

# THE ANSWER TO CAPITALIST REPRESSION CAN ONLY BE A PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS.

The political revolution in the smaller workers states has overshadowed all other events in the last few months. The process which has developed strongly in the Soviet Union must be encouraged by the soviet leadership because the Soviet Union in order to develop has to support every progressive movement, has to accelerate the elimination of the backward stalinist leaderships, in this way improving the capacity to undermine world capitalism. There are many complications in this process, but the liquidation of the stalinist apparatus and the seeking for a more marxist understanding of how to develop the workers state is a severe blow at world imperialism. The latter tries to interpret the changes as a defeat for socialism and make it appear that the workers states are in huge difficulties. There are problems, but those of progress and ascent. The problems of capitalism which are augmenting at every instant are insoluble within the terms of that system. Capitalism is totally inert from the point of view of initiatives, apart from such episodes as invading Panama which is an attempt to intimidate the whole of Latin and Central America. The Rumanian workers state cleanses itself of a mound of rubbish. The Yanks kill and maim in Panama in order to contain progress. The meeting at Malta between Gorbachev and Bush changed nothing in the world, because there is no possibility of a new Yalta. It registered that the Yanks are

reduced to being passive spectators of a situation that they cannot determine. Malta simply records an armed truce, that's all. The Soviet Union will deepen its ties with Nicaragua and that in itself stimulates the revolutionary process in El Salvador and elsewhere. In Afghanistan, Yankee plans have collapsed. All they do now, as in Panama is to kill people aimlessly.

The fall of Ceausescu is an excellent example of how the tactics of imperialism in relation to the workers states failed utterly and bring out the alliance between imperialism and Stalinism. Capitalism has no interest in the welfare of the peoples of Eastern Europe save to exploit them and seek to develop antagonism with the Soviet Union. British imperialism propped up Ceausescu's regime and the Queen welcomed him. Overnight he became a demon and lost his royal honours. Such is the incapacity of imperialism in this epoch.

In the new situation in Europe, German imperialism is trying to play the card of reunification to make itself appear with a "creative" initiative in front of its own people. But the German workers state is there to stay and in due course its socialist influence in West Germany will create problems for capitalism. The appetite of capitalist business is excited by the prospect of new trade opportunities with the workers states, at the very time that competition will become more and more ferocious between the capitalist countries and the

various multinationals. The danger for imperialism is that it is not capitalism which is going to influence the workers states but the latter which is going to weigh within the capitalist countries.

The Thatcher government continues on its reactionary path of privatisation and impoverishing large sectors of the population. In this very critical situation for capitalism, the Labour party is intimately involved. The leadership has been intent on containing opposition to the government, but it cannot eliminate the left of the party. It used a campaign against the militant group, because the latter is very much a closed clique in competition with the labour left, but Kinnock is unable to terminate with the left. The leadership acts as if it were in a form of coalition with capitalism and does not use the opportunities outside parliament to engage with the needs and pressures of the population. The crisis of capitalism passes right through this leadership. They are part of it, because the

classical social democracy was based on sustaining capitalism on the basis of substantial reforms. But when the system can no longer afford reforms and actually takes back former concessions, then the labour apparatus is in grave difficulty and its historic bases are undermined. The poll tax, the housing crisis, the deterioration in the education structure and the health service, the disorder in transportation, all this shows the incapacity of British imperialism. It is putrefying and nothing can stay its downward course except a policy of social transformations. That is precisely where the Labour apparatus is reluctant to tread because it means confronting its beloved capitalist system, source of its careers and its electoral life. They are obliged to go round the financial houses and assure them that labour will do nothing to distress moneybags. They have moved in the direction of the layer of intellectuals, who furious with Thatcher want a Bill of

rights so as to contain the administrative bureaucracy of capitalism. It is reasonable to support anything which places obstacles in the way of capitalist dictatorship—although nothing legal can ultimately restrain the bourgeois state—but the Kinnock group use this as a substitute for deeper social measures.

Capitalism has had extended discussions among its various groupings on when to enter the ERM and the EMS because it means adjusting the economy to a European centralisation. But what is certain is that British imperialism will not solve any of its problems this way. Big business may have its moments of euphoria, but British capitalism has no prospect of improving Britain and is simply an instrument of the Yanks in Europe.

The defiant struggle of the ambulance men and that of the car workers are the most notable recent examples of the rejection by the population of the repression of capitalism. The whole country is alive with social and

Continued on Page 4

## "Socialism in One Country" (further extracts from the 1967 text of J. Posadas.)

These extracts from the main text of Comrade Posadas on the historic balance of the fifty years existence of the soviet workers state continue the discussion on the Stalinist sabotage of the natural relationship between the workers state and the world socialist revolution.

All these historic conditions (Posadas is referring to the centralisation and planning of the economy and the relationship to the world revolution) are the basis of the progress of the workers state, independently of the bureaucracy - inept and

backward as it is, i.e. the Hungarian or the Rumanian. The economy develops because state property demands it. However to justify themselves in history, these bureaucratic leaderships must show that it is they who develop and organise economic progress and take measures necessary to quadruple or quintuple production. But it is only a revolutionary leadership which can really do this. The Bolsheviks were the only ones capable of making the economy recover in seven years, after it had been 90% destroyed. With the development of the bureaucracy, the rhythm of economic progress was slowed down, but above all the

bureaucracy allowed the historic adversary to survive and to reinforce its military capacity. The workers state must not only develop the economy but also organise the masses of the world to destroy capitalism, to combine the cultural, economic and scientific struggle and the military struggle because capitalism is only going to go by force.

The bureaucracy has not had the capacity to develop this function. The workers states have developed, but capitalism has remained because the bureaucracy has not wished to overthrow it, has not profited from the historic stages, has

Continued on Page 4

### Contents.

- Page 1. Editorial; Socialism in one Country.
- Page 2. The German Workers State. Brazil.
- Page 3. The Crisis in the Cuban Communist Party...

Workers of the world, unite!

# RED FLAG

Subscribe to RED FLAG  
1 year ..... £5.00

Order from  
IV International Publications.

CIB 21 Church Road  
Crystal Palace.  
London SE. 19. 2T

Cheques payable to:  
'IV International Publications'

Price 30p.

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

395. 19 January. 1990.



Roumania - victory of the  
political revolution.

## The process in the German workers state.

The most spectacular process of the peaceful political revolution so far has been seen in the events in the DDR and in Czechoslovakia. Both have been marked by immense demonstrations. A structure seemingly immovable collapsed within hours and all stalling devices were futile. A few months ago the rotten leadership of the DDR was congratulating the assassins in Beijing, now that same leadership is being charged with corruption. The will and confidence of the demonstrations epitomised the security of the population that stalinism was doomed, but the workers state was secure. The preoccupation of the masses was the extension of socialist democracy, not the return to the capitalist mode of production. There were no slogans relating to the latter.

The dynamism of these two centres in the DDR and Czechoslovakia which are the most advanced examples of the political revolution outside the Soviet Union, were decisive for the events in Roumania. Certainly the intervention of the Soviet Union through the various trips of Gorbachev has been the precipitating agent. The masses felt that the first workers state was with them and no longer would the stalinist bureaucrats of the USSR come to the rescue of their own kind. They had seen the great changes of leadership in the Soviet Union, the conscious seeking for a better road to socialism and above all the intervention of the soviet proletariat which discussed directly with the leadership, having insisted that it came to discuss. At the same time the massive concentration of the population in the decisive centres indicates a maturing over a long period—the maturing of the conditions of the political revolution, the process of partial regeneration. All this is the result of the disappearance of the conditions which gave rise to Stalinism—the limitations in the world socialist revolution and the relative isolation of the Soviet Union.

The process as analysed by Cde Posadas is an objective one of great force, corresponding to the change in objective conditions, the strength of the workers state and the profound social weakness of capitalism. It also occurs in conditions which have not

permitted much political life. The bureaucracy had limited all discussion and repressed criticism. It is in these conditions that nevertheless the population intervened in such a wave like form, giving no respite to the leaderships and destroying political bureaus and central committees in the twinkling of an eye. It is just one example of the complete superiority of the workers state to capitalism. In the former the active democracy of the streets, the factories and the public meetings liquidated whole leaderships. Under capitalism, no such changes are possible without violent social revolution. All this is another proof that the dictatorship of the bureaucracy is not the logic of the workers state, that it arose in very specific historical conditions which cannot be repeated.

The process in the DDR has been particularly important and influential. Imperialism all the time through its robotic scribblers in the press and television tries to give the impression that everyone is shouting for bourgeois democracy. But the massive interventions of the population were on the line of more socialist democracy and to build a workers state free of corruption. Previously it is clear that sectors of German capitalism in collaboration with other bureaucratic sectors in the workers state had organised the synchronised mass flight of the "refugees", in the hope that the regime would crack down and provoke a stalinist response of greater repression, that is a collusion of capitalism and stalinism against changes. It did not work and what matters is not the technicians who went, but the masses who stay to build socialism. The millions in the demonstrations expressed support for Gorbachev and sang the International. There were no calls for the stonehead Kohl. But the most important aspect of the process in the DDR which reflects its more concentrated economic base and greater social homogeneity, has been the active and leading role of the communist vanguard. The latter was completely linked with the population and it is that vanguard which is now seeking to develop a better leadership and life with the population. What they will have to gain is experience, because

the stalinist political void in which they were obliged to live means that they will be stimulated to regain contact with the roots of marxism as is occurring in the Soviet Union.

Whereas the stalinists had turned the revolutionary tradition of the German working class into a mausoleum, the reanimation of the communist vanguard will eventually reinstate the thinking of Marx, Engels, Rosa Luxembourg, Liebknecht and the German revolution of 1919 into a directly revolutionary force. This concentrated experience in the DDR will have repercussions throughout the workers states, in the USSR and weigh in Poland and Hungary against the small camarillas who live in pipe dreams of putting the clock back.

The East German workers state had expressed its strength even with the Honecker leadership, in its support given to Ethiopia and other African states and also in the statement of Hoffmann at an earlier stage on the inevitability of the war with imperialism. Previously the rebellion of the masses in 1953 showed the bases for the political revolution to come. Then the bureaucracy had the strength to repress the population with violence, now as foreseen by Comrade Posadas and no one else, the conditions have so matured on a world scale that the bureaucracy is deprived of support. One day the leadership seemed immovable, the next day they were the dust of the past.

The clowns of capitalism have been indulging their fantasy life with talk of German reunification etc as though events in the DDR were determined by the "democracy" of the capitalist banks in West Germany. Kohl has been giving himself airs on the future of the DDR. No doubt the soviets are quite happy if sectors of German capitalism can be interested in trade with the workers states and with further possibilities of arms reductions. This will further irritate the Yanks (it is not by chance that a leading German banker was assassinated recently—one far too friendly with the soviets from the yankee standpoint). In the future there is no doubt that the issue of the unification of Germany will take a profounder form—the unification of Germany on the basis of the workers

Continued on Page 4

## extracts The Brazilian section supports Lula

We publish an intervention by the Brazilian section on their support for Lula against the attitude of various renegades from Posadism. This intervention was completely confirmed in the success of Lula who became a powerful contender for the Presidency. We shall comment further on the situation in Brazil in the next RF.

In Brasil a publication called "Bulletin of Voz Proletaria" has been distributed which claims to publish "extracts from papers of sections linked to the Latin American Bureau of the Posadist IV International". This publication does not represent either politically or organisationally the positions of Posadism in Brasil which for thirty five years has published principally through the paper "Frente Operaria", books, pamphlets and Marxist Reviews of the Brazilian Section of the Posadist IV International. This "Bulletin" is edited by former militants of the Brazilian section who long ago abandoned the ranks of Posadism and a part of the leadership of the BLA who are living a process of grave political crisis and of abandonment of the positions of Posadism and of the functioning of the IV International. What interests the Brazilian vanguard are the comments in this article of the bulletin, on the national situation where it says "it is necessary for Brasil to make an electoral united front which incorporates the candidatures of Lula and Brizola". This is a proposal made for the first round of the elections. This article is full of ambiguities and reservations. It says that "the masses are seeking to correct their leaderships (apparently as much Lula as Brizola) and" this expresses the need for a United Front", after it says that "it is necessary to support the PT", and that the United Front must be made in the second round". It appears that the writer of the article has not decided exactly what he is saying. The sense of this article in the "Bulletin of Voz Proletaria" is to "incorporate" Lula and Brizola in a United Front to be able to win the elections but without clarifying economic details which are positively secondary for the authors. Who is going to renounce the candidature, or programme? The struggle for agrarian reform is defended clearly by Lula and rejected by Brizola.... what does this mean?, that the impulse to the independent organisation of the masses expressed in the multitude of committees of the PT, the independent political activity of the proletariat must be submitted to an electoral front with Brizola to be able to "confront the common enemy"? No, a thousand times, no.

We believe that the most important political fact in the recent history of Brasil, that the most important fact of these elections and that the determining element in the process in the country, is that through the PT, the Brazilian proletariat has launched itself to organise its own political party, with a national expression, with its own programme, organised independently of the bourgeois parties, petit bourgeois and nationalist sectors which—like Brizola—push forward certain anti imperialist struggles, but whose intention is to reform, improve, "humanise" capitalism, done within the limits with which Garcia acted in Peru or Menem in Argentina.

Nationalism in Latin America is a movement which is socially exhausted. Now it is not possible to promote the reforms of another epoch as for example the petroleum nationalisation in Mexico, of the mines in Bolivia, of the meat packing industry and railways in Argentina and so on in this way. Hence there has arisen in Mexico a movement which originated from within the PRI headed by the son of Lazaro Cardenas who is already more socialist than nationalist. Hence on the other hand the MNR in Bolivia leads in the application of the programme of the IMF and Menem in Argentina also. Thus Brizola sought to make agreements with all the bourgeois sectors that he could and only advances when obliged through the masses, through his own base, through the PT and the CUT. If it is true that in some countries of Latin America with the crisis of nationalism, the masses have not constructed their own independent instrument and hence continue voting subject to Peronism or the PRI, it is important that in Brasil a left leadership of the masses is being constructed, independent of nationalism, that is the PT. This movement, which frightens some dilletantes, has in nine years grown in such a way that now it allows and demands that its candidate competes in the elections where it enters with as many or more chances than the candidate of bourgeois nationalism—Brizola. If the proletariat which has had to prepare, to educate itself, to form and temper its decision, its confidence in its own forces to transform all society, alters with every passing wind and renounces the competition until the end of the elections, when its own candidate may win, in the name of this or that consideration, it would never be taken seriously by anyone. These positions which we defend were not elaborated by us. They are the positions of the Posadists of thirty five years in Brasil. It is enough to consider what Posadas affirmed when the PT arose: "When the trade unions make the proposal for a new party, this means that the possibilities and conditions exist for an important movement which is not controlled by the

Continued on Page 4

# The execution of Ochoa and the need for socialist democracy in Cuba.

## Resolution of the European Bureau.

In his speech on the thirty sixth anniversary of the attack on the Moncada barracks, Fidel Castro presented the situation in the socialist countries as catastrophic, particularly in Poland, Hungary and the USSR for which he predicted possible disintegration and civil war. He also presented Cuba as the only socialist country which was continuing to progress. This speech partly expresses the situation of crisis existing in the Cuban leadership and its resistance to the changes taking place in the Soviet Union.

As regards the Soviet Union, Castro only emphasised the economic aspects of soviet policy which would mean a retreat towards the capitalist camp. He sees in these measures the abandonment of marxist principles on which the construction of socialism must be based, that is for example, the planning of the economy. Although the economic policy of the USSR contains elements which are ambiguous and contradictory and this remains the weak point of the process of perestroika, the latter is not limited to this. The rest of the process such as democratisation, the reanimation of the life of the soviets, the attack on bureaucratic privileges, the elevation of the life of the Communist party, the questioning of Stalinism, the return to Trotsky and Lenin, all this Fidel Castro ignores.

The economy is not the motor of the process. Holding as its base the stratified economy, the structure of the workers state needs in order to develop to make its human and social forces intervene, this is to say that necessarily it must question the bureaucratic structure developed in the previous stage.

If the economic aspect had been the determining element in the structure of the workers state, as it is in the capitalist system, China for example would not today be anymore in the socialist community. The counter revolutionary leadership of China has gone to the most extreme lengths possible in the liberalisation of the economy, in the alliances with imperialism creating a tense internal situation, the development of capitalist sectors, social inequality, and poverty. In spite of the policy of its counter revolutionary leadership and of the immense social antagonisms which have

been created, China does not retreat and remains a workers state. Castro does not make a word of criticism of this leadership and on the contrary has supported the repression of the mass movement for the reactivation of socialist life in China.

The economic policy of the soviet leadership, even though erroneous and not answering to the needs of the development of the workers state, is not the essential centre of the dynamism opened up by the process of perestroika. The measures which have been taken in relation to the introduction of foreign capital, the creation of new enterprises have not provoked great enthusiasm in the capitalist world because they are still inscribed within the framework of planning. The resistance which the Cuban leadership has mounted to the changes in the Soviet Union does not have as a centre the economic problems which is what Castro wishes to demonstrate. The depth of the problem is the resistance of layers of the Cuban bureaucracy to soviet policy which has opened an uncontrollable and irreversible process in which all the most corrupt sectors, those with privileges, and the conception of power opposed to revolutionary behaviour are called into question.

The prohibition against the diffusion of the soviet reviews "Moscow News" and "Sputnik" is another aspect of this resistance. The Cuban leadership does not do this with the idea of preventing the propagation of capitalist ideas as Castro says, but to prevent the development of political ideas and of the debate necessary for the progress of the workers state, which passes through the discussion of the stalinist period, how the bureaucracy was structured, the causes of the backwardness in the economy, the Bolshevik conception of the party and the organs of intervention of the population.

The support by Castro to the counter revolutionary repression by the Chinese bureaucracy of the movement for democracy in China, shows clearly that he fears an internal process of socialist democratisation which questions the actual functioning of the apparatus of the Cuban Communist party, the absence of life in

the party, and of socialist organs and democracy. It is not that he fears to be questioned as a counter revolutionary like the Chinese. This is not a questioning which annuls the function of Cuba, its revolutionary function in Africa, or in the Non-aligned movement, but it comes from the fact that it is the present world relation of forces, the policy of the soviet leadership and the support of the Soviet Union which allows Cuba to fulfill its function and not that Cuba has such a function in spite of and against the Soviet Union.

The fundamental basis for the existence of Cuba is the support of the USSR, even with its bureaucratic limitations, as with the repression of the Guevarist tendency. But the progress of Cuba is inferior to the help which it has received which amounts to millions and millions of dollars something which no other country has received. In spite of this Cuba continues being dependent on sugar, expressing the limitation of its leadership for the task of the construction of socialism. The internationalist function of Cuba, the heroism of the Cuban masses are the extension of the policy of the system of the workers states based above all on the Soviet Union and this function can be fulfilled because the world relation of forces is guaranteed fundamentally by the existence of the USSR and by the policy of the soviet leadership.

In his speech Castro shows Cuba as the only country in the socialist community which has maintained marxist principles and which struggles for socialism. But he does not explain for example how leaders of the revolution with central posts in the apparatus of the army, of the party and of the government can go so far as to be implicated in the drugs traffic. The condemnation and the execution of general Ochoa, involved with other high officers in different criminal activities such as drugs, arms deals, contraband, corrupt dealings etc pose questions such as how was it possible to arrive at such corruption, at such an abuse of power for years without the complicity at the highest level of the government and of the leadership of the Cuban workers state?

The physical elimination of Ochoa is a way of not

discussing the roots of the problem. It is not the question of a repetition of the Moscow trials as the bourgeois press has attempted to suggest. It is no longer that stage, although in the form it may appear to be so, but the objective with this sentence is to block the discussion or intimidate a tendency which proposes to question the life of the apparatus, which allowed one of the most important leaders to deal in drugs and to degenerate at the side of Castro and within the military and political command. It is not impossible for someone to become corrupt, but it is necessary to discuss what allowed this, what are the conditions which exist so that top leaders and ministers have been involved in such acts of corruption over such a long period. Why then does Cuba not need Glasnost! The execution which was the reaction of Castro is not an indication of political security, particularly when it was made to the detriment of an existing discussion, of a polemic, because to support Deng Xiaoping cannot be done without provoking reactions and comparisons with the internal situation in Cuba. Nothing of this negates the revolutionary function of the Cuban workers state, nor does it endow the leadership with the counter revolutionary objectives of the Chinese, but it shows a limitation in front of the decisive centre which develops in the Soviet Union through the intervention of the masses.

The attention paid to the demands of the soviet miners shows a victory of the Soviet Workers state and of the process of partial regeneration against those who fear the intervention of the masses. It is not a victory of the workers against the leadership, but a victory also of the leadership through a united front between the Gorbachev sector and the working class against the bureaucracy. The prevailing interest was not that of the technocrats or material stimulus, but an elevation in distribution above all relating to compensation for unemployment and for the families of workers who had died in accordance with the decision of the workers themselves. This has nothing to do with the technocrat, but is fundamentally the strength of the workers state, while to support the assassination of

the Chinese students is worse than the technocracy and means to support counter

revolution. The attitude of the soviet leadership to the miners shows a great maturity, including making use of the strike to cleanse the party, to push forward local elections, praising the conduct of the workers on strike and criticising the local bureaucrats through their lack of sensibility on the issue of working conditions.

The elimination of Ochoa means an immediate result, not one of principle, in a struggle of tendencies but fundamentally a defensive action of Castro against a sector which is exerting pressure for more socialist democratisation. It is not that Castro is linked to the drugs racket, but the political life of the apparatus is such that it allows the existence of a sector, in important positions which takes the line that it is possible to get money by any means, provided that it is used for the revolution. A sector which thinks like that can easily be corrupted. We do not affirm that Castro was part of this, but that he was not prepared to lead a struggle against a bureaucratic sector, that he did not propose to make a life in the party and of organs which eliminate the possibility of this type of activity. How can one speak of revolutionary example if Cuban territory is used for the drugs trade. What has happened is a blow at the authority of Castro and this leadership and of his brother and it deprives them of authority with the world vanguard.

