

**J. Posadas**

**On the necessity  
for a new  
International**

(Selection of texts 1962-1977)

International  Scientific Cultural and Political Editions

# **J. Posadas**

## **On the necessity for a new International**

Selection of texts from 1962 to 1977



International Scientific Cultural and Political Editions

# Index

## Section 1 – Hugo Chavez

Call by Hugo Chavez for the Fifth International, 20.11.2009 ... 6

## Section 2 - J. Posadas

**The Founding of the Posadist IV international  
and its Function in History - (texts from 1962 to 1977)**

Chapter 1: The Fourth International until Trotsky's death and the trial of the Second World War .....	9
Chapter 2: The Fourth International after WW2 .....	21
Chapter 3: The Cuban Revolution and the role of the guerrilla .....	32
Chapter 4: Revolutionary Nationalism and the Partial Regeneration of the communist movement .....	35
Chapter 5: The creation of the Posadist Fourth International .....	42
Chapter 6: The function of the Posadist Fourth International and the Partial Regeneration .....	47

## Section 3 – J. Posadas

The Thought and Action of Marx and Engels, 1972 .....	61
Who is J. Posadas? .....	72
Some of the books by J. Posadas published in English .....	73

### Caveat:

*The vast majority of J Posadas' writings originates from the transcription of his speeches in Spanish. These were first recorded on magnetic tape, and then transcribed, translated and published. This way, the author could all at once proceed with the deepening of his theoretical elaborations, speak at conferences and events, and address the functioning of the Trotskyist-Posadist IV International. This is how J Posadas lived and worked. Edit. Board.*

## Contact us:

International Scientific Cultural and Political Editions  
Suite 252, 61 Praed St,  
London W2 1NS, UK

[contact@iscpe.org](mailto:contact@iscpe.org) - ISCPE: International Scientific Cultural and Political Editions

<https://es.quatrieme-internationale-posadiste.org> – use language button

Posadists Today: [posadiststoday.com](http://posadiststoday.com)

In Spanish and French respectively:

[contacto@eiccp.org](mailto:contacto@eiccp.org) - EICCP: Ediciones internacionales Ciencia Cultura y Política

[contact@iscp.org](mailto:contact@iscp.org) - EISCP: Editions Internationales Science Culture et Politique

Published in English: Jan 2024

**ISBN. 0-907694-09-8**

## Presentation

As Lenin developed in his book *Imperialism, Highest Stage of Capitalism*, the capitalist system cannot survive without destruction and war. This is what it does through its fierce inter-capitalist competition and its antagonistic struggle toward the Workers States and the Revolutionary States. The Revolutionary State is a transition to socialism. Its State still operates in a capitalist setting, but already incorporates measures of social transformation within itself.

When the partial disintegration of the Soviet Union happened in 1992, the conservatives of the world proclaimed the failure of the socialist project and “the end of history”. A pessimism dawned on large layers of the communist movement because, in not having correctly identified the roots of this retreat, they concluded wrongly on a failure of socialism.

What this partial disintegration of the USSR has revealed, is the imperative need for humanity to avail itself of a world revolutionary leadership. This requirement is caused by the need of the Workers State’s form to spread all over the world. For the Workers State can no longer reach out to socialism without defeating the world capitalist system.

To defeat the world capitalist system, the construction of a new International is absolutely essential – a new International that incorporates the experience of the Soviet Union and that of all the subsequent socialist revolutions.

The world capitalist system is in a crucial phase of its agony. In all the parts of the world, the populations question deeply and challenge the legitimacy of its regime<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is particularly remarkable now that Israel demonstrates, once again, the monstrous depravity of global capitalism.

A reanimation has taken place in the world and in the Workers States where socialism continues to be invoked. Revolutionary forces spring up from within bourgeois sectors that used to be the servants of capitalist power in the past, as in the army of Venezuela. The fact that these speak in support of socialism led Hugo Chavez to say: “*The Bolivarian revolution is peaceful, but it is armed. It is a socialist revolution.*”

Generally and in Latin America in particular, the political wind blows against the US and EU<sup>2</sup> imperialism – these two being now united through NATO. The war in Ukraine raises new questions because it is not a war between two countries. It represents an elevation in the process that leads inevitably to the global confrontation between the antagonistic social systems. And it is imperialism that designates Russia & China “the enemy” to eliminate. This is openly stated in the NATO’s “*New Strategic Concept*”.

In this process, the world proletariat and the revolutionary movements do not have the instrument needed to get organized. Even for the important debates that are now being held in the world communist, socialist and revolutionary movements, an International Party of the masses is required.

With the participation of more than 200 parties and organizations from all over the world, the Chinese Communist Party convened a World Forum of organizations on the theme of *Marxism today* (Nov 2017). In Cuba, the convocation of meetings between world Marxist theoretical journals regardless of parties has the same sense. Between the different communist parties of the world, the growing polemics reflect this aspiration to unification on a one hand; and on the other, they reflect their fear to confront with a common program and a socialist perspective, the third world war that capitalism prepares.

---

<sup>2</sup> European Union

It is to contribute to this great debate that we publish here a selection of texts by J. Posadas<sup>3</sup> on the need to build a new mass International in the world, with a program of social transformation.

We have deemed it important to publish here Hugo Chavez' "*Call for the Fifth International*". We reproduce it as transcribed in Spanish and translated by ourselves from the video of his address to the PSUV Congress in November 2009.

Should it be called *Fifth International* or something else, what remains of supreme actuality is the need for an International.

International Scientific Cultural & Political Editions.  
The Editors, January 2022<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *The creation of the Fourth International and its function in History*, a selection of texts by J Posadas 1962-1977. And *The Thought and Actions of Marx and Engels*, J Posadas, 1972.

<sup>4</sup> This book was printed and published in Spanish in 2022 and sold at the FILVEN bookfair in Caracas, Venezuela, that year.

## **HUGO CHAVEZ'S CALL TO FOUND THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL**

Intervention by

Hugo Chavez, Caracas, 20.11.2009

In 1864 Karl Marx founded the 1st International. In his Manifesto, he said "*the emancipation of the workers will be the work of the workers themselves*". Led primarily by Marx and Bakunin, that International emerged from the context and conditions then in existence, especially in Europe: A movement coming out of the industrial revolution and very strong labour organizations.

Twenty-five years later, Engels founded the Second International, for the socialist and labour parties of Europe especially. When these faced the crisis of the First World War<sup>5</sup>, the International emerged divided and almost crushed. The internationalist outlook was broken as the member parties each supported their own government in the war. A division arose between the true internationalist proletarians and the others who had been no such thing. These latter allowed themselves to be carried away, possibly by other situations, conditions, oppressions.

Then came the Third International that Lenin convened. He founded it in 1919, mostly from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union but incorporating almost all the communist parties. What came next was a process heavily determined by the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist Party.

This generated quite a few contradictions on our continent. Che Guevara was one to speak out, quite early on – but not so early since it was 1960. The Soviet path had already forked, and as we can see 40 years later, it was never put right.

Figures of importance had appeared in that Third International however; names, leaders and intellectuals of calibre, like Gramsci, Clara Zetkin, Carlos Mariátegui (see note 6), Rosa Luxemburg.

---

<sup>5</sup> Note from Wikipedia: The Second International (1889-1916) was an organisation of Socialist and Labour parties, formed on 14 July 1889 at two simultaneous Paris meetings in which delegations from 24 countries participated.



Then there came Trotsky. The Fourth International that he founded in 1938 did not become a structured movement, and Trotsky died.

145 years have passed since the First International was convened; 120 years passed since Engels convened the Second International, 90 years since Lenin convened the Third International and 71 years since Trotsky convened the IV International.

**I believe that the time has come for us to convene the Fifth International. I dare summon it! The Fifth International!**

I believe this task is of supreme urgency, and a responsibility, seeing how the world crisis keeps on accelerating. There is a memorable and appropriate phrase used by Simon Bolívar when he called for unity between the South American governments not long after their independence from Spain<sup>6</sup>: « We must unite because the world speeds everything up, and if we don't accelerate our own unity, that world will come after us ». Perfectly true this, we know, even if with nuances. That's how nature works; it's full of nuances, it's natural.

We have no manual or guidebook. We don't do guidebooks like the Soviet Union did, to get everyone in line - no. I believe this did a lot of damage to the international, revolutionary, socialist movement. They started forcing the ideas to suit realities produced by wrong decisions. Although we recognize the great contribution that the Soviet Union made to revolutionary Cuba and to many other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. You have to admit it. The Soviet Union has not been a disgrace. The disgrace has been the Yankee empire.

Let a Fifth International step forward in earnest. We cannot leave this in the hands of a bunch of governments. Those with government roles, see how they natter. No! We have to take this to the popular bases. Nothing better than the parties, the true parties of the left, to reach the popular bases and incorporate all the peoples: the women workers, the men workers, the peasant women and the peasant men, the women, the youth, the students, the military, the intellectuals - all the men and the women into this process.

You have nothing without the peoples. They are the engine of history. We speak of the parties of the left, but it must be of the true left. This is what

---

<sup>6</sup> In 1819, Bolívar helped to set up a nation called 'Colombia' out of several provinces recently freed from Spain. That was not the Colombia of today. It was the area known today as 'Gran Colombia'.

we mean. Today, a party of the left must have very clear views about what happens in the world.

This is how socialism failed, the so-called real socialism, the Soviet one as much as of the European one. The social democratic theses failed also, the welfare state, the third way, all that failed. Something new must be built to stop churning out what already exists but is useless to the task facing us: Confront imperialism and propose socialism as the alternative to change the world.

Let us reclaim our experience of the past, from 1864, from all that solid accumulation, all this heritage bequeathed to humanity. We must feed upon it for sustenance today because it is a new socialism that we are talking about. We always said that to create something new, one must use the accumulated knowledge as base. Since nothing comes out of nothingness, we tie our thoughts to our roots - Indo-American in our case. This is how Mariátegui<sup>7</sup> viewed the liberating heroes like Simon Bolívar, San Martín, José Martí: Uniting the experiences, the thoughts of Morazan, Sandino and Farabundo with the emancipating Christianity of Camilo Torres, the great Che Guevara, Salvador Allende, Manuela Sáenz, Eloy Alfaro, and the martyrs like Maurice Bishop, Gaitán<sup>8</sup>.

That's it. It's like reactivating of all the volcanoes. Permit me the simile, for we are in the hour of the volcanoes; the hour of the kilns, not the hour of the frosts. José Martí<sup>9</sup> said: "This is the time of the kilns". We lit all the kilns; we reactivate all the volcanoes.

*Hugo Rafael Chavez Frias<sup>10</sup> - 20 November 2009*

---

<sup>7</sup> Jose Carlos Mariategui , 1894-1930, was a Peruvian Marxist defender of indigenous people.

<sup>8</sup> Simon Bolivar 1783-1830, Buried in Caracas. San Martin, 1778-1850 Nationalist Revolutionary nationalist general in what is part of Argentina today. Morazan, 1792-1842, united provinces of Central America, assassinated, buried in El Salvador. Sandino 1895-1934, led the struggle to expel the USA who occupied Nicaragua. Farabundo 1893-1932, Communist revolutionary murdered in El Salvador. Camillo Torres, 1929-1966 guerrilla and Catholic Priest in Colombia. Che Guevarra, 1928-1968 born in Argentina. Cuban revolutionary leader and assassinated. Salvador Allende 1908-1973, President of Chile and assassinated. Manuela Saenz 1797-1836 Nationalist Revolutionary leader born in Ecuador, buried in Peru. Eloy Alfaro, 1842-1912 President of Ecuador 1893-1901 and assassinated. Maurice Bishop, 1944-1983, President Grenada 1979-1983 and assassinated. Jorge Gaitan 1903-1848, Nationalist Revolutionary of Colombia and assassinated. Note that out of the 12, 8 were assassinated.

<sup>9</sup> Jose Marti, Born Havana 1853, died Rio Canto Cuba 1895. Poet, liberation fighter, journalist, professor, publisher. Had 3 nationalities. Revered in Latin American literature. (Translator apologies for not finding the source of Hugo Chavez' quote).

<sup>10</sup> Hugo Rafael Chavez Frias: 1954-2013. President of Venezuela 1999-2013.

# **THE IV INTERNATIONAL UP UNTIL TROTSKY'S DEATH AND THE TEST OF WW2**

**J POSADAS**

Chapter 1

*In a compilation of texts from 1962 to 1977*

It was 1933 when Trotsky posed, for the first time, the need not to expect any positive change in the Communist International. For the first time, he advanced the idea to pass from the *Left Opposition*<sup>11</sup> to a new International. He pointed to Stalin and the Third International's refusal to use the experiences of history and the favourable conditions to go and help power to be taken in Germany. Stalin was opposed to the USSR coming out of isolation for the sake of economic, political or social support in the world. Having transformed the Third International into an instrument for himself, there was no turning it back; it was perverted.

Up until that time, Trotsky had tried to change the Communist International from within - to regenerate it. Stalin's policy that had allowed Hitler's victory (1933), convinced Trotsky that no regeneration of the Communist International could now be expected. One had to work towards the formation of a new International. The historic conditions were shoring up Stalin's power. His power had not augmented in political or economic terms, but it gained from the policy of keeping the Workers State isolated. This allowed him to justify not looking beyond the Soviet Union. He had turned the Communist International and the Bolshevik Party into instruments to support the bureaucracy. He had perverted the use of Marxism which had always rested on the principle of the expansion of the world revolution.

---

<sup>11</sup> The *Left Opposition* had been crushed by Stalin in 1933, but Stalin had to retake major aspects of it, to fight off the challenge of the right. This included wholesale collectivisation, economic planning and industrialisation. It was done brutally and bureaucratically, but it saved the Workers State.

**Trotsky posed the need for a new International** for the first time in 1933 - and he took more decided steps in 1934. Because National Socialism (Nazism) had come to power in 1934, Trotsky said the following to the Third International and to Stalin: "There is still time, Hitler has triumphed but he has not consolidated. The masses resist him. It is still possible to defeat him. Let us make a front<sup>12</sup> with the Socialists in Germany. Hitler prepares the war. He needs to completely liquidate all class organizations: trade unions and parties. The masses are ready to react".

In doing this, Trotsky was calling for a mobilisation to steal a march on world capitalism: This would be a war started pre-emptively, a war based on the outbreak of revolution in Germany. Not by sending Soviet troops to invade and decide in Germany, but by combining a Communists-Socialists united front with a Soviet intervention, and in readiness for the response to be expected from English, French and North American imperialism. Stalin refused. He accused Trotsky of being an agent of English imperialism. He labelled Trotsky as 'agent of world imperialism'. It was then that Trotsky turned to the organization of the new International.

**With the creation of the IV International in 1938.** Trotsky's *Transitional Program* defended the continuity of Marxist thought – that is to say, the policy, the objectives, the organization of the masses, the struggle for power, the generalization of the process of revolution.

