they can be accommodated as critics of the Workers State, supporting themselves on the benevolence of the capitalist system.

The dissidents of the Workers States are not a natural consequence of Socialism, but a consequence of the Workers State. This is a stage which is still not Socialist, in which there are relations which are unequal, which are determined by unequal wages, 'to each according to his capacity'. This creates divergences, dissidences, over distribution which are a consequence not of Socialism but of the stage of transition between capitalism and Socialism. It is necessary to discuss this. This allows one to understand the policy of the Chinese leadership and also to understand why Rumania has a policy of agreement and support for the junta of assassins in Chile and the assassins of Israel. The Israelis of Begin and Dayan are assassins. They assassinate the Palestinians, daily, and they provide the world capitalist system with assassins.

It is not a question of saying that 'Socialism with a human face' is necessary, or a Socialism with a

smiling face. Socialism has no necessity for having a 'smiling face' or of being 'more democratic'. Socialism is the elimination of all the essential contradictions of society, of the economy and of the policy. Thus, there is no necessity of 'smiling faces', because it is not the smiling face which determines Socialism but the elimination of the contradictions of production and distribution. When sectors of the Communist parties demand a Socialism with a human face, what they are demanding is not Socialism but a stage of transition. The Communist parties do not discuss this, nor have they discussed the stage of transition between capitalism and Socialism as it exists in the USSR and in China. For example, in front of the problem of the invasion of Vietnam by China, it is necessary to see that these are not problems of Socialism but of the Workers State, of a Workers State which has degenerated. This is not Socialism and Socialism has no responsibility for these problems.

It is necessary to take account of these problems which are the essential ones for the discussion with the Communist parties.

J. POSADAS

10.11.79.

Editorial continued from page 1

of the government to control them. It is inevitable that in a stage of history where the soviets decide and the concentration of economic and military power in capitalism in the hands of small cliques accelerates, many capitalist forces internally decompose or withdraw into passivity. The struggle over police methods shows the internal conflicts of capitalism. The central sectors cannot control or impel the rest. In the event of war, all these capitalist apparatuses including first and foremost the armed forces are going to disintegrate - nothing could be further from the power of nazism.

OUT WITH THE YANKEE MISSILES! CLOSE ALL NUCLEAR BASES!

The objective situation here has posed the slogan of the general strike and this is going to reappear so long as this government continues, because the class struggle is reaching new levels internationally and nationally. But it is of profound importance that the forces of the left in the workers organisations discuss the significance of Afghanistan, because such an event tends to concentrate all the forces in society on one side or the other and as part of this, renders passive those sectors who feel that they can no longer play a role. It marks the beginning of the liquidation of the left groups - even if they continue a vegetable existence for a period - and an enormous pressure in the mass social democratic parties to recompose a new type of left with much greater theoretical clarity on the issues that are central - the prime role of the workers states, the road to the final encounter, the need for a new type of party that responds to the interests of the masses, not to electoral careerism, and a programme which serves the masses, a programme of social transformations. Such a programme must be orientated to show the need for a new type of collectivised economy which is based on serving the immediate needs of the population - as they are doing in far worse conditions in Nicaragua - in housing, education, transport, hospitals, with wages to rise with the cost of living, sliding scale of hours in face of unemployment, and for the planned and centralised economy under workers control with mass popular committees to discuss all the problems of society in the factories and workers areas. All this programme has to be linked with a mass campaign by the unions and the left of the Labour party for workers control over all nuclear installations and the end to the yankee missiles in this country.

Subscribers' Rate to

RED FLAG

£2.00 a year.

obtainable from the Party's address.

Full support for the Soviet Union, its intervention in Afghanistan and a programme of social transformations in Britain

Amid all the confusion and hysteria of imperialism and its allies — and the equivocal reaction of much of the leaderships of the Communist and Socialist parties — it is clear that the intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan is a support for the forces of social progress against a residue of landlords, feudal and tribal elements supported by imperialism. If we are to believe the reports of the bourgeois press that Soviet tanks have been destroyed by these elements, then it indicates that they are well-armed with sophisticated weapons and these only come from one source; imperialism. If yankee imperialism hasn't intervened directly, militarily in Afghanistan it is simply because it doesn't have the social support for such an action. This intervention of the Soviet Union has served to deepen all the division and uncertainties in world capitalism and to stimulate the struggle of the masses for progress. Even Pakistan and Saudi Arabia cannot accept the position of having the armed forces of yankee imperialism in their countries. Above all, yankee imperialism and its allies, despite the most virulent anti-Soviet campaign, have been unable to find any social support whatsoever. They have been unable to stimulate a movement against the Soviet Union. Even in Pakistan there have been no anti-Soviet movements of any importance and certainly nothing to compare with the massive mobilisations in support of Iran and against the yankees which there were a few weeks ago. And in Iran itself there has been no retreat in the struggle, in the mobilisations of the masses against yankee imperialism. In the United States itself not only have there been no mobilisations against the Soviets but the Longshoremen's Union (which has a notoriously repressive leadership) has not been able to maintain the boycott which it called of Soviet shipping.

NATIONAL BOUNDARIES DO NOT DETERMINE HUMAN PROGRESS

This intervention of the Soviets in Afghanistan is, demonstrably, not simply a local event but an aspect of the world confrontation of two social systems. It takes a military form but, in depth, it expresses an advance in the leadership of the Soviet Union which goes beyond the immediate necessity to defend the boundaries of the Soviet Union. In the first place it is a direct support for the progress of the revolution and it meant that this leadership had to confront the possibility that imperialism would launch the war which it is preparing. They had to calculate this and their decision indicates a confidence which stems from the nature of the Workers State itself and the support which the Workers State has among the masses of the world. It is an intervention which shows the process of changes and advance in this leadership to confront the possibility of the war with the assurance that the war means the end of imperialism and capitalism. At the same time, there is still a great limitation in the political intervention of the Soviet Union, in the sense that they do not explain the problem of the Afghanistan Communist Party and why Amin had to be overthrown. Neither have they intervened in an unequivocal way to defend the position that national boundaries do not determine human progress. And this only tends to feed the confusion and limitations which exist in the Communist leadership on a world scale. However, the attitude which they have taken has been one of the confrontation with imperialism and the statement of Brezhnev that the Soviet Union could not allow Afghanistan to become "another Chile" is not the language of "detente", or "peaceful co-existence". It is the language of the class struggle, of the struggle system against system.

It is true, of course, that with a better political preparation, with the elevation of the Afghanistan Communist Party in a previous period, the military intervention might not have had to be quite so massive but none of this detracts from the essential significance of this action. It is part of a world strategy, on the part of the Soviets, aimed at confronting imperialism and supporting the anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist struggle. Not least, it is an intervention directed at Iran, in support of the masses and to stimulate those elements in the present Iranian leadership, in the Khomeini sector also, that are open to advance in this direction.

And, for all the equivocation, there has also been an advance in the Communist parties and the stimulating of discussion. The French Communist Party, for example, expressed itself in full support of the Soviets and, in the Italy Communist Party, there has been a discussion on "justified and non-justified" interventions which indicates a preparation for changes. And these are changes determined by the intervention of the Soviets and the pressure of the workers and the masses at the base of these parties, which support the Soviet Union. The absence of any movement against the Soviet Union is not a negative but a positive thing; a proof that the proletariat and the masses of the world, whatever the confusion and limitations of their leaderships see the Soviet Union and the Workers States as the decisive forces for the progress of humanity.

THE NATURAL ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE WORKING CLASS AND THE SOVIET UNION

The position of the NEC of the Labour Party, of demanding the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan and that the new yankee missiles should not be sited in Europe expresses all the division, crisis and uncertainty of the Labour leadership. It is a position which comes from the total crisis of capitalism and the pressure from the workers and masses at the base. The whole weakness of the Thatcher government in front of the Soviet intervention expresses the same total crisis of the capitalist system. Verbally, they have been very forceful but, in action, they have been unable to do very much. The trip of Carrington to gain support against the Soviets has been a failure, notably in India. But the reality of the process can be judged by the actions and preoccupations of this present government of British imperialism. It should leave no confusion in anyone's mind. They are preoccupied to confront the Soviet Union in a campaign of lies, and slander. In common with yankee imperialism, they show that they are preparing the war. And, at the same time, they are confronting the working class in this country. This is the twin axis of their policies. They recognise the fact that there is a natural alliance between the working class and the Soviet Union. And they recognise that of the two, it is the Soviet Union and the Workers States in general which determine the process of history at this stage.

This means that the process of the anti-capitalist struggle, which is reaching a very acute stage now in this country — the idea of a general strike has become quite common in the workers movement — cannot be separated from the world process. It is not possible to advance the struggle against the policies

Link the anti-nuclear movement with the anti-capitalist struggle

The recent release of information, which the capitalist state had silenced for 24 years, over the crash of a B47 bomber near a secret nuclear bomb site in Lakenheath in 1956, is only a part of the situation which the anti-nuclear movement has uncovered. This movement is supported by sectors of the trade unions and in part, the Labour Party. The recent declarations by the TGWU against the siting of nuclear missiles in Europe and Britain, and their call for control over the installations, shows that there is a profound movement and scope for an anti-nuclear organisation, which fuses itself increasingly to the struggle of the working class. At this moment in particular, it is necessary to unite this struggle with that of the steel workers, Leyland, water workers etc.

The reason why nuclear energy is deadly, is because capitalism produces for profit which it realises through in the national or international market. The increase in safety measures, raises the cost of production, and accordingly, the price of electricity. This increases the cost of finished products and diminishes the ability to realise profit. This is the context in which the anti-nuclear movement has to be seen. Besides, we live in a stage of history of an immense increase in the level of competition between all the capitalists, who have lost their colonies. The colonies are passing over to the stage of revolutionary and workers states and are lost to capitalism both as means of acquisition of raw materials and as

markets. Moreover, the Workers states themselves force capitalism, socially and economically, to elevate its competitiveness and therefore productivity; this leads capitalism to introduce technology at all costs in order to seek to continue its existence. The disregard for human safety, human life and human development is therefore inherent to capitalist interest for whom these things are unessential and an impediment to profit. This leads to the criminal disregard for life, as the Three Mile Island disaster shows. The hiding of information of the B47 crash has the same sense, and shows that capitalism will not stop at any crime to continue its function of accumulation.

ENERGY IS USED BY THE RULING CLASS

We support all actions taken to prevent capitalism from getting nuclear installations when, where and as it wants, because all its enterprises, like the siting of nuclear power stations in Britain due to start immediately, with water-cooling systems such as those which were proved faulty in France recently, are enterprises aimed at aiding the desperate survival of a moribund and criminal system. However, it is necessary to see that energy itself — from the remote times in history through the Greeks up to the discovery of steam and afterwards — has been a means of production to raise the standard of life, and that it is the ruling classes which have sought to use it to maintain their rule in history. History has shown that the ruling classes have used every means in their power to retain their existence and privileges, and had it not been for one means of inflicting death, they would have sought another. This shows that it is not necessary to look for alternative means of energy, such as solar or magnetic, or other sources of energy to resolve the "nuclear" problem. It is necessary to develop these alternatives, but for the development of society and not as a defence against capitalism, because all other means of production but the nuclear ones, be they in digging coal, producing steel, fabricating cars, road transport, all these kill workers and people everyday. Thousands of people die every year in the capitalist countries, in driving cars. Thousands

of steel workers, car workers, miners, and people die of accidents, diseases, lack of safety, pollution, cancer, which show that the problem is not nuclear energy, but production under the capitalist system. But humanity has demonstrated that it is its own intelligence which has put the discoveries at the service of the progress of life, and has overthrown all the ruling castes and classes in spite of all the might of the weapons which they have had because they had power and means. So, it is clear that it is not nuclear energy in itself which has to be attacked in the case of the opposition to everything "nuclear", but the capitalist class which is putting it at the service of the defense of accumulation, to compete amongst themselves and particularly with the workers states, in the present stage when the capitalist system is preparing nuclear war against the workers states and humanity. This is why all this discussion has to conclude to say: down with the capitalist system, for energy to be put at the service of human progress, and not of death. So, it is not energy that is the problem, but the social system. We appeal for all existing nuclear installations and all plans for future installations to be put under workers and population control. New installations should not be built unless they are going to be under workers control, particularly considering that these installations will be converted into war installations.

NUCLEAR ENERGY IS USED FOR PROGRESS IN THE WORKERS STATES

In the Workers States, they have eliminated precisely what is murderous in private property, which is the system based on profit, investment, competition, re-

investment and concentration of capital. So, the Workers States care for life. In Moscow, the people see that there is plenty of green space per inhabitant, that rents are very cheap,

of the Thatcher government internally and to ignore the policy which it has against the Soviet Union. They are directly related. On the other hand support for the Soviet Union means support for the transformation of the economy and society, for nationalisations and a planned economy. Therefore, the necessity is for discussions, meetings in the factories and workers areas, in the universities for a programme of social transformations in this country together with full support to the Soviet Union and its intervention in support of the masses of Afghanistan and the progress of humanity.

SHORTLY TO BE PUBLISHED THE TEXT BY COMRADE POSADAS:— AFGHANISTAN, IMPERIALISM, THE USSR, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM 31.12.79

that transport is almost free, and all necessities are cheap and there is no inflation or unemployment. There are no ecology groups in the Workers States because the priority of life is not capital accumulation, but life itself. It is not true that there are nuclear disasters and that the bureaucracy hides them. When there are accidents, it is because of lack of means, lack of knowledge, and this is easily rectified. There are no ecology groups because there is no need for them. There is no incentive to murder people and in the USSR science and technology are used to improve life, to make experiments to give birth without pain, to elevate the relations between human beings and between them and nature and the cosmos. Nuclear energy is used on a vast scale in the USSR to cut the ice in the North Pole. There are radiological centres all over the Soviet Union — extending into Poland — using linear electron accelerators to cure all sorts of diseases, particularly malignant tumours. There are nuclear plants for electricity production, which allow the lowering of the cost of production in all the Workers States which only a few years ago, were as poor as stables. But it is yankee imperialism which used the 'orange' defoliant in Vietnam which provokes genetic catastrophes. This defoliant was produced in Seveso, and leaked into the atmosphere, killing many and maiming thousands, with untold consequences for future generations. All capitalism can do is deny that this is true, or say that it is a fatality of production and life, or give compensation money.

Capitalism has no interest in other things but profit. It also has to compete with the system of the Workers States which is increasingly competitive and which demonstrates to humanity that it is not impossible to produce for need. This forces capitalism to pay for unemployment pay, otherwise, workers would form or join massively, movements united to the Workers States. So, in its social and economic antagonistic competition with the Workers States, capitalism introduces automation as the only means of maintaining the productivity it needs to continue competing. However, it does this at an ever increasing pace, and with deepening disregard for safety and preservation of life, because all these demand precautions which raise production costs. Capitalism sees the development of humanity as an enemy to itself. So, the point has been reached when it does not seek to resolve the problems, but only to survive and this leads it to think in terms of destruction of the unemployed rather than giving them a job. This is the total and agonised crisis of capitalism.

It is necessary to oppose nuclear energy in capitalism, and to discuss that it is being used for competition and profit, and also for war purposes. The Ecology movement, anti-nuclear, anti-atomic war movements must make a United Front and unite the anti-nuclear slogans with the campaign against the siting of nuclear missiles in Europe. A greater link with the other movements in the rest of Europe has to be developed but fundamentally a greater link with the workers movement, the trade unions, the Labour Party where the attractive force will be not so much opposition to energy than to capitalism. Full support must be sought in the TGWU which has a very good position on these problems, and calls made in all industries for workers control of production and safety. There must be full support for the steel workers and all struggles now developing towards a general anti-capitalist mobilisation. This is the way the movement will extend and develop, and finds its real expression in the anti-capitalist struggle.

Editorial

PREPARE THE GENERAL STRIKE WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTI-CAPITALIST IDEAS AND PROGRAMME.

The call by the TUC of Wales for a General Strike against the policy of the government, the rejection by the Labour Party of the boycott of the Olympics which yankee imperialism proposes, and the call by the workers of Llanwern and Port Talbot to continue the steel strike beyond the question of wages increases, indicate that all the conditions for a massive confrontation with the government exist. Indeed the steel strike would have been settled by now if the steel workers did not feel a confidence which can only come from such conditions. However, even if there are similarities between the present situation and the events of 1972/74 which led to the overthrow of the Heath government, they are only superficial. The events of that period are not being re-run like an old film. The present development of the struggle - which is certainly directly against the Tory government - takes place in an altogether different, and more advanced, world context. Since the 1972/74 period we have seen the triumph of the revolution in Iran, in Nicaragua and the defeat of the regime of Pol Pot in Kampuchea. Above all we have seen the advance in the intervention of the Soviet Union and the Workers States - Cuba and Vietnam in particular - in support of the struggle for progress of the masses on a world scale.

The speech of Suslov at the congress of the Polish Communist Party in the last days, shows that the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is not simply to defend the borders of the Soviet Union - although this is correct in itself - but to confront imperialism and to support - and find a support in - the struggle of humanity for progress in all the diverse forms it takes. When Suslov says that the crisis is not of humanity but of the system of private property it expresses a confidence which comes from the Workers State itself, from the nationalised planned economy and the elevated human relations which this engenders. It is also an orientation not simply to the Polish Communists but to the world Communist movement, also, that the problem which faces humanity is precisely the system of private property. At the same time, he implied that the problems which the Polish Workers State has, stem from the existence of elements of private property within the State and from the relation which it has with the world capitalist economy. And he went on to say that the solution lies in the greater integration of Poland with the system of the Workers States, and in the development of the unity and common planning of that system. This speech shows that not only is this Soviet leadership taking the initiative to confront the war plans of imperialism, but that it is elevating the role of the Soviet Union as a world centre and leadership in the realm of political theory, of marxism, in a partial form, and ideas. This process is not without problems which comes from the previous structure and thinking of the bureaucracy but it is not this which determines today.

And the result is already obvious on a world scale, not least in the positions taken by Marchais and the French Communist Party. The stand which they have taken in support of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and in Marchais analyses that this is a revolutionary stage of history, matches the objective reality of the natural alliance between the Soviet Union and the Workers States, and the working class and masses of the world. The proof of this is that whilst Mitterrand of the French Socialist Party has tended to support the equivocal position of the French bourgeoisie which manoeuvres between the Soviet Union and yankee imperialism - calling for a 'neutral Afghanistan' - the base of the Socialist Party is attracted towards the Communists. This is the significance of the electoral victory of the Communists in the regional elections in Picardy where a Communist has been elected as president of the regional council with the support of the Socialist vote. It is the same process as in Portugal where the Communist Party - one of the closest to the Soviet Union - has trebled its vote in a few years whilst the Socialist Party of Soares has lost votes.

In the same way, the public rejection by the Labour Party of the proposed boycott of the Olympic games in Moscow means that the Labour leadership feels that in front of the Labour masses it cannot attack the Soviet Union. The same is true of the fact that the trade union leadership has not broken its links with the Soviet Union. In previous stages of history both these leaderships would - and did - support the bourgeoisie against the 'outside' enemy. But they see the climate expressed in a poll taken by a London evening newspaper which concluded that the majority of people interviewed would 'not fight for this country'. And it was not a poll taken in working class districts. It is true that the Labour and trade union leaderships think and function within the confines of a 'national' perspective and within the confines of trying to reform the system of capitalism. But the working class and the mass of the population see beyond this - the reality of a world process, which is one of the crises of capitalism and the advance of humanity.

It is in this world context that Slater (of the National Union of Seamen) is reported to have said in a meeting of the TUC that the TUC should call a general strike before it is overwhelmed by the actions of the rank and file. Clearly the conditions are preparing for a general strike but the working class and its vanguard are aware that the existing leaderships are not prepared for this stage of history. The workers of Llanwern and Port Talbot want to continue their strike action on the basis of a perspective for the solution of the problems of the economy, of unemployment, of their standard of life. The idea which is being proposed by the trade union leadership - and which finds a

turn to page 3

Posadist Declaration Supporting The Soviet Intervention in Afghanistan (Bolivia)

Comrade Carlos Flores, Member of Parliament of the Revolutionary Workers Party (Trotskyist Posadist), Bolivian section of the IV International (Posadist) has made a declaration of support for the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, in the Bolivian parliament. This activity forms part of the world campaign of the International for this objective.

The comrade showed that the Soviet intervention forms part of the reply to the preparations of war by Yankee imperialism and means an impulse to the social and economic progress of Afghanistan. The declaration received the assent of many parliamentarians of the left.

Workers of the world, unite!

RED FLAG



Monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

299 Friday March 7 1980

Subscribe to RED FLAG
1 year £3.00
European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.50

Order from
IV International Publications,
24, Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

Cheques payable to:-
'IV International Publications'

PRICE 15p

CONFERENCE ON THE WORLD PROCESS OF THE DEEPENING CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

23-12-79

J. POSADAS

SUB TITLES: EDITORIAL BOARD

This text is in two parts. The second part will be published in next Red Flag.

Part 1.

CONFERENCE FOR THE BRITISH SECTION.

Within the crisis of the capitalist countries and that of the Workers States and the Communist parties there is an antagonistic difference. The crisis of the capitalist countries is one of disintegration; the crisis in the Communist parties and the Workers States is one of re-organisation, rectification and progress. This is a process. It is not a stage to be reached, but a stage which we have already reached.

One of the fundamental aspects which shows the world crisis of the capitalist system, the deepening of the weakness of the capitalist system, is the lack of historic and concrete social strength to resolve problems in its favour. On the contrary, the capitalist system is hounded universally and daily, so that history gives it no movement of support. The capitalist system has no economic, social or political answer to contain the world revolutionary process. It only has war, and military means. But, even with military means which it employed before to contain revolutions or processes of opposition to imperialism without being revolution, it has now to admit, accept and receive the blows which the progress of the revolutionary process gives to it throughout the world in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe.

The recent elections in Portugal was first presented by Portuguese capitalism as a great victory of the right. We wrote an analysis showing that it was not a victory of the right; the latter who won the parliamentary majority did so in association with a Social Democrat tendency in which half was not in agreement with a government of the right and, besides, there is the triumph of the Portuguese Communist Party who got almost 20% of the votes - which is a progress in three years of 8%. Such progress of the Communist Party is the most important aspect and expresses the progress of the class struggle in Portugal.

The elections in Portugal - as in any part of the world, but in this precise condition of Portugal and of the world - have to be measured by the effects which they produce on the most representative sectors of the policy, the programme and the objectives of the revolutionary progress of Portugal, which is the Communist Party. This is the Communist Party which, in comparison with other Communist parties of the world, is more to the left. The Portuguese Communist Party has gone from 8 to 20% of the votes in no more than three years. That is how to measure the election in Portugal. This result indicates that the vanguard, that the middle sectors are attracted by the Communist Party and that they are going to influence the rest of the population. The right, on the other hand, has had to ally itself with a sector in which there are layers of the centre left (the Social Democracy) who are going to be influenced by the course of the class struggle in Portugal and the world. The policy of Soares (leader of the Portuguese Socialist Party) was not very different from the Social Democrats. But the policy of the Communists was antagonistic to that and people voted for the Communists. The Communists won sectors who were the 'pride' of the right and gained in bourgeois centres. That is to say, this is the process of revolutionary elevation in Portugal, not the military revolutionary process but the political process, led by a Party with a programme. The Portuguese soldiers do not have a programme, but the Communist Party has. The bourgeoisie now does not say more 'the right triumphs in Portugal', but speaks of an indecisive situation.

The world process expresses an aspect in Portugal which is fundamental, but is expressed also in Italy and in the Italian Communist Party, in the Labour Party in Britain, in the Social Democracy in Germany, and in France also. There is no a uniform or similar development, for the political crisis of capitalism and that of the Socialists, but the base of everything is a process of crisis where they have to go on maintaining themselves with daily changes, with clashes, with an unstable policy full of internal crises, of of accusations of being thieves as

in the case of Giscard d'Estaing, or like the nephew of Churchill who is a common degenerate and thief, or like the families of the big German bourgeoisie, as with the daughter of Opels accused of drug smuggling. Everywhere the decomposition of the capitalist apparatus is expressed and, at the same time, not all the consequences of capitalist impotence through political or social incapacity or internal differences. When this happens, it is because now they do not have the authority or the strength for electoral attraction, that is to say, there is a situation of crisis in capitalism and conditions of change and the progress of the left. This is an aspect of the crisis of capitalism which is expressed in France, in Britain, in Germany, in Portugal, in Italy, and also in North America.

Kennedy, in his electoral campaign, accused Carter of being a protector of an assassin, referring to the Shah. It is an electoral argument, but what an argument! They are accusations which show the weakness, the putrefaction of the regime, and for an electoral campaign they have to resort to this. When it reaches such a level, in an electoral campaign, it is because the issue in dispute is not the electoral campaign only, but the perspectives for later on which are the relations with the Workers States and the Soviet Union, in particular.

The crisis of capitalism has two forms: the normal economic and social crisis which is the struggle of the workers' parties, of the trade unions, against unemployment and for subsidies which costs capitalism a great deal of money; the other aspect is the relation with the Workers States, with the struggles of the masses of the world, with the necessary progress of the whole world, which is expressed in the form of political and social struggles, revolutionary struggle, political struggle in Italy, the social struggles throughout the world, and revolutionary struggle in Latin America, in Africa and in Asia. When capitalism reaches the level of Kennedy, of accusing the government of being a protector of assassins, it is because it is aimed at a very important layer of the petit bourgeoisie and of the

turn to page 2

THE DEEPENING CRISIS OF CAPITALISM.....

continued from page 1

workers. It is not an accusation made in the air so that it will develop, but it is aimed precisely at a state of opinion which is against Carter. At the same time, the criticism of Kennedy is accompanied by very important mobilisations. Jane Fonda has a demonstration of two hundred thousand people in Washington. In New York there was a demonstration of Iranians, in which North Americans participated - the majority - demanding that they throw out the Shah and that the Yanks allow the Iranian revolution to advance. The demonstrators accused Carter of being a protector of the assassins of people.

Everyone knows the declaration by the mother of Carter who said that if she had a million dollars she would pay to kill Khomeini. The mother of the president of the United States as organiser of assassins! The masses of the world and of the United States see this.

THE AMERICAN MASSES REJECT THE POLICIES OF CARTER.