People are not convinced by the explanations and justifications presented in the sentencing of Ochoa. The Cuban masses who have supported the world revolution and who have heroically resisted imperialism are asking how is it possible that our territory could be used for the drugs traffic without the defence forces knowing this? If this drug traffic operated how can one be sure that it could not be used by imperialism? What type of life is led by those in positions of responsibility that allows such negligence with the workers state? Finally in condemning the Chinese students who struggled against corruption and lack of democracy, how is it possible

Continued on Page 4

bourgeoisie and which can have trade union bases. It is very important to support this party launched by the trade unions". (On the problem of striking the Common Enemy). To attack the common enemy can mean at specific moments to fight for a nationalist, anti-imperialist enemy against a candidate of big business. On the hypothesis of Brizola or Collor participating in the second round, for example, the best tactic of the PT would be to call for a critical vote for Brizola maintaining total independence of action for the masses. As regards the attacks which Brizola may give, once in office to the sectors which support Collor, they will be gentle, controlled attacks hardly facilitating the conditions for the proletariat to make attacks in its own way as true class enemies. Revolutionary policy is not resolved in an election. If the vanguard of the PT and the Popular Front in Brazil, opened their councils to this "Bulletin" and renounced the candidature of Lula in the name of striking at the common enemy ie with Brizola, they would be giving a heavy blow to the proletariat and reinforcing for an historic stage, the positions, authority and strength of bourgeois nationalism in Brazil. It is clear that not only Brizola, but all the Brazilian bourgeoisie would be very grateful for this service. What characterises the political process in Brazil is that a candidate of the left, supported by the proletariat is fighting the elections to a finish with the possibility of entering the second round and winning. United Fronts which weaken the proletariat or strengthen bourgeois sectors, even if anti imperialist must be rejected and their authors, at best deserve a good box on the ears. It was absolutely inevitable that Lula and Brizola launched themselves as separate candidates for two reasons; because for Brizola it would be a political suicide not to launch himself as a candidate. The class interests which Brizola represents, want especially to impede the independent political organisation of the proletariat, and thus have no interest in Brizola renouncing his candidature in favour of Lula; for the latter to do so means means that the proletariat would be at the mercy of the bourgeois and petit bourgeois political functionaries and this after an ascending process of nine years extending from strike actions to the winning of the prefectures of San Paolo and Forte Alegre, with concretely the task of being at the head of the anti imperialist, anti capitalist united front in the country. The rival candidates of Lula and Brizola are not the fruit of misunderstandings, they do not arise from a lack of discussions, still less of bad advice; they stem from profound class necessities. Thus an electoral front between Lula and Brizola in the first round is absolutely impossible because in the stage of the process which is developing in Brazil there is the conflict between the proletariat and bourgeois nationalism for the leadership of the mass movement.

When this "Bulletin" affirms that the bourgeoisie in the final reckoning will concentrate around Ulysses Guimaraes in the PMDB, we are only dealing with empty shadows. It is more than a year since the bourgeoisie perceived that it could no longer concentrate around the PMDB. Collor de Melo and Silvio Santos do not have the political space so that the bourgeoisie could be concentrated around the PMDB. The Brazilian bourgeoisie has an economic strength but not the political authority with solid political parties. With the winning of extensive political liberties the PMDB began to decline, as it could not take the next step; to promote social transformations. The masses saw clearly the limits of the PMDB and do not feel linked to it by solid political traditions, seeing that the PMDB was always a movement essentially electoral and bourgeois. Its decline is irreversible and the political instability of the country largely results precisely from this fact.

not intervened when it was possible to do so. It allowed the checking of the Chinese revolution of 1927, afterwards it supported the trade union bureaucracy in Britain and supported the bourgeois republicans in the Spanish civil war.

The economy is only an aspect of revolutionary development. At certain stages it is the most important, at others, no. What becomes fundamental is the development of the relations of social forces and the programme of political struggle. On the economic plane, Vietnam is worth a minute sum in comparison with the United States, but the latter with

all the arms which it had could not conquer Vietnam. What is the historic strength of Vietnam? It is the world revolution, the existence of fifteen workers states, the masses of the world among them those of France, Italy, Britain, Belgium which prevent capitalism from concentrating its energies and its military capacity to destroy Cuba, Vietnam, China and the Soviet Union.

To be able to utilise all these forces, it is necessary to represent objectively the interests of the revolution. Now the bureaucracy is only a usurper. It cannot be interested in or understand the revolution. In 1917 Lenin

to give an example and say that perestroika and glasnost are not necessary?

The shooting of Ochoa does not bury any of these questions, on the contrary it reinforces doubt, not in socialism or the workers state, but in the methods of the leadership and its most recent line of criticising the policy of the soviets. It is not only a problem of the links with the drugs trade which is in question but what method, what policy, what life is led by the Cuban leadership? Is it that the revolution with all its power and creativity has no other way of finding a solution to the problem of corruption? This is an aspect of the life of the bureaucracy, when it substitutes itself for the functioning of the party, when it has no political and theoretical life and which can thus lose all marxist conception and all revolutionary conduct, all contact with the real sentiments of the population which escapes its control.

state. Bush who is seeking to maintain yankee influence speaks of his support for a new Europe, but all the initiatives which have led to the present situation have come from the soviets. The German masses in West Germany are going to see that while it is possible to clear out the corrupt in the DDR, there can be no perestroika or glasnost for capitalism—only its revolutionary destruction.

After the immediate overthrow of the Honecker regime, there were sectors in Dresden who were calling for the unification with West Germany, but this only shows that the stalinist regime inevitably conciliates with backward layers and allowed them to continue. Stalinism represses the revolutionary

The attitude of the Cuban leadership over the situation in China is an example of this. The support which it gave to Deng Xiaoping and the repression of the masses, regarding their intervention as pro-capitalist and counter revolutionary, shows the loss of objectivity of this leadership. The Cuban leadership gives its support to a clique which has reinstated in China norms of capitalist functioning, while it opposes the USSR for these same reasons!

Socialism is not constructed on the basis of repression. It was the conception of Stalin that led to the sclerosis of the party and of the soviets, of the organisms of the intervention of the working class. In order to develop and advance in the road of the construction of socialism, the workers state has to return to the Leninist conception of the party, to develop soviet democracy, to permit the objective discussion of all the problems in all the levels of society

vanguard and conciliates with capitalism. With its disappearance all manner of problems surface but in circumstances which do not allow capitalism to gain historic advantage.

The overthrow of Ceausescu was accompanied by a violent struggle against the praetorian guard of this especially odious regime, and its dynastic brand of stalinism. The alliance of army, party and population showed the strength of the structure of the workers state and the irresistible power of the political revolution.

This massive process which is determining the course of world history still lacks a fully conscious marxist centre which can harmonise all the various aspects of this

and to develop this intervention on a world plane.

Cuba presents itself as a model of revolutionary purity in the world Communist movement, but where is the life of the party, of its organisms, where is the soviet organisation of the population? Where is the objectivity of the leadership when it presents the process of partial regeneration in the Soviet Union as a capitalist restoration and the repression of the mobilisation of the Chinese masses as a defence of marxist principles? The contribution of Cuba to the progress of all the world communist movement and of the community of the workers states, passes through the development of socialist democracy in Cuba itself and through the objective discussion of all the problems which are posed today.

European Bureau. 4.11.89.

experience. The communist vanguard has still to weigh with all its force. Thus for example Havel in Czechoslovakia does not represent the real course of events and is a purely transitional phenomenon. The liquidation of Stalinism demands the unification of all these workers states with a common political and economic programme to put an end to the elements of fragmentation in the process.

It is possible to foresee the superseding of Castro in Cuba and without question the sanguinary regime in China is entering a new phase of crisis preliminary to its downfall. The question of the unification of the workers states must become a preoccupation of the vanguard in the next stage.

environmental issues which demand anti capitalist measures. The labour left on the basis also of the rapid advances of the workers states and of encouraging a much better level of discussion can benefit from this very rich process, leading to a coherent marxist current in the Labour party. 12.1.90.

**SUBSCRIBE TO**

**RED FLAG!**

bureaucracy and not those of the masses of the world. 22.10. 1967.

## Editorial

# The LP and TU left must act as a centre to accelerate the fall of the capitalist government

The policies of the soviet leadership show that the world arena is dominated by the process of the fall of the bureaucracy. The process towards some form of unification of Germany presents a new element in the world situation. This is not to say that the conduct of this unification by the workers states corresponds to the policy of a revolutionary leadership. The soviet leadership is reformist and the full return to a Bolshevik functioning cannot be expected on the dot. Nonetheless the stage of a mutually agreed divided Germany between imperialism and the soviet bureaucracy was one of the results of Yalta. Now the process of unification is taking place in the period of the downfall of the stalinist apparatus and a much more advanced decay of world capitalism.

The dummkopfen who gurgle about the end of socialism are living on borrowed time. Wherever there is capitalism, the anti capitalist struggle continues. When the capitalists for example, in Latin America open the gates to the IMF and its policies, this is no triumph for capitalism, but an expression of its incapacity to develop the economy save for small wealthy cliques. Nowhere in the world does capitalism develop new perspectives. After all the diplomacy of the soviets with the latter withdrawing their troops from the other workers states in Eastern Europe, showing their social confidence in the workers states, Yankee imperialism continues with its star wars projects as before. Yankee imperialism threatens Libya yet again with a military intervention and seeks to maintain the reactionaries in Afghanistan. The difference is that now they have to act much more circumspectly and with far greater difficulty. Their fears of the future are expressed in their alarm that Gorbachev may go and something much worse take his place.

Within the Soviet Union, progress is quite

spectacular. The masses come out onto the streets and seek to participate as much as they can in improving the country. The lack of previous marxist preparation has allowed the stalinist regionalists wherever they are in the Baltic states or Azerbaijan etc to create disturbances and provoke more bloodshed than need have occurred. They hide behind genuine social grievances and movements to seek to perpetuate their positions. We reject any conciliation with private property or social differentiation in the Soviet Union because it is based on a false calculation, but Gorbachev has reasserted the socialist democratic perspectives of the workers state.

There is much chatter among bourgeois publicists about the New Europe, the only New Europe will be one of growing class struggles in the West combined with attempts to deepen the political revolution in the workers states. World capitalism is very shaky. Tremors on the stock exchanges as happened recently in Tokyo, causes instant dismay, such is the falling social confidence of capitalism; so much wealth and so little historic capacity. All the wealthy can do in the world now is strut about. Historic intelligence they have none and they can make no cultural contribution. The Soviet Union on the other hand is going through a major historic advance where soviet democracy is to be discussed and where a lively life of tendencies is developing. A complete revolutionary leadership which represents this progress has yet to be developed, but the bases are in formation.

The anti capitalist struggle in Britain has been dominated by the demonstrations against the poll tax. This movement has been supported by a group of left MPs, but the Labour party is caught in a vice as an apparatus seeking to defend capitalism. Thus the labour councils dutifully fix the poll tax and enter into conflict with the

## Contents.

Page 1. Editorial. Mandela.

Page 2. National Problems; Yugoslavia. J. Posadas.

Page 3. German Unification; Resolution, EB.

*Workers of the world, unite!*

# RED FLAG

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

396. 16 March. 1990. Price 30p.

Subscribe to RED FLAG  
1 year ..... £5.00

Order from  
IV International Publications,

P.O. Box 134  
Nottingham NG1 3QT.

Cheques payable to:  
'IV International Publications'



Feb 25. Moscow. The soviet population intervenes in mass rallies to stimulate socialist democracy.

population. This type of crisis in going to grow in the future because capitalism has nothing to give, only the means to take away. Hence the search will intensify in the labour party and the population for a marxist labour left which works against capitalism and is not submitted to the apparatus. The open alliance between Kinnock and Thatcher to put pressure on the ambulance men to end their strike was a classic of the bourgeois labourites coming to rescue capitalism. The government of Thatcher is simply a failed dictatorship. Bourgeois parliamentarianism is always a dictatorship of capitalism, but it normally tries to conceal this fact and appear "democratic". The Thatcher government has long ago dispensed with the mask and acts like a gang of desperadoes—constantly losing ministers—in an atmosphere of scandal, Harrods, Ferranti, and now the affair of non declaration of business interests, in parliament.

Capitalism is concerned that a centre might appear in the

labour party and the trade unions which could act with some consistency against it. Hence the attack on Scargill. This is a particular concern now that the "middle ground" electorally with sectors like Owen has been politically weakened. Hence capitalism says to Kinnock—do something about these left MPs who support the resistance to the Poll tax. And Kinnock says, in so many words, yes masters, but it is very difficult.

Capitalism has of course delivered long sermons on the subject of violence in the resistance to the poll tax. They denigrate the population by suggesting that only agitators are causing the trouble. Capitalism has gone out of its way to provoke violence by organising such a punitive tax. For the pious supporters of capitalism to raise their eyes to heaven and complain of violence when British troops are used to prevent the just unification of Ireland and a brutal war was waged to keep the Malvinas islands, shows that as usual

the only truth capitalism respects is their own truth—democracy is democracy for them and violence to defend their own class interests is justice. It is not surprising that Kinnock fell over himself to agree with Thatcher. British imperialism as it is now, so beleaguered and a mere Yankee puppet shows all the unease of world imperialism in a concentrated form. Thus Thatcher fears the results of German unification. They see German capitalism throwing its weight about, but also the continued influence of the process that occurred in the DDR. The German proletariat will speak with a more decisive voice, just as the workers in capitalist Germany welcomed Gorbachev...

The speed of the process in Britain will be determined by what happens in the workers states. There the problem remains that of constructing the party to harmonise the construction of socialism, but that requires the closest relation to the world revolution. It is these

Continued on page 4

# THE NATIONAL PROBLEM AND SELF MANAGEMENT IN YUGOSLAVIA

(EXTRACTS FROM A LARGER TEXT)

J. POSADAS 8.5.80

It is important to point out the presence of the communist party led by Tito in the struggle of Yugoslavia against fascism and in later struggles; the merit is not only Tito's but also of the communist party which was a large party. Its function demonstrated that communist progress resolves the national problems which are all the consequence, at times necessary, at times not necessary, of capitalist relations.

Some problems are real in so far as they are generated by conflicts between the diverse interests of capitalist competition, which are expressed in differences of languages and nationality.

Others are national problems which exist in so far as they have a weight among the petit bourgeoisie, in language and literature, but it is possible to resolve these. The Yugoslavs partly succeeded, but they have not been able to give their solution an economic and social form, because they lack the political maturity, the political instruments and the necessary economic conditions.

A weak structure was constructed in which with the absence of a strong party and pushed by the process, self management was devised so that they could maintain themselves and continue. Self management was not an invention, but a consequence of a poor marxist formation. It is not that Yugoslavia was not at a level to resist, but Stalin was there awaiting the crisis of the economy so as to overthrow Tito. Self management was not invented by Tito, but represented a desperate choice to break the circle which the workers states had constructed around Yugoslavia. No workers state traded with Yugoslavia and the capitalists had no interest in helping because Yugoslavia would thus have been able to influence their countries.

Their objective was to exploit the situation. Also an important factor was the numerical weakness of the Yugoslav Communist party, given that the best cadres had been killed in the war. It must be remembered that Tito and a part of his group had taken part in the Spanish civil war and that confirms the tradition of the Yugoslav leadership. This is the proof of the experience of the country, developed among difficulties and limits which drew it closer to capitalist relations; but also it has created a communist base for socialism and not a bureaucratic base ready to reinforce itself. The Yugoslav base is that of a workers

The sharp conflicts in Yugoslavia are the result of the policy of self management which leads to differentiation in the country—thus some social layers prosper and other sectors of the population are impoverished. As Yugoslavia lacks the experience of the first seven years of the USSR, the centre does not have the maturity to solve these issues. But the growth of the political revolution in the USSR will decide the future of Yugoslavia. This article of Cde Posadas explains the background to the present crisis.

state. It is a weak country as at the beginning were also Poland, Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, but these have passed from being agrarian countries to an important cultural and scientific level.

These conquests have been realised by the workers state. The national problems which remain do not come from a conception of the nation of a bourgeois type, but from the consequences of bureaucratic interests and conflicts. There is no national conflict in the population. Britain on the other hand has recently had problems in Scotland, and in Wales; the same has happened in Belgium and Germany where even Strauss has entered into conflict with separatist elements, because Bavaria considers itself superior to the rest of the country.

The historic contribution of Tito to this process was that of having created the communist party, of having defended Yugoslavia against capitalism and of having resisted the stalinist bureaucracy. Yugoslavia was stimulated to enter the present path of weakness of the workers states and of the communist parties during the Stalinist period. The choice of self management did not signal a personal error of Tito, but a desperate choice and the fruit of the immaturity of the communist party.

Self management was not a necessary choice in the struggle against Stalin, because it represented a step back from the communist consciousness. It is a fruit of the lack of preparation of the party and of its immaturity. Without having the necessary instruments, the Yugoslavs found themselves having to confront new problems. It is because of the pressures exercised by Stalin and of his threats to intervene to prevent the country establishing itself as a workers state that there emerged the so called "national problems" to resolve which self management was imposed. This represented a measure to unite all the republics since it guaranteed

to them a certain independence and freedom over local interests. In its roots, this was not a bad intention, but there was a lack of means and of capacity to manoeuvre when agreements were effected between the various regions. It was not a correct historic solution, but only partial. Capitalism in fact was not able to unite the country while the partial statification and planning—limited through self management—allowed them to achieve this objective.

These are problems of the construction of socialism on which they did not have experience because the first seven years of the Soviet Union were buried by Stalin. Self management meant a retreat in relation to the experience of the USSR. It represented a process in which a mature leadership was lacking. Notwithstanding this, they did not return to capitalism.

It is necessary to take into account that self management is rejected by all revolutions; there are none which speak of self management, not even the most backward such as Mozambique, Angola or Ethiopia have applied it. They adopt planning and collective work. Neither Tito nor the Yugoslav Communist Party have contributed with ideas, with analysis, with orientation or programme to the world process. They have only intervened to say "do not fight among yourselves, be quiet, don't be bad", but they have not deepened the analysis on the process of history. This is the result of the blows which Stalinism has inflicted on marxism; it has struck with force and violence and left the process without leadership.

In various countries as for example in India, where there exists a process of economic and social growth, in the zones controlled by the communist party, it makes a policy which within the capitalist system combines political and economic initiatives of the workers

states. That indicates the influence of the socialist revolution; to progress, indeed they must follow this path.

Neither Tito nor the soviets have realised or analysed this process, although the soviets act on it partially and support themselves on it. Capitalism does not offer bases for progress in any country and Asia, Africa or Latin America which desire to advance, must first of all overthrow the existing power, whether it be the military or economic oligarchy. The workers states on the other hand and also Yugoslavia have no need to smash the bases of power, but the existing leadership and only this in part. Capitalism could not lead to progress because it represents private property.

The communist leaders who present Yugoslavia as an example of communism are dreamers and liars. What type of communism is it in which seven hundred thousand people must go abroad to find work? Of these people they make no mention, but organise a campaign for those half a million or million who flee from socialism in Vietnam and present as refugees the 120,000 (more likely 40,000) Cubans who flee from socialism.

These are not refugees but deserters, people who do not want socialism and take flight. In their time capitalism killed anyone who did not accept it, while the workers state lets them go. What should be done? Let these people escape and let them speak and intervene or sustain the element has determined the progress of Cuba, that is the socialist structure?

The present communist leaderships have no theoretical preparation. In Roumania for example they speak of socialism, but do not have sufficient theoretical preparation to understand the situation, but it is necessary to have it. In their time the bourgeoisie had a good preparation: we do not refer to the bourgeoisie in general,

but to Diderot, Moliere and Rousseau who represented and transcended them by some considerable degree. Above all Rousseau was thousands of kilometres in front of them. Is there perhaps a Rousseau in Yugoslavia? They cannot create one and have no need of one. Then they must create people who must defend the workers state, but with certain programmatic proposals which make it retreat. It is an impossible and useless objective, given that the process does not create the conditions so that a similar person can be created. Under capitalism, Moliere was born who in the last instance had little to do with capitalism, but given the period was obliged to write for it. The development of society created a series of competing elements in the world division of labour in which intellectual, thinking capacity was involved. The workers state has a different division of labour. The centre represented by the Soviet Union, means that cultural and intellectual initiative from anywhere is communicated to it. In the bourgeois period on the other hand, it got no further than private property.

Yugoslavia as with the Soviets and the Chinese decided to establish the workers state and developed the centralisation of the economy, of culture, of science and of art, such that bourgeois influence, sustainer of the problem of nationality has not been able to expand. It indeed acquires space in the presence of private interests and behind the protection of nationality of language and of local culture, economic interests are concealed. The Yugoslavs when capitalism sought to divide them, resolved this problem with a socialist programme.

The problem of Cyprus is still there and almost a motive for war between Greece and Turkey—as with other islands of little importance. Before they had a strategic value which today they have lost because a small bomb would be enough to destroy them. But this does not matter to capitalism given that before being destroyed, they could use them as bases for target practice. The soviets have given solutions to the great problem of nationality, while Yankee imperialism must still deal with the problems of the Blacks and the Indians. Thus it is possible to affirm that

Continued on Page 4

## THE WORKERS STATE AND THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY (EXTRACTS) 11.12.66 J. POSADAS

We publish this text of Cde Posadas on the subject of German reunification. The International will be elaborating on this issue which has moved with great speed following the force of the political revolution which overthrew Honecker. Various factors are entering into play, the desire of German capitalism to contain the effects of the process in the DDR, the lack of prepared communist parties in the workers states, and the policy of the soviets to deepen the splits in the NATO alliance.

Capitalism has shown that it is impotent, incapable of finding a solution to the German problem, of co-existence with the workers states; this is one of the essential aspects which the bureaucracy and the capitalists seek to resolve to render possible a peaceful co-existence. Either Germany is a workers state or capitalism seeks to smash the workers states. There is no other solution. Khrushchev wishes to negotiate over the German workers state. For a whole period East Germany supported China against the Soviet Union in spite of the need which it has of the support of the Soviet Union.

