Class Struggle

Vol. 1, Num. 2, December, 2024

Contributions appreciated

For "Who We Are," see our first issue at: https://redstarpublishers.org/ClassStruggle/Vol1/Vol1.pdf

The Overthrow of Assad in Syria: A Victory for U.S. imperialism.



Regardless of what one thinks of Bashir Assad, the chief of state of Syria, his overthrow by Jihadist forces is at least a temporary victory for U.S. imperialism.

In an email from Jake Sullivan, currently Biden's National Security Advisor, to then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on February 12, 2012, he stated: "AQ [Al Qaeda] is on our side in Syria."

The U.S. has some 900 troops in Syria that had worked with forces opposed to Assad's government. Biden has said that these troops will remain there. And in the first week since the overthrow of Assad, Israel has bombed Syria over 800 times.

So the overthrow of Assad will help Israel and U.S. imperialism. However, as the years of struggle over Afghanistan has shown, the jihadists are likely to be only temporary allies of the U.S., as they have their own interests in trying to establish Islamic States in the Middle East.

Contents:

Protest the Acquittal of Daniel Penny 2
Donald Trump Is Not Anti-War 3
Canadian Postal Workers Persevere in Their Fight 5
No to "Congestion Pricing" 6
The Viability of Socialism 7
La viabilidad del socialismo 11

Provisional Editorial Board
Alex Dillard, Julio Disla, George Gruenthal, Gareth O'Neil,
Stephen Paulmier, Donaldo Reyes
Signed articles reflect the viewpoint of the author and not necessarily that of the collective.
We encourage all contributions, comments and criticisms.
We are temporarily housing this periodical on the web-site of Red Star Publishers, at www.RedStarPublishers.org. To contact us, please send an email to webmaster@RedStarPublishers.org, and put Class Struggle in the subject line. Monetary contributions can also be sent by PayPal to the same email address, again marking them for Class Struggle.

Protest the Acquittal of Daniel Penny in the Killing of Jordan Neely



On May 1, 2023, a homeless man, Jordan Neely, was acting erratically on a subway train in New York City, making some of the other riders feel threatened. One rider, Daniel Penny, a former marine, put Neely in a chokehold, killing Neely. The Medical Examiner who conducted the autopsy ruled that the chokehold was the cause of death.

On Monday, Dec. 8, Penny was acquitted in Neely's death. Even after the judge had dismissed the more serious charge of manslaughter, he was found not guilty of criminally negligent homicide.

In the Dred Scott case, in 1857, Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney wrote: "**a Black man has no rights which a white man must respect.**"

Normally, it is the police who kill Black men (and women) with impunity. But now white people can get away with murder in the killing of Black men. So, 167 years after the Dred Scott decision, Chief Justice Taney's statement still holds true.

Donald Trump Is Not Anti-War

By Alex Dillard

Both the liberal/neoconservative foreign policy establishment and the MAGA movement are under the false belief that Trump is anti-establishment and in support of an isolationist/America First foreign policy. Many MAGA influencers such as Dave Smith will even promote this idea that Trump is a "peace candidate" and use this as a justification to support him as a "lesser evil". However, this could not be further from the truth. Trump is just as much of a warmonger as Harris, not only on the issue of Israel/Palestine, but is even more of a war hawk on the issue of Russia/Ukraine than either his liberal opposition or his MAGA base is willing to admit.

For starters, let's look at Trump's cabinet appointments. Michael Waltz (Trump's appointment for National Security Advisor) is a staunch advocate of escalating a war with Russia, and his criticism amounts to Biden not escalating the war quickly enough, even having said "Let's win this damn war!" and calling Biden "weak" for not allowing Ukraine to not engage in further missile strikes on Russian territory. Michae Waltz has also been in support of giving Ukraine long range missiles and has called for Europe to "do more for Ukraine".