This process indicates the weakness of Yankee imperialism. It has an immense quantity of atomic arms. Half of the Yankee budget is for war, not ten per cent, as they say. It has an immense military and economic power but, at the same time, does not have the capacity or the strength to impose itself. They are resisted even in El Salvador. Nicaragua is a small country but it threw out the Yanks, that is the world relation of forces. This world relation of forces develops in a regular, constant and rapid form. It does not develop in an isolated circumstantial event, because it unites a series of social and economic, political or military conditions; but develops in a normal way in any part of the world: in Africa, in Asia or Latin America. More particularly, it has importance in Latin America, because the latter is very close to the Yanks, because it was a centre of the unquestionable domination of the Yanks, and now these peoples who have nothing make an insurrection. Neither Nicaragua nor El Salvador have any material resources, and they have defeated the governments representative of the Yanks, and these have not been able to intervene. Why have they not intervened? Before they did so, Now they do not intervene - through the world relation of forces, because the latter means that the Soviets are going to intervene, that the masses of the world are against them and also the North American masses.

In the United States there is no expression of the masses, no votes, no demonstrations and no meetings. But it has been shown that the masses are against present policies in that the Yanks have not made a single demonstration in support of the government for having protected the Shah. If the government of the United States had authority, and its policy was necessary, it would make a demonstration or fabricate one. It could do it now. This is not done though, because it fears the repercussion of opposition - that is, that such a demonstration would promote demonstrations against the Shah and against Carter.

Hence Yankee imperialism does not make demonstrations. It fears that this might be a centre of poli-

tical animation which would impel the North American masses, beginning with the petit bourgeoisie, the university sectors, the officials and government employees to intervene more constantly in an anti-capitalist policy. The North American masses are being educated with the revolutionary activity of the masses of the world. It is not true that the North American masses are impassive or indifferent. This is a lie. If the North American masses were indifferent or impassive or without interest, the Yanks would already have made demonstrations some time ago. When they do not make them - though they have the money to do so, to pay people, just as they have the money to go and kill in Asia, Africa, Iran and in Latin America - it is because they fear the political and social consequences if demonstrations are made. The consequences would be that real demonstrations would go against them, that the political life of the masses would be stimulated - which stimulates the political organisational preoccupation of the masses to intervene. Hence capitalism does not call demonstrations. If imperialism could make them and afterwards the masses would not move it would do so, as it has the money. But it does not, we reiterate, because it fears the organisational political influences which would afterwards stimulate the masses to action, demanding better conditions of work, more freedom, better treatment, against the brutality of the police, against the assassin behaviour of the bosses, and for the defence of the peoples of the world. Capitalism fears the solidarity of action of the North American masses with the masses of the world. Hence the Yanks do not call any movement in defence of the Carter government for having protected an assassin.

Another aspect of the crisis of Yankee imperialism is the development of the revolution, of the popular uprisings throughout the world against capitalism which, naturally, seek the alliance, the relation, the organisation with the Workers States and the Communist parties. A simple example that it is not possible to deceive history - although there may be leaders who believe that they have the ability to do so - is the visit of the Social Democrats to Nicaragua, among them Soares of the Portuguese Socialist Party. They believed that they were going to Nicaragua to stop the revolution of Nicaragua. They went as representatives of great countries, like capitalist Germany which has much money, and the children of Nicaragua said to Willy Brandt: 'You have much money? But you have no ideas. We want ideas, not money'. The Social Democrats went to Nicaragua to stop the revolution, and the revolution did not stop. They hoped to do the same in El Salvador. They gave advice and orientations, but the objective necessity of the progress of this people needs anti-capitalist advice and anti-capitalist revolutionary orientations. The Social Democrats went to give advice and recommendations of adaptation to the capitalist system.

The attitude of the masses of the world is guided in a constant, increasing and advancing form by the influence, the experience, the support and the aid of the Workers States and of the Communist and Socialist masses (not of the Socialist leaderships which in the

majority are allied to capitalism and fear to go beyond the capitalist system). The masses of the world see the Workers States, support them and see them intervene openly. Without declaring it, the masses understand for example that Nicaragua has made a revolution without material resources and that the capitalist governments of Latin America could have intervened - among them the Argentinian and Brazilian governments which are the strongest. Why did not they intervene? If they intervened they would have translated the crisis into Argentina and Brazil, because they would have a repercussion on the masses, on the petit bourgeoisie and, in part, on the Latin American bourgeoisie who see and feel that imperialist North America, British or French capitalism, is not a guarantee for them. They see that the support which these powers give goes to small capitalist circles, and also against sectors of themselves. The Latin American bourgeoisie sees that Pinochet in Chile made a dictatorship, assassinates workers, but also ruins the economy. Chile is paralysed.

The medium Latin American bourgeoisie sees that it has weight in the economy, in the industrial and commercial sector, and partly agrarian-cattle raising sectors, and sees that all the dictatorships have ended by strengthening small circles of the big property owners and big landowners, in enriching the great trading firms, the importers and the small nuclei of financial investors, of the banks with their infinity of branches and led by a great centre which is the great world bank. At the same time, they see that the country does not develop. These small sectors do, but the others do not. It is a repetition of fascism. It is not the same, because imperialism does not have the strength nor the capacity to make fascism, but it produces the same effect as fascism - a small capitalist sector extends itself and the rest get nothing. Chile is maintained economically, not through the economy in the sense of production and trade, but because it produces copper which is an indispensable mineral in the world market, and nothing more. This is the economy of Chile.

WORLD CAPITALISM IS TOTALLY UNSTABLE.

The crisis of capitalism increases and, more and more, capitalist power is unstable in Latin America, in Africa, Asia and in part of Europe. The capitalist system does not affirm its stability. Its instability increases. This is expressed economically and represented socially and politically. Economically it is expressed in the fact that capitalism has to maintain a process of unemployment, to subsidise it through out the world. Subsidy is part of costs, which means cost of production. Thus subsidising unemployment puts up the cost of production throughout the system. Although this is not increased drastically, it limits the profit of capitalist system, because capitalism has to pay part to the state to subsidise the unemployed. This diminishes the economic power of the market, at the same time. Thus the process of capitalist reproduction is slowed down, contained and, at times, rejected because unemployment becomes an economic weight acting against the capitalist system. Moreover, the latter cannot

Copper is 70% of the Chilean economy. Chile does not maintain itself. There is constant unemployment. The lands were returned to the proprietors. They were compensated, but production is stagnant and consumption is constantly lowered. The bourgeoisie see this, and that all the regimes of a fascist-type are not a base for the development of the economy but, on the contrary, are a base to enrich and strengthen small numbers at the cost of the rest, and that includes themselves. Thus the bourgeoisie seeks intermediate solutions and, while it seeks them, it is a weight against the top capitalist sector.

The capitalist sectors support, first of all, the dictatorships hoping that the liquidation of the workers' movement, of the Communist and Socialist parties and the trade unions will bring tranquillity. It brings them social tranquillity, class tranquillity, but not social economic tranquillity. On the contrary, they are liquidated. Hence afterwards bourgeois sectors resist and it appears in the daily newspapers - and the Communist parties for a long time believed, and still believes - that they are repentant and accept democracy. It is rather that they see things are all going badly and they have no other solution than to make democracy, because they want to participate in the running of the economy. This is the crisis of the Latin American bourgeoisie, and it is increasing in a very acute form. It increases in the bourgeoisie of Argentina, of Brazil, of Uruguay, of Chile and, in that country, there is a very great crisis for any day they may kill Pinochet. It is Yankee imperialism which impedes the changes in Chile. Now it appears that Yankee imperialism is condemning the assassins of Letelier. This is pure theatre. It is imperialism which is supporting Pinochet; without that he would fall.

Imperialism needs Pinochet economically for copper. Copper is fundamental for production and, if there are other countries which produce copper, nonetheless the world copper market is very restricted. Copper is indispensable for the production of armaments, above all.

utilise the unemployed as a social and political element against the Communist masses and the trade unions. Capitalism has to accept such a situation.

Capitalism has economic weapons, powerful military weapons, economic strength and a great concentration of capital. The reproduction of capital is much more rapid than last week, and today will be slower than tomorrow; that is, the reproduction of capital is more and more continuous. This occurs also through the productivity of labour, which allows a rapid turnover of production and sale which means profit for capital. But, at the same time, this process of the reproduction of capital does not find the necessary means to expand production and investment. Before it did so in the colonies, and now in what colony is it going to do this? Thus the development of capitalism is fettered and limited. In turn, capitalism cannot take the line of imposing on the masses of the world acceptance of unemployment and arranging things as they

can, because then it would have to launch the war in any circumstances, at any moment, and it cannot. It has to subsidise.

The single fact that there is a subsidy of unemployment indicates the power of the Workers States which exert an influence so that capitalism has to allow this. It is not because the Workers States say to the capitalists, 'Do this'. The existence of the Workers States says to the masses, 'They have to pay, look at the Soviet Union. There, there is no unemployment. It is a superior society'. The masses of the world do not see the Soviet Union via the dissidents, but see that in the Soviet Union there are no unemployed and, in that, there is no tyranny against the masses. It is necessary to elevate Soviet democracy but the essential basis of economic and social development is constant, and the masses see this. The capitalists cannot remove the eyes of the masses. At the same time, the masses of the world see, feel and assimilate the experience that the Soviet Union and the Workers States support all the anti-capitalist revolutions, although they are not in agreement at first, and limit them; but they have to support them because it is the essential condition for the Workers States to extend their own form of social structure and to increase their weight against the capitalist system. This is an inevitable condition. The Workers States have to do this, because this increases the favourable balance of relations against the capitalist system.

At the same time that capitalism cannot stop subsidising unemployment, cannot impose the cessation of subsidies for unemployment on the workers, because such a policy is rejected, the antagonistic contradiction between capitalism and the Workers States unfolds. Capitalism is a regime of contradictions which lead to a struggle between the capitalist countries themselves. The antagonistic competition between the capitalist system and the Workers States is different from the internal contradictory competition of the capitalist system. The internal contradictory competition of the capitalist system promotes the struggle between the capitalists, but the support to the capitalist system, which tends to affirm capitalist political power, is based on military power. On the other hand, the antagonistic competition with the Workers States is economic, but essentially social. Hence it is antagonistic and shows the inferiority of the capitalist system.

A very simple fact shows this: the most backward countries of the world - including Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, Cuba, and Nicaragua - overthrow capitalism and form Workers States. They advance to Socialism, not to capitalism. That is, in order to develop the backward countries, it is necessary to take the roads of Socialism directly and not to develop capitalism and afterwards Socialism. There is no place in history for capitalism.

These experiences weigh decisively in the process of history and it is part of the relations of forces. The Workers States cannot accept that capitalism acts as it did before, that it invades countries and that it impedes development; that it imposes dictatorships, and that it assassinates peoples. Today, the Workers States have to intervene and give support directly. At the same time, capitalism must feel that every intervention which it makes against the masses of any

country elevates the political understanding of the masses of the world, including the North American masses. These are the relations of forces.

THE MASSES OF THE WORLD SEEK SOCIALIST SOLUTIONS.

The antagonistic competition with the Workers States obliges capitalism to increase the costs of production, and the increased expenditure adds to the cost of production. In this sense, part of the cost of production is not just for payment of labour power for the production of commodities of consumption, but the war budgets of capitalism which take up to 30% of the cost of production. The technology for productivity increases enormously and daily. The immense quantity of unemployed which exists, and which increases, is a consequence of the decline of the capacity of the capitalist market which is the normal crisis of capitalism, and also the necessity of capitalism to constantly increase automation, and this is expressed in dismissals of workers and the increase of production by means of the machine or electronics. Thus they sack a mass of consumers. At the same time that capitalism increases productivity, it does not increase social welfare, social life, but in the Workers State this does happen. To continue responding to the antagonistic competition with the Workers States, capitalism has constantly to increase automation. This produces greater unemployment, a lower level of purchasing capacity on the market in relation to the increase of productivity and increases the social pressure on the system of capitalist production. But, in the Workers States on the contrary, there is no such problem. All the social process which exists in the world tends to seek agreements, alliance and similarity with the Workers States.

This is a crisis of antagonistic competition with the Workers States which capitalism cannot resolve save by war. It cannot resolve it either with political, social or economic competition. Capitalism has to resolve the crisis by means of war, and it is this which they are doing now, preparations for war. In this process of preparation of war, a revolutionary process is developing at the same time throughout the world: Africa, Asia and Latin America. This exists in various forms and spheres, and at different levels: Vietnam, Angola, Nicaragua, Iran and El Salvador. That is, it is not a question of distinct processes but of different levels and spheres; revolutionary processes are all oriented towards Socialist solutions, whether Iran, Nicaragua, Angola, Cambodia, Vietnam or El Salvador, or the process in Portugal. In the different continents, development is anti-capitalist. As a consequence, capitalism feels that the margin to answer the situation by economic competition is becoming smaller and smaller. It has no confidence nor strength in social competition, but with economic competition, that is, with production which succeeds in providing work, it maintains some levels of consumption and life. However, this diminishes all the time, as in Germany, France, Britain, the United States and Japan which are the five vital centres of capitalism. Italy, although a great capitalist country, is the weakest of the main capitalist powers. World capitalism sees such a situation-

World capitalism sees that its world economic and political power is constantly decomposing and

consequently its social power, and thus it tends to increase the preparations for war. The resistance to this, which exists in the capitalist camp, is real and simulated at the same time. It is real because there are great capitalist sectors which see, feel and understand politically, socially and scientifically that the war is the end of them. Capitalism sees this, and also the Yanks. The war is the end of the capitalist system, not the end of the world. Hence, in the capitalist states, the bourgeoisie is in a state of constant anguish. All the capitalists live an anguished life, and this is expressed in a thousand ways. They have the anguish of seeing that they have to go to war, and the war is the end of them. They feel that they are wrong, that the masses of their own country do not support them, and that there is no perspective of triumph, of acceptance and of the continuity of the capitalist system.

Even countries that are very backward through lack of political and social life, through the imposition of the dictatorship as in Iran, transform the reality of Iran in a few days. There is a unanimous concentrated will to overthrow the power of the Shah and the Yankee imperialists, not the Soviets. The masses of the world see this. They see that countries of a very backward social life, without economic, industrial or social development have supported, support and will support measures and policies which tend to eliminate imperialist and capitalist power. In Iran, to eliminate imperialist power is to eliminate the bases of capitalist power. Capitalism is weak in Iran: to acquire strength it has to develop. The Shah allied to imperialism, substituted for the local bourgeoisie and gave it social force through the army; with the elimination of imperialism, the bourgeoisie has no strength. The bourgeoisie has to develop the capitalist regime, and the masses do not develop the capitalist regime but want to develop the Socialist regime. Iran, a country with forty years of dictatorship, woke up and in a week said, 'We will make a regime of expropriations'. The masses of Iran, without annulling religious sentiments and religious will, do not even so have a religious consciousness. They associate that with the necessity for social transformations against imperialism, against capitalism, and a policy which develops the country for the population. With this way of working, although remaining Muslim, they work as a function of social not religious ideas. The force that determines the conduct of the Muslim masses is social behaviour, and they bring Mahomet into the sphere of Socialist policy and they go with Mahomet on this road. This process is producing in the Muslim world an immense stimulus which is equivalent to centuries of cultural and social development. Without abandoning Islamic belief, the masses increase their social understanding and their social resolution to develop religion, so that it serves social development. That is to say, a crisis is developing in the Islamic church and, in part in the Catholic also, because the Catholics are seeing this process. The Catholics are saying, 'We can do the same'.

The revolution in Iran shows how much the world is ready for social transformations, and between the religious behaviour and the social behaviour, it is social conduct which determines religious behaviour: changes, transformations to develop the country. That is to

say that the blindness which paralyses the thought does not exist here, but that religious sentiments - through custom, tradition and previous education - are still maintained; but social conduct is advancing over religious conduct. For now it is linked, but the hand that leads is not that of Mahomet but that of Marx. The Muslim masses certainly accept the social transformations without denying their faith, but adopting it to social needs.

Iran is a country in which there is no leadership. The Communist Party was weak and the dominant power of imperialism massacred the Communists and the intellectuals, even of bourgeois layers who wanted a certain progress. This process shows that when countries, without cultural, scientific, social and political life and with a great religious tradition, burst into the first stage of social activity, the masses take the path of social transformations; not social transformations submitted to the Church. This shows how progress has no limits. The masses of the world see this and that the Muslim masses pray and then grab rifles and go to defend statification. They take hostages and their trial is to sentence Yankee imperialism. This shows the world relation of forces. The Soviet Union is on the borders of Iran and it is true that, for this reason, the Yanks do not have free way to enter Iran. But the political conduct of the masses is not because of the armed military presence of the Soviet Union but the social existence of the USSR which teaches them what it is necessary to do; and the fifty million Muslims in the Soviet Union show that they are Soviet citizens and, afterwards, Muslims. They are above all Soviet citizens, defend the Soviet Union and defend the social structure of the Soviet Union. The masses of the world see this. As a result of the previous social structure, they continue believing in religion but they adapt a God and accommodate him to social necessity. This is an immense progress of the backward masses, of countries in which there was no social life like Iran, and yet rapidly, in less than a year, they have a most elevated level of social intervention. It is most elevated to take religious precepts and adapt them to social needs. The masses Iran have done this in less than a year. Imperialism sees all this and prepares the war.

Imperialism prepares the war because it sees in Iran that the most backward masses of the world take the road of the Soviet Union. In Iran the process is still limited in its levels, which could be much more elevated because there is no political leadership. The political leadership is forming now. But the political leadership which is forming has to be adapted to the will of the masses who want social transformations. The masses of Iran do not want social transformations as a revenge against the Yanks, but because they feel the experience which comes from the Soviet Union, from the backward countries like themselves who have developed statification, planning production, elevation of the function of the trade unions and the elimination of capitalism. The masses see this and learn rapidly. Imperialism sees this and that the present progress in Iran is one of the formation of a new social, Communist and Soviet leadership, not imitation of the Soviet Union or of the Soviet bureaucracy, but Soviet; and this also is going to influence the Soviet Union politically. Imperialism sees this politi-

ness without a solution. Hence it prepares the war.

The masses of Iran and the Muslim leadership are animated to confront Yankee imperialism without fearing invasion. Before, none of them would have been animated to do this, because the Yanks could have sent in a fleet, five hundred planes, and Iran would disappear. But now it is not the case. They move the fleet, send the planes and the Iranians neither fear the fleet, not the planes. They feel, they know that the Soviet Union is going to defend them. But the fundamental reason is not this. Why do they have such security that the Soviets are going to defend them? Why do they not think that, at best, the Soviets will conciliate with the Yanks and divide Iran. Why do not they think like this as the capitalists try to make them believe? Why do the masses say, 'No, the Soviets cannot conciliate with the Yanks?' Because the masses have already learnt, even with their cultural limitations as they have

not been able to study, they have understood that the Soviet Union is a deciding factor of history, is already affirmed, has to extend itself and cannot go to a country to conquer and dominate it for its own benefit. It has to go to a country to impel and develop it, eliminating capitalism.

The masses of Iran, of Nicaragua and of Angola and of El Salvador, already understand this. Imperialism feels and understands that this is a mark of a stage of history which cannot retreat and which feels that it has nothing to do here. Hence imperialism is preparing the war. The North American masses have not made a single meeting against Iran. By paying, capitalism could get ten thousand people. Indeed, there are eight million unemployed. Capitalism could choose half a million and pay them to make a meeting. They do not do it, because afterwards they would go and make meetings against imperialism.

J. POSADAS 23.12.1979.

The Imperialist Campaign Against the Soviet Union And The Preparation For War

The uproar over Afghanistan is only the occasion for yet another round of war preparations against the Soviet Union. The latter intervention there, is an initiative of the workers states taking account of all the accelerated preparations undertaken in the previous period by imperialism.

The rapid acceleration by imperialism does not correspond to a new policy. The tendency to a total confrontation has been on the agenda on more than one occasion in the last three decades and the bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima by the western 'democracies' at the end of world war two, had no other function than to frighten the Soviet Union, and the masses of the world. It contributed in no way to the ending of the war. Nor have the last decades been years of 'peace' as some imagine but only a succession of wars and revolutions anticipating the most decisive conflict of all - between world capitalism and the workers states.

As the coming confrontation is a direct struggle between capitalism and the forces of socialism, it must be recalled that the NATO alliance is as much to counter internal 'subversion' as external 'subversion'. Thus article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty says that any domestic political event can be seen as a threat to 'territorial integrity' and secret agreements exist by which the Yankee military command can repress internal dissent and special forces exist for this.

Objectively both the imperialist powers - particularly the Yanks who lead the forces of the world counter revolution - and the workers states have used 'detente' as a preparation for the conflicts to come. But overwhelmingly 'detente' has expressed the outstanding fact that the world balance of forces has moved overwhelmingly in favour of the workers states. Thus 'paradoxically' as soviet commentators argue themselves under the conditions of detente the NATO powers have

increased their military budgets and weaponry and intensified the campaign over the 'soviet threat' to justify them.

The result of the superior world relation of forces which favour the Soviet Union is that there can be no question of a retreat by the workers states in any way. The pressures being brought by the capitalist powers carry no weight in the Soviet Union. The famous 'eyeball to eyeball' confrontation over Cuba cannot be repeated, that is the Soviet Union retreating in front of imperialism. The Soviet Union in particular has gone through a whole experience, economic, political and social, resulting from the interaction between itself and the progress of the world revolution. The intervention in Afghanistan is the culmination of a series of interventions, Angola and Ethiopia amongst them, made by the Soviet Union which confirm that the workers state for the sake of its inevitable development towards socialism, is obliged to intervene and help all these countries fighting imperialism.

It is important to see that the character of this coming war is of a different quality from the first two world wars. It has a revolutionary quality unlike a war between rival imperialist powers. This undermines imperialism from the start. It has to be preoccupied with the mass organisations, with the communist and socialist parties and with the trade unions. Precisely because of the quality of this confrontation, the war takes on an insurrectionary character immediately. It is a revolutionary war as is elaborated by Posadas in the article 'The War and the Worldwide Elimination of the Capitalist System' (6.12.79).

The driving force for war is Yankee imperialism. It is Yankee imperialism which has imposed the missiles aimed at the Soviet Union in Western Europe. They were installed without any discussion with the population. On the other hand,

Turn to page 4

support in the Tory cabinet - that money allocated for redundancy payment should be transferred to 'keep the industry running without sackings for another two years', is no solution to the fundamental problem because it assumes that somehow British capitalism has a margin for recovery. But British capitalism has to compete with both the Workers States and the major capitalist countries - it has also to use a large part of its profits on war preparations - and so it has to continue a process of introducing measures of automation and technological advance. And this means constantly reducing the labour force, and lowering living standards. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the working class questions the value of its leadership.

The refusal of the workers to support a strike for the reinstatement of Robinson and Longbridge is, in this context, logical. It is true that there is a necessity to defend trade union gains made in a previous period but the workers are looking for a solution to the problems like unemployment, and the closure of factories, which the total crisis of capitalism is producing. And in the leadership which Robinson is part of, they do not see a perspective for advance. There was an impulse to defend Robinson as part of the trade union organisation initially but in front of the procrastination of the top leadership of the AUEW and the lack of a programme from the shop stewards organisation, the workers were not impelled to continue this struggle. To have ensured the reinstatement Robinson would have needed to combine this demand with a programme - which was partly suggested by the combined shop stewards committee - of factory occupations, workers control and appeals on this basis to other sectors of workers. It would have required a previous preparation in the form of factory meetings to discuss ideas, to prepare organisms of workers control. This did not happen.

The motive for the sacking of Robinson was that the bourgeoisie wanted to cut short any possibility of the development of an anti-capitalist tendency which might have provided a base of support for the Soviet Union. That was their judgement. But the workers made their judgement in the only way this leadership allowed them: by voting at a mass meeting.

The reaction of the Welsh miners to the call by the NUM leadership for a strike is part of the same process. They are not prepared with the present leadership to launch themselves into a struggle in isolation from the rest of the working class and without a perspective beyond an opposition to measures imposed by the Tory government.

On the other hand the steel strike continues because it lives in a climate which is not simply anti-Tory but anti-capitalist and because it receives the direct support of not only working class sectors like the miners but the women and other sectors of the population. It shows that the working class is not intimidated by the attacks of the Tories or the limitations of its own leaderships. The conditions for a general strike which could finish with this Tory government and make anti-capitalist advances, exists.

The working class is both in its mobilisations and in its rejection of inadequate leaderships, trying to impel the development, the concentration of an anti-capitalist leadership. And one of the fundamental characteristics of such a leadership is its attitude towards the Soviet Union, and the Workers States which give, in concrete terms, a perspective for the solution to the problems of unemployment, inflation, the lowering standard of living, the lack of health and social services. The latest measures on housing, for example, of the Tory government mean that the construction of new houses is going to fall below the already abysmal level of around 200,000 a year. The poorest are going to be most affected but it will affect a large proportion of the population. A general strike has to form part of a process of attracting these sectors of the population to a programme, to actions for social transformation.

In a sense the class, through the mass 'flying pickets' seeks a means of communication with itself and with other sectors of the population. A general strike which is an action that the TUC could be pushed into in the not so distant future, requires a preparation, the development of ideas, of anti-capitalist programme and the extension of the 'flying pickets' to permanent forms of committees in the factories and workers areas, in the Universities and among the population generally. There needs to be the development of a political life, of meetings and discussions outside of the confines of the trade union bureaucracy and the apparatus of the Labour Party. The 'flying pickets' demonstrate, very well, what is necessary in the sense that they function with a certain independence from the limits imposed by the trade union structure without losing the centralisation of the class around the trade unions and Labour Party. This is a principle which the Labour left, the trade union militants, the Comrades of the Communist Party and the 'left' groups should take and extend on the basis of an anti-capitalist programme and perspectives. And anti-capitalist means support for the intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, support for the Soviet Union and the Workers States as the form through which humanity advances to Socialism, and full opposition to the war plans of imperialism.

24/2/80.