This was not an alliance open and conclusive, but a state of latent sympathy. This was not because the German bureaucracy was closer to China than to the soviet bureaucracy, but because it was a point of support to impede Khrushchev yielding to capitalism. In the negotiations of the soviet bureaucracy, with world capitalism, Germany was a point of decision. If the soviet bureaucracy could not abandon the German workers state, it could at least negotiate on the basis of renouncing the insistence on the recognition of E. Germany. Hence the constant crisis between E. Germany and the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy of the German workers state does not have particular interests different from the rest of the bureaucracy of the workers states. It has its own nationalist interests, it must defend its own state because it lives from this; but at the same time it is under the pressure of the masses who do not abandon the German Workers State.

The so-called Berlin Wall has ceased to exist for a long time. It may exist in the form, but for a long time it has not impeded entering and leaving. The German proletariat and petit bourgeoisie who have remained in the Workers state have remained there because they see that it is more progressive than capitalism. They make a distinction between the reactionary leadership of Ulbricht and of the communist

party and the progressive fact that it is nationalised property, the monopoly of foreign trade and the planning of the economy. This means an elevated political class consciousness. The proletariat of the German capitalist state, in spite of economic progress remains in the socialist party showing an elevated political understanding. Between the two proletarian bases of Germany, there is a unification. This is the panic of Ulbricht and of capitalism. The two essential bases of the social structure of the two countries, the proletariat of the workers state and of the capitalist state show an elevated political understanding; the one remaining in the socialist party, the other sustaining the workers state. That is the solution to the problem of Berlin!

It is the workers state which must make an appeal for unification, not to the "democratic" solution by means of votes; by elections capitalism wins because it has greater weight, a greater capacity of decision in preparing elections. History is not decided according to who votes better or gains more votes. It is resolved on the basis of which is more progressive. Vietnam shows how the problem is resolved; not on the basis of elections nor of Parliament, but on the basis of revolutionary decision.

Although there may not be a direct relation with this socialist-Christian democratic government, the problem basically for the German masses continues to be the same, that is the two Germanies. The soviet bureaucracy and the German bureaucracy speak of the existence of two Germanies. This is a crime! The existence of the two Germanies is a crime. It is an historic fraud. The idea of the self determination of the two Germanies is also a fraud. One Germany exists and there is no reason for the division of Germany. The separation of the two Germanies has not promoted either cultural interests or different historic interests; it is an artificial separation. But at the same time it has created different historic conditions in the two parts of Germany; on the one

side an enormously progressive step, necessary in history; nationalised property; on the other side, capitalist property. A reunification of Germany must be made on the basis of the most progressive sector which answers to the historic and concrete interests of the standard of living, of the development of the economy and of the masses which is the German workers state. There is no problem of self determination, because there are no minorities nor enslaved cultural or ethnic sectors through invasion. There is no reason to maintain the division, the only reason is that the soviet bureaucracy has no interest in a revolutionary policy and the capitalist state has no interest in another Germany as a workers state. While between the masses of the two states, there is no difference, absolutely no difference.

This government will seek to maintain the status-quo of agreement with the bureaucracy of the German workers state. It is necessary to reject this; it is necessary to demand a reunification of Germany on the basis of what is most progressive, not a referendum nor an election, no. Before a referendum or elections, a public discussion by all the masses on what is the best way forward, statified property or capitalist property; individual production, the autonomy of every enterprise or the planning of the economy, the free trade of each capitalist or the monopoly of foreign trade; the forms of political organisation in which the bourgeoisie decide or the soviet political forms which allow the exploited masses to decide. Hence it is necessary to prepare the discussion and then pose the problem of reunification. It is on the basis of this that we appeal to the German masses to prepare for these tasks. Hence the necessity to organise currents and tendencies on the basis of the revolutionary marxist programme which we have expounded and which prepares the conditions for the organisation of revolutionary tendencies in a short stage.

## THE CHANGES IN THE WORKERS STATES AND THE CRISIS OF GROWTH OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT.

The process of partial regeneration has an enormous dynamism. Allied with this there is slowness in the formation of the conscious leadership to advance from partial to total regeneration. But it is very notable that the capitalist system in its violent agony has not succeeded in winning any advantage from this contradiction. When it needs to finish with Cuba and Nicaragua, its only achievement is the intervention in Panama, justifying itself by the campaign against drugs to dislodge Noriega. Meanwhile throughout the world the left, nationalist and anti imperialist movements continue to advance. In Latin America there is the political and social defeat of the Pinochet dictatorship, the conquest of the majority for the left in Montevideo, the historic triumph of the Workers Party of Lula in the elections local and Presidential in Brazil, and the isolation of the right in Salvador through the FMLN in the capital city itself. In Europe there is the progress of the left coalition in the elections in Spain and, in Greece, the gains in almost all the municipalities. Also in Portugal in Lisbon there have been successes through the left fronts. In Japan there is the advance of the socialist party and throughout the world the movements of anti capitalist social struggles develop without cessation.

The crisis in which all the workers states are living in Europe does not lead to the demoralisation of the masses of the world nor the lack of confidence in socialism. The masses have a great consciousness of the superiority of the structure of the workers state, together with the necessity of changes towards socialist democracy. When there are hundreds of thousands and millions of people who participate in the mobilisations in the DDR, Czechoslovakia, Roumania and the USSR, they see that it is to impel progress towards socialism.

In Roumania particularly, capitalism has nothing to talk about. Before the revolution there was only exploitation, total poverty, ignorance, lack of medicine and health for the population. It was at once fascism and feudalism in the countryside. The Roumanian population did not rise against Ceausescu and his family camarrilla to return to capitalism, but to elevate social justice, the distribution of goods as a function of the necessities of people and to free them from the bureaucratic apparatus which made a usufruct of the workers state for itself.

European capitalism looked towards Ceausescu whom it believed it could use in opposition to the USSR, to make use of bureaucratic investments and planning, to participate in the construction of the chemical complexes, of the luxury hotels or official buildings. They had no interest in the "lack of democracy", in the same way as Yankee imperialism has no interest in democracy in Latin America. In Roumania the masses have seen the aberrations of planning by the bureaucracy; the shortage of food, the restrictions in heating, all this was not the result of the country but of the plans of the bureaucratic camarrilla of Ceausescu. The democracy which the masses ask for is socialist democracy. Hence they created committees for socialist democracy from the beginning of the uprising in Timisoara and in all the places that they could. The communist base, a great part of the cadres of the Communist Party participated in all this with the population and with the Rumanian army itself composed of many communists and having a tradition of being pro-soviet. The Front of National Salvation which at present governs has a heterogenous composition, but it has a solid base which is the defence of the structure of the workers state. The political weakness comes from all the bureaucratic deficiencies of the life of the communist party. This applies to Roumania as to the other workers states who were constituted after the second world war on the basis of the triumph of the Soviet Union and of the Red Army, but with small communist parties educated by Stalinism and led by the bureaucrats.

On the other hand, the process of partial regeneration in the USSR advances with a very great order, because it has a more secure political force which is the party and the historic experience of the masses in the soviets. The crisis which all these workers states are living through is a crisis of political leadership. Hence the political

organisations of European capitalism try to draw some advantage, supporting all the liberal or Christian Democrat groups which they can find. But when the masses of the workers states demand the sentencing of the old bureaucrats for their corruption, all the bourgeois politicians become very discrete, because the corruption of the bureaucracy of the workers states hardly touches the minimum which exists in the capitalist world. People did not mobilise to impel this "democracy" but "socialist democracy." The immense will which has been expressed in all the demonstrations from the DDR to Poland, Czechoslovakia and Roumania, is to impel the progress of the workers state, of an equitable distribution of goods, of the full and permanent participation of the working class in all the plans and the organisation of the economy.

Capitalism is eager to promote the development of a "market" economy in the workers states and speaks of plans of aid to develop it in the various countries of Eastern Europe. If we look at capitalist Europe which is the Europe of the multinationals, how are they going to be able to realise the least European unity on the basis of the capitalist economy? The result of the efforts of the transitory governments like that of Poland is already evident; the masses reject the programme of the government and especially the working class with strikes, mobilisations and the rejection of the Solidarity group. The same with the dream of the unification of Germany under the leadership of German capitalism. It is the masses of the German workers state who are exerting a pressure on capitalist Germany. They have sentenced Honecker for his political and social corruption and the masses of West Germany see that all their leaders should go to prison. In capitalist Germany, it is the social democracy which centralises the working class and draws closer to electoral victory. In the conditions of the SPD in government, the discussion of the unification of Germany is going to take another character and there will be a combination of measures and proposals of combining West and East Germany and not as this arrogant Genscher proposes that the DDR has no other alternative than to be a province of capitalist Germany.

All the governments which are installed now in Poland, Czechoslovakia with Havel, in Hungary, in the DDR itself are transitory elements which bring with them all the contradictions of this process, because there is no prepared communist leadership, one that could foresee all these events. But it will be constructed on the march with the intervention of the communist vanguard, with the socialist conduct of the masses, the ever more secure intervention of the working class in all the workers states and also with the development of the discussion and the struggle in the Soviet Union to form the necessary genuine leadership.

The old bureaucracies have been dislodged, stalinism is in definitive liquidation, but these apparatuses have been constructed during many years and incrustated in the structure of the workers state. They have an enormous resistance grabbing hold of anything by which to survive. It is this which lies behind the "nationalist" confrontations in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia etc. This bureaucracy has its links also within the communist party, hence alliances are made between the party of the republic and the nationalist movements against the centralised leadership of the CPSU. They resort to any means to defend their positions and their privileges from pogroms to assassinations (in the tradition of Stalin directly). Stalinism is dead, but the Stalinist bureaucrats are still around.

The debate which is developing within the CPSU on the leading function of the party is very important. The anguish on where the process is going belongs to the bureaucracy, but not the soviet masses nor the communist vanguard. The bureaucratic impositions of the old apparatus are being terminated and the working class is bursting through for the elevation of the communist life of the workers state and also of the communist party. The pluralism which is being posed is not a co-existence of parties which propose antagonistic programmes, whether capitalist or socialist, but the very rich diversity of tendencies, expressing all the ideas, the movements to make the workers state advance. Everything is to be expressed in the soviets, in a permanent life of debates, of criticisms, of control by the population on all the plans of production, of work, of internal and international relations.

This is a very important discussion where the essential principles of marxism are being reborn. We are very far from

## THE RUINS OF ATHENS (BEETHOVEN)

J. POSADAS 17.9.79

This is an analysis made with a group of comrades on listening to the music of Beethoven on the site of the Acropolis, Athens.

The new young leaders of the world revolutionary movement are going to be concerned with knowing about ancient Greece. This corresponds to an historic necessity: to know Lenin but also Greece and Beethoven. In listening to "The Ruins of Athens" by Beethoven, we unite the past to the present in organising and living already the socialist future of humanity.

In his music Beethoven incorporated the choir, wanting to unite music and song which is the most immediate form of communication after language. It thus expresses the necessity to elevate the sentiments and the consciousness towards a form of relation which unifies and centralises all the conquests of humanity, whether on the plane of science, of art, of literature, of the knowledge of the economy and of life in general. Beethoven did not have a very conscious notion of this function, but he aspired to harmonious human relations.

It would be very fine to dance to the music of "The Ruins of Athens". It would be possible to create a dance on the theme of human

relations, where Athens would be part of the history of humanity, which goes towards socialism as an objective necessity of life. But today the stones of the Acropolis are abandoned by the bourgeoisie. The latter are completely uninterested

because it no longer directs the course of history and it does not know what is going to happen to-morrow. It has no future, hence it has no interest in the present save to exploit and extract profit. It cannot create ideas, it is not concerned with uniting the present, future and past. All economic progress is destroyed if it does not continue in a social, cultural, scientific and political progress. Social development must be expressed in culture, in science and above all in the political struggle which centralises scientific, cultural and artistic life.

Beethoven collaborated with the conscious ideas of the progress of humanity, even if he did not propose it and was only a humanist. Marx went beyond the limits of the humanism of his epoch. Marxism concluded with the idea of the transformation of society, in which the human being socially organised will be able to determine the course of history, ideas, and social relations. He posed that humanity must put itself in

agreement with itself, to be able to find out from where it came and where it is going. Beethoven like every great artist had a vision of a human future. It is not correct to present him as a rigid and intractable man. He was a being full of joy and of strength which expressed his vision of the human future. In this music of the "Ruins of Athens" he thought of a past of more than two thousand years ago to communicate with the future. When listening we are stimulated to ideas, we can imagine the Greek Academy. This work is rarely interpreted. It does not interest the producers who seek above all commercial gain. It does not present much interest from this point of view because it is a work which seeks to organise thought. But it gives also the image of a dance of humanity. It will be danced in the future with the joy and tranquillity of those who are not oppressed by the tragic problems of the moment, but who say that humanity is going to be able to resolve all the problems. It will be necessary to create a dance around this music. Beethoven added the human voice in his music which was not sufficient alone to express all that he felt. It will also be necessary to add the dance and incorporate within it all the problems which humanity sees today.

17.9.1979.

## THE RELEASE OF MANDELA

We salute with immense joy the release of Nelson Mandela which is a great triumph, not only of the ANC in its battle with the capitalist exploiter class but of the objective force of the world socialist revolution. This is part of a process which has seen the erosion also of other apparently invincible strongholds of imperialism for example Chile and Israel. This does not mean that capitalism in those places will not continue to resist extinction by all possible methods, but it means that they cannot conceal their growing social weakness. The struggle in South Africa will be protracted because

there is not a communist international in existence which could co-ordinate the world struggle and thus accelerate the downfall of this rotting regime.

Mandela reaffirmed the programme of the nationalisation of the mines, banks and monopoly industries. This shows how the ANC is not simply a party for democratic rights for blacks, but a party whose programme is one of social transformations. The black proletariat is the fundamental force in the struggle for socialism in South Africa.

the end of communism and capitalism in any case does not have much illusion about this. When the process takes on a greater clarity and order according to the intervention of the communist masses and of the soviet proletariat, there will be a return to posing the significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of soviet democracy, of the communist consciousness of humanity, of socialist internationalism, the need for the soviet planning of the USSR and of all the workers states to unify themselves on a world scale towards the triumph of socialism. 10.1.90.

## RESOLUTION OF THE EUROPEAN BUREAU

From Page 1

problems that determine history whatever the particularly local experiences in Britain. It is to these issues that the Labour left must devote attention. It must live the problems of the soviet workers state and the whole world process as their own. Now that the stalinist apparatus is being shattered, an enormous impulse can be given to the programme of social transformations in Britain. 9.3.90.

From Page 2

Self management was not born with the construction of the workers state, but came afterwards; first they centralised everything, then came self management as a determined choice through the policy of the soviets and of the lack of an adequate marxist political leadership. This did not mean a return to capitalism, but it generated a Djilas who as a theoretical expression of the bureaucratic layer which thought as a function of its own interests, theorised on the existence of a new class and considered Tito as its representative. J. Posadas. 8.5.81.



Contents.  
Page 1. Manifesto 1 May.  
Page 3. German Unification. Page 4. Nicaragua.

## MANIFESTO OF THE FIRST OF MAY

### THE POSADIST IV INTERNATIONAL

Workers of the world, unite!

# RED FLAG

Subscribe to RED FLAG  
1 year ..... £5.00

Order from  
IV International Publications.

PO. Box 134  
Nottingham NG1 3QT.

Cheques payable to:-  
'IV International Publications'

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

397 11 May 1990. Price 30p.

## THE PROGRESS OF THE STRUGGLE OF THE MASSES OF THE WORLD, THE CRISIS OF GROWTH OF THE WORKERS STATES AND THE NECESSITY TO DEVELOP THE WORLD LEADERSHIP FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM.

### FOR THE WORLD ANTI IMPERIALIST FRONT FOR THE LEFT AND TRADE UNION FRONT WITH THE ANTI CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

The balance which must be made on this First of May is that the masses of the whole world have not been held back in front of the very acute and partly violent crisis which has broken out in the workers states- which is the disintegration of what remains of the bureaucratic and stalinist apparatus. Throughout the world the social, trade union, political and national liberation struggles have continued and the dictatorships have fallen in Paraguay and Chile.

There have been important mass movements in Africa, in Kenya, in South Africa and Algeria. Namibia has been liberated. South Africa has been obliged to free Mandela and retire from Namibia and Angola.

Great strikes and struggles have broken out in Argentina, Venezuela, and Colombia. In Brasil besides intense struggles, the Workers Party (Lula) obtained in the Presidential elections more than 42% of the vote with an anti capitalist programme; in El Salvador the guerrillas have shown great force and decision in the attack on San Salvador which put in serious danger the reactionary government.

The strike movement of the miners in Virginia (United States) has triumphed after six months of confrontation with the management and found solidarity from workers in every part of the country in spite of all the repressor supported by the government of Bush and the Yankee bourgeoisie. The struggle of the technicians of the Eastern Airlines and that of the

Greyhound Company, the largest bus firm in the United States continues.

Throughout Europe there have been strikes of students against capitalist reforms in education, and of workers for trade union and political rights as in Britain, Spain, Italy and France. The ecologists have been in permanent mobilisation and there have been great demonstrations against racism both in France and Italy. The struggles in Britain and the resistance of the population to a barbaric privatisation have put in crisis and posed the liquidation of the Thatcher government in a short stage. The Intifada has continued strongly, constantly creating acute difficulty for the reactionary government of Israel and stimulating the revolutionary decision of the masses throughout the world and the world revolutionary vanguard.

At the same time the fundamental aspect of all the processes of crisis in the workers states is the intervention of the masses. As in no previous epoch since the Russian revolution have the masses intervened so actively in the process of the liquidation of the bureaucracy. From Tienan men Square, passing through Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary and the DDR, but in an especially mature form in the USSR, the masses have contained the bureaucratic camarillas and in a few months overthrew them. They have done this without breaking up the workers state, without renouncing its conquests and rights, although this movement

is not led or organised.

The highest point of this intervention was the strike of the miners of Siberia who have posed in the correct terms (and in this sense they represented them) the demand of the masses of all the workers states: no to the liquidation of the gains that have been won, yes to the development of social justice, free of the bureaucracy, complete freedom of organisation for the people, but not for the privileged sectors and the parasites. All this powerful movement does not annul its unequal and combined character in which the impulse of the necessity of progress, of a break with the obstacles which impede the development of the workers state, does not find the leaderships, the movements, the organisation and the programme for the immediate leap of progress.

Such is the nature of the process characterised by Cde Posadas as that of partial regeneration, in which the structure of the workers states, through the growth of its necessities, through the maturing of the population and through the general progress of the revolution in the world, poses a crisis within the bureaucratic apparatuses and leaderships which represent in only a very limited sense, the necessity of the progress of the workers states towards socialism.

Hence all the communist parties are in crisis and in particular those responsible for the leadership of the workers states; it is not marxism which is in crisis, it is a whole false conception of

this "marxism-Leninism", of the statues and of the historic symbols of communism to justify the oppression of a caste which is now shown the door and which through its opposition to the necessary progress, has tried by all its means, like the clique of Ceausescu to maintain the control of the workers state.

These are the layers who today foment nationalism, who organise the pogroms and head the reactionary parties and

programme for a transitory stage towards the liquidation of all the forms of property. It is a necessary stage which allowed and allows an enormous progress of society in a short historic time. This has occurred in all the countries which have adopted through revolution or as a consequence of the second world war such a programme and such objectives.

What is in question is the bureaucratic application of such principles which have



Demonstrations in Mongolia. The political revolution must lead to the complete functioning of soviets.

organisations which have arisen in this short period in the workers states; they are the same bureaucratic cliques and layers who confronted with ceding power to the masses and to the progress of socialism, prefer to ally with their worst enemies.

This is not and cannot be the crisis of marxism, of the conception of scientific socialism. The stratification of property, the monopoly of foreign trade and the planning of the economy are the

subordinated the use of state property and economic planning to the interests of a caste. Hence it is mistaken to pose that to reestablish the market economy is going to allow progress. Nowhere in the world has the market economy meant progress, only injustice, waste and increase in inequality. This is the case with respect to the relations between the developed capitalist powers and the rest

Continued on Page 2

of the world and exists within the interior itself of the richest countries like Britain and the United States for example, in which those who live in the area of absolute poverty exceed thirty percent of the population.

The working class, and the large masses of the workers states do not ask for a market: they demand justice in distribution and that they may be protagonists in the management of the common interest and property. Now in Poland and also Yugoslavia it is clear that to invent a market, to give privileges to private interests brings disastrous results for the social relations of justice and equality. The objective of socialism was and will be that of eliminating the exploitation of man by man and no reform of a private type in the workers states can sustain this. Thus those present leaders will have to render account to people. They will not be able to deceive anyone with the promise of a future of abundance in the capitalist market.

History has taught with the experience made by the Bolsheviks in the first seven years of the Russian revolution, that the stratification of property must be under the most complete and extended workers and popular control, that the objective of such management must be that of creating the collective capacity of management and leadership of economic and social activities; that the power of the population must be exercised through soviet functioning, of the councils in which legislative, executive and judicial powers are united in the possibilities of independent decision and application of the conclusions.

This period has taught also that the leading role of the party does not exist through decree. It exists always in activity, always and when this party is capable theoretically and politically and is able to structure itself as an instrument in the service of society, always and when it has firm principles (and this means a dominion of scientific method, of marxism, a correct appreciation of the process of history) and a complete and direct relation with the masses, in which they can control in all instances the conduct of the cadres and leaders, whether through the organs of the party or the organs of direct power like the soviets.

The introduction of parliamentary regimes of bourgeois character resolve none of these problems. All the parliaments in the West are in crisis precisely through not representing the population, but the economic interests which dominate each country. In

the void of the present leaderships in the workers states, in which the masses overthrow the leaders and parties which applied false, bureaucratic and stalinist conceptions of socialism, it is natural that reactionary tendencies arise which push for a retreat in the gains which have been acquired.