When he formulated the principles of the IV International, Trotsky insisted on the thought he often reiterated: 'The Soviet Union has every right to use the contradictions of the capitalist system. It is right to make accords with one imperialist against another to take advantage of their dissidences. But this must never be at the expense of the revolution, or at the costs of the class struggle elsewhere. Such agreements must serve the expansion of the world revolution. They must impel the organization of the revolutionary struggle in given countries. No good will come of pacts that allow imperialism to advance its interests by basically stopping the masses taking power, using Soviet influence to present itself before the masses with the authority to resolve problems, and all this to contain the Soviet Union.

---

<sup>12</sup> There was a very large young Communist Party in Germany. The false policies of Stalin saw it totally exterminated by Hitler. Editorial.

Trotsky and Lenin had written all the main texts of the Communist International because there were no others with the sufficient capacity. [In the 1930's] it was necessary to hold fast to the principle that the world process of revolution would eventually assist the Soviet Union; and that meanwhile, one had to do everything possible in support of the internal agro-industrial development of the Soviet economy and the revolutionary cultural capacity of the Soviet people.

The Soviet bureaucracy had failed in all this. It had surrendered China (1927), the English Revolution (1926), the German revolution (1933 onwards). Proofs upon proofs had piled up to show a Soviet bureaucracy impervious to change. Its bureaucratic apparatus dominated the Soviet Union and absolutely refused any compromise that might affect its power.

Trotsky came to the conclusion that change in this apparatus had become impossible. This went as much for the Third International as for the Communist Party, both in the hands of Stalin. It is then that Trotsky spoke of the degeneration of the Bolshevik Party. He saw the need to create a new Party, a new International, for the vital aim of preserving the program of the world socialist revolution. He was seeing this as part of preparing for the flaming test of confrontation coming up now between the Workers State and the capitalist system. In wait for more developments in the world revolution, he wanted the Party ready for the next crisis and explosion in the capitalist system. He formulated program and policy for all this, and for the Party to be ready to intervene in the process.

**In its first stages, the *Left Opposition* showed that it had strength and historical roots.** It managed to have deputies (MPs) in Chile, in Cuba, in Spain. It developed in France too, with André Marty<sup>13</sup> among others, who was a Trotskyist sympathizer; Maurice Thorez<sup>14</sup> too. In Italy there was Luigi Longo. In Spain Andrés Nin, Juan Andrade and Julián Gorkin. A whole layer of leaders of the communist parties had been attracted by the positions of Trotsky.

---

<sup>13</sup> André Marty 1886-1956. Secretary of the Comintern. Leader in the French Communist Party for some 30 years, he was an MP in France almost uninterruptedly from 1924 to 1955.

<sup>14</sup> Maurice Thorez, 1900-1964. Leader of the French Communist Party from 1930 to his death. He was an MP in France in 1946-47.

Trotsky tried to make the Left Opposition a world movement but he could not succeed. He could not function, he had no resources, he was persecuted everywhere. The Left Opposition failed to coordinate on a world scale. When Trotsky called for the formation of the Fourth International, it was built very weakly, with few roots in the workers' and revolutionary movements. This was logical considering that the communist parties were still very small throughout the world, and the Trotskyists even more so.

The task of the Trotskyists was to convince, educate, uphold the communist perspective. This had to be done in the teeth of a process where the Workers State – still the only one in existence – could be seen murdering Bolsheviks! Stalin radiated moral corruption. He disintegrated the Bolshevik Party, assassinated its main leaders. These blows meant to stamp out all confidence and trust in the communist movement.

One had to show these blows in light of transitional historic consequences - an accident of history. The Left Opposition did not become organised; but if it did not find the means or the historic foothold to persist, that was because the world process of the revolution was one of retreat.

The Soviet bureaucracy had abandoned all Marxist concerns, programs, policies, activities. Once ensconced in its "socialism in one country", it looked for stability in the world by making accords with one imperialism against the other, in search of balance, avoiding clashes, intent on using the divergencies between the imperialists, their contradictions, their competition to try and subsist. And all the while in hope of building socialism in one country.

Trotsky was expelled from the USSR in 1927<sup>15</sup>, but not without having fought in the Communist Party and in the Third International before that. He had devoted his whole being to maintaining, prolonging and sustaining the Russian Revolution. And none of that was to defend himself. In "*My Life*" he says that he took particular care of himself when this was an essential factor of impulsion for the revolution. He gave his everything to impart confidence and security in the revolution and in the Workers State.

---

<sup>15</sup> As a matter of fact, Trotsky was expelled from the Party in 1927. He was internally exiled to Alma Ata in 1928 and deported in 1929.

**Trotsky's entire elaboration rests on the legitimacy of the Russian Revolution and the possibility of subsequent developments.** He demonstrates that the degeneration of the Workers State and of the Bolshevik Party were accidental. For the degeneration had not been inherent to the dictatorship of the proletariat. It had come with the imposition of a dictatorship *against* the proletariat instead. He shows how, when it comes to Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat, these are legitimate organs of history, and necessary ones to build this power.

Capitalism [as it developed] based itself on individual interests with their legal, legislative and executive bodies. From there, capitalism develops central apparatuses for the coordination of its interests. In the Workers State on the other hand, the impetus of society towards socialism depends on the intervention of the masses. These, at the same time as they develop the economy and learn to lead society, must do it through social organs. When they reach that point, they no longer depend on any State apparatus or any official body. This elevates their ability to analyse, to decide and to lead. In the USSR, this role was performed by Soviets, by factory and neighbourhood councils.

The various bourgeoisies got hold of Stalin's crimes for use in anti-Soviet agitation. They laid the Soviet retreat at the door of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They blamed the Party of Lenin for its centralisation, to mean a party of suppression, nobody allowed to think, nobody allowed to speak.

Stalin's actions began to affect and annul the authority of the Soviet Workers State. They worked against the formation of mass communist parties. The world proletarian vanguard discerned the falseness of Stalin's policy, the crimes, the reclusiveness. No longer a pole of mass attraction and organisation, the Workers State was becoming a pole of repulsion. This historic experience in the building of the first Workers State came to lose influence in the sectors of intellectuals and scientists of the world revolutionary vanguard.

**Then the task was to show how the defects, the failings and the crimes were products of the bureaucracy.** The bureaucracy had risen to power through historic conditions that had settled independently of the revolutionary masses – in conditions of economic and political relations

where the proletariat still showed up as weak in participation and in weight on a world scale.

Stalin made heavy use of workers' defeats before inaugurating the "Socialism in one single country". But before that, he had liquidated the possibility of revolution in England (1926) and in China (1927) in order to show that the conditions did not exist for the extension of the world revolution.

One had to face this conception down. One had to explain to the world proletarian vanguard how the treason committed by Stalin against the United Front (Communists-Socialists) in Germany - and which served the Nazis indirectly - was driven by the incapacity of the Soviet bureaucracy. The latter was unable to think, unfit to maintain Marxism, unwilling to stand by the revolutionary interests of the USSR and the world. The bureaucracy came neither from Marxism nor from the dictatorship of the proletariat, only from the layer in power.

It was necessary to deal with this historic 'accident' as part of the approaching perspectives of war-and-revolution opening up - even as Stalin was still ministering to an atrocious process of world decomposition, faced with an incoming onslaught that he did not even know how to respond to. The bureaucracy had no perspectives.

**At the start of the Second World War, the Soviet bureaucracy faced Nazi invasion with no revolutionary perspective and no objective.** The Soviet bureaucracy entered the war to defend the country - nothing more - not with any idea of developing the revolution, foreseeing and preparing the communist parties in the use of stage and process in order to take power.

In the Second World War, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the communist parties in every country of the world took part as simple 'patriots', without program or objectives. This gave cause to basic divergences arising between them, as when the North American Communist Party supported the Yankee government against the Soviet Union. Stalin's chauvinist, social-democratic and bureaucratic policy was having this effect; based on the local interests of the bureaucracy and not



on those of the revolution, it was creating elements of decomposition in the communist parties.

Trotsky had seen how crucial it was to prepare the world proletariat for the stages that were coming. This is why he focused, in all his analyses, on to need to keep full confidence and security in the Marxist method.

**Marxism won its historic credentials with the Soviet Workers State.** Once the Soviet Workers State was made, the matter of whether Workers State and Marxism could triumph stopped being debatable. As Trotsky said, the superiority of the Workers State became visible in the way of facts and figures. Before the triumph of the Russian Revolution, steel and oil had been non-existent and industrial production very low. With the Soviet Workers State, the production of steel, oil and cement shot up. Industrial production gave proof of the economic and social capacity of the Workers State.

Capitalism could no longer stand as the superior form of life before the masses, the petty bourgeoisie, the technicians, the engineers and the scientists. With the Soviet Workers State, an immensely superior world competitor had set up shop.

The ascendancy of the Soviet Workers State stemmed from the superiority of its statised<sup>16</sup> property, its planning of production and its social progress. In capitalism the masses have no right beyond voting every four years or so; and in the trade unions, sometimes not even that, as the bureaucrats prevent people from voting. The rights of people in the capitalist system are minimal; the masses get some say only through a Party and simply through the vote cast by the Party.

**In the Soviet Union on the other hand, the Soviets permit the intervention of the population.** In the USSR, and from the age when the woman or man intervenes in production, they have the same rights as the 80 years old. Their enrolment in production used to determine the attribution of social rights to them, and persons with abnormalities or physical difficulties had the same rights too.

---

<sup>16</sup> The author uses the word 'statised' instead of nationalised, to indicate that the State is the owner, and not the capitalist class through a capitalist state.

When the masses became aware of this social superiority, the Workers State won an immense authority in the world. But that authority had to be maintained. The rise of the bureaucracy punched a great hole in this hard-won authority, causing it to be rejected in the proletarian vanguard, among the technicians, engineers and scientists who had been attracted by the Soviet Workers State and were now going to be essential to the future.

Trotsky saw the necessity to keep defending the continuity of the Workers State. Its legitimacy and its historic superiority would see the Workers State through the test of the imperialist war, the second World War. When he examined this question, Trotsky considered that the Soviet Workers State would pass the test of the war and triumph. And this triumph would give an immense impulsion to the development of the world revolution. Trotsky's conclusions rested on his certainty, historically based, of the USSR successfully passing the test of the imperialist war.

**Trotsky devoted all the activity of the Fourth International to the defence of the Soviet Union.** More important than any strike; more important than any local revolutionary action or any world revolutionary action, the essential task now was the unconditional defence of the Soviet Union for the entire period leading up to the Second World War. Trotsky's IV International was having to educate a vanguard whose leaders had been decimated, and whose Soviet representative bodies had been destroyed by the growing power of the bureaucracy. It was to that vanguard that Trotsky had to impart the confidence to defend the Workers State, this Workers State of crimes committed, in the conviction that these crimes too were accidents of history.

Trotsky pressed home the idea that the structures reached by the Soviet Union were here to stay, permanent; and that whilst these structures were in existence, the difficulties and retrogressions in the authority of the Soviet Workers State caused by the Stalin leadership, would not stop the Workers State remaining intact in the preoccupation of the world proletarian vanguard, secure in the ultimate triumph of communism.

**Trotsky prepared the Fourth International to intervene in the process before the Second World War, and in the war itself.**

Trotsky assured the continuity of Marxism by preparing the program to confront that period in the revolutionary process, for then and for afterwards, to maintain the program of the Russian Revolution.

The communist parties gave no particular thought to World War Two and neither did they expect it. It was to sustain itself that the Soviet bureaucracy tried to contain the attack on the USSR by means of pacts with Daladier [French Prime Minister in 1938-1940 who participated in the Munich agreements]. In an attempt at using the inter-imperialist disputes, the Soviet bureaucracy made accords with the leaders of Germany and France. But capitalism meanwhile, and in order to prepare its war, was using the divergencies between the Soviet Union and the world revolution, the quashing of the world revolution by the Soviet bureaucracy.

Had the bureaucracy encouraged revolutions between 1933 and 1939, this would have entangled and muddled the war preparations of imperialism. That policy would have reached deeper into the countries that soon became Workers States, as well as into Germany, England, France, Italy. The fact that revolutionary conditions exploded in all those countries after the war shows that the conditions had existed for this policy. There was no revolution in England, but the overwhelming triumph of the Labour masses was a complete indictment of the capitalist system. At the end of WW2, the conditions existed for the development of the revolution.

After Trotsky, it fell to the IV International to carry on the task of maintaining the continuity of the Marxist method. The International had to analyse the process of history, economic, social, political and military. It had to educate a whole new vanguard even if it still had to wait for further stages in history. The task was to develop, to influence the possibility of intervening in the course of the revolutionary process, to organise the new leadership on a world scale.

Trotsky could not foresee the exact form or date of future events, but he foresaw the course of history. There is not a trace of disenchantment in any of his texts. You cannot find there any sentiment of defeatism, or of indifference towards the Soviet Union. His texts culminate in the *«Manifesto of the Fourth International on the imperialist war and the world proletarian revolution»* - also called the *«Emergency Manifesto»*. Here, he conveys to the world proletarian vanguard, to the Soviet masses included, his sense of certainty and confidence that the Workers State was going to overcome. The Workers State would pass the test of that war which he could see imperialism was about to make.

**The "Emergency Manifesto" maintains the continuity of the Foundation (Transitional) Program, May 1940.** There, Trotsky poses that, in making ready for war, capitalism shows its historic impotence; if it were competent, it would not make war - it would just demonstrate its social, political and economic superiority over the Workers State; it is its impotence that drives capitalism to war; the Soviet Union has incorporated some 20 different nationalities while capitalism cannot resolve anything without war. Capitalism is after the destruction of the Soviet Union. Trotsky educated the communist vanguard of the USSR and of the world, in showing it that imperialism wanted to crush the Soviet Union.

**The IV International came about for this historic task.** Trotsky was isolated, he had few means and few possibilities for action. He was controlled and was kicked out of several countries, Norway, France, and had to take refuge in Mexico. In Mexico his possibilities for action were limited too. He was constantly exposed to assassination attempts while government controls impeded any public action.

Trotsky set up the Fourth International and, through it, he prepared the word proletarian vanguard for self-orientation. He prepared it to see that the war was going to develop the forces of the revolution. The war was going to create conditions favourable to the reanimation of the world revolution. The Fourth International was born with two essential objectives: The unconditional defence of the USSR, and its own self-development for power taking once the war had arrived. How would this pan out? Trotsky could not tell that.

In 1938 - before the Second World War therefore - the *Foundation (Transitional) Program* of the Fourth International had stated: «Within ten years, millions of revolutionaries will take up the program and the objectives of the Fourth International». If he did not say: «the Fourth International». He said «the program and the objectives of the Fourth International».

It was not possible for Trotsky to predict the form in which this might happen, but he had observed the conduct of the masses. He analysed that, although Stalin's crimes had dented the credibility and the prospects of the Soviet Workers State, the masses of the Soviet Union and of the world were going to use the war to impel the revolution.

Trotsky knew that the masses of the Soviet Union and of the world were not going to surrender, feel discouraged, become corrupted or hesitant.