The imperialist campaign

continued from page 3

Yankee imperialism does not have the element of monolithism (even then superficial) which Nazi Germany enjoyed in 1939. There the workers organisations were destroyed and the conflicts within the ruling teams minimised. But the Yanks are profoundly divided not on the need to liquidate the Soviet Union, which they all want to do, but on the choice of conditions for war and more preponderant sectors feel an overwhelming pessimism. Sometimes this latter is used to justify wholesale hikes in arms budgets, but it also reflects a genuine condition. When Teller the inventor of the hydrogen bomb says the Soviet Union will win the next war, he speaks because there is an ambience of abject defeatism which infects all the leading military and financial cliques of Yankee imperialism. When this statement is published and

highlighted in Germany, it is because German capitalism feels the same sensation of final doom.

European capitalism feels even less confidence than Yankee capitalism. Schmidt and Giscard issued a statement bewailing the soviet intervention in Afghanistan, but as a whole it was weak in character. They are obliged to follow the Yankee juggernaut, that is all. Moreover France, locked in continuous conflict with the Yanks will not attend another meeting arranged for other European countries to discuss Afghanistan. All the capitalist powers including Yankee capitalism are preoccupied with the reactions of their own populations. It is a case of governments versus populations which has never existed on this scale before. Before the war itself, every moment erodes the power and conviction of the

workers control in the steel industry and the organisation of the anti-capitalist tendency in the labour party

The crisis in the steel industry can only be resolved by a planned economy - for the needs of the population - and this can only be achieved by workers control. The working class is the only class capable of and interested in doing this. In the last three years, the work-force there has declined very greatly and now one third of it is to be sacked. Production has fallen from 21.5 million tons to 15, in the same period. This is not fundamentally due of themselves to bad management, to car or steel imports, or imports of cokeing coal, or low productivity, or the increase in the cost of raw materials, or to the fact that the private sector produces special and profitable steels. The root cause of the crisis in the steel industry is the inability of capitalism to develop the internal market or a sufficiently expanding world market. The productive forces enter into profound conflict with the social relations of production. Through the crisis of the steel industry, all the contradictions of the capitalist system are brought to light. If capitalism was capable of solving the problems of the population, it would discuss a programme for steel production for wherever it is needed: Asia, Africa and Latin America. The capitalists would discuss the reorganisation of the industry so as to fulfill the enormous objective need for steel that exists in the world. However, all the measures which they take go the other way. Their sole objective is to see how to elevate profitability. This is why the crisis is not only in this country, but in Germany, Japan, the USA, and they all try to replace steel by lower quality products in order to lower prices.

The present leaderships in the trade unions and the Labour Party seek to pressure management and the government into concessions, investments and ameliorations. They confine the programme and policy in that industry to a dispute within the capitalist system; this is well illustrated by the demand for 'putting off sackings for 2 years', as if the problem may go away in that

time! It is necessary however to discuss in terms of the fact that capitalism has lost the possibility to yield reforms, it has lost the colonies and semi-colonies on the basis of which it could be forced to reform the system or ameliorate it. Capitalism is not interested, not capable and not willing to provide solutions so that the masses have jobs, a cultural and fulfilling life, or even simply a life. If profitability means the destruction of whole areas in the country, or the destruction of whole countries, the capitalists do it.

The nationalised steel industry is submitted to the multi-nationals through the market, finances, and the dedication of capitalism to produce for profits. When capitalism has reached the stage of semi-destroying a key industry such as steel, it is because its perspectives are dominated by preparations for war against the workers states. The original intention of the trade union leadership was to make a struggle for a wage increase. Now however, the struggle has been elevated with the intervention of the flying pickets and the miners, to the level of the struggle against the government, unemployment and capitalism. The presence of miners on the picket lines raises the struggle to a class against class level, corresponding to the system against system struggle on a world scale. It shows that the workers aren't motivated simply by the fear of the loss of their jobs, economic means, or sectional interests. They are motivated by the intelligence which comes from seeing that there is a system in the world, in the Soviet Union and the other Workers States, which has eliminated unemployment, inflation and need. In this way, the workers are seeking to stimulate a political leadership not submitted to the whims of Lord Denning or the Law Lords or 'law and order' which means submission to capitalism. Democracy in the trade unions means overcoming the timid and conservative leadership in the steel industry and this is what the workers are doing, as shown in Hadfields, or with the flying pickets - forcing the Welsh Labour Party to declare

that it may support them completely. This is a political struggle, to stimulate a new leadership, in which the miners are showing themselves to be in the vanguard.

WORKERS CONTROL

It is necessary to discuss that the industry has to be under workers control because the actual management is no different from before, except that the government is made to foot the bill for losses which individual capitalists could no longer or would no longer bear. There must be a national conference of delegates from the car, the mining, the steel and all related industries, with the right for all the workers parties and organisations to speak and give ideas. The crisis we are in, is not a fatality of production or of life, but due to the crisis of capitalism which cannot expand the economy in any way. However, the masses need steel, for transport, houses, buses, planes, hospitals, cultural and sporting centres, roads, bridges, etc., and not just internally but throughout the whole world.

We propose that the strike be now continued under the form of occupations to impose no sackings, work sharing without loss of pay and the immediate 35h week, all wages to rise with the cost of living, factory committees, population/Miners/Car and steel workers committees to decide the cost of living index, not the experts of capitalism and to impel a nationally organised left in the Labour Party prepared to fight for the overthrow of the government and pledged to support workers control. We propose that this should be discussed immediately at mass workers and population meetings at which all workers parties and tendencies can speak and give ideas on how to advance. This will accelerate very greatly the downfall of the government and favour the construction of an alternative policy and programme in the Labour Party.

14.2.80.

apparatus itself, including the very top layers of the military command. The German general Bastion rejected the line of the Brussels NATO meeting which sanctioned the missiles in Europe and ends up speaking to the young socialists.

The policy has been so vicious that it has embarrassing consequences in a stage when imperialism wants to prepare for war without too many complications - hence Carters attack on Thatchers policy

The Thatcher government has been even more hard nosed than that of Yankee imperialism in organising an anti-soviet campaign. The particularly weak performance of British imperialism has given rise to a desperate rightest tendency to try to throw back the gains of the working class and impose a general hardening of policy internally and externally. It is in part a repetition of the Heath experience and is going in the same direction of shipwreck.

The left in the Labour party is going to mature under the effects not only of the domestic situation, but primarily of the whole world course of events. The struggle against capitalism is going to be extended into a rejection of all the policies of NATO and a consistent struggle against the Yankee bases in this country and the uncontrolled use of nuclear energy. All the nuclear plans of capitalism are a menace to the population including nuclear energy for so-called civilian useage - they can be used against the population particularly in the case of a nuclear war. It is clear that the

forces of world capitalism are in disarray and this can be seen in the internal conflicts in the British ruling class. The more the class struggle is waged in a consistent way with a programme of social transformations against the policies of unemployment and military expenditures, so the whole structure of capitalism is made weaker and weaker; its apparatus decompose and the speedier the advance to the workers state. The masses make a clear distinction between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and it is this perception of the progressive nature of the workers states which undermines all the plans of imperialism. The refusal of the LP and the trade unions to break with the Soviet Union is an indication of this sentiment among the masses of Britain.

Editorial

THE MASS DEMONSTRATION ON MAY 14 MUST BE LINKED WITH THE NEED FOR A PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

The outcome of the steel strikes has to be seen in the context not only of the particular situation in this country but of the world class struggle which finds its highest representation in the struggle between the Workers States and the capitalist system. The steel workers imposed a substantial increase on the management compared with the original offer, but not as much as could have been obtained if the trade union leaderships had been prepared to generalise the fight and confront a weakened and disorganised government and system. Even so, socially the strike has been a very great blow at the capitalist system. It has shown to the masses and the bourgeoisie that, even with a cankered and comatose leadership, the class elevated its decision to intervene against the norms of capitalist society in using flying pickets. On returning to work, the spirit and combativity remained firm and secure. It is not true as some commentators try to argue that 'Thatcher is getting away with it'. The process is not like that. Capitalism is embarking on its final agonies. When it has to detach itself so completely from the interests of the population and even alienate its own support, this is because, as a system, it has no perspective and all its energies are fully engaged in preparing for war against the Workers States and repression at home.

NATIONALISATIONS REQUIRE WORKERS CONTROL.

The Budget completely confirms the submission of everything to reducing the standard of living of the population in order to compete with the other capitalist states and to the needs of war against the Workers States. The attack on state benefits for strikers is the most complete example of the civil war which is now taking place. Wholesale cuts are planned in all aspects of education and social services, housing is being ruthlessly cut down, medical and transport services and the planning of cities deteriorate remorselessly. This is not the mark of a system which is preparing for a future, but one which is unloading its crisis on the population and preparing for war. The uprising in Bristol demonstrates the social fury stemming from the most oppressed sectors of the population, black or white, and that this class resistance inevitably leads to confrontation with the state. The masses in Britain sense the whole world process and feel no loss of security in having to meet the mounting inflation and oppression of the capitalist economy.

It is necessary to make May 14 a massive general strike which is certainly the intention of large sectors of the vanguard, but also to give it a perspective of demands which relate to the most fundamental needs of the population. The trade union leadership wants to confine everything to protest, without giving a programmatic orientation, but the vanguard is seeking a perspective. It is necessary not only to attack the government but to underline the need for social transformations. The capitalist system is totally exhausted. It is necessary to have an economy which answers to the needs of the population for housing, decent working conditions, industrial projects for the unemployed, and wages to rise with the cost of living. At the same time, the need to take industry out of private hands has to be linked fundamentally with the need for workers control. Nationalisation under capitalism without workers control serves the rest of the capitalist economy. Look at the steel industry. There is no workers control, and the result of this 'nationalised' industry is wholesale reduction of the work force and the submission of the industry to the exigencies of competition on the world market. At the same time, it is necessary to generalise the slogan 'Out with the Yankee missiles', and for all nuclear energy plants to be placed under workers control.

THE TRADE UNIONS REPUDIATE CIVIL RIGHTS CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION.

The most limiting factor in the situation is the absence of consistent response from the Left of the Labour Party. There is no consistent current which intervenes on the varying issues of the class struggle as they arise; that is, for example, the steel strike, the events in El Salvador, the need to campaign with a programme against the military preparations of the Thatcher government — including now the sinister preparations for chemical warfare which they are discussing — or the significance of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. On the other hand, the conditions for the development of such a current in the Labour Party are elevating. Without question changes there are going to be greatly accelerated by

Turn to page 4

Workers of the world, unite!

RED FLAG



Monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

300 Friday 18 April 1980

PRICE 15p

CONFERENCE ON THE WORLD PROCESS OF THE DEEPENING CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

PART 2

23-12-79

J. POSADAS

SUB TITLES: EDITORIAL BOARD

Imperialism prepares the war and this is evident. It sees that socially it cannot conciliate with the Soviets. Although the Soviets may make concessions, there are a series of vital points which they cannot concede, nor do they want to make concessions; that is, the support they give to countries which struggle against the capitalist system and imperialism. It is an organic necessity of the Soviet Union to support them, if not everywhere openly, directly and immediately. But it is a necessity of the Soviet Union to support every movement which eliminates capitalism, because this facilitates, adds to and unites the progress of development of the Soviet Union itself and impedes the dangers of war and military confrontation, and favours social development. Even so, capitalism is preparing war,

Imperialism feels that it cannot intervene as before, neither openly nor secretly; the Soviets do not allow it. Now the countries of the world, of Asia, of Africa and of Latin America, the masses and the sectors of the petit bourgeoisie, the sectors of the poor local bourgeoisie who feel overpowered by capitalist imperialist dominion, have as an ally the Soviet Union and seek alliance with the Soviet Union. Imperialism sees itself as a consequence surrounded. One of these experiences is that, in the United States, there is no movement in defence of democracy or liberty for the North Americans arrested in Iran, not a meeting of twenty. Reiterating what we have just said: the Yanks have the money to make a mobilisation of a hundred thousand, of fifteen thousand, and they could pay them all. They do not do it because this would stimulate political life which afterwards would go against them, because at the same time it would stimulate criticisms against imperialism within the country, over work, wages, lack of freedom, repression and the sympathy of the North American masses for the progress of the world — including Iran. The papers do not even make a poll over this. They prepare the war because of all this.

An aspect which shows the weakness of capitalism and the process towards concentration of Workers States with Workers States and of the masses of the world with the Workers States is expressed in the discussion over the missiles. The Yanks are lying over SALT and the missiles. The SALT agreement is a dispute between different tendencies of Yankee imperialism. There are sectors

who want to conciliate in order to continue surviving, but there are other sectors, the ones who decide, who do not want to know anything. Thus they make a game of distraction because imperialism is not animated to declare that it is going to launch the war. It has to go seeking the conditions to maintain unity with the capitalist world to prepare the war. It prepares the war while it makes a political and social unity against the Workers States.

The discussion over the European missiles, which is simply an excuse of imperialism to accelerate the preparations of war, shows the unity of the masses of the world with the Workers States. It shows the understanding of the masses of the world about the Workers States. In countries which are still not Workers States, in which imperialism still has political strength, North America, France, Japan, Germany and Italy, that is the great capitalist countries, the discussions are made at the summits. In the United States it is a discussion at the summits and nothing else. There is no public discussion. For example, the Yanks could show, in order to win authority, that they are representatives of the North American people. They could make a population poll, a declaration of the trade unions, of the factories, of the universities, in favour of the missiles, and they do not do it. It is the government and the House of Representatives which represents the great pinnacle of North American capitalism. Even in this pinnacle of North American capitalism, expressions of opinion show dissidence, repudiation and rejection by a very important part of the population of Yankee imperialism, and this is shown in the attitude of Kennedy.

Kennedy does not have a bold attitude (referring to the criticism which he made of the government for having supported the Shah), but expresses a state of public opinion. The North American masses sympathise with the Workers States and the masses of Iran. Meany, the ex-President of the AFL-CIO trade union, retired with a pension of at least 120 thousand dollars a year, besides being owner of various hotels. He was the one who spoke against the Soviet Union, against the 'Communist dictatorship'. But now there is not one poll, factory meeting or declaration which expresses the life of the factory with this content. It is not necessary to take the lack of a workers party in North America or of trade union life as the expression of the incapacity of the prole-

ariat or the lack of interest, will or policy of the North American proletariat. There is no workers party nor trade union life because there is a monolithic structure which impedes the masses speaking and giving an opinion. Thus there is no expression of the political level, the political preoccupation of the North American masses. But there are indications, and one that is very important, revealing and direct, is the electoral abstention. The President of the United States was elected by 26% of the electorate. That's public opinion. Carter himself had to say: 'I was elected by 26% of the electorate'. His first duty was to say, 'I do not represent the United States'. This is a quarter of the population, and the rest who did not vote repudiated him. Thus one cannot take the trade union leaders like Meany as representatives of the will of the North American people. It is through a series of processes that there is no great Communist Party. This has occurred from errors of the Communists themselves, but the essential reason is not the errors of the Communists but the previous process in which Stalinism has one of the most important responsibilities; Stalin and Stalinism, that is to say, the policy of alliance with capitalism against the functioning of the anti-capitalist revolutionary struggle.

THE COMMUNIST PARTIES CANNOT EXPLAIN STALIN.

To measure Stalin and the role of the Communist parties, the Communist Party historians have spoken of Trotsky, of Stalin, of the Soviet Union, and have made analyses. None of them refers as a criterion to the fact that Stalin assassinated the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, assassinated every one of them, including Trotsky. Not one of them asks or answers why he assassinated him or the others. To assassinate the leaders of the revolution is not an error; and if it were true that they were traitors, as Stalin said, why do not they say that he killed traitors. Why do not they explain how a revolution produces disappointment and traitors, the same who made the revolution become traitors. But all this is outside history. To make the revolution requires great capacity and political intelligence, scientific, political intelligence, an understanding of the process of history. Such people cannot become traitors through ten years of Stalin. Thus how do the Communists who have written on Stalin explain this. There is a complete silence.

turn to page 2

Subscribe to RED FLAG
1 year £3.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.50

Order from
IV International Publications,
24, Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

Cheques payable to:
'IV International Publications'

THE DEEPENING CRISIS OF CAPITALISM.....

continued from page 1

The bourgeois historians and also the Communist leaders are silent on this. How does one measure Stalin? There are two essential facts: Stalin: his policy threw out the Bolsheviks programme, and Trotsky. But he did not realise that Trotsky was going to continue living and fighting. As Trotsky himself said: 'Stalin did not understand, otherwise he would have killed me before'. But meanwhile Trotsky who was persecuted and all his comrades assassinated, made the programme of the Left opposition which was an economic and social programme for the development of the Soviet Union. Stalin, who had a programme opposed to this, took the programme of the Left opposition with which he could maintain the economy of the Soviet Union. Even so, he killed nine million peasants. It was the programme of the Left opposition which allowed the maintenance of the Soviet Union. None refer to this. They speak of the sagacity of Stalin when it was the programme of the Left opposition that prevailed. It is enough to read the programme to see this. The bourgeoisie knows this. The Communist leaders know, and they are all silent.

For example, in all the analyses which they made recently over the centenary of the birth of Trotsky, not one Communist leader speaks of the assassinations of Stalin. They condemn him, they criticise him, but essentially to reject the policy of the Soviet Union, to extend the revolution throughout the world, not for the crimes which Stalin committed. They criticise lesser aspects of Stalin, 'who did not allow democracy, did not let people speak' but the issue is this: Stalin decapitated the leadership which had made the revolution which gave the programme of the Revolution and led the construction of the structure of the Workers State.

There was a stage in history called Thermidor in the French Revolution. Thermidor also occurred in the Soviet Union. What is Thermidor? The leadership of a revolution with the same cadres that compose it, changes course, does not represent the will of the masses who made the revolution but represents another layer which dominates the revolution. In the French Revolution this was the bourgeoisie. In the Russian Revolution it was the bureaucracy. Thermidor existed clearly socially in a decisive form. None of those who write say anything about this.

It is necessary to consider that these were not political errors of Stalin but a policy which represented the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy which sought to survive through alliance with the capitalists, not to use the inter-capitalist contradictions of Nazi Germany with the 'democratic' capitalists. The Soviet bureaucracy had an interest in surviving the war, nothing more. Not in maintaining and extending Socialism. Hence it did not extend Socialism, but led the war and through the necessity of the war, expressed through the Soviet people and the soldiers, had to smash capitalism - which was not the programme of Stalin. What was the previous programme of Stalin? It was neither tactic nor strategy, but the interest of the bureaucracy to survive with the capitalist system. The war impelled the masses and, as part of them, the army to smash capitalism and forced the Communist Party to follow suit. Hence, after the war, Stalin wanted to impose his will and thus compromised with the capitalists of the United States, of France, of Germany, of Britain - so that Mao would give power to Chiang Kai Shek and that Tito would give power to the king. Tito and Mao Tse Tung rejected this. No historian discusses all this,

not only do they not discuss it but they present it in a lying and altered form. But, the process also shows how the power of the Workers State forced Stalin to accept such a policy. That is, the conclusions of history were not determined by the Soviet apparatus but by the necessity of the extension of the Soviet Union, which created the conditions for this extension even through war.

The masses of the world supported the development of the Soviet Union and not the nazis. The war brought into existence fourteen more Workers States. Capitalism sees all this. Capitalism saw Stalin, and this time it cannot expect any Stalin. This time, it is Workers States against the capitalist system. Thus, as in Iran and El Salvador, as in Nicaragua, the masses - without tradition of the Communist Party, without political life, with forty years of dictatorship, of massacre - in a week take the level of development of political activity as if it had always been done. Even without culture and scholarly knowledge they know how to elect and decide, supporting measures of anti-capitalist revolutionary progress. Capitalism sees this, and knows that in the next war the conduct of the masses will be much superior to the masses of the previous period. From the beginning the masses are going to decide to smash capitalism.

THE MASSES OF THE WORLD REJECT THE IMPERIALIST MISSILES.

The measure for the installation of missiles in Europe by capitalism is an excuse to prepare the war. It has prepared the war for a long time. It does not mean that it is going to launch it right away, now or when it wants; but it means that capitalism sees now that the relations with the Workers States and the masses of the world are constantly unfavourable to capitalism. Thus capitalism prepares a military intervention to try to break the revolutionary process. To try to break it does not mean that it is going to do so or can do so, nor that it is going to cause very great damage. But imperialism is preparing the war as a reply to the world extension of the revolutionary process.

In this test, the unanimity of the capitalist system has been demolished. When, for historic reasons of common interest, the capitalists must all be united against the Workers States, they have no unanimity. There is resistance even from governments who are not direct representatives of capitalism but who have a capitalist policy - like the Social Democracy of Germany or part of the Socialists in Italy or the Socialists in France or part of the Labour people in Britain. Even with this partial support of forces from the workers' side, North American imperialism and world capitalism feel a void in the masses of the world. The rejection of the missiles is a support to the Workers States. Those who reject the Yankee missiles are essentially the masses of the world. The masses see that the Yankee missiles are to smash progress and life, but that the Soviets, where they go with arms, impel progress in every way. There is not one mobilisation of the masses in any capitalist country against the Soviet Union, but there are millions against the capitalist system. The Socialist governments, the Socialist parties or petit bourgeois parties or governments of the big bourgeoisie like that of France, with the support of sectors of the petit bourgeoisie, have to conceal their attitude and camouflage it to make it acceptable by the petit bourgeoisie. They are not animated to present a measure to contain the Soviet advance, but only in the name

of the interests of the country and of defence in abstract. None of them says with respect of the missiles that 'they are to defend us from the Russian threat'. No one says this, not even the Yanks. They talk generalities. Even so, the masses of the world reject the Yankee missiles which is a support to the Soviet Union. This shows the maturity of the masses of the world and that shortly there is going to be war. Hence all the movements which exist in the world are not against the Workers States but against the Yanks. There is not one organised movement against the Soviets. The capitalists, the petit bourgeoisie, Social Democrats and the capitalist democrats, want to make one but they have no organised movement against the Soviet Union nor against Vietnam. On the other hand, the movement against the Yankee missiles has mobilised hundreds of thousands against the capitalist system, and in countries as developed as capitalist Germany, Belgium, France, thousands have mobilised against the Yankee missiles. The Communists in France made a demonstration of forty thousand against Yankee imperialism, and in Belgium there was one of 60,000 people. This shows already a certain very profound relation of the masses of the world with the Workers States; an intelligent attitude which shows the social and political understanding of the masses of the world.

Half of the participants in the demonstrations against the Yanks' missiles are young people. They went to shout, 'Out with the Yankee missiles' not out with the Soviet missiles. When they do this, it is because the youth aspire to make of each country a better Soviet Union, more developed, democratically more Soviet, or Soviet-wise more democratic. This shows the conduct of the masses of the world and, as a consequence, the crisis which is expressed in the Communist and Socialist parties.

The Communist parties speak of 'eurocommunism' and of 'pluralism'. When it's a question of a concrete, specific fact to show 'pluralism' and 'eurocommunism' all have to defend the Soviet Union: that is, there is no place in history to invent a national Communism. The Communist parties are instruments for the progress of history, as is the Soviet Union. They are inferior to the Soviet Union, but they are the instruments of history. It does not mean that it is necessary to remain depending on what the Communists do. But the existence of the Workers State through its structure, birth and development, makes clear to the Communist parties the conclusion that they have to transform the capitalist system and help to construct Socialism.

The Communists of Italy, France and of Belgium and of almost all the world, do not work as representatives of the interests of the national bourgeoisie. They work as representatives of the interests of each country, French, British - not, however, in the name of the bourgeoisie but in the name of impeding the war against the Soviet Union and to favour social transformations. There is now an immense maturation. The masses, allied with the revolution in Iraq, in El Salvador, in Nicaragua, in Cuba, Mozambique, Ethiopia, with the masses of Vietnam, do not ally themselves with those who cry 'Out with the Soviet missiles', but out with the Yanks.

In the daily paper of the Italian Communist Party, 'Unita', the letters of workers were published which posed openly that 'we are against the Yankee missiles, not against the Soviets, because these

are never going to attack Italy. They have no reason to; but the Yanks, yes. This shows the maturation of the Italian workers and of its vanguard. This means a level of maturation which extends to the British workers.

The discussion which exists at this moment in Britain in the trade unions, in the parties and in the Labour Party, has not occurred for 'British' reasons. It is combined with problems of Britain, but the origin is world-wide which stimulates the vanguard. The masses of Britain, the vanguard feel the influence of the world and are animated to go much further. They do not work on the basis of electoral defeat. They work as a function of the security of the impulse which they receive from the world and the world relation of forces. It is these which will determine the triumph of the revolution in Nicaragua, and soon in El Salvador. They are the same factors which influence, and are going to determine, the process in Britain. Undoubtedly, in Britain the world relation of forces function with less determining effect because capitalism is strong, but it penetrates nevertheless. In Britain there is not the same world relation of forces because there is a strong bureaucratic apparatus which then has to contain the external influence. There is a formed apparatus which impedes revolutionary and scientific political and social life, culture, scientific knowledge and art.

It is true that, within the necessity of life, there is the scientific progress of cybernetics; but also the experience of the Workers States. This is more important than electronics and cybernetics. The masses of the world learn constantly from the experience of the Workers States. The masses of Nicaragua go from 40 years of dictatorship (in a few months) to reconstructing the country. The dictatorship did not create the anguish of individualism or of the family. It did not create the necessity of people withdrawing into themselves through fear, but the hope of intervening massively. The masses of Britain are not in the same conditions. They have better conditions of life, of culture and of science, plus a bureaucratic and very powerful capitalist apparatus, but not a powerful capitalist strength. The apparatus of Somoza, in proportion, was more powerful than the Queen and British capitalism. The world influence in Britain is weaker, more indirect and limited through the power of capitalism, that is, the prepared structure of capitalism which does not come from now. British capitalism has an already formed apparatus and a non-dialectical method of reasoning and discussion, as is generally the case in all the world Communist movements, an impressionist method determined by the interest of immediate application and effect. They do not reason on the basis of dialectical scientific analysis which prepares the conditions for leaps.

THE PREVIOUS STRUCTURE OF BRITAIN COMPLICATES THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE VANGUARD.