This creates a retreat, although partial and transitory in the objective process: countries abandon positions of progress in the international field and the lower layers of the apparatus become liberals, Christian democrats and religious. The stalinists become nationalists, and chauvinists and abandon all and every perspective of progress and put on sale the properties of the workers state. The mafia layers who feed the privileged markets of the bureaucratic layers now dispute the power of the workers state and demand autonomy. They want to give laws in the regions and in the countries making a stand on nationalism and regionalism and manipulating the national sentiment of the masses and the just demands against the excesses and crimes of the Stalinist period. It is these mafias who are the promoters of the pogroms either of Armenians or Azerbaijani in the USSR or of the Hungarians in Roumania. This is not the conduct of the masses of the workers states! With all the difficulties in almost all the workers states, they have overthrown the bureaucratic and corrupt apparatuses without much sanguinary effects: in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, the DDR, the people demonstrated massively and the apparatus had to yield. Even in Roumania the killings of Ceausescu have not had the proportions of civil war. There is no example in the capitalist countries of such a radical renovation in the leaderships of the capitalist countries without a civil war. There is no antagonistic relation between the masses and the workers state—whatever the propaganda of the bourgeoisie says which seeks to make something from this situation.

The historic crisis of the world capitalist system has not ceased. It is not true that capitalism has regained territory and that it is humanising and modernising itself. World capitalism was concentrated in a form without precedence, developing high technology in a process of competition and without restraint at the cost of all the rest of the world and particularly what is referred to as the "Third World" (in reality the most impoverished sectors of the capitalist

world). It is not possible to make a separate, Euro-centrist analysis of such a process of enrichment of some countries at the expense of others; and there is also the issue of ecology, of natural resources and above all the cost to the human being. In all these wealthy countries social inequality has increased, with injustice, unemployment, lack of perspective for youth and now big business foments racism to try to exclude emigrant populations. The relative well being of some countries is the product on the one hand of the plundering of the rest of the world and on the other of the gains which the masses of these countries have made.

For example when the workers of capitalist Germany propose the reduction of the working day to thirty five hours, they are posing a use of scientific progress that favours the human being and against the capitalist clique which like Fiat in Italy throws people out of work or submits them to the rhythm of robots, without reducing in any way the rhythms of production.

This rotten regime now tries to use the crisis of the workers states to show itself progressive in history. But the maximum that it gain is some immediate advantage, to sell some consumer goods to a layer, but in no case to develop these countries. It is absurd to believe that the world bourgeoisie will support the development of new bourgeois layers in these countries so that they develop into competitors. The only objective of world capitalism is to make these countries submit to them, to defeat the workers states with all their conquests and to close the door to any possibility of future progress by the masses of the world.

Hence the task of the revolutionary world vanguard in this stage is to help in the construction of new leaderships, to retake the process of the construction of socialism in the workers states and to extend it on the world level. This is the stage in which we are living; a false conception of socialism has fallen and the urgent task is posed of reviving the most elevated principles of marxism and of scientific socialism! It is necessary to reject every attempt to falsify the interpretation of these historic events, to put in doubt the only programme which can lead to the progress of humanity which is to pass from the workers state to socialism, not on the local, but the world level.

In any case this process in the workers states cannot be detached from the continuation of the class struggle at the world level; the problems which the peoples of the so called



Demonstrations in Tel Aviv of Israelis and Arabs against repression on the West Bank.

third world pose and of the advanced capitalist countries can only be resolved on the basis of anti capitalist struggle. Tasks such as the defence of the environment, agrarian reform, the just distribution of wealth, democratic rights cannot be resolved within the structure of capitalism. Only with the stratification of the means of production, the monopoly of foreign trade and the planning of the economy is it possible to open the door for social transformations.

This continues being valid and has nothing to do with the stratification of the bureaucratic type: to speak today in the advanced countries of "guiding the productive processes and the technological revolution" without posing the expropriation of financial and industrial big business is an abstraction. It is necessary to statify and place the economy at the service of the population under direct control. These are the bases of socialism which must be developed in all the spheres of production and of human activity and above all they must develop in harmony with all the other peoples of the world.

There is no national solution for any country nor for those which are developed nor for those who want to develop and even less so for those on the margins of capitalism. There is no perspective for an independent Lithuania nor for Esthonia nor for a Catalonia outside Spain. But neither are there perspectives for a European Community against the rest of the world! It is necessary to combat the dreams of the "Great" Germany propounded by the German bourgeoisie, but it is necessary to combat also the pretensions of a European Community guided by the capitalist monopolies which closes the gates to the poor countries.

The struggle for socialism continues being an indispensable necessity of history. We appeal for a united world front of all the revolutionary tendencies, progressives, communists, socialists, nationalists, to struggle for a programme of anti capitalist struggle, for democratic rights and against imperialism and the war which it is preparing: the aggressions in Panama and the brazen intervention in Nicaragua together with the constant pressure on Cuba are clear indications of their intentions. It is necessary to reject such intentions and appeal for world support to the masses of these countries in the struggle for democratic rights and social transformations.

It is necessary to make an appeal to the masses and to the communist vanguard of the workers states not to allow themselves to be intimidated by the propaganda of capitalism which promises a paradise of material well being, if these countries renounce the stratification of property and social conquests! It is necessary to aim at the communists who are not compromised with the bureaucracy to struggle to guarantee such gains and elevate the intervention of the masses in the leadership of society. It is necessary to propose a programme of unified development and planning between the workers states and the countries of the third world in the perspective of the construction of socialism. No to the chauvinism and the separation of each country and region!

We appeal for a United Front of socialists and communists in Europe so that unification in Europe is not for the unification of the capitalist monopolies. For the expropriation of the great multinationals, for workers

Continued on Page 4

# THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY AND THE NECESSITY TO EXTEND THE WORKERS STATE

## RESOLUTION OF THE EUROPEAN BUREAU

The recent electoral result in the German workers state in no way shows what is happening socially in the country nor the decisive forces for the progress of the German workers state and all Germany. The sectors which in the final months of the past year were determinant in striking seriously at the bureaucratic dominion of the party and of the state, have not obtained a triumphant electoral result. It was the communist vanguard of the factories, the groups of intellectuals which constituted New Forum, and part of the youth who created the movement which has shifted all the apparatus of previous power, in gigantic demonstrations, to the singing of the International and other revolutionary songs together with the workers strikes. Yet in front of the elections they appear without the strength which they expressed then, without the ability to attract the rest of the population.

An electoral process never reflects the will of social progress of all the masses, and in this case of the German proletariat of the workers state, which has been capable of overthrowing the Stalinist bureaucratic apparatus without damaging the structure of the workers state. The communists have not responded in the discussion over unification, with a programme of defence and extension of the gains of the workers state towards all Germany; with proposals of forms of direct democratic expression like the control of the economy and of the state apparatus on the part of the working class and the most advanced sectors of the population. On the contrary they accepted the elections which impede the communist vanguard exercising all its authority over society.

The people who voted for the CDU were all the old bureaucratic apparatus, the peasants, the people of the black market and of the "Intershops" and a sector of the population, state functionaries with marginal layers linked in all manner of ways to such a bureaucratic apparatus. The pressure of Kohl and of the German bourgeoisie through this sector, exerted a pressure to accelerate the elections and the formation of a new government has the significance of a preventive action to impede the movement of opposition to the bureaucracy developing in an anti capitalist direction. Hence Kohl supported himself on the layers of the same bureaucratic apparatus like the people of the CDU implicated with the security apparatus of the German Democratic Republic.

On the other hand the bureaucracy in front of the possibility of the loss of power and of control over the workers state, has resorted to every type of alliance with capitalism to guarantee the maintaining of its privileges whether in the economy or the state apparatus. In front of a situation which was liquidating

them, they played the ultimate card of converting themselves into functionaries of the capitalist system. In this sense they attracted marginal sectors of the population, their own clientele, the less politicised sectors of society. In the void of a political response on the part of the left to the dimension which the crisis of the liquidation of the bureaucracy has reached, these sectors of the CDU agitating the flag of national German Unity attracted 43 % of the electorate.

At the same time, it is important to see that the vote obtained by the communists, by the SPD and by New Forum, the ecological groups and the Spartacists as a whole had about 44% of the votes. These are the people who can decide the future of the workers state. The SPD and the PDS (communists) were the majority in the most important industrial and urban centres, which were fundamental in the liquidation of the bureaucracy. This has been a vote in defence of the most important social and economic gains of the workers state. It is an expression of intelligence in front of the enormous pressure of the capitalist system and the clamorous collapse of the bureaucracy. This is now expressed in the caution of the representatives of the CDU who have to take such strength into account and also over the promises that capitalism has made - when they are already abolishing the subsidies to the refugees from the workers state in West Germany. Hence also they declare that they are not going to come out of the Warsaw Pact. The result favourable to the CDU creates difficulties for the development of the communist leadership. It can retard, but cannot impede it; Germany shows how the capitalist system cannot make use of the crises which move the workers states, because in reality they are not aimed to question the economic and social structure, but the political power of the bureaucracy. The crisis which the fall of the Berlin Wall unleashed in the capitalist world and the perspective of a future unification of the two Germanies is clearly demonstrative of the impossibility of being able to use and take advantage of the events through which the workers states are living, of the contradictions and of the empirical efforts which are made to organise these countries.

It has been possible to show that the wall was not only a device of the bureaucracy of the workers state in defence of its privileges, reducing the sphere of action and influence of the social and economic structure of the German workers state, but is served also as an element of justification of common interests and relations between the German bourgeoisie and the rest of world capitalism, particularly with imperialism. The fall of the wall has spread and exacerbated old intercapitalist rancours and

disputes. There is no meeting of their representatives in which the theme of German re-unification does not appear.

At the same time the process towards the unification opens great possibilities for the left, for the socialist, communist movement, for the trade union centres and youth and ecological movements, to unify in a process which prepares new struggles in better conditions against the capitalist system. Better conditions because to the immense force which is mobilised against the bureaucracy in the German workers state, there is going to be united the force and experience of the working class of capitalist Germany, of its youth and its left petit bourgeoisie. The demand for the unification of Germany as already posed by Comrade Posadas must be taken by the workers and popular organisations so as to transform the unification discussion into an objective for the conquest of much more elevated social and democratic conditions for Europe.

It is a lie when the capitalist system tries to claim through a campaign of the press and of public opinion that the fall of the bureaucratic regimes is a victory for its system, for its special endowments of "freedom" and "democracy", yet it feels timid and vacillating in front of the possibility of the two Germanys. The German bourgeoisie feels that the moment has arrived to satisfy its hunger which has grown during this period of development controlled and limited by the rest of world imperialism.

Capitalism as a whole, in the first place, the United States with the Marshall Plan contributed to making of Germany a great economic power which would resist the revolutionary influence coming from the workers states which with their transformations, stimulated the masses of the capitalist countries to follow their example. But at the same time they submitted Germany to a limited autonomy, without its own armed forces, without being able to impose freely on the world the "real" economic weight of the marc in a market dominated by the dollar, whose value has a great artificial component through the hegemonic function of imperialism - military and political - not reflective of the real American economic strength. Germany has lived like a political "eunuch" a giant with feet and hands of clay and now in the middle of this situation, it has imagined new conditions and possibilities of unfulfilled grandeur.

The initiative of the soviets and of the communists of the German workers state to open a discussion which leads to the unity of the two regions in a gradual process of the withdrawal of troops on both sides in a period of five years, has been a serious blow to the plans of capitalism. All the programme of the unification of the European bourgeoisie for 1992 has fallen into a thousand pieces

and the entire physiognomy of Europe is not the same as six months before. This is not because the workers states are returning to the arms of capitalism, and as final salvation to the demands of the market and of the European Common Market, but because the rules which regulate the intercapitalist disputes have experienced grave alterations. The desperate solution of Kohl and of the right in capitalist Germany is a serious blow to the unity of the world capitalist system.

The constant changes of position by Kohl, Genscher etc as also of the social democracy, indicate the enormous contradictions in which they all must work and they are not simply accommodations of an electoral character. The German bourgeoisie must impel unity with the German workers state because this will improve its competitive capacity in relation to the rest of capitalism, besides which it must show itself in front of the petit bourgeoisie as the only force capable of resolving the problem which was created with the liquidation of Hitler. In front of the petit bourgeoisie, it would show itself also resolving the cultural demand for independence in relation to the Yanks, because as analysed by Comrade Posadas this social sector feels itself to be invaded by the United States. This is so because even the most backward of the solutions to the problem of German unification passes through a revision of the Yankee military presence and of NATO, as also of the soviets who would withdraw from the German workers state.

On the other hand and this is the basis of the contradictions which torment all of them, there is the fear of making a step which is going to mean incorporating into political and social life, the sixteen million people who in spite of having lived under the dominion of the bureaucracy, have acquired the consciousness of the superiority of the workers state, which has developed this consciousness as an integral part of its economic and social structure. Without any question this will be a very great impulse to the left and hence the fear and the investment of the bourgeoisie and of the social democrats themselves in the electoral campaign in the workers state; millions and millions of marks were spent on this. The bourgeoisie of Kohl who feel themselves to be at the edge of defeat at the hands of the social democrats and the latter also, live in anticipation of the crisis of having to govern under the pressure of a social base, of the trade unions, of the JUSOS and of the greens who are maturing a programme of transformations for Germany. These forces together with the masses of the workers state constitute a very explosive mixture for the capitalist system.

The masses of the workers state aspire through unification to gain better means and conditions to develop the workers state and

socialism to a superior level. The masses of the workers state do not run to the arms of capitalist Germany in search of butter, sausages or pornography, but they feel that together with the masses of capitalist Germany, they can establish a better relation, a condition much more favourable for the progress of socialism.

The masses of the workers state feel themselves to be secure and responsible in front of a task for which they do not have all the means. Fundamentally they lack a genuine communist party, based on marxism and with a better experience of political leadership in society. Anyway they feel capable, intelligent and resolved. It is enough to see that that the workers state has sixteen million inhabitants and West Germany seventy million and it is from East Germany where the best intellectuals, scientists, athletes, originate and the workers state has always held front rank in the international competitions and Olympics. The German masses feel that they are realising the great objective of Lenin who with Trotsky, discussed on the importance that the German revolution would have as a complement to the Russian revolution. The German revolution was closely linked to the perspective of the triumph of the October Revolution. The triumph of the German revolution was going to be able to fuse the Bolshevik vanguard - the leadership of Lenin and the experience of soviet functioning - with the economic power and the experience of the German proletariat. This was the only way with which the nascent Russian revolution would have been able to confront the enormous difficulties which the future showed, difficulties which with the failure of the German revolution aggravated and opened the way for the taking of power by Stalin and the bureaucracy.

The German bourgeoisie is about to take a step which immediately is going to turn against it. It is on the point of making a new sealed waggon as with Lenin and this is going to attract millions in West Germany who will find millions at the station of the workers state, so that together they can open an important process to the left, a serious blow at the world structure of the capitalist system. The German bourgeoisie proceeds like an idiot, because it cannot have any other behaviour; it is obliged to act through the world relations of competition with the rest of the capitalist system. The German bourgeoisie calculates that annexing the workers state would make possible an enormous growth of its economic capacity. Evidently the German workers state is not Poland. It figures among the first twenty countries in the world for its economic growth, with an income per capita similar to that of Italy,

but with a more democratic distribution. It means that it is a question of a population of great development and standard of life which enjoys important social gains of security of employment, housing, health care, education and family support. The German bourgeoisie wants to impose its dominion through the generalisation of the mark as an exchange currency, in this way imposing the control of big business over the economy of the workers state and opening the door to private property. They are its calculations in the air without counting upon the factor of the social resistance which has now been expressed in the electoral result, with the 44% who voted for the left.

The SDP of Brandt is in agreement with a process of unification under capitalist dominion alone and seeks to gain time, and proposes unification for a successive stage of elimination or at least diminution of the importance of the military blocks. They want to calm the German bourgeoisie which now sees itself incapable of containing the growth of the struggles of the working class and the youth in the Federal Republic. In the same way the SDP will find itself in difficulty to contain the presence of the new forces which will incorporate themselves in the left, thanks to the unification of the two Germanies.

The left of the Social Democracy and of the Jusos, together with the trade union vanguard is impelling through struggles, an advanced programme of social conquests like the objective of the thirty five hours week, the transformation of the arms industry and of everything which contaminates the environment, the liquidation of military bases, support to the third world and alliance with the greens in the leadership of the country. The support obtained by the SDP in the German workers state comes about through the loss of authority of the communist party as a result of the previous bureaucratic government, but in any case the base which voted for them was done in defence of the gains of the German workers state. In this way the SDP presented itself to the electors with this programme and also the SDP in capitalist Germany has changed a great deal. They had been the party which in the seventies supported the installation of the missiles in Europe. Now they have changed and on the contrary propose the dismantling of NATO in Germany or that Germany change its role as France and Spain have done.

It is necessary to open a discussion in the communist, socialist and world revolutionary movement on the programme for the unification of the two Germanys, which must be realised on the basis of the social and economic structure which allows the most complete possibility of progress, which is the structure of the workers state. If the Workers state has not

been able to develop still more being a workers state, it is because it has been led by the bureaucracy which has prevented the immense maturity and intelligence of the German people being able to spill over into the organisation and leadership of society and the economy. But anyway the structure was expressed through the social gains and conquests which place the progress of people in the centre of the concern of the economy and production. A woman can stay to look after her child for up to three years and retain complete right to return to her place of work and the trade union rights and freedoms are much more advanced than in capitalist Germany. The head of German industry has declared that among the first measures they propose to adopt is the dismantling of all the labour legislation of the workers state. Social struggles are being prepared which are going to pose questions over the minimum bases for the realisation of unification and besides are going to put in movement the true decisive forces of society. In these struggles electoral support does not count for much, but it is a question of who weighs in the economy and production.

The principles on which the workers state supports itself must be the base for future unification and they are going to find a great welcome in the proletariat and the youth of capitalist Germany which is also preparing new struggles and movements to impose the social democracy in the government and a better relation of forces in the anti capitalist struggle. The struggle for the thirty five hours week as Cde Posadas said, is in the defence of human dignity, it is a serious questioning of the power and the objective of capitalism in production. It is not only a measure to diminish the number of unemployed, but an historic dispute with the bourgeoisie for the benefits which are obtained through the application of modern productive techniques which have improved enormously productivity and the forms of production.

Unification must propose the extension of the democratic and social gains of the two countries, supported on the democratic organs of intervention of the population on all problems. The base of the axis of this process is the sentiment of the German proletariat, which in spite of the war and of the agreements of Stalinism has remained united supporting the workers state and the progress and the struggle for socialism.

It is necessary to reject the agreements of the present leaderships with Kohl, to create a new country with capitalist forms and functioning. The new unified Germany must be made on the bases of the principles of the workers state so that this can be a contribution to the progress of the world revolution.

The European Bureau, March 1990.

## The Nicaraguan Elections

The electoral defeat of the Sandinistas has opened up a new phase in the problems of the advance of Nicaragua from a revolutionary to a workers state. The Sandinistas got 42% of the vote which represents the most advanced and determined layers of the population who want to continue the fight against imperialism and to gain socialism whatever the cost. The 55% of the opposition represented a motley circus sustained by Yankee money and only able to operate on the basis of the brutal campaign of Yankee imperialism to maximise the economic difficulties of the country through blockade and support given to the counter revolutionary contras. The new government finds its basis in the black marketeers, speculators, functionaries and those submitted to religious pressures and overwhelmed by the problems of daily life. Thus these elections were not conducted in the "free" conditions beloved of the journalistic halfwits of capitalism, but in the conditions of Yankee blockade and military pressure.

Such elections in any case do not decide the course of history. It was a limitation in the tactics of the Sandinistas to have called them in the first place. They called them with the objective of trying to influence the forces of imperialism by showing their

legitimacy. Indeed no one expected the Sandinistas to lose, least of all imperialism. In its way to call the elections was an act of audacity, but the best tactic of the Sandinistas would have been to develop a much superior process of popular democratic organs in the country and a revolutionary party functioning which related much more to the population.

In making these criticisms however we are not blaming the Sandinista leadership for the electoral outcome. The problems facing the revolution in Nicaragua stem ultimately from the deficiencies of the world communist movement and the break in the continuity of marxism in the Soviet Union where there is no communist International. The famous "Return to Lenin" has still not broached the fundamental conceptions of Lenin and Bolshevism, that socialism can only be the result of a world revolutionary process and building socialism in one country only means building the bureaucracy. It is important in this connection to see the behaviour of the Nicaraguan Communist party which is actually part of the reactionary coalition. In front of the revolutionary Sandinistas, these people associate with the other side.

Without question imperialism will seek to aid the reactionary government with

economic resources and hope to reorganise a state apparatus submitted to imperialist objectives. But this is a difficult task for them because the Sandinistas will retain their authority as revolutionaries who have already beaten the Yanks in destroying Somoza. Moreover it is not as though world imperialism has the strength to throw back the world revolution. It does not. It may contain on a transitory basis, but it simply reproduces again and again the conditions which inevitably lead to stimulating the world revolutionary process.

Imperialism has nothing to offer Nicaragua, but propping up a few wealthy reactionaries. This may have worked in the nineteenth century, but not now.

For the Sandinistas, it will be necessary to develop a much more profound political discussion, to develop much closer ties with the population and maintain and develop their links with the world revolutionary vanguard. As the experience in Chile has shown, it is necessary to pass from the government to power and power means the total expropriation of the bourgeoisie, popular organs of control and social participation, the planning of the economy and the monopoly of foreign trade.

From Page 2

control, for the elimination of unemployment throughout Europe, reducing the hours of work and defending the standard of living with the sliding scale of wages! For the expropriation and placing under workers control of all industry which contaminates the environment! For the defence of social gains against the privatisation of services, of health and education! For the defence of democratic rights, break the functioning of the bourgeois parliaments with the centralised formation of organs of popular control in all the activities of public interest! Complete rights to the workers councils, of enterprises and of organisms of public administration, complete right to strike, of demonstrations and expression of thought!