The programmatic perspectives as set out by Trotsky have been integrally confirmed. "Within ten years", thirteen new Workers States had been made, and Cuba would not be long in coming after that. Trotsky's assertion that bureaucracy was only an accident of history was confirmed; and once the root causes of bureaucracy were eliminated, the possibilities for its historic reproduction would disappear.

**The program of the Fourth International was to maintain the continuity of Marxist thought applied to the unconditional defence of the USSR.** The indestructible base of the IV International, that of before and that of now, lies in its unconditional defence of the Workers State. Its intransigent struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy conjoins with this defence, but what determines the conduct of the IV International is the unconditional defence of the Soviet Union - not the struggle against Stalin. Had priority been given to the struggle against Stalin, the Workers State could have been smashed.

The essential was to impel the Workers State and create the conditions to eliminate Stalin. Since the objective of Trotskyism was to uphold and preserve the Workers State, its historic function has aimed, and will continue to aim at *the unconditional defence* of the Soviet Workers State, indeed of all the Workers States.

With the unconditional defence of the Soviet Workers State, one defends the most complete instrument for the progress of history. It is the most complete instrument because it lays the bases and provides the conditions for the progress to come.

This defence of the Soviet Workers State must not be confused with a struggle of fractions, of tendencies or of groups against Stalin. It is a struggle against an element in history that was regressive and murderous, which was Stalin, and about which the Party needed to be organised at the same time in order to intervene.

Trotsky wrote all the texts necessary to keep concern alive for scientific preoccupation, the analyses of programme, of policy, of foresight, to arm the comprehension of humanity.

The 1938 program of the Fourth International is not against Stalin. It is a program where the fight against Stalin is included, but that foresees the war and centres on the unconditional defence of the Soviet Union.

It was necessary to stimulate and develop the world revolution, and this will continue to be the task. The world revolution is going to create the conditions of historic ascent equal to the elimination of all bureaucracy and capitalist system. It is not that the struggle against bureaucracy is annulled, but that it is part of the progress of the development of the world revolution. The conduct of the IV International aligns itself therefore along this necessity. Vindictiveness against Stalin is not what drives us.

While the communist parties were conciliating with capitalism, and could not see the war coming, Trotsky was not only foreseeing it, but preparing for when the arc of revolution was going to rise again. He was entirely confident in the future of the Soviet Union.

The communist parties did not prepare for the war. None of them foresaw it, and they were all taken by surprise. There was not one of them to foresee the revolution of course, but Trotsky foresaw the revolution. He did not say how it would unfold. But as he saw it coming, he prepared the Fourth International to enter the war, to crush capitalism. The communist parties, and Stalin, did all the opposite.

**J POSADAS**

*In a compilation of texts from 1962 to 1977*

# THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL AFTER THE WAR

**J POSADAS**

Chapter 2

The Fourth International developed in a very weak way after Trotsky's death. There was a historic reason for that, but the Trotskyists of those days took the struggle against Stalin as their objective. They did not take it as part of the political activity when the essential was to defend the Soviet Union and foresee the course of the revolution in order to rest on it, and develop it, because it was going to create the conditions to eliminate Stalin.

With Pablo, Mandel, Pierre Frank (3 leaders of the International Secretariat), the IV International did not develop. This leadership proved incapable of understanding the actual process of history. This old movement devoted itself to anti-Stalinism. They were all anti-Stalinist, not revolutionaries combating Stalin. For that very reason, they all ended anti-Soviet. There is no longer any need to be anti-Stalinist. The attempt to justify the dissidents<sup>17</sup> is a mark of anti-Sovietism; it favours the forces hostile to the progress of history.

It was fundamental to reanimate the utilisation of Marxism that had been abandoned by the Communist Party. Trotsky did this as long as he managed to live, and continued afterwards through his texts. Marxism is an instrument that enriches itself. Its method of interpretation brings all new events into the unity of history. The Marxist explication elevates one's ability to grasp the constantly emerging facts and generalises them.

---

<sup>17</sup> This refers to the dissidents in the world communist movement in the period between 1962 and 1977 - like Solzhenitsyn in the USSR, Kuron in Poland, Bierman in East Germany, Havel in Czechoslovakia, etc. Old Trotskyism supported them.

It was necessary to create this current in the old Trotskyist movement that had become anti-Soviet. One's intellectual preoccupation had to be dedicated to this, and applied to the organisation of one's life to this end. This why we draw a parallel between the life of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and ourselves. This is not a pretentious comparison. They are our teachers, and we are their disciples, but we feel a complete identity with them in the historic responsibility and duty to apply and develop Marxism. Our thoughts are organised for this purpose therefore, and so are our lives. One's life and that of all our team create the order through which each concern, each study and each piece of learning helps to grow more confident in the struggle for communism. This does away with the individual problems. There are individuals with problems, but no individual problems in Marxism.

**We are only the disciples of our teachers, but like them, we feel the historic responsibility to function for the construction of the communist instrument.** After Trotsky's assassination in August 1940, the Fourth International reeled and wandered. Posadas is the only one that remains in the International from that time, from 1935. All the others withdrew, or joined the International much later. To this day, they have no policy or program. The only one who remains from those days, is Posadas. It is not a distinction: it is an exemplar of the thought continuity of Trotskyism, of its fertility. In the most disadvantageous conditions of isolation, of lack of means, we maintained the functioning of the Fourth International.

**In 1945, we set up the *Grupo Cuarta Internacional*.** Without money, without yet being organically constituted, without being recognized by the Fourth International, we addressed and organized the whole of Latin America: Uruguay, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Peru<sup>18</sup>. The Fourth International led by Pablo had hardly identified Latin America on the map when we had already organized the *Latin American Bureau*, now in existence since 1946. We had the paper *Voz Proletaria*, made to organize Marxist thought. It was not published only for Argentina; it was published there, but it addressed the entire world communist movement. A creation of history that was.

---

<sup>18</sup> J Posadas was born in Argentina (1912) where he joined the IV International of Pablo in 1935. The *Grupo Fourth International* was created from Argentina therefore, but not solely for Argentina itself.



I did not attend the founding [meeting] of the IV International in 1938, but I was already a militant. As I had been in the International since 1935, I had taken part in all these struggles. From Argentina, we had started the polemic against old Trotskyism in Latin America. We gradually imposed communist moral norms, and made it so that the Fourth International stopped being a refuge for dilettantes and petty-bourgeois intellectuals.

At the core of our morale, there was our determination to organize the cadres and dedicate all the activity to the communist purpose. It was not a heroic attitude. It was the base of our morality, now in need of steadfast organisation.

This experience is a tribute to the most beautiful conception of life. We did not have enough to eat, but the role we were playing in contributing to, and in shaping revolutionary thought, was filling us with an infinite joy. I studied all day; I read an immense number of books, many of them worthless for lack of guidance. As I learnt, quite a few comrades whom I met helped me and explained a lot to me. Of the several of them who left the International, none of them is our enemy now. This was no heroic or dramatic action. It was the way to organise life to be able and take on this task. There was no other.

This was one of the foundations upon which we organised what the Fourth International has become. Many of the old comrades, although they left, contributed something to the Marxist moral conception - the behaviour, the concern, the dedication for Marxism. Here is a study for which there is no university and which we did in our homes. I studied ten times more than what was studied in the universities, and to the accompaniment of practical application.

That was the time of the ebbing and regression of the world revolution. I was acquainted with a group of intellectuals, great gentlemen, but who were attacking Trotsky. I was shaping up and felt that Trotsky had to be defended. Although they were pulling it all down, they were teaching me much about Trotsky. There came a time of crisis in 1938 when they attacked Trotsky's comments on André Malraux's book «The Human Condition». They argued that Trotsky had written critically of Malraux because of a sour stomach. This sparked an enormous polemic.

I set out to join the Socialist Party to strike a blow for Trotsky. I wrote verses and the Party magazine published them. I stood for councillor and senator. I kicked off a political struggle against the old socialist leadership in public defence of the revolutionary program of the Socialist Youth. I was a worker without enough to eat, training myself to live up to my Marxist studies. I won the Congress seat and was elected general secretary of the Socialist Youth.

Thanks to the struggle that we waged against the old socialist movement and against the old Trotskyist movement, we created the base upon which to excel afterwards in elevation. I travelled all over Argentina to organize, short of food and money, traveling whole days by bus, aware of having much to learn. Today, all this has become part of the structure, the preoccupation, the scientific dedication, the moral conduct of the International.

I belonged for a time to the *Partido Obrero de la Revolución Socialista*. In reality, this was a non-worker party, nothing 'revolutionary' and even less 'socialist'. There, the only worker was me. This old movement was worthless. It had to be fought, and I took this on openly. Delegates used to come from Europe and the United States, many of them for a tour. There was a day when one of them made the brutal criticism that Trotsky was wrong, and that the Permanent Revolution was rubbish. Another had authored a pamphlet in 1942 in which he envisaged the collapse of the Soviet Union, the triumph of capitalism, and the development of the Fourth International as a result!! See what these people were like!

**Our objective is to take part in communist construction.** In this historic stage, it is necessary to build the Party. We have neither the means nor the cadres in sufficiency, but we have the Marxist capacity to understand. One must raise as high as they can go the Marxist comprehension and the communist morale, for the communist and socialist movement was corrupt, and old Trotskyism as well.

The doing of this forms part of our moral richness and of the richness of the socialist revolution. Because the authority we have presently has bases too, in everything we organised consciously, as when we retook the best of the old Trotskyist movement and based ourselves on the gains they made, which in those days, amounted essentially to the fight against Stalinism.

**Even in those days, we were already changing the relation with the communists.** I was the first Trotskyist to make a united front with the communists. In 1941, I was in the city of Córdoba when news broke out of the war of Germany against the Soviet Union. When some campaneros and me saw this announcement on the noticeboards of the newspaper «*La Voz del Interior*», a cry escaped me: "And that bureaucratic shit (meaning the Soviet bureaucracy) allows this to happen!". I was suddenly pommelled by several fists. Police came, took us to the station, put us all in the same cell. I identified one of my aggressors - I recognised him, he was a communist. I said: "You hit me, didn't you?" - to which he replied: "You were attacking the Soviet Union". "I was not attacking anything" I said, "I was criticizing the bureaucracy". Then another told him: "I told you that you shouldn't have hit him". When police came to question us, an officer asked me: "This is the one who hit you, no?". "No sir", I replied. They let us all go in the end, but we continued to argue. The communist comrade gave me a hug and invited me to the Party locale where he was the doorman.

Some months after that, we Cordoba workers<sup>19</sup> went on a big strike organised by our Cordoba footwear trade union of which I was the general secretary. The Buenos Aires communists attacked us. They said that we were in the pay of their Buenos Aires employers, that we were on strike in Córdoba to spoil the local industry so that the Buenos Aires employers could compete better. There was a big meeting. One of the Communist leaders came to the rostrum and said: « Regarding the attacks on the general secretary of the Cordoba Shoemakers' Union, it is all lies. He is an excellent militant. The lies are used by the Córdoba's employers to wreck the workers' strike ». Everyone knew that this particular general secretary was a member of the Trotskyist Fourth International (Pablo). His picture [as footballer] could be seen any day in the newspapers' columns.

Throughout all that period, I learned to write, working 9 hours a day either as a painter, a shoemaker, a metallurgist or a typographer. A whole team of militants had to be educated to study, and the political situation had to be interpreted. And Trotsky was no longer there to guide.

---

<sup>19</sup> In the 1930's, J Posadas worked as a shoemaker in Cordoba where he created the Shoemakers' and Leather Workers Union. Although this was unheard of at the time, he insisted on women to be elected at all levels in the Union, and particularly in its leadership. In 1935, Posadas joined the IV International then led by Pablo. Trotsky was assassinated in 1940.

After the war in 1945, the Trotskyism of those days broke down and everyone dropped out. I was the only one left. Without the experience which I had made previously, I would not have been able to resist this. I would have lacked the confidence and the security that it takes. I say this to show how important it is to prepare oneself scientifically, how not to abandon when the means come to be lacking. We had been right in our criticisms. The old Trotskyism had capitulated.

This is how we started organizing the new Trotskyist movement ourselves. Having set out to understand what was happening in the region and the world, we started with Latin America. We were well into the organisation of teams in Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil before the leadership of the Fourth International<sup>20</sup> recognised us.

**After the war, it was no longer enough to keep shouting: "Down with Stalinism". One had to understand the new rising problems.**

The old focus on Stalinism had been a specific problem in Latin America, but it was a general one throughout the International. Even into our own ranks, we had to reintroduce the Marxism that had been abandoned by the old teams. The impetuosity of the post-war revolutionary process made a clean sweep of them all.

Coached by this experience, we came to understand Peronism, and started our struggle against the Fourth International of Pablo, Mandel, Pierre Frank. Thinking that we were influenced by Peronism, these leaders attacked Posadas, called him an "agent of Peronism". We proved this was nonsense: an agent of Peronism will show their hand in policy and programme. Our policy and program were against Perón, but supportive of the anti-imperialist measures and positive and understanding towards the Peronist masses. This is why to this day we still have an authority before them.

In Argentina, the process at work was educating the masses in a bourgeois nationalism combined with the very profound combativity of class trade unions. One had to understand this. This movement had to be helped to rise above its bourgeois leadership; it had to make itself independent of the bourgeois leadership. But one had to understand also that this movement was not going to break. It would maintain its cohesion, which it has done to this day!

---

<sup>20</sup> This was still the Pablo leadership.

The Peronist masses function in trade unions to oppose this bourgeois leadership. Here was a new sort of movement that neither Marx nor Trotsky could have foreseen.

**The nature of the nationalist movements had to be analysed.** In those days, one had to make use of the historic experience made in order to learn, and open up above all to the sentiments and the consciousness of the class, the working class. The old team had been incapable of this. In 1951, they were still calling Peronism fascist. A month before the (Third) World Congress, they had published in the review "*Quatrième Internationale*" an article foreseeing "the fall of Perón's dictatorship". In 1955, they called Perón 'fascist' and said that "the twilight of Peronism"<sup>21</sup> had arrived with Perón's overthrow. For them, "the petit bourgeoisie which had once supported Perón would now join forces with the angry masses that had thrown him out". But it is the reverse that happened. The masses supported Perón and the petit bourgeoisie did not.

We (Posadists) analysed that the process of nationalism in Latin America was not a particular phenomenon, but the form that the revolution was now taking in those countries. At the II World Congress of the IV International (1946), we had given battle on the question of Ceylon and India against Pablo and the other leaders. Towards these two countries, we had the same view as towards the countries of Latin America. But those leaders kept seeing fascism in Peronism; they kept taking the nationalist movements of Latin America for fascists.

In 1948, I led the fight against these old leaders. I had written "*The Thesis on Latin America*" for the II Congress, but they had hidden it. In that document, we said of Peronism that it was a nationalist anti-imperialist movement, expressing the course of the revolution and result of the victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War. We recommended that it should be supported, impelled, developed. It was the form through which the course of the revolution was expressed.