The method of reasoning in Britain from the structure of the workers and political movement is determined by practicalism, pragmatism and the convenience of the moment. This creates a structure of analysis and of thought determined by this form, and it was afterwards accentuated by the policy of Stalin and by the errors of the Communist parties which have the Stalinist method of analysing history. Practicalism is determined by the immediate interests of layers of society who think in this form of immediate interest and represent

themselves as being the mouthpieces of the workers movement, of revolutionary necessity. This was facilitated by the Stalinist policy of the Communist parties who analyse

like this: The interest of the leading bureaucratic layer was pragmatic and practicalist. The absence of great mass movements created the current of interest, the interest of the capitalist layers which practicalism expressed. The workers movement, lacking currents of tradition of

Marxist experience (the Russian Revolution which was betrayed afterwards by Stalin) had to accept this situation and had no other way of making an experience. This process goes on in all the Communist parties of the world, and also in Britain.

In Britain this was the case with the aggravating factor of having a Stalinist bureaucratic factor before Stalin. This had the method of Stalinist analysis which had another name but was a Stalinist interest, a Stalinist conception as a function of capitalism. The difference with Stalin is that Stalinism defended the interest of the bureaucracy but had alliance and regular interests with the capitalist system against the process of the revolution. In Britain these pragmatic currents were created during a period of dozens of years that could not receive the experience of history. The experience of history was adapted to the interests of bureaucratic layers who then express a way of reasoning, of deducing, of practicalist policy, a policy of the moment in accordance with manoeuvre, of accommodation to situations and not with marshalling beforehand an analysis and programme to eliminate the capitalist system. These currents, on the contrary, annulled the perspective of eliminating the capitalist system and the defeat of capitalist power through social transformations. If in the Communist parties this problem still exists, and in China there is a counter-revolutionary leadership, the fact that there is a bureaucracy in Britain allied to the Queen is within this process of history and is not an abnormality.

It is necessary to consider then that our struggle against the bureaucracy to form a current is part of this situation of history. It is not that in Britain the situation is impossible but that this is how things are with a structure made in earlier times by British imperialism.

The Labour Party was not defeated in the elections. It was the bureaucratic leadership which was defeated. Within a short time of the Labour electoral defeat, the masses waged a trade union struggle against the repression and the threats of the Conservative leadership. If it had been a political and not an electoral defeat there would have been a retreat of the masses of Britain expressed in the lack of trade union will, in adaptation and in the development of individual interests. There is nothing of this. It is quite the opposite. Disintegration is beginning in the Conservative Party which is in the municipal elections and in the resistance in Parliament to the laws proposed by the Conservative leadership, which were rejected by Conservative parliamentarians (the laws on the rights of the immigrants). This is not by chance. It shows the lack of unity of the Conservatives and sectors linked to the population. It is not these who are going to decide, but the process shows the lack of sufficient social force of the Conservatives.

It is necessary to take into account that the Conservatives have 20%-30% of their votes from people who have no social value - peers, knights, the stupid. While, with the working class, all those who play an active part in the development of the country vote with the working class and participate in the trade union life.

USE THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM TO LINK WITH THE EUROPEAN WORKERS MOVEMENT TOWARDS A SOCIALIST EUROPE.

The preparation of the war on the part of imperialism is activating and developing the cultural deepening and concern on the part of the Labour vanguard. There has always been a Labour vanguard, but the political level was different from the vanguard in other countries - as it was a vanguard which, in cultural, programmatic and political level, was inferior to that of France, Italy and Germany. This resulted from the conditions of life and the tradition of the bureaucratic structure of the apparatus. But now the room to accommodate with capitalism is much less and the pressure of the masses is immense. One must see the Labour Party was defeated electorally and the masses and the trade unions defend a Communist leader (Robinson). It does not do this just to defend a Communist leader but to defend the right of the trade union to participate in the leadership of the country. This is also against the Labour leadership: although the behaviour of the Communists may not be correct, neither do they have the preparation to use this situation. But the masses move with the conduct to maintain their leaders and to confront the capitalist system. British capitalism has less and less the right conditions to continue.

British capitalism is decaying in its structure, in its economic and social ability and its competitive capacity with the rest of capitalism: France, Germany, North America and Japan. The revision of the laws relating to the immigrants show that capitalism is enclosed in a reactionary and protectionist form and unleashes repressive laws on a great number of people to try to free the British market from the competition of the workers of all the countries such as Pakistan and India. It has to make a defence, when before it was open, which shows how confined capitalism has become. At the same time, the will of the Labour masses does not decline and the level of discussion is raised. There is an elevation of the scientific and political level of the discussion in Britain.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IS THE RIGHT ARM OF YANKEE IMPERIALISM.

The expulsion of Robinson, the Communist leader of Leyland, has a profound political sense. It is aimed to impede the organisation of an opposition, even a trade union one giving continuity to opposition or to a trade union tendency which is going to give a motive for the organisation and development of anti-capitalist tendencies. They expelled him to break this process. The Communists have no strength, but they have a certain weight in some unions. Capitalism sees that the process is elevating the struggle of the masses and is going to elevate it in an anti-capitalist sense because solutions do not exist within the capitalist system either for wages or for work. Capitalism has to sack people, to close factories and to concentrate production to maintain profit and competition with the other capitalists and the Workers States. But, at the same time, the expulsion of Robinson is aimed to impede the political development of the trade union tendency that influences the Labour vanguard which is going to enter into struggle in the next stages. Capitalism has also made the expulsion in preparation for war. British imperialism also is preparing war, and they are seeking to cut the political influence towards the left, even in opposition to the bosses, because they see that this is going to lead to a political development of opposition.

British imperialism seeks to isolate the Labour left, the Labour Party and the trade unions from the political influence of confrontation with capitalism. Although it may not be a direct confrontation with the problems which Yankee imperialism

and British imperialism poses, the trade unions and Labour Party lead to a systematic political opposition because imperialism is preparing the war. British imperialism is the right arm of Yankee imperialism. Hence it fears that a tendency, even small in number, can be a centre or is going to be a centre of political advance, which develops the anti-capitalist struggle of the masses of Britain in a systematic way. Hence they threw out Robinson, which is one of the greatest blows to democratic liberties and to democratic rights. This is the policy of the same capitalists, the same Labour trade union leaders who protest because the so-called refugees fly from Vietnam, and because in the Soviet Union there are 'dissidents'. And the Communist leader of Leyland, Robinson, why did they throw him out? This shows the sense of democracy for capitalism. They threw out the trade union leader because he fought for the right of the workers, i.e. trade union rights, or the right to wages and work. It is the greatest attack on democratic rights. This is democracy for capitalism.

For humanity the existence of the present leadership of the trade unions of Britain is a great backwardness. But there is San Salvador which, without leadership, is going towards anti-capitalist power. It is in Britain that it is necessary to intervene to change this situation, but El Salvador indicates that the leadership of the trade unions is not an index of world cultural revolutionary behaviour. The present leadership of the trade unions exists for a series of reasons, of which the most important is the previous policy of the Soviet bureaucracy in the epoch of Stalin. But now capitalism cannot maintain this situation because it has a very great crisis. There is a real competition between France, Germany and the United States. They are united through class interests, and they are going to unite against the Soviet Union, but it is a road for them with many complications which retards the historic capacity of capitalism. This allows the Soviet Union to win time and attract the masses in its favour. Capitalism prepares war amidst greatly expanding unemployment and repression and a great increase in the cost of living. But the repression of capitalism has no effect anywhere. Nowhere is the revolutionary movement stopped by repression. On the contrary, it confronts repression and wins. Thus capitalism is preparing war in the worst conditions for itself.

In the Communist and Socialist movement, the discussion is extending because these are new problems for them. The Socialists were accustomed before to support their bourgeoisie against another bourgeoisie, but now it is not a question of this. Now they have to support the bourgeoisie against the Workers State - which is not the same situation. Although the leaderships of the Socialist parties elect to support 'their country', the masses are not going to support 'their country'. Hence capitalism feels that in the war it has to confront the Workers States and half of every country supports the Workers States in France, Britain and Germany. Capitalism feels that on the outbreak of war the masses will all be against them. In this process in each country the force which is going to decide is the vanguard, not the bureaucratic sectors of the trade

Hence it is necessary to consider the caution with which capitalism moves to prepare the war, because all the masses of the world are against it. In the other wars, capitalism did not face the opposition of the masses. It attracted them nationally against the external enemy which was also capitalist. Now there is the Workers State, and the masses of the world have seen that the Workers State supports Cuba,

The present attitude of the Labour Party of 'out from the EEC' and no return to the 30's, shows an illusion that capitalism has still room for survival by means of another intercapitalist dispute through some national development (imports controls, state credits, etc.). It would be to assume that capitalism is only in another economic crisis, that it has nothing to do with the installation of nuclear missiles in Europe or the NATO alliance, and that if only Britain left the EEC there would be chances for recovery; besides it leads to the conclusion that the European parliament cannot be used, whereas one can see that the Communists and in part the socialists of Europe, are using it as a tribune against capitalism. However, the crisis of capitalism is not primarily an economic one, but essentially social and political, which has also the effect of increasing its economic crisis. The masses of Europe and Britain are mobilising against the nuclear missiles and further deepen their social resistance to capitalism. Capitalism needs to defend itself from US imperialism, but needs US imperialism against the USSR. All the attempts by yankee and British imperialism to use the European capitalists against the USSR following the Afghanistan crisis have failed. None of these events are economic factors, but they all contribute to the crisis of the EEC. Also they all show that the major enemy of British capitalism is not German or French capitalism, but the Workers States. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss in the Labour Party and the trade unions, not in terms of looking for a recovery of capitalism, but of its debacle and rejection by the masses.

THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS

The boycott of the USSR - following its intervention in Afghanistan - by the EEC, in respect to butter, technology, the Olympics etc., has been shortlived. The USSR doesn't depend on the EEC for living, but the EEC depends on the Workers States because its competition with Japanese and US imperialism has never been so fierce, not even in 1939. This is shown in steel and textiles. The reason why the EEC is in continuous and deepening crisis is that it was constituted not to 'plan' between countries, but to defend European capitalism from the Workers States and capitalist competitors. It is an association due to weakness, not to development. There cannot be any planning amongst the capitalist countries because each country is competing with the other furiously, as shown in the 'lamb war' between Britain and France. In front of this, the Workers States are increasing their exporting capacity, their industrial output, because their

Vietnam, Ethiopia and, finally, all the countries which liberate themselves.

J. POSADAS 29.12.1979

economies are planned; in the USSR, steel growth is 5% a year, and 4% in the GDR. There is no unemployment, no inflation, and the human relations - based on collective ownership - allow an infinite and uninterrupted expansion of intelligence and of the economy. This attracts the socialist and communist masses of Europe to the Workers States, as shown in the missiles crisis when no one opposes the USSR but everyone opposes the yankee missiles. This demonstrates to capitalism that it has to attack the Workers States, and not each other. This leads European capitalism into accepting the yankee missiles and all the costs which this entails which yankee imperialism is only too glad to burden them with. Capitalism has to pay for huge arms expenditures, and attack the masses of each country each day more to foot the bill, thus increasing, immeasurably, social unrest. Moreover, this is a major source of tremendous inflation. None of this would be resolved if Britain was out of the EEC. One will not resolve these problems by joining or withdrawing. They are inherent to capitalism; the discussion on the need to 'withdraw from the EEC' is a false one, and the leadership of the Labour Party uses this to contain the discussion about alternatives to capitalism, and anti-capitalist policies.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE SOVIET UNION

At the moment when imperialism tries to punish the Soviet Union for its intervention in Afghanistan, the EEC makes deals with ASEAN which go against US imperialism, and Carrington calls for a 'neutral Afghanistan'.

Britain in its proposed boycott of the Olympics has had to attack publicly its own athletes

Just at this moment also, French capitalism decides to call for self-determination in Palestine, which is a blow at Yankee imperialism and an alliance with the USSR. French capitalism doesn't do

this because it agrees with the Palestinians but it has to defend itself from Yankee imperialism and the french masses. When it comes to do this, supporting itself on the historic antagonist of capitalism against yankee imperialism, it is because there is no historic scope for capitalism; it has nowhere to base itself. It is also in the midst of Afghanistan that the ~~Corby~~ steel workers have decided to call for support from the Soviet and Polish trade unions. The large demonstrations against the Yankee missiles in Europe and this, show that the masses are not against the USSR, and that they are looking to it for support. The base of the Labour Party is part of this process. So it is not a problem to be dealt with in terms of 'for or against the EEC' but 'for or against capitalism'. This is why there cannot be a return to the 30's.

USE THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AS A PLATFORM.

G. Marchais of the French CP, supported by some Socialists, denounced in the European parliament, the role of British imperialism in Ireland. This shows that one can use the European parliament. One can make appeals for instance, for a European strike for the 35 hr. week, for a plan in steel, for an energy plan, for a workers plan of production, and against the siting of nuclear missiles. This will not be achieved by the European Parliament, because this will require the unity of the European Socialists, Communists and trade unions to struggle for this, outside parliament. But it shows that appeals and agitation can be made in the way Marchais has done. It is startling also that for all the opposition the Labour Party makes to the EEC, it never mentions an opposition to NATO. However, NATO and the Yankee missiles are part of the arsenal to confront the USSR and the workers movement. Therefore it is necessary to seek a european organisation of the working class, for an alternative to capitalism, a socialist Europe.

TELEGRAM SENT TO ZANU-PF SALISBURY ZIMBABWE ON 6/3/80

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY
(TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV. INTERNATIONAL
(POSADIST)
24 CRANBOURN STREET LONDON WC2.

5.3.80

Dear Comrades,

Warm embraces for victory. Forward to united front of all forces of progress and social transformations in Zimbabwe

pressures within the trade unions. It is very important that the latter do not lend themselves to the anti-Soviet campaigns of Thatcherism, and at this moment they have turned their backs on the capitalist tactic of using 'civil rights' against the Soviet Union. This has great importance, however limited its programmatic perspective, because it reflects the need for the workers organisations to draw closer to the Soviet Union as the world class struggle approaches the stage of the final encounter between the two social systems. All the Social Democratic perspectives are rendered hollow in this final stage of capitalism, and with the undermining of progress by small reforms, new teams and middle cadres in the Labour Party and the trade unions seek for a Marxist explanation and perspective.

At the same time, this search is complicated by the lack of homogeneity in the world Communist movement. The failure of the Italian Communist Party to attend the meeting of Communist parties in Paris is an example of the resistance of a sector of the ICP apparatus to the need for centralisation around the Soviet Union. They seek to balance with China and its rotten counter-revolutionary leadership against the Soviet Union. This type of behaviour slows down the development of sectors who seek to advance in the Labour Party - which is a very electoralist, conservative party in any case. On the other hand, it is also clear that the Soviet Union is not the aggressive power in the world. It does not murder progressive leaders like the Archbishop of Salvador. That is the result of Yankee imperialism. It presents an example of progress in the solution of all the fundamental needs of the population, whilst capitalism goes in the opposite direction - war, pollution, unemployment, ignoring the needs of the population and cultural backwardness.

The unresolved crisis between Iran and the United States, the process of advance in Zimbabwe, the elevation of the revolution in the Caribbean and central America, are all aspects of the incessant pressure of the world Socialist revolution. In this crisis of the downfall of the capitalist system, Yankee imperialism seeks to organise its forces and impose its decisions on the European bourgeoisie, particularly on the Schmidt-d'Estaing axis, by making use of Britain as its right arm to confront the Soviets. Despite all their preparations, the contradictions between the capitalist powers constantly augment, and also significant layers of bourgeoisie become demoralised in front of endless crises and decisions which tend more and more to be located primarily among the inner circle of big business and the NATO high command. The Left in the Labour Party has to unite all the problems of unemployment, lower standards of living, complete disregard of human life in the capitalist use of nuclear energy and pollution of the environment, with rejection of the Yankee missiles and the call for workers control, a programme of social transformation and a planned Socialist economy. The mass mobilisation on May 14 should be given a direction in this sense, coupled with the perspective of a general strike to smash the reactionary laws and the war plans of the Thatcher government.

THE VICTORY OF MUGABE IN THE ELECTIONS IS THE RESULT OF THE PREVIOUS ARMED STRUGGLE.

The overwhelming victory of Mugabe in Zimbabwe is a massive defeat for imperialism and has demonstrated the power of the balance of forces which favours the world socialist revolution compared with the impotence of imperialism. A bastion of capitalist power Rhodesia dominated by a small and barbaric clique which has defended itself with the utmost brutality was obliged to hold elections which it then lost completely. Its invention Muzorewa backed by huge amounts of foreign capitalist support was liquidated. In the course of these elections imperialism endeavored to develop a campaign of provocation and made several attempts on the life of Mugabe. A constant effort was made to intimidate the forces of the Patriotic Front but everything failed. The masses of Zimbabwe voted for socialism overwhelmingly because they felt that the world process was with them.

This triumph corresponds to the growing concentration of the world masses around the workers states to confront imperialism. It is part of the world revolution which has produced Nicaragua and Iran - cases which have shown the inability of imperialism to throw back the revolutionary process. At the same time the force of the victory was accelerated by specific factors within this situation. Undoubtedly the soviet intervention in Afghanistan played a fundamental role. The masses of the world saw the decision of the soviets to intervene both to defend the workers states and to elevate a country struggling with the most primitive economy and conditions of life. This was an enormous support for the masses of Zimbabwe. At the same time the British conservative government did not have the strength to sustain the regime of the whites and this was primarily because the British proletariat and the masses without any means to express their opinions or to discuss them were not at the side of their ruling class but on the other side. This in itself is not new. British imperialism has never been able to sustain Smith in the way it would have liked because there has been no support from the British masses for such a course. Ultimately world imperialism was obliged to put up with the elections as the least evil. It was a decision forced on the summits of world imperialism. Thatcher was obliged to recognise the right of the guerillas to participate in elections which was never her policy.

The electoral triumph is only a stage in the necessary transformation of the economy of Zimbabwe. It is a question now of going from government to real state power. Ultimately it involves the transformation of a guerrilla movement into a party but this is not going to be done overnight. As there is no previously prepared cadre there is inevitably the problem of developing a firm team to confront all these problems.

In all this process Zimbabwe is not alone. It has the support of the Soviet Union and the experience and aid of Mozambique and Angola is going to be fundamental. It is necessary to develop all the possibilities of trade with these economies to enter into discussions to promote joint planning to facilitate especially the development of light industry to help meet the needs of consumption and in particular to improve the agriculture so that Zimbabwe is no longer just a raw material economy.

The regime has to face the problem of the whites who own the best land and thus control the economy and they have their state apparatus to defend all this. Mugabe has rightly put the emphasis on the need to satisfy the basic needs of the masses - better wages, development of unused land, better health facilities, better education. The logic of this means finally the planned statified economy and the logic of the process will lead to this, whatever the immediate tactic may be. More land has to be given over for the production of food for the masses, with the use of technical experts and the use of high yield grains. This has to be based on forms of collectivised agriculture and of co-operatives to develop the economy. Inevitably the question of white land will be raised. The best land cannot be left out of such plans. To raise the standard of living of the mass of the population transcends the possibilities of small scale peasant production and the retention of land in the hands of a few whites. Mugabe knows this. It is only a question of time to confront this and

prepare to break the state apparatus linked with all this privilege particularly the armed forces.

The conditions for the solution of these problems are extremely favourable. Imperialism has suffered a world defeat. The success of Mugabe stimulates forces within South Africa against the 'apartheid' regime and divides the bourgeoisie and thus the possibilities to maintain the revolutionary momentum of the election are excellent. It is important to maintain a level of discussion of the population, to improve the links between leadership and population as part of the process both of confronting the white capitalist apparatus and preparing the way for the construction of the workers state.

The soviets in one way or another are going to assist the process as part of the necessary global strategy to confront imperialism and advance towards world socialism. When Breznev intervened quickly to congratulate Cde Nkomo and Mugabe it was to stimulate them to go forward and confront the problems. The soviets have given little political example to the countries advancing towards workers states but they do have a necessary consciousness of the need to elevate their interventions to help such states. The electoral success of the Patriotic Front is not going to lead to a 'peaceful' parliamentary solution.

There would have been no 'democratic' elections without the armed struggle, and the next task over a period of time is the need to confront the problem of the white army.

J. POSADAS

THE WORLD BALANCE OF FORCES AND THE TRIUMPH OF MUGABE IN ZIMBABWE.

AND A SELECTION OF TEXTS ON NAMIBIA, RHODESIA AND SOUTH AFRICA.

Scientific, Cultural and Political EDITIONS.

BCM Box 6220, London WC1V 6XX
Telex: MONOMARK 6220 - Lond.

J. POSADAS

AFGHANISTAN, IMPERIALISM, THE USSR AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM.



(This text is in two parts)

SUPPLEMENT TO RED FLAG

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

31. 12. 79
5. 01. 80.

SUPPLEMENT TO
RED FLAG



**RESOLUTION ON THE MURDER OF
COMRADE CARLOS FLORES, M.P.,
BY THE ASSASSIN MILITARY JUNTA
OF BOLIVIA.**

J. POSADAS 15.11.1980

We render homage together to comrade Flores, the Bolivian section and all the Bolivian revolutionaries who, like Flores, have struggled and developed an activity to oppose all the reactionary military coups in Bolivia. Even with different conceptions and objectives, they opposed the military coups, to try to impel the bourgeois democratic development which was going to allow an elevation of the struggles to transform Bolivia.

IN THE NAME OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT OF
THE POSADIST IV INTERNATIONAL

Our homage to comrade Flores is an homage to the Bolivian masses, the trade unions, the parties which have opposed dictatorships and reactionary military juntas, who rose against any attempt to curtail democratic rights. We salute the intervention of the masses to reach superior levels of struggle to develop Bolivia — and so transform it from a capitalist country into a Workers State.

Our struggle does not only tend to reach a certain level of that struggle. It tends to impel the masses. Comrade Flores and the Bolivian section express at the most elevated historic levels that a large number is neither sufficient nor necessary to accomplish a function in history. These comrades, that section, with small means, with the risk of swift reprisals, have led and developed the necessary activity against the military junta. In the Bolivian parliament it was the Bolivian Section of the Posadist IV International — through the intermediary Carlos Flores — which supported the most elevated resolution ever put forward in a Bolivian parliament, in all its history: a proposal to defend the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan. It is the first time in history that such a resolution is defended in a Bolivian parliament, and this — against all the other parties and parliamentary groups, against the will of the government, of the ministers; and against our very friends and allies. In the name of the Posadist IV International, comrade Flores has supported, in that parliament, the most elevated resolution of the whole of its history. The defence of the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan — which is one of the centres for the liberation of Bolivia. Afghanistan received an impulse through this intervention of the Soviet Union. The development and progress of Afghanistan elevates the conditions by which to also elevate Bolivia. It is this that comrade Flores defended, in the name of the Bolivian Section of the Posadist IV International-

It is him, also, who made the trial of Banzer in Parliament. Carlos Flores and Quiroga Santa Cruz – whom they have equally assassinated – proposed to try these assassins. Both of them were assassinated. No Party, not even the Communists and many others who considered themselves as of the greatest democrats, spoke of ever condemning the assassin Banzer. It is our comrade and Quiroga Santa Cruz, leader of the Socialist Party, who raised this proposal in parliament. This is one of the reasons for Flores' murder.

It is not the only reason. Comrade Flores has been assassinated because – as an MP in parliament, as a representative of the Posadist IV International – he was using the House as a means to address the masses of the world and of Bolivia, with the aim of leading forward the struggle against imperialism and capitalism; to bring Bolivia out of backwardness. This is the reason why they have killed him. They did not just kill him because he was in their way. They annulled a representative of scientific political thought. We are a small number in Bolivia. We were neither a danger for capitalist stability, nor one for the stability of the trade union bureaucrats or those of other parties. But the intervention of our small section, in the course of the maturing of Bolivia which made it receptive to the world's influences, signified a risk for all the other parties, the Left wing parties included, of either the Left or the working class. This is so in the sense that this activity tended to force them out of immobilism and out of the confines which they were putting around the struggles. The intervention of the Section in Bolivia demonstrated the possibility to come out of these. This is why he has been assassinated.

Comrade Flores was using parliament to speak to the masses of the world, demonstrating that Bolivia, a small and 'backward' country, had the most advanced idea and was united to the world through the Posadist IV International. This is what he did when he supported the resolution in defence of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, as a necessity for the progress of Afghanistan and of the world. This is why they have assassinated him.

It has not been a chance event or the result of circumstances. They have assassinated him with premeditation and our small Section did not dedicate itself to protect itself but to develop its capacity, even when it could count only a limited number of militants and cadres; they did this to use the parliamentary conditions of Bolivia to address the world and make Bolivia enter the world. Already in 1946–47 the COB had adopted a Trotskyist programme – a programme for economic development and social transformations. Today, too, it is the Trotskyist–Posadists – even with only one MP – who try to impel Bolivia towards the most advanced activity against imperialism and capitalism, supporting the Soviet Union for its intervention in Afghanistan, considering that this intervention was necessary to impel progress. Our Section has not lived in the fear and preoccupation to save its cadres. It preoccupied itself to see to it to use parliament as an instrument to make the class struggle advance in Bolivia.

We congratulate and embrace all our Bolivian comrades. Whilst they are not many, they have acted with the consciousness of a big leadership. They were, are, and will be effectively a great leadership. To be a great leadership means to have the ideas, the programme and the policy necessary to interpret and understand the stage of history, to make history advance in Bolivia and in the world. It is this a great leadership. It is not a question of number

or of quantity. In the last instance, and even if the number is great and at times decisive, when the programme does not correspond to necessity, there come crises, retreats, processes of disintegration such as take place in the French Communist Party, for instance, which has to resort to expel leaders and organisers of the Party right at the top because these people have acquired an anti-Soviet and anti-Communist conception. The French Communist Party is quite right to get rid of these people, such as Elleinstein and all this layer of people, deceived from Communism.

Our Bolivian Section has sought to look after that which was most essential in its life: to make Bolivia advance, to take it out of backwardness which is the only way to make it advance. It has not been taken by fear, and did not seek a refuge in the life of a small group in the dread of repression. It prepared itself within the consciousness that the death and assassination of comrades may occur. Carlos Flores made a declaration, knowing that he may not return before he went to the meeting of the COB (the CONADE meeting that took place in the morning of 17th July at the COB headquarters). He declared that whatever happened, the possibility of assassination, whatever be his own personal situation he was going to fulfil his Trotskyist-Posadist duty. He was going to that meeting to denounce the military coup, call for people to oppose it and call on the COB to mobilise the masses. He made this declaration of principles before going to the meeting of the COB. Knowing that he may be killed, he said: 'I am going, and if they kill me, these are the principles which I defend and which I leave behind'. These principles are those of the Trotskyist-Posadists, of our small Section of Bolivia, and of those of all the world.

It isn't number that decides. In the last instance it is the programme, the policy, the genuine representation of the progress of society which decide, via programme and policy. The number one have may be decisive to lead the masses, but if the objectives and policy don't correspond to need, the Party then has to make changes, undergo crises, blows, retreats, such as is shown in the actual discussions in all the Communist parties - the French, Spanish, Italian, German - because they must change their programmatic and political conception and adapt to the revolutionary process of history.

Our Bolivian comrades acted in the defence of the process of the revolution in Bolivia. Comrade Flores has defended and supported it. He did not do this in a way to despise his own life. But he used it for this end. One has to make the revolution advance, denounce Banzer, Meza, all the assassins, oppose the military coup, mobilise the masses against the military coup - this is what he posed. And this is why they have killed him. Our Bolivian Section did not waver one moment that this was what had to be done. It did not let itself be taken into paralysis after the assassination but continued to function, just the same as the Bolivian masses who continue to do so.

We render homage to comrade Flores for his resolution, his capacity, his will to be the representative of the most elevated and progressive ideas to take Bolivia out of backwardness, to use parliament as an instrument to develop the class struggle at the highest possible level, to have used all the conditions to have made alliances, transitory accords, with whomever, providing such accords signified a progress for the class struggle in Bolivia.

He leaves behind an experience for the leaderships and the revolutionary cadres of Bolivia: that of using parliament, the trade unions, as instruments for the progress of the country. And the experience of doing this when convenient, even to the detriment of one own's individual or collective life. Carlos Flores did it. Such is the education, intellectual, cultural and historic formation of the cadres of the Posadist IV International. We do not render homage to Carlos Flores as such, but to all the Bolivian Section, to all the Bolivian masses, which include Carlos Flores. The Bolivian masses have done the same thing as Carlos Flores did as an MP. There is an identification of our Section with the masses of Bolivia. It is a demonstration of our function in history: a small number in the present historic conditions, but a force immensely large for what regards the significance and historic weight of what it is doing. It is for this reason that they killed him. They could have killed others such as Lechin or the Communists. But they did not do it. They tried to annul and assassinate those whom they saw as the most immediate and most profound danger: Quiroga Santa Cruz and ourselves. The Party of Quiroga Santa Cruz had developed and had increased considerably in electoral support; it had adopted a Socialist programme for Bolivia. And the Posadists of Bolivia had done the same.

We render homage to our Bolivian Section for its resolution not to let itself be smashed or intimidated by the murders, that of Flores or others, that may occur; and to have continued the activity which is necessary for the progress of Bolivia. Therein can be measured the role of the individual in history, the role of a small group in history when it is right, when that small group represents the will for progress. Such is our homage to the Bolivian Section and to all the Sections of the world.

Our homage to Flores is that which the progress of history renders him for his conduct in front of the necessity of the progress of Bolivia as part of the progress of history in the world. It is not numbers which determine either security or capacity. It is reason which determines capacity, and then attracts numbers afterwards.

In the name of the IV International, in the name of the leadership of the International, of the International Secretariat, we salute our Bolivian Section; we salute equally the comrade Flores who represents, by his decision, the will of the Posadist IV International to fulfil its function in history, to develop ideas, analyses, to give a programme to help the world Communist thought to see. Because of the acquired structure of history, this function is necessary. In the Communist parties there are no polemics, there are discussions about concrete, limited and superficial aspects. But, with regard to the programme of history, there is no polemic: for instance about Afghanistan. The only discussion they make is the one to conclude (about the Soviets): 'They must get out, they have invaded and there are no democratic rights'. None of them measures according to what was Afghanistan before, and what is it now? Can the Soviet intervention be seen as a demonstration of invasion and having resulted in an incorporation of Afghanistan to serve the interests of the Soviet people? Or is it an intervention to impel history? This discussion is still not taking place. Those that take place are abstract. We discuss that the progress of history is being accomplished via a necessary instrument: the Soviet Union and the Communist parties. We pose our criticisms at the same time so as to better their interventions, to elevate their consciousness. We feel the joy of fulfilling this function in history, even taking into account the possibility of the death of our comrades and of ourselves. It is, however, a necessary historic function. The

development of history requires such an instrument which thinks objectively and scientifically to help the Communist parties to understand history's process. We do this to help also the revolutionary and trade union leaderships, the countries in development, and mainly the Workers States, to understand the process of history. We do this even at the risk of our own lives. Such is our function in history. We do this and will keep on doing it.

We salute the Bolivian Section and the Comrade Flores and render homage to them. The thought and will for action of Flores are an example in the history of humanity. The father of comrade Flores was the Bolivian Ambassador to Rumania and Yugoslavia for many years. He fulfilled his function of ambassador to allow his children to develop thoughts and sentiments in agreement with the progress of history, which can only be fulfilled through Socialism. There were no conflicts between the ambassador father, the comrades and his own children. They all had an identity of objectives in history and in life – all within the existence of differences in the field of immediate political interpretation. It was a family entirely integrated in the revolutionary struggle. Comrade Flores was not from the bourgeoisie or the well-off petty bourgeoisie won to the revolution. He and his parents have lived a scientific process of incorporation to the revolution. They never made a secret of it. Neither did the father. There were signs which indicated that assassins would murder Carlos Flores; his intervention as a Posadist MP, his defence of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan (in the Bolivian parliament), and the tradition of his family. His father was assassinated. We believe that he was murdered and that the car accident in which he met his death had been provoked. We salute all the family of Carlos Flores.

We turn also to the world Communist movement and in particular to the Communist Party, the M I R of Bolivia, for them to take into consideration that they should have denounced the death of comrade Flores and said that he had been assassinated at the same time as Quiroga Santa Cruz; they must have known this. It was not a problem of a competition with the Communist Party or the M I R or with the parties of the Left. It was necessary to say this. It was necessary to bring out the courage of Carlos Flores, his resolution to defend the programme, the policy and the objectives of the Posadist IV International. Our Section did not let itself be intimidated; it maintains firmly all its capacity and resolution to act, even if it now has less possibilities and less conditions to do so.

We address our salutes and our thanks for their intervention to all the lawyers, jurists, judges, all the Communist parties, the Socialist parties, the trade unions, the ministers, the MPs, the Senators and the Press of all the countries of the world, which took the defence of Carlos Flores and appealed for his liberation and the defence of his life. We thank them endlessly. This activity is part of the structure of a simple united front, not constituted via programme or policy, but a world-wide united front for the defence of the intervention of Posadism in the world. MPs of all countries and of all parties have intervened: Labour MPs, Socialists, Social Democrats, Communists of the whole world have signed for our comrade. We thank all the movements of democratic jurists in the world, all the associations, the professional bodies, the priests, the bishops, the governments such as the one of Ecuador, for their intervention and determination to take steps and mobilise for the liberation of Carlos Flores. We thank them all. We salute also our International which has not ceased its activities at any moment, whilst fully conscious that Carlos Flores had been assassinated.

The whole struggle and objectivity of the Bolivian Section expressed by the comrade Carlos Flores in the Bolivian parliament is going to continue. Such is our homage to comrade Carlos Flores. He continues his activity even now that he is dead because he is a demonstration of the resolution and capacity of ideas, and of the decision to put them forward. The comrade has shown that he accomplished the duty of conscience, of ideas, of programme, which are necessary for the progress of history.

J POSADAS

15.11.1980

We salute this text of comrade Posadas, and adhere to the principles for which Flores died, which are the principles of the Posadist IV. International. Comrade Flores died immediately after being shot at by soldiers who stormed the COB headquarters, in the morning of the coup after the CONADE meeting whilst he was speaking with Quiroga Santa Cruz of the Socialist Party 1 (Quiroga Santa Cruz); The latter comrade fell besides Flores and died soon afterwards. This information comes to us from a leader of that Socialist Party who was recently released together with Lechin and Reyas, among others. We thank the comrade for having informed the Posadist IV International, and thank all those who have supported the campaign both for comrade Flores and others in Bolivia who have died or have been repressed. The struggle continues and the death of the comrade will contribute to final victory.

Revolutionary Workers Party - Trotskyist-Posadist.

30.11.80

**REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY
(TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV. INTERNATIONAL
(POSADIST)
24 CRANBOURN STREET LONDON WC2.**

MANIFESTO OF THE FIRST OF MAY 1980

of the International Secretariat of the POSADIST IV. INTERNATIONAL

- **To the Socialist Countries
(Workers States),**
- **To the revolutionary masses of the world,
of the big capitalist countries,
of Africa, Asia and Latin America**
- **To all
the Communist parties,
the revolutionary movements,
the nationalist movements,
all the movements which seek the struggle
for the progress of humanity and who take
the path towards
the fall of the capitalist system.**
- **To the masses of the world.**



Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Order from
IV International Publications,
24, Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

Cheques payable to:—
'IV International Publications'

MANIFESTO OF THE FIRST OF MAY 1980

- To the Socialist Countries (Workers States)
- To the revolutionary masses of the world, of the big capitalist countries, of Africa, Asia and Latin America,
- To all the Communist parties, the revolutionary movements, the nationalist movements, all the movements which seek the struggle for the progress of humanity and who take the path towards the fall of the capitalist system,
- To the masses of the world.

The capitalist world is in total crisis. The essential base of this stage of history of the world crisis of the capitalist system and the progress of the broad masses of the backward countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe who seek to develop life through the revolutionary struggle. The objective of their struggles is to impel into the leadership of their countries governments which defeat the capitalist system by means of force and develop new economic forms based on the experience of the Workers States.

The essential base of this struggle of history is determined by the world balance of forces, the essential centre is the existence of 20 Workers States (which are called Socialist countries), 20 Revolutionary States which are close to the Workers States (such as Ethiopia, Angola and Mozambique), and the impulse coming from the revolutionary movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Imperialism cannot intervene as it is convenient for it, as it would like and according to its counter-revolutionary economic and social interests. It cannot intervene, because the world balance of forces impedes it from doing so, because the Workers States are going to intervene if it does, because the masses are waiting for any process in which they will intervene, and because the masses – even of the United States – live under the influence of this world process. They are educating themselves in such a way – even without making a direct intervention – with the understanding that the course of the process of history is being made through the anti-capitalist struggle and the bringing down of the capitalist system. These are vivid examples of the world balance of forces which impede capitalism from sending troops where it likes and how it likes. The most backward countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America unfold their economic and social development through the struggle against capitalism, as in Ecuador – and soon in El Salvador – in Mozambique, Angola, Afghanistan, Iran, Zimbabwe. They are simple examples of this

process of the progress of history which is made through the anti-capitalist, revolutionary struggle.

The masses of the world receive this experience and see that this is the form which progress takes and which combines itself with the social, political and trade union struggles. The masses see that the struggle for progress has to mean the overthrow of the capitalist system and the development of economic and social relations, which eliminate the interests of private property and organise the economy and social relations on the basis of state-owned property which, in turn, creates new and more elevated forms of human relations. Humanity is learning to construct Socialism.

The Workers States, led by the Soviet Union, are the vital centre of this process. There is a world campaign of the capitalist system, led by Yankee imperialism, against the USSR and the Socialist countries (Workers States), against Vietnam and Cuba. It is directed at trying to weaken the influence of this process over the petit bourgeoisie, over the masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America; over the Communist and Socialist parties, the democratic left-wing movements, the ecologists. Imperialism seeks to weigh on all these to prevent them from being influenced by the process of ascent of the revolution and being attracted by the Workers States as a whole and by the Soviet Union, in particular.

The intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan is a necessity of history. It is not an invasion aimed at annexation or overpowering a country. It is aimed at impelling the revolution. It is a legitimate defence of the Soviet Union, to impede the counter-revolutionary rising of the Afghan feudals, supported, organised and sustained by Yankee and world imperialism. This activity of the Soviet Union, to prevent its own boundaries becoming a point of penetration of the capitalist system, is legitimate. The character of the Soviet intervention is proved by the fact that the central aim of the Afghan revolution is agrarian reform, distribution of the land, and the economic and social development of the country. This demonstrates that it is not an annexation to create a new class, but that it forms part of the necessity to defend the Workers State, which is a centre for the progress of history.

The struggle of Iran demonstrates how a people can come out of the most backward cultural and economic conditions, from the most backward submission to military and police repression of the Shah's regime, which was supported by world capitalism in general and Yankee imperialism, in particular. In one year the population rose to construct a new Iran on the basis of economic and social development, to allow the development of the necessary economic structure, art and science in the country. They elevate the economy on the basis of the state-ownership of the productive forces and the elimination of private property. Religious problems have not been able to limit social progress. In the choice between religion and social progress, it is the social relation which elevates, educates and leads religion. It was not religion which gave the lead in the economy. The Iranian masses - whilst continuing to be Muslim - push forward the social struggles and give the religious-Muslim qualities, the quality of social progress, developing the economic struggle for social transformations.

The masses receive the education of the world relation of forces which doesn't enter into collision with or counterpose itself to the religious beliefs. Between religious belief and the necessity for social progress, it is social progress which leads the religious belief. It is not religious belief which imposes itself on social progress and impedes it. In previous times religion used to impose upon social progress. That is why the feudals and imperialism could dominate Iran. The masses are learning quickly, in the march of history, how to develop their religious sentiments in such a way as not to clash with the forms of historical progress, which means state ownership of property and the planning of production. They are struggling to the death with the capitalist system and imperialism.

Such are the most elevated instances in history. It is not just a progress of the backward masses, but that of backward masses under religious imposition who, with the world influence of the Workers States and the Soviet Union, in particular, feel inspired in the direction of social progress: eliminating capitalism without abandoning religious beliefs but submitting them to the necessity of social progress. This is the greatest and most complete social education which the masses of the world are receiving. This is the greatest and most complete cultural progress, realised by the world relation of forces in the most backward masses of history, be they Muslim, Catholic or Jewish.

The ecological movement and the movements of struggle against pollution are becoming more enlarged. They develop in various countries. They are essentially petit bourgeois sectors which are won over to the struggle for the progress of society. They are forces which are won over to the workers and revolutionary movements and to the Workers States. Capitalism will not be able to retain them or deviate them, nor detain them through what they have in their head, through thought. It is the revolutionary struggle in the world, the scientific and cultural progress of the Workers States which impels these masses in feeling animated by the will for struggle against the capitalist system, and against the conditions of pollution which are created by this capitalist system. All these sectors are natural allies of the large Communist parties, the Socialist parties and the trade unions. It is necessary to make an adequate anti-capitalist struggle to draw all these sectors, win them over and elevate them consciously into the anti-capitalist struggle. To eliminate pollution it is necessary to eliminate the capitalist system, and push this struggle forward.

Social Democracy, which sticks with the world capitalist system, no longer has any influence, but the Workers States, the Revolutionary movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America influence the masses of the world. All the liberation movements and movements of progress leave the capitalist system. The education of the masses is received in this process of unequal and combined development, in which it is the combined aspect that educate the masses of the world in taking the most elevated measures to develop the economy. This is shown by Surinam and Grenada. These are small countries which take the measure of progress of history: Zimbabwe is soon going to do so also.

Capitalism is powerless to contain this process. All the campaigns which it makes against the Workers States, particularly against the USSR, are aimed at

trying to put a brake on the influence which the USSR is having. It is not aimed at defending the progress of the peoples, neither is it for democratic rights. Democracy has to be measured against the social development of the peoples. Wherever Imperialism goes it impedes the development of the economy, of society, of culture and of science. It only develops which is convenient for its own production, its investment and its capital returns. But, on the contrary, for the development of the peoples the elimination of the capitalist system is needed. The masses are learning this even with the religious sentiments which they have; but the latter are put at the service of social progress. Between religion and the economy, it is the economy, social relations and revolutionary political and scientific thought which decide the course of history.

The masses of Iran are teaching the masses of the world that, in spite of economic, social, political, cultural and military backwardness, their will of progress – supporting itself in the programme already thrashed out by history in the Workers States – is such that it can put up a front against imperialism and the world capitalist system.

This process brings to light the backwardness of various Communist parties in the world. There is now a repeat, in a new form, of what May 1869 was, and which is expressed in the development of ecology groups, feminists, homosexual movements, radicals in various countries – in Germany, Italy, Britain and Belgium – which advance and progress mainly in the petit bourgeois masses which, in the main, leave the fold of the large bourgeois parties and, in part, of the Social Democracy. These movements do not develop against the Workers States or the anti-capitalist struggle, but against the capitalist system. They seek to stimulate the necessity of the struggle for progress which is not undertaken by the existing mass movements, which do not understand and have not managed to develop the struggles. As the mass movements failed to intervene in time, other movements are arising such as the ecologists and the radicals, for instance. These are necessary movements for the progress of history, because the large Communist parties and Socialist parties, the big trade unions, did not resolve the problems in time.

As in May 1968, these movements are an indication that the petit bourgeois masses are ready for changes in history. These movements may become perverted, put on one side, made to retreat, or withdraw and degenerate because the revolutionary movements and the trade unions do not intervene in time. This process doesn't depend on them but on the workers parties and trade unions who must seek an alliance with them to develop a programme of struggle against capitalism, to combine the trade union struggles with the anti-capitalist political struggles and, in a United Front, an alliance with the Socialist countries, to put up a front against the capitalist system.

There is a combined world process of crisis as much in the Communist parties of the Workers States as in those of the capitalist countries. The crisis which the world capitalist system goes through is one of disintegration, in which they do not find the means to put up a front. On the other hand, the crisis of the Communist parties is one of progress, which impels and leads them to the centralisation of all

the movements to confront the capitalist system. The Communist parties are not prepared for this process but they advance and learn, and they are made to learn in the actual advance towards the necessity of the unification of the world Communist movement for the struggle against the capitalist system. Even if the capitalist system could unify itself, it has not even the force to draw the masses in the defence of its system. Half the masses of the capitalist countries are already with the Workers States. The capitalist world is conscious of this, but cannot avoid it. On the other hand, the Communist parties can re-animate themselves and progress, re-impelling the revolutionary movement.

It is necessary to call on them to exert pressure upon China, to oblige it to change the policy, which it is making at the level of leadership, of alliance with the capitalist system against the Soviet Union. This is a conscious necessity of all the revolutionary militants, of all the movements who must support the Communist parties and the Workers States in taking this path. It is not a matter of silencing criticism but of making criticisms aimed at organising thought, and offering persuasion and knowledge to the Communist parties, the Workers States, the Chinese Workers State included, in order to oblige its leadership to change its policy. It is also necessary to include in this a persuasive criticism to the Soviet Union.

The crisis of growth of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries and in part in Workers States such as Yugoslavia, Rumania and Hungary, is the progress of history which elevates the world balance of forces and the experience, security and capacity of the masses. The Communist parties are making a policy which is inferior to the necessity of the struggle against the capitalist system-

The capitalist system prepares the war. All the measures Carter takes are aimed at the preparation of the war. War preparation is a vital necessity for the capitalist system. Its internal contradictions are induced by the development of the Workers States. The contradictions between European and North American capitalism are sharpening because they cannot launch the war when they like, as they like, and where they like. The pressure of the broad masses of the world and the progress of the Workers States combines with the insecurity of capitalism and its consciousness that it will not survive another war. This is why capitalism postpones the war and the actual moment of its outbreak. As it cannot overthrow the Workers States, the contradictions of capitalism and all its internal disputes sharpen in the world inter-capitalist competition for markets, for investments, and through the relations which they must maintain with the Soviet Union.

Inter-capitalist competition accentuates and sharpens because of the development of the Workers States, because of the amplification and extension of the world course of the revolution which expresses itself in countries from Grenada to Nicaragua. This weakens the capitalist system and enhances the historic function of the Workers States. This makes competition between the capitalist countries even more acute, and they are unable to resolve it when they like or as they like. They cannot make the war against the Workers States: eventually they will make it.

All this is part of the world might of the Workers States and of the world progress of the revolution. The trade unions no longer simply engage in trade union

struggles. In all the countries their trade union functioning has led them into alliances and united fronts for a programme of social and economic progress, with Communist and Socialist parties and left-wing movements. The workers and trade union movement see that the possibility of containing the struggles within the scope of improvements in salary and working conditions is being limited. In order to maintain itself, capitalism has to increase unemployment, to go on sacking and sacking, and to intensify the iniquity of work conditions. One of the forms this takes is in the growth in pollution. It is the deepening of the crisis of capitalism which leads the trade unions to an intervention, each time greater, and not solely a trade union but a political intervention. The trade unions have to make a united front with the Workers States, with the Communist and Socialist parties, with the left-wing groups, with a programme of anti-capitalist struggle, to be able to fulfil even their trade union plans.

There is an enormous pressure coming from the trade union base, middle cadres, and the leaders in the trade unions, to impel the union leaderships. And to weigh on them more in order to promote the struggle for better demands and for a greater development in the class struggle. This process is happening as much in the large capitalist countries as in the small ones.

This shows how the struggles now developing in Asia, Africa and Latin America, up to the small Caribbean Islands, demonstrate that the masses are ready for big social transformations, and ready to raise a struggle against the capitalist system as a whole. Capitalism can no longer yield any important concession or give any support to any important mass movement. It is the world crisis of the capitalist system which makes it reduce manpower constantly and concentrate inside the technical apparatus. In consequence, it continually deepens the miserable conditions of the masses, conditions in which capitalism prepares to launch the war.

The world Communist movement, the Socialist parties and the trade unions must discuss the need to take measures of support and sustenance for the most backward countries, impelling them in the revolutionary struggle for the progress of history. What is in development is the future of humanity. The struggle does not unfold with the abstract respect of the democratic rights of a given population. It is a struggle against the capitalist system, and it is necessary to impel countries into liberating themselves. It is in this development that the Workers States intervene - the USSR among them - to impel countries in throwing out feudal powers and capitalist regimes. The intervention of the Soviet Union in the capitalist countries is a legitimate action for the progress of history. The USSR doesn't intervene to create a new class, because the possibility for this simply does not exist.

The attempt of capitalism to take advantage of the intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, to fuel a campaign against the Workers States, has failed. Capitalism has not been able to draw any advantage from these types who leave Cuba, either. Those who leave Cuba escape, they flee Socialism and the progress of history. The masses of the world have understood this and, for this reason, they respond with new revolutionary movements which - like that in Afghanistan - continue the course of the progress of Cuba. The Workers State of Cuba goes forward, and those who leave are the capitalists and those who did not want Socialism. Those who are going are a small minority. Those who leave are 3,000 whilst Cuba has eight and a half million inhabitants, and the Yankee base of Guantanamo is in

Cuban territory, occupying it militarily and with atomic weapons.

The world Communist and Socialist movements, the trade unions, must defend intransigently the right of Cuba to defend Socialism and to develop it. Let those who don't want to build Socialism go away!

The most complete, the most virulent and centralised form of confrontation against capitalism is expressed, not in the capitalist countries – not even in the great struggles of the proletariat which take place in France, Italy, Britain or Germany – but in the confrontation of the Workers States with the capitalist system, because this is the final stage of the capitalist system. It is the Workers States which essentially represent the world proletariat.

It is for this reason that the Communists, the Socialists and the trade unions must see that, in the confrontation between the capitalist system and the Workers States, the capitalist system has an interest in trying to confuse the workers movement, through criticisms, accusations and mud which the capitalist system throws at the Workers States. The capitalist system does this by basing itself on the leaderships, on movements and groups, on upper layers of the petit bourgeoisie, in order to deflect them from giving support to the revolution, and deflect from the united front of Communists, Socialists and trade unions with the Workers States against the capitalist system.

The Communist parties, the Socialist parties, the Groups, the Trade Unions must thrash out a plan of support to the revolutions in progress in Asia, Africa and Latin America. A call must be made to the masses of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, so that they do not simply feel that they get the support of the objective world balance of forces; but the direct, conscious and planned support of the Trade Unions, of the Workers parties and of the Workers States. One must call to the Chinese Workers State, so that its leadership – that has a conduct of alliance with capitalism and which is, in consequence, counter-revolutionary – stops making this policy and allies itself with the Workers States – Vietnam amongst them – for the joint Communist progress of all countries, which includes also China.

It is necessary to launch an appeal to the Communist parties to discuss with China. Let the French and the Italian Communists discuss with the Chinese so that the Chinese cease making such a policy and discuss on the need for progress in the world Communist movement, for a programme of anti-capitalist struggle and a United Front of the Trade Unions and Parties, the Revolutionary Movements and Trade Unions of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

A programme of struggle is necessary to support and sustain the mass movements in all parts of the world, including Argentina, Uruguay, Chile; to give an impulsion to the movements of Africa and Asia in the anti-capitalist struggle. Let us call on the trade unions and the Communist parties of the USSR, China, Cuba and all the Socialist countries, to turn to the masses of the United States – appealing to them to struggle for an anti-capitalist programme. Also, to point out to them that, in order to develop culture, science and art in the life of the people, the capitalist system has to be overthrown. There is a development of the level and of the rhythm of production in the United States, but there is no advance in the conditions of life for the masses, because the masses are constantly submitted to their

depreciation; they are seeing a constant decline of their conditions of hygiene and safety, whilst there is no improvement in conditions favourable to culture, science and art. On the contrary, there is a constant retrocession in this respect-

A call must be made for the United Front of all the Workers States and for assemblies, meetings, public discussions in them, directed to the masses of the world, to show how culture, science and art develop in the Workers States. Let the masses of the Socialist countries address the masses of the United States, Britain and Japan, for these masses to struggle for a Socialist programme and the development of history. Let public demonstrations be made in the USSR, in the German Workers State, in Czechoslovakia, in Cuba, and in all the Socialist Countries, so that the masses of the world see the cultural, scientific and trade union development of the masses in the Workers States who help them to be educated in the struggle against the capitalist system.