Against war!, for the planning of the economies of Europe to develop Greece, Spain, Turkey, Portugal and Ireland to the highest level that modern industrial production can allow; together with a plan of the development of all the other countries of central and western Europe. and of all the

rest of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. We appeal to the trade unions to struggle for such objectives and go beyond all the previous adaptation to the pseudo dynamism of capitalism. For a Europe without unemployment! For a Europe with full social and democratic rights for the immigrant workers who work and produce as the European workers. Immediate cessation of all retreats and concessions in workers rights! NATO out of Europe!.

The Socialist International is not the instrument for such a programme. It is an apparatus which only defends the interest of big business. It has supported and been an accomplice of all the process of privatisations which have asphyxiated social Europe. It has not intervened or resolved any problem of the countries of the third world, has conciliated with the most reactionary and dictatorial government accepted in its structure, representatives of the reactionary government of Israel who are assassinating the Palestinians. This

Socialist International is not the instrument which is necessary for the struggle for socialism.

It is necessary to make a United Front maintaining the independent action of socialists and communists, to push forward this struggle. The construction of socialism in concrete conditions has hardly begun. The experience of stalinism is dead. Now it is a question of retaking the course from its highest level in conditions of development and progress infinitely better than those which the Bolsheviks were confronting, to begin this task. It is necessary to unify Germany under the programme of the Workers State and of the Workers State towards socialism. The possibility of realising the prophesy of Marx is becoming closer, not in the time and forms in which this was foreseen, but on the basis now of an enormous maturity of the whole of humanity for communism, as Cde Posadas has posed. April 1990.

# The LP leadership cannot contain the putrefaction of capitalism

The process in the workers states and the associated process of German reunification is not in any way augmenting the strength of world capitalism, but on the contrary opening up new possibilities for the advance of world socialism.

German capitalism is looking forward to a rich meal as it hopes to eat the DDR and thereby boost its economic and political power versus the other major capitalist powers. However as we have argued elsewhere, whatever the noisy guzzling of the German capitalists as they tuck in to East Germany, we can safely predict that the iron laws of the Klassenkampf will reassert themselves and do honour to the shades of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. There is no doubt that the meal may begin heartily, but end with complaints about severe pains, difficulty in breathing and the onset, combined with other factors, of terminal crisis. As is usually the case with capitalism the eyes will prove larger than the capacity of digestion. The proletariat of West Germany is one of the most powerful in Europe and combined with the workers of East Germany, who have the experience of a workers state despite its bureaucratic excesses is going to detonate many problems for capitalism. The attitude of Lafontaine of the SPD who is obviously afraid of the speed of unification is an indication of the anxiety caused by this new Anschluss. Kohl is trying to hoodwink everyone with the coming glory of the new Germany, but all that has occurred is not the result of the capacity of capitalism but of the crisis of the stalinist leaderships which have allowed capitalism some oxygen. The contradictions within capitalism are augmenting constantly. World imperialism tries to contain them, but the violence of the competition between the USA, Europe and Japan in a world which offers no room for the old imperialist division of the world cannot be contained. The incessant display of resistance by British capitalism to the extended unification of the "European Community" exemplifies the plight of an inferior capitalism in face of the Franco-German block, which

will inevitably oppress all the smaller capitalist powers. Behind all that also Yankee imperialism has to watch impotently the vigour of its European rivals and the fall of its old domination. The unification of Germany is going to make its own highly important contribution to the agony of European capitalism in the next stage. The new free market will only benefit the big monopolies and will polarise all the class struggle in Europe. The numbers of the poor and most oppressed will increase including in the most wealthy capitalist countries. Smaller countries such as Belgium, Portugal etc will become enfeebled. In this respect, history will merely repeat the analysis of Marx, that the greater concentration of production and finance means the greater impoverishment of the population. The conditions are preparing for forms of a French 1968, but now on the wider arena of Europe. Capitalism is opening the way for an eventual socialist unification of Europe, east and west. Of itself it cannot unify Europe because it cannot transcend the nation state. German capitalism may bully some capitalist nations, but it cannot unify Europe. Only socialism can do that.

Uproar continues in Britain as the conservative government lurches from one disorder to another, sustained in power purely on the basis of the supine parliamentarianism of the Labour party, which seeks to contain all discussion within parliament to impede the population at all cost. They seek to bog discussion down by submitting their programme to the accountants of capitalism. How much will that cost etc. There can be no doubt that British capitalism is in its death throes. It does not mean unfortunately that it cannot go on surviving for some time, but historically its a boring spectacle of squalid decay. Some aspects are indeed highly comical. The inability to finance a basic necessity such a communications with the continent or the absurd posturings of Thatcher wherever she is confirm the condition of imperial senility.

The conservative government has failed in all its objectives. In spite of anti

trade union legislation and the stimulation of unemployment by capitalist policies, the capitalist class have proved unable to subdue the proletariat and its allies, who much to the chagrin of capitalism are obtaining wage increases of some importance. The imposition of the poll tax has proved disastrous and the full consequences have yet to be felt. The notorious problems in the police and the revelations over the Guildford trial with its clearly established frame up, deprive capitalism of social authority. The state of the health service and the ceaseless congestion and confusion on the roads are further examples of a society which has no future, which has no creative culture of its own, which lives from day to day and only survives because the immense anti capitalist forces which exist in the world lack a leadership to erase capitalism from history. But the longer the system continues the more barbaric the conditions of life.

The crisis of the Labour party has a particular quality because of its traditional link with the fate of British imperialism, but it is not an isolated phenomenon. All those parties linked to the social democracy ie conceptions of reforming capitalism are now without clear orientation. Capitalism has nothing to offer the mass of the population except more pollution and enslavement. That is why the LP leadership draws closer to capitalism in a very direct way. Even so the contradiction in the LP grows more severe because the masses use it as a point of concentration. Hence the anguish of the party and the activity of Owen who tried to escape the contradiction by posing a new Social Democratic Party. The folding of this

party reflects the profound decomposition of the old order. The recent crisis of the Swedish social democracy in seeking to adapt more to the needs of capitalism, where they originally posed the need to ban strikes, is another symptom that the social democratic model is outworn.

The only tactics of capitalism amount to using racism and taking repressive measures wherever it can. The war preparations against the workers states and the rest of the world will continue, while capitalism will seek to moderate conflicts between the main capitalist powers. Such preparations will be a little more concealed than in the past because soviet diplomacy has made it more difficult to speak of the imminent soviet attack.

The crisis of the leaderships of the workers states and the crisis of stalinist thinking has profound importance for the labour vanguard. A greater clarity about marxism must emerge from all this. The fact that the old stalinist communist party is turning itself directly into a new petit bourgeois grouping means that at least marxism will no longer be hampered by a particularly odious form of stalinist masquerade. It is necessary for the labour vanguard to base itself on the new situation in the workers states which whatever the ensuing complications are creating new supports for the reanimation of marxist principles and the greater intervention of the proletariat in the Soviet Union itself. Capitalism is going into more and more tensions on a world scale. The polarisation of forces in the Middle East and the interminable crisis in South Africa are just two examples of the inexorable course of

the world revolution whatever limitations in leaderships. The development of a genuine marxist wing in the Labour party is fundamental for the process in Britain. 23.6.90.

From Page 3,

possible. Now they use different reasoning, recognition of the objective course of the market necessarily means that private initiative is superior to centralised planning or the world is on a new course and our enemies are not so bad after all. In fact the bureaucracy as Posadas put it, has no past, or future, it cannot produce ideas. It is a usurper in history. These ploys are very feeble and what the bourgeoisie see as the weakness of the workers state, is the weakness and falling powers of the bureaucracy central and local. This is the reality. Once the bureaucracy hid behind "planning" and the monstrous rigging of prices and privileges, now the new bureaucracy is openly linked to non socialist methods. The bureaucracy has no clothes.

The slowness in the emergence of a more conscious leadership in the USSR is largely due to the destruction of political life organised by Stalinism and hence political reasoning is not developed sufficiently. But objectively the dynamic process in the Soviet Union finds its natural ally in the immense accumulation of all the other forces of the world revolution. Capitalism is fazed by the situation which escapes its control, as it does the leadership of the Soviet Union, which however unlike the old stalinist assassins is obliged to listen to the soviet masses.

Contents.

- Page 1. Editorial.
- Page 2 Soviet bureaucracy and Economic reforms.
- Page 3. Function of Soviets.
- Page 4. Resolution on problems of nationality in the workers states.

Workers of the world, unite!



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

398 29 June. 1990. Price 30p.

Subscribe to RED FLAG  
1 year ..... £5.00

Order from  
IV International Publications.

PO. Box 134  
Nottingham NG1 3QT.

Cheques payable to:-  
'IV International Publications'

## THE WEAKNESS OF THE SOVIET BUREAUCRACY AND THE "MARKET" SOLUTION.

The events in the Soviet Union represent a very profound crisis of growth in the role and leadership of the workers state. Capitalism and indeed sectors in the Soviet Union itself are attempting to portray this crisis as primarily economic. This is only superficially true. The crisis is certainly being expressed in the economic field, but it is also being expressed in political and social terms and it is these which are the most critical as the source of the crisis.

In practice so deep and complete is the decomposition of capitalism, that it can hardly extract any advantage from the difficulties in the Soviet Union. It is only necessary to compare the appalling disorder that the Stalinists provoked in the workers state in the nineteen thirties and how powerful capitalism was at the time, to see how the prospects for world socialism are infinitely superior now. Imperialism is contracting. It has no initiatives and is abandoning most of the planet from the point of view of new development. A few wealthy nations withdraw into themselves, beleaguered and insecure. The model they have to offer the new marketeers in Eastern Europe is a prostrate Colombia or a backward Portugal. The arms are piled high against not only the workers states, but the rest of the world.

The Gorbachev regime has seen the displacement of the Stalinist bureaucracy on a far more massive scale than under Breznev. The top bureaucracy has encouraged forms of popular intervention but at the same time severely limiting this intervention. The model the leadership has encouraged is the NEP model - which has no historic justification now - and whatever might be occurring in the ranks of the proletariat and the intellectuals, the discussion of Stalinism, its historic bases on the official level has not been developed by the leadership as a means of reanimating the political life of the workers state. On the other hand it has tried to maintain in part a reasonable relationship with the proletariat. It can do no other. The bureaucracy seeks as its programme to develop market forms in spite of the profound resistance of the soviet people. The sharp conflicts over the price rises caused by the abandonment of food subsidies, exemplifies the empiricism of the leadership and the need to move outside bureaucratic

conceptions. The fact that in face of powerful resistance, the leadership was obliged to retract somewhat, indicates the crisis again not of the masses but of the leadership. The turn to market relations as the answer to the problems of the workers state demonstrates the enormous timidity of the bureaucracy, its fear and lack of experience in having a revolutionary confidence in the masses. The reforming bureaucrats are full of the errors of the command economy - long ago analysed by Trotsky and Posadas - but they never refer to the immense contribution of the masses in maintaining the workers state. The latter was maintained by the masses and

and how gains are to be distributed among the population. Returning to objective market relationships does not mean that the raw brutality of supply and demand is allowed to prevail, but that objective consumer demand is understood and prices are regulated according to the needs of the population and the overall needs of the workers state and not a blind acceptance of the market so that those who can afford products get them and those without go to the wall. The Stalinist converts to the market economy mention the waste of their rotten command economy, but are very quiet on the waste of unemployment. Moreover the trade unions are not just to

of decentralisation, but it also means acting according to immediate interests and not the needs of the workers state as a whole. No wonder there is confusion. There are proposals for greater freedom for individual farming in the Soviet Union to solve the agricultural problem, but what has happened? A very good harvest and worse shortages than ever because the collective farms are not democratised and the individualist farmers can hike the prices and cause artificial shortages. The scope given to individualist farming was always allowed in the Stalin regime and has simply been extended. Genuine decentralisation within the terms of a national plan is

apparently with the bad living conditions of soviet citizens. Now he suggests that it is possible to develop the market economy without causing hardship. Demagogy is his forte, the fact that he feels obliged to take account of the living conditions of the masses is a necessary gambit for the bureaucracy as at present constituted. At one stage there was much talk about the "Return to Lenin" but the founder of the workers state is an embarrassment to the bureaucracy because in explaining NEP, Lenin was clear as to its being an expedient and not a final conclusion. Also even Bertrand Russell in a recently re-published interview was obliged to comment that Lenin was overwhelmingly interested in the world revolution and the USSR was only a step to this - and that was when the Soviet Union was in very great difficulties! What we are seeing is the wholesale decomposition of the bureaucracy, its fragmentation into a variety of interests. Gorbachev was given extra powers precisely to try to contain the results of a situation which completely surpasses the grasp of the "reformers" and the bureaucracy as a whole. The one current which is not present in the councils of the bureaucracy is the Bolshevik one. Ligachev stays on as a mummified oracle of the past, prone to excoriate private property, but this ancient Stalinist is fully associated with the retention of party privileges and has shown no interest in the extension of soviet functioning or in a serious discussion of the reasons for the present problems and process in the Workers States. But it is not historically possible to contain the soviet proletariat within the boundaries of the USSR. Nor is there any justification for a new form of parliamentary cretinism within the Soviet Union. The ANT scandal was an example of trying to solve economic problems, not on the basis of a collective discussion, but selling off state goods for the benefit of some enterprises ie getting around the incompetence of bureaucratic central planning by selling off stock, much of which was actually in short supply in the Soviet Union - in other words not solving the basic problem. The soviet leadership is very concerned to get more consumer goods into the country by developing contacts with capitalism, but consumer goods for whom! There is much reference to the



Moldavia. Out with irresponsible government! Out with the speculators!

had the strength to recover from the civil war and smash the nazis. The "radicals" never refer to this, never refer to the achievements of the workers state - only one long denigration. What is even more grotesque in these arguments which shamefully find place in publications such as New Times and Moscow News, is that arguments are used that justify capitalism. The fact that the latter is now an immense burden to humanity, perpetuating injustice and poverty on an horrendous scale and that it is incapable of developing anything but small layers of the population is ignored. Thus centralised planning is identified with bureaucratic planning and the only alternative is the "market economy". Even here there is a sleight of hand because the question is not that the market has been ignored, but has been concealed by administrative fiat and what is important is how to develop the market within the collective interest and not the interest of a bureaucratic caste. This means making an honest appraisal of prices, an honest comparison between prices in the workers states and world prices so as to see exactly what advances in productivity are to be made

defend the interests of the workers, but also to defend the interests of the workers states by being involved in the planning of the workers state. The present leadership still acts as though incarcerated in a bureaucratic straight jacket. It is still impeded by the attitudes of Stalinist thinking, although it has been obliged to abandon policies of intimidation and has to allow some forms of democratisation. At the end of December there were great demonstrations in the Urals, where the masses came out against the regime of incompetence and disorder which was developing. One communist party member put it well saying that the party was not leading and the soviets still were not taking over. Commenting on earlier proposals, the Liberman proposals, Cde Posadas made the comment that if they had been imposed, chaos would develop. Well the bureaucrats have not gone on that path. Even so elements of free market anarchy are functioning. For example some freedom has been given to factories to act with autonomy, even though price control has not been given to them. This autonomy is a form

quite different from localism which factory autonomy tends to develop. In fact this localism is the basis of the pseudo nationalism which is developing in the Soviet Union. The national movements in general simply express the popular desire for more decentralised functioning and as a protest against the failures of the centre to take account of national needs, but as has occurred in Yugoslavia there are sectors who wish to use this for sectional interests. The ex Stalinists in Lithuania are a class of this type of "nationalists". Another variant of the type is that outstanding windbag Yeltsin. His platform is exactly that of Gorbachev market economy, private property in land, abolition of bans on private enterprise, free economic zones but with nationalist additions such as building a "strong Russia", "make Russia great again" etc. This line further expresses the impotence of the bureaucracy. It is precisely the centralisation of the Soviet Union which maintained the workers state, not its separation into competing regions. Yeltsin distinguished himself by being pre-occupied

Continued on Page 3

# SOVIETS AND THE NECESSITY OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY

J. POSADAS 29.12.74

It is necessary to discuss what soviets are and their function in the Soviet Union. The soviet allows the inhabitants of the workers state to construct themselves with the capacity of leaders of society. Capitalism constructs leaders in the universities, and in the enterprises, influences and gains people in these circles. That is how its leaders are formed. The workers state forms its leaders in life itself, in the factories, the trade unions and the workers areas. This is life and that is where the leaders must be formed. This gathers together the objective collective thought of the population, not the individual interest of one or another, but the objective and collective interest.

The bureaucracy made a series of plans in the course of its management which various deserters of communism denounced as for example in the book of Jan Valtin "The Night Delays". This book only has value in that it made a series of denunciations of the omnipotence, stupidity and incapacity of the bureaucracy. What he wrote was from the standpoint of a deserter of communism, but he made a series of correct denunciations. He shows the stupidity of the bureaucracy which can make two steel factories in which the products are all thrown about are neglected and wasted and left out in all weathers. The bureaucracy planned production and half was ruined through lack of calculation. Or two factories compete. Sectors of the bureaucracy plan production useful to them, what is convenient to them; cars or buildings for them. They make a part of production just for their own use. Sheer carelessness and this created the consciousness of a new power, new forms of power.

Rakovsky, one of the Bolshevik leaders when he was arrested

with the Bolsheviks, including Trotsky, posed his concern over Bolshevik power. That if this did not have sufficient support from the masses of the world, a new form of power could germinate. He posed the dangers of the function of power in the Workers State. As it was a poor, backward workers state without the fundamental support of the world, this would create and develop in the leading layers, even in the Communist party, the desire and the interest in power.

This can also be seen in the communist parties who in opposing the capitalist system try to conciliate with it and develop caste interests. They oppose capitalism, but regulate the opposition diminish the attacks so as to impede a violent overthrow. Thus they give capitalism more stages. They allow it to organise its defence and the crimes which capitalism makes.

When Rakovsky made such accusations, Trotsky supported him and also the other Bolsheviks. It was a real danger. Every revolution which takes power, if it is not supported by the democratic soviet intervention of the masses, stimulates in its leaders the sentiment of power, the use of power. Also in the parties in different forms the expression of arrogance and of power is found at various levels. It is not always and in all cases determined by social and economic interests, but through the petulance of power, of exercising power.

In the case of the bureaucracy, it is not the petulance and the arrogance of power. It is expressed in a petulant form, but it is the interest of castes, of layers who make a usufruct of the revolution and that seek to contain the revolution.

The bureaucracy accommodated the soviet functioning to the minimal level of continuity of the name, but reduced the

functioning to a commonplace banality. The soviet functioning conceived of by Lenin and Trotsky was based on the intervention of all the population, to resolve all the problems. The soviet world policy was not separate from this functioning. The Bolshevik party presented the policy, the improvement of the economy and the population discussed. That was how the Bolsheviks acted and rapidly the population acted with passion. The Bolsheviks made the peasants communist leaders. The Stalinists made of the communist leaders, dead men. They killed them and went on killing them. The Bolsheviks incorporated the peasants into the role of leadership, to think, to reason, to make judgements to compare with the experiences of history. The representation of the population was the soviet.

The soviet impeded the structure of power. As the Soviet Union was then a backward power, it needed concentration and centralisation. It needed to increase the power of the leadership because of the very great risks that were present. The country was invaded by seven countries. There was the internal struggle with the counter revolution. The problem of the peasants was a justification of bureaucratic power. The peasants saw danger to the land; the former owners wanted to recover the land. Thus the peasants supported the Bolsheviks, but did not want to advance much more. The Bolshevik right based themselves on these and also on the technicians and the planners. These people thought of the soviets as a function of their own interests, not that of revolutionary planning; because revolutionary planning was based and still is on developing the Soviet Union as a world centre of the revolution, as was seen in the

second world war. Stalin destroyed all this. Thus the foresight and the prediction of Rakovsky on the professional dangers of power was verified. Stalinism abandoned the revolution and supported itself on one capitalist against another as the basis of the policy of the Workers State. This is a false policy. This is not the policy which sustains and can sustain the workers state. If the Soviet Union was not destroyed, if capitalism did not have the strength to destroy it in 1939, this was through the will of the masses of the world and the world crisis of the capitalist system. It cost the Soviet Union twenty seven million people and a backwardness of forty years of history because sixty percent of the country was destroyed. It is not "in spite of everything" they constructed socialism. Twenty seven millions is not "in spite of everything". Also capitalism has continued to exist in the world and in spite of capitalism, socialism is going to triumph, but at the cost of millions of dead, at the cost of backwardness, destruction of production, of scientific progress and of the construction of life. How use terms like "in spite of everything"!

What demonstrates the weakness of capitalism is not the judgement of the policy of Stalin or of the communists. Capitalism is impotent. It shows that if the USSR had made a correct policy, today the world would consist of workers states and today we would be at the edge of socialism. It is the policy of Stalinism which has impeded this conclusion. Hence they eliminate the soviets. The soviet is the first measure which we are going to take and which shortly all the workers states will take, because it is the most complete reasoning of all society. The whole of society reasons and learns. The lowest level is elevated to

the highest level. The capacity to reason objectively is learnt; to feel to be participating in solutions, in being uplifted in the solution of all the problems and the construction of all the programmes and policies. People learn to see that politics is not a particular profession, but a necessary consequence to develop the economy against the capitalist system. Hence politics exists. When the capitalist system is finished, then politics is finished. It will not longer be necessary.

It is necessary to show and discuss that the workers state is a transitory state. A transitory state which has sustained the most violent and damaging attacks of the capitalist system because the masses of the world defend the workers state. A decisive proof is that outside Nazi Germany and after Italian fascism, in no capitalist country has it been possible to make an anti soviet crusade. In the crisis of the capitalist system which led to the war of nazi Germany with the rest of world capitalism, one of the reasons was the existence of the workers state.