---

<sup>21</sup> Juan Peron (1895-1974): Army colonel who became president of Argentina from 1946 until 1955. From 1952 onwards, he fell out with the Catholic church, and an economic crisis developed. Although he was re-elected with a wide margin, the right wing was organising to bring him down. This was not helped by the death of his very popular wife Eva, also in 1952. In 1955, a military coup forced him into exile in Spain. In 1973, he came back from exile and returned to the presidency, but he died one year later.

Pablo and the others leaders around him characterised Peronism as fascist. The movement of Villarroel in Bolivia<sup>22</sup>, fascist. That of Arbenz in Guatemala, fascist!<sup>23</sup>.

**We organised ourselves the fight against old Trotskyism in Latin America.** Apart from the text where we characterised Peronism for the first time, we had written « *Five-year Plan or Permanent Revolution* ». Another document called « *Our Press* » was a critique of this old Trotskyism which we were breaking from. We said that it was ankylosed, and not useful, because it had developed in an anti-Stalinian, petulant and aristocratic conception, without understanding the significance of the mobilization of the masses.

In the article « *Five-Year Plan or Permanent Revolution* » (1947), we criticised the Peronist government's plan; although we showed also that in case, this was a fairly big step forward considering how it came from a nationalist military movement open to influence. It was the first movement of military origin that was taking anti-imperialist measures<sup>24</sup>. In our Trotskyist leaders, the not wanting to see this had come from the old mentality and from the absence of Marxist application.

\* \* \* \* \*

I was 30 years a worker in the metallurgical or the shoe industries. When taking part and intervening in the demonstrations, we used to feel invigorated and part of the Peronist masses. We did not bow to them, but none of what they were doing - strikes, factory occupations and the fight for their rights - was fascism! Fascism? Where? Perón's program was an advanced nationalist program that the Communist Party and the old Trotskyists called fascist! They called Perón's program 'fascist' until 1951, and they did the same to every progressive movement, the one in India included. They were incapable of understanding.

---

<sup>22</sup> Gualberto Villarroel (1908-1946): Military officer and political leader who became president of Bolivia 1944-46. He saw to the abolition of 'pongueaje', a particular form of exploitation of the indigenous people. He attempted other reforms, and ushered in the MNR that would continue the social revolution in 1952.

<sup>23</sup> Juan Jacobo Arbenz (1913-1971): Military officer and political leader who had been Defence Minister in Guatemala 1944-51. He became president of Guatemala 1950-1954, supported by workers, peasants and intellectuals. He instituted a land reform and granted property to landless peasants. He was overthrown by a CIA-led coup and a vicious anti-communist campaign with dogged accusations of ties with the Soviet Union.

<sup>24</sup> Read: "*Causes and factors in the progressive role of military teams in the world revolutionary process*", J Posadas, June 1974. Should soon appear on site, and available on demand.

In the II World Congress of the IV International (1946), these old leaders brought up a text saying: "Neither Wall Street nor the Kremlin". They were opposing both the United States and Moscow. We rejected this position. The mentality of these people was such that we clashed and could not coordinate. We insisted on respect for the purity of the revolution and of Trotskyism. What they proffered was ankylosis of Trotskyism, petulance, individual and collective aristocracy. They could not wait for the communist parties to dissolve, for Stalin to fall. They wanted the Soviet Union to disappear to be able to justify their views. For our part, and like the masses of the world, we yearned for the triumph of the Soviet Union because it would strengthen the revolution. In 1943, the defeat of the Nazis at Stalingrad gave an enormous boost to the world revolution.

**While old Trotskyism abandoned Marxism, we maintained the program of the Fourth International.** In those days, you could not uphold the programme without interpreting the nationalist movement and the Communist Party. In Argentina, the Communist Party was reactionary - not mistaken, reactionary. It took the side of Yankee imperialism against the Peronist masses and against Perón. It called Perón fascist and it called the Peronist masses shabby and seedy. The same Peronist masses that won the right to factory councils, because Perón had to concede to them, and grant it to them. No doubt that Perón was a bourgeois leader. A bourgeois nationalist that is, who sought a relationship with the working class to defend himself against imperialism and the oligarchy. One had to understand this process, without submitting to it, to be able to impel it and make progress.

The entire movement of the old Trotskyism combated us. They said to my face that I was "Perón's agent". They said that Perón was paying me, when I didn't even have enough to eat! I worked as painter-decorator because there was no other job, still interpreting the Peronist movement, as well as the nationalist movements of Bolivia and of Guatemala. We felt the historic joy of a leading Factory Councils in the largest company of Argentina, the Siam Di Tella with 5,000 metal workers. It was the first time that a Factory Council got formed there. It called itself "la Comisión Interna" - we had stimulated this activity.

This is how we built the IV International in Latin America, against all of them. They wanted the destruction of the communist parties while we wanted to impel the communist parties. This is back then, you know - the epoch we live in today is different.

The communists back then were not mistaken: they were downright reactionary! And we fought them. We called on the Communist Party to correct itself, but we attacked it too.

We waged a struggle in the IV International to help it understand this process. We want the leaders of then to discuss these problems. They were not discussing anything. Everything that they were reproaching Stalinism for, they were practicing themselves!

The Fourth International was built by Trotsky to continue Marxism. But one does not continue Marxism just by publishing his articles. This is only a part of it. Marxism is maintained and Marxism gets continued through one's positions in front of history. And there was one position to take then. It consisted in understanding that the essential task was neither to crush the communist parties, nor Moscow. The problem was to comprehend the nationalist movements such as they were given, develop this new force, create a Trotskyism united to those movements and wait for the development of the communist parties.

In 1956, we held the Third Latin American Conference<sup>25</sup>. Our report ended like this: « **In Latin America, the world process of the revolution can permit, even to petit-bourgeois currents, to take power** ». We raised the possibility of Fidel Castro taking power<sup>26</sup>. And we wrote on the revolutionary nationalist processes.

We foresaw the course of the revolution in Latin America, in Europe and Asia - a course inevitably leading to capitalism preparing for war.

It has become transparent since, that even though capitalism has not made total war, it wages it piecemeal, bit by bit. And it prepares for general war too. We showcase this course in the process to fortify the world's communist and non-communist proletarian vanguard in the certainty of steady capitalist enfeeblement and the ascent of the world revolution. And to see how to intervene, with a stress on two essential, irreplaceable positions: Soviet democracy, and the necessity of the world United Front and local.

---

<sup>25</sup> This Conference belonged to the functioning of the Latin American Bureau of the IV International. There, the members of the old team (Pablo etc) did not take part. They were opposed and they opposed Posadas' view of the communist parties and the revolutionary nationalist movements, that in Cuba included.

<sup>26</sup> This evaluation by J Posadas amounted to a forecast. The Castro leadership (a fierce critic of Posadas) took power in Cuba three years later, in 1959.



To respond to these necessities, we produced an innumerable quantity of texts. Texts that defined the stages of history, and amongst them *"The Role of the Guerrillas"*. We wrote that *"Cuba had to, and could be a Workers State"* and that *"It is capitalism that is now clandestine"*.

At a time when the Workers States and the world communist movement still saw capitalism with an immense power, we wrote these to spell out that it was capitalism that had to hide. We made those texts to show the debility of the capitalist system.

## J POSADAS

*In a compilation of texts from 1962 to 1977*

## THE CUBAN REVOLUTION AND THE FUNCTION OF THE GUERRILLA

**J POSADAS**

Chapter 3

When the Cuban revolution triumphed in 1959, we intervened and sent comrades. One year before Fidel Castro opted for communism, we had said the following about the situation: "*Fidel Castro is going to communism*", and "*Cuba is a sui-generis political revolution going to communism and cannot be detained in humanism*".

At our **Third Latin American Conference** in 1956<sup>27</sup>, we presented a document on the Cuban revolution where we said: "*In these conditions of history, of revolutionary development of the revolution, of constant risings in China, in Europe, the ground is being laid for petit-bourgeois movements – not Stalinian but petit-bourgeois – to go as far as taking power. Not through conditions of their own, but as a result of the process in the world*". This is how I had ended my report. This was our prognosis of Cuba's revolutionary progress. That is to say, what we still had left to find out, was the form the revolution was going to take. [To achieve this,] We had started from the premises of our masters, those of Trotsky particularly and also Lenin. And into our capacity of foresight, we had incorporated the analyses of this stage of history. For none of masters had ever said that the petit bourgeoisie is going to take power.

---

<sup>27</sup> This Latin American Conference was still a function of the IV International and its old leadership (Pablo etc). Delegates from the old leadership were taking part, but in opposition to Posadas' critical support for the revolutionary nationalist movements - that of Fidel Castro above all else. These old leaders, often based in the European countries, behaved as if Latin America and Argentina were a long way away, and Cuba a far-away island of not much importance. Posadas and the teams of his followers broke from that organisation in 1962, creating the Posadist IV International. The British section of the Posadist IV International was formed that same year, 1962.

In 1959 and just before the great advances of the Cuban revolution, we wrote an appeal to the Cuban government and published it in the *Latin American Marxist Magazine*. We called on it to statise<sup>28</sup> everything and organize Soviet democracy. We called for the creation of social organs to defend the revolution in every locality. In the old leadership of our International however, they were remaining indifferent. When Fidel declared himself a communist, they accepted the fact - but for a whole year and a half before that, they had not given him a thought. But for us, we had foreseen this. We had prepared the International for lending a hand. We acted in this way in Bolivia, Guatemala, Colombia and later Peru.

In 1960, we organised a delegation of Latin American comrades to attend the *Latin American Youth Congress in Cuba*<sup>29</sup>. We did this against the wishes of the leadership of the IV International which was opposed. If we were going to Cuba, it was not to make a mark on the world, or to show off as the Latin Americans. Our aim in going was to try and influence the revolutionary process that was unfolding.

We can say that we really did have an influence. Fidel Castro resolved to nationalize 36 Yankee companies at that time. Him and his team had not yet nationalized anything before; they were seeing things in light of a bourgeois-democratic revolution; and in that conception, some role had been played by the French Communist Party.

Off we went to Cuba with our program and objective: impel the nationalizations, help build a socialist Cuba. For a whole year previous to that, the only thing that Fidel Castro had said was that, in reality, he was a democrat. In an article of 1959, I wrote that he was wrong, and that deep down, he was a communist. I said also that his sentiments, his way of talking and his outlook could not prosper or be included in the capitalist system; and that what he posed could only happen in a process going to communism. At a later time, we also discussed with Guevara. He was accepting much of what we were saying, as his declarations and speeches demonstrated.

---

<sup>28</sup> *To statise* is used in place of 'to nationalise', to insist on the aim of economic planning for human need.

<sup>29</sup> That was the first *All Latin American Youth Congress*, 28.7.1960. Che Guevara and others made speeches.

**Our International intervened in the Guatemalan guerrilla, the MR-13 de Noviembre** – We did this to show that the guerrilla was not making sense by itself, and that a Party had to be made. We raised this at the *Youth Congress in Cuba* which we attended. All these are historic experiences. We do mean here to narrate them all, but to show how the building of an instrument like ours' needs every bit of experience and education brought into it. It was for such a purpose that the International intervened in Guatemala. Just as in Cuba too, and to very great effect.

Without our intervention, without the writings of Posadas, without the Argentinian section and Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International, the guerrilla experience would have just continued. It was us, ourselves, who opened the polemic with the Cuban leadership - a polemic which was not against Fidel Castro. We contended that the guerrilla experience had ended, and that the conditions that had raised Fidel Castro into power would not be repeated.

J POSADAS *in a compilation of texts from 1962 to 1977*

# **REVOLUTIONARY NATIONALISM AND THE PARTIAL REGENERATION OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT**

**J POSADAS**

Chapter 4

When we began, our struggle was to defend the conception of the nationalist process in Latin America. From 1954, we fought in the Fourth International to replace "entryism" with what we were calling "interior entryism". This new formulation was to convey our desire to encourage the communist parties as against 'entryism' that sought to break them up. With this change, we made it known that we expected regeneration in the communist parties, even if not in the leaderships. The process would eventually oblige those parties to regenerate.

This was the reason why we decided to break with the old Trotskyism of Latin America (See note 19). It was not the aim of "interior entryism" to target the Communist Party. Our aim was to accompany a process of favourable evolution within it. This was the perspective that gave us the elements to formulate our concept of *Partial Regeneration* later on.

We interpreted a nationalist process in Latin America which was not just Latin American. It was the expression of relations of forces in the world that the triumph of the Soviet Union had spurred and that, consequently, were going to generate conditions favourable to the revolutionary process.

It was consciously that we fought for this position. We were still a small nucleus of working-class origin. It is us who grew and developed the International into what it is today in Latin America<sup>30</sup>. We maintained the concrete application of Marxism. We published the texts of Marx, Engels,

---

<sup>30</sup> <https://en.quatrieme-internationale-posadiste.org/scientific-cultural-and-political-editions/>

Lenin, Trotsky and of the Third International. We interpreted history and we created the new leadership for this stage.

From 1954 onwards, we looked in the direction of the communist parties for signs of regeneration. We took the fight to Pablo and the others who were mounting a whole struggle against the communist parties and the Workers States<sup>31</sup>. For the USSR, they had found the name of "Soviet glaxis". When the Soviet troops entered Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania in 1944-45, they demanded that the Soviets should leave: "Neither imperialism nor the Soviet glaxis" they said! To which we countered: "No, let's have the Soviet troops staying and handing the power over to the masses. Out with the capitalist troops!".

In 1958, the Chinese attacked the Islands of Quemoy and Matsu<sup>32</sup>. Pablo published a text showing the attack as a diversionary action, the Chinese trying to hide their economic failure. We said that this event testified to the permanent revolution by military means. What Pablo had seen as a retreat of the revolution was an advance instead.

With these former comrades, the discussion about the attack on Quemoy and Matsu became springboard for our differences. Two years later, we had broken from them. We had verified in every way their loss of confidence, of security, of interest to build the International. We had witnessed their adaptation to, and their development of cast-like interests, of bureaucratic accommodation.

It was us who organised all our Latin American sections. We do it by integrating them into the life of the International. This is not any sacrifice, but an elevation in the form of thinking and of conceiving life. We play soccer at meetings, we sing. As these activities improve the cultural and revolutionary relations, which is the way to elevate the human relations. What predominates otherwise is the individual relations.

I was already in work at the age of 6. All my family had worked from childhood. That was the most common thing in Latin America. I was in the factory at the age of 8. This did not give me any feeling of oppression because that was the normal thing. When we were having a fiesta, children used to come from everywhere. We had them intervening in

---

<sup>31</sup> Posadas refers here to the post-war situation. The USSR defeated Nazism and there were now 13 or 14 Workers States.

<sup>32</sup> Two islands in the Taiwan Strait.

activities of responsibility. Which makes it that now, we are used to educating children, making them participate in our life. We used to have meetings to listen to Beethoven and to explain him.

