

Editorial

The Electoral campaign is aimed to impede any discussion of the anti capitalist programme.

The approach of the general election does not mean that the population has the opportunity to intervene and discuss policies and programmes. As with bourgeois "democracy" it means that the masses are presented with programmes little different in content and thus will be subject to the vast quantities of the capitalist party line. This time around the LP apparatus has been most interested in expelling two left wing candidates from the party to prove its loyalty to capitalism and to show that the main concern is to prevent any discussion of socialist policies. In practice if in other forms this is a continuation of the electoral dictatorship of Thatcher, a policy of coalition politics to maintain the status quo. Kinnock speaks like the Victorian paternalist capitalist of the combination of competition with compassion! So great is the connivance with capitalist politics that the discussions over the Maastricht treaty dominated the scene for some time, not with posing a socialist alternative to the dictatorship of capitalism in the new Europe but with grumbling over the details like a board meeting. In reality the Maastricht agreement was simply a step in the closer capitalist integration of Britain with Europe, refraining from the Social Charter and postponing the acceptance of a common currency until later. Much has been made of all this by the conservatives who have a problem with some of their number who resent the dominance of German capitalism and are preparing for a time when Europe will be used as a excuse when matters go badly for British capitalism. British capitalism reaffirmed its worship of NATO, continuing its alliance with Yankee imperialism. But even sectors of German capitalism have not been too keen on the Social Charter. All in all the Maastricht treaty is not historic, merely an inevitable response to the urgency to facilitate the tasks of European capitalism, to try to smooth out problems between the various large and small creatures in the trough, to limit the amount of squealing if possible. Inter capitalist disputes will continue within

this common dictatorship and ideas to democratise the dictatorship of capital will mean nothing. It is necessary for the left to utilise the European parliament as a tribune for the masses, but any idea that the capitalist tiger is going to be pacified by parliamentary prating is pure mystification. That animal has rather more vital concerns such as stirring the racist issue and preparing the means for repression on a European scale.

Even the spokesmen of capitalism have been obliged to admit that the slump will not go away. Although the trade cycle will improve in time, there is no question that the British economy is on the blink and that it is severely disadvantaged in the period that is coming with the European free market. The closing of the Ravenscraig steel works shows the inability of capitalism to develop

productive industry. Some sectors of capitalism want a devaluation, others quite content with some form of deflation are against, but whatever the arguments within capitalism over this, the structural deficiencies of the British economy are so marked that no currency modifications are going to work for long. The fact that alarms were raised over the possibility of less Japanese capital being available in the next period show the inescapable deficiencies of British capitalism. No doubt the very big monopolies have the resources to survive but the small fry go to the wall complaining bitterly about the banks. It is being argued that with the utter failure of the "deregulated" capitalism more state intervention will be on the agenda to contain the worst excesses of the system. But whatever new ploys capitalism uses will not alter the basic torment of the system—its inability to expand and win more support, on a world scale. Karl Marx always has the last laugh.

The resignation of Gorbachev is the end of one stage in the disintegration of the soviet bureaucracy. In this case part of that sector of the bureaucracy centralised in Moscow which held together the Union has been liquidated and the country is now divided between local bureaucracies

Contents.

Page 1. Editorial.

Page 2. Resolution on Social Weakness of Capitalism.

Page 3. The Harmony of Knossos.

Workers of the world, unite!

RED FLAG



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

407. 24 January. 1992.

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'

Price 30p.

who are engaged in trying to preserve their interests in competition with the others. The substitution of the Soviet Commonwealth for the Soviet Union is a retreat, in so far as it is part of the attempt by the fragmented bureaucracy to destroy the centralised power of the workers state, to substitute their own local interests and combat the united forces of the soviet proletariat. The proposed economic reforms are the centre of attention for the next period. This liquidation of the Moscow centred Soviet Union has been arrived at in order to facilitate the economic reforms, but the fact that there is more independence from a bureaucratic centre is also dialectically a progressive step. Although the poisonous elements in the bureaucracy seek to maintain themselves by using such national movements to maintain their local power, it is also true that now they lack an all powerful centre to cover up their corruption. Gorbachev had hoped to do an Alexander II ie improve the bureaucratic system without actually destroying it. However he helped unleash a process which brought out the two possible roads—the advance of the workers state to a complete soviet democracy or a full retreat by the bureaucracy some parts of which quite openly seek the capitalist road. As part of the old system Gorbachev was quite incapable of conceiving of socialist policies. Economic reforms was his solution and attempts at a greater collaboration with capitalism. In the last stage after the reactionary coup of Yeltsin, he did not turn to the masses and went along with the suspension of the communist party. The Minsk coup to establish the Commonwealth, without any pretence of discussion with the Soviet people who had

voted to maintain the Union was the logical outcome of the impotence of Gorbachev. The latter at the last gave no great credence to the "Commonwealth" and had previously reaffirmed his belief in the objectives of the Russian Revolution and its perversion by Stalinism but was unable to draw the conclusions of all this.

The objectives of the Yeltsin clique are thoroughly reactionary. The fact that Yeltsin proposed in some distant future to join Nato the instrument of counter revolution shows the mentality of this presumptuous clique. However it is one thing to have reactionary intentions and hopes and another to realise them. To turn the clock back in the workers state requires far more than coups and hiking consumer prices. It will require a turn to private property in front of the resistance of the soviet masses, an undertaking requiring favourable world conditions and the actual support of the very masses who would suffer from any such changes. Even if they attempt to change the property relations more slowly this will also provoke resistance. Capitalism as a world system gained much support because it showed itself superior to feudalism. The Yeltsin team can only offer hardship followed by more hardship, a retreat on previous gains with benefits only for small groups. The recent demonstrations throughout the Soviet Union denouncing Yeltsin and reaffirming the Soviet Union are part of the new communist left which is in process of formation. There are different tendencies certainly, but the basis is being laid for a better political life founded on superior world conditions.

Whatever the degree of privatisation in the Soviet Union, imperialism has no great confidence in the outcome. The American secretary for defence objects to the continued soviet manufacture of missiles aimed at the United States ("not acceptable!") and the latest Pentagon texts speaks about adopting new missile systems to cover all the danger spots throughout the world. Even a modified form of SDI is being planned. Thus the reality of confrontation with the world revolution and the workers states continues as before.

While Britain goes towards the elections, the conservatives have nothing to say except more of the same. They talk of privatising railways and the mines and even more reductions in income tax for which the rich will especially benefit. Everything is determined by cuts. For example they pretend an interest in new ideas for more teacher training in the schools, but the reality is that they want to reduce education departments and colleges ie cut costs and thus put more burdens on teachers in the schools. The labour party has been obliged to offer some small concessions to the masses but they do not explain how they are going to make the capitalist economy expand and invest at the level necessary to meet the needs of the population. Some millions to improve the infra structure is not going to solve the deep rooted problems facing the population. Britain is in the classic capitalist contradiction, the forces of production are at war with the relations of production. The election will be only one more stage in the convulsive agony of the system. Labour is not so keen to win as it

Continued on Page 4.

The Social Nature of the Crisis of the Capitalist System.

Part 2.

International Leadership. August 1991.

The crises through which the political leaderships of the workers states are passing do not mean a reinforcement of the capitalist system, much less the "fall of communism". On the contrary the crisis and the social disintegration of capitalism continues the course of the laws discovered and analysed by Marx. We are living through a transitory phase; none of the countries of Eastern Europe who have sought in private property and the market the solution for their problems have improved the economy, much less have they advanced in democratic conditions. They are not going to do so by this road. In Poland the first important private enterprise which was constituted has been organised on the basis of swindles and robbery and now the whole management of the enterprise is being sought by the police. Capitalism cannot do anything other than this which is its norm of life—swindling, robbery, reduction in the quality of the product. Capitalism does not have either interest or means or social authority to be able to invest and influence within the workers states.

That ex communists renege and proceed to eulogise private property and the market does not mean that now "communism has fallen". The same journalists who speak of the latter, in front of the fall of Napoleon—who arose as a representative of the new bourgeoisie which displaced feudalism and afterwards was crowned and governed with absolute powers—would have said that "capitalism has fallen" when it was precisely then that the period of history in which the bourgeoisie was going to play a progressive role was commencing. Today capitalism is exhausted and the process of its historic substitution by socialist society is not in question, but difficulties have arisen which among other things were foreseen by the founders of marxism. These are not difficulties derived from some historic illegitimacy, but the necessary difficulties that arise from an experience by a class with limited means such as the working class. To this it is necessary to add the difficulties created through the Stalinist experience which has impeded the political life, allowing the systematisation of experiences and the development of a new communist leadership for this process. It is one which combines the war and the final liquidation of capitalism with the

organisation of the society based on the active participation of the masses and in the development of harmonious human relations. The exhaustion of the capitalist system is economic, political and fundamentally social. "The masses of the world have already condemned the capitalist system" said Cde Posadas. They are not awaiting solutions, but fight constantly to defend and impose conquests. Hence the Pope in his encyclical must recognise the function of the working class and aims at criticising the capitalist system. It is his accomodation to the situation and we expect nothing from the Pope, but we interpret his attitudes to evaluate the social state, the thought of the Catholic masses who await the intervention of the working class, not God. The Pope manoeuvres to position the church as a pole of attraction for this maturing of the masses which neither he nor religion can impede. The Pope is conscious that the rebellion which smashed down the bureaucratic power of the workers states was not concerned to promote returns to capitalism. Hence he tries to propose the church as a substitute for the capitalist leadership which lives in a state of the most profound moral, and intellectual decomposition and in all other aspects of life.

The most salient aspect of the exhaustion of the capitalist system is the wastage of the productive forces and the great concentration of economic power in the hands of a few multinationals. Despite the assertions of those who think that the analysis of Marx has been superseded, it remains completely valid to understand imperialism and the present phase of the capitalist crisis. Capitalism has expelled from every form of market, eighty percent of the world population which is outside any possibility of consuming or of using its workforce. Thus it destroys part of its production to maintain the price, it destroys also all this energy, all this human potential to defend and increase even more the accumulated wealth. Capitalism has no other alternative for the immediate future than to throw out thousands of workers in the main capitalist countries or attacking the most basic workers conquests

in constructing its industrial plants where trade union organisations do not exist as in South East Asia and where it can use economic blackmail as in Mexico. In Italy the shadow economy increases and the deaths through industrial work are more than two thousand a year and another five thousand die from illnesses derived from the conditions of work which do not show in the statistics. All this is constantly aggravated.

Capitalist investment cannot generate any progress. This could be done in its initial phase when it was in full development. It invested, created markets and with that it grew socially because it extended and incorporated more people into the economy but now no longer. It is illusory to expect that capitalism will invest to make the Soviet Union develop as do some communist parties or some leaderships of the workers states. We appeal for a discussion of this problem in the world communist movement; capitalist investment cannot generate anything important. Progress is linked to progress as a workers state and to the joint unification and programme of all the workers states with the active participation of society in the control and elaboration of the plans of production.

The capitalists argue that there are still not sufficient political conditions in the workers states to guarantee their investments. Then why do not they invest in Bangladesh where they have no opposition. Apparently they invest there via the farce of the Aid and Development fund but the money does not come from the capitalist banks. Bangladesh is a country which has received more "aid" than most—20,000 million dollars in recent years. Comparatively it is almost what Gorbachev asked for the USSR—100,000 million dollars, considering that Bangladesh has a population of sixty five million people. Well and what is Bangladesh with all this money which capitalism has given? It is the poorest country in the world, one child in five dies and with the last storms more than two hundred thousand people died.

On the other hand before the October Revolution, capitalism already existed in the Soviet Union as also in the other workers states. If they constructed workers states it

has not been through the caprice of the communists but as a consequence of the failure and the defeat of capitalism. There are very good books of Lenin and also Trotsky on the peculiar development of capitalism in Russia. It was a peculiar development, but it was a capitalism based on foreign investments and thus great social backwardness was combined with modern capitalist production. There was a great weight of the working class in the city and in opposition a weak structure of the bourgeoisie which had its bases in the rest of the Imperial powers and not in Russia. These investments which came from the epoch of Peter the Great did not promote progress, only the accelerated growth of a working class which afterwards imposed democratic rights—which the bourgeoisie should have developed—with the revolution and the installation of the first workers state.

All the great capitalist opulence in opposition to the "failure of real socialism" is merely the economic opulence of a small sector of society and has been made at the expense of the life of people, in the retreat and corruption of human relations, and the retreat of culture and of science. The United States is a country which comparatively is more backward than Albania. It has more than 40 million people (the great majority blacks) who live in the most appalling conditions and has a net income ten million times that of Albania which only has five or six factories. In Albania the bureaucratic management of the economy has meant very hard conditions for much of the population and has now worsened through the capitulation of the previous leadership. But in the United States all the big cities are full of the "homeless" and capitalism competes over the merits of swindlers ie Bush comes out better than Reagan, both in the Bush family father and son are swindlers, whilst Reagan was not able to convince his son to abandon drugs to become a swindler and spy like himself. Another great record is the American marine who killed more than sixty people. Italian capitalism can compete well in the speciality of violence and crime with two million felonies a year or its

two thousand, five hundred homicides per year but even in the most complete activity of mafia, camorra together, this does not achieve the superiority of North American society. These are considerations which we make in a mocking form but which expresses the profound decomposition in which capitalist society is engulfed at the final stage of its existence. This is going to culminate in the war which it is going to launch against humanity.

In the United States together with this decomposition of the regime, there is a growing and powerful social movement of opposition. There are important actions and symptoms which found their maximum expression in the great demonstrations, with a majority of young people, made against the war in the gulf. It is necessary to unite these to the recent demonstrations of the Latin American community and workers strikes in the Detroit and Pittsburgh areas where important successes have been registered and where important movements of opposition have been created to the mafia of the trade unions of the AFL-CIO and also in campaigns of solidarity with Sandinista Nicaragua and the other liberation movements in Latin America. They represent important centres of social opposition which in the United States acquires an anti imperialist and anti capitalist character. The world communist movement, the USSR, Cuba and other workers states must consider this opposition and lead a policy to help it to progress. This must be done via appeals and fundamentally with the most complete development of the democratic soviet life of the workers states. If Cuba developed this democratic life of the masses, organised a defence against the United States, this would be a hundred times superior to the arms or the courage of the Cuban people which is very great and has been historically tested. The Democratic party is paralysed and now has not decided who will be the candidate in the next presidential elections; they are afraid because on the one hand to oppose Bush they would need a programme which puts in question the sector of the big bourgeoisie and high finance

otherwise: they will remain submitted as in the Gulf war, but on the other hand in a campaign of an opposition character they will be pressured by a movement of the left which can go much further than they want to go.

The development of science stimulates the development of human relations and it is not possible to develop contemporary science with the arrogance of power. The Yanks have concentrated all the development of science, particularly of technology—now that science is very little which they develop in the United States—in production for competition and for war. In this way they limit and deprive science of its universal and objective character, preventing its application for the development of humanity. This has to be compared with the early development of capitalism in the first communes and republics in which the science and art of the Renaissance represented an enormous leap for humanity, based on a level of security and confidence achieved by society then. With this a perspective for a whole period of history was prepared. Today capitalist technology has no perspective; there is no art or science because they have no security in the future but it is simply a certain ability in the service of the continuation of power. Capitalism intoxicated by its "science" measures everything by the productivity and rapidity of production; as in the time given for the making of a portable phone which does not communicate but isolates people even more. It takes less time to construct than the time in which a new communist leadership is constructed which retakes the road of Lenin so that all humanity can communicate with itself and with nature and the universe. Then capitalism says "communism failed" looking upon it as some old technology. The workers states particularly the USSR and the struggle of the masses of the world are the basis of the rebirth of this epoch; a superior culture is in development which now is expressed again in the political struggle of the masses, but is laying the

foundations for a development without limits of art and science. The trips of Mandela with the great demonstrations accompanying them are among the greatest cultural events of all time. Even without having installed the workers state in South Africa, it is in their mind as also it is in the mind of the world vanguard which mobilised together with Mandela. This is culture as Cde Posadas explained. It is the culture which the masses of the world develop as a result of the practice which they make in the daily fight, the culture of the permanent revolution. Mandela came out of prison with the decision to construct socialism, even with the backwardness of a population savagely repressed and divided into tribes, its leadership wishes to construct socialism, because it has confidence in the security of the people, in the world support of the masses and of the youth and of the workers states.

In Europe capitalism has an aggressive plan to throw back the gains of the masses which is going to be resisted. The masses stimulate the trade unions and the workers parties, but these are all passing through very serious crises. The fears of all of them in developing an anti capitalist policy when they considered that the conditions were more favourable have been transformed into an uninterrupted series of conciliations, at the moment in which the bureaucratic apparatuses and the world communist movement are in great confusion as a result of the lack of adequate leaderships. The trade unions and the workers parties have assumed some of the objectives of the predominant bourgeoisie in their country and negotiate reductions in wages and employment, or through accelerated redundancies or on the other hand night work for women and extension of the working day in some cycles of production.

All this retreat which they are seeking to impose is closely linked to the retreats which are marked in the struggle for democratic

rights. The role of parliaments has diminished. The governments control through laws and decrees imposed arrogantly. In France and Italy they are discussing electoral laws against the masses. And if all this fails, capitalism exhibits clandestine powers as was seen with Gladio which show that it is going to resist with all the forces at its command.

We appeal for a campaign by the left in defence of and for the extension of the democratic rights of the masses so that the immigrant workers can vote and also the young from fourteen who have given proofs of maturity by participating in the demonstrations against the war. It is for this reason that they must vote; in the same way the foreign workers who work in Europe and in the great capitalist countries. Everything which participates in the creation of wealth and which is interested in progress such as the young people have the right to elect the government of their countries.

The communist parties are those who have most paid for the crisis of the workers states, not because they call themselves communist but because they have not understood what happened before nor what is passing now. They have postponed anti capitalist demands for future centuries and now live with a day to day policy which disorganises the forces which remain to them. While the masses of the world have not been limited in their understanding nor their will to struggle, through what is passing in the Soviet Union and the other workers states, and during the Gulf War mobilised outside the paralysis of their parties, the communist parties are living through important crises. These crises were inevitable because in all of them old layers who had been formed in the Stalinist epoch of conciliation with the capitalist system continue to exist and must be separated because they are a dead weight for the progress of

Continued on page 4.

The Harmony of Knossos.

Extracts. J. Posadas.

In seeing this city it is possible to realise the way in which Greek philosophical thought was formed. For the essential point is that Knossos expresses an harmonious way of seeing. The ruling class had a certain harmony. It was later that slavery and feudalism appeared through which the ruling class submitted the whole of culture and knowledge to the interests of production and property. At Knossos this process was not yet advanced and they were able to develop all this harmony and capacity.

There is a sense of harmony including the network of water pipes disposing of waste. Everything was made with a sense of harmony. Much later in the epoch of the kings of France, such people were filthy and did not wash whilst at Knossos thousands of years before people did this as a norm.

The architecture and the paintings do not suggest hostile or bellicose or pitiless sentiments. Although the Cretans were fighters, they give a sentiment of harmony.

It was only in 1900 that this city was discovered by the archaeologists. This shows the absence of interest which capitalism had in relation to Ancient Greece. Since 1900 they have left Crete much as they found it and have done little with it. Capitalism is not interested in the development of culture and of science and as a result was not interested in the past because the past is against it. Life has not developed as the bourgeois say it has, on the basis that "every civilisation has known a stage of advance, development and decadence". This is a religious and mystical conception.

War was a creation of society and it is through these conditions that human sentiments were formed. But communism is a necessity already accepted. We are part of this necessity. Also we see the past objectively with its beauty and harmony. It is the regime of property which developed and created war. War was created by the class struggle at first among the landowners and afterwards with the working class and the bourgeoisie. It is a dialectical process. The world was not made as stated by the bourgeois historians.

In the civilisation of Knossos, art and the economy were not developed in a parallel way. Art surpassed the economy. Knossos gives a sense of harmony which developed all the qualities which later were the qualities of the

Greeks. This civilisation did not develop a great economy, although these people were considerable merchants. It was a strategic island between Africa, Europe and a part of Asia. The city of Knossos was a centre.

The architecture is very harmonious. It shows a knowledge of the union between technology and beauty, of the combination of forms and colours, of the beauty in architectural structure, of the beauty of the place where the palace was built. All that has a great harmony. The despots, the rich like the feudal seigneurs or Mussolini also loved to have palaces, but they loved constructions with brutal forms. The architectural expression is a part of the way of thinking and the civilisation of Knossos suggests harmonious forms.

It was a society of classes but of classes not developed in the strict sense. For example the women did not participate in the political life in the Greek period. They participated in the social and cultural life, as it is possible to see in the works of art, but in politics it was men who decided. It was also the men who went to the market.

It is important to acquire this knowledge of history in so far as it is a question of something new. The world communist movement does not take support on these examples of history. But these show that it is always

Continued on page 4

For the economy to be planned for the benefit of the population on the basis of the expropriation of the main industries and banks under workers control!

**Out of NATO, Out with the monarchy!
For the Socialist Republic with the Unification of Britain and Ireland.**

intelligence which weighs in the economy. Intelligence needs the economy, to organise social relations which allow it afterwards to flourish and generalise itself.

These civilisations made a contribution to history even if they were limited. But it is above all now that they contribute to the progress of history. In their epoch they were not able to do it. They were not able to develop because the existing relations were relations of private property. The civilisation of Knossos developed knowledge of art in the harmony between human relations and forms and colours. The relations between forms and colours, space and form, space and colour express how thought develops. It can be seen in the columns of the palace, in the grounds, and in the designs. Colour is communicative of a development of sentiments and of thoughts which to flourish must seek social relations which correspond to them and these social relations in their turn must seek economic relations. All that leads to the elimination of private property. However the relation of property was dominant. Also this form of thought was not able to develop. The kings and the leaders of Knossos were not able to develop the thought corresponding to this form of art which expressed much harmony in the forms and colours. They represented a bureaucratic caste, but they had a certain relation with the population. All this harmony to be able to flourish had to go against the strengthening of the caste. Now the power of the caste could not allow that because it needed private property and the latter does not allow the existence of harmony.

Capitalism has had to allow a certain harmony because it needs to develop production. At the same time that it advanced, it created in a parallel fashion a progress in art, culture, science which went beyond the relations of private property and gave the proof that the progress of the economy and of social relations could lead to a regime superior to capitalism. No one discusses in this way Ancient Greece or Crete. One professor or other explains the concrete facts but nobody analyses how human history has developed. It is necessary to do this. They are contributions to historic knowledge.