The USSR even without being able to develop itself, even with a limited development has shown that statified property, the planning of production and the monopoly of foreign trade are forms of organisation and economic activity which infinitely surpass the capitalist system. Hence the Soviet Union came out of the war strengthened.

It is necessary to return to the soviets. What exists in the Soviet union today are not soviets. There are deputies who say they function in soviets. The soviet is a form of functioning it is not a title or a designation. It is necessary to return to genuine soviet functioning. And it is necessary with this to return to defend the world revolution. 29 December 1974.

J. Posadas.

From Page 2.

soviet citizens with savings who save because there are no goods upon which to spend their earnings. But what about the millions who live without savings in the Soviet Union and who face higher prices and unemployment because of this marvellous free market which the October Revolution was designed to put out of business? Once the free market mentality is applied, we have the justification for the latest lunacy of the bureaucracy, which is complaining that some republics ie Russia,

subsidise other parts of the Soviet Union. So every region should charge what it wants and to the devil with the workers state.

As the central leadership does not lean on freely functioning soviets and does not therefore utilise the popular forces which exist in Lithuania etc, the regionalist groups who utilise these forces for their own egotistic interests are made to appear with some strength. Thus the backbone of Stalinism is irretrievably broken, but the

mode of thinking of Stalinism ie crude regionalist, anti international interests still pertains. The lack of a political life sustained by the CPSU allows the egotistic interests to fill the void. Doubtless some in the bureaucracy would regard "socialism in one suburb" as perfection compared with "socialism in one country." However the weakness of the leadership cannot overcome the structure of the workers state which was cemented by the triumph over the nazis, affirming the unity of

the Soviet Union. Nor can the immense pressure of the world revolution be contained within the workers states.

Revolutionaries and revolutionary currents develop in all parts of the world and the Soviet Union will receive the full weight of this. Above all the soviet proletariat which has been repressed and blocked for years by the stalinist parasites is intervening. Imperialism is trying to make it appear that the Soviet Union is now much weaker, indeed on the verge of

collapse. Hitler also believed this, saying that all that it was necessary to do was kick the door in and everything would fall. What is actually occurring is a complex process in which the bureaucracy has been decisively weakened and it is now trying on new clothes in order to justify its increasingly unjustifiable existence. In the period of Stalin, the bureaucracy used various ploys, such as the Soviet Union was surrounded by enemies and no discussion was

Continued on Page 1.

# THE NATIONALIST PROBLEMS IN THE WORKERS STATES CAN ONLY BE RESOLVED WITH THE INTERVENTION OF THE MASSES

## RESOLUTION OF THE EUROPEAN BUREAU

The changes in the socialist countries which have occurred in recent months, today concentrate the attention and the concern of the communist, socialist and revolutionary vanguard and of a very important sector of the population which is elevating its consciousness and participation more and more in the progress of the world revolution.

In a short historical stage structures have fallen which have been in power for decades and are now cracking through the force of the revolution and their fall poses the need to resolve problems which are decisive for the advance of the world revolution, the liquidation of capitalism and the triumph of socialism. This disintegration of the bureaucracy of the workers states has not been achieved in a homogeneous and co-ordinated form, but the mobilisation of the soviet proletariat and especially the miners proletariat has been the detonator which has attracted the communist masses who in an historic mobilisation have overthrown the remains of the agonising stalinist bureaucracy.

The fall of Honecker, Ceausescu, the Czechoslovakian leadership and those who followed them, is an example of the capacity of the masses, who today respect no obstacle or limitation which was imposed by the past, but sense that they are posing an historic problem; the construction of the new revolutionary leadership. It is for this reason that in the socialist countries, alternative leaderships have arisen which are inventions to fill the historic void of decades of stalinist education of the leaderships of the communist parties and of the workers states.

We believe that it is important to deepen the discussion on what are the roots of the present problems which are besetting the socialist countries, where the bad planning and distribution, the shortages plus the backwardness of some regions and the nationalist problems which have arisen, are the results of the policy which Stalin applied in the USSR and then extended to the rest of the leaderships of the workers states formed after the second world war.

Stalinism to impose its policy of conciliation with capitalism, the consequence of its lack of confidence in the communist future of humanity,

needed to drown the life of the party, the political discussion, the utilisation and dominion of marxism as a scientific means to analyse soviet functioning, to be able to usurp the will of the masses and to benefit as an apparatus from the progress and conquests of the workers state. Stalin thus was the head of a bureaucracy which broke with proletarian internationalism, liquidated the mass communist international which was the link of the Soviet Union with the world revolution, and locked itself within the workers state applying the policy of socialism in one country. The bureaucracy thus developed a life similar to the bourgeoisie, but submitted to the structure of the workers state. It was the soviet proletariat which impeded a greater retreat of the bureaucracy, defended the USSR from the attack of the nazis, impelled the construction of the new workers states and the liquidation of Stalin and today is the axis of the progress of the Soviet Union and the liquidation of all the Stalinist apparatus.

In front of the problems which the USSR is living today, with the confrontations in Armenia and Azerbaijan and the difficulties with the Baltic states, it is necessary to return to the most elevated experience which the workers states has made and which was the first seven years of the Russian revolution the intervention of the Bolshevik party, Lenin and Trotsky and the whole of the proletariat, who were able to confront the isolation of the revolution, the backwardness and the destruction of the productive apparatus and to resolve the problems of different languages and nationalities, unifying the masses in the objective of the socialist construction as the only solution of progress for the USSR and humanity. It was the revolutionary leadership of Lenin and Trotsky which supporting itself on the communist vanguard, on the soviets and the trade unions, with the leading activity of the Bolshevik party gave confidence to the population to confront and resolve all the difficulties. Stalin and the soviet bureaucracy to affirm itself had to betray the gains of the October revolution and for that to

imprison, repress and assassinate the communist Bolshevik, revolutionary vanguard. They assassinated Trotsky and perverted the life and functioning of the CPSU and the rest of the mass organisations. They supported themselves on the most backward and decomposed sectors of the different republics to exploit their resources and make a usufruct of the gains of the workers state for the benefit of a privileged caste. The policy of Stalin was a retreat on the social and political development of the Soviet Union, which impeded temporarily the full leading function for which Lenin and Trotsky had prepared it.

Stalinism impeded an homogeneous development of the communist life of the socialist countries and maintained and accentuated regional elements, local elements, resentments of a backward layer of the population which felt that the workers state did not respond to or resolve its most vital needs.

These are the causes and the origins of the situation which have sustained until today, regional concerns and interests and hence the massive demonstrations of support to nationalist slogans and nationalist leaders. The masses have intervened rejecting the exploitation and repression to which they have been submitted by the central bureaucracy of the workers state in complicity with the regional bureaucracies.

These mobilisations have not only been in defence of nationalist principles, but they are the forms which have been acquired in this stage of the intervention of the population which seeks to make itself heard and to participate even with the difficulties and the errors in the construction of a state without castes and privileges.

The CPSU has not intervened in the leading form necessary to confront all these difficulties which are part of the construction of the workers state. It is necessary to pose that nationalism will reduce the standard of life of the masses, not only on the level of daily necessities, but also of social, cultural rights and the possibility of development. It will separate different regions, impede the inter influence among them and

as a consequence will be a retreat in scientific technical and cultural capacity.

Lenin and Trotsky constructed the bases of the Soviet Union supporting themselves on three fundamental pillars; statified property, planning of the economy and monopoly of foreign trade. These are the bases which allowed the regeneration of the workers state, the liquidation of Stalin and the extension of its revolutionary function.

Centralisation and planning have been a conquest on which the development of the different workers states was sustained in spite of the fact that it was applied by a bureaucratic and usurping leadership. J. Posadas posed that "the centralisation in the workers state means co-

ordination, planning, centralisation of productive, economic and cultural capacity to develop the whole country. Otherwise it cannot be done". This means to double the capacity since it eliminates competition, the loss which is signified by competition under capitalism".

It is necessary to discuss all these problems in the trade unions, the factories and in the party showing that the confrontations, the regional interests attack the centralisation of the masses and thus diminish the level and the function of the Soviet Union and the whole of the workers states. It is necessary to pose openly that if nationalist and regional interests are still maintained in the socialist countries, it is because they have been led by the bureaucracy which has developed and maintained these interests. It has stimulated layers, backward layers of the population, buying them with privileges and these now in order not to lose them base themselves on the lack of political life of the workers state to drag a sector of the population behind chauvinist objectives.

All these elements have been expressed ultimately in the resolution of independence by Lithuania, the confrontations with the leadership of Gorbachev, the decision on the part of the Soviet Union to cut the oil supply to Lithuania which forced a retreat of the Lithuanian government in its pretensions. But if the objective of the Lithuanian masses had been to defend

independence and confront the Soviet Union and separate themselves, they would have demonstrated massively to

defend the positions of their government, as they did before against the arbitrariness and injustices of the bureaucratic apparatus. When the Lithuanian President and parliament retreat in their separatist plans and accept again the need to dialogue, it is because they do not have the total support of the population and of the workers movement, which is not disposed to support a measure which breaks centralisation and weakens the Soviet Union.

The government of Gorbachev and the leadership of the CPs have not had an objective attitude over the nationalist problems. They have not supported themselves on the experiences of the first seven years of the soviets, of the revolutionary roots which were the Russian Revolution and the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky. Still they maintain in the party and in the functioning of the workers state, forms of functioning and conceptions of the bureaucratic apparatus, since these teams which now exist have been educated in the school of manoeuvre and imposition.

Hence they still maintain in the CC of the CPSU the sector of Ligachev which is not only defending their privileges and positions in the leadership, but also an isolated Stalinist conception of the masses and the world revolution. It is not possible to resolve the problems which this stage poses in the socialist countries, without stimulating the intervention of the proletariat and the masses, without organising the scientific life of the party, without retaking the

principles and the method of marxist analysis.

The leadership of Gorbachev and the leaderships who are developing on the Soviet Union and in the rest of the workers states as part of an historic necessity can and must support themselves on the most elevated revolutionary roots and examples to be able to solve the fundamental problems which humanity is posing to liquidate capitalism—the construction of its revolutionary leadership. EB. April 1990.



Contents.

Page 1. Editorial.

Iraq and Imperialism.

Page 3 The 28 Congress of the CPSU.

Posadas on Trotsky.

Editorial

# IMPERIALIST FORCES OUT OF THE GULF!

The crisis over Kuwait has to be placed in the context of the overall concerns of imperialism which is to try to contain and smash the world revolution. It is part of the preparation of the final confrontation of imperialism with the workers states and the masses of the world. A massive propaganda campaign has been carried out, worthy of the nazis, in its use of high sounding phrases, about "world law and order," "protecting the rights of small nations" and other such cynical garbage.

As the chief cupbearer of the yanks, Thatcher has ordered the sending in of British planes, ships etc and endangered the lives of many British people in so doing. The Labour party apparatchiks have also bayed in unison, indeed some speakers seemed to be vying with Thatcher to prove their loyalty to imperialism. Kinnock of course is quite outstanding in his devotions—barking in the right places, rolling over, wagging his tail etc. The world resistance to war has tempered somewhat this enthusiasm to smash Iraq and the LP has been obliged to stress the need to take notice of the United Nations, much on the lines of soviet policy. All this is occurring when world capitalism is entering a critical phase economically, the result of its inability to develop new markets, its contraction in face of a world situation unfavourable to its continued existence. The dollar shifts about uneasily, internal and external deficits weigh down

the Yankee economy and even the other main pillars of capitalism, Germany and Japan no longer have that air of endless good health.

The unification of Germany is beginning to embarrass capitalism politically and economically, bringing with it a mountain of complications for the Kohl government and weakening greatly its political and social strength. The capitulation of the Stalinists in East Germany has brought little to German capitalism except trouble. NATO has been thoroughly undermined. Moreover the arrangements over German unification were made between Kohl and Gorbachev and the Yanks had little to do with it. World capitalism will try to continue to co-ordinate its world economic policy, but the drift into forms of recession, the complete lack of interest and capacity to solve any of the vast problems of poverty and lack of development of most of the world apart from a few privileged countries, socially undermines it.

The collisions between the various sectors of world capitalism led to the Ridley affair which showed how deep are the antagonisms between British imperialism with its Yankee dimension and the rest of European capitalism. The hatred for "the Germans" in Europe was very completely expressed in the terms of one boorish capitalist complaining of another. The British invention of the ECU currency is part of the effort to contain the power of the Bundesbank and its economic

*Continued on Page 2.*



*The struggle in South Africa continues.*

Workers of the world, unite!

# RED FLAG



Subscribe to RED FLAG  
1 year ..... £5.00

Order from  
IV International Publications.

PO. Box 134  
Nottingham NG1 3QT.

Cheques payable to:-  
'IV International Publications'

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

399 14 September. 1990. Price 30p.

## IRAQ AND THE INTERVENTION OF IMPERIALISM

The annexation of Kuwait by Iraq is the justification of Yankee, British and world imperialism, aided by various stooges in the Arab world such as Mubarak, for an intervention designed to intimidate the Arab masses and the Arab revolution. The Arab revolution which has been expressed in various stages such as the Nasser expropriation of the Suez Canal, the process of statifications in Iraq, Syria, Iran and Egypt and most recently in the profound depth of the Intifada uprising against the Israeli fascists, lacks a focus and in the absence of a leadership by the workers states, it tends to find centres without any coherent programme or consistent policy to correspond to the needs of the Arab population. The regime of Saddam Hussein is in the tradition of cliques and camarillas such as the Russian or the Chinese Stalinists. The Baath party has its own "nomenclatura". It bases itself on forms of nationalist, anti imperialist sentiment mixed with Islam, but suborned within the objectives of groups who usurp the creative capacity of the population in the service of their caste objectives. The completely sterile character of such an apparatus was shown in the Iran-Iraqi war which cost both nations enormous losses in human and material terms.

Oil is a fundamental source of wealth for Iraq and the annexation of Kuwait was provoked by the policies of Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates who were increasing production and so lowering the price. That benefits particularly the imperialist states. An enormous loss was opening before the Sadaam regime, so it is said of a billion dollars a year. The Yanks knew all about this and

knew that such a provocative act was bound to lead to some form of crisis for the Iraqi regime. Imperialism has been conducting a campaign against Iraq for some time. Thus the recent Arab conference in Amman showed that Iraq was a centre of vehement anti Israeli and anti imperialist propaganda. In Britain a great commotion was made about an apparently massive Iraqi gun which had been commissioned from British manufacturers. The fact that Israel has atomic weapons is played down by the organs of bourgeois public opinion. Thus the magic word sanctions is now everywhere, but when the South African fascists entered Namibia for twelve years no such methods were called for. When the Israeli assassins invaded Lebanon and continued to shoot Arab children on the West Bank, nothing was heard of sanctions and when the Yankee assassins killed millions in Vietnam we cannot recall any sanctions against US imperialism, nor were nations being encouraged to send troops to eject North American imperialism in the interests of "small nations". Who bombed Libya and thus ignored "international law"! World imperialism! There is no doubt that in the opening stages of the fight, imperialism was thinking of a massive blow to destroy Saddam Hussein, but it became increasingly evident that the world balance of forces was against this solution, particularly when the soviets had made it clear that they were not going to collaborate any further than sanctions (in itself a disgrace by the soviet leadership). The soviet leadership have taken their distances from the leadership of Saddam Hussein which is correct, but utterly insufficient. Their foreign policy needs to relate itself to the masses of the Middle

East, not just intervening to take advantage of the problems of imperialism in the region. Imperialism will do itself no good from this intervention. Although it has enormous military and financial forces, its manoeuvres will tend to augment the anti imperialist and anti capitalist sentiments of the Arab masses. The reactionary leaders of Saudi Arabia walk a little closer to the precipice as they rush into the arms of their Yankee backers, who in addition are making them pay the costs of the American forces there. The Israeli right wing may lick their lips at the prospects of more Arab dead, but the authority of the Palestinian resistance will increase and further decompose Israeli authority. Moreover it is clear that outside the USA and its ally Thatchers Britain, neither the Arab states nor the rest of the capitalist world is enthusiastic about heightening tension. More important, whatever the statements of the imperialist reporters, the masses of the United States, Britain and the rest of the world do not support Yankee intervention and the Nato counter revolutionaries know this. Hence they are obliged to restrain themselves. Whatever the outcome of the present crisis, there will be no solution to any of the problems of developing the countries of the Middle East outside collectivised economies and a socialist federation that embraces Israel—but an Israel free of the Yanks and free of capitalist control.

Objectively the suppression of the Sheikdom of Kuwait is a progressive act and a blow both at the feudal and imperialist structures in the Middle East. Why should anyone, anv American or

*Continued on Page 2*

British soldier die for the useless parasites of the Sheik of Kuwait who oppress their foreign workers? Naturally the regime of Hussein conducted this overthrow purely in a military way, impeding an intervention by the Kuwaiti masses. Sadaam Hussein represents a form of Stalinism based on the stratified economy of Iraq—despite some turn to privatisation—but at the same time, as this is not the period for a stabilised bureaucracy or new ruling class, his regime is fraught with interminable crisis. He has killed communists, Kurds etc with ferocious zeal and has solved nothing. There is constant and growing pressure among the Arab masses for social advance and an end to imperialist diktat via Israel. Hence Hussein was obliged to make remarks that the oil revenues should be used to benefit the population and not the sheiks. He tries to conceal the social

revolutionary character of the process in the Middle East by appeals for holy wars etc, but even this means anti imperialist and ultimately anti capitalist sentiment.

The attitude of the soviets has been very limited. They have intervened to impede the war plans of imperialism with some effect and have stressed the need for peace. But going along with the embargo on trade with Iraq and refusing

to re-examine previous soviet policy in the region which has left it without support is weak, in line with the internal policy of the "market". But even with this weakness, as the Soviet Union continues with the weight of a workers state with no interests to exploit other nations, its authority limits and weakens imperialism. Moreover the aggressive character of the imperialist intervention in the Middle East throws doubt on all the paraphernalia of schemes to work with imperialism developed by the soviet leaders and deepens the discussion within the soviet workers state—world revolution or handshakes with the class enemy.?

We appeal for a world anti imperialist campaign to effect the withdrawal of imperialist troops from the Middle East and an end to the blockade.

No war to defend the Sheik of Kuwait nor any of the other Sheikdoms!. On the wider plane, it is necessary to campaign for the socialist federation of the Middle East, incorporating an Israel free of the capitalists and their Yankee backers! Full democratic rights for socialist organisations in the Middle East, expropriation of the big landowners and all the other capitalist oppressors, throughout the region.!

supremacy which reflects also a political weight, not to the happiness of Yankee capitalism.

Imperialism tries to disguise its overwhelming weakness by distorting the process in the Soviet Union. In reality it is losing its most formidable ally—the Stalinists who blockaded the workers state and repressed its internal and external supports. The present phase is transitory to a reassertion of the revolutionary function of the workers state. The 28 Congress of the CPSU showed new forces are appearing in the communist party and they are not the pro-market layers nor the old stalinist functionaries. There are layers in the proletariat calling directly for a workers direction of the economy. It is to be noted also that the growing separation of party from government is an excellent development and the departure of people like Yeltsin is a sign of very good health indeed. This confirms the prior analysis of Posadas that the bureaucracy is weakening and that it cannot reproduce its forces. Thus the way is more and more open for the reassertion of revolutionary and genuine communist ideas. It is not by chance that at the end of the Congress, the latter changed the title of its commission on the economy. All reference to the market disappeared, there was only reference to the need for ways to overcome the present crisis. Gorbachev continues to play a centralising role

against those who wish to fragment the workers state, but the most powerful forces of centralisation, that is the proletariat and a Bolshevised party are the real channels of centralisation.

As could be seen at the TUC conference, the trade union bureaucracy continues on the path of submitting to the restrictions on secondary picketing, abandoning the closed shop etc in line with their earlier policy of co-operating with Thatchers policies, isolating the miners etc. This is naturally hailed as good sense by the Labour leadership which is concerned to appear above classes in search of "national" consensus. However on a deeper plane, such leaderships are more and more irrelevant to the process. Just as the Stalinist apparatus could no longer justify its existence in the Soviet Union, so the pomposo in the LP and TU apparatus have nothing to justify their role—what have they got to offer as solutions to the well known decay of British imperialism? How with their programme are they going to solve the problems of poverty and the precariousness of an economy more geared to financial operations than productive industry? They have not succeeded in demoralising the proletariat, although collaborating with the conservatives they seek to isolate Britain from the force of the world revolution. The reception for Mandela however has shown that this policy

also is falling.

The left labour MPs who rejected the parliamentary consensus supporting the government over the gulf crisis show that even on that plane capitalism does not present a real strength. Benn's denunciation of the antics of the Yankee invaders in the Middle East has a profound echo in Britain. The crisis in all the social services, the catastrophic situation in education outlined by sectors of the bourgeoisie themselves and the incapacity to renew the infrastructure of Britain such as the railways etc is creating an intolerable situation whereby the forces of production enter into profound collision with the social relations of society. The masses will continue to use the LP as a centre by which to concentrate against the class enemy, but their intentions are different from those of the seasoned careerists of the apparatus who may imagine the sun will never set on their system. But it is setting now and the labour left can base itself on the progressive process in the Soviet Union and the deterioration of world imperialism to prepare for the next phase with the programme of social transformations, for a planned economy to satisfy the needs of the population, a socialist republic to replace the monarchy and an end to NATO.

8.9.90.

## SUBSCRIBE TO RED FLAG!

From page 4

## THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET PROLETARIAT

The soviet proletariat seeks to mobilise. When it will be able to do so, it will be the most important event in all human history after the Russian revolution because it will put in movement its immense social weight, its historic assurance, its capacity and its organisational experience. It will lead the masses of the world and shorten the delays in the socialist reorganisation of humanity. This fear of mobilising the soviet masses means that the bureaucracy feels that the proletariat progresses in its revolutionary decision to put the Soviet Union again into motion. The soviet people is profoundly convinced and resolved to reassert the functioning of the soviets. Also the bureaucracy needs to maintain between it and the soviet people certain democratic links i.e. that it is following the way of communism and is not prepared to oppose it. The tradition of soviets is immense in the Soviet Union. Also the bureaucracy must in front of the soviet masses seem to respect the communist tradition and to propose to construct communism and to maintain the soviets in the form. But its policy is neither communist nor anti capitalist, it is direct or indirect conciliation with capitalism. In not reacting to the bombardments of North Vietnam, it allows imperialism to continue to act. Lenin and Trotsky would never have allowed this. They had to make the concession of Brest Litovsk, but they explained to the masses of the world that they did not have the strength to do otherwise, but they were hoping to reconquer and reorganise their forces to struggle for the taking of power.