Another notable Trump cabinet pick is his Secretary of State, Marco Rubio, who ironically ran against Trump in the 2016 Republican presidential primaries. Marco Rubio's hawkishness is no secret, having been a lifelong supporter of regime change around the world. His track record includes being the strongest advocate of sanctions on Latin American governments that are critical of US foreign policy such as Venezuela, Cuba and Nicaragua, with even Trump having praised Rubio in a February 2019 speech as the chief architect of regime change inside Venezuela. Marco Rubio is also a long-time supporter of regime change in the Middle East, having visited Libya alongside Lindsay Graham in 2011 to promote the facilitation of NATO backed regime change. In particular, Rubio has been a staunch supporter of the Zionist entity and an opponent of Iran, going as far as to even address and speak at the meetings of an anti Iran cult and regime change lobby known as the People's Mujahideen of Iran (MEK), an organization known to physically and psychologically abuse its own members.

Trump also appointed Mike Huckabee as US ambassador to "Israel". Mike Huckabee opposes any sort of two state solution or peace settlement with the Palestinians, stating that "I've never been willing to use the term West Bank. There is no such thing. I speak of Judea and Samaria. I tell people there is no occupation; It is 'occupied' by the people who have had a rightful deed to the place for 3,500 years." Mike Huckabee uses the language of America First and non-interventionism, claiming that he opposes "telling Israel what to do" while at the same time still promising "Israel" continued and even increased military and political aid from the United States with no strings attached, essentially opposing the use of any sort of leverage that the US might have over "Israel" that

comes with such aid. The idea of an “independent Israel” is one of the main talking points that has been used to justify US aid to “Israel” under the guise of an “America First” foreign policy and has infected many supposedly “anti-war” and “anti-establishment” circles in the American right.



Even some of the supposedly “anti-war” cabinet picks such as Tulsi Gabbard come with their own problems. Tulsi Gabbard, being a major opportunist, has been known to flip her political positions on a dime whenever it benefits her. For example, Tulsi in 2020 called for the end in her own words an “illegal occupation of the Palestinian territories” in a presidential campaign speech, while in 2023 she ends up speaking at the March for “Israel” in Washington DC and slams Biden/Harris for not being hawkish enough in their defense of the Zionist entity. Tulsi has also been known to even flip flop on the question of Ukraine depending on what audience she is speaking to. During her 2020 campaign she was in support of US aid to Ukraine, but in 2023 all of the sudden she was opposed to it as popular sentiment shifted in the base she is trying to appeal to (the MAGA movement) against US aid to Ukraine.

To anyone reading this article who is a supporter of Donald Trump, MAGA or America First, this article was necessary because many of you voted for Trump because you believed he would stop the war in Ukraine or significantly scale back US involvement in the Middle East. However, both the Democratic and Republican parties are inherently pro-establishment and pro-war parties and cannot be changed from the inside as proven both by Trump’s caving to the neoconservative foreign policy establishment with his cabinet picks and the DNC cheating Bernie Sanders in the 2016 and 2020 primaries. However, the only way we will stop these wars is not by voting for a presidential candidate but by building a mass movement to oppose war and genocide. If you are anti-war and you associate with MAGA or America First, please use your time and energy to help build a growing mass anti-war movement that is completely independent of the duopoly and represents students, labor and the broader community.

Further reading:

"America First" Hawks Admit US Weapons in Ukraine are Plunging Down a "Black Hole" by Michael Tracey

Trump's pick for Sec. of State Marco Rubio's love affair with Israel, MKO, Pahlavis by Press TV

Michael Waltz Expresses Support for Providing Ukraine Long-Range Missiles by Wall Street Journal

Taken from Communist Party of Canada (M-L)

Postal Workers Persevere in Their Fight for Their Rights and Dignity: Strike Enters Fourth Week



Calgary, December 4, 2024

The strike by the 55,000 members of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) has entered its fourth week. Postal workers from coast to coast continue to stand strong in defence of their right to improved wages, safety on the job, job security and protection of their pensions. Canada Post is trying to strip away health and safety protection for workers and turn secure jobs into precarious low paid gig jobs. Postal workers are determined to stop these attacks.

In communities across the country, labour councils and provincial federations along with workers from many different unions have joined the postal workers' picket lines, along with small business owners and customers.

Negotiations between Canada Post and the Union, with a mediator appointed by the federal government, broke off on November 28 and since then there have been exchanges through the mediator. On December 1 Canada Post provided what it called a comprehensive framework, to which the Union responded with its own proposals on December 5. Canada Post's response on December 6 to the Union's proposals contained "drastic changes and rollbacks that no union in the world would ever accept," CUPW reported....