The historians of a determined historic official science make determined historic the dependence of man in circumstances. The relation to private official historians property as a consider the dependence fatality. It is necessary on private property as a to revise- without conclusion, an imposition rejecting everything-the of relations with analyses of the nature, whereas it is a historic past, to correct question of social many matters which are circumstances. It is incorrect such as making necessary to develop all man dependant on these these scientific needs as if it was an explanations. historic destiny. Man was J. Posadas. 7.10.78. transformed since the

From page 1

would adopt much more class policies if it did, so it seeks to win marginally. There could be a hung parliament further allowing excuses for doing nothing. However as the social order buckles the need for the programme to expropriate capitalism and liquidate the monarchy is going to weigh and the united front of the conservatives, liberals and labour apparatus will not succeed in diminishing the crisis of capitalism only making it worse as they wage the class struggle against the masses.

As the background to all their policies of conciliation this lies the inevitable have been irretrievably tendency towards world war weakened in spite of their

these parties. This is the next stage which the communist parties and the left trade unions will live through.

The Italian communist party has been dismantled through a leadership yielding to the pressure of a social democratic layer which has already lost completely its faith in a communist future. There are tendencies like the Communist Refoundation, the most important and others from the ICP that seek to maintain an activity linked with the masses and with anti capitalist proposals which is going to have a transcendent power to the extent that they stimulate the process of unification of the communist forces and of the left in Italy, aimed particularly at the left base which still maintains itself in the PDS to make it change. There is no perspective of consolidating an important mass movement like that of the former ICP behind a social democratic policy, as part of the leadership of the PDS wishes to do. This impossibility is going to be the basis of future struggles, crises and internal breaks. The social democratic perspective does not correspond to the state of maturity of the masses and the workers vanguard which in an important part stays with the PDS and with the state of health of capitalism which cannot concede anything, but on the contrary must repress even more the standard of living of the masses. The proof of this lies in the socialist experiences in Greece, France, Spain and Portugal.

Capitalism must anyway reduce the standard of life of the masses and not simply as a tactical response to the confusion prevailing in the communist and socialist parties, but as a necessity for its survival. These are the conditions it must impose to reduce even further the costs and to be able to compete with success on the world level. Capitalism will lead society to important levels of retreat unless a left anti capitalist solution is imposed. The masses and the working class and the youth have made demonstrations, clear evidence that they are disposed to

continual electoral functioning. The new reactionary leaderships in the workers states are unstable. The process in the Middle East remains one of backward regimes in permanent crisis with no perspective within the terms of capitalism for a solution of the Palestinian issue. There are no exits for world capitalism save war. 18.1.92.

struggles, but the process is slow because the leaderships are not prepared.

The experience of the ten years of the Mitterand government is demonstrative that ambiguous and weak solutions are not possible in front of capitalist property. Even having established a series of social measures of progress, like wages to the unemployed or in the terrain of education and culture, all obtained in the first period-the period of alliance with the communists and of nationalisations,-they ended with concessions to private property and privatising some of the enterprises nationalised at the beginning. This present policy has deprived the social measures of effect and today we have in France more than 10% unemployment with very large areas of poverty.

It is true that the Yanks and world capitalism have made a great pressure to make life difficult for French industry in the world market, but submitting to them has cut the links which held the socialists to the mass movement. The most serious blow to the confidence which the masses could have in the socialists was the French support to the war in the gulf. The same has occurred with Gonzalez and Soares who have handed Spain and Portugal over to the hands of a sector of the bourgeoisie linked to the multinationals and caused retreats in the standard of life of the masses.

The communist "renovators" who visualise the advantages of the market and private property do not discuss these experiences. The labour party and the SPD who have the possibility of going to government are in immense crises with internal struggles because they do not know how to manage this stage of the capitalist crisis, the labour people fear the Trotskyist left and the SPD the pressure of the masses who have lived through the experience of the former DDR. They know that to survive they must apply anti capitalist measures and want to contain the social effects of the same.

The Communist parties must appeal for a united front with the socialist parties and the trade unions to develop a programme of progress in respect of the capitalist system, the defence of social conquests, of health, of education and culture, of conditions and hours of work, defence of the environment from contamination and development of public transport, minimum wages, sliding scale of hours and prices. Employment and wages must be maintained in the enterprises in difficulties and where the

factory is to be closed it must be nationalised and placed under workers control. It is necessary to open a public debate including the organisations and the masses of the workers states over the unification of Europe for the benefit of its population and of the world population; a workers and popular programme of the development of production for the benefit of the population and serving to develop the backward countries. It is necessary to have a programme

of the working class to resolve the problems of immigration, a programme which eliminates all the obstacles to progress of these countries, obstacles which are economic, political and cultural and so that means are developed to enable the masses to participate in the leadership of the country. Capitalism has stimulated the "refugees" from the workers states for political interests and then afterwards has facilitated some immigration for work which the workers of the more developed countries will not do besides using them as a pressure to contain the wages of the workers. It is necessary to integrate the immigrant workers with the rest of the working class, imposing complete democratic rights for the immigrant workers and thus together to develop an anti capitalist policy. This is the only way to eliminate the immigration

problem; eliminating the capitalist system in the developed countries and in the backward countries, programming the economy for the benefit of the masses. One of the most important aspects of production which the left must undertake is the transformation of the arms industry into an industry of products useful for the masses.

Capitalism is going to oppose a programme of this type and thus it is necessary to eliminate capitalism. This is not the end of the world, but the necessary traumas for progress. Even to feel the relief from the elimination of a defective tooth, it is necessary to suffer the pain of extraction. Progress in society is not even. It is not possible to advance seeking to satisfy all, without making a noise and being concerned with what the bourgeoisie will say. The only concern in any case must be with what the masses say. This is the living thought of Lenin. The moving of the statues in the USSR is the moving of the petrification of Leninism which was the thought of the bureaucracy of Stalin and which extended through all the world communist movement.

FOR A LABOUR VICTORY!

- A Planned Economy for the Benefit of the Population.
- Out with the Monarchy!

We call for a vote for the Labour party to terminate the regime of the Conservative government. Although as we have frequently indicated the present LP leadership is dedicated to reforms which will not alter the essential character of the capitalist system, nonetheless the repudiation of the conservative government would be a powerful blow socially at the system and deepen its crises. It will mean a government under pressures which will complicate the functioning of capitalism and encourage the forces of the left to rediscuss issues of principle.

The ruling class fears the entry of a labour government and hence there have been massive falls in share prices, an exhibition of capitalist defeatism. Bush gave his blessing to the unctuous Major, because he has fears over the intervention of the social base of the Labour party. The electoral campaign has been an obscuring of the reality of British capitalism—that it has no future but economic decline and social and political putrefaction.

In the last period, it has no longer been possible to argue that Europe is going to offer a great and glorious future. Even the German "miracle" has come to an end and the German proletariat faces big business with considerable forces. The British slump is profound and pervasive, leading to almost ten percent unemployment. 1991 saw a massive fall in investment one of the largest in recent decades. These conditions of economic decay exacerbate the social and political weakness of the capitalist system, hence the alarm of the ruling cliques at the possibility of electoral defeat. Even the return of water to some form of public

control causes anxiety as it raises again the spectre of public intervention against private interest. The liberal democrats simply offer another variant of the capitalist programme. The arguments of the electoral contenders are superficial—the conservatives arguing that it would be worse under Labour and the latter pretending that the conservative government rather than the nature of capitalism is the cause of the crisis. The liberal democrats talk a great deal about education and the environment, but as they are equally wedded to capitalist schemes, they offer a minor variant of the consensus. Thus the discussion over taxation cannot help but be within the confines of capitalist functioning. It is appropriate that in the middle of the electoral campaign the Barlow Clowes fraud case was again in the news, not forgetting the Maxwell swindle of pension funds, appropriate examples of what this social order is about. Fraud is the only area where capitalism distinguishes itself, apart that is from killing people in a variety of ways, through wars or economic assassination.

The profound consensus in the political structure, reinforced by the domineering television presentation of the electoral game can be seen over the Irish problem where no discussion appears, despite the demonstrations for peace in Northern Ireland which are a profound repudiation of the bloody carnage induced by the division of Ireland. No one refers to the sinister case of the British agent convicted of involvement in plans to murder Catholics. Labour does not raise the Irish issue except to affirm the continuation of the British army in Northern Ireland. Nor has there been any serious discussion over Gladio—the

state within a state which has come to the fore in Italy but refers to a Super Gladio all over Europe. This is important when it has been disclosed that the security services may be centralised by M15, even more outside control by parliament than are the other security organisations. This testifies to the fact that the crisis of the soviet bureaucracy does not limit the needs of capitalism to facilitate the repression of internal opposition. This is the reality of Britain not the facade of the elections and infantile declamations in the parliamentary club of conservative and labour pals.

The tendency for demands for the independence of Scotland to be voiced more powerfully also testifies to the weakening structure of capitalism. Scotland reflects the dereliction of capitalism, the inability to develop outside narrow areas. Independence on the basis of capitalism would settle nothing but the fact that capitalism leads to such tendencies shows how complete is its historic failure so that what was a progressive unification is now questioned. The polls indicated

in general that the two main parties were very close. As the campaign has developed, there are signs of a swing to the LP, but this has nothing to do with the LP leadership. If the conservatives are to be beaten it will be entirely the result of an overwhelming pressure. It is impossible to conceal the disaster of the Thatcher-Major government. In the middle of a profound capitalist crisis, the performance of the LP leadership has been very timid. Many in the bourgeois press itself in the previous

Continued on page 4

Contents.
Page 1. Editorial. The Yeltsin Dictatorship.
Page 2. Resolution on Partial Regeneration. August 91.
Page 4. The Film on the Kennedy Assassination.

Workers of the world, unite!



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

408. 27 March. 1992. 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'

Price 30p.

The Yeltsin Dictatorship and the Social Basis of the Workers State.

The soviet bureaucracy as revealed by its dissidents of a former stage inevitably generated forces which seek to retreat to private property. The logic of expropriating the wealth of the workers state and expropriating the proletariat politically is ultimately to seek to establish a new class. All this was outlined by Trotsky in the Revolution Betrayed. Trotsky also believed that despite all the damage of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the workers state would hold. It did and this was the achievement of the soviet people who survived the criminal counter revolutionary political and military blunders of stalinism and the atrocities of the nazis.

Yet again the soviet bureaucracy is inflicting criminal damage to the structure and achievements of the workers state, but this time in the process of its decomposition and fall. There is an extensive retreat in production, consumption and imports. The abandonment of the most complete centralised planning is a blow at the workers state. At the same time it is necessary to maintain an historic perspective on this situation.

The bureaucracy always justified itself on the basis of improving the development of the workers state and also that they were surrounded by powerful capitalist powers with fascism hell bent on destroying it. On the basis of statified property the workers state did develop and in spite of the pathological

brutality of the bureaucracy the masses made gains in employment and improvements in conditions of life, although this was not at all evenly spread. Now what is the justification of this layer of ex communists who desire to be capitalist? To go forward to capitalism on the basis of vandalising the workers state! As though the latter were to be turned into a primitive accumulation for capitalism. To do this can only mean gains for a few and impoverishment for the majority. Thus swindlers like the mayor of Moscow, Popov who calls himself a democrat—presumably on the basis that all state property is up for grabs and no sector should be excluded from his sticky fingers—can hardly convince the soviet people that new possibilities are developing for them. At the same time prostrate before world capitalism, it has been impossible to evoke an external enemy to justify their policies. The arguments of these people are based only on the deficiencies of the previous bureaucratic planning.

Hence Yeltsin after attacking the corrupt elements in the communist party has quickly lost authority and now complains that the soviet people have no memory of private property. Even he has to admit the enormous social weight against the programme of privatisation—the degree of which remains obscure because figures are not published. The instability of this layer is shown by the outbursts of Ruskoj, his deputy, who openly says of the government that it is criminal and going "against Russia"—

Continued on page 3

Partial Regeneration and the Crisis in the CIS. (USSR)

International Leadership. Part 1.
August 1991.

This text was written before the coup against the USSR, but the analysis remains useful in examining the anterior process in the workers states which is fundamental in understanding the dynamics of the permanent revolution for this phase of world history.

The grave crisis through which the Soviet Union is passing represents a new phase in the process defined by J. Posadas as the partial regeneration of the leadership of the workers state. It is a process whose base is the necessity for a progress of social relations in society and of a response on the world scale to the necessities of the liberation of all the peoples of the world to which the destiny of the USSR is indissolubly united. As the leadership is a bureaucratic caste its response to this necessity is partial. It answers at a certain limit to that of its own disintegration and afterwards it tries to block the process. But the process is more powerful and tries to advance. The apparatus disintegrates and gives way to tendencies of every type including communist revolutionaries who are calling for the recovery of the socialist course of this process. It is on these that it is necessary to be based on these in the next stage.

On the other hand the development of counter revolutionary tendencies forms part of the same process profoundly dialectical, of the construction of the workers state which contains within it elements of both capitalism and socialism. But it would be an absurd and superficial conclusion to pose that the "soviet model of socialism" has failed. The heralds of the "end of communism" will soon have to shut up. The destruction of the structures of the workers states is an arduous task and with little possibility of success. They have passed other tests and have survived. The bureaucracy wishes to be candidate for a class but cannot become so without the smashing of the masses, a type of fascism. This is its programme, but the movement which gave origin to this crisis was not a regression in history but an imperious necessity of progress. The lack of preparation and the lack of a communist leadership has placed transitorily the initiative and the control of the apparatus in the hands of the most degenerated sectors of the bureaucracy.

WHENCE THE CRISIS?

All the events after the death of Breznev have shown that the Soviet Union could not continue supporting the revolution in the world only in an economic or military form; that it could not satisfy anymore the internal economic needs, sustaining an enormous military force and at once competition with the capitalist system, without great

changes which would open the way to socialist measures and the extension of the frontiers of the workers states throughout the world. This cannot be done without making a profound political change in the leadership of the USSR and the full democratic soviet development of society.

Conditioned through the historic nature itself of the workers state, the bureaucratic leaderships tried to overcome this situation beginning with Andropov and then the period of Gorbachev. The latter initiated a new phase posing a series of objectives which continued the proposals of Andropov to "develop the potentialities of socialism". This meant then to place in motion a series of democratic mechanisms among them a greater autonomy of the enterprises and their functioning under the "workers collectives". Small private commercial activities were legalised. This was a means of

bringing to light the hidden economy in the belief thus to be able to control the corruption and black market. They tried a campaign of correction of the apparatuses, moralising measures as with the combat of alcoholism which did not touch the foundations of bureaucratic functioning. It was the continuation of a phase of the centralisation of the apparatus in which the central control of the workers state and above all the CPSU felt the necessity to throw out the most backward layers and those most hostile to the necessary centralisation of the progress of the workers state.

There was an accumulation of problems among which the economic had an essential weight. The extensive economy, the use of natural resources and apparently limitless, manpower instead of the utilisation of modern technology, all this was in the context in which the USSR dedicated an enormous part of its wealth to defence and to sustain revolutionary countries such as Africa and the rest of the world without-different from imperialism- these relations with the world bringing economic benefits as a result of exploitation. All this created an explosive situation, of not being able to respond to the necessity of progress including the satisfaction of the needs of the population which was the very reason for the existence of the USSR. The "stagnation" of the last stage of Breznev was a real process whose clearest manifestation was economic exhaustion of

resources, ecological problems, enormous investments responding more to the interests of bureaucratic or regional camarillas than to the needs of the workers state and with established plans and objectives managed and applied bureaucratically with the subsequent demoralisation of the producers and the population itself. But it would be mistaken to analyse the economic factor in abstraction from the fundamental social and political problem which has led to such a crisis: bureaucratic power and management which were the real causes of the so called "stagnation".

Gorbachev and the soviet leadership confronted very superficially this fundamental reason for the crisis. The measures for some control of the black market, the regulation of individual activity, a certain autonomy and the reduction of costs with the countries dependent on the USSR only touched superficially the real problems. Hence the measures discussed and proposed in the 27 Congress of the CPSU had no effect and then in the 28 Congress they made still more concessions to the autonomist and privatising measures thus beginning a cycle which led to loss of control of the situation, to rebellions of the nationalities and to the strengthening of an enormous layer of reactionary sectors with private interests.

The external policy of concessions to imperialism whose culminating points were the passive acceptance of the unification of Germany and the position of submission to imperialism in the case of the war in Iraq (passing through the reduction of economic and military aid, the abandonment of political support to the revolutionary parties and movements in the world) was supplemented with the conception of "new international relations" of the "return of the USSR to the International Community", of the "Common European Community" which they proposed as though imperialism and world capitalism would leave the USSR in peace and tranquillity so that it could develop and resolve its problems.

Such a policy in the epoch of Stalin was the defence of the "status quo" (including at the cost of handing over revolutions as in Spain). Afterwards it was called "peaceful co-existence" and later qualified by Posadas as the "policy of inter penetration"-because now it did

not propose the betrayal of revolutions, but the use of agreements with imperialism above all in the economic field. But this policy was also to fight to neutralise capitalism, to weaken it gradually, without renouncing the objective of defeating it, sustaining at the same time the revolution throughout the world but without developing or leading it to the political consequences of confrontation. Such was the policy conducted in Afghanistan, Angola, Mozambique and even Nicaragua. Imperialism intervened to block these processes, but the USSR even in intervening did not develop the policy towards the ultimate consequences, that of revolutionary confrontation.

Hence the new soviet leadership drew the mistaken conclusion that the support to the revolution was no use. In reality the process did not advance precisely because it was not accompanied by revolutionary policy and programme. On the other hand and this can be seen clearly now, this relation with the world represented a point of fundamental support for the progress of the USSR. The internal policy (characterised by a concern with the problems of the economy and of the struggle against the bureaucracy) has determined the

external policy of withdrawal and abandonment of positions. But in turn such an external policy has brought with it grave effects which are essentially political and social: all the xenophobic reaction of the nationalists, the weight of the reactionary tendencies is directly proportional to the weakening of the links with the world revolution. The USSR was born as the first link in the chain of revolutions which were intended to lead the proletariat to power and then to the abolition of classes. The theory of "Socialism in a single country" has developed the egotistic conception of "everyone for himself" and the result has been a brutal limitation in the ability in planning, programming and the full integration of the so called socialist countries which otherwise would have developed an immense social and economic power.

THE COLONIAL REVOLUTION AND THE NEW WORKERS STATES AND REVOLUTIONARY STATES.

All this unequal and combined process in which the most advanced aspects influenced the less advanced was without a coordinating centre, without a theoretical organising centre at the world level (Stalin had liquidated the Communist International before dissolving it physically), although impelled

throughout the world. Revolutions triumphed in Cuba and China, tens of countries passed from being colonies to revolutionary states, in which in different historic periods socialist principles, teachings and methods were applied, inspired by the experiences of the USSR, and after of China and Cuba. Vietnam triumphed with Angola and Mozambique and finally Nicaragua. Nationalist movements of a socialist and anti imperialist character developed.

In spite of the Stalinist period and of all its arbitrary features, not only did the USSR defeat the nazis and recover from the enormous destruction and the loss of over twenty five million dead in the war, but it developed upto twenty workers states. Yemen, Sudan, Iran, Somalia, Mali, Libya, Chile, Guatemala, Bolivia, Madagascar, Peru, Egypt, Syria and even Iraq to name only some of these processes. In the sixties and seventies, they were at the head of anti imperialist movements at different moments. All have posed parts of the programme of the workers state; statifications, nationalisations, the organisation of the trade unions, socialist objectives and measures against imperialism. J. Posadas had characterised them as revolutionary states. If all this powerful movement did not develop in tune with the USSR and the other workers states, this was through the lack of revolutionary policy, programme, and objectives, of a marxist organisation at the world level, the mass communist International.

A void succeeded to the third international and only the mobilisation of millions and millions of human beings of the exploited masses of the whole world allowed the advances of the world revolution and created an ambience favourable to the USSR so that it would progress in all fields. But without legitimate leaderships or due to isolation, these revolutions have retreated with the degeneration of the leading groups or have received blows from imperialism (Bolivia, Chile, Nicaragua) or have remained in some aspects- Syria, Iraq, Sudan, Libya- or been checked by counter revolutionary guerillas sustained by imperialism-

Continued on page 3

Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia. Revolutionary nationalism many times gave way to reactionary camarillas and groups who had nothing to do with the original leadership of the movement.

The unity of the world capitalist economy was not completely broken by the new association of countries. The system of the workers states remained limited by the bureaucracy and did not have a socialist programme which would have permitted these countries to free themselves from dependency on the capitalist system. There were crises in the workers states. China passed from supporting the revolutions to a reactionary policy and finally aggression against Vietnam. There was crisis in the world communist movement, conflicts like that of "Euro-communism", the crises of the CP's after 1968. But even so imperialism has not been able to work freely. It failed in Vietnam, has not made Cuba submit and has not been able to subdue Libya nor the guerrillas of San Salvador. The masses of the world have not ceased to struggle in the advanced capitalist countries. The seventies and eighties were periods of gains in general for the workers in Europe and for social struggles throughout the world. In Latin America the dictatorships installed by imperialism fell. This has characterised the world relations of forces favourable to the world revolution in which the existence of the USSR but also of the other workers states was fundamental.

These experiences have not ended, have not been forgotten although the world process has experienced retreat, limitation and a transitory dispersion. This has partly economic roots (in the eighties some few capitalist countries succeeded in destroying the economies of almost all the other countries and this has also impeded any development in the impoverished countries with revolutionary leaderships) but fundamentally political—the lack of a world revolutionary policy, of a mass communist international and the present crisis of the workers states. It does not arise because another perspective of development has been demonstrated. Capitalism has simply used the weakness of the policy of the workers states to smash, destroy and kill economies and peoples. It is precisely for this reason that capitalism has not recuperated social or political force and their contradictions and antagonism with the masses of the world are more alive than ever. In this sense the recovery and the solution of the crisis of the workers states is fundamental. If such a crisis was resolved in an unfavourable form with much damage and destruction in the USSR and the other workers states the difficulties for humanity would be enormous, but at the same time there is no termination of the class and revolutionary struggle on a world scale. Hence the evolution of events in China, Cuba and also in Vietnam acquire particular importance.

THE CRISIS IN CHINA.

China represents a most important element in the world relation of forces. J. Posadas has characterised the leadership of Deng Xiao ping as counter revolutionary such was his policy on the world plane and internally. The Posadist IV International after the death of J. Posadas has maintained this characterisation without ceasing to accompany the contradictory evolution in which the workers state conditioned the leadership and did not permit a retreat towards capitalism.

In China disastrous economic policies have been applied from the social point of view with the development of private interest in the special economic zones and agriculture, which have introduced elements of capitalism, producing greater capitalist inequalities, exploitation and mentality which have reduced the capacity of the social revolutionary influence of the workers state. The counter revolutionary world policy (support to the Chile of Pinochet, to the Afghan counter revolution) has continued but in an attenuated way. Now China weakens in its support to Pol Pot and seeks relations with the USSR and Vietnam. Internally the bureaucracy has sought to maintain itself in a type of "status quo". The renewal of diplomatic relations with Vietnam and seeking a solution for Cambodia shows this equilibrium has broken in favour of the revolution.

Tiananmen Square—analysed by the IV International in documents—

represented an expression of the influence of the process of the democratic openings in the USSR which affected China. This was repressed in a bloody form by the Chinese bureaucracy to prevent the proletariat being able to intervene; while the movement had a student aspect, the bureaucracy tolerated it, but when the movement began to influence the working class and the army itself it tried to smash the popular intervention. This of course does not exclude the influence of reactionary sectors; as in the USSR, among the "democrats", there are all types. The Chinese bureaucracy has developed tremendous private interests, rich peasants and managers and lives in equilibrium between its own interests as a caste and those of the private and millionaire sectors. On the other hand the thousand million Chinese workers and peasants are not disposed to renounce the existence of the workers state and its conquests—even considering the bureaucratic distortions and limitations which impede a greater progress. But the workers state must develop, must improve the life of people and for this the Tiananmen Square demonstrations represented in a preponderant way the will of people to develop socialism and eliminate the bureaucracy which is a real gang of mandarins. It is basic necessity which has placed in crisis the bureaucratic apparatus of the USSR and is beginning a process of political revolution

which has still not finished and which is going to shake China. Either the Chinese leadership changes or it will be crushed by history. It is not possible to maintain the status quo. Anyway there is a development in the Chinese economy and this has to be taken into account above all by those who speak of the "end of communism". This progress however bureaucratic it might be, is, as defined through the interpretation and teaching of marxism, the material product of the workers state. It is going to help in the recovery of the world communist movement.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF CUBA AND THE NECESSITY OF SOVIET DEMOCRACY.

The defence made by the Cuban leadership of the principles of socialism and the socialist option has been fundamental in these circumstances. But the Cuban leadership maintaining such a position from the beginning has not given an historic, political or theoretical interpretation of what has happened. It has not done so because it results from the same lack of preparation which has led to the present crisis in the USSR, but also through not knowing how to confront the problem of political democracy in the workers state. Undoubtedly we do not measure democracy with the ruler of bourgeois democracy, but of soviet democracy which is the tradition left by the October revolution. Beyond discussion is the great social and cultural

Continued on page 4.

From page 1

Ruskoj himself being a supporter of privatisation. In this atmosphere where the bureaucracy has lost its centralising power, it can only resort to xenophobia and also to return where possible to forms of repression. This in itself cannot guarantee a counter revolution.

the conditions will provoke a search for a genuine marxism. It must be recalled that even the xenophobic Zhirinovski believes that the majority of state enterprises must continue and the collective farms. His perspective is a form of reanimated bureaucracy plus repression under pseudo nationalist slogans.

However as has been argued before with the elaborations of Trotsky and Posadas, the social relations of the workers state are historically rooted and it is difficult for these corrupt gangs without much authority, like Yeltsin to get their own way exactly as they would like. The Yeltsin counter revolutionary group are already a dictatorship. Thus he rules by decree—outlawing the communist party—and has actually vetoed local elections appointing personal representatives as the local satraps. A repression by this social excrement is certainly not excluded, but the historic prospects as

opposed to immediate gains do not favour them. The fight with the police on the ceremony of the Unknown Soldier, after various workers organisations were forbidden by the despot Yeltsin to enter Red Square shows the steady accumulation of social forces against the mafia bureaucracy. This cannot be dismissed as simply interventions by those who wish to bring back the Stalinist past.

It is also necessary to see the emptiness of the foreign policy of Yeltsin. Like Gorbachev he seems to imagine that foreign visits carry great weight. In complicity with world capitalism he advises Libya to submit to world imperialism and goes along with criticisms of Cuba over "human rights". However his proposals and the attitude of capitalism clash. Yeltsin as part of his prostration in front of capitalism which is even more grotesque than that of Gorbachev desires to share in the SDI.

He also offered not to target the USA and

Britain. The Yanks are not keen on any of these proposals and as Shaposhnikov head of the former Red Army said "we shall have to think what to do if the USA does not give up the SDI". Quite so. The criminal behaviour of the Yeltsin embezzlers does not correspond to the reality of the world. Simply because he and his fellow criminals wish to love capitalism, it does not mean that world capitalism loves them, however much they wish to further disorder in the republics of the workers state.

Certainly the autonomy of enterprises draws closer to capitalist functioning, although the dominance of state property continues. If this were to proceed without hindrance it could eventually lead to forms of economic differentiation even on a Yugoslav scale, but the Soviet Union, now the CIS is not Yugoslavia, its historic experience is totally other.

Moreover the role of the Red Army is not over despite the change to national armies. It also embodies historic experience, the defence of statified property. Yeltsin can change names but not the character of a state.

Unquestionably this process has weakened the centralisation of the world revolutionary front against capitalism and imperialism. The soviet masses do not have the organs by which they could intervene, but that does not mean that they will not intervene in the future. The soviet proletariat has not by any means weighed in with all its force. However the advance to world socialism has never been linear and only the bland think human progress is a pleasant evolutionary dance, without problems. The Yanks are now threatening Iraq and North Korea. They can issue dictats and murder without respite but the brutal course of capitalist decay will inevitably lead to massive

Continued on page 4

development of the Cuban people, the merit of the workers state and which has exercised an enormous influence not only in the Latin American continent but in Africa and the world.

The polemic of the Cuban leadership in front of the retreats in the workers states with the formation of reactionary governments in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the situation in the USSR, although just from the point of view of the defence of the workers states has not explained the reason for the rebellion of people and the reason for the capitulation of the communist parties in front of the mobilisation of the masses, because for years these parties developed a policy and defended a bureaucratic conception of the workers state. The Cuban leadership did not explain because in Cuba there exists the same apparatus, although less powerful and it is that which is in question. Hence there was no discussion over Ochoa: he was a "traitor". But where did he come from? How was he formed? How was he able to work and last for so long? These are not mysteries, but problems of the construction of socialism in a workers state which is an island surrounded by imperialism. But for the Cuban masses there is no explanation.

Like all the other workers parties the Cuban leadership has not been capable of posing the problem of soviet democracy, of the construction of socialism as a universal conception and achievable on the world scale; that is how to make people intervene in all the activities so as to pass gradually towards the suppression of the state and to distribution "to each according to necessity" as a perspective, but also as a concrete exercise of socialist distribution.

If Cuba continues declaring itself to be socialist and has resisted more reactionary changes, it is because the Cuban bureaucratic apparatus was less powerful than that in the other workers states and because Cuba, like China and Vietnam did not arise simply as a result of the intervention of the Red Army but of a profound popular revolution which afterwards won the support of the USSR. But the laws of the development of the workers state which pose the advance towards socialist relations are also valid for Cuba. Otherwise all the economic difficulties weigh.

Cuba cannot be an "island" of socialism, something which cannot exist in history. If Cuba exists, it is through the existence of the USSR which has prevented imperialism smashing it and through all its relation with the world revolution. But the Cuban leadership has always utilised such a situation (the support of the USSR and the constant threat of Yankee imperialism which is

real) to postpone the solution of the problems of the direct participation of the population. Without doubt the Cuban people has always had a discipline

and centralisation in the conquests and also a respect for its leadership. Hence it resists the worst economic difficulties, results of this situation of a blockade. All this crisis with the USSR, has meant for Cuba a blow and difficulty without precedent, not only for the economic aspect, the partial non fulfilling of the agreements (reduction in the provision of oil mainly) but principally through political isolation which increases the risks of some aggression on the part of imperialism. The recent measure of the withdrawal of soviet troops is another political blow which can represent a reinforcement to the interventionist tendencies of Yankee imperialism.

We reject those who propose "free elections" with universal suffrage without posing the programme, the objective and the substance of such democratisation. It is enough to look at the other workers states to see that if this does not answer to the objective of making participate and giving effective power to the workers, it serves only the interest of reactionary tendencies. The Yanks have the means and thousands of agents ready to return to power and influence in an eventual electoral process in Cuba. And they would not be democratic elections after thirty years of economic blockade which has certainly limited immensely the development of the country. It would not be an equal contest. In the same way there is nothing democratic in the Nicaraguan elections. After almost ten years of military aggression and economic boycott, how believe that the masses of a country can express themselves freely? It is a lie and it is necessary to reject it.

The Posadist IV International calls for the unconditional defence of the Cuban revolution in front of whatever threat of aggression by Yankee imperialism. But the most efficacious weapon to develop is the link with the world revolution and for that, Cuba must demonstrate that it does not fear the intervention of the population, developing soviet democracy; full participation of the workers at all the levels of the economy, of the administration and of the government! revocability of mandates for all positions, elimination of every type of party privilege and of the state functionaries! It is necessary to mobilise people politically not to listen simply to the discourse of the commander in chief, but to discuss, to debate in meetings of thousands and

The Film on the Kennedy Assassination.

The film on the assassination of Kennedy has caused a disturbance in the flow of interminable triviality which fills the screens of the capitalist cinema. The importance of the film does not lie in its technical skills but in what it says about the attitude of the American people to their government.

The film has been reviled in general by the organs of capitalism as sensational and unconvincing. All sorts of criticisms have been made of the director for his idealisation of Kennedy and of the lawyer Garrison. Above all it has been criticised for its suggestion that Kennedy was liquidated by a team organised by sectors within the ruling class. This is anathema to the thinking of capitalism which is always criticising

"conspiracy theories". Apparently

conspiracy and assassination only exist in the mafia or financial fraudsters never among the ruling class itself.

Kennedy was assassinated because of rifts in policy over the attitude to the Soviet Union. He had disagreed with the military who had desired to bomb Cuba during the missiles crisis and was interested in some form of detente. Nixon was destroyed for similar reasons but in a different way, because he also developed an interest in peaceful co-existence. The military via Haig finally ended up in the White house.

The progressive sectors of North American society, the workers, the various immigrant groups and the urban petit bourgeoisie are not

deceived by their ruling class as in previous epochs. It is not by chance that such a film appears now when American capitalism is weakening, when its incapacity becomes daily more glaring. Only now when such is the contempt felt by the masses towards American capitalism can such a film find a popular audience. The director Stone himself said he was not claiming that everything was totally accurate in the film but that it was intended to provoke a discussion.

As the American elections show, the decomposition in American capitalism is profound and the forces of resistance to the ruling class are equally profound and in united front with the world revolutionary process.

From page 3

crises and renewed wars in which the capitalist regime is called into question on a global scale. In all this the workers states, including the Soviet Commonwealth will play a fundamental role. The process that is coming however novel the forms, will impel towards a renovation of the movements towards socialism. The gains of 1917 and the war against the nazis can never be erased and will reappear in a higher form in the final encounters between humanity and world capitalism. Those who already

believe that the soviet experience is over are fair weather participants in revolutionary progress. The first sign of important problems and they are off to more convenient climes

There is no question that the issues raised by the formal dissolution of the Soviet Union require thought but

to write off the soviet experience or to be dominated by the pessimism of various left movements in the world none of which have any marxist

conception has no basis.

Out with Capo Mafia Yeltsin and his fellow criminals! This government should be ejected on the basis of the extension of soviet democracy and the liquidation of the bureaucracy. For the full reestablishment of the USSR on the basis of the return to soviets and the fullest decentralised application of centralised decisions. For the planned economy, the monopoly of foreign trade, workers control and the return to the Mass Communist International.

From page 1

period have noted the reluctance of the LP to wage a real struggle and some have added that the LP does not desire to win. In essence the LP apparatus only desires to win on the basis of nothing in its programme which seriously jeopardises the capitalist system.

thousands, all the problems of the construction of socialism. It is necessary to develop cadres, initiatives and participation, to make of Cuba a centre for the reorganisation of all the communist tendencies in the world and in this sense more than condemnation and polemic, it is necessary to assist the process of partial regeneration and political revolution in process in the other workers states and centrally in the USSR.

To be continued.

On the world plane, the economic crisis allied to the social and political weakness of world capitalism means that all the conditions exist for more wars and social catastrophes as in the Iraq conflict. The Yanks are putting the pressure on Libya and North Korea but even if these cases are settled, imperialism is also incapable of changing the

balance of forces against it.

Without a leadership in the workers states to confront world capitalism the costs for the world population are going to be enormous - they would be enormous anyway - although capitalism is sinking into a morass and is historically doomed. If imperialism had acquired new forces as a result of the crisis in the workers states, Bush would not

have ended on the floor of his Japanese guests and be so empty in front of the American elections. The defeat of the right in the South African referendum, although there can be no illusions in de Klerk shows that the process of human progress cannot be blocked and capitalism cannot return to a more stable past.

Out with the Major Government! For a Labour victory on the programme of social transformations! Workers control throughout industry and the banks! Planning of the Economy on the basis of the expropriation of the Monopolies! Out with the Monarchy! For the Socialist Republic!

THE PROGRAMME OF THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT IS SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC REPRESSION.

The return of the Conservatives for a fourth term with a greatly reduced parliamentary majority and as usual the minority in the population, plus the heavy defeat of the labour party apparatus. is an indication of the decomposition of capitalist politics. The LP won back many seats but failed to win the popular vote of 1979 and was unable to convince sectors of the working population that it had any capacity to confront the crisis of the whole social system.

This immense social and economic debacle has no prospect whatsoever of a solution in terms of the existing policies. In general all forms of repression are the only possible conclusion to maintain the system of the private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

For years the policy of the camp of imperialism has been the clandestine preparation of war against humanity and the liquidation of the workers states. The crisis of the bureaucracy in the workers states has not diminished this policy, but a new phraseology makes its appearance such as the need for "new forms of co-operation" to deal with "emergencies" ie Iraq. In this country in face of the downward path of the economy and society, ludicrous phrases are invented such as "citizens charters", "a caring society", even a "classless society" and "open society". But the real agenda is quite different, even more clandestine, but quite in the old mould—preparation for global interventions and world war and measures against the famous enemy within ie the masses and all anti capitalist currents.

With the present grave crisis for the existing leaderships on the traditional left in this country, it is necessary to be clear on the international structure which conditions the policies of British capitalism. Without that the workers organisations are left to cope in a purely pragmatic way with what is happening and live in an enclosed world without apparent exit. The

collaboration which existed between the LP and reactionary union leaderships and the Thatcher regime always tried to present Britain as isolated from the rest of the world with its own special conclusions. Keep the population isolated from the rest of the world! Keep the world process at bay so that the professional careerists who litter the LP can humbug about in parliament.

There is certainly a crisis in the leaderships of the workers states, but in practice this has only superficially benefited capitalism because the latter is in terminal condition. All the leaderships in the workers states who seek to impose capitalist norms enter into immediate crisis and impasse—we have no need to remind anyone in detail of that inspired clown Walesa who provides entertainment at a moments notice. It is true that the Polish people are greatly aggravated by this particular comedian but in the eyes of history a joke has certainly been perpetrated.

The events in Los Angeles, a city in the centre of world imperialism show the impotence of the ruling dynasties to solve anything. Bush has had nothing to say—apart from how the police where marvellous in the USA. He simply turns up with his troops in LA a fitting image of the situation of world capitalism. The new massive demonstrations in Washington have demanded resources to transform the American cities on the basis of cutting arms expenditure. The rulers of America who determine the course of world capitalism are certainly, although in the most clandestine form, considering yet again the old problem—hit the world now with a series of military interventions or play the game slowly. The issue has not changed since Kennedy was taken out and the Pentagon wanted to take Baghdad without delay. How far do they go? Delay means further decomposition—with profound consequences in the USA itself—but precipitate action

Workers of the world, unite!



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

409, 29 May, 1992.

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'

Price 30p.

will also play against them and after all capitalism will not survive the nuclear conflict. They won a military victory in Iraq, but at the cost of social defeat. This is the arena which conditions every local politics. Capitalism has given up on the world—apart from wishing to retain power. After all the vast majority of mankind are now pauperised by capitalist policies, a small wealthy handful oppresses the world. That is the situation and it will only end when capitalism as a system is removed. Imperialism is actively preparing for the final encounter. It has stuck its snout in Yugoslavia talking full advantage of the criminal policies of Milosevic, and openly encouraging the break up of the workers state. They threaten Serbia and encourage all manner of hoodlums in Croatia and Bosnia etc. Imperialism is also planning to utilise the fall of Najibullah in Afghanistan to make problems in soviet Central Asia. As with UNO, the dirtier the methods the more sanctimonious the words. But it has to be repeated, the situation does not favour capitalism. It has long outworn its welcome on the stage of history. Its atrocities will not save it.

In comparison with the reality of the world situation, the present discussion in the Labour party has been very limited—limited because sectors are only interested in their parliamentary careers with the object of "governing" capitalism.

In the debate over the leadership the right wing of the trade unions wanted no discussion, but simply the election of Smith as quickly as possible without even consulting the members. The old

idea of getting rid of Clause 4 was raised, ie dump any socialist perspective whatsoever. Prescott one of the candidates for the deputy leadership reiterated the necessity to keep the relation with the unions and maintain non capitalist policies. Becket suddenly remembered that she came from the left and had continued to support CND. The discussion is very superficial, but on balance the apparatus has been shaken and a minor dose of vaguely "left" phrases are allowed to circulate. The labour left is very weak. Apart from what has been characterised as a small "hard" left which means maintaining basic anti capitalist and anti imperialist positions as over Iraq, much of the parliamentary left is the lightest shade of pink. It is not by chance that Kinnock came from this layer, one without firm principles and attracted primarily by office. However the severity of the problems for capitalism can open further the gates for the labour left to discuss not just the latest tax modification, but where contemporary capitalism is actually going as opposed to where it says it is going. Passive acceptance of capitalist argument is in fact connivance with it, as happened over the miners strike and the incapacity to oppose Thatcher, who was overthrown not by the LP and TU leadership but by the resistance of the masses. The continuation of the war in Ireland has to be seen as part of the general capitalist preparation for war and internal repression. The take

over by M15 is part of this. It is going to be difficult for British capitalism to make much of a recovery from the slump and whatever is made is not going to lead to any structural change to improve British industry or alter its downward course. It does not have the resources to cope with superior foreign competition. Unemployment is increasing and the public services are going to deteriorate even further. The health service will be dominated by "rationing" but the arms budget will continue on the basis of the latest technology, as with the USA. All the contradictions that Marx analysed are grotesquely apparent on a world scale—huge technological and scientific capacity strangled by private property which more and more leads to poverty, repression and war.

It is necessary for the labour left and the trade unions to organise discussions on the perspectives of capitalism and socialism and organise struggles against the whole sale closing of factories, reaffirming the statification and planning of the economy for public as opposed to private benefit under workers control and denouncing NATO as a continued weapon of imperialist intervention against social progress. The labour left must also intervene over the issue of the falling monarchy to pose the issue of the socialist republic. The crisis of the leaderships of the workers states is an opportunity to clarify many issues over the path to a socialist society. 18.5.92.

Out of NATO, Out with the monarchy!

THE MAY DAY MANIFESTO. 1992

THE POSADIST IV INTERNATIONAL

TO THE WORKING CLASS AND THE
MASSES OF THE WORLD

TO THE MASSES OF THE WORKERS
STATES.

TO THE COMMUNIST AND
SOCIALIST PARTIES AND THE LEFT
AND REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS.

The masses of the world are living a process of great reflection on the events which have moved the USSR and the whole of the workers states. At the same time they continue their struggles against the capitalist system to avoid this unleashing against society the bitter consequences of its decomposition. Capitalism uses ephemeral advantages which may arise from the crisis of the political leaderships of the communist and socialist movement together with all the desperation which is shown in the preparation of the war.

The provocation which imperialism is seeking to mount against the revolutionary state of Libya and against the whole of the Arab peoples confirms the lie that is concealed behind the solemn declaration of the "end of the cold war". North American imperialism with world capitalism has no other solution for its own crisis and to resolve the contradictions accumulated through inter capitalist competition, than that of launching war against the masses with the transitory reduction of the weight of the workers states on a world plane. Quite contrary to those who suppose that this would calm the warlike anxieties of imperialism, it has stimulated them to accelerate their plans.

UNO under the control of the government of the United States has been converted into an instrument with which imperialism seeks to conceal in a most absurd way its plans for war. After the massacre which it realised in Iraq which it continues to repress using the economic boycott occasioning thousands of deaths of children and old people, it now mounts the farce utilising the Lockerbie crash to strike at the Libyan revolution. The Libyan revolutionary state originated from the revolution of the young soldiers who in 1969 overthrew King Idris. In a short time with the nationalisation of the oil wells and of the finances which were in the hands of the North Americans—Libya established important social progress. This is one of the

few countries where oil has not served to enrich small layers allied to world capitalism, but which has contributed to bring out of backwardness millions of human beings; in less than twenty five years child mortality has been reduced by half and the life expectancy has been increased to sixty two (it had not reached fifty in the time of the monarchy) and the educational and health provision of the population has improved enormously. Central planning and agrarian reform has developed agricultural production even in the desert and today agricultural production per capita is more than that of Italy or France and in a short time Libya will reach self sufficiency in food.

This is what world capitalism wishes to eliminate; the Libyan revolution and its example for all the Arab world. Egypt with an economic structure and tradition of a previous period is floundering in a crisis which has been accentuated with the economic plan of privatisation and submission to the dictates of the IMF, placed in position by Sadat before and continued by Mubarak. The result is that hundreds of thousands of Egyptians find employment precisely in Libya which develops and not in Egypt which is linked with international capitalism in a subordinate position.

We appeal to all the parties of the left and to the masses of the world to make solidarity with the Libyan masses and with all the Arab and Palestinian masses, to impede the economic blockade and the war against Libya. We do not support certain adventurist actions which some leaderships like Libya have undertaken using various means to be able to defend their anti imperialist revolution; but this does not impede much less in these moments, expressing all our solidarity with the present leadership and the Libyan people for the social and political progress which they have undertaken. The real terrorists in this phase of history are imperialism and its capitalist allies.

North American imperialism is accelerating its plans to settle accounts with the rest of the capitalist world and with the world revolution; the contained struggle of the masses of the workers states and that of the capitalist countries. It has neither the means nor the capacity to resolve in market competition its differences with

Germany, with Japan and with the rest of Europe. It needs to prepare itself and impose on them by means of the constant tension of war. It does not have the capacity because the counter revolutionary policy which it has conducted against the USSR and the workers states during the last years has exhausted it economically, politically and socially. It must continue then with its war policy to be able to concentrate the forces of world financial and industrial big business behind this objective and also because it has no confidence that the retreats imposed on the workers states are a real and definitive "return to capitalism".

The soviet masses and the other workers states are seeking by all means to retake the road for which they mobilised in the eighties to put an end to the power and privileges of the leading bureaucratic layers and open the road to better forms of democratic participation in the construction of socialist society. The lack of revolutionary leaderships as an alternative, and absence in time of marxist currents with mass authority which could lead to the process of regeneration of a part of these leading groups towards the retaking of the process of the construction of socialism, has not allowed the crisis to have a progressive conclusion; it has given place to the substitution of leaderships with reactionary sectors, generally originating in the same degenerated caste, which submit to world capitalism and dream of entering into history as gravediggers of the workers state; with this policy the bureaucracy is breaking its final links with progress and precipitating the conditions for its own liquidation. There are a thousand elements which bring out the transitory quality of the dominion of such leaderships,

In this process the Posadist IV International salutes with immense joy the recent appearance in the USSR of Trotskys great book "The Revolution Betrayed", as also the great success of its sale. In this way the critical and self critical reflection of the communist vanguard and of the masses of the workers state is being made without damaging the instruments and the great social economic, and cultural gains established by the Russian revolution and the experience of the construction of the workers states. It is for this reason that the road

leads to marxism, to return to marxism as Cde Posadas posed. The first edition in the USSR of "The Revolution Betrayed" of Trotsky is a great step in this direction and a demonstration that it is not a question of the "fall of communism" through which the former USSR is living.

The triumph over nazism, the extension of the structure of the workers state in Europe and the development of new workers states in the world, the anti colonial and anti imperialist revolutions, the great scientific, social and economic process in the USSR and of the system of the workers states led to a process of the partial regeneration of its leaders reversing historically the Stalinist process and imposing a return to the great objectives which Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks outlined for the future of the Russian revolution. The USSR was linked organically to all the progress in the social and revolutionary struggles beyond the doubts and crises of its leaderships. Hence it is not possible to speak of the years which preceded Gorbachev simply as "glacis" or "stagnant".

From the period of "68" and Vietnam to the support to the Cuban revolution, the revolutions in Angola, Mozambique, to Afghanistan and Nicaragua, the masses of the great capitalist countries and of Asia, Africa and Latin America felt themselves participants in a gigantic process in which the function and the example of the USSR and the other workers states has been determining. Humanity has been able to live the greatest of its experiences in history: communist and nationalist, military and religious, workers, peasant and tribal leaderships have ascended from the silence to which the regime of private property condemned them to the possibility of having in their hands the leadership of countries, regions and great social movements. They have had to do this without having been able to make a prior experience, without economic means and with the opposition without quarter of the world capitalist system which at the same time has constructed the greatest military apparatus of all time with the objective of containing and smashing the world revolution and has intervened throughout the world to organise the counter revolution.

The Soviet Union without having reestablished the marxist leadership at the level of the Bolsheviks of the period of Lenin and Trotsky represented in this way, partially but legitimately, the objective that the revolutionaries projected in 1917 and the comrades that created the Third International; the workers state integrated its future with the future of the world socialist revolution and made possible a relation of forces which besieged the capitalist system to which no perspective was left but the launching of the war. The bureaucratic origin of the leadership of the workers state limited the levels of the process of the regeneration of the workers state and made it partial as cde Posadas analysed and it was this which limited the qualitative necessary leap of the leaderships to develop in a superior form this structure of history.

In this sense the progress of the world class struggle imposed new demands and uncovered the limits of the social, political and economic proposals of the bureaucratic leaderships. The economy of the workers states would have had to extend the levels of planning and to incorporate the masses in the decision of the objectives of the programming in the economy and society; at the same time the active and leading participation of the masses was the only means to develop the capacity and the objectivity of the leadership ready to confront capitalism in this phase in which the question of the war has been placed on the agenda. To the so-called "arms race" there did not correspond an equal development of socialist relations, the economic potential of the workers state remained limited to 10% of its true possibilities. The soviet leadership wished to resolve the problem with a new, great conciliation with world capitalism and made the most complete military and strategic concessions including the abandonment of the DDR to its own fate.

THE WAR CONTINUES TO BE THE ONLY ANSWER OF CAPITALISM.

Capitalism before this situation has responded according to its nature hastening all the plans for war. It has not only not dissolved its international

organs of repression nor abandoned its armaments (the reductions in general consist in the renovation of its arsenals for other more up to date weapons) but it launched the war against Iraq to exert a pressure and push the Soviet leadership to capitulation.

The massacre of the Iraqi people in this sense was a military action in which imperialism wished to show its ability to concentrate world capitals to launch the counter revolutionary war. Capitalism not only did not reply with peaceful co-existence but intensified its aggressive actions. This

represented a mortal blow for the centrist policy of Gorbachev which led to the coup of August 1991 and the effort to dissolve the present Soviet Union. This buried definitively any possibility of peaceful co-existence between the two systems; the only objective of capitalism is the destruction of any theoretical or real possibility of socialism or communism. But does it have the strength to achieve this?

CAPITALISM HAS NOT INCREASED ITS OWN FORCES.

The acceleration of its own war plans is not the result of an increase in the forces of the capitalist system for at the same time that the crisis develops in the workers states, the system of private property lives its own crisis which is shown in all aspects, political, social and economic. An example of this is the great debt accumulated by the main capitalist countries which is the result of the policy against the workers states and the world revolution of these last twenty years, a policy which has enriched a sector of high finance and of the arms industry at the cost of the rest and has exhausted the economic system. A new greater concentration and new more aggressive war plans are the only path which remains.

In the competition capitalism wastes an ever greater part of production on a world scale and with the present concentration this law of capitalist functioning means the liquidation of enormous productive energies, entire competitive countries, war

itself. The decision of the Pentagon to transform the United States into an hegemonic power is not the result of a document "top secret" but is now its public attitude. The provocation itself against Libya corresponds to these plans. A war will mean a blow at the business of Italy and France as it will mean also a serious

effort to control essential sources of energy supplies for the European bourgeoisie.

Another element which intimidates capitalism is the constant struggle of the masses throughout the world. The masses affected by the crisis of the workers states and of its leaderships in the capitalist countries - which do not understand what is happening in the workers states - have not been paralysed and continue their struggles. Capitalism wants to use the situation to throw back the various conquests which resulted from the great weight acquired in the world by the Soviet Union such as the sliding scale of wages and pay for unemployment and has a perspective in a few years to expel from production millions of workers alone in the seven main capitalist countries.

The great strikes in the USA like that of Caterpillar lasted for months and the working class outside the mafia which leads the union, gained the support of the left workers and intellectual vanguard of the whole country. In less than a month in New York half a million people demonstrated in defence of Cuba and half a million, in the majority women, came out to defend the legislation in favour of abortion. In the same way

in France, Italy, Germany, Spain and Britain the working class, the peasants and particularly the youth have waged and wage important fights. The recent elections in France, in Britain, in Germany and Italy have indicated in a partial form the attitude of the masses. It is this way because there are no prepared leaderships for this stage. But anyway all the main parties of the bourgeoisie have suffered great losses and also the social democrats who propose a solution to the capitalist crisis have been criticised.

The elections in France have been a punishment for the submission that the socialist party of Mitterand has made in the interests of French imperialism. The growth of the right of Le Pen is at the cost of the rest of the moderate right and of a part of the base of the left which finds no orientation on the part of the big workers parties. It is a transitory support which with an anti capitalist policy and in the social struggles is going to join with the forces of the parties of the left and of the trade unions. The votes to the greens is a vote for the left, it is the base of the socialists which wanted to demonstrate critically against its leadership and at the same time to maintain itself

within the camp of the left. The communists even obtaining the support from an important part of the workers vanguard have not been able to attract support because of its policy of competition with the socialists in the name of a programme which in the final instance represents the interests of the national bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie.

The recent elections in Britain have seen the conservatives victorious, but they won losing a great number of seats and helped by the present electoral system which is a real swindle against the popular will. The Labour vote although having increased a great deal did not succeed in overcoming the conditions imposed by the said system by reason of the excessive guarantees which the leadership of Kinnock gave to British imperialism eliminating the minimum programmatic reference to socialism, to nationalisations or to disarmament. British imperialism through the conservatives carried out one of the most violent campaigns in history against the Labour party to which these answered by yielding politically. These concessions deprived important sectors of the masses of confidence and they were not attracted to vote Labour. The crisis of British capitalism is very serious and the conservatives and partly also the Labour party do not appear with much resources to administer the next stage which will be one of great recession and retreat in the standard of living of the masses.

The elections in Italy have meant the defeat of the party of big business; the Christian Democracy. The bosses met in the full course of the electoral campaign and launched their programme for the future; privatisations, closing of the factories, state subsidies to renovate the

productive apparatus and to dismiss workers, the elimination of basic worker conquests such as the sliding scale of wages and the gains in favour of women workers and the limitation of negotiations with the trade unions and trade union organisations at the base. The defeat of the Christian Democracy and of the parties of the government deprives them then of the political instrument to push forward this programme. Such a defeat has been the result of the great mobilisations of the working class against the threats of unemployment and

Continued on page 4

Belgium

ECONOMIC DECAY AND POLITICAL FRAGMENTATION.

The elections of November 1991 saw an important advance in votes for the extreme right above all in the Flemish region and for the ecologist party in the Walloon region and also a list Van Rossen (somewhat like the Italian radical party). The former gains were at the expense of the CVP (Social Christians) and the second group took votes from the CP, the liberal party, the Socialist party and the parties of the extreme left - POS and PRB. In these elections a part of the petit bourgeoisie and workers, marginalised by the capitalist crisis have shown their protest against the parties of the centre left and liberals incapable of proposing a policy otherwise than austerity for the workers and the petit bourgeoisie.

Moreover the demonstration of the 22 March which assembled more than a hundred thousand against social deprivation against the extreme right and against racism also expressed the social will and sentiment of the population which was not to be found in the formation of the government following the elections. People mobilised not only against the extreme right, but also against everything which favours it, against the deterioration of the conditions of work and of life in general. It was a demonstration of popular unification to defend human dignity and solidarity, young and old, with different nationalities and an important participation of factory workers. The trade union organisations mobilised a great part of the masses which took part. This is important for the future organisation of the struggles in Belgium.

There is a considerable conflict in the political leaderships of the workers movement; between the PS and the SP, between the Brussels Region and the Walloon region even without considering the various conflicts between the leaders of each provincial sector. The trade unions have maintained a national cohesion but remain on the defensive and support the programme of the Haene government considering that this is the least evil in relation to a government openly of the right.

The process of capitalist concentration continues massively. The Societe Generale has been bought by a large French company, the BBL by a large Dutch company and Sabena has passed into the control of Air France and many smaller enterprises have become the subsidiaries of the big German and American corporations.

The de Haene government not only does nothing against this

but it must find means to make the working population pay for the crisis. To do this it has to conform with the norms of the FMI and of the ECC to reduce the public debt. An important part of the budget prepared for the new government will serve only to pay off the interest and the capital of this debt to the great international banks. This will be at the expense of the working population, the pensioners, the small businesses, with the increase in taxes on numerous products of consumption, through the increase in social contributions from wages and through the whole sale deprivation of the right to work for extensive layers of workers.

There is in addition the intention to privatise a great number of public services or to sell public enterprises. Estimated figures have been suggested for these sales in the press and the socialists have been very indignant, but in fact SP sectors have been partial to this plundering to fill the hole in the public debt. A government of the left must have the decision to demand the annulling of this "national" debt like the countries of the third world with their debts.

Thus the propaganda of the extreme right criticises the deterioration of life but throws the responsibility on immigration (although they say nothing about the rich Japanese or the Saudis). But they are careful to make no attack on the system which utilises the immigrant workers as a pressure on the rest of the working class. Capitalism uses the fascists as a means of intimidating the socialist parties saying either go along with us or we use the fascists.

There have been some very important strikes during the last period - Caterpillar, Volkswagen, GB and strikes of teachers and hospital workers. All this cries out for a programme of general struggle against the capitalist system as a whole.

The left has some weight in Belgium. But it is necessary to develop a common programme which places the emphasis on the right to work, right to vote of the immigrant workers, right to housing and education, control of the political representatives with right of immediate recall, the extension of public control over the banks and energy, workers control to prevent industrial pollution, control of hiring workers and the conditions of work.

Belgian Section

the repression of the government against the media and the television programmes of the left, and the mobilisations of the youth against the mafia and for the transformation of the university and the whole educational structure

The masses with the elections have struck at the structure of power but at the same time have not been able to centralise their forces through their traditional parties. The socialists have submitted themselves to the plans of capitalism and the leadership of the former ICP with the transformation of the party to a reformist perspective has limited immensely the possibility of attracting the support of the masses. Anyway the great currents of the former ICP (PDS and Communist Refoundation) maintained the votes which the ICP got in 1990 and together with the Greens, Radicals and Left Christian Democrats received over 30% of the votes.

THE MEANING OF THE GROWTH OF THE FASCIST MOVEMENTS.

The votes to the Northern League in Italy respond to the protests of sectors of the middle and petit bourgeoisie in front of the arrogance and corruption of the capitalist state, but also to the lack of response on the part of the left to the crisis. This movement is a reactionary and chauvinist reply to the contradiction created by capitalism itself through the exploitation of the impoverished countries to the South, the cause of the growing immigration which serves to make a pressure on the labour market.

But this "threat" to the well being of the rich populations is a manipulation, as these workers once arrived in Europe are occupied in the most burdensome jobs with low pay which no European worker accepts anymore and above all without any trade union protection or political rights. This represents the continuity of the reactionary policy of suffocating democratic and trade union rights and is the continuation of the war against communist ideas on the national level.

The nazis groups throughout Europe in this sense are a creation of capitalism and serve to prepare assassin layers and the conditions to repress not only the immigrant workers but also the European workers. The movement of Le Pen in France, the "revival" of the nazis rituals everywhere do not correspond to great social movements, but they are apparatuses paid and immediately propagandised. The

possibility or not of these developing depends on the type of response which the forces of the left can give to such a situation.

The plans of European capitalism have to be opposed to the maximum through the united front of the parties of the left and the trade union centres with a programme which proposes to go beyond the limits of the capitalist system; statification of the factories threatened with closure or unemployment, workers control to produce what serves the masses, full trade union and political rights to the immigrant workers, an economic plan aimed to develop the backward societies of Africa, Asia and Latin America and the conversion of the arms industries to useful purposes with the elimination of toxic material dangerous to health. Full trade union freedom and freedom of action to the factory committees and the pickets who sustain the strikes. For a programme of production geared to equality of conditions with the countries of the so called third world and solidarity with the masses who struggle against anti democratic regimes sustained by world capitalism. This is the programme of the working class to resolve the problems of immigration.

THE CRISIS AND STRUGGLES IN THE WORKERS STATES.

The mobilisations in the USSR against the programme of economic reforms as in Poland and the former DDR and of the Roumanian miners, are the actions which are determining the instability of the regimes in government since 1989. The masses have not made the great demonstrations since 1989 to give a blank cheque to bandits like Yeltsin. The latter seeks the aid of world capitalism to satisfy a reduced clientele which mobilised recently, in order to oppose it afterwards to the rest of the masses ; to apply completely his programme of reforms he must smash the resistance of the masses and this is not going to be easy. Yeltsin continually postpones measures, changes programme and ministers and fights against everyone because in reality he is clashing with the great structure which constitutes soviet statified property and with the consciousness which the masses have constructed integral with this structure.

The working class in the world and in a particular manner in the workers states are seeking to concentrate their forces, to centralise their experiences and impel the vanguard to overcome

a difficult moment in the selection of leaders ready for this stage of the anti capitalist struggle. In spite of the defection of their leaderships, the workers states have shown a valid structure and historic legitimacy. With all the immense productive capacity of the capitalist regime it has in no way been able to develop science, culture and human relations. This is the strength which allows soviet society to resist all the empiricism of the policy of the "community of the bandits" (CIS). Capitalism made a great propaganda suggesting that with the winter, millions of soviet citizens were going to die, and so make believe that communism had brought society to a state of barbarism; this did not succeed because the structure of the workers state impeded it. It is the state industries and their workers collectives which guarantee the distribution of the elements of prime necessity. With some economy they buy... "The Revolution Betrayed of Trotsky".

The working class of the workers states must make this experience confronting the provocations of world capitalism which is entering the workers state to disintegrate it or make it retreat as in Yugoslavia. The crisis of Yugoslavia after Tito is the result of the failure of the policy of "self management" which did not lead to socialist progress but on the contrary to regionalisation and inequality. Also in the USSR the war between Armenians and Azerbaijani is fomented by imperialism. In the case of Yugoslavia the participation of fascists and mercenaries is notorious at the side of the Croats and in the second case the mercenaries of Lebanese origin are present on both sides.

If Cuba had been a capitalist country in the same conditions as so many in Latin America it would have been transformed into a dictatorship where a handful of rich people exploited a majority of starving. But in Cuba the little which exists is shared and the children and the old people are guaranteed food, education and health which in a continent like Latin America is no small thing. In a continent where malnutrition and cholera is extending where education is the street, and health goes into the arms of death, Cuba continues being the example for the struggle of millions of human beings. The crisis of leadership in the workers states does not negate this, although it is necessary to distinguish the structural crisis (result of the previous

existence of the bureaucracy, waste, arbitray planning, empiricism) with the conjunctural crisis (result of the disintegration of states and entire economies, of the internal wars fomented by nationalist cliques and the invasion of the empiricism of the market); in any case history teaches another great conclusion; "socialism in a single country" was and is a reactionary utopia.

At the same time the plan of imperialism to want to separate the Cuban masses from the workers state, from their leadership is stupid. The masses criticise the errors of the leadership as did the recent congress of the Communist Youth which claimed a greater democratic participation in the leadership of the country and questioned the programme of concessions to the capitalist system as with the joint ventures in tourism and in industry the deal over oil; but even making these criticisms which are the same as we make of the Cuban leadership which has not understood and has not intervened in the crisis of the political leaderships of the USSR and of the other workers states, the masses fuse with their leadership in the defence of the Cuban revolution. We appeal to the world vanguard to support the Cuban revolution and to demonstrate all the solidarity with the Latin American workers state during the first visit of Castro to Europe.

The struggle of the masses of the world is expressed also in the recent defeat of Apartheid in South Africa. Although there is still much ground to win, the result of the referendum shows that the national liberation front exercises a great influence over the white population which has been decisive in imposing changes on the government of de Klerk.

Throughout Latin America, the masses are preparing new battles. The masses have gone through experiences of popular organisation of a soviet type as in the periphery of Lima; the savage assassination of comrade Moyano, organiser and leader of the poor population by the Sendero Luminosos, is not going to

stop the struggles. The reply of capitalism is the coup of Fujimori which as the only reply to the crisis tries to impose arrogantly the pro imperialist and free market policy. The popular mobilisations begin to influence also the lower layers of the army tired with serving as the gendarmes to the local oligarchies. This has been seen in Venezuela and now in Peru; the coup is also to reestablish the control of the bourgeoisie over the population, reducing the democratic expression of the left and of the nationalist sectors. In Argentina, Brasil, Mexico capitalist countries of a certain weight, the governments apply neo liberal policies with disastrous results for the populations. In these countries the diversion of the "end of communism" can have no effect; the masses have a clear understanding as to what "real capitalism" is all about.

This First of May is an important moment for the working class, for the parties and movements which have not let themselves be intimidated in front of the crisis of the workers states to organise new struggles, to extend the discussion and the experience of the construction of the workers states and socialism. Revolutionary Party, workers and popular control, soviet democracy, socialisation and planning of the economy on a world scale in the interest of all the peoples, unification of all struggles on a European and world level, these are indispensable and urgent objectives for the progress of humanity. It is necessary to make a universal united front of all the marxist, revolutionary, religious, progressive, left nationalists currents to discuss the problems of the construction of socialism to help the populations of the countries who have made experiences of socialism to advance without falling into the fraud of the "market economy" which means to lead humanity in an accelerated way towards a new world war. 19 april 1992.

THE POSTPONED CONTINUATION OF THE ARTICLE

ON PARTIAL REGENERATION WILL APPEAR IN THE NEXT ISSUE.

SUBSCRIBE TO

RED FLAG!

THE DECOMPOSITION OF BRITISH CAPITALISM POSES THE NECESSITY FOR THE PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS.

The discussion in the LP over the electoral defeat has not been seriously deepened. The apparatus suffered a major blow, but in the absence of much political life in the LP and the Unions and the absence of a well organised left tendency, it hopes to survive with a quick wash and brush up, varying the slogans but seeking to gain office on the incompetence of the government and without conceding anything to the left. The election of the Smith-Becket team guarantees the continuity of pious consensus with capitalism.

Even from the Whitty report it is clear that substantial sectors of the worker and poorer petit bourgeois base of the LP had no confidence in the party line, of conceding to capitalist pressures and telling capitalism the LP could be relied upon to defend its interests. What has labour to offer the population than a little more charity even though this may be decked out in the latest jargon of "empowering people". The LP apparatus is not concerned with changing society but winning office, rather like gaining promotion in a profession or in business.

The leaders will put on some lachrymose performances about "compassion" and paying attention to the "grass roots" and drone on as before, enjoying the "best club" in the world as they call parliament. The warm farewell of Major to Kinnock shows that both are on the same side in the class war-anti socialist.

Even so objectively the left is in a better position to intervene and in this sense the declarations of some unions against the privatisation of the railways and the mines has importance. But to weigh consistently this left has to develop a greater political life and a better relation with the population outside the Labour party because being tied utterly to parliament is to permit asphyxiation. It is important to see that the present LP is even more devoid of ideas than in the past. At

least in the period of Kautsky in the German social democracy there was some semblance of a theory of changing capitalism. Now they have nothing. This apparatus has never succeeded in anything except in their careers. The Welfare State which capitalism is now dismantling was not the result of the Labourists. They profited from the war which shook capitalism and made it concede. That was all and now that capitalism is in another situation they collaborate objectively with it. The only perspective they seem to propose is "we must all putrefy together".

The Labour party is a bourgeois party with a worker base. Despite the famous Clause four the immense contradiction between its base and its bourgeois character as a party persists. The labour party originated in a phase when capitalism constructed an extensive labour aristocracy in different historical conditions from those prevailing now. Its orientation towards capitalism but without any important reforms to offer the population will continue to undermine its traditional relation to the masses. The social structure of British capitalism is being shattered. The post second world war boom is over and whatever the recovery it will be limited.

The UK share of world exports has stabilised at 6.4% of world exports in itself a decline from 8.1% in 1979. The massive weight of imports shows the weakness of the manufacturing base. The argument over devaluation is not decisive because there is no remedy, devaluation or no devaluation which is going to solve the problems of a falling economy. Inter capitalist competition is going to be more ferocious, whatever currency expedients are devised.

While capitalism throws more people out of work, the right in the party wants to weaken the link with the trade unions. The latter demand is logical from the point of view

Contents.

Page 1 Editorial.
Page 2 Text on Partial Regeneration; Italy.

Workers of the world, unite!



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'

Price 30p.

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

410 July 17 1992. Price 30p.

of capitalism because it wants to weaken the defences of the working class. They attack the union block vote as being undemocratic, but they did not bother about democracy when the block union vote automatically determined a total right wing policy. Matters are more complex now and left trade unions are a permanent threat to the class conciliators. What no one has mentioned is the need for a genuine trade union democracy where delegates are mandated by the shop floor putting an end to mythical figures of so many million votes for a motion when the union members have not discussed the resolutions in question.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF A UNITED CAPITALIST EUROPE.

The crisis provoked by the Danish rejection of the Maastricht treaty in the Referendum is a very striking example of the waning political and social capacity and authority of contemporary capitalism. There are great divisions among the capitalist class across Europe over this treaty and the antagonisms between the various powers is not going to go away. Capitalism cannot transcend the national state. Clashes are inevitable between stronger and weaker capitalist nations and further weakness is shown in the the political disorder present in one form or another in all the European countries. The experience in Italy is revealing.

The assassination of the public prosecutor Falcone was arranged at the very top because only the small number of the highest state security could know of his movements. This points to a violent internal fight among the bourgeoisie on the level of the kidnapping and murder of Moro also arranged at the highest level. The social and political weakness of capitalism has been shown with

particular force in Italy but the underlying tendency is within all capitalism. The latter seeks a strong repressive state with encouragement to fascist sectors.

THE YUGOSLAV CRISIS.

World capitalism finally decided to encourage the break up of Yugoslavia as part of their strategy of "combat readiness" ie to attempt to control disagreeable events in the world process and the world revolution, but particularly when there is an opening to try to smash a workers state. Capitalism cannot solve the most basic needs of humanity ie housing etc but it knows when to make "the Serbs" the "cause of all the trouble". Such is the primitive retrograde mentality of capitalism which has accelerated all the problems of Yugoslavia resulting from the previous disaster of "self management". The threat of military intervention in Yugoslavia is part of the counter revolutionary offensive of world capitalism with the aid of the Yeltsin clique in Moscow. The pious concerns over the children of Sarajevo is utterly bogus. Imperialism has actively connived at the break up of the Yugoslav Workers state and at the sending of fascist mercenaries and support for the Croatian fascists. If they were so concerned with people why did they never intervene to help the millions in Africa dying from wars or against the murderous Israeli assassins in the Lebanon. Quite simple. It does not suit their class interests. It suits them to intervene towards Yugoslavia and creates a precedent to intervene later in Eastern Europe.

THE RIO CONFERENCE.

This conference was not of the slightest importance in confronting the problems of

ecology because these problems are caused under capitalism by the policies of private property. The reactionary press have tried to present the problems of the "Third World" as the result of over population. The policies of the local bourgeoisie are based on market economics with disastrous effects. Poverty on the land and the extortion by debt repayments has not been stopped. At least Castro exploded the mythology of this conference in his denunciation of imperialist and capitalist policies. It is typical that social democratic parties such as the LP have no anti imperialist policies which link in a world anti capitalist struggle. Such is the criminal parochialism of such parties and their prostration in front of imperialism.

THE WORLD PROCESS.

Bush in his negotiations with Yeltsin was at pains to appear as the great lord of the world. The utter farce of the much trumpeted "peace" process in the Middle East has ended with more Israeli oppression against the Arabs and regular bombing of South Lebanon. It is in fact a war process directed by the United States. However the defeat of the Likud is another example of the weakening of a counter revolutionary base of imperialism. It would be naive to believe that this will change the Middle East because more than Israel is at stake, the policy of imperialism is involved. Nevertheless as in South Africa- in spite of the massacre of Boipatong- open reaction has suffered a social defeat and this affirms the continuous isolation of imperialism. Similarly in Latin America Bush had to beat a hasty retreat in front of demonstrations in little

Continued on page 4

Partial Regeneration and the Crisis in the CIS.

Part 2.

The International Bureau of the Posadist IV International.

The communist world movement must give support to Cuba and condemn all those who are saying that Cuba must continue on the road of privatisations and bourgeois democracy. But it cannot escape theoretical and political interpretation of this process. It must combine support for Cuba with a discussion over soviet democracy and the problems of the construction of socialism. The Cuban masses are ready to give their lives for the gains of the revolution but they have to have confidence in their leadership. They have to feel it capable of giving a perspective and an interpretation of this process.

THE CRISIS IN THE "DEFORMED WORKERS STATES.

The crisis in the workers states of Eastern Europe has been more profound since it is a question of "deformed" workers states as J. Posadas explained in his texts, which originated in the intervention of the Red Army after the war still under the leadership of Stalin. Here there was conciliation with the structures, movements and social bases of the previous regimes. Above all the political leaderships were purged and submitted to the soviet bureaucracy. A real social integration with the USSR did not develop. Comecon did not represent a real integration and united planning between the workers states towards the abolition of the idea of the nation itself, in the advance towards socialism. All the development which took place was the merit of economic planning, of the statification of property and of a certain functioning of the workers state, although contradictory. As Cde Posadas has already explained these "deformed" workers states where private interests, links with capitalism and an inheritance at the level of political leadership and of state apparatus of the whole Stalinist period co-existed, constituted the weakest link in the system of the workers states. They were the first to capitulate in front of capitalism when there were changes and crises in the USSR, when the soviet leadership renounced control and in turn no other political leadership developed in these countries with authority to develop a

socialist perspective, and the support of the masses. Thus it is the same caste, bureaucratic and recycled, deprived of its "communist" suit which goes over to lead the new cycle of reactionary measures, supporting itself on the legitimate discontent of people and in their movement to overthrow the bureaucracy.

The condemnation of the USSR and its bureaucratic leadership for the "handing over" of these countries are cries in the void. It is impossible to avoid the analysis of the dynamic which the population developed to reject the "communist" apparatuses, bureaucratic and enclosed which governed these countries. Some think mistakenly that the "strength" of the Warsaw Pact could have contained the situation, but here it is not a question of a combat between apparatuses, but of people themselves against the bureaucracy. Now is not the epoch of answering people with tanks. This was never the Bolshevik way of discussing. The Bonapartist bureaucracy utilised tanks as a substitute for the political intervention of people as in the case of Czechoslovakia against other very bureaucratic and reactionary sectors. It is necessary to use tanks against the counter revolution, against the capitalist armies never against people who wish to intervene. It is necessary to relate politically with the masses and it is necessary to have confidence in and stimulate people so that they can intervene! None of these communist parties was prepared for this. They believed that the power of the apparatus was eternal. People at the first opportunity that they had to express themselves directly posed out with the bureaucracy! Out with the privileged and not down with socialism! There was no reply, there were threats, efforts at repression and finally there was an improvised electoral solution with out orientation, without preparation without party life in which capitalism could exercise a great pressure, above all through the bureaucratic sectors, refugees from socialism. This explains why many people voted in many cases for reactionary or nationalist sectors; this was the only

We continue with the next part of the text on the process of partial regeneration which preceded the counter revolutionary coup of Yeltsin. The latter is hoping to turn a political blow into a complete social counter revolution. But as with the antecedent process, Yeltsin is working in a world constantly shaken by the tremors of capitalist crisis and war which affect and condition the CIS.

way of opposing and people wanted to vote against these apparatuses. This happened also in Germany and had very serious consequences in the specific problem of being a single but divided country.

THE CONCESSIONS TO CAPITALISM AND THE GDR.

It is true that the soviet leadership yielded terrain to capitalism unnecessarily. We condemn the soviet leadership for the lack of orientation, of discussion, of preparation of an alternative leadership to Honecker to maintain the workers state and to retake the process of the construction of socialism. The loss of the German Workers State is a great defeat for all the world workers movement. But the alternative could no longer be the tanks, when people mobilised in millions and demanded to intervene. The demand for unification, the national question was the ultimate blow at the apparatus of the former GDR which has to be condemned as treacherous, capitulationist and criminal; for years and years it prevented the masses expressing themselves and afterwards as a block it adhered to capitalism. It sold itself and betrayed without the least resistance, went over to the other side and abandoned the masses to their fate. The soviet leadership in these circumstances could and should have intervened politically. Now it is paying the price and the conclusion is; to each concession to capitalism there is no corresponding progress, like "international co-operation" but the counter revolution. Capitalism wanted to liquidate the GDR and is doing this. It wants the agreements with the USSR to do this nothing more.

But at the same time it is necessary not to abandon the dialectical materialist method in seeing that Germany is unified under capitalism—and in this sense the part of the former GDR cannot be characterised as a workers state—but this is not the end of everything. We have said that it is a Trojan horse in the city of German capitalism. Since today the

pieces. The same in Poland, Hungary and Rumania. Nevertheless these

countries are at once an expression of the world relation of forces and of the depth of the experience of the workers states; two years of distance from the process of the defeat of the "communist" bureaucracy, the reactionary leaderships of these countries have not succeeded in reestablishing capitalism. They have made laws, put on sale the public patrimony, have made a foreign policy of alliance with imperialism, have made a Thatcherite social policy and find that world capitalism has thrown them to their fate. Capitalism is not going to invest, firstly because it has no interest or capacity and secondly because it has no confidence that these countries could really return completely to the bourgeois conception. What is notable is that this rejection of the capitalist mentality is in peoples minds, it is a problem of culture, of better social relations.

The new reactionary leaderships of Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and even those hybrid leaderships of Albania, Bulgaria and Rumania, but who have similar programmes of privatisation and agreements with capitalism, now see themselves confronted with this structure which they cannot destroy easily; they are damaging it, trying to destroy it, to demoralise the working class and eradicate communist ideas. They have arrived at the barbarism of closing hundreds of homes for children, suppressing gains by the population, of women, of old people. They develop layers of adventurers, financial speculators and every type of corruption. The "new rich" appear who already existed before but the workers state had not allowed them to rob so much. But they do not succeed in breaking the structure of the workers state, not only the statifications and a whole state functioning but principally of the consciousness of people who are accustomed to live without capitalism, without competition and dispute and have an elevated sentiment of social justice. When there was rebellion against bureaucratic arrogance, the people did not have the least intention of reestablishing the feudal order. This is now the case

masses of the former GDR struggle every day and influence the masses of the "other" rich Germany. Capitalism is impotent to impose on the people of the former GDR to reason as individualist competitive bourgeois; it is incapable of developing this part of the country. It has neither the interest nor the possibilities for this. Hence the process of sale and liquidation of state enterprises has been so slow in the GDR. Hence the German capitalists do not intervene, have no security or interest to do so. And this is a question of their own country, but as Benedetti said the boss of Olivetti "the concept of the nation is superseded, capital has no colour". He himself threatened to take out his investments from Italy and send them to Thailand where he could make new profits with low paid work force. Thus the German bourgeoisie works in this way with the former GDR; similarly the Italian bourgeoisie with Albania and the whole of capitalism with the workers states of Eastern Europe who still await the investments which do not come.

CAN CAPITALISM HELP THE WORKERS STATES IN CRISIS?

Nowhere in the world not even in the "hunting reserve" as is Latin America with respect to the USA or French Africa, has capitalism today the intention of developing society. How could it be otherwise if in the advanced capitalist countries themselves, the social conquests are reduced and exploitation at the level of robotisation and unemployment increases in infernal cycles constantly excluding millions of men and women from work. The masses are learning and above all they are concentrated in the difficult task of the construction of new leaderships which must arise from the ashes of the apparatuses of the ex communist parties and of the bureaucratic governments reduced to a thousand

with the former GDR in Poland,Rumania;every day there are strikes,demonstrations and protests.Now this is to be seen in the USSR in front of the reactionary governments which try to dominate in the republics.

The world workers movement has to count upon these forces.We call upon the working class of these countries to reconstruct the communist parties as revolutionary parties on the basis of experience which has been made and free of all the vestiges of Stalinism which will be necessary in the first stage to reconquer the course towards socialism.This situation cannot last and capitalism has already demonstrated that it is not going to help these countries and republics although many are led by its " friends " like Lithuania .It wants to smash and negate them nothing more.

THE SUPPORT TO THE WORLD REVOLUTION AND REVOLUTIONARY POLICY.

We appeal for a discussion to draw conclusions from these experiences of the liquidation of the bureaucratic apparatuses and the residue of Stalinism.The problem is that the soviet bureaucracy has never developed a programme of true integration with these countries nor with those who make revolutions or progressive coups although in very poor countries.They made inter state agreements of some programming as with Comecon;and then the economic,social and scientific effects of such agreements remained very limited.In the case of the revolutionary states, they could be efficacious to prevent imperialism overthrowing the governments.Undoubtedly the Soviet and Cuban interventions in Ethiopia,Angola and Mozambique contained the hand of imperialism from the military point of view.Even so imperialism sustained and maintained the counter revolutionary guerrillas to sabotage and impede any process of anti capitalist development.This required of the soviet leadership a political capacity which it did not have.Hence Egypt and Somalia countries which for many years have had nationalist leaderships of the left and a profound alliance with the soviets and in which the USSR invested money(recall Assuan for example) and military resources,exercising a great

influence, end in the arms of capitalism and have developed neither socially or economically.But this is not because the masses desired this, but because alternative communist leaderships were not developed.The policy of the soviet bureaucracy was submitted to bourgeois limitations of the leaderships and camarillas and interests formed remote from the masses.As no economic and military help could substitute for the development of these countries,they are exhausted and remain at the mercy of imperialism which tries to attract them to their sphere as colonies.

ECONOMIC COMPETITION WITH CAPITALISM AND THE DIFFERENT NATURE OF THE WORKERS STATE.

In recent years the necessity of the economic and military competition of the workers states with capitalism posed a situation of crisis without precedent for the USSR;the fall of prices of raw materials,which the USSR was exporting in great quantity to obtain foreign exchange and the limited competitiveness of its products on the world market,the costs of help to the other revolutionary countries or the other workers states in a context of waste and internal monopoly on the part of the mafia and the bureaucratic sectors(which have always existed but which have intensified in such circumstances) meant a struggle to the death in order that the USSR could maintain itself on a par with imperialism.

The problem was to formulate in what terms the USSR might confront world imperialism: as competitor against all to satisfy its own population at the cost of the rest of the world and above all pursuing standards of consumption on a par with the most developed capitalist countries? Or structure socially superior relations,promoting social justice the use of economic planning associated with soviet democracy so that such a model of development would promote the economy, and benefit millions of human beings, as the most profound structure of the workers state determines, combined with the necessity of advancing towards socialism?

The bureaucratic leadership responded as if it was logical that the workers state must make the free market to achieve the "superiority" of capitalism.

As Cde Posadas posed and in this sense completed and developed the analysis of Trotsky in the present stage,the problem of "equalling and surpassing" capitalism in terms of the productive structure is not posed as before in terms of the indices of the productivity of labour,technical-scientific capacity and global production;the experience of the workers state has given historic demonstrations of its possibilities even under bureaucratic dominion which reduces these immensely.

In this sense the USSR has demonstrated its strength in the accelerated industrialisation before and in the reconstruction after the war.A state not directed by the bourgeoisie arrived at confronting all world capitalism,developing itself to the level of competitor in space-which presupposes an enormous technological and productive capacity-showed to the peoples of the world a life of progress and consequently has produced the expansion of the revolution throughout the world with the instantaneous assimilation of statifications and of the economic programming by countries such as China and Cuba which have been backward for centuries.It is not possible to say today that the soviet "model" in toto was an absolute dictatorship, anti historic.This does not explain its world authority and extension.It cannot explain why millions of human beings and a multitude of revolutionary movements have adopted its experiences,methods and teachings ,even criticising and modifying them .This was not the merit of the bureaucracy-which we reiterate contained and distorted such an influence-but of the structure itself of this new State,this new economy which still now resists the disintegration promoted by the disbanded bureaucracy.

Moreover Posadas posed that the construction of socialism does not depend anymore strictly on the satisfaction of economic needs. Given that society could at least move in the ambit of democratic soviet relations- although still in the phase of the workers state-exploiting fully the existing bases and developing them,economic problems could be resolved with an unimaginable velocity.

Continued on page 4

ITALY. THE AGGRAVATION OF THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

AND THE SITUATION OF THE LEFT.

The situation in Italy is very unstable from both the political and institutional point of view. Italy has never been an engine of advanced capitalism and it had to fight to become a member of the select group of seven.Italian wealth has been based more on financial than industrial activities,on tourism and the tertiary service sector of the economy-and with every type of activity associated with the mafia.The arms trade and commercial exploitive relations with the "third world " are also important.But the wealth obtained industrially is also the product of almost a decade of industrial re-structuring at the cost of the workers.

In fact in the eighties the Italian trade unions gradually ceded to all the demands of the management over the closing of factories,the introduction of night work for women,non regulation of sweat factories with less than fifteen employees (six million workers are without protection),dismissing workers when reduction in production demanded it on the basis of an eventual and uncertain regaining of employment.

This situation is the result of a lack of anti capitalist policy not only of the trade unions, transformed into remote apparatuses with the suppression of any mechanism of democratic control,of assembly,elections and the replacement of delegates by functionaries, but also of the former PCI.

The latter has been transformed into the Democratic Party of the Left(PDS) and and the minority which did not accept such a metamorphosis has created the Party of Communist Refoundation(PCR) recalling the best popular traditions and struggles of the PCI.Such a crisis has been the result of on the one hand the lack of response to the apparent dynamism of capitalism in the eighties, but on the other of the events which have occurred in the workers states in Eastern Europe and the USSR in particular.

The Italian communists were not prepared either for the one or the other and in spite of the enormous electoral weight,the strength in the local government,the great cultural,trade union and political influence of the movement, they remained submitted to the alliances of power,to the eternal desire to enter government without changing profoundly the rules of the game.These

included the permanent role of imperialism through NATO in Italian politics,in alliance with a party of the Christian Democracy,of the socialists and of other bourgeois parties of lesser importance.To each period of advance of the PCI there corresponded a wave of terrorism and of conspiracies in order to destabilise the situation and intimidate the communist leaderships.The latter had neither the preparatiuon nor the audacity to respond to such a situation which would have naturally unchained enormous left forces throughout Europe.

On the other hand the USSR of this epoch did not have the policy for Italy as a function of the policy of interpenetration led by Breznev in order not to destabilise the world. In the most acute phase of the confrontation of system against system ,the soviet leadership proceeded to stimulate the Italian communists to go to government, but there was never a clear policy inb this sense.It was thus that the dynamic of capitalist development of the eighties and the polarisation of the confrontation with the USSR led the PCI into a cul de sac;to such a point that Berlinguer finally declared that he felt more protected "under the umbrella of NATO" than with the tanks of the Red Army.History has shown with the Gladio case(para military organisation of NATO to destabilise governments in Europe where it is considered necessary) that the PCI was really " protected." Continued on page 4

Ochetto, second secretary of the party since the death of Berlinguer and the new leading group found the magic formula to "unblock" the Italian political situation; profiting from the crisis of the communist world with the fall of the Berlin wall, the events of Tien an Men square and the other events of 1989 he proposed the change from being the Communist party to the Democratic Party of the Left. He hoped with that to recover what he called "the submerged left" which was not in the party because it did not accept a strictly communist party and remained dispersed between greens, catholics, the young and the petit bourgeoisie. But he only established that a part of this "submerged left" which had abandoned the CP precisely because of its class conciliation, had no intention of adhering to a party still more undefined.

He hoped equally that the socialists would accept finally a pact abandoning the alliance of fifteen years with the Christian Democracy, creating thus a "new majority" to change the system of power which had lasted for forty five years in Italy. This did not answer to a class analysis and did not take account of what the Italian socialists represent today; a petit bourgeois caste plunged up to the neck in the administrative apparatus, above all in the most appetising branches of the state economy, regional and national with an enormous highly paid clientele, making a competition with the Christian Democracy allies of American imperialism and mortal enemies of communism.

But in all this and the great desertion of membership of the PDS above all of the most militant sectors, a group recognised as a communist group seeks to influence the leadership, fighting openly against another tendency called the "improvers" which defends an alliance with the socialists and demands practically the unconditional re-unification with them to enter at any price the Socialist International. The PDS proclaims its million members but there is much reason to doubt this for a great part of the ex militants of the PCI have had their cards renewed by the PDS without that being confirmed by them.

The Communist Refoundation on the other hand gained initially from the last Congress of the PCI a minority of members but also a great number of militants who had abandoned the PCI on the basis of its conciliatory policy in the eighties. It has today about 150,000 members. Since then it has been enlarged with "Proletarian Democracy" (a small left party with combative positions but with little electoral possibilities) and other movements. If it is true that the central nexus of the Refoundation is constituted from worker, trade union and popular cadres of a communist tradition, numerous other supporters including the presence of young people has changed its physiognomy.

The Refoundation made its first national congress in December 1991 with great difficulties in establishing an identity between the representatives of marxist orthodoxy, the guardians of the symbol and of the communist liturgy and the representation of a "new communist force" capable of interpreting the tragic events in the east without renouncing either traditions or principles. The first road was certainly cut by the events of August 1991 in the USSR which had an immediate effect and gave birth to a period of discussions which have not finished. The most "orthodox" leaders like Cossuta have held very flexible positions opening a common reflection with the Stalinists, the Trotskyists, and the anarchists on the future of socialism. They have defended a more flexible functioning of the party in order to avoid the repetition of the bureaucratisation and careerism of the former PCI.

What party is going to represent the left in Italy in the next period? It is a difficult question. In the last elections the PDS obtained 17% of the votes whereas 20% had been

The new technology of production, even those developed by capitalism produce more goods than is necessary to live on the human plane because capitalism must invent a consumption market; an important part of the population of the rich countries not only have everything but do not know what to do to consume what they have. The confines of the standards of "socially considered" wealth have extended themselves, but also human consciousness has been extended and in a superior velocity. Thus it is that in capitalism itself people are opposed to consumerism, the generalised waste and reject the enormous accumulation of existing wealth. This is the rebellion of the productive

From page 1

Panama already savagely oppressed by the Pentagon. The Bush Yeltsin conference made no difference to the fact that imperialism is keeping its nuclear arsenal with the objective of intimidating and assassinating humanity. It may have been Yeltsin's "happiest day" but he got little from it and at Munich was obliged to offer raw material resources of the CIS as collateral for loans. The meetings of Yeltsin and imperialism were a distant parallel to the Soviet Nazi pact and have as much chance of "success". Yeltsin may grovel but he will never grovel enough for the assassins in the Pentagon. With the trial of the Communist Party, Yeltsin is hoping to further his schemes for social counter revolution but the road is difficult because even his clique and the "Russian" army are faced with a ferocious enemy which has no interest in Yeltsin save as a repressor of communists and a

predicted. The Refoundation got 7%, one percent more than was foreseen. These elections have been a test to verify the forces of each and its social representation, but the crisis of capitalism is not going to allow any possibility of experimentation over a long period. A great social crisis is developing, with the increase—as a part of the global strategy of imperialism—in xenophobic and fascist demonstrations, increase in unemployment, reduction of social gains, increase in corruption and the probable participation of Italy in the warlike adventures incited by imperialism.

The communist left can play a very important role in this situation. But the condition is to recover authority over the workers movement and the young people who protest in a multitude of ways against the bureaucratisation of the trade unions, the mafia, the war, seeking to organise themselves and give no sign of capitulation.

If the crisis in the workers states has been a blow in the experiences for the construction of a new society, it has not altered the brutal contradictions of capitalism and the will of people to struggle against it. It remains for the communist vanguard to give a programmatic and anti capitalist perspective to such a process of struggles. April 1992.

forces of this stage which shows at once that "everything can be done" but that if all remains in the hands of capitalism the results are aberrant.

The bureaucracies of the workers states have taken capitalism as a reference to compare the development of the so called "windows" of Europe like Germany, Switzerland, Sweden and then they made a false comparison between the world of the so called socialist countries and the countries of the capitalist sphere, ignoring totally the other face of capitalism which is the horrific misery of the countries of what is called the third world. But even considering the rich countries, it is false to pose the level of consumption as a central

element of comparison. In this sense Posadas has posed in a profound and decisive form, the problem of the criterion of wealth and standard of living in the developed capitalist countries not only via the economic indicators per capita, the consumption of meat, how many shoes, cars but including the social conditions of life, the rhythm of work, crime, environmental pollution, contamination and fabrication of food, not to speak of the social conditions of the pensioners, the exclusion of the young people from life, the unemployed, the mafias and all the other things which any person who lives in capitalism knows well.

To be continued.

wrecker of the workers state. Imperialism expects a large pound of flesh for every minute piece of aid.

THE DISCUSSION ON THE MONARCHY IN BRITAIN

The recent preoccupation with the monarchy is linked to discussions within capitalism over the function of the monarchy ie whether it has much use. Some might be prepared to junk it. But for capitalism junking the monarchy has its dangers, because the process of discussing the monarchy opens up other discussions for example about a socialist as opposed to a capitalist republic. The left must press forward on this issue but associate such a discussion with the general programme against capitalist hierarchy and privilege.

A most powerful case must be made throughout the workers movement for the programme of social transformations. The appearance of the counter

revolutionary regime in the Soviet Union has undoubtedly shaken the communist vanguard, but the soviet masses are not to be so easily dismissed. In the great events which are going to develop whatever the criminal plans of Yeltsin, he cannot erase historic experiences like 1917 and the defeat of the nazis. In the new stage of capitalist decay and inevitable war these will express themselves decisively.

The idea that capitalism has somehow won an argument with socialism is totally absurd because all the usual expression of this rotten system continues with redoubled force—the continuous contradiction between market and production, the inevitable tendency towards war, the reduction of most of humanity to poverty, the vast wastage of resources on arms, the complete incapacity to solve even minimum problems such as traffic congestion. The world is now replete with enormous unsolved issues which are accumulating from the fight in China where bourgeois layers want to try to liquidate the workers state or the countries of Eastern Europe where even with reactionary governments left forces continue to develop as in Czechoslovakia or East Germany, to all the tensions of the so called developed and "developing" countries fraught with every form of social, economic and political crisis. All the conditions are preparing for new gigantic struggles, in the process of the vicious and convulsive degeneration of world capitalism. Trotsky before his assassination predicted that humanity in the near future would move heaven and earth to construct socialism. He was right then and is so now.

14.7.92.

NO TO MAASTRICHT!

The Paralysis of the LP Leadership opens the way for greater initiatives from the Labour and Trade Union Left.

The uproar generated by the imposed devaluation of the pound—with the devaluation of the lira and the defence of the franc—illustrate very well that allied to the social and political weakness of British capitalism, its economic decay has entered the domain of disaster. The world capitalist economy is in a slump and there are only limited bases for any important recovery. There have been attempts to blame the Bundesbank for not sustaining the pound, but the simple fact is that capitalist Europe is two tier and has been for a long time. The idea of a harmonious capitalist Europe is total fiction and does not correspond to the reality which has developed since the end of world war two. What has occurred shows the utter fraud of the Maastricht treaty and the crises within the conservative and Labour parties reflect the lack of perspective of the existing social system. The discussion within capitalism over a strong currency or devaluation can have no solution. There is on the one hand a necessity for capitalism to have a stable currency and the top financial-industrial sectors in Britain were in favour of the ERM as a means also of containing inflation. But the slump allied to high interest rates has proved particularly ominous for Britain. In the eyes of the financial markets the British pound was greatly overvalued. Devaluation in itself will not change matters because British industry although having a more "realistic" currency is very weak and inflation is again on the horizon.

The Labour and Union bureaucracy is hopelessly compromised over this issue. Wordy attacks are made on the government, but the LP leadership supported the ERM—they wanted the Germans to revalue—and continue to support Maastricht. This illustrates their criminal submission to the interests of capitalism. What is this famous "Europe" in which the stoneheads place their faith? Over fifty million poor people, immense regional disparities, the dictatorship of the banks and the big monopolies, the failure to integrate large numbers of immigrant workers. What can renew this Europe? More pious speeches by the functionaries? Thus they reject a minimum

point of democratic discussion, that is a referendum. Like the Stalinists from which they learned so much, democracy is only for them. Smith's speech to the LP conference was empty bureaucratic rhetoric, simply attacking Major as the cause of all the problems! And then a masterstroke, doing nothing to overthrow this government but sustaining it by supporting Maastricht. In the elections to the NEC, the left sector was reduced with the removal of Skinner.

However the intervention of Scargill and Skinner on the issue of resisting the privatisation of the mines and the intervention of the delegates preventing Jordan of the right and leader of the engineers from speaking on this issue shows that the apparatus cannot achieve their objectives even now, after all their brazen efforts to prevent discussion. The efforts of the right wing trade unions to weaken the links with the labour party suffered a major defeat.

Thus although the LP apparatus appears to be in control over the Maastricht treaty, the refusal to discuss is not a sign of strength but of a profound malaise. The resignation of Gould confirms this. The apparatus does not have the old reformists who could invent schemes and delude people because capitalism itself gives no basis for reformism. Like the Stalinist bureaucracy, they would like to seem eternal but they are not. We do not pretend to foresee all the forms of their collapse, but their impotence in front of the dereliction of the capitalist system means that they cannot justify their existence. This gives great opportunity to the left in the party and in the trade unions to develop a vibrant and confident opposition. It is possible for the apparatus to arrange NEC elections, but history cannot be arranged. It is also important to see that the crisis of the monarchy is linked to the decomposition of capitalism.

Now the monarchy is to be treated like a branch of the civil service with a partial cut in its income. Its function as the mystical facade of capitalism unifying the nation is vanishing, for there is nothing to unify. Britain is down to the

bare bones in all its social services and infrastructure, what role the monarchy? A sharp reduction in humbug is opening the way for its eventual disappearance which is inseparable from that of capitalism.

FOR A SOCIALIST EUROPE

Capitalist Europe is in torment. The struggles in Italy against the attacks on the standard of living, the general strike in Spain, and the public sector strikes in Germany which forced the government to concede plus the failure of the Mitterand government to gain a decisive success on the issue of the Maastricht treaty, are symptoms of the decomposition of capitalist power. Without question they are going to play the racist card, use fascist groups and repress, but intercapitalist contradictions and the lack of capitalist authority are immovable obstacles. In this situation the forces of the left inside and outside the Labour party and trade unions are in a position to organise demonstrations and meetings to develop a massive anti capitalist united front and programme. Brown of the ruling LP team has spoken of the need for an emergency plan to reduce unemployment and government intervention to promote investment. In that case the left must demand what all this amounts to. Serious efforts to meet the crisis mean anti capitalist measures with the intervention of the population in this process.

No to Maastricht! For a United front of the workers parties in Europe on the programme of social transformations, the stratification of all the main industries and banks under workers control. 3.10.92.

Contents

Page 1. Edit, Yugoslavia. J. Posadas.

Page 2. Partial Regeneration and the CIS.

Workers of the world, unite!

RED FLAG



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

411. October 9. 1992.

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'

Price 30p.

The Yugoslav Crisis. J. Posadas.

These are short extracts from a text of Cde Posadas called "Tito, the Third World of the Non aligned" countries and the Construction of Socialism" of 8.5.80.

Self management was not an opportune expedient, but the result of poor marxist formation. It is not that Yugoslavia was not in a position to resist, but Stalin was at the frontiers expecting the fall of the economy so as to overthrow Tito. It was Stalin who stimulated him towards this solution; self management was not an aimless invention of Tito but represented a desperate choice, a means to break the circle which the other workers states under Stalinist leadership had constructed around Yugoslavia. No workers state traded with Yugoslavia and the capitalists were not interested in helping Yugoslavia to progress because then it would have been able to influence their own countries. Their objective was simply to exploit the situation. An important factor was the numerical weakness of the Yugoslav Communist party given that the best cadres had died in the war.... It was a weak country, as at the beginning were Poland, Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria which then passed from an agrarian to an important scientific and cultural development.

This achievement was the result of the workers state and the national problems which remain, do not come from a conception of the bourgeois nation, but are the consequences of bureaucratic interests and clashes. There is no national conflict in the population.... The historic contribution of Tito was that of having created the Communist party, of having defended Yugoslavia against capitalism and of having resisted the stalinist bureaucracy. The choice of self management did not signalise 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, but represented a step backward in the Communist conception. It was the fruit of the lack of preparation of the party and of its youthful inexperience which without having the necessary strength found it had to confront new problems. It was because of the pressures exercised by Stalin and by his threats of intervening that self management was imposed. Self management represented a means to unite all the republics, since it guaranteed

Continued on page 4.

Partial Regeneration and the CIS.

Part 3. International Bureau of the Posadist IV International.

The bureaucratic caste concealed deliberately this "other face" of capitalism and the problems of the rest of the world, in its obsession to enrich itself at any price and free itself from the structure of the workers state as a candidate for a new class.

This opened the way to the most criminal false plans for the solution of problems; the proposal for privatisations, autonomy of enterprises not as management of a socialist type but for private interest, the break in the state monopolies and planning, considering the "successes" of capitalism. This is the bureaucratic mentality, the will to accumulate privileges and wealth and to avoid confronting the necessity of profound changes in the functioning of the state economy in order to improve it.

THE DISSIDENTS.

The obsessive campaign of the so called "democratic" sectors was not concerned so much with the standard of living of people as much as their own privileges and interests. All the ex-dissidents have ended by making the apology for private property which was the depth of their protest from the time of Sakharov. They were capable only of proposing plans like the "500" days and other similar concoctions. But they are not capable of producing either literature or theatre or cinema. Throughout the whole period of glasnost and perestroika they have not been capable of creating a work which defended the socialist point of view, whether utopian or libertarian. Their concern was to "act like the west" and today the countries of the East are full of commercial films and pornography while the sectors who wish to produce art are thrown out. That is where these dissidents have ended. Not one of these people defended socialism to clarify the history of the USSR by separating the first seven years of the Revolution from the Stalinist period.

Out with the monarchy!

THE DISCUSSION OVER THE NEP

In this sense the discussion which Gorbachev raised over the NEP even speaking in the name of the necessity to follow the "Leninist policy" held certainly some aspects of the truth, but it does not correspond to this stage of the development of humanity and to the experience already made in the USSR, to pass to a phase of socialist construction. It is true that Lenin posed concessions to the capitalists in a struggle on two fronts which he raised against the extreme poverty, starvation and backwardness of the Russian society of that time and at the same time against the nascent bureaucracy. Lenin came to say to the communists that they were honest revolutionaries, but they did not know how to direct the economy, the administration: "learn from the capitalists". Here it was a question of overcoming the world capitalist encirclement and isolation and at the same time to win the confidence of the peasants hostile to a workers state, incapable of securing the conditions of survival in the country. But the objective of Lenin was to reinforce the young workers state to be able afterwards to return to the offensive against capitalism. For this reason, he said clearly "it is them or us", that is he considered the NEP a retreat, but an ordered one with an objective and a limit; the defence of the workers state. It was not a leap in the void. The risks were great. If "they" the capitalists showed themselves stronger, the workers state could succumb. But "we" the communists must learn rapidly to defeat the bourgeoisie in the most difficult area; the economy and the administration of the state. Thus Lenin developed up to the moment of his death, a great struggle against the growing bureaucracy, becoming more and more powerful, which ended by suffocating the party. All this was explained by Trotsky and subsequently by Posadas.

The situation of the USSR when Gorbachev came to power was totally different. It was a planetary power with an enormous technological, economic and military development, but above all with a social and a functional and political crisis due to the bureaucracy. It was a country which needed to emerge from the straight jacket of the

This is the final part of the text on the experience of partial regeneration. Although written soon after the events of August 1991 the conclusions still stand. Posadas had considered the possibility of the most retrograde sectors of the bureaucracy seeking a return to capitalism. But as he said there is no historic time for such a construction. Capitalism is in its death throes and the bureaucracy goes down with it

bureaucracy, to advance and suppress the capitalist system antagonistic to the workers state on a world scale. It was a workers state which could no longer just continue to be a "workers state" but had to pass towards the tasks of a socialist society.

What elements of analogy in this analysis should be valued? The autonomy of enterprises, the flexibility in economic reforms, the use of the laws of the market, the convertible rouble all this was posed from the point of view of socialism, for the Bolsheviks and analysed in detail by Trotsky in the epoch of Stalin. The passage of the workers state towards socialism requires measures of transition but transition towards the overcoming of the norms, capitalist rules and functioning; the overcoming of the distribution of "to each according to work" in favour of "to each according to necessity" with the consequent suppression of the state apparatus as the organ of oppression. In this ambience all the decentralisation, dynamising and modernisation which today seem words in themselves, must be realised through the intervention of all the population through the direct management by the population in the administration. The leading group of the CPSU in the epoch of perestroika never took into account this experience or only timidly through a certain functioning of the workers collectives in the beginning.

Various important sectors of the working class (and part of the communist factory leaders) made important experiences; democratic election of directors and heads of production, rational decisions in the use of machinery and raw materials, use of profits of the factories for the benefit of the population. The working class has demonstrated that it was disposed to intervene and has done it also in strikes, when it saw that a part of the bureaucratic leadership was giving to perestroika a direction of even greater pillage for their own private interest rather than the development of soviet democracy with the full participation of the working class.

This surprised utterly sectors of the bureaucracy who replied by raising issues of nationality and promoting economic sabotage without precedent trying to put the

blame on the CP, on the existing leadership. After not having spoken anymore of "workers collectives", everything was concentrated on breaking the state monopolies, the "liberalisation of prices" in a run towards the market, without the adjective "socialist" which now exercised no restraint. The independence

movements (constituted in general through the bureaucracy itself up to that moment in power) used the situation with the mafias and the interests of various layers and sectors to liquidate any possibility of normalising the economy. The soviet leadership in not having confidence in or not wanting to depend on the proletariat responded to this situation by increasing concessions to the west to try to attract capital, going so far as to pose adhesion to the IMF, to the group of seven and the other institutions which regulate the functioning of international capitalism.

This has nothing to do with NEP. It was simply the loss of control, the absence of principles and above all the panic fear and the incapacity of the bureaucracy as a whole to rely on the intervention of the population and above all of the working class to correct the problems of the economy. Lenin said that the NEP was yes a retreat, but to overcome the siege of the enemy, since they could not conquer it with the frontal attack. But in this case we are in front of a disbanding caused by the panic fear of the bureaucracy.

THE FEAR BY THE BUREAUCRACY OF THE INTERVENTION OF THE MASSES: THE LIMITS OF PARTIAL REGENERATION.

Gorbachev and the best sectors of the CPSU remained prisoners of the fear of supporting and organising the working class when this had demonstrated an enormous decision to struggle against the privileges of the bureaucracy. The strikes of the miners and of the oil workers posed the necessity of social justice against privileges, for democratic rights and the participation in the management of the enterprises. Instead of supporting themselves there, the soviet leadership allowed opportunists like Yeltsin to assume these slogans in a demagogic way. He did this before with the five million

votes in Moscow. Meanwhile the CPSU refused to take serious measures against the corrupt and the privileged (promoting a campaign against alcoholism which in no way affected the social roots of the problem). The expedients of every hue deepened the popular discontent, separating them rapidly from the CPSU. The appeals of Gorbachev himself to purge the party that it might lead popular struggles directly intervening towards people, remained in the void. The process of regeneration was much slower than that of a rapid degeneration of a great part of the leading apparatus, which abandoned the ship of state and of the CPSU as rats leaving a sinking ship.

The process of partial regeneration meant that layers and sectors emerge as a reply to the necessity of progress of the workers state through the world relations of existing forces and the pressures of the world revolution on the USSR which cannot ignore them without disappearing. The democratic concessions to the masses were the most important and fundamental aspect of all this period in spite of the fact that the leadership gave it a

completely bourgeois character: the Soviets which already functioned as parliaments without autonomy acquired autonomy and representation but functioned as organs of bourgeois democracy. Even so the information, the general democratic rights and the open discussion of all the problems constituted an important impulse to the masses of the workers state. Trade union life acquired a new dynamic with the fall of the apparatuses and the formation of new organisations.

But the retreat of the CPSU, its incapacity to cleanse itself and transform itself into a political leadership with authority did not allow the proletariat to become an active force to retake progress towards socialism, liquidating what remained of the bureaucracy. Hence the Partial sense of the process of regeneration. The bureaucracy seeks to survive as a caste. Before it did so developing the workers state, but in developing it reached an antagonistic position. As a result a series of reactionary layers have been reinforced, as in all countries of Eastern Europe, refugees from the party apparatus itself in which now they have no

margin, representatives of the worst of society, parasites, swindlers, thieves and hierarchs of the party who until yesterday lived in some tranquillity with the party card. This is the origin of the Yeltsins. Such layers, utilising the opportunities of the electoral game, the economic means of which they dispose, including the support of imperialism but fundamentally the discontent of the population through the intensification of problems, have succeeded in gaining some support in the population. With the fall of the bureaucratic apparatuses, the affirmation of a leadership in the CPSU has not corresponded with communist objectives and with the scientific conception of the construction of the workers state.

PRIVATISATION AND THE RESISTENCE OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE WORKERS STATE.

In not doing this, in not developing in time in the party a tendency which had the conviction of principles and programme of socialist construction, proposals of privatisation emerged which they are trying to apply; beginning with the republicanisation of properties of the present Soviet Union and then the 60-70% privatisation of factories with the corresponding institutional regulation; freedom of sale and purchase, inheritance, property, import and export of capital, national currencies etc.

Experience as with China, Yugoslavia and even in some of the workers states of Eastern Europe already show the disastrous results from such measures. Hence from the foundation of the workers state, from the army and the working class, there is a resistance to such measures of capitalist restoration although not expressed through the organs of the masses. Such resistance does not come only from the "conservative" apparatuses desirous of maintaining their own privileges. It comes also from a part of the leading bureaucracy more linked to state property and with a certain consciousness of the cul de sac with is meant by a return to private property.

All the greatest resistance has still to express itself and will be that of the masses and above all of the industrial proletariat in front of the miserable spectacle of the pillage of state property. Now the regional bureaucracies cannot agree among themselves and

accuse each other of appropriation of the property of the Union. It is necessary to expect great struggles and resistance on the part of the masses. In India which is a bourgeois state some months ago the police had to shoot some workers who were defending a state factory against privatisation. The soviet masses with more reason are going to resist massive privatisation. The leading caste does not have the minimum legitimacy to liquidate the fundamental gains of the October Revolution.

If the epoch of Gorbachev affirms a conclusion, it is that no problem can be resolved in the USSR without the participation and the opinion of the masses. The masses of the USSR want to intervene and showed this earlier with the Referendum for the maintenance of the Union, when world capitalism concentrated everything to say "Everything is disintegrating there". When the nationalists were sabotaging the Referendum and terrorising people so that they could not vote, the Soviet people responded with 70% of the votes for the USSR. People want to intervene but there is no leadership. Hence Yeltsin was able to manoeuvre and use the miners movement in Siberia and the Kusnets basin. But the population is not static!

The bureaucracy deliberately confused political freedoms with "economic freedoms" for the worst path of capitalist restoration. This led to the reactionary coup and counter coup, two faces of the same currency—the inability of the bureaucracy to answer to the necessity of the progress of the workers state. With empiricism, it is not possible to construct socialism. This is the conclusion of this experience. Even taking power after seventy years of the experience of the workers state, it is necessary to discuss the inviolable principles of the construction of socialism which have been analysed for years and years in an infinity of works by Cde Posadas.

YUGOSLAVIA: CIVIL WAR AND THE RESULTS OF "SELF MANAGEMENT".

An example of the results of a hybrid policy and of conciliation with capitalism is to be found in Yugoslavia. There is a large work by Cde Posadas on the origins of this process and we recommend a reading of this for the understanding of the history of the Yugoslav revolution. For years some communist parties placed Yugoslavia as the example of

the "third way" for socialism; but the result was the accumulation of regional interests masked as "national" interests and a struggle between camarillas to impose the strongest over the weakest.

The socialist perspective has unified different peoples, created the structure of a country and permitted a great development. But the model of "self management" led directly to the reestablishment of the old relations. It was not a question of socialist management, but of sectors, managers and administrators and this is a teaching for all those who today draw the conclusions that the evils of the USSR issued from the excess of centralisation. Nothing is more mistaken. The beginning is indeed the centralisation in planning—which must answer to the common interest of all society—and decentralisation in application understood as workers control and control by the masses, organs, soviet democracy. Yugoslavia in maintaining itself in the middle between the workers state—and not existing a real integration of the socialist countries—and the capitalist world has been led into a situation where the richest regions have developed at the cost of the poorer. The appetites of the regional bureaucracies have grown and all of them have in common contempt for the people, for the workers for the harmonious development of the country.

Now this process has reached the level of an explosion with civil war in which the army anyway represents a unified structure and a revolutionary tradition, although expressed militarily and bureaucratically. This is the result of the fact that the party, the League of Communists for some time has ceased functioning and existing. Each continues on the "national" road with the masses abandoned to their fate. The masses reject the supposed ethnic motivation of such a confrontation. It is necessary to say that the population is against the war, that it rejects this flight of the richest regions Slovakia and Croatia as a robbery of a wealth which was constructed thanks to the existence of the workers state.

This situation has nothing to do with "self determination" of peoples, but of divisions through actions made behind peoples backs and against the workers. It is notable how hardly a year ago, Yugoslavia was dominated by demonstrations of workers for more wages against the

bureaucracy. The bureaucracy has answered to the social issue by fomenting ethnic issues and talk of independence, pushing the country to civil war. It is the same as the regional bureaucracy has tried in the USSR and still continue sustaining hatred and confrontation.

The ethnic questions in Yugoslavia exist but are residual. A much more important question is the existence of a parasitic bureaucracy which acts as a candidate for proprietorship of the means of production. This is the depth of the issue—to prevent people reasoning, thinking and participating. People say "until yesterday we lived without problems it is the leaders who have invented the hatred". It is clear that this is not a popular war but a war of paid mercenaries, of apparatuses which represent nothing more than leading camarillas. In any case the closest to some traditions of the workers state is the Serb leadership and above all the army.

Hence we are against this "self determination" and the separation of the ethnic groups. It is completely anti historic. Separately these "republics" have no perspective but remain completely submitted to Italy, Austria and Germany. This must not be supported or fomented, but on the contrary there must be appeals for the intervention of the masses of Yugoslavia to liquidate the bureaucracies, to the workers and peasants to take power and in the factories, throw out the managers and administrators and place everything to function in the interests of the country, to develop Kossevo and Montenegro without any imposition nor oppression between ethnic and religious groups.

FOR THE UNITED AND SOCIALIST YUGOSLAVIA!

It is necessary to create organs and soviets for the participation of the masses, to discuss the necessity of unification, of the planning of the economy, for the common well being and to break submission to the FMI and international capitalism. Tito did not submit to Stalin when the latter appeared all powerful and Yugoslavia with all the difficulties they had, continued to develop. But there is no special Yugoslav model for socialism. It is necessary to apply the teachings of history and to seek the

integration with the other workers states. To emerge from the crisis and it is necessary to discuss the problems of the construction of socialism.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM.

We do not dedicate ourselves to the condemnation of the leaders of the layers and sectors responsible for the disasters now being witnessed. We seek to impel all the elements within and outside

the party (and the same for the workers states), the trade unions, the Red Army, the revolutionary and communist vanguard to dominate and defend such principles, overcoming all the bureaucratic conception; but for that it is necessary to discuss everything and to dominate all the experiences of history, including the fact that capitalism is going to launch the war whatever agreements are signed.

In the last moment of his career, without power and a hostage of Yeltsin and his clique, Gorbachev said that these problems were not the result of the October Revolution but of the Stalinist period. Then why so slow in discussing and applying the most complete experiences and principles which are embodied in the first seven years of the October Revolution? We understand the origin of these leaders and they tried to respond to the progress posed by the existence of the workers state, but this does not diminish the damage and the backwardsness produced by the fact that the most important communist party in the world in the leadership

of a workers state which had been capable of passing through the most severe tests of history, capitulates and

abandons the struggle wasting enormous forces not only in the Soviet Union but amongst all peoples which still in these moments consider the USSR as the most advanced bulwark in the struggle for its own liberation.

The Posadist IV International calls and will call ceaselessly to all the world revolutionary vanguard, communist, socialist, nationalist of the trade unions, to discuss openly this experience. The commotion, shatterings, crisis

Continued on page 4

SUBSCRIBE TO

RED FLAG!

and convulsions in the world communist movement must be transformed into a world and public discussion over the problems of the construction of socialism. Cde Posadas had made this appeal already on the occasion of the invasion of Vietnam by China, the Sino-Soviet war and an infinity of occasions which had affected the revolutionary world movement. He said that in the process of construction of a completely new society this phase called erroneously "socialism" of the workers state bore contradictions, class struggles and conflicts going as far as confrontations. But at the same time the fundamental factor for the overcoming of such contradictions was the construction of the Mass Communist International. This is our task; to help to reconstruct this International. Posadas said also that the proletarian vanguard, the masses of the world did not lose confidence in the workers states through the disasters which its leaders caused. They continue the class struggle in their countries, support the trade unions and the parties of the left. Today it is the same, the principle has not changed. The proletariat, the poor masses of the world and even the world petit bourgeoisie and above all the soviet proletariat are not going to renounce the anti capitalist struggle and are not going to forget the gains which the existence of the USSR itself represented.

The most urgent task of humanity is the reconstruction of a revolutionary leadership which cannot be other through the logic of life, than a world leadership. We call for the unification on the basis of a profound discussion and programme of all the experiences of the construction of the workers state, of all the communist and world revolutionary movement. We appeal to Cuba, China, to Vietnam, to the communist and socialist parties to retake the struggle against capitalism on a world scale unifying the struggles, experiences, and economies, planning in common and making the masses, the workers, intervene fully to dismantle the false myth of bourgeois democracy. All power to the Soviets! All power to the masses, to the trade unions, to the organs of the population! Workers and popular control over administration and production. Full freedom of revolutionary tendencies, of discussion, publication and diffusion of ideas!

THE STRUGGLE IN THE USSR HAS NOT TERMINATED.

While this is written the USSR lives an enormous convulsion produced by the failed coup of the apparatus and the reactionary counter coup of Yeltsin. The Congress of Peoples Deputies and the negotiation for the maintenance of the USSR although mutilated through the departure of Lithuania, Esthonia and Latvia with the confrontations between the various national bureaucrats and the declarations of independence, show anyway that these cliques do not have their hands free to do what they want. The analysts of capitalism itself have counselled the leaders against separation and the ECC warned that for the Baltic states to introduce a new money would be disastrous. Georgia even in separating from Russia maintains itself in the economic council and people have moved against the dictatorship of Ghamsakurdia. These bureaucrats will have to confront very soon the structure of the workers state. Passing through the ambience of anti communism, of hysterical revanchism and of a nationalism artificially manipulated, the project for a bourgeois restoration will clash directly with the demands of the masses. Such a project can give nothing to them, neither material advance, peace or formal democracy. The bureaucrats are capable of going to war—as in Yugoslavia—to conceal the basis of its historic fraud and its reactionary perspective.

Gorbachev struggled to maintain the Union but the defence of privatisations which he made ceded to the most reactionary bureaucrats to maintain a compromise. It is necessary to expect great fights in the apparatus and also a great participation of the masses throughout the USSR. The Lithuanian "government" has begun by absolving the war criminals and the collaborators with the nazis. This being its programme, it is necessary to expect—and to intervene to help—the reorganisation of the communist and proletarian vanguard.

As we write these lines there is information of an intense activity among the communists seeking a reorganisation. The tendency of the CPSU the "Marxist Platform" has been constituted as a party, the "Union of Communist Workers" and some leaders of the CPSU in Russia have created the "Association for the defence of the rights

of the Communists". Many communist parties which have disassociated themselves from the CPSU even changing name and programme in a bureaucratic way, still maintain part of the objectives of the CPSU and in many places people have protected the statues of Lenin.

On the other hand it can be seen clearly that anti communism by minority sectors, declassed elements of every sort, lumpem proletariat, religious national and also "intellectuals" until now beneficiaries of palace privileges are naturally under the sponsorship of imperialism and its means of mass communication. These people have nothing to do with the anti bureaucratic struggle or the fight for progress but defend anti historic and retrograde conceptions. In the great wave of the "democrats" there arise differentiations and fights because none of them defend a valid alternative of progress. The only ones who prevail are those who have the objective of taking over state property and trying to reestablish capitalism. Hence they have to persist, determine and maintain the initiative while the others moan as now in the Russian parliament, rebelling against the dictatorial measures of Yeltsin.

THE NECESSITY FOR THE THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL EXPLANATION OF WHAT HAS OCCURED.

It is necessary to reject the leaders of the communist and socialist parties who identify Lenin, the Bolsheviks and the October Revolution with Stalinism. The latter was another historic period brilliantly characterised by Leon Trotsky as the "Thermidor" in "The Revolution Betrayed" which as J. Posadas said is the most complete text of our epoch for the explanation of the phenomenon of the degeneration of the workers state and the rise of the bureaucracy. It is disgusting and unacceptable that they speak of the "model of failed communism"! These same leaders dedicated years to repress the voices of the opposition in the revolutionary movement in order to impose that Stalin was the living continuation of Lenin. Now they are making a career to see who had made the criticism first; if in 81 with the Berlinguer -Soviet Union rupture in Italy, if in 1968 with Czechoslovakia or 1956 with Hungary. Others end by saying that the error already lay with 1917 and even further by saying Marx was really a Utopian! The problem is that this "Utopia" has

them a certain independence and liberty in local interests, it was not necessary in the struggle against Stalin, but was developed on account of the weakness of the party. In its origins, it was not a bad intention... It was not a just historical solution. Capitalism indeed was not able to unite the country while partial statification and planning—then limited by self management—had allowed this objective to be achieved. Situations such as these are part of the problems of the construction of Socialism of which there have been no further experiences, since the first seven years of the Soviet Union were buried by Stalin.

Self management signalled a retreat in relation to the experience of the USSR. It represented a process in which a mature leadership was missing. But notwithstanding this, they did not return to capitalism... Neither Tito nor the Communist party contributed with ideas, analysis with orientation and with programme to the world process. They only intervened to say

"don't dispute etc" but they did not deepen an analysis on the process of history. This is the result of the blows which Stalinism inflicted on marxism; it struck it with force and violence and left the process without leadership.

The Communist leaders who present Yugoslavia as an example of Communism are dreamers and liars. How can there be a Communism when seven hundred thousand people emigrate to find work?....

already changed humanity and continues doing so. We call for a discussion in the world communist movement over these historic phases, "the problems of the construction of socialism" as they were called by J. Posadas.

There is no soviet "model", much less that bureaucratized and deformed version. There are principles of social functioning, each organ has a precise role, the soviet, the party or revolutionary parties—the Bolsheviks never defended the "single party"—the trade unions, all this on the basis of the economy at the beginning statified and then collectivised. We invite a reading of Lenin's "State and Revolution". This was the programme and the objective. These were very precise historic conditions whose application was impeded by the Stalinist Thermidorean stage. All this discussion in the period of perestroika and of glasnost was hardly approached, but in general concealed because the apparatuses did not have the aspiration to advance towards socialism, but of disputing the power of the bureaucracy for its own interests. The defence of the USSR as an historic communist experience passes through this discussion. We direct an appeal to the cadres of the Red Army, to the trade unions, to the communists who today try to defend the communist party against the decrees of illegality and dismantling: No to the destruction of the gains of

the Workers State! For the defence of statified property, Revolutionary Soviets of workers, peasants, soldiers and workers together! Out with imperialism! For the maintenance of the USSR as an entity, against reactionary nationalism, for the hegemony of the proletariat and of the peoples at all levels of decision! Out with the bureaucracy! With the usurpers, the mafiosi, for control! For the defence of the monopoly of foreign trade, for the soviet and democratic programming of the economy for the good of all the masses! No to any retrocession in history! Reconstruct the Revolutionary party based on the most advanced sectors of the CPSU, on the experience of Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks and all the elaboration of Cde Posadas. Whatever the situation this is the duty of the communists in the USSR. The world leadership of the Posadist IV International makes this appeal to all the world revolutionary vanguard—Unconditional defence of the Soviet Union! Down with the reactionary tendencies, no retreat to capitalism! For the Mass Communist International.

Out of NATO

THE SPANISH GENERAL STRIKE.

The General Strike was a very important expression of the struggle of the masses throughout Europe to resist the plans of capitalism which more and more reduce the previous gains achieved through the workers movement.

The strikes in Germany, Italy and France show the refusal of the proletariat to go on tolerating the results of the crisis of the capitalist system. If the trade unions or the left still cannot impose their demands, it is through the weakness of the leaderships and the absence of a programme which may give an alternative to the policy of the bourgeoisie.

The trade union leaderships limited the objectives of the General Strike to the level of immediate minimal demands and did not unite them to the needs of the population. In order for the government of Gonzalez to implement the plans on housing, health and education proposed by the Spanish Socialist Party, he would have to increase and not reduce public expenditure, abstain from agreements with the rest of European capitalism and apply a programme of social transformations.

With the Treaty of Maastricht, it is not possible to have a social pact as the trade unions demand, because capitalism cannot afford it and is not interested anyway. The European Union is the Union of the Multinationals and the big banks. It is the effort to compete in better conditions with the United States and Japan at the cost of the population.

The result of the last elections in Italy, France and Britain demonstrated this situation. There is no movement which posed a solution as a whole to the problems of society and hence there arise tendencies which can have a transitory echo like the Lombard League in the North of Italy or the nationalist parties in Spain which attract a sector of the petit bourgeoisie.

The defeat of the Labour party in Britain is a confirmation of the failure of a centrist policy or of appearing as administrators of capitalism, when there is nothing to administer. Hence this road like the Socialists in Spain or France does not advance towards social transformations. The relation of world forces and the crisis of capitalism led in Spain to the disintegration of the UCD of Suarez.

Felipe Gonzalez has the same intentions, but his weakness makes him a prisoner of the bourgeoisie putting on one side the demands of the Unions and of the masses as a whole and making a centre of the PIB-Gross National Product- in capitalisation, modernisation and reconversion of industry which has favoured the bourgeoisie, increasing its wealth but without improving the standard of living of the masses and reducing unemployment).

The large constructions which went up for the Seville Expo and the infrastructure of the Olympiads and which meant a stimulus in public investment on the part of the state, have distributed the benefits among a few great enterprises and multinationals without creating positions of stable employment thereby making palpable already the great crisis in the field of construction.

This situation occurs in Spain when there is a deficit of more than a million houses, a shortage of schools, roads, hospitals and means of public transport.

The State through Regional Governments and city councils and with the intervention and control of the trade unions must intervene to resolve these problems which affect the whole of the population and especially the youth. It is necessary to impede land speculation where the Socialist Government has not given a good example as in the case of RENFE (Railways).

The municipalities must not authorise luxury residences but stimulate the construction of popular housing. If the construction firms do not agree, then it is necessary to organise co-operatives where the trade unions control the investments and the quality of the housing.

A great part of the increase in the cost of living in the recent stage of the socialist government and of the reduction in the standard of living of the masses is due to the rising price of rents and housing which are outside the reach of a large sector of the population.

The trade unions, the United Left, the currents of the left within the Socialist Party must impel this discussion and a programme which defends the nationalised factories with workers control and impedes the closing of factories and more dismissals.

The activity of the next general strike has to be united to this perspective, otherwise the strike serves as a safety valve to escape from the great pressure of the masses, but it is not sufficient to impose retreats in economic policy.

It is necessary to develop the discussion in the factories in the trade unions, in the workers areas, in the university over the economic crisis, on the new measures for the reduction of strike pay and the law regulating strikes. That

Continued on page 4

Contents

- Page 1. Edit. Spanish General Strike.
- Page 2. Resolution on Maastricht
- Page 3. Resolution on Yugoslavia.
- Page 4. The Clinton Perspective.

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).

412. December 11, 1992. Price 30p.

THE PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS MUST CENTRALISE MASS ACTIONS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.

The demonstrations and meetings called by the miners against the pit closures received great popular support and the TUC and the left of the LP led by Benn have called for a day of action. In all this the most important aspect is to utilise whatever opportunity presents itself to discuss in factory and mass meetings the need for the anti capitalist programme of social transformation. Some union leaders are quite capable of calling for general strikes-even the break away Miners union apparently called a general strike- and leave it at that. For them it gives the impression of action to exhaust the energy of the members and the demands are of a purely minimal, reformist and defensive character. The employers may be forced to retreat in a particular instance, but the population is faced with situations which are going to be repeated. What is necessary is a unifying programme of demands which question the functioning of capitalist society as a whole such as proposing for example that any enterprise to be closed must be expropriated by the state and put under workers control. Moreover a workers plan of production must be proposed to meet the immediate demands of the population. Otherwise the initiative is left to capitalism. The latter has nothing left to give social progress. When it talks of "modernisation" it means lowering costs and unloading its problems onto the population as can be seen with the mounting unemployment and massive deterioration in all public services. Nothing more can be expected of it. On a world scale it is like this. It has nowhere to go save war and impoverishing humanity in every country. Even states such as the USA, Japan or Germany with powerful technological structures are

showing crises of every complexion, economic impasse and political weakness.

Much depends on the evolution of the labour and trade union left which has to develop a more profound life of discussion and intervention in front of the abject capitulation of the LP and the right wing trade union leaders-the TUC even invited a representative of big business to participate in its Congress. This timewasting has been particularly evident in the uproars in parliament. Here prodigious amounts of time are spent on going on about selling arms to Iraq, a normal capitalist practice, and than Lamonts financial dealings. On the other hand the LP apparatus issues instructions that capitalism must be obeyed ie compulsory redundancies and increased charges in local government. With "representatives" like that who needs enemies? It is impossible to see any substantial difference between the two parties. On the issue of the monarchy which is one where a workers party can make an effective political intervention, there is relative silence, leaving the initiatives to the right. It is a marvellous opportunity to raise many issues but apart from some efforts by Dennis Skinner, it is left alone.

On the world arena sectors of capitalism are actively seeking to develop the race issue as with the firebombings in Germany and the tightening of restrictions on immigration. Imperialism intervenes against Yugoslavia and then makes laws excluding refugees. New domestic and international crises are developing as capitalism will seek to solve its problems by repression and war. What is clear however is the great social weakness of the capitalist powers in whatever country, a lack of authority and no programme which

can gain a serious social support.

The counter revolutionary Yeltsin made a ceremonial visit to London and has indicated that he will look less to the "West" and more to the "East" and that he will strengthen links with Eastern Europe. It has finally dawned on the representatives of capitalist restoration-who as bureaucrats have no ideas whatsoever save those of capitalism- in the CIS that Western capitalism will treat them like dirt. For the big international banks and conglomerates the world outside the main capitalist states ie North American capitalism, Japan or the wealthiest nations in Europe is to be subjugated, contained, and if necessary attacked.

The Labour and trade union left has to base itself with confidence on the inevitable triumph of socialism because it is logical and rational and what has occurred in the former USSR is the result of the complete perversion of marxism and the counter revolutionary doctrine of socialism in one country. In the resistance to the crisis of British capitalism it is necessary to propose for factories about to be closed their immediate statification under workers control and if the industry is already nationalised then workers management must be instituted. All wages and pensions to rise automatically with the cost of living, for a workers plan of production including the conversion of arms production to civilian use to meet the social needs of the population, particularly the unemployed and the most deprived sectors. The monarchy must be ousted and all royal properties and incomes placed under the control of the trade unions and popular committees to meet the housing needs of the population. 5.12.92.

THE TREATY OF MAASTRICHT AND THE NECESSITY FOR THE SOCIALIST UNIFICATION OF EUROPE.

RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE POSADIST IV INTERNATIONAL.

The Treaty of Maastricht is one step more towards the establishment of a Europe of the multi-nationals and the banks. Nine tenths of the text of these agreements concern the installation of a single European bank and of a single currency. The principle sacred to capitalism of private property, of the market economy and of competition is affirmed there. On the other hand this text is very short on democratic principles. The power of the European parliament is reduced to a rubber stamp for the benefit of the Council of Ministers and of the Commission whose members are chosen without the slightest control or vote of the population.

This is then a European government chosen by national governments which will be charged with implementing the new financial and economic directives without veto or control by the European parliaments. The latter only has the right to make recommendations that is a purely consultative role. Compared to the national parliaments the European parliament is much weaker. Even if it has a majority of deputies of the right or of the centre its weakness means that the top layers of the European bourgeoisie have made a democracy just for them. They need a strong centre to achieve the concentration of capital, to have a great competitive position on the international market. This power lies in the hands of the Council of ministers and of the European Commission.

The only point which could be considered as positive from the point of view of democratic rights is the affirmation of the right of participation of all the citizens of the Europe of the Twelve to communal elections in their place of residence. But the Communes have so little weight in the important economic, social or political decisions and such limited means to develop a policy of economic and social justice that this right to vote is just a bone thrown to the left parties.

The Treaty of Maastricht is still more guarded in relation to any propositions of social progress for the population. It states that the achievement of economic and financial unity will automatically engender growth and full employment. It announces that unemployment is going to diminish, that the standard of living is going to increase, that the social welfare of the population of the Twelve is going to increase. It makes an inventory of good intentions. The

agreements are detailed and precise for the functioning of high finance but are very nebulous in relation to social perspectives. But the Treaty does impose on its members the necessity to reduce their public debt and to control inflation within a short period. That has an immediate result, for all the governments with the socialists or without the socialists must take more and more drastic austerity measures against the workers, the unemployed and the pensioners, against the young and the schoolchildren.

The unification is very advanced from this point of view; attacks on the right to health, reduction of unemployment pay and elimination of an increasing number with right to benefits, extension of the pensionable age, prolongation of the hours of work without increase in salaries, restrictions in education and an increase in taxes of all sorts for the majority of the population. Maastricht serves as a weapon to pass anti social measures. Another constant in all the European governments even when the socialists are part of them is the liquidation of important parts of the public services or their privatisation - all in the name of the Treaty of Maastricht and of the construction of Europe.

This treaty is submitted to the Referendum in some countries but in the majority it is the parliaments who have ratified the treaty without further consultation. Nonetheless in Ireland nearly a half of the electors did not vote and the "No" secured 30% of the votes and in Denmark a majority voted "No". In France the "Yes" only just made it. If the Treaty of Maastricht was submitted to a vote in all the countries, it would be quite clear that the Europe of the banks, of the multinationals and of the technocrats does not meet with popular enthusiasm and that people are not the dupes of all the European speechifying by the political leaders of right or left. Any way the will of the masses has no importance in this Europe. Irrespective of the opinion of the population capitalism has need of this unification to survive.

But the agreements of Maastricht as with the other treaties and negotiations concerning agriculture, foreign trade, foreign policy also express the crisis of the capitalist system. The latter is not capable of doing other

than Maastricht. The unification of Europe is an objective necessity. The first to propose this theme were not the Schumanns, Monets, Spaaks etc but the Communists, Lenin and the International in the early part of the century. But it is an historic task which is incumbent on the workers states, on the socialist, trade union, communist, progressive forces, on the working class and on the sectors of the population not dependent on private property. It is the only way of being able to harmonise Europe and to integrate there all the population, to utilise the immense material and human resources for the good of all. Like the workers states, the communist and socialist movement has not yet entered upon this task and the unification of Europe is being made under the regime of capitalism. But the maximum that the latter can give is Maastricht, that is to say the dictatorship of big business over the rest of the bourgeoisie, of the petit bourgeoisie and of the workers.

It is an imperious necessity to confront the competition of American Imperialism and Japan. But this unification is also a double edged weapon because in order to make this Europe, capitalism attacks not only the working class, the social rights acquired in struggle by the workers, but

also by the feeblest sectors of capitalism, the petit bourgeoisie, the peasants and the small business men and shopkeepers. The social movements which are developing at the present moment in the Europe of the twelve include salaried workers, the peasants and the truck drivers. To facilitate and favour the intervention of the multi nationals and of European high finance in the rest of capitalist Europe, it is proposed that Europe yields to the United States on the plane of agriculture and sacrifices the peasantry to the demands of the GATT. This means reducing subsidies to agriculture to liquidate in fact the Common Agricultural Policy. The farmers will be obliged to reduce their cultivated lands by thirty percent. The CAP was a substitute for a planning of agriculture, but it showed this necessity anyway. Now all this seems about to disappear. There is a great capacity in agricultural production which could be planned throughout Europe with the object of satisfying the needs of all the European population and contribute to the needs of the masses of

Africa whose tragedy is for all to see on the TV networks. In all domains of the economy, the agreements of Maastricht fix certain rules to control competition between the different European capitalist countries so as to allow the best conditions to confront world competition. But they do not propose the least perspective of planning in common, of the organisation of the economy answering to the needs of the population.

The first European treaties organised the rationalisation of production of coal and steel and the result has been the destruction of important centres of the steel industry, the closing down of thousands of mines and the elimination of hundreds of thousands of workers from production. There has been no plan for the replacement of the destroyed industries and entire regions have become deserts in Britain, in Belgium (where all the mines have now been closed) and in Italy. The Treaty of Maastricht totally ignores these problems and makes monetary unification the panacea of economic and social development.

Meanwhile it is unemployment which has developed with the great increase in poverty in which more than fifty million poor people are excluded from economic and social life. This is going to be aggravated and it is going to be normal for a part of the population to be deprived of all rights. The measures which the governments are taking on unemployment have this logic; they establish a series of rules to render more difficult the maintenance of the right to benefits but on the other hand offer no employment!

The Treaty of Maastricht gives very great freedom of action to the multi nationals and practically exempts them from taxes. Everything which the capitalists do not pay is paid by the population and taxes multiply to finance the European Community. The Communist and Socialist Parties, the trade union organisations, the Ecological movements and left Christian movements must declare clearly against this Treaty, against this Europe of the dictatorship of big business. But it is necessary also to show that there exists an alternative of progress for the European masses.

The crisis of the Workers States of Europe, the liquidation of Comecon, the withdrawal of what remains of the bureaucracy to national or

regional bases has also shaken the confidence of the workers of capitalist Europe in the near perspective of the imposition of workers States throughout Europe. It is certain that with the counter revolutionary power of Yeltsin and of his allies in Russia and in other republics of the former USSR, European capitalism takes comfort and is no longer submitted to the permanent comparison between the Workers States and Capitalist Europe. The former are no longer an immediate social and political competitor for the European parties of the bourgeoisie and the social democracy. But the inter capitalist competition and the need for war by capitalism are in no way reduced. The masses of Europe reject the idea that they should have to bear the cost of this policy and the crisis of capitalism. They reject war in Yugoslavia and that explains in part the vacillations of the western countries for a massive military intervention. The Treaty of Maastricht poses the necessity to reinforce the Union of Western Europe, to develop a common European defence intervening as such within NATO. The leaders of the Social Democracy present that as a guarantee of a durable peace. But Yugoslavia is a flagrant denial of all those claims.

The weight which the system of workers states represented obliged capitalism to contain its inter capitalist conflicts from fear that that would benefit the revolution and the workers states. Now this obstacle is weakened and the conflicts between divergent capitalist interests are becoming more and more virulent. Yugoslavia is a battlefield of all the contradictions of the capitalist world, between Europe and the United States, between Britain, France and Germany equally.

The Unification of Europe is an historic necessity. Capitalism is incapable of doing anything else but Maastricht and the dictatorship of big business. Thus this task of Unification is a necessary responsibility of the working class who do not defend private interests and who are able to push forward socialist measures to transform society. The retreat of the workers states, the collapse of the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, the absorption of the RDA by capitalist Germany express a failure not of the statification of property and of the centralised planning of

THE DISMANTLING OF YUGOSLAVIA, A TRIAL RUN OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM FOR NEW WARS.

RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE POSADIST IV INTERNATIONAL.

the economy, but of the bureaucratic leaders who displaced the working class from power and ran statified property with the narrow mentality of the bourgeoisie. Socialist Democracy, the leading and permanent participation of the masses in the organisation of the economy, in all the decisions of the governments of the Workers States, that is what is missing and it is one of the essential conditions to sustain and make the statified economy progress. The governments of the Europe of the Twelve trample all this under foot, in one form or another with the privatisation of the public services and the large public enterprises. It is necessary to defend the public services in Europe and to struggle so that they are placed under popular control through workers and trade union councils. The workers understand the difference in Europe between public property and the parasitic bureaucracy which manages them. Everywhere where these enterprises are attacked there have been great mobilisations to defend them from Spain to Greece, to Italy to Belgium, without forgetting the profound resistance of the masses, of the workers states to privatisation of their common patrimony. The defence and extension of statifications and their functioning under workers and popular control must be a central point of the common European programme of trade union and political organisations of workers.

The common programme of the left for Europe must deal with the problems of immigration in general. After that of the Maghreb, of the Turks, there is a new massive immigration coming from Poland, Yugoslavia, Roumania, Hungary with more people demanding the right of exile. The governments of the Twelve have been the first to favour this new immigration, for example in signing the agreements of Schengen which authorise the emigration of refugees from Eastern Europe without visa. That is convenient for capitalism to have abundant manpower to exert pressure on the organised workers movement. It hopes to impose more easily its austerity plans and the withdrawal of social gains. It is necessary to have a unified response from the trade unions and workers parties to this situation. It is not possible to accept any measure for the closing of European factories, but one must on the contrary impose on the owners in all the European countries to pay all workers equally irrespective of origin, to prosecute those who develop the clandestine labour force, to struggle against the black economy which cankers

Yugoslavia, at present composed of Serbia, Voivodne, Montenegro and Macedonia has been compared to the Iraq of Saddam Hussein by American imperialism. In effect after having recognised precipitately the independence of Croatia, Slovenia and Bosnia, the Western powers interpret every action of the Serbs as the invasion of another country. They did that over Iraq and Kuwait. This comparison was not accidental. There is no oil in Yugoslavia, but European and American capitalism have a very important political interest in fomenting and maintaining this war, that is the fragmentation of the former socialist republic to force Serbia to its knees. The economic, diplomatic and sports embargo imposed by UNO is like a prelude to a direct military intervention. It was also declared in great haste on the basis of unproven facts. These have even been put in doubt by the leaders of the UNO observers who suspect now that the Bosnian militia have on more than one occasion provoked attacks on the citizens of Sarajevo, then attributed to the Yugoslav army so as to justify the embargo.

But American imperialism was not assured in this case of having an undisputed hegemony. In Yugoslavia the great capitalist powers of Europe and the United States conflict and express their competition. Already Germany, Austria, Italy and France have intervened with different interests to push Slovenia and Croatia towards independence or to maintain

not only Italy, but all the other states of Europe. A popular control is necessary on the conditions of work, to integrate all the workers in the trade unions and to struggle for equality of wages and conditions of work. It is also necessary to establish a common programme of the workers movement of all the Europe, of the Twelve to defend and sustain in a more elevated level all the social gains of the workers; the 35 hour week for all, pension for all at sixty, unemployment pay for an indefinite period until obtaining more work, sliding scale of wages and hours of work paid by capitalism. The right to health, to housing, to education, must be debated together by all the trade union centres of Europe. It is necessary also to discuss and develop in common, a plan of development of the European

Serbia. Now with the participation of the United States which does not wish to leave a military initiative in the hands of Europe alone, they have invented the independence of Bosnia Herzegovina and do not recognise the right of the Serbian or Montenegrin government to call itself "Yugoslavia". Thus the conditions are created for new steps towards a general war. This situation of the dismantling of Yugoslavia has nothing to do with the problem of the right to self determination of peoples and nations. The masses of Yugoslavia have had the shared experience of the struggle against the nazis and the German occupation of the resistance movement and of the partisan movement of Tito, of the construction of the workers state for over fifty years. The weakness of the communist leadership of Tito allowed the development of bureaucratic layers in the republics with their different interests and their self management. These are castes which have lent themselves to the manoeuvres of European and American capitalism with the object of keeping power and privileges on the regional scale as the capitalist economic crisis and recession have been felt for many years in Yugoslavia. The working class and the majority of the population in Yugoslavia have lived in a united way, families are mixed inextricably and there are more than a million mixed marriages in the country.

In the name of an abstract right to self determination must one then support the

economy to respond to the needs of the European masses and to contribute to the development of other continents. Why must the left leave to capitalism the decision on what it must produce and for whom? The Treaty of Maastricht has nothing to say about the needs and the social progress of the population.

The Posadist IV International appeals to all the progressive organisations, the communist parties, the left socialist tendencies, the trade unions, the ecologists to discuss a common programme in order to emerge from this crisis and the drive to war, showing that the European left proposes a socialist alternative to the Europe of Maastricht

The International Bureau of the Posadist IV International 25 August 1992.

right to independence of a hill or of a locality?. It is not even possible to speak of nationalist movements in the different republics. It is simply armed groups which are fighting. They are very well armed by world capitalism which has no scruple according to its various interests in furnishing plenty of arms for the right of facilitating one group of "self determiners" against another. The armed bands originate in the former territorial militia of Yugoslavia from the time of Tito. With the exacerbation of conflicts and of competition between the leaders of the different republics of the Federation of Yugoslavia, these territorial militia have been converted into little armies which act on their own account or in the service of the dominant bureaucracy of each republic. On the other hand the policy of self management has left the door open to capitalist investments via the western banks which find themselves very well placed especially in Croatia and have served as an intermediary for transactions of the government of Trudjman. The organs of capitalist opinion always speak of the atrocities of the "Yugoslava army" or as in Sarajevo the lack of means to care for people etc without the least evidence. With the total embargo on Serbia does this not provoke similar effects on the civilian population? The refugees whose number does not cease to increase are as much Serbs as Croats or Bosnians according to the region. The forces involved in the bombardment are equally of all nationality. The example of the airport of Sarajevo is very significant from the point of view of the partiality with which the organs of bourgeois opinion present the facts. There are "Serb" forces which control the airport... But there are also "Serb" forces which bombard the airport and prevent its use for humanitarian convoys. And as regards such aid no great confidence should be put in it. An organisation like that presided over by the French minister of Health Kouchner makes very political choices over aid when his President announces that the only way to facilitate aid is an international military intervention against the Serbs. On the other hand some others like the President of the MSF-Belgium- on his return to Sarajevo recognised that the situation is complex and that the armed groupings of

every type are an obstacle and escape any control and every possibility of respecting any cease fire demanded by UNO.

There is a will of some capitalist powers to go to war against what remains of Yugoslavia. It is in the logic of the embargo already recently increased. In the same way the decision to prevent the Yugoslavian sports teams from participating in international competitions is a purely political and reactionary measure to try to strangle every idea of peace between the nationalities of Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav team is composed of members coming from all the republics. Capitalism is trying to make this reality disappear so that people forget that the Yugoslav masses fought together against nazism and constructed Yugoslavia as a workers state.

Beyond the specific problem of Yugoslavia, it is necessary to see what all the manoeuvres of the different international capitalist powers amount to. Yugoslavia does not offer important financial or economic interests for world capitalism. Yugoslavia has become a political game in the inter capitalist conflicts between the great powers of Europe and between Europe and American imperialism. At the same time that this conflict in Yugoslavia develops, there is a great discussion in Europe on NATO and on the role of national armies. NATO is in itself an organisation under the protection of the United States as a counter revolutionary base to confront and attack what was then the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. The dangers of "Soviet Aggression" are supposed to have disappeared according to the various governments, yet NATO is going to redouble its power and military means. It has already served as a support in the Gulf War, to exert pressure on Libya and now it is being discussed as a means for military interventions in any corner of the world to defend the interests of the "West". The war against Iraq was a sort of laboratory of experimentation for a super technological war. Yugoslavia serves as an experiment for the installation of an international military force outside the laws of any country commanded by American imperialism and accepted by the other main capitalist countries. The conflict which they have maintained is to determine how to share the

power of decision over the military forces of modern mercenaries.

Some European capitalist powers want the reinforcement of the United Nations. That is part of the agreements of Maastricht which envisage giving the European Community, a common defence in which the armed forces of France and Germany would be the nexus. But the others Britain and the United States are hostile, as it reduces their hegemony. All that is reflected in the oscillations and the relative paralysis of capitalism over Yugoslavia. It is also necessary to see what lies behind the present discussions in many countries on the suppression of military service. On first sight such a decision could only find support in the pacifist movements and the left organisations. But in fact the militia army is no longer necessary to capitalism and besides to organise the most modern war technology it is much simpler than to order men in tanks who realise that they are not being asked "to defend their country" but are being used as mercenaries against everything which is not convenient to the orders of big business. In the Gulf War the desertions of the American soldiers were very numerous and concerned the imperialist generals. Similarly in the different countries of Europe, the soldiers who were sent against Iraq showed no enthusiasm to defend the interests which were foreign to them. UNO as was proved in particular during the war in the Gulf was not an organism for peace. It serves fundamentally as a cover for the imposition of "order" over the rest of the world by the interests of the great capitalist powers. When the Soviet Union intervened there, there was still a counter weight which in a very limited way allowed the UNO to intervene in a very progressive way in some situations. But this role is completely finished now. The only way in which it can be used is to utilise it as a tribune to expose and denounce imperialism.

Even the Secretary General of UNO, Boutros Ghali goes against the decisions of the Security Council taken without his opinion. He is not ready to send more important military forces and forces of intervention in Yugoslavia seeing the enormous dangers of sinking into quicksands as the Security Council dominated by the United States and the great European capitalist countries advocate a military intervention against Serbia. This discussion expresses the great crisis of world capitalism. Sectors of the bourgeois military experts

believe that hundreds of thousands of men would be required to "separate the combatants" to occupy Bosnia and conquer Serbia. The European or American soldiers are not enthusiastic for the war. There remains the option of bombarding Serbia, but that risks leading to the opposite effect of making the world rise up against them.

The capitalist system seeks to put on foot new forms of counter revolutionary military organisation by attributing to NATO "the right of interference" against every country which does not respect the new order. Yugoslavia is an experiment in this sense. Later they think to do the same thing against the ex Soviet Union, sustaining one republic or a national minority against the others according to the needs of the moment. Now it may be the Russia of Yeltsin, to morrow it may be perhaps the Ukraine or Moldavia. Only the struggle for Socialism can be a bond for the masses superior to national aspirations, even if in the process of construction the workers states must provisionally maintain their frontiers to defend themselves against world capitalism. But neither capitalism nor the bureaucracy of the workers states has been capable of reinforcing this unification. In Yugoslavia, as in the Soviet Union it is the former leaders of the Communist Party or of the Communist League who have become strenuous nationalists. Before the conflict and the war, the political leaders of the Yugoslav masses were shattered or resigned. The Communist League was dissolved in 1987 giving way to six "independent" parties each giving the primacy in regional demands. The workers councils and the trade unions no longer functioned. It is this political void which has been filled by the most backward tendencies of the bureaucracy. In the crisis which has broken out in the workers states, in the struggle of the masses to throw out the obstacles of the bureaucracy the policy of the bureaucracy is everyman for himself to maintain their power and privilege. To do this they have become more "nationalist" than the others. From Milosevic to Trudjman the present leaders are all part of this moribund bureaucracy.

The working class in Yugoslavia as in the ex USSR has not been able to impose the workers collectives, factory committees and popular control which makes no difference between nationalities. In Yugoslavia

THE CLINTON PERSPECTIVE AND THE WEAKNESS OF NORTH AMERICAN CAPITALISM.

The Clinton victory in the United States reflects the need of North American capitalism to readjust its policies. Clinton has tried to gain support among the petit bourgeoisie with the idea of improving the economy and giving more attention to social needs. He waged a populist campaign presenting himself in the mould of Roosevelt as a great democrat and leading America towards green pastures.

However the differences between his policy and that of Bush are not so vast. The social weakness of world imperialism meant that Bush after almost destroying Iraq found himself in an impasse. Although Yankee imperialism boasted of winning the "cold war" in reality the enormous war expenditures not only led to a crisis in the workers state, they also drowned the economy of imperialism and it is this legacy of ruin which Clinton has to face.

Clinton does not have an impressive popular mandate. Certainly the percentage of the electorate actually voting rose possibly as high as 55% as opposed to less than fifty percent in recent elections. More women, young people and members of ethnic groups voted for Clinton yet even so the majority of the worker and poor petit bourgeois masses did not respect him and continued not to vote. They had no faith in the system nor in the contenders. Perot reflecting something of the exasperation of bourgeois and petit bourgeois layers over the decomposition of capitalist authority gained twenty percent of the votes largely on a protectionist ticket. Clinton in fact was elected by 43% of those who voted and various polls reflected that many who voted were

as in the USSR, the populations are enormously mixed. There are no two families who do not have members of different nationalities. The workers participated together in the struggle of the partisans against nazism and its puppets in Croatia and Serbia. They constructed and reconstructed the workers states in the war of 1940-45. To day they are still the only force which is able to take Yugoslavia out of the present morass. The necessity of socialism is affirmed even more strongly as a result of the present crisis. It is the only perspective which can finish with these conflicts and with the war. It is necessary to reunite Yugoslavia as it was established with the victory of the partisans of Tito so that the trade unions of all the republics, the workers organisations in the factories and the communist vanguard of the Communist League communicate this appeal. August 1992.

not taken with any of the candidates but voted for the least evil.

The new government is constrained by the colossal budget deficit caused by the arms race and even if the Pentagon budget is rationalised the preoccupation with defence ie war will continue. The population will be obliged to fund an enormous national debt to the benefit of high finance but impeding social improvement. By manipulating and increasing taxes—hitting the petit bourgeoisie—and cutting costs in some areas, Clinton hopes to finance his social proposals but these are palliatives designed to mollify the situation rather than solve any underlying problems. Moreover he speaks not so differently from the previous government about "abandoning the something for nothing ethic" an observation used against the unemployed and those receiving benefits. His response to the social turmoil of the great cities is to expand the police forces.

On the international plane Clinton still poses that the CIS and its possible break up or the emergence of an "aggressive" regime in Russia as the gravest threat to the new world order ie the old enemy remains the enemy. Thus as in economic affairs, the changes from Bush centre on problems of tactics not fundamental issues. The capitalist regime will maintain its full military preparedness with the additional proviso "to compete and win in the global economy" which means strenuous inter capitalist competition. This inevitably weakens the front against the workers states and the world masses. The apparent "strength" of the bureaucracy in

the workers states gave an equal illusion of strength to capitalism giving it a unity it did not possess. The decomposition of the soviet bureaucracy has weakened the capitalist system as a whole. It is not clear that Clinton has anything new to say on the Middle East except that the Arabs have got now to be more conciliatory to Israel! There is no sign of any new tactic towards Iraq, Iran, Libya and Syria. As regards China there is some talk of a tougher policy and Clinton has supported the campaign to extend the trade embargo against Cuba. Thus the line of Clinton amounts to changes in nuance but nothing very fundamental because the world agony of capitalism does not allow it. There can be no analogy with Roosevelt because the latter was in a position to develop an American hegemony with an authority which no longer exists. As for those who see America as the harbinger of a new Keynesian revolution, state intervention by capitalism cannot solve structural problems and despite Roosevelt's ingenuity, it was only the war which gave a "solution" to the social and economic problems of that epoch.

Clinton has aroused hopes among sectors of the petit bourgeoisie which he cannot satisfy and this is going to open the gates to a greater discussion and pressures in the United States, where the lack of a powerful workers party based on the trade unions has given the initiative to the bourgeoisie. However that initiative is going to be put severely to the test and North American imperialism is weakening socially and economically. The acute despair of Bush after the electoral result is symptomatic of the fears of capitalism for the future. Its margins for survival are narrow and the social basis for the programme of social transformations, the structuring of the collectivist economy are extending.

Out of NATO!

From page 1

is part of the package of measures which the European bourgeoisie have used in Maastricht and try to impose on the whole of the population. The world crisis of capitalism, the demand to elevate productivity to compete on the world market, forces the European bourgeoisie to liquidate the demands and gains of the workers movement obtained after years of struggle. Hence Italian capitalism has to eliminate the sliding scale of wages. In Germany they are discussing removing end of year bonuses to assist the costs of German unification and in Spain the impotence of the capitalist system is carried by the unemployed and the lowered purchasing capacity of the population. It is necessary to organise mobilisations in all the workers areas, concentrations and assemblies in each factory, in the university, in the colleges where resolutions can be drawn up against these plans and an alternative discussed to the irreversible crisis of capitalism by proposing the nationalisation of the key centres of production under workers control, the collectivisation and exploitation of the land to satisfy the needs of the masses.

That is to say to oppose a programme against Maastricht, a programme of social transformations where the left, and the trade unions must be the fundamental base for its application in a United Front.

From "Lucha Comunista", Organ of the Spanish Section.