J. POSADAS

geniuses functioning to obtain some award or distinction, but to contribute to the progress of history.

The concern of Trotsky was to leave behind him a movement which had the same concern to intervene as a world instrument, which centralises the capacity to think and as a result to foresee and to programme its intervention in a process whose actual development he could not see clearly. Hence the reason for his declaration on the power of the masses to move heaven and earth within ten years. But he could not say in what precise form. But he demonstrated that he was basing himself now on an instrument which humanity, the world workers vanguard possessed to organise their concern and their intervention in future events: the workers state. The latter had passed through the most prejudicial stages in history through Stalin, the assassination of the Bolshevik leadership, the elimination and annulling of the Bolshevik party and the development of the activity to eliminate the existence of the communist parties.

It was at this stage that Trotsky founded the IV International. It was shown as an indispensable necessity to be able to prepare for the future of humanity. To organise the IV International corresponded to the continuation of the Russian revolution. It was designed to organise a world team of leaders, of revolutionaries, to develop them in the confidence, the assurance in the foresight that socialism was an absolute necessity of history. It was an absolute necessity and not just a need of the working class. Absolute means that socialism is indispensable for all humanity. 25.8.1976.

# THE 28th CONGRESS OF THE CPSU, THE NON-VIABLE ECONOMIC REFORMS AND THE PROGRAMME FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORKERS STATE

## RESOLUTION OF THE EUROPEAN BUREAU

In this Congress of the CPSU all the crisis of the lack of revolutionary leadership of the workers state has been reflected, but at the same time the definitive conclusion that there is no more stalinism and with this the liquidation of the bureaucracy as a power standing above the workers state. As the Posadist IV International, we feel part of all the difficulties and the problems which the communist comrades of the USSR are now debating within and outside the Congress itself. We defend also the unity of the Communist party and the struggle to return to the function of the Bolshevik party, to the first seven years of the Russian revolution.

The struggle in the Congress has not been as the bourgeois press presents it and some leaderships of the western communist parties, that is on the one side the conservatives of the right and on the other the reformers of the left. Among these so-called reformist tendencies, some are very reactionary who want to break up the Soviet Union and the party. There is an ebullience throughout soviet society where the working class intervenes in a more and more elevated form and where all the old bureaucratic layers of every sort (regional, national, the old planners and members of the party apparatus) desperately grab hold of anything they can, to maintain a power or a privilege.

Hence the proposals of Gorbachev towards the Congress and previously towards the Soviet parliament contain so many contradictions and constant readjustments. The project of the law on the economic reform was hardly presented than it was postponed by the soviet parliament and the Congress and rejected by the soviet population. The miners are preparing a new strike demanding the resignation of the government which has presented such a reform and has not been capable of respecting its promises in front of the demands of the working class. The leadership of Gorbachev is now cornered because on the one hand it has made a great cleansing within the bureaucratic apparatus, but on the other fears to be surpassed by the intervention of the working class in which it does not have full confidence.

But even so Gorbachev has the historic merit after Andropov of having impelled

the establishment of the workers collectives, the development of democracy through the masses, of having liberated the social forces of the masses held down under Stalinism and all its vestiges for years, and now also because he seeks to preserve the centralisation of the Soviet workers state which is a fundamental historic conquest against all the nationalisms and separatisms and the unity of the CPSU against all the egoistic currents from Ligachev to Yeltsin and Afanassiev who want to use the party for their own particular ends.

It is not an economic crisis which is developing in the USSR but it is fundamentally a political crisis of the leadership of the construction of the workers state. The central problem was posed in the Congress that what existed in the USSR and the other "socialist countries" was not socialism. Hence it is not possible to speak of the end of socialism. But then how characterise what has been won since the October revolution? Trotsky and Lenin and afterwards Posadas in all their work showed that the USSR is a workers state, a state in transition, one of rupture with capitalism towards a new socialist organisation, which cannot be achieved save on a world scale. Thus, as such, the workers state contains all the contradictions inherited from capitalism, together with the bases of the organisation of the new socialist society. This is a theoretical and practical conception that is essential to measure objectively the process in course in the USSR as in the other workers states of Europe and the rest of the world.

The workers state to be able to develop cannot co-exist anymore with an overbearing bureaucratic power as was Stalinism. This process of the rebellion of the living forces of soviet society which was characterised as "partial regeneration" by Cde Posadas continues to develop. The planning of the economy is a necessity of the workers state like the monopoly of foreign trade and the statification of property, but they cannot continue with the burden of the bureaucratic apparatus and the technocrats. It is in front of this that the Gorbachev leadership sought a response.

But the projects of the economic reform, even responding to a situation which could not continue in

this way have given no perspective for overcoming the problems. The market economy when one takes account of what it represents in the world—and not only in three or four developed capitalist countries, is the law of oppression, of exploitation, of the most brutal social inequality. World imperialism which has had to concede some crumbs to the masses of the most developed countries only continues because it has exploited and continues exploiting savagely all that remains of the capitalist world including of the most developed countries.

Besides the capitalist system does not function essentially on the basis of the law of the market, of free competition between entrepreneurs who are all equal, but through the great multinationals, of the world banks which have already divided up the world market and dominate everything. What remains of the "market"—those areas destined for the service industries for the immediate consumption of the population and which are the sectors which are considered the most deficient in the Soviet Union—are occupied in the capitalist world by the small and medium enterprises and show the greatest exploitation of the workers in the sweat shop conditions of the so-called shadow economy where the workers have no social security. It is to this and not the development of the productive forces, which a development of private sectors or co-operatives will lead in the Soviet Union.

This sector now exists in the Soviet Union and the Soviet masses have rejected it with reason. The co-operatives are simply the refuge of the bureaucracy, dislodged from other positions of power and they do not have the least link with the structure of the workers state. They have a desire for profit at any cost and have no doubts about killing or provoking nationality disputes to protect their interests.

On the other hand it is necessary to develop a better standard of living of the soviet population. The economy of the Soviet Union has the ability to do this and without the need as some tendencies of the bureaucracy propose (like Yeltsin or Afanassiev) of reducing the aid of the USSR to the world revolution. The oil workers and the miners have proposed simply what the road is; it is necessary to

*Continued on Page 4*

## POSADAS ON TROTSKY

Fifty years ago, Trotsky was murdered by a stalinist agent. The stalinist apparatus was anxious to dispose of Trotsky before the onset of a new war involving the Soviet Union, fearing that with war, revolution would ensue and if Trotsky lived his authority could gain access to the revolution and provoke dire consequences for both stalinism and imperialism. But as the bureaucracy could only respond to its immediate material interests, it could not understand that Trotsky represented ideas and analysis rooted in historic necessity. An icepick may kill an individual, but it is incapable of liquidating superior ideas. Today everything that is occurring in the Soviet Union, the downfall of the stalinist bureaucracy and the continuous process of political revolution is the affirmation of marxism, of the ideas of Trotsky and the analysis of Posadas on the basis of Trotsky, that is the process of partial regeneration. Trotsky lives most especially in the intervention of the Soviet proletariat and with that the immense force of the world revolution which is pulling imperialism into the abyss. Trotsky's marxist passion and the will which went with it, makes him one of the great acquisitions of human history. Today marxism is being recuperated among the workers and the intellectuals of the Soviet Union and the bases made for a new communist international and the definitive overthrow of world capitalism.



*Trotsky, Leader with Lenin of the October revolution and Commissar for War.*

## FROM THE INTRODUCTION TO THE LIVING THOUGHT OF TROTSKY JANUARY 1979

**J. POSADAS**

Trotsky elaborated documents in order to maintain the assurance, and confidence within the world communist vanguard in the idea that socialism was necessary and inevitable. There was no leadership but the vanguard was going to create it. We recall in this sense one of the most complete, scientific thoughts of Trotsky when he addressed the North American people in 1938, saying "In ten years time, millions of revolutionaries will move heaven and earth and will know how to construct history". Trotsky was not able to define in what manner but he foresaw that the masses were not going to remain passive, that they were going to intervene and defend the Soviet Union, that they were going to move heaven and earth. They did move heaven and earth and in 1948 twelve more workers states were created.

The predictions of Trotsky were aimed to see the process in its essential elements. His preoccupation to stay alive, to be useful, demonstrated that this was not as a function of his own security. If he wanted to be useful, this was the most essential moment to say what he had to say. It cost him his life. If he had said nothing, if he had not spoken, if he had not intervened, the soviet bureaucracy would not have acted against him. But the bureaucracy acted to suppress him, because it saw him as a central axis of the theoretical thought which organised the political concern of the proletarian world vanguard, as well as of the vanguard of the Soviet Union.

The clash between Tito and the soviet bureaucracy was without doubt of less importance in relation to the development of the other workers states, but the resistance of Tito indicated that in an empirical way the defence of principles and not the capitulation desired by Stalin was expressed through him. Tito was pushed towards conciliatory

*Continued on Page 4.*

norms because he had no way out and lacked a prepared party. But Tito showed already that the world proletarian vanguard was disposed to vanquish Stalin and world capitalism. Of all the main countries in the Balkans, Yugoslavia was the weakest economically. It was particularly exposed, but Tito resisted. Stalin was not able to find a support in the appeal which he made against him. When he wanted to destroy him, the Red Army was opposed.

The communist comrades who criticise with a certain justification the Soviet Union should consider that even in the period of Stalin in 1948, a part of the Soviet Army, without being Trotskyist, had a conception of it. Yugoslavia was a competitor and not an enemy. It was necessary to leave it alone because it was necessary for the Soviet workers state. If Yugoslavia returned to capitalism, it would go against the workers state. The stupid mentality of the bureaucracy could not see that. Part of the army saw that. It had no bureaucratic interest and also a part of the communist party shared that opinion. All these conceptions are based on a central and undeniable factor that the workers state engenders and creates forces to defend itself. It does not invent nor stimulate them, but creates the necessity to defend itself internally and externally. The workers state needs to prolong itself for the development of its economy, of science and of society.

In order to know the course of the war and its aftermath, Trotsky gave a series of alternatives which included a very simple declaration, indicating his thought. In reply to a journalist who asked of him "And if after the war revolutions break out, what is going to happen? What will happen with Stalin, Stalinism and the degeneration of the workers state?" Trotsky only replied "In that case the conditions which provoked the degeneration will disappear." He could not say anything more, because he could not invent but he outlined the path. He gave to us the principles on which we must intervene and above all on which we are based. We are based above all on the principle that "from here in ten years, millions of revolutionaries will know how to move heaven and earth" and in our confidence in the historic role of the working class, in the historic role of the soviet workers state.

It is not a question anymore of a homage to Trotsky. It is a question of making Trotsky live in the revolutionary process of history, of making him participate. Trotsky is present with us in this analysis which we make. This record has the object of continuing with the living revolutionary thought of Trotsky, in the same way as he continued the living thought of Marx. They are present with us through their living thought.

This is not a metaphor but a reality. Trotsky is present with his thought, his assurance, his dynamism his preoccupation, with the fact that in spite of the attacks of Stalin and of the soviet bureaucracy, he continued to write, knowing that in this way he would accelerate the moment of his death. But it was necessary that he continued. Thus he said "I need five more years to complete my work, the other revolutionaries will know afterwards what to do".

This is one of the most excellent examples of the function of the revolutionary and which shows at the same time the strength of revolutionary ideas; no difficulty can overcome the revolutionary, no assassination, no crime, no Hiroshima, no atomic bomb, because revolutionary ideas are the consciousness of the unconscious process of history. Trotsky was this consciousness just as the Soviet Union showed already a certain consciousness of history. This was no longer the unconscious process of history of the epoch of Engels. The workers state has already shown to others "This is what has to be done". There is already a certain consciousness, quite a profound bases about what has to be done.

Trotsky was concerned to provide humanity with some principles of interpretation, of analysis, to give a base to those who were going to continue. One of the examples is the question which was posed to Lenin and to Trotsky. "Do you believe that socialism is going to triumph?" Both replied "Of

course". But don't you realise that a lot of difficulties are going to arise and that you are going to make mistakes". Lenin replied "Certainly we can make mistakes, but we are not afraid of them. Moreover if we are destroyed now, because it is necessary to develop the revolution in Germany, those who will come afterwards will know how to do better than us, because they will have the experience which we do not have". That is the experience of the workers state. Lenin was a genius of history. With the homogeneous simplicity of communism, everyone saw their function, not as

devolve to the working class the control of production, of economic planning and then the conditions are going to allow to make better products for collective consumption, better houses for people and health services and hospitals for everyone. What has to be liquidated definitively, is planning for the benefit of the bureaucracy. It is necessary to propose the generalisation of the power of the collectives over economic planning. All the masses of the USSR must participate in the elaboration of planning which must be done with a complete decentralisation. At the same time a scientific centralisation is necessary in the preparation of the economic plan, but it must not be a planning of technocrats who decide as a function of the interests and tastes of a small layer and not of all the people. It is necessary to return to a decentralisation in the application of the plan under the control of the workers collectives and of the soviets throughout the country.

In the primitive accumulation of socialism, the intervention of the working class and workers control, the creative participation of the masses are a fundamental factor together with the relations of the USSR with the rest of the world. The economy of the USSR depends on the world revolution and the other workers states. Hence the solution to the economic problems of the USSR does not consist in reducing help to Cuba, to Nicaragua, to Vietnam, to Angola, to the other workers states or revolutionary states in the world, but in elevating a collective planning among them. Internationalism is not a question of revolutionary morale, but part of the necessity of extending the workers state, of reinforcing the structure of the workers states, throughout the world and the USSR cannot construct socialism by itself. It is necessary to make a revision of all this help and many readjustments of these plans which have served as supports to the previous compromises of the soviet bureaucracy and to the local bureaucracies of the different countries, among them Cuba. We propose the necessity

of maintaining the economic support to Cuba, together with the necessity of a political intervention towards the Cuban leadership. With all their diatribes against the USSR, the leadership of Fidel Castro hides the fact that it does not wish to make changes in Cuba. The fight against the Cuban bureaucratic apparatus is also very necessary. Besides it must be said that the sectors within the USSR who propose the reduction of aid to Cuba in particular, are the most reformist groups of the bureaucracy, which is not the working class, nor the leadership of the CPSU or of the workers state.

At the same time, it is necessary to take into account that the crisis of world capitalism continues and develops. The conflicts between the great capitalist powers are very profound. Capitalism tries to gain advantage from the present crisis of the workers states, but does not have any security. If with China, it has not succeeded in developing much in spite of the fact that the leadership of that workers state was most advanced in the economic agreements with capitalism, then it is going to have much less success with the USSR. It has no security as was shown in the report of the OECD, in the situation in the workers states, in the continuation of private property nor in the social reactions of the masses. The strikes, the mobilisation of the working class in different countries, from Poland to the German workers state, show the social insecurity of the groups that have arisen out of the bureaucracy who have desired to sell the properties of the workers states to capitalism. German capitalism in particular wants to annul politically the DDR to smash and intimidate the German and

European proletariat. But it has not succeeded in breaking the structure of the workers state nor the social communist consciousness acquired through the proletariat of the Workers state. The government itself of De Maiziere offers many resistences to absorption in the Federal republic. In Poland there is a very great crisis in the government as in the movement of Solidarnosc. It is

the crisis of the pro capitalist policy which has affected Walesa like Mazowieski and provoked essentially by the resistance of the working class. Hence there is such desperation shown by Walesa who lacks a perspective. On the other hand the processes which are developing in Rumania, as in Bulgaria with the electoral victory of the Front of Iliescu and of the new Bulgarian communist party express very well that there is no possibility of a capitalist restoration in Eastern Europe and that the retreats which have occurred have no basis for stabilisation. In the process of the liquidation of the bureaucracy as the power of the workers states and through the lack of a revolutionary leadership which has arisen in time to lead all these liberated social forces, there is a sector which has arisen from the bureaucracy which is disposed at any cost, having lost all interest in the workers state to sell itself to capitalism. Hence these groups which have an economic power in Poland, Hungary and the German workers state. But they are going to die because the crisis itself of the capitalist system does not give them any room to develop and on the other hand the communist consciousness acquired by the masses of the workers states is already weighing and organising its reaction to defend and retake the leadership of the workers states.

It is true that all the leading groups of the workers states in Europe were useless as Sheverdnaze said in the 28 Congress and that the USSR could not intervene to defend or sustain them, from Honecker to Ceaucescu, but it is also has to be said that there has been a weakness in the soviet leadership in meeting these events. Comecon has died, but the USSR like the other workers states of Europe and of the world, need a collective planning and the establishment of new relations between them of a world united front to restructure and make their economies progress and all their social and political relations, in the perspective of world socialism. EB. IV International Posadist 8. 7. 90.

FOR THE UNITED SOVIET SOCIALIST STATES  
OF EUROPE!

# The programme of the capitalist government is the preparation of war

The gulf crisis is an index to the decomposition of the world capitalist system. Imperialism desires to police the world, stop the development of workers state towards socialism and intimidate the masses of the most oppressed nations such as Iraq. Despite all the capitalist propaganda about the end of communism and the difficulties of the Soviet Union, their own system is rotting and has no other prospect than war. Having been undermined by the initiatives of the soviet leadership, NATO has been greatly weakened. Now there is no pro imperialist or ebullient capitalist sentiment on which the capitalist powers can draw. Thus stupid analogies are made between Saddam Hussein and Hitler, with crass demands for a trial of the former. The capitalist powers have immense economic resources, but socially and politically they are weak. Imperialism is caught in a tormenting vice. Logically it must and eventually will go to war, to block the Soviet Union and the advance of the world revolution, but it is mired with indecision and division. The fact that Bush was obliged to dismiss the head of the US airforce because of his open pressure to bomb Bagdad pronto, demonstrates the great rifts within the American ruling class and the fragility of all their plans.

Moreover, the slightest postponing of the final encounter with humanity and the workers states does not ease the problems of capitalism. In the past capitalism went to war, destroyed resources, solved internal difficulties and then the aftermath gave it the opportunity to develop again. Now as the war has not yet occurred, all the domestic problems of economic and social disorder augment. Germany and Japan have been less affected and have enjoyed a period of recuperation. But they also are entering upon complications. This historic agoraphobia, the lack of ability to open new continents, aggravates the normal intercapitalist competition, and diminishes the strength of the system as a whole. The extraordinary humbug over Kuwait is part of an empirical strategy to increase the forces of imperialism in the Middle East, in view of the inability of the Israelis to repress the Intifada. That has continued in spite of the fascist persecution of the Israelis and it has tended to divide Israel. Behind the Palestinian masses lies the support of the other peoples of the Middle East. The Arab reactionary regimes are all feeble, hence imperialism wishes to be more directly represented. This of course will deepen the instability of these regimes. But imperialism cannot afford to be intelligent. It is notable that neither France or Germany are especially enthusiastic about war over Kuwait, although hitched to the tiger of private property it is difficult to get off. The soviet leadership has also trembled over Kuwait and has displayed all the fears of a



The Intifada continues to undermine Israel-Yankee base

Contents.

- Page 1. Editorial; LP conference.
- Page 2 The European Parliament. J. Posadas.
- Page 3. The Alhambra. J. Posadas.

Workers of the world, unite!

# RED FLAG



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

400. 16 November. 1990. Price 30p.

Subscribe to RED FLAG  
1 year ..... £5.00

Order from  
IV International Publications,

P.O. Box 134  
Nottingham NG1 3QT.

Cheques payable to:  
'IV International Publications'

bureaucracy in front of an expropriation of a Sheik. Thus it has admonished Hussein on the subject, but has also been obliged to respond to the progressive character of the workers state, by emphasising the need for a peaceful solution. This adds to the embarrassment of messrs Bush and Thatcher and soviet policy continues to make maximum use of the differences in the imperialist camp. Gorbachev was also obliged to emphasise that a solution by war of the Kuwait issue was not acceptable. Soviet policy has been very limited, but even so there is no way in which the workers states can go along with imperialist intervention in the Middle East which threatens the very existence of the Soviet Union. The anti war demonstrations in the United States are particularly significant, considering also that the North American masses have no centre around which to mobilise. The visit of Heath to Iraq and the proposed visit of Brandt indicates that large sectors of the world

bourgeoisie have no taste for war because they feel that the consequences can be disastrous for capitalism as a world system. Nonetheless the decisive layers of world capitalism are desperate in front of the Middle East revolution and war could develop at any moment. British imperialism is in a most agonised situation mirrored in Thatchers constant hectoring and bad temper as everything goes from bad to worse. The struggle over entry into Europe is displaying really the end definitively of Britain's pretensions to being a major power. It is obvious that Britain has been of little importance for a long time, but the imperialist leaders of this country have held onto the coat tails of the Yanks in order to give themselves the appearance particularly in front of the petit bourgeoisie that Britain was very influential in the world. When Gorbachev had meetings with Thatcher, this was seized upon as an example of the authority of Britain. But now that German

imperialism is getting into its stride, it is no longer possible to pretend that Britain is anything but a poor relation of the Yanks who themselves are in great difficulties. Hence the Thatcher fuming as the inevitable process of European centralisation, diminishes the weight of Britain and reduces it to just an offshore island in comparison with the European centre of Germany. The "special relationship" with the US was always a myth, because Britain was and is a humble lap dog of the yanks, but even that is meaningless in present realities. The process is ending all that "specialness" of Britain with its own brand of insularity and opens it more and more to outside influences

When Thatcher speaks about defending the British parliament, what she means is defending the connection with the Yanks and not submitting

Continued on Page 4.