The Union's response to Canada Post's "comprehensive framework" reiterated its four key issues: A wage increase to keep up with inflation; prioritization of workers' health and safety on the job, including getting rid of schemes like Separate Sort from Delivery (SSD) which increase the danger of injuries to workers who already suffer the second highest rate of disabling injury among workers under federal jurisdiction; maintenance of the defined-benefit pension plan for all Canada Post workers; and expansion of public postal services that postal operations in other countries have successfully operated for many years, including postal banking and electric vehicle charging stations.

Canada Post continues to attack the workers who are exercising their right to strike. At the outset of the strike it announced that benefits would be cut off, causing tremendous hardship to many workers, including denying payments for life-saving medications for workers and their families....

Canada Post has also issued layoff notices to some striking workers, without informing the Union of who is being laid off and why. Every effort is being made to bypass the Union and single out individual workers, to undermine the strike.

Postal workers joined by workers in all sectors of the economy, continue to show their determination to fight for their rights and dignity and keep Canada Post a public service for all Canadians. A public post office is vital for nation-building and protecting the interests of everyone in cities and rural areas as well.

All Out to Join the Picket Lines and Support the Postal Workers!

No to "Congestion Pricing", Another Tax on Working People!

By George Gruenthal

Congestion pricing has been put forward as the only way that Governor Hochul could pay for the needed improvements for New York's subway system. She "paused" congestion pricing in June, but many people realized that this was just a gimmick to keep suburban voters in the ranks of the Democratic Party through the elections. If she really acknowledged that many people driving into downtown Manhattan would suffer from the basic $15 price tag, she could have reduced it to $9 then, as she has done now. But a smaller tax is still putting the burden on working people.

There are worse things about congestion pricing. It was only meant to raise about $1 billion dollars in revenue (and now at a lower rate it will raise less), but the MTA needs at least $15 billion for basic needs, for which the $1 billion would just be "seed money". The rest was to be raised through bond sales. But as anyone knows who has used a credit card to pay for basic living expenses, you just end up in greater debt. The sale of bonds will only end up providing more profits for the banks and other big capitalists who buy them.

There is no doubt that the MTA needs funds: to replace aging infrastructure, to make subway stations accessible to people with disabilities, etc. But it is mainly the big companies and real estate firms who benefit most from a reliable mass transit system. They need their workers to be able to get to work on time. That is why almost all subway lines go from the outer areas to midtown or the downtown financial district. Note how the MTA spent $2.4 billion to run the extension of the #7 train to Hudson Yards, which otherwise would have been largely isolated from mass transit.

So rather than tax ordinary working people to drive into downtown Manhattan, why not tax the big financial and real estate firms to pay for the improvements MTA needs, as they are the main ones who benefit from it. Of course, these capitalists and their government will not voluntarily pay for this, unless there is a big mass movement that exposes how they are dependent on mass transit!

The Viability of Socialism

By Julio Disla

From his book “Una mirada hacia el presente y otra hacia el futuro”
(One Look Towards the Present and Another Towards the Future”)



Nowadays people do not often talk about "socialism". The noise of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the years immediately after, of the end of the first socialist experiment in history: the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, which gave rise to the first workers' and peasants' state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), still echoes. That collapse left us quite stunned. The commotion was so great that it took years, decades, for us to slowly be able to talk about these issues properly again: socialism, class struggle, revolution, anti-imperialism, people’s power. This is a summary of the first two chapters of the book: The Viability of Socialism, which will be released soon.

The world right-wing exultantly sang about what it considered its victory without extenuating circumstances: the main socialist experience had perished, while the other great socialist power, the People's Republic of China, embraced market mechanisms, which led one to think of a capitalist restoration in that giant Asian country. It was supposedly the death of socialism. A representative of that thought, which was triumphant at the time, Francis Fukuyama, called it, without hesitation or reservations: "the end of history and ideology". These were times when neoliberal plans (read: savage, ruthless, super-exploitative capitalism) were resoundingly imposed on practically the entire world, and a spokeswoman for these policies, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, was able to express it categorically: "There is no alternative". That is: either capitalism... or capitalism!