**Trotsky says: "Since humanity passed from the monkey to the Workers State, who says it is not going to make socialism?"**. And so we say: since Stalingrad happened, since Nazism was impotent in destroying the Soviet Union, who says the communist parties are not going to regenerate?

The condition of *bureaucracy* is not congenital. The Soviet bureaucracy was not born that way, nor will it continue that way either. It was created by historic conditions. It has an apparatus that must be destroyed, but as a bureaucracy, it can no longer procreate or continue to grow. The process of history runs counter to this.

Take Peronism in Argentina for instance. When a military coup there, originally composed of various currents, ended up in the victory for the nationalist tendency – and the same happened in almost all the movements of Latin America – here was a force to reckon with in history, with a capacity to influence.

One had to connect with this force and understand it. In it, the masses were not just tailing behind the bourgeois currents. They were seeing an instrument of progress which was neither communist nor socialist, but nationalist. The fact that people wanted to impel this forward was indicative of new historic stages coming, and that Trotsky could not have foreseen.

The damage inflicted by Stalin was very great, very profound. But it never broke or destroyed the confidence of the Soviet masses in the building of communism. The latter had already proved infinitely more powerful than all the weapons and the armies of the capitalist system, more powerful even than Stalin. When they fought at the Stalingrad siege, they defended a principle they had already assimilated. They could see the significance of that fight for humanity.

Trotsky had counted on this. He just could not have told the form that it would take. When he was asked: "If war brings revolution, as you say, what will happen to the bureaucracy?" he simply answered: "The conditions that gave rise to the Soviet bureaucracy will have ended".

Through this declaration, Trotsky already looked into the situation that would create new conditions.

**Without capitulating to the Communist Party, one had to understand the process within it.** One had to inspect what in its nature, was going to generate the conditions, the means and the power to develop conscious revolutionary currents in the communist parties. Meanwhile, one had to confront the Stalinist apparatus, its way of thinking and of reasoning, the structure of its economic and material interests, because all these have to be destroyed.

Trotsky could not tell what would happen in WW2 and after. But he summed it up when he said: "*Within ten years, millions of revolutionaries will know how to move heaven and earth*". One had to interpret this. The old International had no idea what it meant - and neither had the communists. In the run up to the war, no communist party prepared for power. Each communist party prepared to conciliate with capitalism instead. The turn this gave to history determined all the particular processes that came afterwards.

**No profound thought can be created without theoretical comprehension and without a knowledge of the process of the world.** Every national process at whatever level of historic significance has its roots in the world, and not in the country. It is the world relations of forces that decide how the process presents in a country, in magnitude and in form. Marxism has no region. Its origins are in Marx, pinnacle of the best in the way of thought of his epoch. It summarizes the most complete thought of humanity.

We prepare the International to understand these aspects of the revolution. The overall arc of history passes through the rise of the Workers States, the defeat of capitalism, the triumph of the masses in 1943 in Stalingrad, the triumph of the Chinese revolution. These created the historic conditions for the debilitation and the disintegration of capitalism. They impelled the masses, edified the petit bourgeoisie, attracted the peasantry – formed a corpus, as yet not structured [...] of revolutionary feats [of the sort] that would send ripples of influence also in the army and in the Church.

The old Trotskyism did not understand these things. Its leaders (Pablo etc) lacked in scientific preoccupation and in scientific severity.



We do not make them solely responsible in themselves because this had been a very difficult stage. We were isolated. We had nothing and the new process had to be interpreted. The communist movement was proving insecure. In Europe, the communists had entered bourgeois governments. Stalin was continuing in power, and the USSR had made tremendous depredations in the countries where the Red Army had entered.

Our old team saw carnage all round, everything falling apart. In 1951, they posed that Yugoslavia was returning to capitalism. And it was with complete rigidity that they kept repeating: '*Down with Stalinism! Down with the communist parties! Use 'entryism', profit from the blunders of the communist parties!*'. We were opposed to all this. We wished instead that the communist parties should take power. Not much of this seemed plausible between 1940 and 1946, but yes, it became so in 1952, 1953, 1954<sup>33</sup>. One had to have the patience to foresee.

**In the past, capitalism used to beat the drums of war pompously,** with flags and soldiers' parades. Now it hides the troops because at the first whiff of war, the population becomes contrary, and half of the army as well! It is stealthily and clandestinely therefore that capitalism must prepare for war. This is all opposite to what the Workers States do. The Soviet Union announces publicly: "*We support all anti-imperialist liberation movements*"<sup>34</sup>. It is not bourgeoisies that it sets out to support, but Angola, Cuba, Mozambique. Here you see clearly the Workers States deciding the course of history in spite of not having yet returned to Marxism in any harmonious or consistent form.

**Military movements used to "the solitude of the uniform" are now joining in the revolutionary process.** Without even having removed their uniforms, you get soldiers quitting the solitude of their uniform by intervening in the revolutionary process. This was never foreseen or considered by the past revolutionary leaderships. Yet history cannot be understood now without foreseeing this, interpreting it, considering it,

---

<sup>33</sup> The Communist Party of China took power in 1949. The Communist Party of Bolivia started gaining support in the working class after 1952, especially among the mine-workers. The Cuban revolution was in preparation and took place in 1959.

<sup>34</sup> This phrase was enshrined in the 1977 New Soviet Constitution. This was not a formality. The policy of supporting the national liberation movements was implemented, and already been implemented for some years, since it was in 1975-76 that the Soviets were helping Cuba to intervene in Angola. Editorial.

extrapolating it, and seeing that new soldiers are going to come, no longer in the solitude of the uniforms, but in the 'alegria' of the uniform<sup>35</sup>. Armies which used to go and crush revolutions now go in search of a role and function in the revolution. They do not do this because some motion was voted in the army, in some Party or somewhere else. They do it as an integral, a wholesome reaction to the influence of the course of the progress of history flowing from the Workers States.

**We discussed in the International that the atomic war is inevitable.** We argued in the post-war International that no historic example shows the war can be avoided; or the class-war for that matter, or the inter-capitalist war. In our present case, we are dealing the war of the capitalist system against the Workers States. We argued this. Mind that this had been the position of the IV International up until 1959. It was 1959 when Pablo, Maitan and the others decided that the most important task for the IV International was to prevent the atomic war. They called the Posadists 'savages' not only for predicting the atomic war, but for "wanting the atomic war". To this we answered in substance: "*Not so. We don't want the atomic war, and we don't want any war. But we don't want to go hungry, and we do. And we don't want to get wet in the rain. We don't want people to die anywhere in the world, but they do. Capitalism kills them. We are not weighing the possibilities of war against no war. Our analysis concludes on the inevitability of the atomic war*".

The old Trotskyists declared that the objective of the Fourth International was to prevent the war. They said: "*It is absurd to believe, like Posadas, that socialism can be built with the atomic war*". But this is neither absurd, nor do we want this ourselves. It is just so. And more than this still, we interpret that the war is not going to prevent socialism. When you consider what is happening in the totality of Asia, Africa and Latin America - the deaths of the peoples, their enormous food deprivation: what do you call that?

**What does 'atomic war' mean? The terrorization of humanity - that's what it means.** But the havoc that will be caused by it will be easily mended. It is absurd to surrender to the thought that war can have more primacy over nature than the scientific capacity of humanity. If we passed from the monkey to what we are today - when we can recreate,

---

<sup>35</sup> No English adjective (happiness, delight, joy) seemed to translate 'alegria' in this context. Translator note.

rebuild, reproduce, alter and interchange living cells - how doubt that the atomic war is going to be a passing evil, very limited? Who doubts that all the material losses will not be rapidly reconstituted? Isn't the capitalist system already producing all these human death at scale? Those who prove that they want war are the capitalists. They bring war to every country they enter. Take the Israelis in Lebanon for example<sup>36</sup>. There, they wrought a devastation a thousand times greater than the three Palestinians who had launched an attack.

The threat of the atomic war is a form of final settlement of accounts<sup>37</sup>. This is the dialectical interpretation of the system-against-system confrontation. The war is inevitable, but it will not destroy the development reached by humanity. It will not write evolution off, and it will not destroy the Workers States. The atomic war is going to be the ultimate act of desperation of the capitalist system, the final settlement of accounts.

**The 'final settlement of accounts' includes the process of the Partial Regeneration raised without limits<sup>38</sup>.** Does anyone believe that, when the final settling of accounts is upon us, the bureaucracy will still be there to say: "I am still boss here!"? The war is going to sweep off its feet the total capacity of the Soviet people, all their ability to think and to act, their entire experience, all their resoluteness. Every war brings to the fore the intervention of the masses. At such times, they become the actual protagonists of history. Such was the conclusion of the last war.

How not to see that the final settlement of accounts carries this conclusion too? The final settlement of accounts is not 'the nuclear holocaust'. We do not want any 'nuclear holocaust'. What is 'nuclear' is the war. This is the way to look at it: it has tragic effects for humanity, in any case, a limited tragedy that cannot be avoided.

J POSADAS, *in a compilation of texts from 1962 to 1977*

---

<sup>36</sup> Through its intervention on 1977, and then its invasion of Lebanon in 1978, Israel pushed the PLO north of the Litani River.

<sup>37</sup> By final settlement of accounts, J Posadas refers to the final confrontation between the capitalist system and the Workers States.

<sup>38</sup> Partial Regeneration is the name that J Posadas gave to the process happening in the USSR, *for instance*, when it supported Cuba's armed intervention (on the MPLA's side) in Angola - a major factor in the defeat of Apartheid South Africa.

# THE FOUNDING OF THE POSADIST FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

**J POSADAS**

Chapter 5

We broke with old Trotskyism in 1960. In 1962, we broke from the leaders of the International Secretariat and formed another International<sup>39</sup>. Our difference was about the characterization of history, about the world we live in today, and what position to take regarding the nuclear war.

The old leaders saw our epoch in light of a passive interlude during which capitalism had to be warned against war: "*Don't go that way, many people are going to die*" - as if capitalism were going to feel aghast and give up on making the war. They also said that "*capitalism is afraid of dying*". We said that one capitalist is afraid of dying, two perhaps ... or maybe one thousand. But the capitalist system is not. The capitalist system does not reason, it cannot be persuaded. It has to be imposed upon.

Our programme is this: The necessity of history realises itself in the final confrontation between the Workers States and the capitalist system. Capitalism is not going to let itself be ousted or eliminated from history without reacting. It will intervene. One must prepare for the final settlement of accounts. 'Prepare' here means more than waiting for the final settlement to arrive. It means developing the revolution, developing the communist parties; it means encouraging the intervention and the growth of the masses' struggles all over the world.

In this present stage, our Posadist function is defined by the relation *capitalism-Workers States*. Our activity is determined by the balance of class and revolutionary struggle that history has established. For there

---

<sup>39</sup> The Trotskyist-Posadist IV International.

are now some twenty Workers States in existence, along with a political process that passed from degeneration on to a regeneration leading to the historic re-encounter<sup>40</sup>. This alters the function of all the political parties. The historic objective of the revolutionary party is the social transformation that raises the function of the working class up into the leadership of society, tending, searching, being inexorably drawn to eliminating the classes.

This required from us activities new to history, as when we incorporated the concept of the *Revolutionary State*<sup>41</sup>. We did this from the theoretical, political and programmatic angle, and from that of activity. We ended the old polemics. No more internal wranglings over tactics about one or other aspect in one or other country.

What decides in history now is the global relation between the capitalist system on a one hand, and the Workers States on the other, the latter considered in this matter as together with the revolutionary movements at whatever level. We do not see tactics as fundamental any more, but as partial, because the 'normal' class struggle is no longer what decides. It is not even the advent of a communist or socialist government in any country that decides. What decides is the world relations of forces.

This brings up the need to act in a way that is new in history, a way not dissimilar to what happened in Europe and the world when new Workers States were formed appeared after WW2. The need to be guided by events at world level had existed before, but it has developed to the point of being an essential aspect in today's social relations. One must still intervene locally in strikes, demonstrations, political activities, elections and trade union movements. But the big decisions are now being made in the global power relations capitalism-Workers States.

**What decides now is the global power-relations capitalism-Workers States.** It is globally that the course of history is being decided

---

<sup>40</sup> Historic re-encounter. With this concept, J Posadas describes the coming together of all the political forces derived from the Russian Revolution, along with a new coordination between all the forces inspired by Marxism and the historic experiences made by all the Workers States. Trotsky will be returned to Lenin's side as a unique master and builder of communism.

<sup>41</sup> J Posadas formulated the concept of the Revolutionary State which is a capitalist state that can no longer operate for the reproduction of capital. It is not a passing phase, it is a new structure leaving the camp of capitalism, although still in capitalism. Venezuela is an example. <https://en.quatrieme-internationale-posadiste.org/book/the-revolutionary-state/>

nowadays. The movements of whatever nature - socialist, communist, dissident, «gauchista», syndicalist - that grew over a certain stage and period of time - must now take a side in this world relation of global forces. They either join the camp of the Workers States, or they will disappear; they will not join the enemy camp, at least not for the most part, but they will disappear. Because already the big decisions do not come from each country, from the great strikes, the great political events or the big electoral victories. The big decisions emerge from world relations of forces that have already been determined by the economy and the political-social leaderships created within the relation *Workers States-capitalist system*.

It is all this that determines the function which we play. We do not dwell on the partial activities in one country or the other, but on the overall conjunction of these activities. There is no scope for the development and the growth of currents, tendencies and parties in dispute with the trajectory of history. There is no room for those in dispute with the socialists, with the communists, the trade unions and the Workers States. Amongst all those, it is the Workers States that decide. It is the Workers States that sway the others.

Those who do not see this end up wandering.

We constituted this Posadist IV International in the full consciousness of what this entails. We laid out the essential points to this end: the points that are necessary and the points that are going to be necessary. These amount to the following: The Workers States have to confront the war and everyone must get ready.

The end result will be decided by the use of arms.

Human resolve is political, but its means of implementation is military.

The Workers States must get ready for this conclusion.

\* \* \* \* \*

**It is the Workers States that determine the course of culture, of science, of politics and of society.** This does not mean that the Workers States are always right or that they do everything well. It means that that they are those with the authority to inspire humanity forward. In this process we must define therefore why we exist, the justification for our world activity.

The groups that were born claiming to be the IV International have almost all dissolved. None conserved anything of the original Fourth International. Pierre Frank, Mandel, Livio Maitán did not, and neither did the others who appeared afterwards in so many parts of the world. They take no part in what history shows the need of, to transform society. They continue as currents in dispute with the communist parties. They argue between themselves but do not contribute with analyses, ideas or tactical experiences. Even when they make some criticisms momentarily necessary and just, their resulting accusations and activities amount to trade union responses; while at political level, they only address partial aspects, not the questions that have become historically decisive.

All these problems surface in the process because, whilst the capitalist system disintegrates, the advances of the Workers States proceed without the leadership, the programme, the policy or the social-scientific relations required by the necessity to liquidate the regime of private property.

**A world instrument was wanted to intervene in this new process of history.** The instrument that history required now was no longer of the sort that competes and disputes for the taking of power. The task of this new instrument was to help with the rectification of the political organs that were already existing for the taking of power. To build it, one had to cultivate a grade of consciousness, of sentiments and of capacity that was relatively new in history.

A movement that goes about in search of its own programme was no longer necessary. Its programme was to impel the centres that hold the leadership of the masses, and not just in every country but in the Workers States that determine the course of history.

It was necessary to organize a movement to respond to this necessity: the political parties are already present; there are already the historic forces in place for social transformation. Since these historic forces cannot be changed or eliminated, the task is to accompany them in this process.

It was necessary to organise a world movement, an International, with this consciousness, and to prepare our own selves for this function in history. For this therefore, we had to provide programme policy and method.

We had to organise the functioning of the Party along the lines of this conclusion. We had to take the internal Party relations away from the political disputes developed in the past around power-taking and combined military-electoral power methods. Our starting point was that now, those powers are already in existence through the Workers States. These are degenerated, but when their chain of degeneration breaks, they will have to come up instead a process of regeneration.

Such was the historic function of our International. There was no need to create a new body because the body was there already. That body was not sick, it was just wrongly led. We had to intervene to bring it to its senses.

We had also to give a thought to whether, at first, we were going to be ignored, or some attempt might be made to liquidate us.

We trusted in that the development of history, of the economy, of science and technology were going to create, along with human intelligence, the conditions wanted by this process.

**J POSADAS**

*In a compilation of texts from 1962 to 1977*



## **THE FUNCTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL AND THE PARTIAL REGENERATION**

**J POSADAS**

Chapter 6

The phrase 'partial regeneration' does not signify that one waits for the Soviets to make changes. We use that phrase to contribute to the creation of a new leadership. It is not so much that they are going to change as that they cannot hold on to, or maintain their dominion over the Party as they wish. The changes in the Soviet Union do not take the form of contortions. They express instead, and rather inorganically, the immense pressure of forces and relations favourable to the development of the revolution. The masses of the world impel their leaderships to make them change.

We have to intervene in a process in which we have not the forces, the numbers or the authority in sufficient quantity, but where the Workers States themselves are having to move towards Marxism.

Socialism cannot be built without Marxism. In the USSR, the discussion about the need for change is coming, and the necessity for change. Because to make progress, the Workers State must suppress capitalism. To suppress capitalism, it has to confront it. It must get prepared therefore for the possibility of confrontation. To do this, and even without going to war, the Soviet leaders have to develop their forces, their consciousness, their capacity. They need to generalize the experiences; not the experiences of the apparatus, but of the experiences of those who express combativeness and anti-capitalist positions. The apparatus imposes deadlines, but the necessity of history extends the deadlines.

We put our trust in history, the way Lenin did in 1917, the way Trotsky did when he predicted that «*within ten years millions of revolutionaries will know how to move heaven and earth*». Here you see confirmed, in consequence, the necessity for the programme, the activity and the instrument such as ours' - this Posadist Fourth International.

Today's problems are not the same as those after the war. In those days, the French and Italian Communist Parties entered the capitalist governments and sought to make careers. They nourished the widespread illusion that, through being in government, they were going to forge ahead and get communist ministers. But as the apparatus was capitalist, the communist minister faced a conflict that could only result in being rejected, or in having to accommodate. Here is a historic experience. Let no one think that it has died. Berlinguer, Améndola and Marchais<sup>42</sup> do not remember it, but history has not forgotten, and neither have the masses.

Here are experiences that demonstrate that, in order to transform society, it is not possible to enter a capitalist government and adapt to it. One will not transform society through becoming the capitalist minister who makes administrative, diplomatic or financial changes – and perhaps some relatively programmatic ones – with the intention of transforming society that way. The year 1946 proved the truth of this in two of the largest European countries, Italy and France. It is not possible to repeat this experience today, because a part of the communist apparatus has already understood and will now demand guarantees, which guarantees are the masses, the program and the objectives.

In 1946, the policy of the communist parties created illusions in the masses. In those days, the balance of forces was less favourable than now. The level of maturity was inferior, and above all, the USSR's leadership was encouraging this. Stalin and the Soviet bureaucratic apparatus were imposing this kind of policy to shore up their own power.

Such matters are all to the reverse today. Now the communist parties feel the need to respond to the pressure that comes from the militants of their own parties, and the Soviet Union is no longer interested in reconciling with capitalism at their expense, as Stalin used to do. These are new conditions in history.

These new conditions modified our function. They did not demand changes in our structure, but they posed the need for change in our objectives. We see that the class organisms already in place – communist parties, socialist parties, the big left-wing trade union centres – benefit from the existence of the Workers States which lends them more weight.

---

<sup>42</sup> Enrico Berlinguer 1922-1984, leader of the Italian Communist Party 1972-1984. George Marchais, 1920-1997, leader of the French Communist Party 1972-1994. Giorgio Amendola, 1907-1980, Communist MP in Italy, 1946-1980.

These workers' organisms are solid, relatively speaking, because the presence of the Workers States influences the masses and raises their level of confidence. More often than not, the petit bourgeoisie and the intellectuals come down on the side of the communist and socialist movements. Through their existence, the Workers States convey the notion and the grasp that socialism is accessible, not very distant. This motivates people to look for better than a capitalism improved, more humane or less bloodthirsty. In that process, a series of new programmatic questions have been coming up for debate.

**The China-USSR unification is a vital centre for the future of mankind.** Why are China and the Soviet Union divided? Behind the intervention of every revolutionary movement, there must be the essential aim of considering this problem so vital to the history of humanity. One cannot handle history without having this question resolved. And it is not a matter of just waiting for it to happen. One must help the world communist movement, and help it to mature by giving it confidence in the ideas and in the method.

To return to Marxism does not equate to returning to studies. To return to Marxism means to apply conclusions, positions, program and objectives that are only attainable through Marxism; one analyses therefore through the instrument, with the comprehension and the method of dialectical materialism.

To call correctly on Marxism, one has to live Marx, to feel him. Marx is alive here with us. His thought is didactic and dialectical because he deals with the principles that determine the comprehension of what moves the classes, the reason for their behaviour, the nature and the structure of their behaviour. With a grasp of what motivates the humans and the classes, one can interpret any development in any situation, and the reasons for the rise of divergences and differences.

The "return to Marxism" in the communist parties will not be advanced by instructions on our part! Our task is to accompany the life of the communist parties, in the appreciation that they are instruments of history. This wants for a measure of historic patience. We are not the antagonists of the communist parties.

We do not dispute with any Party that seeks human progress. We have divergences and disagreements of course, but in that context we value the use of persuasive criticism.

**The function of criticism is no longer what it was in Marx', Lenin or Trotsky's epoch.** There were times when the polemics in the world communist movement sought to impose methods, programs, objectives and tactics. You can still find this sort of thing today, but today, the historic scenario has changed. In the past, there had not been Workers States in development as there are now. There had not been the experience of the masses, or events like Vietnam. There had not been an Angola, where the 8 years-old participates in the revolutionary process. These events bear witness to transformations that have taken place in the nature of human thought and agency. Now the 8-years-old expresses the existence of the will, the resolve and the capacity for transformation, along with the means for transformation, which are the Workers States. This happens when there is identification with progress. So, the task is no longer to create new organisms, produce new ideas or new programs. There already exist the instruments that edify, develop and influence the human capacity to build and organize.

**The program for this historic stage must adapt to the existence of the communist parties.** There is already an instrument in history that cannot be ignored or discarded - the Workers State. Almost 20 Workers States exist that have passed all the tests of history. They guide the thought of the masses with programs, social organisms and historic structures. They form instruments within which we must intervene.

We want to accompany the life of the communist parties and of the Workers States. We share in their errors without endorsing them. We do not underrate the errors but we share the concerns. It is their authority in history that we respect. In Angola, it is the existence of the Soviet Union that inspires the 8 years-old to act audaciously.

The sense of historic security that you see in the masses of Mozambique and Cuba comes from the existence of the Workers States. The latter are imperfect and full of errors, but here they are with us. Should you look at this matter from a historic perspective, you see the Workers States accompanying the fundamental necessity of human progress against the capitalist system. They do this with all their limitations, their conflicts and their conciliations, but it is forward that they go.

Criticism in this stage is different from when Marx, Lenin and Trotsky lived. Our critique of the USSR takes into account that its leadership (Brezhnev) confronts the capitalist system. In such an endeavour, the Soviet leadership represents humanity. Its programme and policies are short of the necessary, but it acts as tool of global confrontation with the capitalist system. This explains the audacity of the children of Angola. It explains the elderly woman in Portugal, [fist raised in salute to the 1974 revolutionary soldiers]. Without the existence of the Workers States, without the will of the masses of the Workers States and without this Communist Party of the Soviet Union - however bureaucratically led - matters today would not have reached such a level.

The Workers States need an instrument like ourselves to intervene towards them, to accompany and assist them in what they think and decide. We help them to plan and universalise their political thought. The form of criticism we use towards them aims at persuading, not competing. The communist comrades are very remiss in the things they say. They can also show a great lack of resolve and audacity. There is a lack of historic audacity behind their political equivocation. If something characterizes the historic function of the proletariat, as distinct from all the previous classes in history, audacity is it. The audacity of the 8 years-old in Angola does not reflect a particular birthplace, but the historic security of the Workers States, which is that of the proletariat.

The proletariat, the workers' parties, and the world proletarian revolution do not express themselves through an Italian, French, Portuguese and Spanish workers' movement. They express themselves through the Workers States. It is in the Workers States that you find the global force of the proletariat and the conduct of the proletariat. The Workers States are the measure. The Italian, French, English or German proletariat can achieve great victories, but it is only partially and superficially that they do shake the structure of society.

**It is the advance of the Workers States that raises the consciousness of the masses of the world** – The Workers States give to the world's masses the notion that they (Workers States) embody the changes that must be made, and the way in which the changes must be made.

The Workers State imparts a theoretical and practical understanding that comes not from study, but from the practical conclusion of theory. The authority of the Workers State invites the proletariat to generalise its experience. The advances made by the Workers State can be seen to emanate from an anti-capitalist structure, whereas this is not so in the case when a strike wins a wage rise or better conditions. What people see in the Workers State is that it opposes capitalism. The proletariat sees it.

The universal and concentrated experience epitomised by the Workers State is worth more than twenty successful strikes in the capitalist system. This does not take anything away from the importance of winning strikes, because they contribute to the progress of the class struggle. The Workers State does the same thing however, and in a concentrated way, as a system: the Workers State is superior to the capitalist system. This fact induces human comprehension and political valour.

All this which we uphold above must serve the ability to persuade the communist movement. The persuasive criticism we use when addressing the communist parties seeks to improve their comprehension and their security. It aims at giving them confidence. Mind that we do not introduce here any new method. It is only that what Marx, Lenin and Trotsky posed in previous stages must be done in this way in our stage. We no longer have to create the class [proletarian] instruments as in the past. This question has been solved. There is the Soviet Union, there is China.

Mind that China is not the "*Gang of Four*" presently in the government (1976). China is the Chinese people who made such a Revolution - a Revolution that passed directly from the feudal epoch over to the Workers State. This is Trotskyism<sup>43</sup>. Here you have Trotskyism, Marxism, Leninism. Here you have the program of history. China passes from feudalism, from slavery – women were slaves and not only subjected to a feudal structure – directly to the Workers State. The Chinese people have been capable of this, guided by Mao Tsé Tung whose historic achievements are very great. How believe that the Chinese people have now been smashed by "*The Gang of Four thieves*" and "*The Sixteen Policemen*"? If China is facing a transitory process of retreat in leadership, it is alongside the constant advance and development of the class struggle in the world, and of the Workers States.

---

<sup>43</sup> Based on Trotsky's analysis of Permanent Revolution, J Posadas analyses how many countries like China, passed directly from feudal epochs over to forms of Workers States or Revolutionary States – leaping over the capitalist stage, particularly in the colonial revolutions after WW2. Editorial

This is how we wish to be persuasive. Between persuasion and rejection, we give priority to persuasion. Even in the most difficult aspects, our criticism aims at persuading. In so doing, we are not adapting, being soft or delicate. We seek the arguments most likely to encourage the movements that demonstrate vitality, capacity and transcendence.

In the old days, the polemics used to aim at replacing one [political] instrument with another. Such it had been in the old socialist movement, in Lenin and Trotsky's times. Today, the existing [proletarian] organs are the instruments of history. They need change in the way they think and plan, but they are valid and legitimate instruments. This is why we always said: "We will not do anything to harm the communist party". It is not a tactic on our part. We see it as a necessity of history.

**Criticising the Communist Party is not the essential thing nowadays.** We say this with all the passion and communist love for the progress of humanity: the Soviet Union and the communist parties are fundamentally the instruments. We must do no harm to them, and we must not adapt to them either. Far from it, we must intervene to hoist them up into the role and consciousness which are rightly theirs'.

Such is our task. As organs, the Workers States and the communist parties were not created by the present bureaucratic leaderships. They are instruments that history created in the class struggle. And the present bureaucracy is not the same as it was in epoch of Stalin either. This bureaucracy today has to crush capitalism, even if bureaucratically and in a parliamentary way. For the sake of its own life, it must crush capitalism and let the working class move forward. It is no longer possible for a bureaucracy to exist at the costs of the proletariat. Today, it has to seek an alliance with the proletariat. The grades of its relation with the working class are on an ascending curve, and at the costs of the bureaucracy.

We were handed over absolutely nothing from the old Trotskyist movement because it was a complete void. We had to organise ourselves every activity through which to create, develop and impart confidence in the conscious preparation of the scientific method that is Marxism. It was us, ourselves, who saw to the unconditional defence of the Soviet Union. And we saw ourselves to the comprehension of the revolutionary process in Latin America, Asia and Africa, that the old Trotskyists did not understand.

We had to demonstrate to our own organization (the old International of Pablo) that the communist movement was not going to be destroyed; that it was an instrument of history. In the post-war, the conditions were not conducive to what we were saying. It was a complicated situation. The communists had entered the French and Italian governments. Old Trotskyism was insisting that the communist movement was finished, and all we could do was to disagree.

It was only with the passing of time that our own positions started showing their worth. We mention this to show that we inherited nothing from the old International. It was us, ourselves, who organized a world movement through the methods and the experiences based on the unconditional defence of the Soviet Union, the unconditional defence of the Workers States.

The objective of our International is to fortify the intelligence of the world communist movement. As we proceed in doing this, we create a movement for a historic function that stops us becoming an organ of mass authority, or of weight for ourselves; we create a movement that enables us to grow through the growth of the organs of the masses that decide - our aim being to help prepare the intelligence of the world communist movement for its own function in history.

Our International is the result of all that past, but we take on today's tasks with the theoretical and political security we acquired in that past. This will have its effects in the present process already developing openly, which does not go backwards, of public polemics about method, principles and objectives in the world communist movement.