## THE LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE

The conference of the Labour party was pre-eminently a meeting not to discuss ideas or experiences in order to advance towards socialism, but a meeting of the apparatus to win an election to prove that it can run capitalism better than the capitalists. The labour left is well intentioned, but is submitted to the parliamentary conception of politics and has no political homogeneity. A resolution was put forward demanding a programme of nationalisations and was defeated. But one demanding cuts in defence expenditure was passed. The fact that such a motion could be passed shows

that even in present conditions the apparatus cannot entirely control the party.

The main plank of the Labour apparatus is that they will improve the necessary infrastructure of capitalism, invest in transport and education and also see that pensioners and the health service are properly financed. At the same time as they do this, they say there are no quick solutions and that it will all be terribly slow because the conservatives have made such a mess. On the other hand the apparatus gives the impression that Europe will be good for us. In other

words, it might be said this conference represents the milder wing of capitalism which has to pay some attention to the masses, but basically they are seeking to preserve the capitalist system, to save it from its worst excesses—a pipe dream of bureaucrats, but one useful to those who live from the system. The conference gave an air of insufferable mediocrity and claustrophobic insularity. It represented the lack of interest in the world or at least any sympathy with the millions in Africa, Latin

Continued on Page 2

# THE FUNCTION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

3.12.78 J. POSADAS

The European parliament is a form of the multinational. We are going to participate in the European parliament as we have participated in the parliament of every country. To participate in the European parliament is no contradiction, but our programme is the same in every country. We participate as Lenin participated in the Duma; as the Bolsheviks participated in the first meetings to determine the issue of war or peace. When they had the majority the Bolsheviks broke the alliance, that is "undisciplined, with lack of respect for agreements" and took power. When the Bolsheviks had their majority in the soviets, they sent the Constituent Assembly to the devil and the soviets decreed the taking of power. This was not through lack of respect for democracy, not contempt for agreements, but the appreciation of the historic function of progress, because progress could not be made with the Constituent Assembly. It is necessary to find the form in which the proletariat can weigh. This is the form of the progress of history.

The European parliament is a fraud perpetrated on history. It is a way of resolving the problems between the capitalists, but at the same time because they feel surrounded by the revolutionary struggles in Europe and in the world, then they have to make an opening for the communists, socialists and the trade unions, giving to them a reformist alternative of history. This is the depth of the problem the two things at once.

IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO PROGRESS WITH THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT.

..The European Parliament is an instrument to regulate the relations with the bourgeoisie and also with the workers parties and the trade unions, to try to adapt domestic, lead and corrupt

We publish extracts from an article of Cde Posadas on the European Common Market which are confirmed by the latest meetings of the European capitalist powers. The masses of Europe are confronting a dictatorship of the banks and the monopolies expressed among other institutions, through the European parliament. The gentry in Eastern Europe who seek to return to capitalism will be simply the ignominious beggars of such a system. At the same time the dynamism of the process will lead to confrontations with capitalism throughout Europe and there will be no massive stalinist apparatus to impede the resulting social conflagrations.

them.. That is the object of capitalism with the European parliament. Mistakenly the socialist and communist parties go to the European parliament without posing these conclusions. They go as a means of eliminating the capitalist system, as a means of progressing. This is false. It is not possible to progress with the European parliament. The multi nationals control here and if they saw that the European parliament was an instrument against them, they would break it. Besides the method of parliamentary elections basically allows the capitalists always to have the majority and decide by majority. And although the working class might have the majority and decree the termination with private property, capitalism has atomic arms to defend the system just as it used arms with the Paris Commune.

The parliament is an instrument in which to dispose of the struggles of the working class, of the workers parties, to simulate a perspective which does not exist; a perspective of transformations, of progress which does not exist. In front of the brutal crisis of the capitalist system, the European parliament can offer nothing. Capitalism in order to live has to make war, it has to dismiss thousands of workers to maintain and increase competition. It has to modernise production and that means unemployment and an increase in pollution. It is absurd to believe that the

European parliament will be a better instrument of social relations in Europe. It is an instrument to organise and systematise control of the inter capitalist struggle and competition. In this it is a bridge for the development of parliamentary careerism and of reformist conceptions in the workers, socialist and communist movement and thus create illusions in this objective.

It is necessary to intervene in the European parliament, denouncing its objectives, but maintaining the struggles for social transformations, independently of the number, the weight or strength in the European parliament. It must be used as a tribune to lead the masses of the world as Lenin did and as use must be made of any parliament, showing that progress means social transformations. To make social transformations, it is not possible to wait for the right number of deputies or legislative relations, but relations of social forces. As a consequence it is necessary to co-ordinate, to enter the European parliament the trade union and political struggle to develop and make social transformations. It is necessary to pose the struggle for statification, planning and workers control. It is necessary to demonstrate that the working class is the unique representative of the progress of society. It is false that there is any other form of progress. Today the concentrated, even diminished, simple and partial

form of progress is social transformation. It is possible to change a government and put in its place another better and it may last a week. Through the nature of the capitalist system, corruption is part of daily functioning, one may be more corrupt than another, but corruption is part of the daily functioning of the capitalist system.

Capitalism in desperation attempts to concentrate the trade union and political bureaucracy to gain historic time and at the same time to regulate intercapitalist competition. It has to do it now with the "snake" or the European monetary system (EMS). It is a way of regulating through finances the development of each country. It is absurd to believe that they are going to make the monetary system for the benefit of the poorest capitalist countries such as Italy, Portugal, Spain or Greece. One has to be ingenuous to believe that if they organise this monetary system, it is to regulate the struggle between them and those who determine and regulate are the ones who give the orders, the French and the Germans. The British do not enter because they have contradictory interests with these two countries, but anyway its the big capitalists who determine the European monetary system. The rest are points of support for them. As a whole all are united to confront the Yanks in economic competition. ...if the European parliament could serve as a point of support for the progress of

revolutionary tendencies, capitalism would annul it. In relation to this, they create illusions and develop a whole layer of functionaries, of organs in which capitalism supports itself to contain the objective independent development of the communist and socialist parties. Hence it is necessary to consider that all the communist and socialist parties must discuss this problem and see what is the objective of the European parliament. Is it a more elevated form of democracy than capitalism gives? No. Capitalism has to make use of the European parliament to seek to conciliate, concentrate and regulate its disputes and attract the hostile enemy forces which are opposed to them, to neutralise, contain and thus dominate them. This is the objective which they seek. In Italy there are seven million people who work as slave labour. They can work at home for twenty hours a day in order to exist and then the work appears as "very cheap Italian shoes and clothes". This is the European parliament! Is the European parliament going to help to resolve this? It is going to defend above all French and German imperialism who have several million unemployed.....

The "powerful" capitalist Germany has great internal debts which is about twenty percent of the national income - this is owed to the German capitalists. The idea that the great development of the economy makes the state powerful is a lie. The French state as much as the German is in debt and submitted financially to the capitalists. This goes also for the other capitalist countries. These are problems which the European parliament is not going to resolve, but the class struggle is going to resolve them. The European parliament seeks to make a class conciliation; but at the

*Continued on Page 4.*

*From Page 1,*

America or the Middle East which receive the brutal dictatorship of international finance, starve and die with no future within the capitalist system. On the issue of Iraq the apparatus was more or less identical with bourgeois public opinion. In fact Kinnock tried a very imperialist line speaking about settlements which were to include the liquidation of Iraq's chemical weapons and nuclear capacity! Nothing of importance was said about the activities of the Israelis. Moreover the

same silence was extended to the issue of Northern Ireland. The apparatus is prostrate in front of imperialism on the latter, but when it comes to Kuwait, the high mindedness knows no bounds.

The party was obliged to look at the problem of electoral reform. Proportional representation is not liked by some sectors of the apparatus because it tends to let in the smaller parties and therefore diminishes the weight of the LP. Others think that some

concession has to be made, but trust that it will not lead anywhere. PR is better than the present farce, but it is no answer to the problem of liquidating a moribund capitalism. In reducing the weight of the block vote, in itself a monstrous system which speaks in terms of millions who have never been consulted, the apparatus seeks to give itself a more democratic face, but it means nothing in terms of making a party closer to the needs of the population, because the

apparatus, largely linked to imperialism is violently opposed to this.

However although the left was relatively quiet at this conference and there was a studious effort not to look too closely at the world, the fact remains that the LP programme is not going to find solutions for the problems set by capitalism. The present capitalist structure does not have the funds to do anything but slightly modify the problems of the system. Historic decay cannot

*Continued on Page 4*

**SUBSCRIBE TO**

**RED FLAG!**

## THE ALHAMBRA AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF ARAB CIVILISATION TO HISTORY

J. POSADAS 29.11.80 EXTRACTS

These extracts from an article of Cde Posadas show how earlier civilisations could transcend the limitations in part of the economy and show a quest for harmony in the world. In comparison capitalism now has a "culture" devoid of ideas. Its technology which remains its only capacity, has ended in being an oppressor of the majority of mankind. Killing and provoking killing is its only occupation.

It is necessary to observe and analyse Arab civilisation to learn about art, culture, science and to be able then to appreciate the development of human capacity in whatever stage of history; in this case through the constructions in which the Arabs expressed the form of the sentiments, of consciousness, of intelligence and of love. Although economically they did not develop a great deal—they did not dedicate themselves to the economy—they dedicated themselves to producing structures like the Alhambra. They had the ability to do this, although they did not have an economic ability, because through the nomadic character of the Arab people, this did not emerge from the previous cycles of their history.

The glazed tiles of the interior of the Alhambra express forms of dialogue; it is not an abrupt composition, but a harmonious relation which produces an harmonious impression, taking into account that it was made more than seven centuries ago. The same impression is made by the stuccoed inscriptions over the arches which are not tattoos because the tattoo has a semi abrupt expression; they give an impression of dialogue, of conversation but also of some nebulosity, through the lack of development of intelligence in the economy.

The Arabs constructed the Alhambra, creating figures, forms and relations, which did not produce an abrupt or coarse expression. They do not clash. There are various forms, but all with an harmonious relation composed and integrated. This was one of the essential concerns in the organisation of human civilisation, but with objects and things, because in human relations it was still not possible to develop such harmonisation as the economic and social basis for this did not exist. In human relations harmony was very empirical, inconstant and without transcendence, but in objects they recorded sentiments of relations, which were expressed very vehemently.

All the walls with representations of figures or inscriptions have movement, expression of sentiment and consciousness which are agile and dynamic because they are movements of the brain and of sentiment and the same movement is expressed by the decorations in the roof. But in the feudal epoch the dominion of catholicism was being established and the walls and roofs are bare without room for anything else to compete. This was before the appearance of gothic art which introduced some changes, as with the stained glass windows, although they were an impediment to the more direct penetration of light. But catholicism which needed to eliminate the Arabs as competitors had to appropriate and assimilate their culture.

The interiors of the Alhambra are full of movement. This was the movement of Arab culture, but without definition because they did not dominate the economy; hence they did not make a history of the world. But the Christians had to do so because they represented a social regime which was developing.

The dining room of the Alhambra for example is harmonious but at the same time has no conclusion. There are beautiful figures and decorations, a product of sentiment, consciousness and intelligence, but they lead to no conclusion. They have identical movements, repetitions of movements created with much harmony, but to where do they lead? Hence in the aspect of the development of the economy, essential points remain in which they show their lack of understanding; and as a result did not develop as a leading layer in the economy. Another layer developed which afterwards was converted to catholicism and on whose base there then developed the regime of private property. Hence the importance of religion, of the economy, of the social forms of property and of the regime of production. And the Arabs lacked the ability to understand and to have intervened in developing the social system of production.

All the figures of the walls express the structure of thinking which is not able to understand the economy. Although they are harmonious forms which do not give a sensation of crowding, there is no opening towards life, towards nature. This is expressed in the repetition of themes and the fact that the unity has harmony, but without definition. It is a harmony which remained enclosed in movements of figures with an element of sensuality which was partly expressed in the relation with women.

The religious relation of the Arabs in a general sense sought a correction of the individual, of the human being, but was determined and remained in the hands of the landowners and the conquerors. Even so the base of this relation was the harmony between the human being, nature and the future. This was the relation but without developing.

It is necessary to understand the incorporation of Arab culture in the history of knowledge, together with the lack of development in the economy, including in war because in so far as this developed through armies the Arabs remained backward and hence they were defeated.

The organisation of the construction of the Alhambra and its harmony, transcended the leading economic and social base of that time. Thought went much further than the interests formulated by the ruling caste. It had to allow this because it depended on a whole number of sectors or individuals which were much more intelligent than itself. A notable fact is that in spite of such progress, music did not arise and what arose afterwards had a basis of lamentation which was inherited from the Jews. The social development was structurally important but in leading layers, not in the population; because in not having an economic development, the population was not developed. In other conditions the economy would have imposed different social relations. But science, art, and culture can only impose themselves very limitedly. The leading caste had to put up with these activities because it could do no other. Hence afterwards Turkey which failed in the organisation of

Continued on Page 4

## SOUTH AFRICA



Mandela condemns the fascist policy of the "iron fist".

The recent bloody encounters between the ANC and the Inkatha movement of Buthelezi, plus the carefully planned murders on the railways by "persons unknown" point to the limited possibilities of any adjustment of Apartheid to satisfy the needs of the South African masses. Capitalism may allow blacks to enter previously prohibited areas, but that is not going to change the oppression of the black proletariat nor alter the white ownership of everything that is important. The confrontation is total. There is no black bourgeoisie with whom the capitalists can play against the masses. Buthelezi is quite simply a willing capitalist stooge. He was against even economic sanctions, was a confirmed enemy of the ANC and its policy of armed struggle against the regime. However he is perfectly prepared to use violence against the blacks. de Klerk was obliged to open negotiations, not because the intrinsic policy of the regime has changed, but because the regime had got to appear to have some initiatives in front of the continuing pressure of the masses and the great weakness of international capitalism. It has used the

suspension of armed action by the ANC to massacre via Buthelezi, hundred of blacks. It is at this time that Bush and Thatcher welcome de Klerk. The timing is impeccable. It brings out clearly the policy of world imperialism. This is systematically to kill and destroy the class enemy ie the masses and then settle down to long homilies about "democracy". The fact that they cannot do more of this is due to the fact that imperialism lacks the authority it had in previous epochs and has to prepare its counter revolutionary world war in reduced circumstances. The ANC and the SACP is not helped by the crisis of the soviet leadership, which as a bureaucracy lives in mortal terror of revolutionary preparation and action. Nonetheless it is necessary for the ANC to develop a better internal life of political discussion on the world process, maintaining its revolutionary and socialist objectives and trying to participate in the renewal of the revolutionary and communist movement. South Africa will not be free of Apartheid and capitalism outside the world elimination of capitalism.

## ITALY

The disintegration of the Stalinist apparatus in the Soviet Union has affected all the communist parties in various ways. The manner in which the German workers state has been sequestered by capitalism and the lack of orientation from the Soviet Union have all led to forms of crisis in various communist parties. This has been particularly marked in the Italian communist party. That party has for years been paralysed by the bureaucratic apparatus educated in the tradition of Togliatti, a

vicious compound of Stalinism on the one hand and pseudo democratic electoralism on the other. The failure of the ICP to advance beyond electoral gains has in fact led to falling votes for the party. Unable to make a serious marxist balance of what is occurring in the Soviet Union, the leadership of Occhetto is trying to utilise the downfall of Stalinism to move the party to the right. It has now been renamed the "Democratic Party of the Left" and the hammer and sickle has

Continued on Page 4

From Page 1,

be put right with the measures that the apparatus proposes. Moreover the addiction to the ERM is in fact following a capitalist line, one of peculiar stringency. The price of entering Europe will be opportunities for some and disasters for many. It is not the promised land that the bureaucracy proposes, but they have nothing else to offer within the confines of capitalism. The conference was very hot on labour being fit to govern ie to continue capitalism. But capitalism is becoming feebler and any Labour government will find that capitalist policies will not be popular. The Labour apparatus will not contain the catastrophic course of capitalism and the conditions of society will continue to deteriorate. The resistance of the population will give new bases for the Labour left. It would be better if a world leadership existed to harmonise the destruction of the capitalist system, but even without such a

leadership, nothing can stop the decomposition of the system. World conditions allow no capitalism a new lease of life, least of all the rotting corpse of British imperialism. Nonetheless even with a reformist programme which is the equivalent to a coat of paint designed to conceal profound structural damage, it is necessary to centralise a vote around the labour party in the coming electoral fight, because the termination of the Thatcher regime will be a heavy social blow at capitalism. It will augment the demoralisation of the capitalist class and impel the class struggle to new levels of activity transcending the activities of the labour apparatus and pose with even greater urgency the need for a programme of social transformations, placing the banks, and the key industries under mass control, for an economy which responds to the needs of the population and not the few owners who serve no useful social function.

From Page 1

to influence of German imperialism. The debate over the ERM reflects the forlorn state of British imperialism. The various sectors argue, but in practice Britain has entered on the basis of deflation. The fall in interest rates is part of the admission that the economy is in recession, which is well advanced with excess indebtedness, bankruptcies etc. The LP says it was a bad moment to enter the ERM, but that is very relative because the LP apparatus offers no perspective outside a capitalist Europe. The economic unification of Europe will increase the power of some capitalist sectors, but more important it will tend to unite the various proletariats and polarise class forces. Capitalism is incapable of transcending the nation state, it may lay the bases but only social revolution can complete the task.

The electoral defeat in Eastbourne, when a very safe conservative seat fell into the arms of the Liberal democrats exemplifies the depth of the crisis of the

conservatives. British industry having moaned about interest rates is now involved with a strong pound whose "discipline" will reduce the UK's share of world trade and clean out the smaller businesses. Inflation may in the short run be somewhat reduced - and not for long - but the population will have to pay the costs of capitalism in unemployment, falling exports and imports. The Thatcher regime, which it should be remembered would not have existed, if it was not for the collaboration of the LP and the right wing trade unions, has only increased the torment of British capitalism. Like another famous leader, capitalism has marched up the hill and down again and it is in worse shape as a result of this exercise.

The Thatcher government must be thrown out. Its a government devoted to war in the gulf and world war. While the situation of millions of British people deteriorates in housing, education, transport, the environment and a brutal police state has been

established, this government is prepared to spend millions on arms to attack Iraq, just as they waged a bloody war over the Malvinas. The LP apparatus has been pleased to collaborate with Thatcher over war preparations in the gulf, part of their abject function in defending capitalism, but the left of the LP has intervened against the war. It is necessary to continue to mobilise and call meetings against such a war and to discuss the new process in the world, with the changes in the workers states and the accelerated crisis of capitalist decay. All this must be combined with slogans that favour the planned economy, based on the expropriation of the main capitalist banks and industries placed under workers control. For an economy that is determined by the needs of the population not the wishes of private advantage! Out with the imperialist troops in the gulf! For a socialist Federation of the Middle East, incorporating an Israel free of the Yankee assassins and the capitalists! 7.11.90.

From Page 3.

feudalism, finished trying to develop a military, not intelligent power.

Jewish music was sorrowful because in its origin lament was still a prayer of uncertainty (prayer is partly uncertainty), an uncertainty about the reason for living; people die of hunger, through plagues, as do animals, and storms which destroy. Then there is a feeling of fear in front of this. At the same time the prayer and lament expressed sentiments of fear and also of complaint - why has this come about? As this society did not develop afterwards economically or scientifically, to give an explanation and security, then the lament persisted. But the later development of private property gave rise to the Catholic Church, which represented it and which transformed this lament into a rite. Then the lament continues, but through the oppression of women. The oppression of women was the same among the Arab and Turkish feudal layers as among the capitalist layers. But in capitalist society the development of the economy gave rise to a greater intervention of women, in work, in social preoccupation and the possibility of giving an opinion. In Arab society, women hardly figured; it is now in this stage with the revolution, that the Arab women participate. Hence it is an error with all those who criticise Khomeini saying that he imposes the chador on women, when all their lives they have been submitted to it. But now they carry the rifle and the chador and what is important is the rifle, not the chador. The chador hides the face, but the rifle makes them see the world.

From Page 2

same time it shows the weakness of capitalism because it has made the European parliament because it cannot make the counter revolution. In Spain it had to liquidate Franco. Franco was long dead before being a corpse but they had to bury him.... The king was empowered after the death of Franco (or the fall of Franco which is the same thing) and this is not a form which expresses the strength of capitalism, but its weakness. He was introduced as a means of conciliating the

different tendencies of capitalism which are expressed in a very eloquent and simple form in the federation of Spain. Each province in Spain wishes to be a country and wants to be united to the others through federal pacts which is against the objective progress of the economy, of science and technology; and against what was done in their epoch by the capitalist system of uniting through countries. This allowed the concentration of economic capacity, technology and

consequently production. Now on the contrary they divide.

It is necessary to intervene in the discussions on the European parliament, not simply to reject it, but to show what is its function and how the communists, socialists and trade unions can intervene. We participate with this objective, with this programme and without weakening or abandoning the anti capitalist struggle and for social transformations in each country. 3.12.78. J. Posadas.

## ISRAEL - OUT OF THE GOLAN HEIGHTS

From Page 3,

been reduced to a small square pasted to a tree. The smooth bureaucracy of the CPI has been trying to do this for years. However they have not succeeded in getting rid of the symbol, which is important because they will never have such favourable conditions again. Ochetto speaks about uniting equality and liberty, all he has achieved is a further attempt to emasculate the party. Berlinguer invented an unusual process called the historic compromise which was neither historic nor a compromise, merely a concession

to the bourgeoisie and Ochetto wants to make another step in that direction. However the left has mobilised strongly under Ingrao and whatever the hopes of the CP's bureaucracy, the experience of the communist vanguard is too powerful to be ignored. Now that the whole capitalist world in entering into new economic and social crises, the reanimation of the Italian proletariat and the process of the world revolution will determine the fate of the ICP not the bourgeoisie.

## FULL SUPPORT FOR THE ARAB MASSES AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR