

BY WAY OF EDITORIAL

We present Marxist Perspective Nº2, amid a worsening of the world crisis that began in 2008 and which yet, despite all the recipes, the cadres of the imperialist bourgeoisie have not been able to contain it. In this issue, we aim to recover for the new generations of revolutionaries categories and concepts belonging to the Marxist legacy that have been, in the understanding and extension in their historical development, denied or “updated” to theories strange to it. This idea, shared by intellectuals and academics, has been carried out in the name of a pretended “sophistication” which the result has been a pastiche between elements taken from Marxism and bourgeois theories in vogue, these latter analyzed under the old logic of separating its “good” aspects from the “bad” ones -against which Marx argued with Proudhon- or taken to the postmodern theories of the uses. We try to go further in the analysis of the Theory of the Permanent Revolution (TPR) in the face of the transition phenomena of the former workers’ States to capitalism, what we have denominated “assimilation”, and the transition from the postwar stage, always from the perspective from which we assess the historical processes between revolution and counterrevolution. We will focus in elucidating not only the character and internal nexus, but also in the method of the international revolution proper to the TPR, recovering the concept of proletarian dictatorship and its international extension. We will also try to make a structural analysis of Latin America and the development of the category of sui generis Bonapartism and its political implications. Also, we include articles on very important processes such as the ones going on in Greece and Chile. Our aim with this magazine is to fight as a tend against “Trotskyist” centrism, that has begun to become a statist current, to whom the subject is not the working class but “revolution”, and from there they establish class correlations. So they talk about “types of revolution”, as a theoretical foundation for national programs that sum up redistributionist measures and the redirecting of capitals within the state frame, and thus losing the transitional internationalist idea. That is why they cannot confront phenomena such as Syriza and Podemos -counterrevolutionary reformist expression of the idea of sustaining the Welfare State in the middle of the terminal crisis of the European Union- in face of which the centrists appear to be impotent, since they intend to oppose statist measures without the perspective of the struggle for power. Considered historically, “classical” reformism completely lost its social basis. Such basis was labor aristocracy, on which it leaned after its claudication, and it made revolutionaries discuss, in the organizational field, the impossibility of the formation of Unified Marxist Labor Parties, since a sector of the labor movement had been won over by revisionism. When capitalism went from its organic period to its critical period, this trend that posed the harmonic and pacific development of capital and who defended democratic reforms was jeopardized. Without reforms there is no reformism and without prosperous capitalism there are no reforms. This implies that the reformist right wing becomes anti-reformist, in the sense that it directly or indirectly helps the



bourgeoisie smash previous gains of the working class. This phenomenon was developed and emerged in the period after the crisis of '29, when social democracy as a current wrecked; its left wing adapted to the numerous nuances of centrism and its right wing became social-imperialist. Against reformism, a revolutionary and proletarian policy (Marxist Communist) entails to us a system of ideological and methodological struggle that aims first to the revolutionary downturn of the bourgeois State with the method of unifying the proletariat

under the sign of the dictatorship and then reorganize the society in a socialist manner. Communism as a trend is born with the Marxist theory of Scientific Socialism. Scientific Socialism is the conscious expression of the unconscious historical process, e. g., the spontaneous and instinctive aspiration

of the proletariat to rebuild society on communist foundations. Communism is the vanguard of the working class, united by the program of socialist revolution. Here we must say that the whole of the currents that vindicate themselves as heirs of Trotsky's legacy argue that the weakness of the IV International was not having anticipated that the Second World War would not open the field to victorious revolutions, in which Trotskyism would rise as the leadership, but that Stalinism would live, in a non-aggression pact with the triumphant imperialism. Some currents even pose that the mistake Trotsky made was to start from only one hypothesis, that of the fall of Stalinism by revolutionary means. Nothing further from

truth than these assertions. Trotsky had another hypothesis, about which he warned, and it was that if the proletariat did not triumph in a revolutionary way at the end of WWII, all the contradictions would go back to the States, generating new complex processes, of Bonapartist type. The strengthening of Stalinism at the end of WWII was in that statist key, seeking to reinforce the deformed Workers' State and its zones of influence, while the most counterrevolutionary power in history was forming up: USA's hegemony. In this



way, because the contradictions concentrated in the states, Marxists were posed new problems. The imperialist bourgeoisie responded with the so called Welfare States, the building up of fictional states and the great imperialist enclave of Israel. This process is defined as "statism", that means, the bourgeois State manages the means of transport and some industries. These measures were one of the symptoms that the productive forces overpassed capitalism itself and partially deny it. Thus was expressed in the most acute way the confrontation between two social systems, one of which had begun to organize by leaning on backward productive forces, while the other was based on productive forces of a much greater power.

Trotsky said in "The class nature of the Soviet State": "The ongoing state-capitalism does not prepare nor pave the way for the task of the future Socialist State, but, on the contrary, it created for it additional difficulties. The proletariat has missed a number of opportunities to seize power. Along with that it created the political conditions for the Fascist barbarism and the economic conditions for the destructive action of "State capitalism". After the seizure of power, the proletariat will have to pay in the field of economy its political mistakes.

And he added: "During the capitalist ascension, that ended with the war, there could be considered -under determined political conditions- as 'progressive manifestations' the different forms of statization, that means, consider that State capitalism impulses the society forwards and makes easier the future economic

task of the proletarian dictatorship. But the current "planned economy" must be considered as a completely reactionary stage; State capitalism intends to set it apart from the world division of labor, to adapt the productive forces to the Procrustean bed of national State, artificially constrain production in some branched and create in an identical artificial manner other branches through huge unproductive investments." Likewise, in his report on the Soviet NEP and the perspective of world revolution, he affirmed that "if the bourgeoisie holds political power it will continue to exploit the proletariat through the capitalist State, just like the bourgeois exploits through private property its own workers." (...) "We, Marxists, have never denied socia-



“The ongoing state-capitalism does not prepare nor pave the way for the task of the future Socialist State, but, on the contrary, it created for it additional difficulties. The proletariat has missed a number of opportunities to seize power. Along with that it created the political conditions for the Fascist barbarism and the economic conditions for the destructive action of ‘State capitalism’. After the seizure of power, the proletariat will have to pay in the field of economy its political mistakes”

list reforms, but have affirmed that the epoch of socialist reforms would be inaugurated only after the seizure of power by the proletariat, and this is the central point of the polemics”. (...) “Statism, in its efforts of directed economy, does not inspire in the need of developing productive forces, but on the worry of conserving private property against of productive forces, that rebel against it. Statism stops the development of technics, since it sustains enterprises that are not viable and maintains parasitical social layers: in one word, it is profoundly reactionary.” Because it is important to understand that, as Marx posed, “Socialists certainly say that we need the capital but not the capitalist. The capital appears here as a mere thing, not as a relation of production that, reflected in itself, is precisely the capitalist. He can, surely, separate from that individual capitalist the capital and transfer it to someone else. But when he

loses the capital, he loses the quality of being capitalist. The capital, therefore, is perfectly separable from this or that capitalist, but not from the capitalist that as so opposes to the worker. In the same manner, the individual worker can also cease to be the being for itself in labor; he may inherit money, steal it, etc. But then he ceases to be a worker. As worker, he is only the labor that exists to itself”. The magazine is devoted to this polemics, to prevent the new generations of revolutionaries from the adaptation to the old outdated theories and encourage the construction of revolutionary parties at a national and international level, which is the reconstructed IV International, to -among other things- no to succumb in the oscillations of the masses that we are witnessing in the different processes.