Capitalism has not launched the war yet because it has not been able to do so, but it is trying to prepare the war, nevertheless. Yankee imperialism seeks to exert pressure on the European bourgeoisie to keep it under its domination and to confront the Workers States in such a way that it is European capitalism which comes into direct collision with the Workers States. Thus, the Yanks hope to take advantage from the consequence of the mutual destruction of Europe and the Workers States. These are wild fantasies of the capitalist system. (Yankee) capitalism seeks to impede a greater internal collision and to limit the increase in internal competition, by imposing its own economic and political interests on the European capitalist countries. But the insecurity of the capitalist system, its fear of being engulfed in the coming war, prolongs its agony and internal resistance, and this leads to an exacerbation of their internal competition, because they cannot use the only way out for them: the war! And, with it, the crushing of the Workers States. They have a feeling of certainty that the war against the Workers States is the end of the capitalist system: this is why they try to postpone the outbreak of war. But the war is inevitable, and capitalism prepares for the day when its agony finally pushes it into the war.

Through Carter, Yankee imperialism breaks relations with Iran to fill the European capitalist system with terror, pressurise it and drag it along. This shows the immense weakness of imperialism which has to break relations with countries it used to invade before. It is the world relations of forces which impedes it from invading. It is the presence of the USSR and the rest of the Workers States which prevents it from doing so, and the influence of the world process over the masses of North America. All this prevents imperialism from invading Iran.

One must launch an appeal to all the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Socialist countries, to turn to the North American masses so that they struggle for the development of the United States. This means that the development of technology and production must elevate culture, science, art and the economy

in such a way that the masses can develop within knowledge, science, art and economic life, through the elimination of the existing system of production. The capitalist system cannot develop the country, this is why one has to call on the masses to bring it down. One must call for a United Front of all the Socialist and Communist movements, the Groups of the Left and the Trade Unions, for an anti-capitalist programme.

Capitalism proceeds in its economic, social, political, scientific and cultural crisis. It cannot offer anything to humanity but war and corruption.

It is in such conditions that this First of May 1980 is taking place. Revolutionary movements arise in all parts of the world. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan has impelled revolutionary movements – quite the reverse from the criticisms we heard which pretended that this intervention would lead to a retreat of the struggle of the masses. Countries such as Nicaragua, deprived of everything, arise and bring down one of the most fundamental pillars of the world capitalist system, which was based on Yankee imperialism. Soon, El Salvador and other countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa will do the same. Rhodesia used to be a vital centre for the extermination of the Blacks, a vital centre for feudalism in the service of Yankee and world capitalism. It has been smashed by the progress of the guerrilla struggle and of the electoral struggle. It highlights the impotence of the capitalist system in impeding the progress of history. All this is part of the world balance of forces, which means that any liberation movement comes to count on the support, the sustaining force, the logical necessity to impel and support them, which comes from the Workers States (Socialist countries), the Communist parties and the revolutionary movements of the world.

Such are the conditions in which this First of May 1980 is being celebrated. It is necessary to make a United Front of the Trade Unions, the Workers Parties of the whole world to discuss a plan of progress in the economy, in technology, in culture, in science and in art. And this programme must allow the raising of the conditions of human life, eliminating pollution. For this, it is necessary to make a struggle against capitalism. This cannot be achieved through the creation of ecological groups, because their capacity is limited and because the vital centre of the masses is the Workers States, the Communist and Socialist parties, the left-wing movements and the Trade Unions. It is necessary to call on the groups named "Green" to include themselves in these movements, to try to win the main sectors of the petit bourgeoisie, of the big Liberal parties, the Social Democratic parties, the bourgeois parties – and that all these petit bourgeois sectors be brought into the anti-capitalist struggle.

On this First of May 1980, in the name of the Posadist IV International, we salute with all our revolutionary fervour the struggle of the masses of the whole world and of the Workers States. And we call on the Workers States (Socialist countries) to contribute one day of each workers's wage each month to the development of the struggles, to the progress, the education, the culture and the economy of such countries as Nicaragua, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Cuba, Mozambique, Angola, the countries in the Antilles like Grenada, Surinam, and all the other movements, which are developing themselves.

They must take advantage from all the indecision, the disputes, the inter-capitalist clashes, to influence the petit bourgeois masses which are still, electorally speaking, around the large bourgeois parties. But all this has to be done by the Workers States, the Communist and Socialist parties, without damaging either the programme nor the policy of the anti-capitalist struggle.

It is necessary that the Communist parties make a discussion of ideas, that they elevate the debate of what was posed by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, and what arises from the experience of the world struggle which has led to the existence of 20 Workers States and 20 Revolutionary States.

This is the base for the education of the masses of the Communist parties, of the Trade Unions, of the Revolutionary Movements, of the Socialist movements, to influence the petit bourgeois masses and impel those movements which are called 'ecological' or 'green', all the feminist and masculine movements, in the anti-capitalist struggle.

We call on the Trade Unions of the world, on the Communist parties and the Socialist parties, on the Workers States, to turn to the Chinese masses for a joint discussion with a common planning of the struggle for progress in China, and in the rest of the world, on the basis of the anti-capitalist struggle.

One must demand the direct intervention of the trade unions, the cells and regional committees, and the Communist Party of the USSR, and those in the other Workers States, towards the masses of the world; and for the masses of the world to gauge the democratic Socialist development in the Workers States, to serve as a source of education, security and influence over the masses of the United States and Japan, Britain, Germany and all the countries of the world.

This is the programme for the progress of history, for the progress of humanity and that of culture, science and art, a process which is unfolding in the struggle for the construction of Socialism, against the world capitalist system.

- VIVA THE SOVIET UNION, VIVA THE GERMAN WORKERS STATE,
VIVA THE CHINESE WORKERS STATE
- VIVA ALL THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES AND THE MASSES OF THE WORLD
- For the World United Front of all the Workers State, the Trade Unions, the Communist parties, the Socialist parties of all the world, against the capitalist system
- For the United Front in each country of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party and the Groups of the Left and the Trade Unions, for a programme of anti-capitalist struggle; because this is the only way to bring about progress in the economy, science and art, in each country.

18.4.1980

Workers of the world, unite!

J. POSADAS

**AFGHANISTAN,
IMPERIALISM,
THE USSR
AND THE
CONSTRUCTION OF
SOCIALISM.**



31. 12. 79.

5. 01. 80.

(This text is in two parts).

SUPPLEMENT TO RED FLAG

Monthly organ of the

**REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)**

Note to the reader: This text is in two parts, each one with a different date. The first part, dated 31.12.79, is an analysis made by comrade Posadas immediately after the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. The second part, dated 5.1.1980 continues and extends the analysis made in the first text and refers to the events which took place subsequently. All subtitles are from the Editorial Board. February 1980.

AFGHANISTAN, IMPERIALISM, THE U.S.S.R.,
AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM.

J. POSADAS 31.12.79. -

This is a process of the profound crisis of the capitalist system and of the development of the Workers States in which capitalism has now reached the most open preparations of war, an index of its crisis. But this latter isn't only or essentially of a particular economic or social character of various countries; it is the crisis of capitalism, of the capitalist system in front of the Workers States. It is not a crisis through a strike, through unemployment, or because the market is saturated. All this exists. These are the conditions of the crisis of the capitalist system. But the essential crisis is that capitalism can no longer sustain the progress of the Workers States and the progress of the latter is expressed above all in the fact that these are intervening in the world impelling the development of social transformations.

Now, the workers movement in any part of the world, is based on the consciousness of a support, of a sustaining force and of a relation of forces which aren't their own, nor do they come from their Party nor from their movement, but from the world relation of forces whose essential centre is the existence of the Workers States and the existence of the Soviet Union.

This process doesn't develop in all countries in the same way. It is uneven and combined because even countries with less tradition, with less political trade union or military preparation, are stimulated towards social transformations. They don't have any strength and their development is very uneven in respect of the rest of the world. They are poor and their is no developed economy, but they have the strength to advance towards social transformations.

This unequal and combined process allows the most backward countries to have the resolution to make social transformations, up to very small countries like Grenada which is a small island in the Caribbean and they resolve to apply a socialist programme. Grenada is a small country which has neither the economic conditions nor the financial bases nor the relation with the world for this. It is a small island but it is stimulated to propose a socialist programme.

This resolution of Grenada and the resolution of the Soviets to support the revolutionary movement of Afghanistan are two of the resolutions determined by this uneven and combined process and by the world relations of forces which determines the course of the process, whether economic, social, political, revolutionary or military.

Any important aspect in these five aspects, is determined by the world relations of forces ; which determine each. This is going to influence all the Communist parties. This process of concentration of forces in the Workers States , who accumulate all the necessary forces for the progress of history - and in the capitalist system which collects the detritus, is going to be expressed more and more and is going to tend to reduce and eliminate the existence of all bureaucracies . To reduce and eliminate, does not mean to make disappear. Bureaucracies can live, they can continue to make some activity, but the process is proceeding to eliminate them.

This process also gives rise to movements which - originating as movements of protest - develop in a more organic sense, like those of the Ecologists or in a lesser degree, the homosexuals. These are movements without their own historic reason; neither the Ecologists nor the homosexuals have a historic reason to exist. Ecologism is the result of the barbarism of the capitalist system. To resolve the problems of Ecology, it is necessary to resolve the cause of the problems, which is the capitalist system. This necessity is expressed in a special and particular Ecological movement because the (workers) parties which have the function and the duty to overcome and destroy the capitalist system and construct socialism, haven't done it. Hence these particular movements arise, the cannabis movement, Ecologism and the homosexuals. They are the expression of the lack of a necessary historic response for which the conditions exist but the old Communist parties, the Socialists, the trade unions and the Workers States, didn't supply it. It isn't true that this answer could not have been given. It is not an accusation against the Workers States, but a statement : they have not dealt with these problems, because to deal with them, it would be necessary to effect the destruction, elimination and overcoming of the capitalist system.

This process of complete and acute crisis of the capitalist system, leads the latter to the preparation of the war in the most open way. Before it was done with stages, negotiating with the Soviet Union on arms, negotiating over SALT, masking and concealing their necessity to seek how to survive, with pretences of agreement with the Workers States. Now capitalism cannot do this, although superficially it may do it because there is a process of intensification of such a nature that the Workers States have to intervene anyway and in intervening it shows that there is a sector of the bureaucracy which has decided to confront the capitalist system even with war. Moreover, it confronts it with foresight, not with the foresight like Stalin whose allies - the Germans - launched the war. Stalin made an alliance with the Germans so as not to be attacked and to impel the Germans to attack first the so-called democratic capitalists. But the Germans attacked him, just the same! This was the lack of capacity, of political understanding, of the historic function of the Workers State; because the bureaucracy thought essentially in its own limited interests as bureaucracy and thus, could not see or interpret the world.

It is necessary to understand this process. Thus, as before it was necessary to understand the permanent revolution, and the political revolution, now it is this process which it is necessary to understand. All the old Trotskyism is annihilated because it is not prepared theoretically, politically or organisationally to understand this process. It remained in the old Trotskyism, which poses the political revolution, and the permanent revolution. The latter sees the behaviour of the Soviet leadership as Stalinism, although it is not stimulated to speak any-

more of Stalinism in a general form but particularises aspects of it. Some continue to speak of Stalinism as if history was still in 1935, which shows the political annihilation of these people, who have nothing to do not only with Trotskyism, but with revolutionary ideas. They are detritus. While Ecology exists because it expresses a necessity to which the workers parties do not respond, these people express the backwardness with which they live and the marginalisation of such movements as they do not see the progress of history. They do not relate their functioning to the progress of history, as the Communist parties and particularly the Workers States do.

In the Workers States, there are also the ultra-lefts and the rightists. In Yugoslavia we have the right of the Workers States which corresponds to groups like Rouge (*) of France, corresponds to all the movements which still live on the criticisms of the Communist parties and the Workers States without basing themselves on the fact that this is another situation in which the final settlement of accounts is being prepared and that the Workers States support and impel the world revolutionary movement in all the forms in which it is necessary to do, limitedly in some cases, but they support it. They don't consider that the Workers States do not have any other future in this world relation of forces than to associate themselves with the progress of the world revolution - against the capitalist system. None of them sees this. They continue speaking of the 'political revolution', or of 'permanent revolution'; but they don't grasp the experiences, and the conclusions of this process of history. They continue with backward interpretations of history.

For example, as regards the problems of Iran and of Afghanistan, history shows a clear and decisive process. If Grenada resolves to transform itself into an apple, and transports all the red of the pomegranate to the apple - if Grenada resolves to advance to Socialism, (without having the strength, the economy, the preparation or the technicians which it needs), it's because it receives the influence and the impulse of the world process of the revolution. This means the consciousness that capitalism is weak, that the Workers States are strong, that historic necessity means socialism, that people want socialism and that even a country like Grenada, without literacy, submitted previously to the most brutal exploitation of british imperialism, without strength, resolves to seek the road of socialism in order to progress and people accept this. Without a proletarian base, with very few plantation workers, without culture, without educational knowledge, they take the road of socialism.

.....

* Rouge is the paper of the Mandelist organisation in France.

THE SOVIET INTERVENTION
IS FIRM AND DECIDED.

It is necessary to see Afghanistan as part of this process expressed in Grenada and Afghanistan is another index of the level of the process. It began in Afghanistan two years ago, through an indecisive revolutionary process, because there was no Party, no trade unions, no leadership and the Soviet leadership didn't work with all the necessary decision in time to construct a movement nor a Communist Party. This then creates internal indecisions, and allows layers to predominate which represent indecisive programme and policy, which express lack of resolution, and lack of homogeneous programming towards anti-capitalist measures. It gave rise to every type of currents and tendencies linked to the old feudal sectors who governed Afghanistan. But even so, in this process of two years, the Soviets with their intervention - even politically limited - have succeeded in imposing a much more resolved government on the socialist line. The sector of Amin isn't a case similar to Pol Pot in Cambodia, because this movement of Afghanistan had its origin in bourgeois layers, petit bourgeois sectors combined with others linked to the Soviet Union and to the Communist Party, whilst Pol Pot was a movement directly or considered as a Communist Party. This sector of Afghanistan is more linked to the bourgeois apparatuses.

This shows also that the Soviets have not developed a policy of education, of explanations, of examples, of development of socialist measures and this allowed the bourgeois sectors to prevail. This timid attitude of the Soviets came from their fear of the Yanks and fear of compromising their own apparatus. Otherwise, there would have been no necessity for an Amin to appear in Afghanistan. It is the same as happened with the Communist Party of Iran which - being very bold - had an erroneous policy and did not foresee Khomeini. It did not believe that the process could give rise to a Khomeini. The Soviets intervene with troops in conditions in which imperialism has already demonstrated openly that it is preparing war. It is a very decided reply of the Workers States through the Soviet Union, which shows how they prepare for the war that imperialism is preparing; it shows that they are prepared to confront imperialism and they are ready to win all the territory, all the countries, all the historic political, social, economic bases, all the development of countries in whatever part of the world, to confront the capitalist system and that they are not essentially preoccupied (preoccupied in part but not essentially) with the reaction of imperialism in its intervention above all on the frontiers.

This attitude of the USSR is totally the opposite of the stage of Stalin who made the pact with Hitler. Now, the USSR instead of making a democratic pact with yankee imperialism, impels the revolution everywhere in the world. This gives no room for backward left movements of Trotskyist origin, because the processes now are not resolved in a regular, normal, electoral, parliamentary or even trade union form, but are resolved in a concentrated way in the form of confrontation of system against system.

It is true that the French and Italian proletariats are very powerful, very strong, and that the Communist and Socialist parties of these two countries are strong. It is true that British Labourism is strong but the genuine representation of the world proletariat is the Soviet Union and not the Communist Parties or the trade unions of France or of Italy. The world proletariat sees, in the Soviet Union, the realisation of the anti-capitalist struggle, and sees the Workers State as representative of the historic and concrete interests of the working class against the capitalist system. But the proletariat of France or of Italy, or of Britain, are conducting great struggles with a great courage and decision against the capitalist system. They do not have either consistent anti-capitalist programme or policy, as has the Soviet Union. The masses of the world are guided as a consequence, not by what the proletariat or the Communist parties of Italy or France do, but by what the Soviet Union does.

This determines the course of the process; It isn't going to give any room for backward movements of Trotskyist or any other origin which don't understand this process. The process is confining them to the point of making them disappear. These movements do not understand this process. The existence of the Ecologist movement expresses the same process. Ecologism is the reply of protest of the population, of well-off petit bourgeois origin, petit bourgeois in general, and also, bourgeois sectors; but principally it is the reply of sectors of the petit bourgeoisie, especially the poor sectors of it, who are attracted to form a movement with these characteristics, because they are not attracted to the Socialists and Communists who lack in continuity, in consistency and anti-capitalist political security. But Ecologism is a movement which removes the struggle for ecological problems from the totality of the social problems. It continues the struggle for the cleaning of the environment, for the elevation of life, to a particular aspect which cannot be resolved without eliminating what produces pollution which is the capitalist system. This is not an error from the Ecologists, but a consequence of the lack of security and confidence in the workers parties, who have not waged in time the anti-capitalist struggle - which they should have done.

Three years ago, in the most important manifestos of the International, we posed the problem of the Ecologists, supporting their preoccupation and posing the necessity to incorporate them. The Ecologists are not a fractional form of decomposition of the struggle against capitalism, separating it in various aspects. They are a form of the will for anti-capitalist combat, in which the Workers States and the communist parties are deficient. Thus, these movements maintain it. In this way, it is necessary to interpret and to win them. The new movements which are formed have no support or aid or acceptance by the capitalist system. They are new movements against the capitalist system. Even the homosexuals of Europe having no importance or significance, unite, and do not ask for the continuity of the capitalist system but associate themselves with the struggle which the left develops. This shows the rupture of the capitalist system with culture, with science, with art, with the progress of humanity and with civilisation. Capitalism prepares war in these conditions which are the most unfavorable for it, and revolutionary movements like those of Grenada and others like Nicaragua and El Salvador, are produced because there is a conviction, there is the security that people observe and see the road of progress which is the anti-capitalist struggle and are stimulated to take it. These countries are backward. They have nothing - this is the uneven side. But, the combined aspect is that they see countries like Cuba, Ethiopia, Angola or Mozambique in other parts of the world, who have nothing but who have waged a

great struggle like themselves, and triumphed. But in these countries there were either communist parties or revolutionary movements which transformed themselves afterwards into communist parties -- but communist parties following the road of the Soviet Union.

In these conditions capitalism has no point of support or aid. It prepares the war in the utmost solitude and it is in this stage that conditions and struggles, like those of Afghanistan, are prepared, which are not the same as Poland and Finland in 1939. Then, there was only one Workers State and the invasion of Poland and Finland was carried out by the Soviet Union against its ally of that moment -- which was nazism, to gain space. So Trotsky defended it. The idea was to keep the nazis at a distance. The latter invaded Poland because they hoped to get closer to the Soviet frontier and to make a circle, a pincers against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union with perfect right, invaded Poland. People said to Trotsky that he was supporting the invasion by the Stalinism which wanted to kill him. and Trotsky replied that the invasion of Poland was a necessary evil and that the historic situation of this moment was resolved in the world as a whole and not through the intermediary of the small countries but of the large countries of Germany, France, Britain and the Soviet Union. These were the countries which were going to resolve the social problems. The small countries do not count as instruments of the progress of history but they are little territories which can only incline to one or other side, because they do not have their own forces and as it was the great powers who decide, the small suffer the consequences and Trotsky said that to interrupt the democratic right of Poland was a necessary evil to provide the bases of a superior democratic right which is the Polish Workers State. The Soviets did not form a Workers State in that moment, nor did they have the time but afterwards, they did so. But the German invasion of Poland was to crush it. The problems of democracy, of democratic right were determined by the course of the progress of history. If the Soviets had not invaded Poland, they would have left the Germans to move closer to the gates of the Soviet Union through Poland. If the Soviets respected the right of this small country, they would have been giving strength to a power which was going to make history retreat. Trotsky placed democracy as a function of history, not democracy as a Sunday best suit but as a function of progress.

The democracy of capitalism say that it allows freedom so that people can decide, but it is the ruling class which decides not the people. It is different when --as in Nicaragua-- the people intervenes, led by an anti-capitalist political leadership. It is not possible to make an abstraction of "let the people decide". In Afghanistan, the intervention of the Soviet troops contributes to elevating the conditions of life of this country and the eliminating of sectors who want to repress and assassinate the Afghan people.

The Yanks are occupying militarily Puerto Rico. Why don't the Yanks leave Puerto Rico? All those who protest about the Soviet intervention, why don't they make a campaign against the Yankee occupation of Puerto Rico? Why not demand the expulsion of imperialism from the zones which it occupies and do not belong to it? For example, all the zone of the South East of the United States was Mexican, and the British (imperialists) still have colonies in Latin America. Attention should be given to this. This is useful to the domination of yankee capitalist 'democracy', to assassinate people. There, 'democracy' is a name because 'democracy' does not exist. Democracy is not the right to vote or elect. It is the right to live, to progress, to elevate the conditions of life and to be able to seek the means for

this. If it is necessary to enter a country to elevate it, it is not an occupation, it is not a retreat nor an invasion, but a technical, scientific and cultural means to elevate the country. What has to be proposed at the same time, is the development of soviet democracy in the country concerned.

This conception of democracy also applies to Afghanistan. Democracy is an instrument of the progress of history. To respect democratic rights of a country when this at the same time, serves as an instrument for reaction and to attack the Soviet Union, is not democratic, is not to defend historic rights necessary to the progress of life but to respect a power which is going to make the rights of life retreat. Thus the interpretation and the application of democratic conclusions is determined by the necessity of progress of history whether in respect to Afghanistan or any other country.

All these authors whether of Trotskyist origin, communist or socialist, who furiously attack the Soviet Union because it invades a country or because it prevents the right of this country to develop, do not say what right is in question. In Afghanistan, feudalism exists. When they say that the people must speak, it is a lying distortion. What people? Nowhere still does the people decide outside revolutions because electoral representation is a deceit and a lie. In the elections, a proportion intervene who may be twenty percent of the population - which is bourgeois, who have nothing to do with progress. For example, in Britain, the conservatives won relying on twenty percent of votes from people who have nothing to do with life nor with history, nor with culture, nor art, nor any thing else and these include the queen and all her family.

All the great possessors of money, proprietors of the banks, of industry, commerce, have nothing to do with anything. They have no idea about anything. They have no knowledge or culture and nevertheless, they intervene. There are 70, 80, or 90 years old who have nothing more to do than to collect the interests on their money. These people vote, but on the base of what do they vote?

All these champions of democracy and liberty, what democracy or liberty do they defend? Democracy is an instrument of the progress of history and the history is the class struggle and the class struggle is: Workers States versus capitalist system. It is on the basis of these relations that it is necessary to define the function of democracy.

If we demand democracy in the capitalist system, it is because democratic rights and democratic necessity, are to impel the class struggle towards a Workers State. Democratic rights are not an abstraction but an instrument of the progress of history. That the peoples decide, is a lie. There is not a single people which can decide through its own will, because they do not have the means. Children of eight work in India, in Latin America and even in Europe. They vote when they are 18, but at 8 they work. So, they say that the children do not have the consciousness to vote, but to be exploited yes, the children have a use. If the children voted, they would do so in accordance with their function in the economy. The person of 80 who collects the profits, has a consciousness yes: - a capitalist one. There is a whole mystification about democracy, in which the groups of Trotskyist origin share, when they say that the people has to decide. What people? In Afghanistan, it was not 'the people' who decided before.

Recently now with the support of the Soviet troops, the people can decide, because it can animate itself to go against the landowners who were the ones sup-

ported by Amin (the overthrown government), by imperialism, by socialist parties, and movements of socialist origins, but not by the population of Afghanistan.

As a remnant, as a consequence of the past of feudal dominion, all these countries have the same problems. In Iran, it is the same. How can one say that the government of Khomeini is a dictatorship, the same as the other? The dictatorship of the shah was linked with the CIA and impeded the development of the economy, of culture, of civilisation and was the support to impel reaction in the world. It supported the capitalist system. Now it is an other thing. How then say that Iran is the same as before? It is a lie. The movements who interpret in this way, do not see, that even with all the theological, religious limitations of the muslim movement, the latter impels the struggle against the capitalist system and that its point of support is this. If it is indecisive, without consistency. this is a problem which will be resolved in the form of movement, of programme, of policy, of discussion to incorporate the population. But to say that it is necessary to give complete liberty as a condition to advance in Iran is to falsify the reality. We want complete freedom, with the socialist programme. But we support the present progress in Iran, even led by the muslim movement, because it is a struggle against the capitalist system. We make alliances with transitory allies and in the process of the alliance, a part of the ally is won. It's like this with Khomeini.

If the democratic, socialist or communist movements do not understand this, it is not through ill will or because they are allies of the capitalist system, but because they do not have the theoretical and political preparation to understand it. Thus they yield to the impression of democratic abstraction. They do not see democracy as an instrument of progress.

For example Afghanistan is under feudalism. To progress, the Soviets have no other remedy than to do this and not to defend the frontiers of the USSR only, but to make Afghanistan advance and also to defend the frontiers of the USSR, which is the instrument of the progress of history. Hence there is not one anti-Soviet mass movement; not one. Neither could the Yanks make one. All these left movements who propose the abstract defense of democracy represent intellectual circles, of state employees, of functionaries, who live incarcerated in themselves, and not in contact with the progress of the struggles and their significance. They do not see that in Afghanistan even with Soviet intervention, this tends to eliminate feudalism and impel the Workers State. It is on this basis then, that it is necessary to support the democratic soviet demands of Afghanistan, but supporting this present situation and the Soviet intervention which is a necessary instrument.

The intervention of the United States with the shah - is this not an intervention? The shah has stolen fifteen thousand million dollars (this is what's known) There is no government leader who - from his work - can earn 15 thousand million dollars. Yankee imperialism supports this. Is it not a legitimate right of the Iranians then, to take measures and reprisals against imperialism to stimulate struggles and to advance? What all these movements which criticise the Soviet Union - the Trotskyists, democrats, socialists and communists - should say, is that the thousands of millions of dollars which the shah stole should be returned to Iran. It is the United States which should be judged, as it is a helper, protector of criminals and assassins. This is an attack on democracy, and not the intervention of the soviet troops in Afghanistan, because these are impelling progress, while protection to the shah is to impose retreat.

THE WORKERS PARTIES LACK UNDERSTANDING OF
FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS.