The European socialist camp vanished, what Enver Hoxha called the sick shadow of socialism, with the reconversion of many communist parties, which either disintegrated or became social democratic (capitalism with a human face). The socialist projects disappeared in numerous countries that had begun to trace a path with that perspective (in Africa with its processes of national liberation, in the Middle East and the Maghreb with its proposals for Arab socialism, in the Americas and the Caribbean the socialism of good living or 21st century socialism had appeared), and, in the face of all this, the global popular camp was orphaned, without references.

China, although today it continues to raise questions about its future with its "market socialism", at that time could still less offer itself as a mirror for the working class and impoverished peoples in general. Discouragement spread, and the idea of a social revolution, of a socialist character, which a few years ago, in the 1960s and 1970s, seemed to be within reach, was eclipsed. The system, through its numerous mechanisms of ideological-cultural control, but also with bayonets, torture, forced disappearance of people and war tanks, was responsible for burying her forever.

In any case, the popular struggles continued, because the causes that led to them never disappeared, although Marxist ideology was temporarily called into question, was overshadowed. Today, more than three decades after the collapse that marked the end of the century, it is time to take up the abandoned ideology with force, revising it, updating it if necessary, but always based on the premise that the change in the making is essential, so that these ideas of transformation are still absolutely valid. Or has the "triumph" of capitalism led us to paradise? That triumph consists of having shopping malls full of luxury and attractive merchandise that very few can buy, while there are beggars at their doors. What triumph is that? What success? We must return to those principles not on a whim, but because everything indicates that the capitalist system has no way out and, basically, because we must look for valid alternatives to overcome the monumental debacle in which world society is bogged down.

According to Atilio Boron "we must remember, as often as necessary, that Marx was not interested in unveiling the most obscure secrets of the capitalist system out of mere intellectual curiosity, but he felt urged on by the need to transcend it, given the radical impossibility of building a more just, humane and sustainable world within its structures. And this impossibility is even more evident and visible today, at the beginning of the 21st century, than at the end of the 19th. Hence, the reintroduction of Marxism into the philosophical, political-theoretical and contemporary debate, as well as into the agenda of the great social movements and political forces of our time, is one of the most urgent and productive tasks of the hour."

As Claudio Katz correctly put it: "What is the point of battling capitalist oppression without developing an alternative project?" What is important today, even more, what is essential, is to critically review those first steps of socialism proposed by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the first stammerings, one could say: which had barely a century against six or seven centuries since the first glimpses of capitalism in the Hanseatic League in northern Europe. Thus, after correcting errors, which, of course, there were, we propose the way to continue the struggle for a world that overcomes opprobrious capitalism.

Although the first socialist experiences suffered setbacks, although today, as we said above, talking about "socialism" is not the norm, and although the media-cultural-ideological machinery of dominant capitalism tries to show the impossibility of that "feverish and unrealizable" dream of a society of equals, socialism continues to be a hope. It existed, which shows that it is possible, and it continues to exist. Socialist ideology undoubtedly continues to be valid, because the causes that brought it into being are still absolutely valid. To say that those first and stammering experiences failed is, at the very least, a lack of respect, or more precisely, a huge error of judgment. Or worse: an ideological vomit. They made fabulous advances. As a minimum example, many more can be given, just look at what happened in the first workers' and peasants' state in history, Bolshevik Russia, led first by Lenin, and then by Stalin. It changed from a feudal country to become the second world power (in economic, scientific-technical, military, cultural terms) in just a few decades.

Of course there were fabulous achievements, even if capitalist propaganda minimizes them: a minimum and decent wage for the entire working class, paid weekly rest, paid holidays, maternity leave, subsidized high-quality public transportation (the Moscow subway is considered a great work of art, unique in its kind), subsidized home heating, guaranteed decent housing for the entire population, electrification of the entire country and a huge industry, communal agricultural-livestock farms of very high productivity, free, secular and compulsory education for the entire population, literacy for 100% of its inhabitants, universities and research institutes of the highest world prestige, free high-quality health care for the entire population, complete eradication of malnutrition, full equality of rights for men and women, women's suffrage, the right to abortion (the first country in the world to have this), legalized divorce, repeal of the tsarist regulations that prohibited homosexuality, portentous scientific-technical advances (the first artificial satellite in history, the first human being in space, the development of civilian nuclear energy, advanced metallurgical technologies, great achievements in biotechnology, synthetic rubber, mobile telephones), real people’s power through the development of direct democracy with the establishment of soviets (worker-peasant and soldiers' councils), fabulous promotion of art and culture (cinema, theater,

music, literature, ballet, architecture), the defeat of the Nazi invasion during World War II (a military advance incited by the capitalist powers of the time to destroy the Revolution).

The question is why that experience fell; why, after these great advances, it entered a period of bureaucratization, creating again a virtual division of classes, why the population did not defend its rights when the coup d'état officially restored capitalism in 1991. In China, the other great country that produced its socialist revolution, there were also fundamental achievements. It is unquestionable that, from being a semi-feudal country at the time of the revolution in 1949, it was able to lift 500 million people out of chronic rural poverty, becoming in a short time a superpower in all ways, with an extremely satisfactory standard of living for its population.

Socialism is undoubtedly possible, even if the forces of capital do everything imaginable to prevent it. In any case, today, at the time of this little writing, the march of the world seems to indicate that the possibility of an anti-capitalist revolution is not very likely. "The great strategic problem lies in the fact that many thinkers believe that the left should focus on the construction of a model of post-liberal capitalism. This idea obstructs the radicalization processes. It assumes that to be on the left is to be post-liberal, that it is to fight for an organized, humane, productive capitalism. This idea has been undermining the left for several years, because to be on the left is to fight against capitalism. It seems to me that that is the ABC. To be a socialist is to fight for a communist world," Claudio Katz rightly states.

Why wouldn't that communist world be possible? It is not only possible, but imperatively necessary. Analyzing the real existing socialist experiences that emerged in the 20th century can give us clues as to how to continue fighting to achieve that post-capitalist aim. In real socialism there were immense, immeasurable errors. But do not forget that these experiences never went beyond a few decades; Capitalism has been accumulating for seven centuries. On the other hand, what was expected of socialist revolutions: paradises?

March 11, 2024.

La viabilidad del socialismo

Por Julio Disla

De su libro “Una mirada hacia el presente y otra hacia el futuro”



Hoy día hablar de “socialismo” no es lo más frecuente. Todavía resuena el estrépito de la caída del Muro de Berlín en 1989, y en años inmediatamente posteriores, de la extinción del primer experimento socialista de la historia: la revolución bolchevique de 1917, que dio lugar al primer Estado obrero y campesino, la Unión de Repúblicas Socialistas Soviéticas (URSS). Todo ese derrumbe nos dejó bastante aturdidos. Fue tan grande la conmoción que debieron pasar años, décadas, para que, lentamente, pudiéramos volver a hablar de estos temas con propiedad: socialismo, lucha de clases, revolución, antiimperialismo, poder popular. Este es un resumen de los dos primeros capítulos del libro: La Viabilidad del socialismo, que saldrá a la luz próximamente.

La derecha mundial cantó exultante la que consideró su victoria sin atenuantes: la principal experiencia socialista fenecía, a la par que la otra gran potencia socialista, la República Popular China, abrazaba mecanismos de mercado, todo lo cual hacía pensar en una restauración capitalista en ese gigante país asiático. Era, supuestamente, la muerte del socialismo. Un representante de ese pensamiento, triunfador en el momento, Francis Fukuyama, lo dijo sin reparo y sin mediatinta: “fin de la historia y de las ideologías”. Corrían tiempos donde los planes neoliberales (léase: capitalismo salvaje, despiadado, hiper explotador) se imponían rotundos sobre prácticamente todo el mundo, y una vocera de esas políticas, la primera ministra británica Margaret Thatcher, lo pudo expresar terminante: “No hay alternativa”. Es decir: o capitalismo… ¡o capitalismo!

Esfumándose el campo socialista europeo, a lo que Enver Hoxha llamó la sombra enferma del socialismo, con la reconversión de muchos partidos comunistas que, o se desintegraban o se transformaban en socialdemócratas (capitalismo con rostro humano), con la desaparición de proyectos socialistas en numerosos países que habían comenzado a trazar una senda con esa perspectiva (en África con sus procesos de liberación nacional, en Medio Oriente y el Magreb con sus planteos de socialismo árabe),en América y el caribe apareció el socialismo del buen vivir o del siglo XXI ,y, ante todo ello el campo popular global quedó huérfano, sin referentes.

China, si bien hoy sigue abriendo interrogantes sobre su porvenir con su "socialismo de mercado", en aquel entonces menos aún podía ofrecerse como espejo donde mirarse la clase trabajadora y los pueblos empobrecidos en general. El desánimo cundió entonces, y la idea de revolución social, de carácter socialista, que unos años atrás, décadas de los 60 y 70 del siglo XX, parecía tenerse al alcance de la mano, fue eclipsándose. El sistema, a través de sus numerosos mecanismos de control ideológico-cultural, y también con bayonetas, torturas, desaparición forzada de personas y tanques de guerra, se encargó de sepultarla para siempre.

De todos modos, las luchas populares continuaron, porque las causas que las provocan nunca desaparecieron, aunque el ideario marxista quedó temporalmente en entredicho, opacado. Hoy, más de tres décadas después de aquel colapso que marcó el fin de siglo, es momento de retomar con fuerza el ideario abandonado, revisándolo, poniéndolo al día si es necesario, pero siempre a partir de la premisa que el cambio en ciernes es imprescindible, por lo que aquellas ideas de transformación siguen siendo absolutamente vigentes. ¿O acaso el "triunfo" del capitalismo nos ha llevado al paraíso? Ese triunfo consiste en tener centros comerciales repletos de lujosas y atractivas mercaderías que muy pocos pueden comprar, con mendigos y pordioseros a sus puertas. ¿Cuál triunfo entonces? ¿Cuál éxito? Debemos retomar aquellos principios no por un puro capricho, sino porque todo indica que el sistema capitalista no tiene salida y, básicamente, porque hay que buscar alternativas válidas para superar la debacle monumental en que la sociedad planetaria está empantanada.

Siguiendo a Atilio Borón "debemos recordar, cuantas veces sea necesario, que Marx no estaba interesado en develar los más recónditos secretos del régimen capitalista por mera curiosidad intelectual, sino que se sentía urgido por la necesidad de trascenderlo, habida cuenta de su radical imposibilidad de construir, dentro de sus estructuras, un mundo más justo, humano y sostenible. Y esta imposibilidad es aún más patente y visible hoy, a comienzos del siglo XXI, que a finales del XIX. De ahí que la reintroducción del marxismo en el debate filosófico, político-teórico y contemporáneo, así como en la agenda de

los grandes movimientos sociales y fuerzas políticas de nuestro tiempo- sea una de las tareas más urgentes y productivas de la hora."

Como correctamente lo dice Claudio Katz: "¿Qué sentido tiene batallar contra la opresión capitalista sin desarrollar un proyecto alternativo?" Lo importante hoy, más aún: lo imprescindible, es revisar críticamente esos primeros pasos del socialismo planteado por Carlos Marx y Federico Engels, los primeros balbuceos, podría decirse: con apenas un siglo contra seis o siete siglos desde los primeros atisbos capitalistas en la Liga Hanseática en el norte europeo para que, corrigiendo errores, que, por supuesto, los hubo, plantear cómo continuar la lucha por un mundo que supere al oprobioso capitalismo.

Aunque las primeras experiencias socialistas sufrieron reveses, hoy, como se dijo más arriba, hablar de "socialismo" no es lo habitual, y aunque la maquinaria mediático-cultural-ideológica del capitalismo dominante intente mostrar la imposibilidad de ese "afiebrado e irrealizable" sueño de una sociedad de iguales, el socialismo sigue siendo una esperanza. Existió, lo cual muestra que sí es posible, y sigue existiendo. El ideario socialista sin dudas continúa vigente, porque las causas que lo originaron se mantienen absolutamente vigentes. Decir que esas primeras y balbuceantes experiencias fracasaron es, como mínimo, una falta de respeto, o más precisamente, un enorme error de apreciación. O peor aún: un vómito ideológico. Lograron avances fabulosos. Como un mínimo ejemplo, se podrán dar muchos más, solo baste con ver lo que sucedió en el primer Estado obrero y campesino de la historia, la Rusia bolchevique, dirigida primero por Lenin, y luego por Stalin: de un país feudal pasó a ser la segunda potencia mundial (económica, científico-técnica, militar, cultural) en solo unas décadas.

Por supuesto que hay logros fabulosos, aunque la propaganda capitalista los minimice: salario mínimo y digno para toda la clase trabajadora, descanso semanal remunerado, vacaciones pagas, licencia por maternidad, transporte público de alta calidad subvencionado (el metro de Moscú se considera una gran obra de arte, única en su tipo), calefacción hogareña subvencionada, vivienda digna asegurada para toda la población, electrificación de todo el país y un enorme parque industrial, granjas agrícola-ganaderas comunitarias de muy alta productividad, educación gratuita, laica y obligatoria para toda la población, alfabetización del 100% de sus habitantes, universidades e institutos de investigación del más alto prestigio a nivel mundial, salud de alta calidad gratuita para toda la población, completa erradicación de la desnutrición, plena igualdad de derechos para hombres y mujeres, voto femenino, derecho de aborto (primer país del mundo en tenerlo), divorcio legalizado, derogación de la normativa zarista que prohibía la homosexualidad, avances científico-técnicos portentosos (primer satélite artificial de la historia, primer ser humano en el espacio, desarrollo de la energía nuclear civil, tecnologías metalúrgicas de avanzada, grandes logros en biotecnología, caucho sintético,

telefonía móvil), poder popular real a través del desarrollo de democracia directa con implementación de los soviets (consejos obrero-campesinos y de soldados), fabuloso fomento del arte y la cultura (cine, teatro, música, literatura, ballet, arquitectura), derrota de la invasión nazi durante la Segunda Guerra Mundial (avanzada militar azuzada por las potencias capitalistas de la época para destruir la Revolución).

La pregunta es por qué esa experiencia cayó; por qué, tras esos grandes avances, entró en un período de burocratización, generándose nuevamente una virtual división de clases, y la población no defendió sus derechos cuando el golpe de Estado restaurador del capitalismo, oficial en 1991. De China, el otro gran país que produjo su revolución socialista, también hay logros fundamentales. Es incuestionable que, de ser un país semifeudal en el momento de la revolución en 1949, pudo sacar de la pobreza rural crónica a 500 millones de personas, constituyéndose en poco tiempo en una superpotencia en todos los órdenes, con un nivel de vida de su población sumamente satisfactorio.

Sin dudas, el socialismo es posible, aunque las fuerzas del capital hagan todo lo imaginable para impedirlo. De todos modos, hoy, al momento de escribirse este opúsculo, la marcha del mundo pareciera indicar que la posibilidad de una revolución anticapitalista va saliendo de circulación. “El gran problema estratégico radica en que muchos pensadores consideran que la izquierda debe centrarse en la construcción de un modelo de capitalismo posliberal. Esta idea obstruye los procesos de radicalización. Supone que ser de izquierda es ser posliberal, que ser de izquierda es bregar por un capitalismo organizado, humano, productivo. Esta idea socava a la izquierda desde hace varios años, porque ser de izquierda es luchar contra el capitalismo. Me parece que es el abecé. Ser socialista es bregar por un mundo comunista”, afirma con razón Claudio Katz.

Ese mundo comunista ¿por qué no sería posible? No solo es posible, sino imperiosamente necesario. Analizar las experiencias socialistas realmente existentes surgidas en el siglo XX puede darnos pistas de cómo seguir luchando para conseguir ese horizonte post capitalista. En el socialismo real hubo inmensos, inconmensurables errores. Pero no olvidar que esas experiencias nunca pasaron de algunas décadas; el capitalismo lleva siete siglos de acumulación. Por otro lado, ¿qué se esperaba de las revoluciones socialistas: paraísos?

11 de marzo de 2024.