**Any communist party that breaks with the Soviet Union signs its own destruction.** This discussion has just started. We are going to be intervening in it as part of the world communist movement. Our persuasively critical writings take nothing from the depth and the breadth of our criticisms. Our principles and objective are unchanged. We only change the method through the adoption of *persuasion*. The world communist movement has nowhere to go except to communism. As a movement, it wanders off, advances, retreats, experiences fear - but it has nowhere to go but forward. The alternative would be the creation of an entirely new movement, a new leadership global or local, and there is no room at all in history for this.



**This International is not the continuation of Pablo's; it is the continuation of the IV International of Trotsky and its First**

**Congress.** Of the International that Trotsky organized in 1938, I am the only one left. There is no one else left, all the others disappeared. This is not down just to perseverance and resolve. It is about the continuity of Trotsky's method, the continuity of his thought. It is for this reason that we must necessarily be conscious of our function in history; a function that requires not only comprehension, but theoretical and political preparation. The problems are not resolved with numbers, but with ideas.

What the world communists are currently discussing marks the start of an improved debate that can only keep improving. The discussion is not sufficiently consistent or frequent, but it already raises matters of program, policy, theory. The Soviets are forced by the process to discuss theory and historical experience in greater depth. Among the capital things that they are going to discuss more, there is the elimination of the capitalist system.

We might have dedicated our Posadist International to winning strikes and to leading organisations. This we can do, but we must not create a movement that collides with the Soviets. Our task lies in the life of discussion which we hold, where all analyses and political concerns serve the production of the documents wanted by our objective. Should we not be doing this, we would be involved in strikes and struggles for partial demands in a way not conducive to this education which we need, this revolutionary cultural preparation. But we intervene also in strikes, and to win them; and to develop our weight more than before.

The present leaderships of the communist movement are bureaucratic, but they need to confront capitalism in order to develop themselves. They do this mindful of not promoting too much leftism, let alone conscious Marxist development, and they limit their vision to suppositions when they discuss. But they are progressing if only in the necessity to hold discussions that are clear and conclusive.

Our International devotes itself to these problems, and to all the problems of life: the youth, the «gauchistas», feminism, the children, music, the atomic war, the processes in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the concept of «self-determination», etc. We have intervened on most questions.

The communist movement sees us as a part of itself; it watches this [Posadist] Fourth International that intervenes on the theoretical, political and practical problems.

As the process in the Workers States passed from degeneration to partial regeneration – something that had not been foreseen – our political task in the communist movements could not stay the same. New conditions were being created in history favourable to an activity towards these movements, for us to support and develop them, along with a perspective of ourselves eventually participating in their leadership.

There used to be no room for this sort of thing, in the days when political parties had to struggle to assume the control and leadership of the masses. They used to aim at power, governments or parliaments. But this is not a proposition anymore. The [proletarian] organs for the progress of history - the communist parties and the Workers states - have already been constructed. Indeed, they are the fundamental element that drives the activity of the working-class movement in the world.

**The most important of all the tasks is to influence the Workers States, to help them change and evolve.** This applies also to our activity towards the communist parties. For they are, themselves, a reflection of the Workers States. The communist parties live on because there are Workers States. If this were not so, they would decompose. We are certainly lacking in numbers for this task of ours', but we are not lacking in ideas, policies or program. We do not have enough cadres or material means, but we have program, policy and ideas.

The process advances through acquired social, economic, scientific and military factors underpinning its development. At economic level, the progress of humanity can no longer suffer capitalist management or the management of bureaucracies.

The body of human progress is too huge to fit into the capitalist suit of clothes, or the bureaucratic one. Their suit leaves no space for human progress to create the harmonious coordination between the capacity of human intelligence and the *means* that human intelligence has the power to create. It leaves those *means* infinitely stunted.

Seen from every angle, it is intelligence that determines the process of today. And intelligence asks: "What do you want private property for?".

People yearn for the human relations, and not of the sort imposed by interests, by property or by power. People wish for the full development of their human sentiment. They reject having to live in servitude to the economy, to dispute.

All this brings a constant process of change. It is not that the communist parties have determined these changes, but that the process is determining these changes in the communist parties. We have built our whole policy upon this conclusion.

The communist parties are wont to manipulate. They will continue to do so for some time, through their own apparatuses and through those in the Workers States. But these apparatuses will not always be able to contain in this way. The ascending course of the process of history and of the economy represents the progress of humanity. After having got hold of the advance of the economy where it is based, the progress of humanity expands it in turn in the form of ideas, of harmonious relations. This will not be contained even where every apparatus of subordination wishes to turn it off, silence it, keep it at bay.

We were motivated by all this when we created our first *Latin American Marxist Review*. That publication enabled us to pose that a return to Marxism was necessary; and that the communist movement had to return to Marxism. We did not expect anybody to suddenly go off and start studying. We knew that the objective process depends on series of factors, and that these are not all coordinated. And that unlike a chain, they form the harmonious process that culminates in intelligence.

The development of the economy harmonizes nature and technical capacity. Today, it is human intelligence that develops the most. Angola has not enough to eat, but it already knows that the answer to this is to be free of exploitation. Its head is open to intelligence and to science. Its people do not experience the oppression of feeling trapped in individual domesticity - with a wary eye on the possessions, the house, the son - in the way of the capitalist gripped by the factory, to compete. The Angolan people see that all this must be eliminated. Their intelligence is free of the private property model.

**Our task is to influence in the historic centres of revolutionary decision.** Our way of working today comes from before, as when we gave critical support to the Peronist movement and the Perón government. We recall these experiences to demonstrate our ability to take initiatives. We have used this ability to great effect in Cuba, and towards leaders like Guevara. In our own team, we have encouraged the appreciation of life in the love of ideas, and of party functioning, in order to be able to formulate ideas. We did this before, and we do it now, with the same conception, with the same intelligence and with the same comprehension.

**It is necessary to analyse the depth of the crisis of capitalism and the inevitability of the war.** The Workers States do not have the capacity to foresee the course of the process. They still believe that it is possible to prevent the war. But you cannot understand the future if you start from the conception and formulation that 'the war can be avoided'. This formulation leads to chains of equivocations, linked to the dozens of reactions, relations and conclusions spewed by the capitalist system.

With the formulation 'let's avoid the war', the bureaucracy is not making a mistake. It is making a wish. It is afraid, because the war brings the disappearance of the bureaucracy. For the bureaucracy, the idea that the war can be avoided is not an objective conclusion: it is its desire for itself to survive. But for the bureaucracy to exist, it needs to flesh out the Workers State; and as coordination and planning demand the development of the Workers State, the bureaucracy has to oppose the capitalist system. The bureaucratic leaders can no longer make agreements with capitalism as in the past.

The 'peaceful coexistence' formula has disappeared from communist speak. Some have been talking of violent revolution.

We do not reckon that it is our task to be influencing the Soviet Union to make it change. Our aim is to have the Soviet Union itself elevating its own capacity of comprehension in a process that is going to force it to think more and more in anti-capitalist terms.

The Soviet Union is already being forced to think more and more in anti-capitalist terms. The Soviet bureaucracy is anti-capitalist, but not revolutionary. It wants to suppress capitalism, but not by force.

There is still no open discussion about the possibility of war, or war preparations, in the USSR. But several high-ranking Soviet army commanders have already spoken of the war being inevitable; and of the need for the preventive war; and that there is no possibility of any long-term coexistence between antagonistic social systems.

Capitalism cannot concede power. It will never do this, be it through accords with the communist parties or with the USSR. Capitalism just cannot let go of the levers of the power it holds. These will have to be seized from it, by force, its whole capitalist structure being for the defence of the system.

### **The Posadists are part of the world communist movement.**

Our intervention is guided entirely by our analysis of the course of the process. In that course, the communist parties and the Workers States are going to have no option, and no way to evade, pronouncing against capitalism. We do not expect them to reach that point equally. We expect nothing homogeneous, simultaneous or harmonious. But whatever the process and the form it will take, the trajectory will have to be anti-capitalist. There is no other way to pass from capitalism to socialism.

When the various communist currents stop fretting about and confronting the Trotskyists, they will be led to discussing these matters. The process prepares the conditions for the Trotskyists to form part of the world communist movement, their natural home. We come from there, and there we are going back to. Not so much perhaps because we have so wanted it, as because it is necessary for the progress of history.

We are part of the world communist movement. Our roots are in the Soviet Union and our thinking is part of communist thought.

We honour Leon Trotsky, he who educated us, prepared us, gave us the theoretical and political confidence in the certainty that this task was the necessary one.

In everything that Trotsky did, he never sought to defend his own legacy or his own name. He contributed ideas for an activity that he was not going to see. Before his murder, he wrote: 'I need five more years to finish my work. If they kill me, let it be after that'. And he finished his work. He was not building to see the result for himself. He never intervened to demonstrate how right the IV International was, or how right he was himself, but to contribute to the progress of humanity.

The 1938 program of Leon Trotsky goes on being valid. The principles of the *Transitional Program* still apply today: the sliding scale of wages, the sliding hours of work, factory councils, the role of women, the role of the elderly. They are still all necessary points, because Trotsky did not elaborate them for 1938, but for the future of humanity.

We keep Trotsky alive in everything we do to influence conduct in the world communist movement. From Trotsky to now, what has changed is that he had no prospect or possibility to become included in the communist movement, whereas we have.

Whatever divergence may appear with one sector or another on our way, this is where we are going, this is our destination. It will not be many years before we are recognized as the Trotskyist-Posadist wing of the world communist movement.

## J. POSADAS

*In a compilation of texts from 1962 to 1977*

# THE THOUGHT AND ACTION OF MARX AND ENGELS

**J POSADAS**

1972

Marx came from the bourgeoisie, but he represents the most complete political and scientific thought of the class to which he does not belong. The same goes for Lenin. The scientific preoccupation of them both made them identify with the instrument for the progress of humanity, the proletariat. In Marx, the progress of humanity found the most complete interpreter who developed the method based on dialectical materialism – method based on the analysis of history, of nature, to be able to intervene, unite, transform, gain the ability to foresee the course of the process and prepare the forces.

In Marx, the proletariat finds its representative. This is why Lenin says in *The Three Sources of Marxism* that 'Marx was the complete scientific advocate of the historic necessities represented by the historic function of the proletariat'. Hence the identification. Marx is at the same time the vector through which the most progressive of his epoch, and the most elevated knowledge, were made to serve the progress of humanity expressed by a working class that could not yet triumph in that stage.

In 1948 - seventy years before the triumph of the Russian Revolution - Marx's mastery of the scientific analysis of history made him aware that capitalism was condemned to death. The capitalist regime was leading to a process out of which a class was being created to bring it down. Of itself, that class would not be able to acquire Marx' level of scientific knowledge, but it would build the historic power of attraction, of impulsion and of organisation, to gather the scientific means, the forces, the fraternity, the solidarity and the elements constitutive of this scientific thought.

The proletariat was fighting objectively to defend itself from the capitalist system. The incorporation of Marxism showed it the necessity to build a class party to struggle for itself. As in struggling for itself, it could not do it in the name of replacing one owner or capitalist by another, the proletariat at the same time as it struggled as class *in itself* for economic demands, was struggling as class *for itself* - to confront the power and suppress the structure of property and the system of production that were provoking exploitation and all the consequences of exploitation.

It was consciously that Marx represented that stage of history. His texts show how much he was interested in physics, chemistry, natural sciences; he had also a great comprehension and mastery of the mathematics. It was to the social struggle that he turned to however, this being where he could respond to consciousness and sentiment at their deepest. This is how Marx found the way to develop intelligence without limits, unhindered by the personal concern. He gave to thought and to comprehension the freedom to use the human sentiment as base and conduit to unbounded intelligence and human fraternity. To the idea, he gave its most complete form as part of the noblest and most objective intelligence.

### **The importance of the struggle of the proletariat in the personal formation of Marx.**

Marx is not just a product of intelligence. He is the product of the great struggles of his epoch, and also of a scientific focus that the proletariat could not have. When Marx becomes one with the proletariat, the result is a conscious and scientific instrument. Marx does not figure in it as an extra but as a representative of the historic function of that instrument.

This manifests itself in the homogeneous coordination between the objective development of the economy and of society on a one hand, and the conscious scientific representation on the other. Marx dedicated himself to the cultivation of ideas and to concern for their development. His ideas, analyses and texts briefed our masters and ourselves in the understanding of historic development and the historic necessity of socialism - the power source not being goodness, desire, sentiment or solidarity, but scientific comprehension. Hence the phrase: 'scientific socialism'.



Marx and Engels applied themselves to the elaboration of the dialectical method. Their polemic with Eugene Dühring came when the latter transformed this method into the empiricist, suivist method (tagging along) which is the metaphysical method. In the name of 'dialectics', Dühring posed that socialism was not possible if he, himself did not determine it.

What was being discussed was that socialism is the result of a necessity determined by the development of production but where private property leads capitalism to a blind alley. Unable to make production serve human progress, capitalism resolves its competition by means of war. But far from this, the proletariat can have the economy grow without limits. In having no particular interests opposed to this, or competing, the proletariat develops society in the interests of human development.

The proletariat does not have a scientific awareness of society but this is what the party provides. Marx saw the need to build the party. He was enormously concerned to demonstrate the need for socialist transformation, challenge all the lies of capitalist society and organise the dialectical method of thinking. He saw the need to show how the entire history of humanity is the result of the class struggle and essentially, of the class struggle on scale of the world.

All the historians before Marx, along with politicians, scientists, sociologists, saw the development of humanity in terms of the qualities of goodness or badness. Progress consisted in that, at a certain moment, society would become composed of good people, and progress would come. A whole philosophical, theoretical and programmatic outlook was built in accord with this historic way of thinking. Far from this, Marx analysed how the engine of historic progress was the class struggle.

From primitive society to slavery, to feudalism and capitalism, everything is class struggle. All the way to, and capitalism included, the whole process is determined by the class struggle, by the interests of class and by the class imperatives. As this eventually led to the concentration of the productive forces on a world scale, capitalism had to continue competing with two factors accounted for: the huge concentration of production & finances, and the Money-Commodity-Money<sup>44</sup> process in dynamic reproduction and concentration.

---

<sup>44</sup> Marx explains how from *Commodity-Money-Commodity* – C-M-C – the general formula for capital eventually became M-C-M.

Inter-capitalist competition was leading to a constant decline in the level of the resulting social progress. Whilst humanity had discovered fire and had gone on to eliminate its dependency on the blind forces of nature, the progress obtained during the whole of the regime of private property would be in the form of war – the war bringing a retrogression as large as the progress made. So much so that between the material economic advances allowed in the capitalist system, and the retrogression signified by the war, the people became informed that this system had to be changed. This system was destroying the riches that the human being had produced.

### **The proletariat had to show its ability to lead and**

**progress.** [When Marx lived] the political task had been to create structures and social organs responsive to the relations between the proletariat and production. One had had to organise Trade Unions, and at the same time, create the fighting organs to go further than the immediate struggle for wages, conditions and wealth distribution. The situation demanded a superior level of struggle, in defence of the living standards and also for the right to participate in the leadership of the country. The proletariat had to demonstrate its capacity to do lead society. It had to demonstrate its capacity to attract the rest of the population as the class that can resolve the problems that capitalism cannot. To do this meant to adopt positions with programs and objectives in the interests of the whole population. And this in the field of the economy, production and social welfare, as much as in that of hospitals, road building, transportation, production of electricity, water, etc.

The proletariat had to show that it represented the interests of the whole population, and that it (proletariat) can run and develop production without limits. It had to present itself as the class that can lead society, eliminate competition, eliminate the private interests; because it is in doing this that the proletariat does away with all the elements of inter-capitalist war.

For such an activity, scientific specifications were required at the level of program, policy and unity between the immediate trade union demands - the fight for life improvements - and the struggle to bring down the capitalist system. One had to teach and communicate to the working-class all the lessons and all the experiences that help in the learning of how to lead society.

Prior to actual power taking, Marxism was seeing the need for workers to be involved in progressive actions of leadership. Either through the trade union or through the party, they would defend projects in the immediate interests of the population. This would help in the laying of bases for the [genuine] development of production, alongside the creation of a leadership in society composed for the most part of the oppressed masses: workers, peasants, petit-bourgeoisie.

At the same time, one had to keep showing that these progressive actions did not need any war, any destruction or any competition. And that they were the actions needed to eliminate capitalist competition and the capitalist war. The proletariat had to be educated in this. It had to become convinced regarding the necessity of the revolutionary party. To convince the proletariat in this way meant that one had to attract it, and show it the practical feasibility of organising a functioning revolutionary party. This was not like telling the proletariat what to do! As a class, the proletariat already knew what to do. What it needed was the scientific knowledge that it cannot acquire due to its role in society, in production and in the economy. The proletariat as a class had neither the means nor the preparation for this. The fact that Marx, yes, had all this, was conducive to the unification with the proletariat.

**Engels and the continuity of Marxism** - After Marx's death, Engels went to America. His biographers write very positively about him, but they do not understand who he really was. They do not show the richness of Engels' life, or the influence upon him of the idea of human justice. Like Marx, it was love for human justice, and not scientific speculation, that drew him to the revolutionary camp. It was in the elaboration of the [political] instrument that he made with Marx that he found the answer to his feeling for human justice. He had to join the proletariat, or live without justice.

Engels went to America intentionally, curious to see that capitalist system - already one of the most advanced - earmarked for the greatest development in the whole of the history of capitalism. Yankee imperialism was on the rise. Masses of people had kept coming from England and particularly from Ireland<sup>45</sup>.

---

<sup>45</sup> "New York saw the largest amount of Irish immigration and by 1855, 26% of population in Manhattan was Irish; and by 1900 that percentage had risen to 60%. The key component affected by this immigration was the laborer force. Additionally, this rise in population also helped decide the outcome of the Civil War." Wikipedia.

Engels wrote texts, memoirs and notes about his visit. Documents dating from his return show that he expected such a country to take the overall lead of world capitalism in the coming stages. He could not say in what form, but he identified the powerful dynamics.

Engels' thoroughness in his work should not be remarked upon in passing. He was meticulous in his Marxist preoccupation to investigate, analyse, communicate and generalize experience. Note must be taken that Engels was alone. He was much sought-after and appreciated but, as he used to say, others could take him for the library volume that does not move, does not agitate or write - and him still remaining a good Marxist.

The Labour aristocracy and the social democracy do not need the whole of Marxism. They use Marxism in doses, enough to grasp what capitalism is about, sell that knowledge, and sell their functions. But when Engels gave the program, they said to him: « No, old man, you keep quiet ». And Engels continued writing.

Engels says about his role with Marx: "We were a duo in which Marx played first fiddle". Engels was not belittling his own action which could be superior to that of Marx' at times. About his political life with Marx, Engels says: 'There were moments when I had the initiative. But with only one word of mine, he knew what it was about. And like a powerful and invincible bird's wing, he would fan the matter out and immediately develop his thought'.

The two of them could be eight hours discussing and exchanging about the most essential and constructive ideas of history. They had no material means (Marx had to sell a shirt to bury his son), but their concern was to value the capacity to analyse, to investigate and to draw the conclusions that come from the ability to think. They were not after results for themselves. They felt secure that humanity was going to use their results through the proletariat.

The Russian Revolution and the Soviet Workers State are Marxism materialized. They are the ideas, the thought, the historic and concrete analysis of Marx in tangible Workers State form, i.e., Marx historically confirmed in Workers State form.

In this task aimed at raising the capacity of human thought, Marx and Engels had full grasp of the historic and class function of the proletariat. This was not any old endeavour; but they had the qualities wanted to dominate the entire development and scientific progression of humanity, and they gave their everything to this.

As Marx himself put it, Marxism<sup>46</sup> is an invincible instrument. If he did not focus exclusively on the class struggle, it is particularly that he did so, to show that the entire history of humanity is the history of the class struggle. And to show that the revolutions are the engine of history through the class struggle.

The process is not determined. It gets determined by the course of history, in which the conscious factor is the decisive one. When consciously organized, the working class joins its need for subsistence up with its historic function as constructor of the new society. This task does not chance on the working class through choice. The working class is forced to take it on, or otherwise perish.

### **Marxism would become a tool of human progress based in the class struggle, the motor of history itself.**

Into the class struggle, Marxism went on incorporating the revolutionary and conscious conceptions, programs and objectives of the working class.

Marx and Engels dedicated themselves to the demonstration of this necessity. As far as humanity is concerned, their most beneficial polemics are those where they show how to handle the ideas of social development, of program, of the human experience, i.e., how to set about building the progress of society.

In Marx's time, the scientific, economic and technical advances were appealing. The bourgeois class would grant honorary positions; it would open all sorts of royal academies. Marx was rejecting all this. One day when he was in great need to support his family, he started as an employee for a London railway company. After having been dismissed for smelling bad, Engels said that it was a good thing that they fired him. This saved him from getting stuck there.

---

<sup>46</sup> Marx might have been referring to dialectics. Editorial.

Marx endured this situation until Engels became able to help him. Many biographers of Marx and Engels commit the atrocious injustice of presenting Marx as living off Engels. Engels repudiated this, but his own biographers ignored that part, or cancelled it. Engels was indignantly opposed to such a conclusion being drawn. Had Marx devoted himself to accumulation, he could have accumulated more than what Engels owned.

Marx and Engels dedicated themselves to the elaboration of the revolutionary thought, the ideas, the writings, the organisation of the mind, the organisation of the party of the working class as part of the class struggle. The Party was needed, and so was the United Front (of all the forces). One had to define what the United Front was for. One had to give ideas, and communicate with resolute confidence the fact that the capitalist regime was transitory. Such a regime could not stay stable indefinitely. By its very nature, it led to crises, wars, revolutions. One had to prepare oneself to bring it down.

All of Marx polemics intended to show this necessity. Marx wanted to influence and to win people. He wanted to attract all the scientists who could be influenced by scientific truth, never mind that they came from capitalism and worked in the service of the capitalist system. Some of them, and not always knowingly, utilised the dialectical method and worked for the scientific progress of humanity.

This explains why Marx wanted to win Darwin. When Darwin drew his conclusions on the origins of the human being, Marx and Engels celebrated this great scientific advance with much emotion. They themselves had shown that social and economic development is no mystery, driven as it is by the class struggle. Now it was in the natural sciences, anthropology in particular, that humanity was being proven to result from the earth, from an empirical organisation of nature - and not from any deity or unfathomable mystery.

Marx and Engels celebrated Darwin's discovery effusively because it illustrated the dialectical method. Darwin had known nothing about the dialectical method, but he had implemented it. Note that between the early primates and the humans of today, there is a much greater lapse of time than what the anthropologists are wont to say<sup>47</sup>.

---

<sup>47</sup> In other writings, J Posadas explains how the mechanical, idealist or mystical method of reasoning of bourgeois society leads scientists into under-estimating, or even ignoring, the span of life's evolution. Edit.

## **Marx and Engels created the concept of the dialectical leap.**

Darwin's discovery was a major contribution to science. The capitalist system was then in full expansion. In that expansion, the prevailing thought was that the humans were simply passing from indigence, needfulness and precariousness, to the great abundance of the capitalist system. It was necessary to show that this was not so. That the social conceptions of the time resulted from previous social regimes, property regimes, production systems. One had to show that the process of change was dialectical, had its origins in nature, and created new forms by superseding the previous ones.

The dialectical method ran counter to the empiricism of syndicalism and anarchism. The latter had no idea where they were going. And they did not attempt to create the conditions for the masses to represent society as a whole. Syndicalists and anarchists represented the desperation of people; the rebellion of people against capitalist injustice. As for the communist party instead, it was consciously that it set out to have the masses organised to transform society.

It was therefore with infinite joy that Marx and Engels celebrated the validation of their method in another field of science. Darwin's discovery did not fire in Marx and Engels the personal joy of a thesis verified, but of their self-approval as representatives of the necessity of the progress of humanity. It is Marx and Engels who corroborated scientifically the principle (of the dialectics) – and based themselves on it for the revolutionary activity of the proletariat.

The dialectical process starts from a point, whichever one chooses, in nature or in society. It carries within itself, at its heart and in its structure, all the elements that contributed to its formation. These elements develop in their turn and grow internally, creating antagonistic forces there. It is in such a process that capitalism found the need to create the proletariat.

The proletariat developed antagonistically in relation to the capitalist system, and it developed contradictions at the same time, within itself, internally. These contradictions come from different interests between working class layers. In that class where everyone is exploited, the common interest becomes the determinant unifier.

The problem then is to find a scientific representation for this unity of interests - which is objective before it becomes conscious - to organise the class in defence of the common interests that make it conscious of its historic function.

To organise the forces and the social instrument for social overturn, the Party is necessary. The Party lies at the historic core of the process where the dialectical leap must happen. By the dialectical leap, we mean that, to pass from one stage to another, and with transformation in mind, one must not expect the change to be gradual. It will come with a leap. This is because at a certain point in the centralisation of the factors of change, there comes the condition to pass from one stage to another. The dialectical leap comes violently, not gradually.

Before Marx and Engels, the theoreticians who had accepted the need for social change had all considered that it should be done gradually and through reforms. Even after Engels, the parliamentarian Kautsky<sup>48</sup> had claimed that this could be done through parliament or by bringing in ministers.

What Marx and Engels showed far from this, is that social transformation cannot be achieved in this way. Because what needs transforming is not the function of parliament, but the structure of the country based on private property. The juridical system itself defends private property. Deep in the structures, Parliament is only a branch of little importance. When capitalism feels the need, it launches a coup that shuts parliament down, or it starts a new war. Parliament is ineffectual in those matters. Capitalism holds the levers of power and those levers must be seized from it. This is why the Party is needed therefore. The Party is needed for this task.

**Engels had said that "*Marxism is the consciousness of the unconscious process of history*".** Engels used this phrase because the economy had reached a raised level concentration in the system of private property - from capitalist slavery onwards - in a slow but uninterrupted process that spanned hundreds of years.

---

<sup>48</sup> Karl Kautsky, 1854-1938. A Czech-Austrian philosopher, author, journalist and (German) SPD leader for a time. Lenin rebuked him for his wavering stance in opposition to WW1, and his hostility to the 1917 Russian Revolution.



Essentially, and through this process of hundreds of years, history had reached the concentration of the capitalist system. This is how the conditions and the necessity were created for an industrial centralisation and a form of economic planning that capitalism simply could not provide.

In capitalist society, it had become possible to intervene consciously in this matter through the means of the Party. One can supersede the antagonistic contradictions of the capitalist system through the Party. One can take power through the revolution and move onwards to conscious forms. Production must be unified and centralised to respond to the needs of the human beings, eliminating in this way all the factors of war, antagonism, contradiction, dispute, and oppression; and from there all the other factors of antagonistic, aggressive and contradictory relations of human dispute.

This is why Marxism is the consciousness of the unconscious process of history.

J POSADAS

*Excerpt from a conference by J. Posadas in September 1972: "On the History of the Worker's Movement and of the Fourth International".*

## Who is J. Posadas?

J. Posadas was born in Argentina in 1912 and died in Italy in 1981. He began his activities as a trade union leader in the footwear industry. He soon adopted Trotsky's ideas and joined the Fourth International (Pablo) in 1935. He developed as a writer, theorist, political leader and revolutionary organizer. In 1947 he organized the Fourth International Group (GCI) and started the newspaper *Voz Proletaria*. There, he analysed the progressive and growing role of revolutionary nationalism in the world, which he had first identified in Peronism in Argentina. He wrote major works such as "*Plan quinquenal or Permanent Revolution*" and *El Peronismo* in 1963, and "*from Nationalism to the Workers State*" in 1966.

In 1962, J. Posadas created the Trotskyist-Posadist Fourth International on the basis of some of his fundamental texts like: *The Construction of the Workers' State and from the Workers State to Socialism; The role of the USSR in History; The Living Thought of Trotsky*, and *Partial Regeneration, Historic Re-encounter and the Process of Permanent Revolution in this stage*.

In the more general field of Art, Science and Culture, the author has left many writings that incorporate into the Marxist analysis themes ranging from 'The human relations' to 'The communist future of humanity'. This formed part of his *History of Human Civilization* that he left unfinished due to his unexpected death in 1981.

Aware of the implacable and historic antagonism of the capitalist system towards the Workers States and humanity, J. Posadas upheld Trotsky's "unconditional defence of the Soviet Union" and of the Workers State. He did not want world war or any war, but from the behaviour of world capitalism, he saw the need to prepare humanity, and the world's soldiers, for the war which will be also world revolution.

He devoted his life, and all of his work, to the task of giving humanity confidence in that the war of capitalism forms part of the dialectical process of history, and has no supernatural powers. Human confidence and creativity have always been more powerful than the destructive capacity of fear and unreason.

Some of J Posadas' last words were: "*Life makes no sense without the struggle for socialism, with all the consequences.*"

Editorial ISCPE: <https://en.quatrieme-internationale-posadiste.org>

Use language button.

# Visit the site in English

<https://en.quatrieme-internationale-posadiste.org>

*Use the language button. Just download.*

*Contact us if there is no text to the title. We are in the process of uploading all contents.*

- The Revolutionary State
- Living Thought of Trotsky
- Role of USSR (2 volumes)
- The Soviet Union
- China
- Poland (2 volumes)
- War & Peace
- Iran (2 volumes)
- Socialism and Cosmos
- On Stalin
- On Soviets
- The Six Day War
- Nuclear Energy
- On the Labour Party
- Latin America
- Function of the Trade Unions
- European Common Market
- Afghanistan
- Nicaragua
- Vietnam
- Zimbabwe
- Beethoven
- Aristophanes
- Art & Socialism
- Theatre & Socialism
- Children & Family
- Cinema
- Music and Song