These conditions of this stage of history -which are going to be extended in every sense - go beyond all the existing groups and also the Communist parties, who have no theoretical or political preparation for intervention. Hence the Communist parties have uneven positions with respect to the Soviet Union which expresses the fact that they each receive the influence of the bourgeoisie of their own countries, whether in Italy, France, or elsewhere.

All this process is going to be amplified and extended. It is not going to be weakened or retreat, but is going to be extended more and more.

The instruments of history are the communist parties, the big trade unions, and the Workers States. An unconditional support is necessary to the historic function of the Workers States and partial criticisms on the road of progress. The criticisms formulated by groups like 'Rouge' in France, their attitudes, or that of any other group which is outside the necessity of history, are no use, and they are more and more outside history.

The communist parties do not educate cadres in the conviction of the dialectical preparation so as to intervene in the process. They have to take positions which are constantly contradictory. For example, the french Communist party gives a direct support to the Soviet Union and suddenly poses criticisms or reserves as regards the policy of the Soviet Union; and before when the soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia took place, its policy was one of reserve over this. The policy of euro communism, of pluralism, is against the policy of alliance and of united front with the Soviet Union. With the Soviet Union, it isn't just a simple alliance, an episodic alliance for one or another problem that is necessary, but a United Front - a precise and consistent programme of anti-capitalist struggle. The communist parties and even the socialists and the trade unions, will be forced in a persistent, continuous and advancing form, to deal with these problems because now capitalism gives no margin for demands within the capitalist system. Ecologism has arisen because capitalism cannot now give anything more. Thus, there is no possibility of maintaining the workers movement or the workers parties in dispute or discussion, in parliamentary or trade union struggles, by means of workers demands, with perspectives of progressing and progressing. This is now evident because capitalism cannot concede anymore. If Ecologism has arisen, it is because capitalism has nothing more to offer. When in Grenada, a movement appears which takes power and speaks of socialism, it's because capitalism does not provide anything anymore, and at the same time, Grenada like Nicaragua, expresses the influence of socialism in the most backward countries of the world.

This process is much more profound than appears on the surface; and it is of a nature which constantly creates crisis for capitalism and the communist parties and makes the latter change their leaderships. For example, the french Communist Party spoke against the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia and now it supports the intervention in Afghanistan. But it is not because Afghanistan is different from Czechoslovakia but because there is a great pressure of the Communist base and a great objective pressure of the process. This leads the Communist Party to take this position, as opposed to the italian Communist Party which condemns the intervention in Afghanistan. The absence of security, of unanimity or of agreements in the positions of the communist parties with

respect to the Soviet intervention, is determined by the lack of theoretical and political preparation of these parties, who continue to function with the conception of democracy as an instrument to transform society. Democracy cannot transform society. Bourgeois democracy is an instrument of history which allows advancing in struggles and it is necessary to defend democratic rights as a means of influencing the population, for the struggle against the capitalist system; this is in order to overthrow the capitalist system whatever may be the forms or the combination of necessary forms to do it. But democracy is not a means by which the capitalist system can be overthrown or replaced, or overcome.

The attitude of the communist parties who place themselves in this situation with ambiguity, with resistance to or rejection, in relation to Soviet policy, or in relation to the nature of this intervention in Afghanistan which supports a revolutionary movement against the feudal layers and its representatives - has no future. This rapid change of positions, these public and open divergences between the french and the italian communist parties, this lack of unanimity of the communist parties, is determined by their lack of theoretical and political preparation, their lack of having lived in an objective form these processes and having seen that democracy is an instrument for the progress of history, but not the instrument by which progress is made. It is a transitory instrument for progress, because bourgeois democracy is not going to allow the communist parties to go beyond it, democratically or on the parliamentary plane. The communist and socialist parties of Italy who believe in bourgeois democracy, are now receiving examples, influences, and blows which demonstrate to them that it isn't like they think. It is necessary to defend democracy, and democratic rights to the maximum as an instrument for progress to overcome the capitalist system, seeking the maximum of parliamentary progress and trade union progress, with the effect that the population matures, demonstrating that progress is necessary and that for this, social transformations are necessary and that they have to be made without expecting that the capitalist system will consent to them. Thus, it is necessary to defend democratic rights, but with a programme at the same time, of concrete social transformations and a policy to implement them. Thus, the masses, the petit bourgeoisie, will see that democratic rights are an instrument within the capitalist system for the progress of history.

The open soviet intervention in Afghanistan has been made when the Yanks are discussing the SALT agreements and when the problem of the atomic arming of Europe is under discussion also. This Soviet attitude is going to influence the sectors of the yankee right so that they harden their policy and influence the capitalist sectors of Europe to accept the yankee plan. The Soviets - even so - take such an attitude, because it is more important to extend the frontiers of the USSR and by this to extend the revolutionary process which is going to influence in Iran. The Soviets intervene in Afghanistan because they feel the necessity to extend the Soviet Union to confront the capitalist system which is preparing war and shows this by the reinforcement and increase of atomic armaments in Europe. This indicates the resolution of the Soviet bureaucracy not to yield to black mail and not to be deluded as regards the yankee plans. Stalin was mistaken because he answered to sentiments, to consciousness, to bureaucratic interests which do not make the bureaucracy linked to history. If Stalin maintained himself, and if the pact with Hitler did not immobilise the USSR, it is because the army of the USSR came from the previous Red Army and because the working class and the Communist vanguard of the USSR never abandoned the Soviet Union, never fell into defeatism, or desperation. This allowed the USSR to animate itself and to confront the nazis.

In this case, it is different, because now it is the Soviet Union which takes the initiative - supported by twenty Workers States - to confront the capitalist system. It is not taken by surprise, as when the nazis invaded, on account of the ingenuouness and bureaucratic policy, which was the base of Soviet ingenuousness. It was not that they were ingenuous, but that bureaucratic policy prevented them from being objective, and dialectically realist. This made them ingenuous. This is the ingenuousness of those who are afraid of the revolution. Now there is no ingenuousness in the Soviet Union ; what appeared as ingenuousness before, was an attitude of fear in front of the progress of humanity from which part of the fear of war was formed.

Now, it is different. The Soviet Union shows that it is ready to extend its frontiers and to extend the existence of the Workers States which is, to increase the historic power of the Workers State against the capitalist system, whether in Cuba, Ethiopia, Vietnam or in Afghanistan and this - as opposed to the statements of imperialists, is going to influence a great deal in Iran and also in Pakistan, India and Turkey.

The level, the quality and the motives of the discussion has been raised. Neither the Communists nor the Socialists have answers for all this. They do not have them; because they are problems which they have neither foreseen, nor been prepared for, nor do they understand them. They are taken and dragged along, by history. The proof is that the french Communist Party speaks of pluralism and they now have to support revolutionary movements which are against pluralism, like Afghanistan. They speak of the 'local road' to socialism and they have to employ programme, policy and objectives which are universal. That is to say, a programme which means to impose social transformations, to eliminate capitalism, which isn't going to let itself be done with. A consequence of this is that imperialism is preparing war and does so, because it feels that it has no social, economic political, cultural or scientific force to maintain authority and the leadership of the world, not even of the capitalist world.

That the Socialist parties like the french, have to discuss in a certain way with a certain level, proposing that they are opposed to the preparation of the north american atomic arsenal in Europe, means that in their base, there is a real fear of war and that this (socialist) base does not see the danger in the Soviet Union. If it saw it, they would be with their country. But now, they discuss the attitude of their country and they discuss that the Communist parties of France, Portugal, and Italy, openly reject atomic armaments. It is a sign that they do not have trust in the capitalist system and show to the proletariat and to the petit bourgeoisie that the responsibility for the crisis in the world is not the Workers States but the capitalist system. They admit that it is the Workers States who advance the progress of history. Otherwise, they would be patriots and say: "Long live my country, against the rest!" But they present themselves in front of the masses as opposed to their country, as against the arming of the capitalist system, because it is going to attack a country which represents the progress of history.

The war imperialism is preparing is against the Workers States and not like the wars in 1914 or 1939. This position of the communist parties now favours the bases of the progress of the anti-capitalist struggle because they oppose the war of the capitalist system.

THE WORKERS STATES EXERT THE
DECISIVE INFLUENCE
ON THE MASSES OF THE WORLD.

There is not a single movement against the Soviet Union or against the Workers States. There are criticisms against the bureaucracy, but not a movement. There are movements against those who are equivalent to the nazis of now, which is Yankee imperialism. In the socialist parties, the discussion over the socialist attitude to the crisis and war preparation, is going to deepen. It is not only a question of the preparation of war, but of the crisis of the capitalist system, which - while it prepares the war - is maiming in an ever more virulent way - the working class and population. These are the conditions which impel the discussions within the socialist parties and programmatic points arise, which are not a support for the alliance with the capitalist system. There is not an objective and stable base for their alliance with the capitalist system. On the contrary, there are constantly more motives to break the alliance with the capitalist system which was the earlier function of the Socialists and which it still is in part.

The influence of the Workers States over the masses of the world, is a constant and profound encouragement to see that the Workers State is the solution. The masses don't see the Workers State as a bureaucratic and assassin monster, but that even with the criticisms which have to be made, the Workers State resolves the problems that capitalism does not resolve such as employment, security, life, culture, science, art and sport. All the efforts to want to launch against the Workers States the same accusations made against the capitalist system - saying that the Soviets occupy countries in the same way as the capitalist system does - are not accepted by the masses. Thus, ecological movements have formed, but not one movement has been formed for instance, against the 'occupation' of Ethiopia or Afghanistan. There are small groups, disinherited from culture, science and politics, who may object - but nothing more.

The leaderships of the communist parties want the working class to limit themselves to their level, when the working class through historic experience, is with the Soviet Union; it is unconditionally with the Soviet Union. It sees that the Soviet Union is a progress, an indispensable progress of history, which is the vital centre which is going to overthrow the capitalist system, which is opposed to the capitalist system and encourages the anti-capitalist struggles. The vanguard the working class of the world, see it like this. Hence, capitalism hasn't succeeded, hasn't had any success at all against the Soviet Union.

The Communist parties of France and of Italy, have doubts about this policy, because they do not have the political and theoretical preparation for an alliance, a United Front, with the Soviet Union - while maintaining at the same time, the criticisms about the need for a superior development of Soviet democracy in the USSR. It is necessary to have a United Front with the Soviet Union on an anti-capitalist programme.

What has occurred in Afghanistan is going to be repeated in other countries. Imperialism cannot intervene. It complains, protests, makes accusations, but doesn't intervene against the USSR. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is a stimulus to revolution in Iran. As opposed to the imperialists who say that Iran is going to see the 'soviet danger', it is only the Iranian bourgeoisie and the capitalist sector of Khomeinism who see the soviet danger. A series of Khomeinist sectors

for their part, are going to mature with this Soviet intervention and they are going to feel secure; they will not feel usurped by the Soviet Union, but secure that they - like the Soviets and us - know that in Afghanistan, there was a landowner leadership which was making a coup similar to the landowners sectors which they have also in Iran. It is necessary to make appeals to all the Workers States, so that they contribute to help to develop Afghanistan. It is necessary that the Workers States, (socialist countries), make contributions of economic help, plan this help, and give credits, so that Afghanistan can buy part of its production; and a part of the production in Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Germany, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union must be dedicated for Afghanistan. This is going to have an immense effect to help develop Afghanistan. Technological, and scientific help is necessary. This means one must send teachers and professors immediately, to elevate educational, cultural and scientific capacity and to develop the country economically and culturally. This will have an immense effect on the masses of Iran, Pakistan, India and all the rest of the world who will see then in a practical daily form, the function of the Workers States. They are going to see it in a daily immediate practical form and this is going to permit them to see that they can do the same in other countries, that it is possible to make the most backward country reach the more developed level of the Workers States, without passing through the stage of capitalist development which is no longer the stage of bourgeois democracy. The latter cannot provide anymore the democracy of its own stage of development.

It is fundamental to carry out this task, because it will have an immense effect on the formation of the intellectual, cultural development and social decision of the backward masses of all Asia, Africa, Latin America, and also of the Workers States and among them also on China, to cut short the counter-revolutionary function of the leadership of the Chinese Workers State.

It is necessary to appeal to make demonstrations, call meetings, discussions in the factories, in the workers areas, in the cells of the communist parties, of the Workers States, of Bulgaria, of the USSR, of China and Cuba and in the world Communist parties, to debate that it is not a question of the invasion of a country, but of the necessary extension of socialist influence to the rest of the world, an influence which is transmitted through various forms, cultural scientific, economic, political - and which defends the conquests of the socialist progress of humanity because it is for the benefit of humanity and not of a new class nor for a new leadership.

It is necessary to understand that it is not a question of supporting a country to strengthen a new bourgeoisie or a leadership which is going to monopolize power and is going to carry it to other countries - as capitalism wants to present the Soviet Union. Stalin wanted to do this with the communist parties of the world, and was destroyed. Stalin assassinated the leadership of the Bolshevik Party in the name of the counter-revolutionary leadership of the CPSU of that moment. It was destroyed. The bureaucratic apparatus assassinated the Bolshevik leadership, but the Soviet Union went forward. The masses of the world sustain unconditionally Soviet support in Afghanistan. They do not see this support as an 'invasion' nor a bureaucratic imposition but as a support to extend the revolution. The same happened with Cuba. When the Cuban revolution occurred, the Soviet Union was ready to give it support and it intervened. It could not do it with troops because it was not on its frontiers, but the Soviet Union intervened. All those who criticise and protest

now about Soviet intervention, omit to say -- for reasons of interest-- that the intervention was called by the government of Afghanistan and besides, even if it was not called, the Soviet Union has a right to intervene because Afghanistan has a frontier with the USSR and it is a strategic point which imperialism can use against the Soviet Union. Thus, the intervention is an impulse given to the country, not to annex it to the Soviet Union, but to develop it on the road of the construction of socialism.

Those comrades who criticise the Soviet Union as if it was an annexation, must on the contrary, encourage all the communist parties to take resolutions for the expulsion of imperialism from Cuba which has occupied a part of Cuba, and with atomic arms. It is necessary to expel it and the communist parties have to propose this.

They have to go to the various parliaments to propose this and to discuss in their meetings and congresses this objective: "Out with imperialism from Cuba!" Before, these leaders never made a campaign to throw imperialism out of Nicaragua, and it is the masses who are throwing imperialism out of El Salvador. It is necessary to discuss this. It is not a question of taking later resolutions or making general declarations of 'out with imperialism' from here or there, but a question of a policy tending to throw out imperialism from where it is, in association with the forces which impel the overthrow of imperialism throughout the world, and these forces are the Workers States and the masses of the world which are consistent with this policy.

(All subtitles are from the Editorial Board).

SECOND PART

AFGHANISTAN, IMPERIALISM, THE USSR,
AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM.

J. P O S A D A S 5.1.80 -

The Soviet Union is conscious that to intervene in Afghanistan may lead to war. It has intervened anyway and prepared itself with an organisation which foresees the possibility of war. The Soviet Union acts with no panic or fear. No Workers State has warned: "Careful, don't do this!" On the contrary, they have said to imperialism: "It is you who have decided to make the war". Moreover, it is capitalism which is seized with panic; the whole system is, and not just the Yankees. The Yankees seek now to make meetings with the main governments of capitalist Europe to try to draw them nearer, to provoke ruptures between them and the Workers States, to lead them to reduce their commercial, economic and social ties with the Workers States and to obtain a greater liaison between European capitalism and imperialism.

Imperialism goes all through these contortions to justify what it is up to; it pretends to reason as if to say: "See how the Soviets act, what a savagery!", but it is all a pack of lies because imperialism is in the wrong. "LE MONDE" (*) - commented; "What do the Yankees come and tell us about Afghanistan? It is all a facade, because it is they who accompanied Somoza, and the junta of El Salvador, up to the very last moment. What lessons have they to give on "non intervention"?". This attitude and that of Schmidt and Brandt in Germany show that capitalism is uncertain. It does not enter war with resolution and confidence. It fears that the weight of the socialist and communist opposition is very great. Even if the weight of the Socialists is weaker, the Socialists question imperialism because they see that the war is the end of them all.

All of them, the Socialists included, see that the war is not meeting with popular approval. At the time of the second world war, they justified it by saying that the enemy was the nazis. But this cannot be said anymore today. It is the Workers State which intervenes in Afghanistan and a confrontation with it does not meet popular acceptance. This indicates the immense authority of the Soviet Workers State in particular. The capitalist system is in panic because it does not know what is going to happen immediately after the war. So, it makes a thousand manoeuvres and movements to justify war preparations in the eyes of the masses. It manoeuvres to justify itself and seeks time to reach an internal coordination which is no longer there. They have a coordination on the military plane, but not as regards the population. There is no coordination between them and the population. Jane Fonda organised a demonstration of 200. 000 people against the war, against the Yankees and against imperialism, and not against the Workers States!

Imperialism has not been able to mobilise even 10.000 people to support the 'sovereignty' of Afghanistan, or for the liberation of the hostages in the yankee embassy in Teheran. This shows that imperialism prepares the war with feet of

.....

LE MONDE: French bourgeois paper.

clay. It is falling and collapsing. The Yanks see this. This is the source of their panic. This is also why there is no preoccupation in any of the Workers-States in front of the war possibility. Even Rumania has not condemned the Soviet Union directly. Imperialism sees the depth of all this situation and sees the security with which the Workers States are intervening - and the masses of the world who are not one bit intimidated. The masses of the world are in no state of intimidation.

In the last world war, each Communist Party supported its own bourgeoisie. But now, the Communist parties are with the Soviet Union in any case. The Spanish Communist Party itself has had to say: "Yes, we defend national sovereignty. But what right have the Yankees to make all this noise?" This demonstrates the disintegration of the capitalist camp and the insecurity with which it has to enter the final stages of war preparations. Imperialism is confronted with two fronts. The front with the Soviets and the front internally. At a given moment of the war days, it will be the internal front which will decide. Because the war is going to be a matter of days, not of years or months. It will be a matter of days, not weeks, but days.. and possibly hours. Such is the calculation of the Soviets and it is correct. The Soviets say that they will destroy New-York and the United States in half an hour. This is not a joke. They can do it, and have all the necessary arms for it. It is a question of hours, because they are going to destroy the essential centres of capitalism and the system will crash down.

Capitalism enters the worst conditions of history for its survival, because the masses of the world see that progress is on the side of the Workers States. Any country at all - however small it may be, as small as Grenada, (which is small like the fruit) says: "Let us construct socialism". When they are told: "But how can you do this, when you have nothing at all and always depended on the English?", they answer: "We are constructing socialism; Cuba did not have any more than ourselves. So, we will do like Cuba".

Capitalism does not prepare itself with the security that it will triumph in the war and will be able to reassert itself. It is important to consider the feeble mental structure of the capitalists. Militarily speaking, their structure is more powerful than their mental one. Their mental structure on the other hand, is very fragile. This is because they have not the historic right on their side. From their inner state they are led to acts of panic. They do not act as a function of logical reasoning but of panic. They do not have the attitude of someone secure who takes measures. Even now, the reprisals which they raise against the USSR, are not measures of war. These reprisals are not different from how they acted with the soviet ballerina whom they refused her exit in a plane because they wanted her to stay in the US with her husband. But not only she did not stay, but it is the husband who came back to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Workers State has an enormous influence on the petit bourgeoisie of North America. It is not by chance that Carter found the need to declare in a somewhat intemperate way: "We have overcome the Vietnam complex". Why a Vietnam complex? If he talks about a Vietnam complex it must be that he directs himself to a petty bourgeoisie whom he wants to affect and which is not prepared to go to death in another military conflict of the Vietnam sort. Carter talks to an immense layer of the petit bourgeoisie, technicians, scientists who used to be points of support for the capitalist system and imperialism and who - today - ha

have doubts, or are against capitalism.

Imperialism is preparing the war in the worst conditions for itself, and its duration will be made shorter still, because of all this. The massacres are going to be enormous but the disappearance of capitalism is certain, as is certain that the Workers States will continue. From there stems the panic with which capitalism takes all its measures.

If the Soviets intervened with such a determination in Afghanistan, it is because they had prepared for this previously. The Yankees knew it also, and it is obvious. But the fact that the Soviets had prepared this intervention, and have acted the way they did, indicates that they feel sure and resolute. Stalin on the other hand, abandoned half of Poland to the capitalists. But the Soviets today intervene before the Yankees. They intervene resolutely. Stalin moved against his own ally - the nazis and had to occupy Poland against his own ally, because the army of the Soviet Union and its Party, forced him to. Even if the (Communist) Party did not function, it reacted according to the interest of the Workers State and opposed german capitalism. Today, on the other hand, it is the Soviets who take the initiative and extend throughout the world.

The masses of the world see that any progress is accomplished in the form of the Workers State. No capitalist country allows any progress at all under a capitalist form. All that you find in the capitalist countries are smears, denunciations, and a public and obvious state of regression. In the eyes of humanity, capitalism is responsible for all the evils and backwardness; and in their eyes also the Workers State is the bearer of progress, even with a bureaucratic leadership. A tiny country such as Grenada hardly any bigger than Nicaragua, and El Salvador, decides to take the road of Socialism. In so doing, it sees that the one who is opposed is capitalism and that it marches against the logical necessity of history. Capitalism is like someone who would try to prevent the sun from rising by putting their hand in front of it. The progress of history however is like the rising sun. From Copernicus to day, everyone knows this.

Even with great military mobility, capitalism is preparing for this confrontation with a great social inertia. On the other hand, the Workers State possesses a great military capacity, superior to that of capitalism and a social capacity superior to its military capacity. This is why the Workers States are springing up everywhere. In the drawing near of the war preparations, there come Workers States, and more Workers States. For capitalism, there is only defeat upon defeat. In the mind of the capitalists there is a sentiment of defeat.

The intervention of the Soviets in Afghanistan, expresses the confidence of the Workers State, its might, and the transcendancy of its perspectives. This intervention highlights particularly well the weakness of the capitalist system, its divisions and fear. The Soviets however, did not hesitate to intervene in Afghanistan. They had sought to conciliate first with Amin, but when they overthrew him, they did it to protect the Workers State and extend its frontiers - facing fully the possibility of unfavourable reactions in Iran, from the Yanks, or in Pakistan and from China. The Soviets intervened in spite of all this. It indicates the confidence and resolution they have in the defense of the Workers State, and also, a capacity of political organisation and manoeuvre, greater than before. The feudal layers of Afghanistan, directly or indirectly would have

reopened the doors to the Yankees. The Soviets came out to cut this short. This is a way of declaring to the masses of the world: "We are ready to defend this historic conquest, even if the price is war". The masses of the world understand this, they have seen that the Workers State seeks to extend its frontiers and develop elsewhere similar conditions to those inside the USSR, and that this is against the capitalist system. The masses of the world grasp this, they understand and learn to develop the capacity of political manoeuvre, corresponding to their historic objective and not as a function of the interests of the ruling caste.

The other interventions of the USSR in Poland and Finland before the second world war, had the same decision about them. But they had been conducted with less tactical skill and with less acceptance on the part of the masses. The Soviets intervened in Poland, against their former (nazi) ally, and were partly supported by the Polish population. But today, the afghan population which lives and intervenes, supports the soviet intervention. It is a country of no mads, poachers and thieves. The bourgeois press keeps on about "the poor afghan people who struggle, resists the USSR, brings down its planes and destroys its tanks". But the bourgeois press says nothing about where these people obtain their arms from, their military training, their means of transport? The capitalist declarations have the coherence of the killer, of the assassin, who sees no more than what he wants. To be coherent has to mean, to understand how could such dejected and deprived people of the afghan tribes, acquire quite suddenly the necessary weapons to be beat the soviet army with? The soviet army is the army which defeated nazism and which imperialism does not dare to tackle. How can it be routed by "these poor little afghan rebels, armed with wooden guns"? One has to be totally stupid to believe this. All these things are lies. We heard all these lies before about the rebellion of the Eritreans against Ethiopia. There again, if the Eritreans were capable of such things as the 'destruction of 15 soviet tanks' as once reported in the capitalist press, then it must have been because they were equiped with sophisticated weapons and that these, came from imperialism.

Imperialism sees the danger; if Afghanistan develops, it will influence, both Iran and Pakistan. It wants to stop this. It was for this reason that capitalism wanted to exploit the situation in Afghanistan. From the geographic point of view, imperialism could not do much in that part of the world, and it is not now that it will have the time to acquire forces there. So it tried to exploit the situation to contain progress and make itself the centre of an anti Soviet struggle in that part of the world. Imperialism was doing this also to prevent the other capitalisms such as the french, japsesse and british, from conducting their own particular negociations with the Soviets. But the Soviets intervened directly because they were ready to do all what is necessary, even with the danger of war. At the same time as the Soviets try to prevent the war and negociate to try to impede it, they prepare themselves for it - a thing that Stalin did not do. Stalin only prepared very relatively on a military plane and socially, not at all. The Soviets today, on the other hand, prepare themselves very well, militarily and socially. There are 20 Workers States and the masses of the world do not let themselves be confused; they do not consider the Soviet intervention as an annexation, but as a necessary measure to which the masses aspire. Weren't the people of Nicaragua anxious for Cuban help?

The opposition which arose from some parties or trade unions to the Soviet in

tervention is superficial. It has nothing serious or important about it. It stems from sectors which have no force of attraction over the political conduct of the proletariat. These sectors may have a weight on the plane of the trade union struggles, on the plane of transitory demands; but historically, in the political and social fields, they have no weight. It is the proletariat which decides. It is the Soviets and the proletarian vanguard which support the Soviets who have authority over the rest of the working class.

The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is a very great defeat for imperialism. The Yanks were hoping to be able to use Pakistan to install themselves there, and from there, proceed to make some concessions to Iran, and keep Iran under its control. Imperialism was preparing a pincers, with war in mind, To believe that it could do all this, shows the stupidity of imperialism. Imperialism acts in a crazy way, by desperate jerks. But all in all, the steps it has taken are rather cautious, which shows that it is meeting a fair resistance, even inside the United States. The meeting which the US government has had to make with the wheat producers about a wheat embargo against the USSR, has only highlighted that the capitalists are acting according to their commercial interests and not according to their common interests as capitalists.

Imperialism has been powerless to foresee and contain the soviet intervention. It is the Soviets and not the Communist parties which are decisive in all this. What the Communist parties may do or say, has no influence in such places as Nicaragua for instance. But the actions of the Soviets, yes - has an influence. The masses of Nicaragua or of El Salvador do not see in the Soviets, a bureaucratic caste, and the Soviets are no longer one. They are bureaucrats but not a caste. The masses see that it is from the Soviets that progress flows. They see that Stalin came and was liquidated and that the Workers State went forward. In the United States, on the other hand, they see that after Ford we had Carter and that nothing at all has changed.

At the same time, the position of the communist parties is one of doubt. The French Communist Party supports the Soviet intervention in general, and the Italian one does not oppose the Soviets intransigently. It makes circumstantial declarations but no campaign against the Soviets. The Spanish Communist Party has criticised the Soviets but without condemnation, and they also criticised the Yanks; they did this to keep in touch with the Communist Party base. But what is most significant, is the attitude of the French Socialist Party; they do not only say that the Soviets have intervened, but they accuse the Yankies of invading also. They speak in the name of French capitalism. Giscard d'Estaing invited Mitterrand and Marchais for a chat (at the time of Afghanistan), and this was to associate them with his policy, and to gain a certain electoral support.

The attitude and the resolution of the Soviets in Afghanistan, is a great progress of history. All those who talk about the 'big fight put up by the afghan rebels', forget to wonder whence come their arms. The weapons however, come from the capitalists who arm Pakistan - for Pakistan to hand them over to the 'rebels'.. who are feudal and bourgeois types. Before this, we were shown all about the Kurds of Barzani (who entertained a feudal court around himself), which Kurds were bringing down iranian planes with kitchen and pocket knives... And we were told the same story with the Eritreans. But all what these people were doing, could only be done with modern weapons, and not with courage and

audacity only. How are we to believe that the USSR is dropping 'napalm bombs' and that these people resist with knives, wooden revolvers and friction matches?! But this is what the newspapers tell us! The newspapers are responsible, and also the journalists who write this. Their duty as journalists is to say: "Look, I will not broadcast this, it is a pack of lies!". Those who put out such news, do it with a clear political interest.

The attitude of the Chinese is more cautious. They see that it is not a simple affair for them. The Yugoslavs and the leadership of the other Workers States formulate their judgements on the strength that they have known the imposition exerted by the Soviet bureaucracy led by Stalin and they continue to believe that the Soviets are like this today. But it is not that they do not see the changes which there have been in the USSR since Stalin. It is rather that they go on opposing the Soviet Union to defend their own bureaucratic interests, which correspond to Stalinism.

The Soviet intervention was done openly. In the world communist movement, they are assessing the character of this intervention. An intervention in another country is not necessarily an invasion or an annexation. There are interventions necessary to aid other countries in developing.

The soviet bureaucracy continues to say that 'it has intervened because it was invited in'. It does not pose that it is a problem of a confrontation of class against class; it does not say that the problem is one of Workers States versus capitalism. It still wants to make it be believed that one can take advantage of the relations with imperialism, to prevent the war. All the former policy of the Soviets consisted in trying to avert the war. This is why they did not spread the conception of the inevitability of war, when they were preparing for an inevitable war, internally. The military preparations they made, were for this, but they justified it - not on the basis that war is inevitable - but that it was a means of dissuading imperialism from attacking... They thought they could advance this way and that this way, they would progressively disintegrate imperialism, and allow the advance of the Communist parties.

However, this expected advance in the communist parties, went the other way. They became independent of Moscow; they developed a policy apart from Moscow. Sometimes they went as far as coming out with opposed positions to Moscow, positions opposed to the interests of the Soviet Workers State and certainly not favourable to the masses of their respective countries. Such parties, as the Spanish, the French, or the Italian, are making a bureaucratic policy which seeks conciliation with capitalist system. The Japanese Communist Party used to do this, but it has changed. The anti-Soviet wing was cast on one side, and this is why there is such a progress in the Communist Party of Japan. It is also like this in the Portuguese Party.

Capitalism prepares for war with a very great feebleness and in the worst conditions of history. It prepares the war with a great inner weakness and without internal cohesion. The various capitalist sectors are united only by the same class fear which they all share, but not because economic competition leaves some creative scope in the ability to think! There is no more to be thought in that field, and it is fear that unites them. At the same time, they have to accept that the Workers States are a reality. The masses of the world see that it is capitalism and not the Workers States who retreat. They see that where the Workers Sta-

tes intervene, there develop anti-capitalist social movements and progress. These are the conditions of capitalism entering the war.

The attitude of the Soviets shows a very great resolution. This doesn't mean that they are going to consent completely to revolutionary progress, or that they are going to just let revolutionary wings appear inside them. But it means that the bureaucratic power is going to diminish. The power and progress of the Soviet Union have meant a diminishing of the power of the bureaucracy. At the time of Stalin, it spelled out the end of Stalin and the subsequent weakening of the bureaucratic apparatus until the fall of Krutchev - that is to say, the moment when the coarse and crude apparatus fell. It is after this, that Breznev made the Soviet Constitution - to link with the world. This Constitution declared: "The Soviet Union seeks the construction of world Socialism. It supports all national liberation movements and all movements for social progress".

Capitalism is besieged throughout the world. There are Workers States everywhere, in Latin America, Asia, Africa and Europe. Capitalism is encircled. It would like to surround others by means of weapons - but weapons are the weakest instrument of history. The Soviet Union is besieging capitalism by means of Socialism and this means the mightiest arm in history. Socialism bears in itself all the necessary means for advance. Arms do not create, they kill. Whilst Socialism creates. The masses of the world see this, and the Soviet masses also. Capitalism is entering war with the sentiment and consciousness that it is the end of its existence, and the last act of the capitalist tragedy.

The Yankees have not been able to appeal to the North-American masses and neither do they dare. It is true that the Soviets are not making any public appeals to them either; but all what the Soviet masses are doing, constitutes an appeal to the North-American ones. The Soviets have intervened openly and directly in Afghanistan whilst the Yankees have had to hide, disguise and camouflage their intervention there. There has not been a single demonstration against the USSR or Vietnam in the United States. On the contrary, it is Carter who has had to talk about "eliminating the Vietnam complex". When he has to say such things it is because there is such a complex; it wasn't just a simple formulae but the characterisation of a state mind of the bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie in North America. The 'Vietnam complex' measures the sentiment of defeat over having intervened unjustly and badly. When Carter tells us that the 'Vietnam complex' is over now ... it is because it is still there for all the attempts to obliterate it. They have the 'complex' of seeing that capitalism is going to be crushed. The Yankees have announced an embargo on wheat sales to the USSR, but the wheat producers have announced that they do not agree. Such are their contradictions.

IMPERIALISM HAS BEEN UNABLE TO
CONFRONT THE WORKERS
STATES

The movement which is going to develop in this process of war preparations, is going to pass way over the head of some leaderships of the Communist parties. These are timid, conciliatory with capitalism and have an evolutionist conception of the progress of society. These are going to be erased, and eliminated. The Communist parties have no sure or firm positions. They change and meandre. They come up with one position, and then change it, and reverse it again. They have wandering positions whilst the Soviets have firm positions. They have intervned in Cuba, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique and now, Afghanistan. The masses of the world are learning this way, what the world relations of forces are. They learn this in practice.

This Soviet intervention is a very great progress and index of the few perspectives left for the existence of capitalism. Not only is it entering the war, in very weak conditions, but also it hasn't managed to terrorise humanity - and the Communists for a start. The letters which UNITA (Organ of the Italian Communist Party) publishes express the thought of the Communist base. This situation brings also to light the very great security of the Soviets who do not let themselves be intimidated by the attitude of the Chinese or by the objective United Front of them with capitalism. The Soviets see that once the war will have started, the Chinese will have to be by their side, and not by that of the Yankees. Brown has gone to China to seek a common front. If they manage to make a front, one must expect very important movements against this leadership within China. This Chinese leadership acts in an arbitrary way and with no notion of anything. But the masses, and even a part of this leadership, do not. There is no political or trade union life in China, so that we cannot say precisely what movements are going to occur. But it is certain that there is a resistance in China, to the capitalist system. In the begining, the TV used to show us that the Chinese had schools for western ways of dancing, hairdressing, etc.. But see no more of these things. Had all this grown since it started, the TV would have continued to show it, to comfort capitalism in the thought that the Chinese are doing all this to attract certain layers of the population in China. But all this has ceased. Even if it still going on in China, it is not receiving the same treatment as before. This is the demonstration that a part of the leadership and of the proletarian revolutionary vanguard in China is waiting for its time to intervene. This Chinese leadership has not been able to organise any important mass movements, assemblies, meetings or congresses. It doesn't do any of this because it is not sure of having a majority; or even it is sure that it will not have it, and possibly not even an important minority in its favour! In the war against the USSR, China will be by the side of the Soviet Union, not of the United States. Imperialism is trying - at best - to use China. But even the Japanese have not wanted to be involved with the Yankees. Japan, like Germany, feels that it is going to be engulfed by the coming war.

Imperialism has done nothing to prevent the Soviet intervention. It hoped that this intervention would lead to an anti-Soviet reaction in Iran. But it was all the other way around. The Yankees said immediately: "Iran will see that the USSR invades Moslem countries". But the Iranian (people) have launched no attack against the USSR. It is a process in which the Workers States have all the conditions to win, because they are the bearers of the truth. Even in the undecided

conditions in which Iran still is, Iran does not retreat. Iran cannot be used as an anti-Soviet base any longer, or develop a new capitalism.

We think - as regards the hostages - that it is an error to keep them any longer. They should have been tried, or released. The best policy would be to free them and to make them transmit resolutions and declarations to the North American people, like: "We free the hostages, we have treated them well, we have such and such objectives". They must be made to visit and see the development of Iran now. But the Iranian leadership does not have this understanding, that is why it remains stationary on this. The hostages have to be tried but it is not all that important either, politically; the most important thing is to communicate to the North American people, the objective of the Iranian revolution and the progress it has already made. The shah is a thief and an assassin. He has robbed more than 20,000 million dollars. He never acquired such a fortune by honest work!

The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan responds to a necessity of the progress of life and of history. It is an impulse to the social and economic progress of Afghanistan itself. The Soviets continue what they did, through Cuba, Ethiopia, and Angola.

This intervention is not an annexation. It is an aid. The masses of the world, see this; they judge this by its results, and by the behaviour of the Soviets. 'Invasion' is what submits countries. In Afghanistan, the economy, society and human relations are developing. Then, what 'invasion' was this? In the same way as science and culture contribute to knowledge and development the Soviet intervention also contributes to the development of the country. So, it is not an invasion. On the other hand, the masses are learning that relations are being decided between the major forces of history, which are on one hand, the Workers States - and the capitalist countries on the other. Capitalism means death, regression, the grave of culture and the economy. Imperialism is interested in the economy and not in people. So, it cares for the productive apparatus to accumulate profits and not for the life of people. The Workers States, on the other hand, have the life of people at heart and put the economy at the service of people. The masses see this and they measure 'intervention' as a function of the need of the country to progress; they judge according to this result, and this interpretation. You cannot talk of 'invasion', when the latter develops a country on the cultural plane, economically and on the scientific plane.

At the time of the 1939-45 war, the Soviets occupied Germany and created a Workers State in spite of Stalin. The same happened in Poland and other countries. People remember this, they recall that the Soviets had troops in all these countries and Workers States were formed there. It is the Soviet army, which contributed to develop these Workers States whilst it could have just stood still... When Stalin on the other hand, wanted to impose himself on Yugoslavia and met Tito's opposition, the Soviets did not invade; this is not because capitalism made threats or exerted pressures, but because the army and population of the Soviet Union opposed the use of military measures against Yugoslavia and China. The Soviets could have invaded China also. That is to say that - even under Stalin's rule, it was not the bureaucracy of Stalin which decided the conduct of the Workers State. What decided that conduct was a process

which was already moving and which ended with the liquidation of Stalin and Krushchev.

The masses judge that the intervention of the Soviet army in an other country is neither an 'invasion' nor an occupation, but an intervention to help that other country to develop. This is the way to measure. The Soviets themselves should say: "We have come to aid this country to help its development". The reason they do not say this is that they have a bureaucratic conception and believe they can keep the danger of war at distance in this way, or not precipitate it, or not stimulate it.

The progress of the development of humanity is not determined by small countries but by big forces. These are what decides the course of history. The existence of capitalism signifies the keeping of the masses in backwardness, where, in 300 years of its existence, capitalism has kept half humanity in the hunger zone. In all the capitalist countries, tens and hundreds of children die of hunger and work. In India, and in Pakistan, children work up to 10 and 12 hours a day, from the age of five.

The world relations of forces are determined by the participation of the Workers States, which allows any movement - such as Nicaragua - to decide to smash So moza without fear of a Yankee intervention. The Yankees have tried to intervene, but could not because the Soviets and the Cubans were ready to intervene also, and because the masses of Latin America would have risen. What decides the course of the progress of history, is the Workers States. Capitalism wants to surround the Workers States to weaken their forces, their importance and their weight in history. So, it is legitimate that the Workers States reject any threats from imperialism and any attempt to throttle them. It is completely just, even when it means intervening militarily. Such a step as military intervention, is not an annexation but an intervention to develop, politically and socially, the country concerned which would not have been able to cope without that support, by itself. It is not an annexation but a necessary measure for the progress of history which is being resolved within the confrontation capitalism-Workers States.

The Communist parties of Spain and of Italy, do not understand this. they continue to believe that it is possible to respect the 'independence of each country'. But how is it possible believe this, when capitalism doesn't? Capitalism, has never respected anything but its own interests. It kills, assassinates, in every way and poisons the population, to maintain capitalist accumulation, to sustain inter-capitalist competition and its antagonism with the Workers States. In these circumstances, how can one continue saying that 'each country must be left alone to decide for itself'? The world relations of forces is such that small countries do not decide for themselves; it is the big countries that do. On the part of capitalism, this spells death to the small countries because capitalism submits the small countries to the big (capitalist) countries. But on the part of the Workers State, this means the development of small countries, because not being imperialistic, the Workers State cannot accumulate profit from the small countries or submit them to itself. If the Workers State ever tried this, it is

the Workers State that would start declining culturally and scientifically. The condition for the continued existence of the Workers State, is that it must develop other countries scientifically and culturally, which are the bases for economic development. When some Communist parties demand 'liberty' and 'respect for national sovereignty', they must not separate this from social historic conduct and the necessity of the progress of history. Capitalism has never given democracy in any form, but the Workers State has to, and this democracy which the Workers State gives allows the development of countries, in every way.

The intervention in Afghanistan is the same as the intervention in Angola and Mozambique. Why haven't all these Communist leaders protested against the Cuban intervention? And who doubts that it was the Soviets who aided the intervention of Vietnam in other parts of Indochina, through military and economic support?

One cannot make an analysis of history by clinging to "Let us respect the independence of each country"! This independence has to be defended but to impel the development of the progress of history; it is not true that the people of each country decide their own destiny. It is true in the USSR and the other Workers States, but it is not true in the United States. There, it is the Yankee imperialist government which takes the decisions. In countries like Afghanistan, the people never decided anything, not even electorally, because 80% of them have never participated in any election. It was the big landowners and feudal lords who decided and it was these very same people who prevented the development of the country. Soviet aid is eliminating these people and, therefore, developing the country. This is not an 'invasion', but an intervention and participation in the progress of Afghanistan. The form in which it is being done is demanded by the need to eliminate the sectors who prevent social and economic progress. The analysis has to be made in this way. It is the same with respect to Ethiopia and the other countries in Africa and Asia.

The soviet intervention shows that the USSR needs to impel the world to be in its own image, and not to submit the world to itself. Not one of the countries which the USSR has entered, has been subjected. They have all developed and Vietnam is an instance. How can it be said that the Soviet intervention is tantamount to an annexation and that 'each country should be sovereign'? Not so. In Afghanistan, the people could not decide previously because feudal camarillas had always decided for the people. If the Soviets had to dislodge Amin, it was because Amin was negotiating with the feudal lords, the capitalists and the Yankees.

The Yankees have supported the shah, they have welcomed him, covered him up politically and militarily. They gave protection to an assassin and a thief of at least 20,000 million dollars. Is this yes or no, an annexation? The Italian Communist comrades must say this. They must say that those who have "annexed" something - are the Yanks. By protecting the shah, they made an annexation of 20,000 million dollars! This means to protect robbery and the murder of the people. The Soviets on the other hand, do not go to rob any one or kill anyone. They go to impel countries. They need to do this in order to develop the conditions to advance from the Workers State to Socialism.

THERE HAS TO BE A
PROGRAMME OF PROGRESS
AND MASS INTERVENTION
IN AFGHANISTAN

It is necessary to support unconditionally, any measures - like the Soviet intervention - which impels Afghanistan towards the Workers State. At the same time, it is necessary to call upon the population to intervene, to participate in discussions, organise trade unions, district committees, committees in the countryside. The population has to be called upon to participate rapidly in a plan for a political, economic, and social programme of development. There must be a plan for the development of cultural, academic and artistic knowledge; and an intensification of cultural and scientific programmes through the radio, the TV, etc... It is necessary to create cadres in the trade union field and in the universities, so that people intervene in the process. Appeals to the nomadic tribes - who are determined by the big landowners - must be launched seeking to win the tribesmen over. The Soviet Union was full of such nomads like Afghanistan today, and it incorporated them into the social life of the Soviet Union. The Communist parties must interpret the Soviet intervention on this basis. The criticisms one may address to the Soviet leadership, concern the limits there are in the development of internal soviet democracy. Then it is necessary to demand more Soviet democracy. But before demanding this from the Soviets, the Communist parties must start practicing Soviet democracy themselves! The Italian Communist Party, or the French Communists, cannot demand from the Soviets greater democracy, when in their own parties, one cannot discuss.

It is necessary to support agrarian reform. One must give it a systematic character, distribute the land to the peasants and set-up collective cooperatives through the State. The big landowners must be expropriated and the land distributed to the peasants together with a plan of production, supported by the technical intervention of the State. Or, the nationalised land has to be worked under state control. At the same time, trade union and political life must be improved and one must proceed with the organisation of cooperatives, intensification of education, and a plan for literacy, political education, and industrial production. The plan must be developed to respond to the needs of the population in housing, roads, means of transport, hospitals, running water, gas, electricity and the production of all manner of foods. The population must feel that the plan is for the population. It must see that it is not a programme dedicated to - or for - the benefits of capitalist sectors; it must see that production isn't geared to affirm, increase or reproduce capitalist interests and exploitation. The population must be shown that production is for its fulfilment. There must be the formation of organisms in the schools, in the factories, in the districts, etc... There, the population must discuss this programme and the plans for its application so as to elevate the political and cultural capacity of the population, and for it to become able to intervene in production. This is going to give the masses an enormous confidence.

At the same time, the political education of the masses must be elevated. It will be on this basis that the capacity and interest of the population to learn will elevate. The population is going to understand this quickly because it

is going to see the link between this and the progress of its standard of living. It is going to see the unity which there is between political preoccupation and the programme to satisfy the necessities of life.

The Soviet government must give all its support. It must give loans and economic aid, and make appeals to the international workers movement, workers and the revolutionary movements, for them to support this development of Afghanistan. Appeals must be launched to the moslem movements of the world, to support this, to bring the masses out of backwardness. The world moslem movement must be made to feel that the Soviet Union and the other Workers States are preoccupied and interested in the developing and progress of the populations, be they Catholic, Moslem, Jewish or any other religion. The Workers States have an objective preoccupation for the social and cultural development of the peoples. It is necessary to act like this to influence the Moslem movement and also for the Moslem masses of Iran to see that there is no contradiction at all between the social, political, scientific and cultural development of the Moslem movement and the development of Workers States. Religion, is not an obstacle to this - it does not contradict the cultural, social and economic development of the population.

The population must intervene and lead this process. Let the population do this and, in this way - impede the formation of bureaucratic apparatuses which contain, deviate the process; they interfere to contain the development of the scientific and cultural elevation of the population.

In Afghanistan, there is an internal struggle where a belated leadership for this process is being formed. The Soviets and the Communist parties have intervened late - but a leadership is in formation. There is an elevation of the struggle internally and internationally. It is obvious that imperialism has an interest to block the spreading of the political authority of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet intervention is not an invasion. Invasions are aimed at the crushing of people, or at preventing that they develop in a given country. The Soviet Union is doing just the reverse. It develops countries. Then why don't all those who demand the expulsion of the Soviet troops now from Afghanistan, make a special campaign for the expulsion of the Yankee troops from Cuba?? The Yankees are occupying illegally Guantanamo; a part of the Cuban territory is occupied by the Yankee military arsenal. They are there specifically to prevent the economic and social development of Cuba. However, they do not succeed in this; this is because of the world relation of forces which prevents imperialism from intervening.

The actual process is one of a struggle between the capitalist system and the Workers States. It is a struggle system against system. The masses of the world are guided by the Workers States and not by the capitalist countries. They do not even look to the Communist parties for guidance. They support the Communist parties, because they see in them the representatives of the Workers States. Even when the Communist parties do not say so, the masses see them as the representatives of the Workers States and as the instrument with which to bring the capitalist system down, and construct Workers States.

The masses of the world see also the war preparations and they are not

frightened. Capitalism hoped to petrify the masses with the war threat. But the masses are not intimidated. The military petulance, the military arrogance and all the presumptuousness of the yankee weapons, have not intimidated the masses of the world. The latter feel themselves sustained, protected by and allied to, the Workers States. They feel allied to the great masses of the Communist parties of France, Italy, Japan, Portugal and -in part - Spain. The masses feel full of security and they act with this security. They do not feel perspectiveless and they see that progress means: stratification (state ownership), the participation of the trade unions, the functioning of organizations of mass intervention in the factories, the districts, and the schools. The masses are learning from the Workers States, to pass over from the most backward levels in the economy, to the most advanced. And even when they have no economic means with which to develop as in the case of Nicaragua, Mozambique, Angola, they feel that this is the road.

The masses of the world have rejected the campaign of imperialism against Vietnam; imperialism has had to drop that campaign. The masses have seen that Vietnam has not intervened in Cambodia to crush it, but to develop it and that the Vietnamese (boat people) who fled Vietnam, were thieves, escapees from work and the construction of socialism. The masses have seen that it is not the Workers States which crucify, torture, or ill-treat people. This is how they judge. They see that it is the Workers States that have impeded imperialism from crushing the revolutionary movements in the world. Imperialism cannot intervene as it used to, where it likes, when it likes, because the Workers States are there.

Capitalism prepares the war in conditions when the world masses feel that progress lies in the Workers States and not in capitalism. And the masses learn to conclude that the criticisms to make of the leaderships of the Workers States, are due to the lack of Soviet democracy. They mean by this the democracy one needs to construct socialism and not the democracy for everyone to say just what they like. The masses do not let themselves be intimidated by the dissidents who give no ideas and who are escapees of the Workers State. The masses understand that, having some criticism of the Workers State, the latter supports the development of social transformations and opens the conditions for social, cultural, and scientific progress. Such are the world relations of forces. The masses see that the Yankees cannot intervene, whilst the Soviets, Cuba and Vietnam do! The masses also see that Vietnam did not let itself be intimidated by the Chinese invasion. And that was, an invasion! Vietnam has had to defend itself, repel the Chinese, and this has influenced enormously the Chinese masses. Many of those whom we hear protest today against the soviet intervention in Afghanistan, we never heard say a word at the time of the chinese invasion of Vietnam... However that was an invasion, the aim of which was to crush Vietnam's development. Its aim was to prevent the development of Vietnam and the social development of Cambodia, Laos, to impede them from influencing inside China itself. It is the Chinese however who lost the battle. Sustained by the world relations of forces, Vietnam remained firm. The Yankees have not been able to intervene and this is because the USSR is there. For the same reason, the Chinese (leadership) calculated carefully each yard of their invasion. They knew that beyond a certain point, the Soviet Union would intervene.

After having experienced decades of war, without any means at their dis-

posal, the Vietnamese also defeated the Chinese, and forced them to withdraw. The masses of the world have seen all this, and they have judged the conduct of Vietnam. Vietnam could have annexated Cambodia, or Laos; but they did not do so. On the contrary, they stimulated these countries to develop themselves. Socialism, cannot be constructed by means of annexations. Socialism needs to impel the anti-capitalist struggle and construct the bases for new Workers States.

In this process, there are limitations due to the lack of maturity, the lack of preparation of cadres; there is a lack of previous political, cultural and scientific life. These factors help to develop bureaucratic apparatuses. Also the struggle against capitalism demands the concentration of all political, cultural and military life around this objective and this gives scope for the formation of apparatuses. But the bureaucratic apparatuses have increasingly less scope to develop a life of their own and to their benefit, and they must develop themselves objectively against capitalism. This leads to an ever higher cultural, social, and political development of the population. This in turn, weakens all the bureaucratic apparatuses of the Workers States and the Communist parties. The latter must discuss all this.

The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, is a necessity of history, to prevent the formation of a government which -through its feudal structure - would have allied itself to imperialism and then threatened the Soviet Union, Iran, and the revolution in all that part of the world. Such are the aims of the Soviet intervention. The masses of the world see with satisfaction and joy this defeat of imperialism. They are not guided by what the press, the United Nations, or the imperialists are saying. When the Vietnamese intervened in Cambodia, the capitalist press and the imperialists screamed: "Annexation of Cambodia!" But the masses did not see it in this way. Their experience, their cultural capacity, is infinitely more elevated than that of all leaders of the Communist parties. They have no cultural scientific preparation as such, but they have a very elevated political and social understanding, because they have their own life experience and because they see development in all the countries where the Vietnamese and the Soviets have intervened.

This intervention is not an annexation to the advantage of the USSR, but an intervention to develop Afghanistan. The capitalists are screaming: "Annexation, annexation!", because they want to prevent the anti-capitalist development of Afghanistan and the whole area. Not one country occupied by the Soviets, the Cubans or the Vietnamese has perpetuated capitalism... On the contrary, these countries have eliminated capitalism and created the conditions necessary for the development of the economy, culture, science, art. Such are the conclusions to be drawn.

J. P O S A D A S 5.1.80

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (P O S A D I S T)
24, CRANBOURN STREET,
LONDON W.C.2.
